




Anuario de Psicología Jurídica 2021

<https://journals.copmadrid.org/apj>



Legal Consciousness: A Systematic Review of its Conceptualization and Measurement Methods¹

Filip Horák^a, David Lacko^b, and Adam Klocek^b

^aCharles University, Prague, Czech Republic; ^bMasaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 7 September 2019
Accepted 25 April 2020
Available online 26 June 2020

Keywords:

Legal consciousness
Legal knowledge
Conceptualization
Systematic review
Legitimacy

ABSTRACT

This article reports on a conducted systematic review focused on conceptualization and measurement methods of legal consciousness, which can be understood as the equivalent for the legitimacy of law. A systematic search identified 2,054 articles, resulting in the inclusion of 156 relevant articles after two phases of the screening process. Articles analyzed lacked a clear conceptualization of a legal consciousness construct and validated methods of its measurement with satisfactory quality. A considerable room for improvement was found for both conceptualization and measurement methods of legal consciousness. This review identifies six separate components of legal consciousness (general knowledge, skills, specific knowledge, attitudes, trust, and identity) and offers a unifying and comprehensive definition of legal consciousness based on those components. Using descriptive characteristics and inference statistics, main methodological weaknesses of selected articles were discussed and a set of criteria for optimal measurement method of legal consciousness was introduced.

La conciencia jurídica: una revisión sistemática de su conceptualización y de los métodos de medición

RESUMEN

Este artículo versa sobre la revisión sistemática de los métodos de conceptualización y medición de la conciencia jurídica, que puede entenderse como el equivalente de la legitimidad del derecho. La búsqueda sistemática identificó 2,054 artículos, que dio lugar a la inclusión de 156 artículos relevantes después de dos fases en el proceso de selección. Los artículos analizados carecían de una conceptualización clara del constructo de conciencia jurídica y de métodos validados de medición de suficiente calidad. Se vio que había bastantes posibilidades de mejorar tanto la conceptualización como los métodos de medición de la conciencia jurídica. Esta revisión encuentra seis componentes distintos de la conciencia jurídica (conocimiento general, habilidades, conocimiento específico, actitudes, confianza e identidad) y ofrece una definición unificadora e integral de la conciencia jurídica basada en esos componentes. Utilizando las características descriptivas y estadística inferencial se abordan los principales fallos metodológicos de los artículos seleccionados y se propone una serie de criterios de un método óptimo de medición de la conciencia jurídica.

Palabras clave:

Conciencia jurídica
Conocimiento jurídico
Conceptualización
Revisión sistemática
Legitimidad legal

The aim of this article is to conduct a systematic review of articles on both the conceptualization and the measurement possibilities of legal consciousness (hereinafter LC). There are two main goals of this review: the unification of the so far highly diverse terminology and the exploration of recent measurement methods in the field.

We argue that further development of LC research field is of crucial importance in current legal science, because LC itself can

be understood and explored as one of the core elements of the legitimacy of any legal system (Jennes & Calavita, 2018; Young, 2014). Generally, two different ways of accessing legitimacy of law can be distinguished. First, legitimate law should be “justifiable” (i.e., considered as potentially just and acceptable by legal philosophers and other professionals). Second, legitimate law ought to be also “justified” (i.e., considered as actually just and acceptable by citizens

Cite this article as: Horák, F., Lacko, D., & Klocek, A. (2021). Legal consciousness: A systematic review of its conceptualization and measurement methods. *Anuario de Psicología Jurídica*, 31, 9-34. <https://doi.org/10.5093/apj2021a2>

Funding: This article is part of the project Specific academic research “Legal Consciousness: Concept, Formation, Effects with respect to the Impact of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union on Legal Consciousness in the Czech Republic” [in Czech language: “Právní vědomí: pojem, formování, účinky se zvláštním zřetelem k působení Listiny základních práv Evropské unie na právní vědomí v České republice.”] solved at the Faculty of Law, Charles University. The work was supported by the grant SVV 260 495/2020.

Correspondence: david.lacko@mail.muni.cz (D. Lacko).

ISSN: 1133-0740/© 2021 Colegio Oficial de la Psicología de Madrid. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

or, in other words, by those who are supposed to follow legal rules; see Horák & Lacko, 2019a).

We claim that this second meaning of legitimacy of law is in fact equivalent to LC. This leads us to conclude that, if LC was empirically measurable, it would be also possible to empirically measure the level of legitimacy of law in the population and use these results to offer scientifically based advices and recommendations to both legislative and judicial bodies. Proper scientific analysis of people's demands for and reactions to legal development could allow a gradual adaptation of law-making and law-interpretation processes according to findings provided by "behavioral legal science" (Berns, 1963; Korobkin & Ulen, 2000; Sunstein et al., 1998; analogously to "behavioral economics"; Thaler, 1980; Kahneman & Tversky, 2000). Through this research, legitimacy as well as the entire functioning of the legal system could be significantly improved, which makes this research justified and desirable (see Horák & Lacko, 2019b).

LC research development is nevertheless significantly slowed down by a serious problem, which is inability of researchers to agree upon LC's universal and broadly accepted definition. We argue that questions of "what exactly we do measure" and "how we should measure it" are yet to be answered and without the answers to these questions LC research cannot fulfil its theoretical, empirical, and practical potential (for a deeper discussion, see Horák & Lacko, 2019b).

Therefore, a systematic review focused on conceptualization and measurement of LC seems to be not just helpful but also necessary. This conclusion is even amplified by the fact that there is no previous truly systematic review on LC concept available.

Background

The term LC itself has gone through a significant development (see Stevens, 2013), which gradually broadened and blurred its meaning. The investigation of LC has a long history, beginning with Ehrlich (1913) and empirical studies investigating the knowledge of specific laws (e.g., Flavier & Chen, 1980). The most frequent term in those studies seemed to be the legal knowledge which was quantitatively measured. Simultaneously, the term LC was used, but it referred to the particular form of consciousness that characterizes the legal profession as a social group, at a particular moment. It contained a vast number of legal rules, arguments, and theories, a great deal of information about the institutional workings of the legal process, and the constellation of ideals and goals current in the profession at a given moment (Kennedy, 1980, p. 23).

This rather quantitative approach was considered as too reductionistic and therefore unsatisfactory, which initiated both methodological and conceptual discussions. Current development in this field is therefore characteristic for its clash of diverse approaches.

LC has become a more general term which encompassed not only the knowledge of the legal system but also the ways ordinary people think of, talk about, and understand law in their everyday lives (Ewick & Silbey, 1998; Merry, 1990; Nielsen, 2000; Sarat, 1990). The LC concept was thus understood as the integration of terms such as legal knowledge, legal awareness, trust in law, and opinion about law, etc. Furthermore, it expanded its focus from legal experts to the general population. As far as conceptualization of LC is concerned, studies focused primarily on a deeper understanding of specific LC components including their classification. For instance, Ewick and Silbey (1998) presented three schemas of LC, namely "before the law", "with the law", and "against the law". Another example can be Hull's (2003) argumentation that LC should be understood as a "layered phenomenon", composed of cognitive and behavioral layers. Generally, this approach, based on more psychological point of view, can be characterized as an individual, static, or micro perspective focusing on LC as a measurable variable (i.e., the state of knowledge,

understanding, skills, opinions, or beliefs concerning law at a certain moment) through qualitative research designs based mainly on narrative interviews or ethnographic evidence (e.g., Peterson-Badali & Abramovitch, 1992).

A second paradigm, which evolved gradually as a reaction to the former one, used a more sociological approach and analyzed social relations whereby the meanings, opinions, and beliefs concerning law are created and recreated. Therefore, this approach can be described as social or macro perspective (Silbey, 2005) and also rather qualitative, for it gains results primarily through qualitative methods and surveys (Gómez, 2016).

The most recent development tried to overcome this cleavage through "second-order legal consciousness research" was based upon the idea of individuals adjusting their LC according to their subjective assumptions of the state of LC within the society (i.e., the people around them). Such an approach, therefore, connects both the individual and the social point of view as well as focuses on the dynamic processes of LC creation and modifications rather than on static LC measurement (Gómez, 2016; Young, 2014).

This whole development led to both conceptual and methodological diversity in the LC research field, making the concept of LC rather blurred or terminologically ambivalent. This situation was probably caused by the interdisciplinary nature of LC integrating psychological (Nielsen, 2000), sociological (Hirsh & Lyons, 2010), legal (Klare, 1978; Mandelstam, 1996), pedagogical (Ashar, 2016), and other perspectives.

The conceptualization problem is even amplified by the fact that there have not been any attempts to agree upon a universal and broadly accepted definition of this concept yet (Ranasinghe, 2010). Consequently, many of the analyzed studies do not correspond to one another, even though they actually use the same terminology. Most LC researchers discuss the same term but measure completely different constructs. As far as methodology is concerned, again, the enormous diversity ranging from the most rigorous quantitative methods (e.g., experiments) to the variety of qualitative approaches (e.g., in-depth interviews or ethnographic studies) causes the inability of LC researchers to agree upon and validate optimal measurement methods. We believe that the systematic review which is presented in this article can contribute to the solution of all these problems.

For the purposes of this review, it is, therefore, necessary to include as many diverse and frequently overlapping terms and constructs corresponding to LC as possible (see searching string). As mentioned before, the meaning and terminological ambivalence of LC was gradually increasing till the current state, where the concept of LC might include numerous constructs, such as "public sense of justice" (Balvig et al., 2015), "knowledge about law" (Swoboda et al., 1978), "legal knowledge" (Riles, 2008), "trust/faith in law" (Messing et al., 2015), "law awareness" (Uzoka, 2016), "legal awareness" (Macura et al., 2011), "sense of justice" (Tapp & Kohlberg, 1971). The majority of scientists usually choose one or more of those constructs and define it differently. However, most of those definitions share some elements with one another. Hence, it is necessary to take all of them into consideration.

Method

Systematic Review

A systematic review is defined by strict and well described procedures, namely locating, sorting, extracting information from previous sources, and synthesizing the results in one complex study treating eligible sources as individual cases and comparing them with one another (Farrington & Petrosino, 2001). Application of systematic review procedures in the field of law seems to be both possible and desirable (see Baude et al., 2017; Davies & Boruch,

2001). Moreover, the systematic review is useful for the selection of an optimal specific measurement method (Terwee et al., 2012), which is one of the primary goals of this article. Therefore, we used systematic review with elements of integrative and scoping review (see Grant & Booth, 2009; Whitemore & Knafl, 2005; Peters et al., 2015) in order to achieve the aforementioned goals. Due to lack of evidence-based results in this field, no explicit hypotheses were set; therefore, this research shall be understood as exploratory.

Database Search Strategy

To systematize and synthesize the research of LC, a systematic literature review was conducted, targeting all aforementioned constructs encompassing qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methodological approaches as well as various measurement methods and study designs because the primary goal of the article was to analyze current LC measurement methods. A systematic search was applied within three electronic databases (EBSCO, Web of Science, and SCOPUS) to recognize the vast majority of relevant articles. The search was conducted during December 2017. We used the following searching string²: “legal consciousness” OR “public sense of justice” OR “knowledge about law” OR “legal knowledge” OR “trust in law” OR “faith in law” OR “law awareness” OR “legal awareness” OR “sense of justice”) AND (“quantitative” OR “method” OR “experiment” OR “measurement” OR “assessment” OR “evaluation” OR “screening” OR “classification” OR “level” OR “data” OR “index” OR “scale” OR “questionnaire” OR “interview”) AND (“pupils” OR “adolescents” OR “students” OR “children” OR “youth” OR “young adults” OR “adults” OR “older adults” OR “elderly” OR “seniors”)

rater reliability ($\alpha = .806$). This result showed that there would be only 4.16% chance estimation of alpha being below the usable minimum of .67 if all abstracts were tested and thus all reviewers coded article very similarly.

During the second step, all remaining articles were again divided into thirds, swapped between the reviewers, and their full texts were examined. Eligibility (e.g., inclusion/exclusion) criteria used in both screening phases were: a) study contained at least one of the LC-related constructs (i.e., LC component); b) study contained at least any kind of measurement; c) study contained data of real (i.e., not simulated or artificial) population; and d) study language was English.

The direct results of the inclusion process (search & screening) are depicted in the PRISMA consort diagram in Figure 1. Primary database search found 2,054 articles. After removing duplicates, 1,836 articles in the abstract screening phase and 300 articles in the full text screening phase were analyzed. Finally, 156 articles were included into the study (Figure 1).

Data Extraction and Coding

After full text screening, relevant information, e.g., country, legal system, study design, population characteristics or LC components (complete list of variables is depicted in online supplement material 1 - Methodological properties description) from eligible studies were extracted and coded.

Methodological properties (MP) were also extracted, categorized and coded. Separated sets of MP categories were created for quantitative (based on Higgins et al., 2011), qualitative (based on Long & Godfrey, 2004), and mixed (based on Fàbregues & Molina-Azorín, 2017; Heyvaert et al., 2013) methodological approaches with modifications in order to be better suited for both the socio-legal research and LC construct specifications (for all MP categories, see Table 3; for definitions of categories, see Appendix).

Results

This chapter is divided into two parts – Descriptive characteristics of articles and Differences among articles. Data extracted from 156 articles included and processed with IBM SPSS Statistics (v. 25) are comprehensively reported in Appendix.

Descriptive Characteristics of Articles

In order to conduct general descriptive statistics, we separated the articles according to the methodological approaches used into qualitative ($n = 32$), quantitative ($n = 76$) and mixed ($n = 48$) clusters. Most of the studies were examined within the Anglo-Saxon legal system (73.7%), especially in the USA (47.4%). Even though 114 studies (73.1%) focused on LC as their primary outcome, only 43 (27.6%) of all studies had a theoretically based background. Although the majority of studies used a descriptive (42.9%) and analytical (36.5%) study design, only few studies (3.8%) used an experimental design, which is adequate for an analysis of causal relationships.

The most used standardized methods include the Inventory of Legal Knowledge (ILK; $n = 5$), MacArthur Competency Assessment Tool - Criminal Adjudication (MacCAT-CA; $n = 5$), Survey of Children’s Legal Rights ($n = 3$), Ethical and Legal Issues in Counseling Questionnaire (ELICQ; $n = 2$), and Test of Malingered Incompetence (TOMI-L; $n = 2$).

Based on the variety of terms used and constructs measured in the analyzed articles, LC components were identified and coded during data gathering. The most frequently used construct corresponded to a) knowledge about the functions of basic legal regulation, institutions, and the laws, which also incorporates the basic ability to search for such information and to use it (coded as general legal knowledge, LC1,




Figure 1. Prisma Consort Flow Diagrama.

Screening and Eligibility Criteria

The articles found during database search were imported into Mendeley (v1.18) and after removal of duplicates a two-step process of article screening (abstract screening and full text screening) was used in order to remove irrelevant articles. During the first step, screening of titles, abstracts, and keywords of articles were performed. Articles were divided into thirds and examined by the three reviewers independently. Krippendorff’s alpha (Hayes & Krippendorff, 2007) within the 100 shared articles demonstrated high satisfactory inter-

Table 1. Descriptive Article Characteristics

		Quan	Qual	Mixed	Total
Country	USA	34 (44.7%)	20 (62.5%)	20 (41.7%)	74 (47.4%)
	UK	5 (6.6%)	3 (9.4%)	7 (14.6%)	15 (9.6%)
	Canada	2 (2.6%)	2 (6.3%)	10 (20.8%)	14 (9%)
	Australia	5 (6.6%)	-	3 (6.3%)	8 (5.1%)
	Other	30 (39.5%)	7 (21.9%)	8 (16.7%)	45 (29.8%)
Legal system	Anglo-Saxon	46 (67.5%)	28 (87.5%)	41 (85.4%)	115 (73.7%)
	Continental	23 (30.3%)	4 (12.5%)	4 (8.3%)	31 (19.9%)
	Sharia	1 (1.3%)	-	1 (2.1%)	2 (1.3%)
	Other	6 (7.9%)	-	2 (4.2%)	8 (5.1%)
Method type	Questionnaire	65 (85.5%)	1 (3.1%)	19 (39.6%)	85 (55%)
	Interview	4 (5.3%)	23 (71.9%)	5 (10.5%)	32 (20.5%)
	Hybrid	6 (7.9%)	5 (15.6%)	20 (41.6%)	31 (19.5%)
	Other	1 (1.3%)	3 (9.4%)	4 (8.3%)	8 (5%)
Study design	Descriptive	26 (34.2%)	26 (81.3%)	15 (31.3%)	67 (42.9%)
	Analytical (pre-post, correlation)	35 (41.6%)	4 (12.5%)	18 (37.5%)	57 (36.5%)
	Analytical (between groups)	12 (15.8%)	1 (3.1%)	11 (22.9%)	24 (15.4%)
	Experimental	2 (2.6%)	-	4 (8.3%)	6 (3.8%)
	Quasi-experimental	1 (1.3%)	1 (3.1%)	-	2 (1.3%)
Theory-based background	Yes	13 (17.1%)	17 (53.1%)	13 (27.1%)	43 (27.6%)
Outcome	Primary	48 (63.2%)	25 (78.1%)	41 (85.4%)	114 (73.1%)
Complexity of LC (sum of LC components)	5	-	1 (3.1%)	5 (10.4%)	6 (3.8%)
	4	3 (3.9%)	5 (15.6%)	2 (4.2%)	10 (6.8%)
	3	20 (26.3%)	5 (15.6%)	10 (20.8%)	35 (22.4%)
	2	19 (25%)	13 (40.6%)	21 (43.8%)	53 (34%)
	1	34 (44.7%)	8 (25%)	10 (20.8%)	52 (33.3%)
LC Components	LC 5	11 (14.5%)	20 (62.5%)	9 (18.8%)	40 (25.6%)
	LC 4	18 (23.7%)	23 (71.9%)	16 (33.3%)	57 (36.5%)
	LC 3	65 (85.5%)	14 (43.8%)	40 (83.3%)	119 (76.3%)
	LC 2	24 (31.6%)	10 (31.3%)	21 (43.8%)	55 (35.3%)
	LC 1	26 (34.2%)	7 (21.9%)	29 (60.4%)	62 (39.7%)

39.7%); b) the ability to orientate oneself in a legal environment and to perform basic juridical acts such as filing a lawsuit, concluding a contract, or finding a proper attorney (coded as legal awareness, LC2, 35.3%); c) more detailed knowledge of a particular area of legislation (coded as ad hoc legal knowledge, LC3, 76.3%); d) critical reasoning about and an evaluation of a certain legal regulation or court decision (coded as opinion about law, LC4, 36.5%); and e) general trust in law within a state or society, i.e., an abstract, often affective attitude of citizens towards the legal system (coded as trust in law, LC5, 25.6%).

We also reported the complexity of LC (i.e., the sum of all five LC components). The majority of the studies reached the complexity of up to three points (89.4%), whereas only a few articles reached the complexity of 4 or 5 points (10.6%). This indicates that there is an enormous space for further research as far as complexity of the entire LC construct is concerned. The detailed descriptive characteristics of all articles are shown in Table 1.

It is important to highlight that the general population was examined only in 17.9% of the articles, whereas specific populations

Table 2. Sample and Demographic Characteristics

		Quan	Qual	Mixed	Total
Sample size	Range	32-11155	19-427	7-4747	7-11155
	Mean (SD)	1172.9 (2234.41)	81.7 (95.76)	572.4 (1067.29)	775.1 (1728.28)
	Median (IQR)	392 (133-867)	55 (27-98)	156 (65-458)	190.5 (76-643)
Sample age	Reported	31 (40.8%)	7 (21.9%)	21 (43.8%)	59 (37.8%)
	Mean (SD)	32.1 (9.30%)	35.8 (5.91)	26.36 (11.54)	30.5 (10.25)
Gender	Reported	53 (69.7%)	20 (62.5%)	29 (60.4%)	102 (65.4%)
	Female	54.18%	53.95%	43.56%	51%
Education	Reported	13 (17.1%)	8 (25%)	6 (12.6%)	27 (17.3%)
SES	Reported	4 (5.3%)	3 (9.4%)	3 (6.3%)	10 (6.4%)
Nationality/ ethnicity	Reported	27 (35.5%)	18 (56.3%)	19 (39.4%)	64 (41%)
Population	General	19 (25%)	2 (6.3%)	7 (14.6%)	28 (17.9%)
	Children	2 (2.6%)	1 (3.1%)	5 (10.4%)	8 (5.1%)
	Specific adults	20 (26.3%)	19 (59.4%)	12 (25%)	51 (32.7%)
	Legal experts	1 (1.3%)	3 (9.4%)	3 (6.3%)	7 (4.5%)
	Other experts	20 (26.3%)	3 (9.4%)	11 (22.9%)	34 (21.8%)
	Mixed	8 (10.5%)	3 (9.4%)	8 (16.7%)	19 (12.2%)
	Not reported	6 (7.9%)	1 (3.1%)	2 (4.2%)	9 (5.8%)

(e.g., homeless, LGBT, drug users, and inmates) in 32.7% of the articles. Moreover, only seven studies focused on populations of legal experts (4.5%). It is also interesting to point out that only a few articles reported relevant socio-cultural variables such as SES (6.4%), education (17.3%), nationality/ethnicity (41%), and age (37.8%). Even gender was reported only in 65.4% of the articles. The median sample size was 190.5 (range = 7-11155) and the mean age of participants was 30.5 years (range = 8.6-49.1). It is interesting that articles with reported age completely lack the population of older adults with the mean age higher than 50. Detailed descriptive characteristics of the sample are shown in Table 2.

MPs were estimated for each methodological approach separately. Quantitative studies varied between 0.5 and 4.5 points (max 7 points; $M = 2.22$, $SD = 0.99$). Qualitative studies varied between 1 and 5 points (max 6 points; $M = 3.03$, $SD = 1.08$) and mixed methods studies varied between 0.5 and 9 points (max 13 points; $M = 4.82$, $SD = 2.31$). However, mean values of quantitative, qualitative, and mixed studies cannot be compared due to different MP categories for each approach. In general, irrespective of which methodological approach was used, the articles analyzed showed a rather lower to moderate MP³.

Table 3 represents the mean score of individual categories of MP (1 = best MP score). As a consequence, the main weaknesses of each methodological approach could be described. Within the sample of qualitative studies, the main weaknesses were in impact of findings (i.e., transparent, clarified, and easily utilized results). As could be expected, these studies had relatively rich theoretical background because of its qualitative nature. However, the result of .452 is still unsatisfactory because this category should be main strength of qualitative approach. Within the sample of quantitative studies, the main weaknesses were in psychometric properties of used methods (i.e., reliability, validity) and lack of comparability and randomized sampling. Also, their theoretical background was unsatisfactory. Within the sample of mixed studies, main weaknesses were categories responsible for conjunction of both qualitative and quantitative approaches (i.e., mix design utilization and symbiosis), unsatisfactory theoretical background, as well as insufficient psychometric properties responsible for both quantitative (validity) and qualitative (data analysis) parts of the studies. Similarly to quantitative studies, mixed studies showed unsatisfactory comparability and randomized sampling as well.

Table 3. Scores of Individual Categories of Methodological Properties

	Quan	Qual	Mixed
Theory-based	.169	.452	.198
Adequate setting context	-	.516	-
Adequate sample context	-	.581	.573
Transparent data collection process	-	.774	.729
Data analysis (elements of validity and reliability estimate)	-	.500	.313
Impact of findings/ results	.597	.210	.053
Reliability	.273	-	.448
Validity	.260	-	.313
Comparability and randomized sampling	.006	-	.042
Attributability of LC components	.461	-	.500
Representativeness of sample	.448	-	.406
Mix design utilization	-	-	.083
Systemicity of research	-	-	.458
Symbiosis between qualitative and quantitative measurements	-	-	.229

Differences among Articles

Despite the explorative character of the research and the absence of the explicit set of hypotheses, we decided to perform statistical

inference. For this purpose, we included all potential variables into analysis in order to provide regular hypothesis testing. However, for the purpose of avoiding data fishing, all expected relations and differences are described and explained in each of three following thematically coherent subsections (i.e., Differences between Methodological Approaches, Differences in LC Complexity, and Differences between LC Components concerning LC Measurement).

The nominal or ordinal character of the examined variables and their non-parametric distributions (Shapiro-Wilk tests were performed) determined possible statistical procedures primarily to robust and non-parametric analysis, such as chi-square tests (χ^2), Mann-Whitney (U), Kruskal-Wallis (H), their adequate effect sizes (Cramer's V , ϕ , r , E^2_R), and post-hoc tests where appropriate.

Differences between methodological approaches. In this part differences between the methodological approach (i.e., quantitative, qualitative, and mixed) and five other variables (i.e., method type, theory-based background, primary outcome, study design, and legal system) were analyzed (see Table 4).

Two statistically significant differences (method type and study design) were expected, because specific methodological approaches imply specific study designs and adequate measurement methods (e.g., quantitative approach typically uses questionnaires and qualitative approach is often descriptive).

We also expected that continental legal researchers should prefer quantitative approach and that Anglo-Saxon legal researchers, who gradually accepted rather sociological and second-order LC paradigm, should prefer qualitative approach. Although continental researchers used quantitative approach in 74.2% studies and Anglo-Saxon researchers only in 40% studies, the difference was not statistically significant.

Finally, two statistically significant differences (theory-based background and primary outcome) were found. More specifically, the qualitative approach was more theory-based than other approaches and mixed approach focused more on LC as its primary outcome than quantitative approach. The difference within theory-based background can be explained by the rather theoretical character of qualitative approach compared to the other two. We therefore assume that numerous quantitative and mixed studies examined some of the LC components without realizing the entirety of the LC concept, including its theoretical background (e.g., knowledge of a specific law among nurses; see Cho et al., 2015). Nevertheless, this assumption also suggests that researchers using a qualitative approach should be more likely aware of LC as the primary outcome, which was not confirmed. However, this result had only weak effect size.

Differences in LC complexity. This part analyzes the differences between LC complexity (i.e., the number of LC components distinguished in the studies) and six other variables (i.e., method type, methodological approach, primary outcome, study design, theory-based background and primary outcome + theory-based background). Differences in this part were either not significant or significant but with rather weak effect sizes (see Table 5).

We expected that a more theoretical qualitative methodological approach, a non-reductionist descriptive study design, and more complex hybrid methods would imply higher LC complexity. Nevertheless, statistically significant differences were found only in two of these cases (method type and methodological approach). Surprisingly, the difference between LC complexity and the study design was not significant. Furthermore, the difference between LC complexity and methodological approach had only minimal effect size and did not show any significant result in the post hoc test. These results suggest that even those approaches and methods which aim to assess the LC concept more comprehensively were not actually able to achieve such a goal.

We also supposed that researchers who are aware of LC concept of their primary outcome and are able to offer LC theoretical background properly should study LC in a rather complex and comprehensive

Table 4. Results of Statistical Inferences for Methodological Approaches

Differences between methodological approach and...	Test	p-value	Effect size (ES)	Post hoc tests (Bonferroni method; reported only sig. differences)
Method type	$\chi^2(14) = 117.208$	< .001	$V = .613$ (Large ES)	Questionnaires were more likely used in quantitative studies, whereas more rarely used in qualitative studies ($p < .05$). Interviews were more likely used in qualitative studies in comparison with others ($p < .05$). Hybrid, i.e., combination of multiple methods, was more likely utilized in mixed studies ($p < .05$).
Theory-based background	$\chi^2(2) = 14.641$	= .001	$\phi = .306$ (Medium ES)	Qualitative studies had more theory-based background compared to quantitative and mixed studies ($p < .05$).
Primary outcome	$\chi^2(2) = 7.930$	= .019	$\phi = .225$ (Weak ES)	Primary outcome measurement was more likely in mixed studies compared to quantitative studies ($p < .05$).
Study design	$\chi^2(8) = 31.170$	< .001	$V = .316$ (Medium ES)	Descriptive study design was used in qualitative studies rather than in the others ($p < .05$).
Legal system	$\chi^2(8) = 15.420$	= .051 (ns)	Not performed	Not performed

Note. ns = non-significant.

Table 5. Results of Statistical Inferences for LC Complexity

Differences between LC complexity and...	Test	p-value	Effect size (ES)	Post hoc tests (Mann Whitney used as pairwise post-hoc; reported only sig. differences)
Method type	$H(7) = 16.466$	= .021	$E^2_R = .106$ (Weak ES)	Studies with hybrid method were slightly more complex than studies used only questionnaire ($p = .043$)
Methodological approach	$H(2) = 6.195$	= .045	$E^2_R = .039$ (Minimal ES)	No significant differences in post-hoc tests (all $p > .05$).
Primary outcome	$U = 1656$	= .002	$r = -.247$ (weak ES)	No post-hoc test is needed. Studies with LC as the primary outcome of the measurement reached higher complexity of LC.
Study design	$H(4) = 5.902$	= .207 (ns)	Not performed.	Not performed
Theory-based background	$U = 2153$	= .251 (ns)	Not performed.	Not needed
Primary outcome + Theory-based background	$U = 1851.5$	= .317 (ns)	Not performed	Not needed

Note. ns = non-significant.

way. However, the difference between primary outcome and LC complexity had only weak effect size and the difference between theory-based background and LC complexity was not even significant. Possible interpretation of these results is that despite the complex knowledge of the current LC theory, researchers are not able to assess the LC concept comprehensively. Although the focus on LC as the primary outcome is a necessary condition of the complex approach, it is certainly not sufficient.

In addition, we created a new combined variable (i.e., primary outcome + theory-based background) in order to analyze differences within LC complexity between studies, which cumulatively were theory-based and focused on LC as a primary outcome, and the other studies. This difference was neither statistically significant, which could suggest that even meeting both of these properties is not enough to assess the LC concept more comprehensively. Nevertheless, statistical insignificance cannot be understood as a proof of non-existing relation (i.e., a proof in favor of the null hypothesis).

Differences between LC components concerning LC measurement. The final part of statistical inference presents differences between each of the LC components (i.e., LC1-LC5) and two variables related to LC measurement (i.e., method type and methodological approach; see Table 6).

We assumed that the aforementioned LC measurement aspects are determined by the character of individual LC components. LC1-LC3, which are typically a set of information or skills regarding positive law, should be more frequently examined by quantitative and analytical tools (e.g., questionnaires with closed-ended questions), whereas LC4-LC5, which are characteristic for their attitudinal or emotional relations of an individual towards law, ought to be more suitably examined by qualitative and descriptive tools (e.g., in-depth interviews with open-ended questions or vignettes).

The findings of the statistical inference indicated significant

differences between methodological approaches and specific LC components, namely the qualitative methodological approach was more frequently used for the study of components LC4 and LC5, whereas quantitative or mixed methodological approaches were more frequently used for the investigation of component LC3. Moreover, researchers used various methods and study designs depending on measured LC components. Namely, LC1 and LC3 were examined more via questionnaire and hybrid methods than via interview, and LC5 was mostly examined via interviews.

These results are in compliance with our expectations and suggest that in the context of LC measurement it is necessary to use adequate measurement methods determined by the specific character of each LC component.

Discussion

Possibilities of LC Construct Conceptualization

The first main goal presented in this article was the creation of a new general and unifying definition of the LC construct. During full text screening and coding phase of the research new LC-related terms emerged, which could possibly be included into the LC construct (e.g., “legal nihilism”, Hendley, 2012; “legal literacy”, Preston-Shoot & McKimm, 2013; “competency to stand a trial”, Ficke et al., 2006). Nevertheless, each of these terms were successfully incorporated into one of the distinguished LC components (LC1-LC5) and were, therefore, not able to further broaden the meaning of the LC concept.

Contrary to the aforementioned terms, there were actually identified two constructs related to LC, which could potentially enrich the LC concept with new valuable content or meaning. First, the LC “conative/behavioral element” was found in several

Table 6. Results of Statistical Inferences for LC Components

Differences between LC components and...	Test	p-value	Effect size (ES)	Post hoc tests (Bonferroni method; reported only sig. <i>r</i> differences)
LC1 and method type	$\chi^2(7) = 13.804$	= .027	$V = .318$ (medium ES)	LC1 was examined by hybrid method rather than by interview ($p < .05$)
LC2 and method type	$\chi^2(7) = 14.795$	= .039	$V = .308$ (medium ES)	Post hoc-test did not find any significant results (all $p > .05$).
LC3 and method type	$\chi^2(7) = 22.765$	= .002	$V = .382$ (medium ES)	LC3 was examined by questionnaire rather than by interview ($p < .05$).
LC4 and method type	$\chi^2(7) = 10.487$	= .163 (<i>ns</i>)	Not performed.	Not performed.
LC5 and method type	$\chi^2(7) = 26.082$	< .001	$V = .409$ (medium ES)	LC5 was examined by interview rather than by questionnaire ($p < .05$).
LC1 and methodological approaches	$\chi^2(2) = 13.804$	= .001	$V = .297$ (weak ES)	LC1 was examined by mixed rather than by qualitative or quantitative studies ($p < .05$).
LC2 and methodological approaches	$\chi^2(2) = 2.192$	= .334 (<i>ns</i>)	Not performed	Not performed
LC3 and methodological approaches	$\chi^2(2) = 23.627$	< .001	$V = .389$ (medium ES)	LC3 was investigated rather by quantitative and mixed compared to qualitative studies ($p < .05$).
LC4 and methodological approaches	$\chi^2(2) = 22.86$	< .001	$V = .383$ (medium ES)	LC4 ($p < .05$) was examined rather by qualitative studies in comparison to mixed and quantitative studies.
LC5 and methodological approaches	$\chi^2(2) = 28.968$	< .001	$V = .431$ (medium ES)	LC5 ($p < .05$) were examined rather by qualitative studies in comparison to mixed and quantitative studies.

Note. *ns* = non-significant.

articles (e.g., Al-Rukaibi et al., 2008; Hull, 2003; Jiang et al., 2013; Sarat, 1975). Compliance or non-compliance with the law would probably covariate with LC. Nevertheless, it can be objected that non compliance with the law is a consequence rather than an inherent part of LC itself. The conative part was therefore not included into our LC conceptualization.

Second, “legal identity” was found in few articles (LC6; e.g., Muñoz, 2016). This LC component should be even more abstract than trust in law and shall contain beliefs and values about what should the ideal system of legal norms look like. By incorporating this component, an individual not only becomes the object of legal regulation but also its co-creator. Law and an individual (as a member of society) create hereon mutually constitutive relationship, which corresponds to the newest LC research development described in the first chapter of this article. Despite its inclusion into our LC conceptualization, this LC component was identified in a negligible number of articles and was, therefore, not reported in the Results section.

Based on the previously presented overview of possible LC-related constructs as well as of descriptive characteristics, we suggest that the LC concept shall consist of six components (LC1-LC6), namely “general legal knowledge” (LC1; e.g., Crawford & Bull, 2006), “legal awareness” (LC2; e.g., Cho et al., 2015) “ad hoc legal knowledge” (LC3; e.g., Erickson et al., 1993), “opinion about law” (LC4; e.g., Jülich, 2006), “trust in law” (LC5; e.g., Berrey et al., 2012), and “legal identity” (LC6; e.g., Muñoz, 2016).

These components can be further connected into two separate dimensions of LC. LC1-LC3 components are focused on what law is, i.e., “LC ‘real’ dimension” or “de lege lata dimension”, whereas LC4-LC6 components aim at what law ought to be, i.e., “LC ‘ideal’ dimension” or “de lege ferenda dimension” (for further information, see Engel, 1998; Hertogh, 2004; Podgorecki, 1973; Reh binder, 2003).

To conclude the conceptualization, the six LC components (and two LC dimensions respectively) can be synthesized into the following universal (i.e., generally acceptable and cultural independent) definition of the LC concept:

Legal consciousness is a complex of law-related knowledge, skills, attitudes, beliefs, and values of an individual, whereby the mutual relationship between the individual and law is being created, deepened, and developed within the context of specific society and legal system providing such system with the necessary authority and legitimacy for the regulation of human behavior.

We believe that this definition includes all important characteristics of the LC concept and simultaneously excludes all similar but still

different terms and constructs. It also endorses its potential impact on the functioning of the legal system. This is especially crucial in the light of the conceptualization and methodological problems observed in this review. We found that numerous researchers (those using quantitative and mixed approaches more than those using qualitative approach) study LC without even being aware of doing so (see Table 4). Furthermore, even the deep and proper knowledge of current LC theoretical background does not help researchers to achieve higher LC complexity (i.e., to study the LC concept in a sufficiently comprehensive way; see Table 5). This finding suggest that current LC theory is not satisfactory and complex enough.

We suggest that the primary cause of this problem lies in the insufficient and too vague definition of the object of study itself. So far, the most comprehensive definition by Merry (1990), who describes LC as “the ways people understand and use law” and consciousness as “the way people conceive of the ‘natural’ and normal way of doing things, their habitual patterns of talk and action, and their commonsense understanding of the world” (p. 5) is still too general, abstract, and consequently vague. It is impossible to find out, what “understand and use law” specifically means and how to operationalize those properties.

We believe we have provided a clarification of these former definitions within this review article. The definition and conceptualization presented in this article is not in contradiction with current LC paradigms. On the contrary, it combines, deepens, and specifies these definitions as well as current knowledge in order to allow further development of the LC research field.

Possibilities of LC Construct Measurement

The second main goal presented in this article was the comparison of current methods of LC measurement and suggest a set of criteria for the development of the optimal LC measurement method.

At the beginning of this section we focus on several specific methodological problems observed in the analyzed articles. First, examined articles showed a lack of ability to report the results properly because many important values were missing (e.g., effect sizes, reliability and validity estimates, etc.). Second, most of the articles did not report relevant socio-demographic and cultural variables, such as ethnicity, education, age, or SES (see Table 2). We assert that these factors are important determinants of LC at an individual level (see Horák & Lacko, 2019b). Therefore, omitting these variables could limit the analysis of individual differences at LC level.

Third, most of the articles were focused on a specific (i.e., contrary to general) population. Therefore, their results cannot be smoothly generalized to the common society.

Fourth, the majority of studies were conducted in the Anglo-Saxon legal system (see Table 1). Since every legal system and legal culture is unique in a way (Horák & Lacko, 2019a; Horák & Lacko, 2019b), it can be supposed that the LC construct is perceived and understood differently across the world. For example, Miyazawa (1987) argues that LC is understood differently in Japan than in the USA. Thus, it is possible that there are differences in the usage of LC between Anglo-Saxon and continental legal systems (cf. Hertogh, 2004) as well as between two countries within one legal system (cf. Cowan, 2004). Ignoring potential cross-cultural differences represents a danger of artificial implementation of methods and results in societies where they do not fit.

Fifth, all analyzed articles shared weaknesses as far as methodological properties (MP) are concerned (see Table 3). Generally, the MP of the examined articles was not satisfactory even though we deliberately designed it only as a set of minimum requirements for scientific and empirical method of measurement. Although a few of the examined articles evinced an almost maximum level of MP, it is not possible to evaluate them as "ideal", because there are many more factors on top of methodological properties assessed in this review.

Besides these specific problems, a more general issue was also identified. The findings of the conducted review suggest that researchers used all mentioned methodological approaches (quantitative, qualitative, and mixed), as well as various study designs and methods, while the questionnaire was the most used method of all (see Table 1). Moreover, all LC components were represented in the articles with the exception of LC6 which had only negligible occurrence. On the one hand, the diversity in LC operationalization as well as methodology of LC measurement suggests that LC is an interesting topic accented by numerous researchers across various scientific disciplines. Consequently, the LC research field is characterized by enormous complexity and variability. It is also positive, that researchers attempted to use the different measurement methods for assessing specific LC components (see Table 6). This suggests that all of the identified methods can be beneficial for LC measurement, but it is crucial to use only adequate methods determined by the specific character of each LC component.

On the other hand, this situation causes ambivalence and methodological chaos. This is even amplified by the fact that no broadly accepted and validated LC measurement instrument have been developed yet. Even though the latest development of the LC research field seems to prefer and advocate qualitative methodological approach (e.g., Ewick & Silbey, 1998; Gómez, 2016; Merry, 1990; Nielsen, 2000; Sarat, 1990; Young, 2014) for its presupposed ability to analyze the LC concept in more complex (i.e., non reductionist) way, the results showed that the complexity of LC research is rather poor irrespective of the methodological approach used (see Table 5). Within these conditions the results of the analyzed articles are hardly comparable and therefore no meta-analysis can be conducted. Consequently, LC researchers are able to produce a plentiful of partial knowledge about rather specific aspects of the LC concept but are not able to study and understand this phenomenon comprehensively and deeply enough to provide results influencing the real functioning of legal praxis (e.g., law-making and judiciary). The potential of LC research remains therefore unfulfilled.

In spite of searching for an optimal measurement method in the selected articles, we decided to point out the major mistakes and provide the set of criteria for such a method. The optimal method of LC measurement for empirical and scientific purposes depends not only on the perfect MP (such as proper theoretical background, psychometric characteristics, impact of results, etc.), but also on a) consideration of both the LC concept in its complexity and the specifics of individual LC components, b) ability of testing

and analyzing the real level of LC within the general population, c) standardization and normalization, d) elimination of researchers' subjectivity, e) consideration of socio-cultural variables and their adequate statistical procedures (e.g., in case of different ethnicity: invariance measurement, multi-level analysis, multi-group factor analysis, etc.), and f) applicability of results to practical functioning of legal system (e.g., legislation, legitimacy of law, and legal education).

As for future directions of LC research, the next step should rest in designing a new, reliable, and valid measurement method of the LC concept based on the presented conceptualization in its entire complexity and to conduct pilot testing of such method as well as the whole standardization procedure. This method should be used for empirical research of LC on the general population as well as for finding relevant socio-cultural variables determining the LC concept (see Horák & Lacko, 2019b). Since the six extracted LC components were derived from reviewed articles and not from the measurement of the LC concept itself, further empirical research (e.g., by factor analysis) could lead to a different amount or definitions of LC components compared to those presented in this article.

Moreover, its findings could verify the real level of legitimacy of law in the legal system as well as provide important recommendations and suggest desirable improvements for both the legal system (i.e., law-making and judiciary; see Horák & Lacko, 2019a) and the individuals within this system (i.e., their knowledge, skills, and attitudes towards law).

As far as legal system is concerned, in order to be considered legitimate, law should be understandable (LC1), accessible (LC2), recognizable (LC3) and rationally (LC4), intuitively (LC5), and axiologically (LC6) acceptable to people. In other words, every individual LC component, if assessed and measured properly in the population, can provide an answer to the question whether laws and judicial decisions meet the demands of social efficacy and elimination of extreme injustice presented for example by Alexy (2016) in order to be considered legitimate by the people. Practical application of LC measurement and its results can be found in both preventive (ex ante) and subsequent (ex post) measures. Among preventive measures, the most important one is the possibility to significantly improve current Impact Assessment (IA), which the legislator ought to conduct before any laws are enacted (e.g., Bäcklund, 2009). One of the most neglected deficiencies of IA may be seen in the absence of assessing the sociopsychological impact of legal regulation, i.e., the impact on the six LC components. We assert that studies of understandability, accessibility, recognizability, and rational, intuitive and axiological acceptability of laws for individuals and society should be one of the most important and inherent assessments in the framework of IAs in the future. Possible ex post measure, which should be nonetheless used rather restrictively, is the competence of constitutional courts to hold unconstitutional a statute or a judicial decision, if such legislation or decision extremely fails to meet the demands derived from individual LC components (for further discussion see Horák & Lacko, 2019b).

Concerning individuals within the legal system, practical applications could be found especially in new innovative and rather personalised ways of dissemination of legal information (e.g., Janeček, 2019) and, more generally, legal education. These measures could potentially enhance the level of LC in the population significantly.

Conclusion

A systematic review of 156 selected articles focusing on the concept of LC was conducted. Main research goals were to provide a unifying conceptualization of LC as well as to discuss the possibilities of an empirical LC measurement.

Concerning the conceptualization of the LC concept, this article provided two important outcomes. First, six separated LC components

(LC1-LC6) encompassing all the possible aspects of the LC concept were identified. Second, a complex and unifying a definition of LC based on the aforementioned LC components with the potential to solve current conceptualization issues was introduced. As far as the possibilities of empirical LC measurement are concerned, this review provided a set of descriptive characteristics as well as statistical inferences describing and analyzing LC measurement among selected articles. Findings indicated that there is quite an extensive room for methodological improvement within LC research field. Hence, a set of general quality criteria for a LC research method, which could potentially overcome current methodological issues, was described.

We believe that our results, as well as our suggestions and recommendations, will help to enhance future LC research to the state where it can actually produce valid results and findings directly influencing and improving the functioning of the legal system.

Conflict of Interest

The authors of this article declare no conflict of interest.

Notes

¹We strongly support the idea of open science (i.e., the open materials and the open data), hence, our materials and data are included within:

“Complete data” (<https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.12890.59840>)

“Specific data” (<https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.33023.25765>)

“Screening phase material” (<https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.21698.63687>)

“MP assessment phase material” (<https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.13310.02880>)

²There are two important reasons for the incorporation of a population-related criterion based upon the enumeration of specific age groups. Applying such a process of selection granted us a) the rigorous restriction to only real, not artificial or simulated population by eliminating other potentially misleading terms regarding population type, and b) the possibility of retaining a wide spectrum of age groups providing possibilities of comparison of articles studying various kinds of population.

³According to MP, the best qualitative studies were Stevens (2013) with a value of 5 and Hernández (2010), Kilmer (2016), Berrey et al. (2012), and Lageson (2017) with a value of 4.5. The best quantitative studies were Murdock (2013), Cavanagh and Cauffman (2017), and Grisso et al. (2003) with a value of 4.5. As for mixed studies, the best MP score was achieved by Block et al. (2010) with a value of 9 and Viljoen, et al. (2002), and Dickert et al. (2012) with a value of 8.5.

References

References marked with an asterisk indicate studies included in this meta-analysis. See Appendix.

- *Abenzo, S., & Arjona, C. (2017). Socrates behind bars: A report on an experimental course on justice and philosophy. *The Law Teacher*, 51(3), 327-348. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03069400.2016.1272041>
- *Abrego, L. (2008). Legitimacy, social identity, and the mobilization of law: The effects of Assembly bill 540 on undocumented students in California. *Law & Social Inquiry*, 33(03), 709-734. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-4469.2008.00119.x>
- *Abrego, L. J. (2011). Legal consciousness of undocumented Latinos: Fear and stigma as barriers to claims-making for first- and 1.5-generation immigrants. *Law & Society Review*, 45(2), 337-370. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5893.2011.00435.x>
- *Adhikari, R. (2016). Knowledge on legislation of abortion and experience of abortion among female youth in Nepal: A cross sectional study. *Reproductive Health*, 13(48), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12978-016-0166-4>
- *Akhmejanova, G., Olzhabayev, B., Grigoryeva, R., Karibaeva, Z., Avilkhan, A., & Sakenov, J. (2016). Formation of professional competence of

- legal specialty students in the elective courses studying. *International Journal of Environmental & Science Education*, 11(8), 11163-11173.
- Al-Rukaibi, F., Ahmed Ali, M., Aljassar, A., & Al-Abdulmuhsen, L. (2008). A Study of driver behaviour with regards to traffic control devices. In L. Al-Quadi, T. Sayed, N. A. Alnuamini, & E. Masad (Eds.), *Efficient transportation and pavement systems: Characterization, mechanisms, simulation, and modeling* (pp. 73-82). CRC Press.
- *Albery, I., & Guppy, A. (1995). Drivers' differential perceptions of legal and safe driving consumption. *Addiction*, 90(2), 245-254. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-0443.1995.tb01042.x>
- Alexy, R. (2016). *Begriff und Geltung des Rechts*. Verlag Herder.
- *Ambagtsheer, F., Van Balen, L. J., Duijst-Heesters, W. L. J. M., Massey, E. K., & Weimar, W. (2015). Reporting organ trafficking networks: A survey-based plea to breach the secrecy oath. *American Journal of Transplantation*, 15(7), 1759-1767. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajt.13245>
- *Arundale, J. (2002). How much law should librarians know? *New Library World*, 103(1181), 376-384. <https://doi.org/10.1108/03074800210447686>
- Ashar, S. M. (2016). Deep critique and democratic lawyering in clinical practice. *Law Review*, 104(1), 193-224.
- *Auchmuty, R. (2016). The Experience of civil partnership dissolution: Not 'just like divorce'. *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*, 38(2), 152-174. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09649069.2016.1156884>
- *Babalola, S. (2014). Dimensions and correlates of negative attitudes toward female survivors of sexual violence in eastern DRC. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 29(9), 1679-1169. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260513511531>
- Bäcklund, A-K. (2009). Impact assessment in the European Commission – a system with multiple objectives. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 12(8), 1077-1087. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2009.04.003>
- Balvig, F., Gunnlaugsson, H., Jerre, K., Tham, H., & Kinnunen, A. (2015). The public sense of justice in Scandinavia: A Study of attitudes towards punishments. *European Journal of Criminology*, 12(3), 342-361. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1477370815571948>
- *Barragan, M., Sherman, N., Reiter, K., & Tita, G. (2015). Dammed if you do, damned if you don't: Perceptions of guns, safety, and legitimacy among detained gun offenders. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 43(1), 140-155. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854815611707>
- *Barton, E. (2004). The construction of legal consciousness in discourse: Rule and relational orientations toward the law in a disability support group. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 36(4), 603-632. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(03\)00098-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(03)00098-5)
- Baude, W., Chilton, A. S., & Malani, A. (2017). Making doctrinal work more rigorous: Lessons from systematic reviews. *University of Chicago Law Review*, 84(1), 37-58.
- *Beletsky, L., Agrawal, A., Moreau, B., Kumar, P., Weiss-Laxer, N., & Heimer, R. (2011). Police training to align law enforcement and HIV prevention: Preliminary evidence from the field. *American Journal of Public Health*, 101(11), 2012-2015. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2011.300254>
- *Beletsky, L., Wagner, K., Arredondo, J., Palinkas, L., Magis Rodríguez, C., Kalic, N., Ludwig-Baron, N., & Strathdee, S. (2016). Implementing Mexico's "narcomenudeo" drug law reform: A mixed methods assessment of early experiences among people who inject drugs. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 10(4), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689815575862>
- *Berger, D., & Snortum, J. (1986). A Structural model of drinking and driving: Alcohol consumption, social norms and moral commitments. *Criminology*, 24(1), 139-154. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1986.tb00380.x>
- Berns, W. (1963). Law and behavioral science. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 28(1), 185-212. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1190729>
- *Berrey, E., Hoffman, S., & Nielsen, L. B. (2012). Situated justice: A contextual analysis of fairness and inequality in employment discrimination litigation. *Law & Society Review*, 46(1), 1-36. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5893.2012.00471.x>
- *Berti, M. (2010). Handcuffed access: Homelessness and the justice system. *Urban Geography*, 31(6), 825-841. <https://doi.org/10.2747/02723638.31.6.825>
- *Block, S., Oran, H., Oran, D., Baumrind, N., & Goodman, G. (2010). Abused and neglected children in court: Knowledge and attitudes. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 34(9), 659-670. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2010.02.003>
- *Bowl, P., & Wanke, I. (2001). Lay knowledge of courts in Canada. *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*, 29(2), 173-194. <https://doi.org/10.1006/ijsl.2001.0148>
- *Brown, L., & Lallje, M. (1981). Young persons' conceptions of criminal events. *Journal of Moral Education*, 10(3), 165-172. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0305724810100302>
- *Bussmann, K. (2004). Evaluating the subtle impact of a ban on corporal punishment of children in Germany. *Child Abuse Review*, 13(5), 292311. <https://doi.org/10.1002/car.866>
- *Cartwright, C. M., White, B. P., Willmott, L., Williams, G., & Parker, M. H. (2015). Palliative care and other physicians' knowledge, attitudes and practice relating to the law on withholding/withdrawing life-sustaining treatment: Survey results. *Palliative Medicine*, 30(2), 171-179. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0269216315587996>
- *Cavanagh, C., & Cauffman, E. (2017). What they don't know can hurt them: Mother's legal knowledge and youth re-offending. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 23(2), 141-153. <https://doi.org/10.1037/law0000112>

- *Cervantes, R., Roan, K., & Dueñas, N. (2004). Programa shortstop: A culturally focused juvenile intervention for Hispanic youth. *Journal of Drug Education, 34*(4), 385-405. <https://doi.org/10.2190/QJ39-MBYR-GX09-JKQ8>
- *Chaturvedi, S., Chhabra, P., Bharadwaj, S., Smanla, S., Kannan, A. T., & Students Study Group (2007). Fetal sex-determination in Delhi: A Population-based investigation. *Tropical Doctor, 37*(2), 98-100. <https://doi.org/10.1177/004947550703700214>
- *Chen, C., Ou, J. J., Zhou, J. S., Zhang, Y. D., Cai, W. X., & Wang, X. P. (2013). The comparison of disposal attitudes towards forensic psychiatric patients among police officers, psychiatrists and community members in China. *Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine, 20*(8), 986-990. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jflm.2013.08.015>
- *Cho, O. H., Cha, K. S., & Yoo, Y. S. (2015). Awareness and attitudes towards violence and abuse among emergency nurses. *Asian Nursing Research, 9*(3), 213-218. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anr.2015.03.003>
- *Cleary, H. M. D., & Warner, T. C. (2017). Parents' knowledge and attitudes about youths' interrogation rights. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 23*(8), 777-793. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1068316X.2017.1324030>
- *Colwell, L. H., & Colwell, K. (2011). Assessing feigned cognitive impairment in defendants hospitalized for competency restoration: Further validation of the TOM. *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice, 11*(4), 293-310. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15228932.2011.562804>
- *Colwell, K., Colwell, L. H., Perry, A., Wasieleski, D., & Billings, T. (2008). The Test of Malingered Incompetence (TOMI): A forced-choice instrument for assessing cognitive malingering in competence to stand trial evaluations. *American Journal of Forensic Psychology, 26*(3), 17-42. <https://doi.org/10.1037/t71418-000>
- *Cooper, A., Wallin, A. R., Quas, J. A., & Lyon, T. D. (2010). Maltreated and non-maltreated children's knowledge of the juvenile dependency court system. *Child Maltreatment, 15*(3), 255-260. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077559510364056>
- *Cormier, K. E. (2007). Grievance practices in post-soviet Kyrgyz agriculture. *Law & Social Inquiry, 32*(2), 435-466. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-4469.2007.00065.x>
- *Cowan, D. (2004). Legal consciousness: Some observations. *The Modern Law Review, 67*(6), 928-958. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.14682230.2004.00518.x>
- *Crawford, E., & Bull, R. (2006). Teenagers' difficulties with key words regarding the criminal court process. *Psychology, Crime and Law, 12*(6), 653-667. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10236190500489970>
- Davies, P., & Boruch, R. (2001). The Campbell Collaboration: Does for public policy what Cochrane does for health. *British Medical Journal, 323*(7308), 294-295. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.323.7308.294>
- *Denvir, C., Balmer, N. J., & Pleasence, P. (2013). When legal rights are not a reality: Do individuals know their rights and how can we tell? *Journal of Social Welfare & Family Law, 35*(1), 139-160. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09649069.2013.774764>
- *Dickert, S., Herbig, B., Glöckner, A., Gansen, Ch., & Portack, R. (2012). The more the better? Effects of training, experience and information amount in legal judgments. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 26*(2), 223-233. <https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.1813>
- *DiGregorio, N. (2016). Same-sex marriage policies and lesbian family life. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy, 13*(1), 58-72. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13178-015-0211-z>
- *Downar, J., Knickle, K., Granton, J. T., & Hawryluck, L. (2012). Using standardized family members to teach communication skills and ethical principles to critical care trainees. *Critical Care Medicine, 40*(6), 1814-1819. <https://doi.org/10.1097/CCM.0b013e31824e0fb7>
- *Driver, C., & Brank, E., M. (2009). Juveniles' knowledge of the court process: Results from instruction from an electronic source. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 27*(4), 627-642. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.881>
- *Dunlap, W. R., & Iccaman, D. J. (1985). The development and validation of set of instruments to assess the independent living skills of handicapped. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 45*(4), 925-929. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164485454024>
- Ehrlich, E. (1913). *Grundlegung der Soziologie des Rechts*. Duncker & Humblot.
- *Einat, T. (2004). Criminal fine enforcement in Israel: Administration, policy, evaluation and recommendations. *Punishment and Society, 6*(2), 175-194. <https://doi.org/10.1177/146247450404041263>
- *Emshoff, J. G., Davidson, W. S., & Conner, R. F. (1980). Training prison inmates as paralegals: An experimental project. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 8*(1), 27-38. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0047-2352\(80\)90057-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0047-2352(80)90057-4)
- Engel, D. (1998). How does law matter in the constitution of legal consciousness? In B. Garth & A. Sarat (Eds.). *How does law matter?* (pp. 109-145). Northwestern University Press.
- *Erickson, A. D., Woodruff, S. I., Wildey, M. B., & Kenney, E. (1993). A baseline assessment of cigarette sales to minors in San Diego, California. *Journal of Community Health, 18*(4), 213-224. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01324432>
- *Erickson, P. G., Van der Maas, M., & Hathaway, A. D. (2013). Revisiting deterrence: Legal knowledge, use context and arrest perception for cannabis. *Czech Sociological Review, 49*(3), 427-448.
- Ewick, P., & Silbey, S. S. (1998). *The common place of law: Stories from everyday life*. University of Chicago Press.
- Fàbregues, S., & Molina-Azorín, J. F. (2017). Addressing quality in mixed methods research: A review and recommendations for a future agenda. *Quality & Quantity, 51*(6), 2847-2863. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-016-0449-4>
- *Farmer, A. K., Sun, I. Y., & Starks, B. C. (2015). Willingness to record police-public encounters: The Impact of race and social and legal consciousness. *Race and Justice, 5*(4), 356-377. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2153368715581663>
- *Farrell, A., Pennington, L., & Cronin, S. (2012). Juror perceptions of the legitimacy of legal authorities and decision making in criminal cases. *Law & Social Inquiry, 38*(4), 773-802. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-4469.2012.01323.x>
- Farrington, D. P., & Petrosino, A. (2001). The Campbell Collaboration crime and justice group. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 578*(1), 35-49. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000271620157800103>
- *Fekete, B., & Gajduschek, G. (2015). Changes in knowledge about law in Hungary in the past half century. *Sociologija, 57*(4), 620-636. <https://doi.org/10.2298/SOC1504620F>
- *Ficke, S. L., Hart, K. J., & Deardorff, P. A. (2006). The performance of incarcerated juveniles on the MacArthur Competence Assessment Tool Criminal Adjudication (MacCAT-CA). *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law, 34*(3), 360-373.
- *Flavier, J. M., & Chen, C. H. C. (1980). Induced abortion in rural villages of Cavite, the Philippines: Knowledge, attitudes, and practice. *Studies in Family Planning, 11*(2), 65-71. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1965798>
- *Galletly, C. L., Pinkerton, S. D., & DiFrancisco, W. (2012). A quantitative study of Michigan's criminal HIV exposure law. *AIDS Care, 24*(2), 174-179. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540121.2011.603493>
- *German, D. B., & Hoffman, M. K. (1973). North Carolina youth and the legal system. *NCJRS: National Criminal Justice Reference Service, 011936*, 1-95.
- *Gleeson, S. (2010). Labor rights for all? The role of undocumented immigrant status for worker claims making. *Law & Social Inquiry, 35*(3), 561-602. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-4469.2010.01196.x>
- Gómez, L. (2016). Connecting critical race theory with second generation legal consciousness work in Obasogie's blinded by sight. *Law & Social Inquiry, 41*(4), 1069-1077. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lsi.12238>
- *Goodwin-De Faria, C., & Marinos, V. (2012). Youth understanding & assertion of legal rights: Examining the roles of age and power. *The International Journal of Children's Rights, 20*(3), 343-364. <https://doi.org/10.1163/157181812X652607>
- *Gosselt, J. F., Van Hoof, J. J., & De Jong, M. (2012). Why should i comply? Sellers' accounts for (non-)compliance with legal age limits for alcohol sales. *Substance Abuse Treatment, Prevention, and Policy, 7*(5), 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1747-597X-7-5>
- *Gottfried, E. D., & Carbonell, J. L. (2014). The Role of intelligence on performance on the Inventory of Legal Knowledge (ILK). *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology, 25*(4), 380-396. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14789949.2014.920900>
- *Gottfried, E. D., Hudson, B. L., Vitacco, M. J., & Carbonell, J. L. (2015). Improving the detection of feigned knowledge deficits in defendants adjudicated incompetent to stand trial. *Assessment, 24*(2), 232-243. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10731911155605631>
- Grant, M. J., & Booth, A. (2009). A Typology of reviews: An analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies. *Health Information & Libraries Journal, 26*(2), 91-108. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-1842.2009.00848.x>
- *Greene, S. S. (2016). Race, class, and access to civil justice. *Iowa Law Review, 101*, 1263-1321. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2592150>
- *Grisso, T., Steinberg, L., Woolard, J., Cauffman, E., Scott, E., Graham, S., Lexcen, F., Reppucci, N. D., & Schwartz, R. (2003). Juveniles' competence to stand trial: A Comparison of adolescents' and adults' capacities as trial defendants. *Law and Human Behavior, 27*(4), 333-363. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1024065015717>
- *Guenther, C. C., & Otto, R. K. (2010). Identifying persons feigning limitations in their competence to proceed in the legal process. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 28*(5), 603-613. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.956>
- *Guzik, K. (2008). The agencies of abuse: Intimate abusers' experience of presumptive arrest and prosecution. *Law & Society Review, 42*(1), 111-144. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5893.2008.00336.x>
- *Haines, A. (1983). Legal studies and developmentally disabled persons. *Australia and New Zealand Journal of Developmental Disabilities, 9*(3), 129-133. <https://doi.org/10.3109/13668258309016148>
- *Hammel, C. A. (2010). *Faculty knowledge of disability law and its relationship to attitude, education, and experience* (Doctoral dissertation).
- *Hansen, J., & Walden, E. (2013). The role of restrictiveness of use in determining ethical and legal awareness of unauthorized file sharing. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems, 14*(9), 521-549. <https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00342>
- Hayes, A. F., & Krippendorff, K. (2007). Answering the call for a standard reliability measure for coding data. *Communication Methods and Measures, 1*(1), 77-89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19312450709336664>
- *Hendley, K. (2012). Who are the legal nihilists in Russia? *Post-Soviet Affairs, 28*(2), 149-186. <https://doi.org/10.2747/1060-586X.28.2.149>
- *Hernández, D. (2010). *Litigating health risks: Using the law to mediate the relationship between poor housing and poor health* (Doctoral dissertation).
- Hertogh, M. (2004). A 'European' conception of legal consciousness: Rediscovering Eugen Ehrlich. *Journal of Law and Society, 31*(4), 457-481. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.14676478.2004.00299.x>

- Heyvaert, M., Hannes, K., Maes, B., & Onghena, P. (2013). Critical appraisal of mixed methods studies. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 7(4), 302-327. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1558689813479449>
- Higgins, J. P., Altman, D. G., Göttsche, P. C., Jüni, P., Moher, D., Oxman, A. D., Savovic, J., Schulz, K. F., Weeks, L., Sterne, J. A. C., & Cochrane Bias Methods Group. (2011). The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *British Medical Journal*, 343(7829), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.d5928>
- *Hill, L. M., Maman, S., Holness, D., & Moodley, D. (2016). Legal knowledge, needs, and assistance seeking among HIV positive and negative women in Umlazi, South Africa. *BMC International Health and Human Rights*, 16(3), 1-10.
- Hirsh, E., & Lyons, C. J. (2010). Perceiving discrimination on the job: Legal consciousness, workplace context, and the construction of race discrimination. *Law & Society Review*, 44(2), 269-298. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5893.2010.00403.x>
- *Hlavka, H. R. (2013). Legal subjectivity among youth victims of sexual abuse. *Law & Social Inquiry*, 39(1), 31-61. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lsi.12032>
- *Hongyan, S. (2003). The current status of Chinese children. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 24(4), 337-353. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1027329309556>
- Horák, F., & Lacko, D. (2019a). Právní vědomí a legitimita práva v podmínkách demokratického státu [Legal consciousness and legitimacy within the conditions of democratic state]. In M. Večeřa, T. Sobek, J. Kokešová, & M. Hapla (Eds.), *Weyerovy dny právní teorie* (pp. 107-123). Masarykova univerzita.
- Horák, F., & Lacko, D. (2019b). New contributions of multidisciplinary and empirical approach to legal consciousness. *The Lawyer Quarterly*, 9(3), 248-261.
- *Horvath, M., & Gier-Sorolla, R. (2007). Below the age of consent: Influences on moral and legal judgments of adult-adolescent sexual relationships. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37(12), 2980-3009. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2007.00290.x>
- *Hsiao, L. H. C. (2013). A Study on marketing mix strategy, law awareness, and repurchase intention of imported tobacco. *Актуальні проблеми економіки*, 5(143), 501-511.
- *Hughes, C., Ritter, A., Cowdery, N., & Sindicich, N. (2014). 'Trafficking' or 'personal use': Do people who regularly inject drugs understand Australian drug trafficking laws? *Drug and Alcohol Review*, 33(6), 658-666. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dar.12167>
- Hull, K. E. (2003). The Cultural power of law and the cultural enactment of legality: The case of same-sex marriage. *Law & Social Inquiry*, 28(3), 629-657. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-4469.2003.tb00210.x>
- Janeček, V. (2019). Personalised Dissemination of Legal Information. In G. Peruginelli & S. Faro (Eds.), *Knowledge of the law in the age of big data* (pp. 86-99). IOS Press.
- *Jaruseviciene, L., Lazarus, J., & Zaborskis, A. (2011). Confidentiality and parental involvement in adolescent sexual and reproductive health care: A cross-sectional study of Lithuanian general practitioners. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, 39(5), 484-491. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1403494810396554>
- Jenness, V., & Calavita, K. (2018). "It depends on the outcome": Prisoners, grievances, and perceptions of justice. *Law & Society Review*, 52(1), 41-72. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lasr.12312>
- Jiang, S., Wu, Y., & Wang, J. (2013). Citizens' obligation to obey the law: An empirical study of Guangzhou, China. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 57(4), 495-518. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306624X11434005>
- *Jülich, S. (2006). Views of justice among survivors of historical child sexual abuse: Implications for restorative justice in New Zealand. *Theoretical Criminology*, 10(1), 125-138. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13624806060059988>
- *Jurecska, D. E. (2010). *Competence to stand trial: Special challenges for the population diagnosed with intellectual disabilities and borderline intellectual functioning* (Doctoral dissertation). https://www.oregon.gov/doc/RESRCH/docs/jurecska_dissertation100628.pdf
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (2000). *Choices, values, and frames*. Cambridge University Press and the Russell Sage Foundation.
- *Kalinina, R. R. (2014). Legal consciousness of youth in conditions of vocational education: Problems and solutions. *Наука Красноярья*, 6(17), 43-51. <https://doi.org/10.12731/2070-7568-2014-6-4>
- *Kazyak, E. (2015). "The law's the law, right?" Sexual minority mothers navigating legal inequities and inconsistencies. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, 12(3), 188-201. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13178-015-0184-y>
- Kennedy, D. (1980). Toward an historical understanding of legal consciousness: The case of classical legal thought in America, 1850-1940. *Research in Law and Sociology*, 3, 3-24.
- *Kilmer, A. (2016). *I'm just trying to fit back in: The role of social bonds, stigma, and legal consciousness on the reentry experiences of recently incarcerated adults* (Doctoral dissertation). <http://udspace.udel.edu/handle/19716/19955>
- *Kim, C., Ko, E., & Koh, J. (2016). Consumer attitudes and purchase intentions toward fashion counterfeits: Moderating the effects of types of counterfeit goods and consumer characteristics. *Journal of Global Fashion Marketing*, 7(1), 15-29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20932685.2015.1105109>
- *Kim, K. K., Kim, I. S., & Lee, W. H. (2007). Perception of legal liability by registered nurses in Korea. *Nurse Education Today*, 27(6), 617-626. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2006.09.010>
- Klare, K. E. (1978). Judicial deracialization of the Wagner Act and the origins of modern legal consciousness, 1937-1941. *Minnesota Law Review*, 62(3), 265-340.
- *Kleefeld, J. C., & Farnese, P. L. (2015). Incorporating a creative component in first-year law. *The Canadian Journal for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*, 6(2), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.5206/cjsotl-rcacea.2015.2.8>
- Korobkin, R. B., & Ulen, T. S. (2000). Law and behavioral science: Removing the rationality assumption from law and economics. *California Law Review*, 88(4), 1051-1144. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3481255>
- *Kramer, D., Kesselheim, A., Brock, D., & Maisel, W. (2010). Ethical and legal views of physicians regarding deactivation of cardiac implantable electrical devices: A quantitative assessment. *Health Rhythm Society*, 7(11), 1537-1542. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrthm.2010.07.018>
- *Kramer, D., Kesselheim, A., Salberg, L., Brock, D., & Maisel, W. (2011). Ethical and legal views regarding deactivation of cardiac implantable electrical devices in patients with hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. *The American Journal of Cardiology*, 107(7), 1071-1075. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amjcard.2010.11.036>
- *Kumar, H., Gokhale, Jain, K., & Mathur, D. R. (2013). Legal awareness and responsibilities of nursing staff in administration of patient care in a trust hospital. *Journal of Clinical and Diagnostic Research*, 7(12), 2814-2817. <https://doi.org/10.7860/JCDR/2013/7737.3886>
- *Lageson, S. E. (2017). Crime data, the internet, and free speech: An evolving legal consciousness. *Law & Society Review*, 51(1), 8-41. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lasr.12253>
- *Lambie, G. W., Hagedorn, W. B., & Ieva, K. P. (2010). Social-cognitive development, ethical and legal knowledge, and ethical decision making of counselor education students. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 49(4), 228-246. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2010.tb00100.x>
- *Lambie, G. W., Ieva, K. P., Mullen, P. R., & Hayes, B. G. (2011). Ego development, ethical decision-making, and legal and ethical knowledge in school counselors. *Journal of Adult Development*, 18(1), 50-59. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10804-010-9105-8>
- *Landry, P. F. (2009). Does the Communist Party help strengthen China's legal reforms? *The China Review*, 9(1), 45-71.
- *Lazarus, J., Jaruseviciene, L., & Liljestrand, J. (2008). Lithuanian general practitioners' knowledge of confidentiality laws in adolescent sexual and reproductive healthcare: A cross-sectional study. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, 36(3), 303-309. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1403494808086984>
- *LeBlang, T. L., Henderson, M. D., Kolm, P., & Paiva, R. E. A. (1985). The Impact of legal medicine education on medical student's attitudes toward law. *Journal of Medical Education*, 60(4), 279-287. <https://doi.org/10.1097/00001888-198504000-00001>
- *LoGalbo, A. P., & Callahan, C. M. (2001). An Evaluation of teen court as a juvenile crime diversion program. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, 52(2), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-6988.2001.tb00039.x>
- Long, A. F., & Godfrey, M. (2004). An Evaluation tool to assess the quality of qualitative research studies. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 7(2), 181-196. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1364557032000045302>
- *Lubsky, A.V., Volkov, Y. G., Denisova, G. S., Voytenko, V. P., & Vodenko, K. V. (2016). Civic education and citizenship in modern Russian society. *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*, 9(36), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.17485/ijst/2016/v9i36/102035>
- Macura, B., Zorondo-Rodríguez, F., Grau-Satorras, M., Demps, K., Laval, M., Garcia, C. A., & Reyes-García, V. (2011). Local community attitudes toward forests outside protected areas in India: Impact of legal awareness, trust, and participation. *Ecology and Society*, 16(3), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-04242-160310>
- *Maguire, E., & Johnson, D. (2015). The structure of public opinion on crime policy: Evidence from seven Caribbean nations. *Punishment & Society*, 17(4), 502-530. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1462474515604385>
- *Maier, S. L. (2007). Rape victim advocates' knowledge and insight on rape laws. *Women & Criminal Justice*, 18(4), 37-62. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08974450802095994>
- Mandelstam, M. (1996). Community care, occupational therapists and the law. *British Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 59(12), 550-556. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030802269605901202>
- *Maunsell, C., Smith, H. V., & Stevenson, C. (2000). What happens in court? The development of understanding of the legal system in a sample of Irish children and adults. *The Irish Journal of Psychology*, 21(3-4), 215-226. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03033910.2000.10558254>
- *Maxwell, C. D., Robinson, A. L., & Post, L. A. (2003). The nature and predictors of sexual victimization and offending among adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 32(6), 465-477. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1025942503285>
- *McLoughlin, C. S., & Lelles, D. B. (1997). School psychologists' knowledge of children's legal rights. *Psychological Reports*, 80, 451-455. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1997.80.2.451>
- *McLoughlin, C. S., & Sametz, L. (1983). Knowledge of trainees in school psychology about children's legal rights. *Psychological Reports*, 52, 286. <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.1983.52.1.286>

- *McLoughlin, C. S., Sametz, L., & Streib, V. L. (1983). Prospective educators' knowledge of children's legal rights. *American Educational Research Journal*, 20(4), 591-600. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312020004591>
- Merry, S. E. (1990). *Getting justice and getting even: Legal consciousness among working class Americans*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Messing, J. T., Becerra, D., Ward-Lasher, A., & Androff, D. K. (2015). Latinas' perceptions of law enforcement: Fear of deportation, crime reporting, and trust in the system. *Affilia*, 30(3), 328-340. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886109915576520>
- *Militello, M., Schimmel, D., & Eberwein, H. J. (2009). If they knew, they would change: How legal knowledge impacts principals' practice. *NASSP Bulletin*, 93(1), 27-52. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192636509332691>
- Miyazawa, S. (1987). Taking Kawashima seriously: A Review of Japanese research on Japanese legal consciousness and disputing behavior. *Law and Society Review*, 21(2), 219-242. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3053520>
- *Mohamadinejad, A., & Mirsafian, H. (2015). Connection between the legal knowledge and social background of sports coaches at Iranian universities. *Iranian Studies*, 48(4), 551-566. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00210862.2014.894746>
- Morita, T., Miyashita, M., Shibagaki, M., Hirai, K., Ashiya, T., Ishihara, T., Matsubara, T., Miyoshi, I., Nakaho, T., Nakashima, N., Onishi, H., Ozawa, T., Suenaga, K., Tajima, T., Akechi, T., & Uchitomi, Y. (2006). Knowledge and beliefs about end-of-life care and the effects of specialized palliative care: A population-base survey in Japan. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*, 31(4), 306-316.
- *Mullen, P. R., Lambie, G. W., Griffith, C. & Sherrell, R. (2016). School counselors' general self-efficacy, ethical and legal self-efficacy, and ethical and legal knowledge. *Ethics & Behavior*, 26(5), 415-430. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2015.1033627>
- Muñoz, S. M. (2016). Undocumented and unafraid: Understanding the disclosure management process for undocumented college students and graduates. *Journal of College Student Development*, 57(6), 715-729. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2016.0070>
- *Murdock, L. S. (2013). *The effects of the JCCS curriculum on juveniles' legal knowledge, competency, and anxiety* (Doctoral dissertation). <https://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/thesesdissertations/2013/>
- *Nicholson, R. A., Briggs, S. R., & Robertson, H. C. (1988). Instruments for assessing competency to stand trial: How do they work? *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 19(4), 383-394. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7028.19.4.383>
- Nielsen, L. B. (2000). Situating legal consciousness: Experiences and attitudes of ordinary citizens about law and street harassment. *Law & Society Review*, 34(4), 1055-1090. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3115131>
- *Nievelstein, F., Van Gog, T., Boshuizen, H. P. A., & Prins, F. J. (2008). Expertise-related differences in conceptual and ontological knowledge in the legal domain. *European Journal of Cognitive Psychology*, 20(6), 1043-1064. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09541440701674777>
- *Otto, R. K., Musick, J. E., & Sherrod, C. (2011). Convergent validity of a screening measure designed to identify defendants feigning knowledge deficits related to competence to stand trial. *Assessment*, 18(1), 60-62. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191110377162>
- *Park, N. K., Kazyak, E., & Slauson-Blevins, K. S. (2016). How law shapes experiences of parenthood for same-sex couples. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies*, 12(2), 115-137. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1550428X.2015.1011818>
- *Paul, G. D. (2015). Justice perceptions and practices of restorative justice facilitators and the public. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 18(3), 274-295. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10282580.2015.1057678>
- *Pennington, L. (2015). A Case study approach to procedural justice: Parents' views in two juvenile delinquency courts in the United States. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 55(5), 901-920. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azu109>
- *Pennington, L. (2017). Socializing distrust of the justice system through the family in juvenile delinquency court. *Law & Policy*, 39(1), 27-47. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lapo.12065>
- *Pereira, H., & Monteiro, S. (2017). The Role of political and legislative changes in the everyday lives of LGB individuals: The case of Portugal. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, 14(3), 300-309. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13178-016-0261-x>
- *Perry-Hazan, L., & Birnhack, M. (2016). Privacy, CCTV, and school surveillance in the shadow of imagined law. *Law & Society Review*, 50(2), 415-449. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lasr.12202>
- Peters, M. D., Godfrey, C. M., Khalil, H., McInerney, P., Parker, D., & Soares, C. B. (2015). Guidance for conducting systematic scoping reviews. *International Journal of Evidence-based Healthcare*, 13(3), 141-146. <https://doi.org/10.1097/XEB.0000000000000050>
- *Peterson-Badali, M., & Abramovitch, R. (1992). Children's knowledge of the legal system: Are they competent to instruct legal counsel. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 34(2), 139-160.
- *Peterson-Badali, M., Abramovitch, R., & Duda, J. (1997). Young children's legal knowledge and reasoning ability. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 39(2), 145-170.
- *Pinski, I., Labouvie, E., Pandina, R., & Laranjeira, R. (2001). Drinking and driving: Pre-driving attitudes and perceptions among Brazilian youth. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 62(3), 231-237. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0376-8716\(00\)00173-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0376-8716(00)00173-3)
- *Pleasence, P., & Balmer, N. J. (2012). Ignorance in bliss: Modeling knowledge of rights in marriage and cohabitation. *Law & Society Review*, 46(2), 297-333. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5893.2012.00490.x>
- Podgorecki, A. (1973). *Knowledge and opinion about law*. M. Robertson.
- *Preiss, D. R., Arum, R., Edelman, L. B., Morrill, C., & Tyson, K. (2016). The more you talk, the worse it is: Student perceptions of law and authority in schools. *Social Currents*, 3(3), 234-255. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2329496515616813>
- *Preston-Shoot, M., & McKimm, J. (2012). Perceptions of readiness for legally literate practice: A Longitudinal study of social work student views. *Social Work Education*, 31(8), 1071-1089. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2011.608125>
- *Preston-Shoot, M., & McKimm, J. (2013). Exploring UK medical and social work students' legal literacy: Comparisons, contrasts and implications. *Health & Social Care in the Community*, 21(3), 271-282. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hsc.12014>
- *Preston-Shoot, M., McKimm, K., Kong, W. M., & Smith, S. (2011). Readiness for legally literate medical practice? Student perceptions of their undergraduate medico-legal education. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 37(10), 616-622. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jme.2010.041566>
- *Preston-Shoot, M., McKimm, K., & Thurnham, A. (2013). Outcomes of law teaching in social work education: Further findings from a cohort study. *Social Work Education*, 32(5), 607-625. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02615479.2012.695344>
- *Quinn, G. P., Koskan, A., Sehovic, I., Pal, T., Meade, C., & Gwede, C. K. (2014). Contrasting the ethical perspectives of biospecimen research among individuals with familial risk for hereditary cancer and biomedical researchers: Implications for researcher training. *Genetic Testing and Molecular Biomarkers*, 18(7), 467-473. <https://doi.org/10.1089/gtmb.2013.0461>
- *Rafky, D. M., & Sealey, R. W. (1975). The adolescent and the law: A survey. *Crime & Delinquency*, 21(2), 131-138. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00112877502100205>
- *Ramkrishna Reddy, N., Riyaz Basha, S., Ravish, K. S., & Venkataraghava, S. (2010). Medical and legal knowledge of medical students on eye donation. *Journal of South India Medicolegal Association*, 2(2), 52-55.
- *Ranasinghe, P. (2010). Ambivalence towards law: Business improvement associations, public disorder, and legal consciousness. *International Journal of Law in Context*, 6(4), 323-342. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1744552310000273>
- *Rao, G. W., & Hari, N. (2016). Medico-legal knowledge assessment of interns and post graduate students in a medical institution. *International Archives of Integrated Medicine*, 3(10), 105-110.
- *Redlich, A. D., & Shteynberg, R. V. (2016). To plead or not to plead: A comparison of juvenile and adult true and false plea decision. *Law and Human Behavior*, 40(6), 61-625. <https://doi.org/10.1037/lhb0000205>
- Rehbinder, M. (2003). *Rechtssociologie*. Beck.
- *Richoz, C., Ayer, A., Berchtold, A., & Richoz, S. (2011). Record keeping by Swiss physiotherapists: A national survey of knowledge regarding legal requirements. *Swiss Medical Weekly*, 141(w13291), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.4414/smw.2011.13291>
- Riles, A. (2008). The Anti-network: Private global governance, legal knowledge, and the legitimacy of the state. *The American Journal of Comparative Law*, 56(3), 605-630. <https://doi.org/10.5131/ajcl.2007.0018>
- *Riley, M., Ahmed, S., Reed, B., & Quint, E. H. (2015). Physician knowledge and attitudes around confidential care for minor patients. *Journal of Pediatric & Adolescent Gynecology*, 28(4), 234-239. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpjag.2014.08.008>
- *Ryo, E. (2017). Legal attitudes of immigrant detainees. *Law & Society Review*, 51(1), 99-131. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lasr.12252>
- *Santos, C. E., Menjivar, C., VanDaalen, R. A., Kornienko, O., Updegraff, K. A., & Cruz, S. (2017). Awareness of Arizona's immigration law SB1070 predicts classroom behavioural problems among Latino youths during early adolescence. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 41(9), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2017.1311021>
- *Sarat, A. (1975). Support for the legal system: An analysis of knowledge, attitudes, and behavior. *American Politics Research*, 3(1), 3-24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1532673X7500300101>
- Sarat, A. (1990). The Law is all over: Power, resistance and the legal consciousness of the welfare poor. *Yale Journal of Law & the Humanities*, 2(2), 343-379.
- *Saucier, C. D., Zaller, N., Macmadu, A., & Green, T. C. (2016). An initial evaluation of law enforcement overdose training in Rhode Island. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 162, 211-218. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2016.03.011>
- *Schildmann, J., Herrmann, E., Burchardi, N., Schwantes, U., & Vollmann, J. (2006). Physician assisted suicide: Knowledge and views of fifth year medical students in Germany. *Death Studies*, 30(1), 29-39. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07481180500236693>
- *Shabanzadeh, A. P., Sadr, S. S., Ghafari, A., Nozari, B. H., & Toushih M. (2009). Organ and tissue donation knowledge among intensive care unit nurses. *Transplantation Proceedings*, 41(5), 1480-1482. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.transproceed.2009.01.113>
- Silbey, S. S. (2005). After legal consciousness. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 1(1), 323-368. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.lawsocsci.1.041604.115938>

- *Şişli, Z., Kizil, M., Üstünkaeli, N., & Şemin, M. İ. (2016). Legal awareness of elderly about abuse and neglect. *Turkish Journal of Geriatrics*, 19(4), 238-244.
- *Smith, T. F. (1985). Law talk: Juveniles' understanding of legal language. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 13(4), 339-353. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0047-2352\(85\)90004-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0047-2352(85)90004-2)
- *Sproule, L. D. (1992). Canadians and the law: Assessing knowledge and information needs. *Justice Research Notes*, 4, 11-13.
- *Stevens, H. (2013). *Rules, laws and conceptions of justice in middle school: An exploratory study of children's legal consciousness* (Doctoral dissertation). <http://hdl.handle.net/1920/8351>
- *Stewart, D. (1998). Legalisation of education: Implications for principals' professional knowledge. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 36(2), 129-145. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09578239810204354>
- Sunstein, C. R., Jolls, C., & Thaler, R. H. (1998). A Behavioral approach to law and economics. *Stanford Law Review*, 50, 1471-1550. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1229304>
- Swoboda, J. S., Elwork, A., Sales, B. D., & Levine, D. (1978). Knowledge of and compliance with privileged communication and child-abuse-reporting laws. *Professional Psychology*, 9(3), 448-457. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7028.9.3.448>
- Tapp, J. L., & Kohlberg, L. (1971). Developing senses of law and legal justice. *Journal of Social Issues*, 27(2), 65-91. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1971.tb00654.x>
- Terwee, C. B., Mokkink, L. B., Knol, D. L., Ostelo, R. W. J. G., Bouter, L. M., & de Vet, H. C. W. (2012). Rating the methodological quality in systematic reviews of studies on measurement properties: A scoring system for the COSMIN checklist. *Quality of Life Research*, 21(4), 651-657. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-011-9960-1>
- Thaler, R. (1980). Toward a positive theory of consumer choice. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 1(1), 39-60. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-2681\(80\)90051-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-2681(80)90051-7)
- *Thomson, J. C. (2014). *Social construction of copyright: The popular production of communication-based legality* (Doctoral dissertation). <https://search.library.wisc.edu/catalog/9910188509802121>
- *Tie, F. H. (2014). A Study on the legal literacy of urban public school administrators. *Education and Urban Society*, 46(2), 192-208. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013124512446220>
- Uzoka, F. A. (2010). *Development of family law awareness programme for families in Anambra State* (Doctoral dissertation). <http://www.unn.edu.ng/publications/files/images/UZOKA%20FLORENCE%20AMARACHUKWU.pdf>
- *Valentine, G., & Harris, C. (2016). Encounters and (in)tolerance: Perceptions of legality and the regulation of space. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 17(7), 913-932. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649365.2016.1139171>
- *Vermeulen, S. C. A. (1998). *Legal knowledge and decision-making in adolescents plea decisions and competency to waive charter cautions* (Doctoral dissertation). <http://summit.sfu.ca/item/7402>
- *Viljoen, J., Klaver, J., & Roesch, R. (2005). Legal decisions of preadolescent and adolescent defendants: Predictors of confessions, pleas, communication with attorneys, and appeals. *Law and Human Behavior*, 23(3), 253-277. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10979-005-3613-2>
- *Viljoen, J., Roesch, R., & Zapf, P. (2002). An Examination of the relationship between competency to stand trial, competency to waive interrogation rights, and psychopathology. *Law and Human Behavior*, 26(5), 481-506. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1020299804821>
- *Wadoo, O., Shah, A. J., Jehaanandan, N., Laing, M., Agarwal, M., & Kinderman, P. (2011). Knowledge of mental health legislation in junior doctors training in psychiatry. *The Psychiatrist*, 35(12), 460-466. <https://doi.org/10.1192/pb.bp.110.030320>
- *Watson, M. E., & Kivisto, A. J. (2017). The Inventory of Legal Knowledge (ILK) and adults with intellectual disabilities. *Journal of Intellectual Disabilities and Offending Behaviour*, 8(2), 83-89. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JIDOB-10-2016-0018>
- *White, B., Willmott, L., Cartwright, C., Parker, M. H., & Williams, G. (2014). Doctors' knowledge of the law on withholding and withdrawing life-sustaining medical treatment. *The Medical Journal of Australia*, 201(4), 229-232. <https://doi.org/10.5694/mja13.00217>
- *White, B., Willmott, L., Cartwright, C., Parker, M. H., & Williams, G. (2016). Knowledge of the law about withholding or withdrawing life sustaining treatment by intensivists and other specialists. *Critical Care and Resuscitation*, 18(2), 109-115.
- *White, B., Willmott, L., Williams, G., Cartwright, C., & Parker, M. H. (2017). The role of law in decisions to withhold and withdraw life sustaining treatment from adults who lack capacity: A cross-sectional study. *Journal of Medical Ethics*, 43(5), 327-333. <https://doi.org/10.1136/medethics-2016-103543>
- Whittemore, R., & Knafl, K. (2005). The integrative review: Updated methodology. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 52(5), 546-553. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.13652648.2005.03621.x>
- *Withey, C. (2010). Rape and sexual assault education: Where is the law? *New Criminal Law Review: An International and Interdisciplinary Journal*, 13(4), 802-825. <https://doi.org/10.1525/nclr.2010.13.4.802>
- *Yeon, A. L., Azhar, A., Ayub, Z. A., Abdullah, S. A. J., Arshad, R., & Suhaimi, S. (2016). Youth awareness on youth development law. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 6(S7), 277-281.
- Young, K. M. (2014). Everyone knows the game: Legal consciousness in the Hawaiian cockfight. *Law & Society Review*, 48(3), 499-530. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lasr.12094>
- *Zajdel, J., Zajdel, R., & Kuna, P. (2013). Knowledge of medical law amongst doctors of internal diseases. *International Journal of Occupational Medicine and Environmental Health*, 26(2), 242-256. <https://doi.org/10.2478/s13382-013-0083-5>
- *Zarzeka, A., Stacharska, M., Belowska, J., & Gotlib, J. (2015). Assessment of knowledge of legal acts regulating nursing profession among final year bachelor's degree students. *INTED2015 Proceedings*, 6198-6206.
- *Zucker, E. J., & Barth, R. A. (2017). Impact of California computed tomography dose legislation: Survey of radiologists. *Journal of Medical Imaging and Radiation Sciences*, 48(2), 144-150. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmir.2017.02.072>

Appendix

Characteristics of All Reviewed Studies (continued)

Study	Country (legal system)	Study design	Sample size	Age range (M ± SD)	Population (general description, gender, nationality/ethnicity, education, occupation, SES)	Method (specification for LC measurement)	P/S (1/2)	Complexity of LC	LC parts	T-B (1/0)
Abenzo and Arjona (2017)	Spain (continental)	Qualitative (descriptive)	19 (G1 9, G2 9, G3 1)	Not reported	General description: G1 (Students of law); G2 (Inmates); G3 (professor)	Document analysis (interpretative phenomenological analysis, analysis of reflective diaries)	1	4	G1: 1, 2, 4 G2: 1, 5	0
Abrego (2008)	USA (Anglo-Saxon)	Qualitative (descriptive, longitudinal)	42 (27, after 3 years 8+15 new)	17-24	- General description: Undocumented immigrants - Nationality/ethnicity: Guatemalan, Mexican, Salvadoran	H: Interview (in depth); observation	1	5	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1
Abrego (2011)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Qualitative (descriptive, longitudinal)	55 (G1 27, G2 28)	G1 17-24; G2 25-55 (M = 29)	-General description: Undocumented immigrants -Nationality/ethnicity: G1 (Guatemalan, Mexican, Salvadoran); G2 (Salvadoran)	H: Interview (in depth); observation	1	3	2, 4, 5	1
Adhikari (2016)	Nepal (anglo-saxon + religious aspects)	Quantitative (descriptive)	5,050	15-24	- Gender: Women (100%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Brahmin (31.9%), Janajati (40.6%), Dalit (15.1%), other (12.4%) - Education: No (17.1%), primary (17.6%), secondary < (65.3%) - SES: Bottom (35.5%), middle (21.7%), upper middle/top (42.8%)	Survey Questionnaire (Nepal Demographic and Health Survey, NDHS 2011)	1	2	2, 3	0
Akhmejanova et al. (2016)	Kazakhstan (continental)	Mixed (experimental, between groups)	22 (IG 11, CG 11)	Not reported	General description: Students of Law	H: Interview; questionnaire; observation; document analysis	1	3	1, 2, 3	0
Albery and Guppy (1995)	UK (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (descriptive)	1,172 (1,011 completed)	17-80 (M = 36.35)	- General description: Driver's license holders - Gender: Women (40.9%)	Survey Questionnaire (1 LC item)	2	1	3	0
Ambagtsheer et al. (2015)	Netherlands (continental)	Mixed (descriptive)	546 (241 completed)	26-68 (median 48)	- General description: Transplant professionals - Gender: Women (46.1%)	Survey Questionnaire (true/false)	2	1	3	0
Arundale (2002)	UK (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (descriptive)	7	Not reported	General description: Senior librarians or information center managers	Survey Questionnaire (open ended, Likert)	1	2	3, 4	0
Auchmuty (2016)	UK (anglo-saxon)	Qualitative (descriptive)	19	29-69	- General description: Homosexuals - Gender: Women (73%)	Interview	2	1	3	0
Babalola (2014)	Democratic Republic of Congo (continental)	Mixed (descriptive)	2,088	Not reported (M = 32.6)	General description: Urban and rural participants with experience of sexual violence - Gender: Women (54.4%) - Education: No/primary (41.8%), secondary < (58.2%) - Occupation: Employed (56.8%)	Survey Questionnaire (y/n)	2	2	2, 3	0
Barragan et al. (2015)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Qualitative (descriptive)	215 (140 completed)	18-66 (M = 29)	- Gender: Women (8%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Afro-American (46%), Latino (36%), Caucasian (4%), other (10%) - Education: Primary (32%), secondary (39%), college (27%)	Interview (in depth)	2	2	4, 5	0
Barton (2004)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Qualitative (descriptive)	Not reported	Not reported	General description: Families with child with disability	Interview (narrative analysis)	1	3	1, 2, 3	1
Beletsky et al. (2011)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (analytical, PP)	107 (94 completed)	21 <	- General description: Police officers - Gender: Women (5.4%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Afro-American (3.3%), Caucasian (89.1%), Hispanic (4.3%), other (3.3%)	Survey Questionnaire (1 LC item)	2	1	3	0
Beletsky et al. (2016)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (descriptive)	737 questionnaires (32 of them interview)	Not reported (M = 37,25)	- General description: Drug addicts - Gender: Women (38%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Mexican (89%), USA (7%) - SES: Bottom (50%)	H: Questionnaire; interview	1	2	3, 4	0

Appendix

Characteristics of All Reviewed Studies (continued)

Study	Country (legal system)	Study design	Sample size	Age range (<i>M</i> ± <i>SD</i>)	Population (general description, gender, nationality/ethnicity, education, occupation, SES)	Method (specification for LC measurement)	P/S (1/2)	Complexity of LC	LC parts	T-B (1/0)
Berger and Snortum (1986)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (descriptive)	1,000 (758 completed)	16 <	- General description: Drivers and alcohol consumers - Gender: women (50%)	Survey Questionnaire (4 LC items)	2	1	3	0
Berrey et al. (2012)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Qualitative (descriptive)	100	Not reported	General description: Plaintiffs, plaintiff lawyers, defendants, defendant lawyers	Interview (in depth, open ended, semi-structured, narrative analysis)	1	1	5	1
Berti (2010)	Canada (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (descriptive)	196	Not reported (<i>M</i> = 34)	- General description: Homeless - Gender: Women (19%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Caucasian (64%), Aboriginal (28%)	Interview (semi-structured)	1	1	5	1
Block et al. (2010)	USA (Anglo-saxon)	Mixed (descriptive)	85 (G1 43, G2 42)	Not reported (G1 <i>M</i> = 7.56; G2 <i>M</i> = 9.57)	- Gender: G1 women (55%), G2 women (47%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Afro-American (45%), Caucasian (32%), Hispanic (22%), Asian (1%)	Interview (structured; Children's Court Questionnaire, CCQ)	1	4	1, 2, 4, 5	0
Bowal and Wanke (2001)	Canada (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (descriptive)	275	Not reported	General description: Undergraduate and MBA students of Faculty of Management	Survey Questionnaire (true/false)	1	3	1, 2, 5	0
Brown and Laljee (1981)	Australia (anglo-saxon)	Qualitative (descriptive)	129	15-17	General description: Students of secondary school	Survey Questionnaire (open ended, 4 LC items)	1	2	3, 4	0
Busmann (2004)	Germany (continental)	Quantitative (descriptive)	9,400	Adolescents 12-18; parents not reported	General description: Adolescents, parents (with at least 18 years old child)	Interview survey (structured)	2	1	3	0
Cartwright et al. (2015)	Australia (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (analytical)	2,702 (867 completed)	29-83	- General description: Medical specialists - Gender: Women (34%)	Survey Questionnaire (9 LC items)	1	3	2, 3, 4	0
Cavanagh and Cauffman (2017)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (analytical)	1,216 (selected 648)	Sons 13-17 (<i>M</i> = 15.38, ± 1.24); Mothers not reported (<i>M</i> = 46.24, ± 7.23)	- General description: Mothers and sons (juvenile offenders) - Nationality/ethnicity: Caucasian (18.5% sons, 21.4% Mothers), Hispanic (61.1% sons, 58.5% mothers), Afro-American (16.7% sons, 17.3% mothers), other (3.7% sons, 2.8% mothers)	Questionnaire (true/false, multiple-choice; 44 LC items)	1	3	1, 2, 3	1
Cervantes et al. (2004)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (analytical, longitudinal, PP, between groups)	352 (children; parents not reported)	9-17 (<i>M</i> = 14.5)	- General description: Hispanic juvenile offenders - Gender: Women (18.5%), not identified (11.6%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Mexican (35.5%), Mexican-American (24.7%), Hispanic (17.3%)	Questionnaire (children: Legal Education Survey for Youth, LES; true/false; 1 LC item); parents: Legal Information Survey for Parents, LESP; y/n; 3 LC items)	2	2	1, 3	0
Chaturvedi et al. (2007)	India (anglo-Saxon+ continental)	Quantitative (descriptive)	1,514	Not reported (<i>M</i> = 35±8.1)	Gender: Women (68%)	Survey Questionnaire (semi-structured; 1 LC item)	1	1	3	0
Chen et al. (2013)	China (continental)	Quantitative (descriptive)	505 (completed 344; G1 118, G2 121, G3 105)	Not reported (G1 <i>M</i> = 29±8; G2 <i>M</i> = 39±9; G3 <i>M</i> = 33±7)	- General description: G1 (community members), G2 (psychiatrics), G3 (police officers) - Gender: G1 (women 42.4%), G2 (women 47.1%), G3 (women 8.6%)	Survey Questionnaire (5 LC items)	2	2	3, 4	0
Cho et al. (2015)	South Korea (continental)	Quantitative (descriptive)	150 (137 completed, 131 selected)	Not reported (<i>M</i> = 28,1±4.9)	- General description: Nurses - Gender: Women (88.6%)	Survey Questionnaire (Jung's elderly abuse and legal knowledge evaluation questionnaire; y/n/unsure; 7 LC items)	1	2	2, 3	0
Cleary and Warner (2017)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (descriptive)	303 (294 selected)	18-67 (<i>M</i> = 36.9±9.2)	- General description: Parents - Gender: Women (80.2%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Afro-American (80.9%), Caucasian (10.4%), other (8.7%) - SES: Bottom (69.3%) - Education: Secondary > (22.6%), college (46.4%), bachelor (19.8%), post-gradual (13.2%)	Questionnaire (The Understanding Police Interrogation Questionnaire, UPI; y/n; 3 LC items; The Youth Legal Rights Attitude Scale, YLRAS; Likert; 4 LC items)	1	2	3, 4	0

Appendix

Characteristics of All Reviewed Studies (continued)

Study	Country (legal system)	Study design	Sample size	Age range (M ± SD)	Population (general description, gender, nationality/ethnicity, education, occupation, SES)	Method (specification for LC measurement)	P/S (1/2)	Complexity of LC	LC parts	T-B (1/0)
Colwell et al. (2008)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (quasi-experimental)	392 (S1 242, S2 30, S3 120)	Not reported (S1 M = 20,3±4; S2 not reported; S3 M = 23,7±6,4)	- General description: Undergraduate students - Gender: S1 (women 62.2%), S2 women 16.8%, S3 (women 67.5%) - Nationality/ethnicity: S1 (Caucasian 77.4%, Afro-American 14.8%, Hispanic 2.5%, other 5.3%), S2 (Caucasian 46.7%, Afro-American 33.3%, Hispanic 13.3%), S3 (Caucasian 67.5%, Afro-American 27.5%, Hispanic 2.5%, other 2.5%)	S1: Questionnaire (Test of Malingered Incompetence – Law, TOMI-L; written version; 25 LC items); S2: Structured interview, TOMI-L; verbal version; 25 LC items; S3: Questionnaire, TOMI-L; written version; 25 LC items)	2	1	1	0
Colwell and Colwell (2011)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (analytical)	82	Not reported (M = 36.34±11,49)	- General description: Forensic inpatients - Gender: women (0%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Caucasian (45.1%), Afro-American (45.1%), Hispanic (7.3%), other (2.4%) - Education: Primary (62.2%), secondary (8.5%), college (29.3%)	Questionnaire (Test of Malingered Incompetence – Law, TOMI-L; 25 LC items)	2	1	1	0
Cooper et al. (2010)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (descriptive)	167 (164 completed, G1 89, G2 78)	4-14 (G1 M = 10,08±2,72; G2 M = 9,67±2,61)	- General description: G1 (children with experience with abuse), G2 (children without experience with abuse) - Gender: G1 (women 54.9%), G2 (women 47.4%) - Nationality/ethnicity (G1 & G2): Hispanic (40-50%), Afro-American (20-25%)	H: Interview (Legal knowledge interview, terms definition, 7 LC items); Questionnaire (story questionnaire, open ended, close ended)	1	2	1, 2	1
Cormier (2007)	Kyrgyzstan (continental)	Qualitative (descriptive)	Not reported (28 completed)	Not reported	- General description: Farmers - Gender: Women (60%)	H: Focus groups discussions (open ended); Observation	1	3	2, 4, 5	0
Cowan (2004)	UK (anglo-saxon)	Qualitative (descriptive, longitudinal)	700 (completed 94)	Not reported	General description: Homeless	Interview (open ended)	1	4	2, 3, 4, 5	1
Crawford and Bull (2006)	UK (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (analytical, between groups)	111 (G1 55, G2 56)	12-15 (M = 13,46)	- General description: G1 (children attending non-selective school), G2 (children attending selective school) - Gender (G1 & G2): Women (55%)	Survey Questionnaire (open ended, close ended, terms definition, Knowledge of Court Questionnaire, 16 LC items)	1	1	1	0
Denvir et al. (2013)	UK (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (analytical)	3,806	16 <	General description: Data gathered from English and Welsh Civil and Social Justice Panel Survey (CSJPS, 2010)	Survey Questionnaire (open ended)	1	2	1, 3	0
Dickert et al. (2012)	Germany (continental)	Mixed (experimental)	137 (IG1 50, IG2 47, CG 40)	Not reported (IG1 M = 23.8±1.39; IG2 M = 52.7±10.3; CG M = 24.4±6.5)	- General description: IG1 (Law students), IG2 (lay judges), CG (students) - Gender: IG1 (women 38%), IG2 (women 50%), CG (women 38%)	Experiment & Vignettes (8 LC items)	1	1	3	0
DiGregorio (2016)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Qualitative (descriptive)	21	25-48 (M = 35.8)	- General description: LGBTQ community members - Nationality/ethnicity: Afro-American (14%), Native-American (5%), Caucasian (81%) - Education: Secondary (19%), college (81%)	Interview (semi-structured, in depth)	2	2	4, 5	1
Downar et al. (2012)	Canada (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (analytical, PP)	51 (44 completed)	Not reported	Gender: Women (33%)	Survey Questionnaire (Likert, 11 LC items)	1	2	2, 3	0
Driver and Brank (2009)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (analytical, PP)	167 (118 completed)	Not reported (M = 15.55±1.37)	- General description: Juveniles in detention - Gender: Women (7%)	H: Questionnaire/ performance test (open ended, closed ended, 30 LC items)	1	2	1, 2	1
Dunlap and Iceman (1985)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (descriptive)	278	Not reported	General description: Handicapped persons	Interview (closed ended; The National Independent Living Skills Assessment Instrument, NILS; 53 LC items), observation	1	2	1, 3	0

Appendix

Characteristics of All Reviewed Studies (continued)

Study	Country (legal system)	Study design	Sample size	Age range (M ± SD)	Population (general description, gender, nationality/ethnicity, education, occupation, SES)	Method (specification for LC measurement)	P/S (1/2)	Complexity of LC	LC parts	T-B (1/0)
Einat (2004)	Israel (anglo-saxon)	Qualitative (descriptive)	40	Not reported	- General description: Magistrates - Nationality/ethnicity: Israeli (100%)	Interview (phenomenological, semi-structured; content analysis)	1	1	4	0
Emshoff et al. (1980)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (experimental)	56 (selected IG 10; CG 10, but only 8 completed)	Not reported	- General description: Inmates - Nationality/ethnicity: Afro-American (55%), Caucasian (45%)	H: Questionnaire/ performance test (Test of legal knowledge, multiple-choice open ended, true/false, 130 LC items); Survey Questionnaire (Semantic Differential Attitudinal Questionnaire); Qualitative Questionnaire (Legal problems questionnaires)	1	5	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	0
Erickson et al. (2013)	Canada (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (descriptive)	1,562 (122 interviews; 1,440 phone survey, but only 1,081 completed)	Not reported (M = 35.9±12)	Gender: Women (34.7%)	Interview (in depth)	1	2	3, 4	0
Erickson et al. (1993)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (analytical)	294 (256 completed)	17-76 (M = 39)	- General description: Store owners, managers, assistant managers, clerks - Gender: Women (28%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Caucasian (39%), Hispanic (9%), Asian (5%), Middle-Eastern (16%), other (31%) - Education: Primary (7%), secondary < (93%) - Occupation: Manager (80%), salesman (20%)	Survey Questionnaire (4 LC items)	1	1	3	0
Farmer et al. (2015)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (analytical, between groups)	884 (644 completed)	18 <	- Gender: Women (57%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Caucasian (42%), other (58%)	Survey Questionnaire (Likert, 5 LC items)	2	1	3	0
Farrell et al. (2012)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (analytical)	3,497 (1,940 completed)	Not reported	General description: Jurors	Survey Questionnaire (Likert)	2	1	5	1
Fekete and Gajduschek (2015)	Hungary (continental)	Quantitative (descriptive)	1,000	Not reported	General description: Data gathered from The General Survey on Peoples' Legal Knowledge (2013) and from National Survey of Kálmán Kulcsár (1965)	Survey Questionnaire (The General Survey on Peoples' Legal Knowledge, 2013; 13 LC items)	1	3	1, 2, 3	1
Ficke et al. (2006)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (analytical, between groups)	247 (G1 26, G274, G3 100, G4 47)	9-18 (M = 14.7±1.8; G1 9-12; G2 13-14; G3 15-16; G4 17-18)	- General description: Juveniles - Gender: Women (19%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Afro-American (66%), Caucasian (31%), other (2.1%)	Interview (structured; MacArthur Competency Assessment Tool-Criminal Adjudication, MacCAT-CA; 22 LC items)	1	3	1, 2, 3	0
Flavier and Chen (1980)	Philippines (continental)	Quantitative (descriptive)	676	Not reported	Gender: Women (100%)	Survey Questionnaire (1 LC item)	2	1	3	0
Galletly et al. (2012)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (descriptive)	384	19-70 (M = 43±10.28)	- General description: HIV positive persons - Gender: Women (35.6%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Afro-American (54.3%)	Survey Questionnaire	1	2	3, 4	0
German and Hoffman (1973)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (analytical, between groups)	2,679	Not reported	- General description: Students - Gender: Women (48.2%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Caucasian (88.8%), other (11.2%)	Survey Questionnaire (open ended, multiple-choice)	1	5	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	0
Gleeson (2010)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Qualitative (analytical)	41	18-59	- General description: Documented and undocumented immigrants - Gender: women (17%) - Nationality/Ethnicity: Latino (100%)	Interview (in depth, semi-structured)	1	2	3, 5	1

Appendix

Characteristics of All Reviewed Studies (continued)

Study	Country (legal system)	Study design	Sample size	Age range ($M \pm SD$)	Population (general description, gender, nationality/ethnicity, education, occupation, SES)	Method (specification for LC measurement)	P/S (1/2)	Complexity of LC	LC parts	T-B (1/0)
Goodwin-De Faria and Marinos (2012)	Canada (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (analytical)	50	13-17 ($M = 16.08$)	- General description: Adolescents - Gender: Women (30%)	H: Interview (semi-structured, Grounded theory); Vignettes	1	2	1, 3	1
Gosselt et al. (2012)	Netherlands (continental)	Qualitative (descriptive)	106	Not reported	General description: Liquor store managers	Interview (cross-sectional, open ended, 2 LC items)	2	1	4	0
Gottfried and Carbonell (2014)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (analytical, between groups)	130 (G1 65, G2 65)	G1 18-71 ($M = 41.85+13.69$); G2 18-30 ($M = 19.66+2.4$)	- General description: G1 (mentally disordered persons), G2 (students) - Gender: G1 (women 9.2%), G2 (women 70.8%) - Nationality/ethnicity: G1 (Caucasian 53.8%, Afro-American 46.2%), G2 (Caucasian 84.6%, Afro-American 15.3%)	Survey Questionnaire/performance test (Inventory of Legal Knowledge, ILK; true/false; 61 LC items)	2	3	1, 2, 3	0
Gottfried et al. (2015)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (analytical, between groups)	260 (S1 195, S2 65)	Not reported (S1 $M = 19.51+2.23$; S2 $M = 38.22+13.22$)	- General description: S1 (undergraduate students), S2 (psychiatric population) - Gender: S1 (women 73.8%), S2 (women 7.7%) - Nationality/ethnicity: S1 (Caucasian 77.4%, Afro-American 17.4%, other 5.2%), S2 (Afro-American 50.8%, Caucasian 49.2%)	Survey Questionnaire/performance test (Inventory of Legal Knowledge, ILK; true/false; 61 LC items)	2	3	1, 2, 3	0
Greene (2016)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Qualitative (analytical)	97	18-65	- General description: Residents of public housing communities - Gender: Women (48.5%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Caucasian (56.4%), Afro-American (43.7%)	Interview (in depth, semi-structured)	1	4	1, 2, 4, 5	0
Grisso et al. (2003)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (analytical)	1,429 (1,393 completed, G1 927, G2 466)	G1 11-17; G2 18-24	- General description: G1 (imprisoned adolescents), G2 (imprisoned young adults) - Gender (G1 & G2): Women (41.2%) - Nationality/ethnicity (G1 & G2): Afro-American (40%), Caucasian (35%), Hispanic (23%), Asian (1%), other (1%) - SES (G1 & G2): Bottom (75%)	H: Interview I. (structured; MacArthur Competency Assessment Tool-Criminal Adjudication, MacCAT-CA; 22 LC items); Interview II. (structured; MacArthur Judgement Evaluation, Mac-JEN; Likert); Vignettes	1	3	1, 2, 3	1
Guenther and Otto (2010)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (analytical, between groups)	307 (G1 207, G2 100)	G1 18-54 ($M = 20.46+3.89$); G2 18-61 ($M = 37.67+11.3$)	- General description: G1 (college undergraduates), G2 (psychiatric population) - Nationality/ethnicity: G1 (Caucasian 54%, Afro-American 21%, Hispanic 13%, Asian 7%, other 5%), G2 (Caucasian 48%, Afro-American 27%, Hispanic 20%, Asian 2%, other 3%) - Education: G1 (college 100%), G2 (secondary < 70%)	Survey Questionnaire/performance test (Inventory of Legal Knowledge, ILK; true/false; 61 LC items)	2	3	1, 2, 3	0
Guzik (2008)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (descriptive)	30	20-58 ($M = 31.1 \pm 9.19$)	- General description: Inmates - Gender: women (10%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Afro-American (56.7%), Caucasian (36.7%), Latino (6.7%)	Interview (semi-structured, narrative analysis)	2	1	5	0
Haines (1983)	Australia (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (analytical, PP)	12	14-16	General description: Psychiatric population	Survey Questionnaire (Legal Studies Knowledge Test, LSKT; 13 LC items)	1	3	1, 2, 3	0
Hammel (2010)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (analytical)	1,822 (168 completed, 134 selected)	Not reported	- General description: Faculty members - Gender: Women (70.1%)	Survey Questionnaire (The Disability Law Knowledge Survey Questionnaire; y/n; 26 LC items)	1	1	3	0
Hansen and Walden (2013)	USA (anglo-saxon)	S1 Mixed (experimental), S2 Quantitative (experimental), S3 Quantitative (experimental)	1,111 (963 completed, S1 600 (473), S2 211 (196), S3 300 (294))	Not reported	- General description: S1 (consumers), S2 & S3 (students) - Gender (S1, S2 & S3): Women (45%)	- S1: Vignettes (8 LC items) - S2: Vignettes (3 LC items) - S3: Vignettes (Likert, 5 LC items)	1	1	3	0

Appendix

Characteristics of All Reviewed Studies (continued)

Study	Country (legal system)	Study design	Sample size	Age range (M ± SD)	Population (general description, gender, nationality/ethnicity, education, occupation, SES)	Method (specification for LC measurement)	P/S (1/2)	Complexity of LC	LC parts	T-B (1/0)
Hendley (2012)	Russia (continental)	Quantitative (analytical, longitudinal)	9,958	Not reported	- General description: Data gathered from Russian Longitudinal Monitoring Study of the Higher School of Economics (RLMS-HSE) - Round 13 - Gender: Women (56.6%) - Education: Secondary > (80.2%), college (19.8%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Russian (80%), other (20%)	Survey Questionnaire (Likert, y/n; 2 LC items)	1	1	5	1
Hernández (2010)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Qualitative (quasi-experimental, between groups)	72	Not reported	- General description: Mothers - SES: Bottom (100%)	Interview (semi-structured, ethnographic); Observation	2	3	2, 4, 5	1
Hill et al. (2016)	South Africa (continental + anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (descriptive)	1,480 (G1 571, G2 902)	Not reported (M = 25.5±5.3; G1 M = 26.4±5.1; G2 M = 25±5.4)	- General description: G1 (HIV positive persons), G2 (HIV negative persons) - Gender (G1 & G2): Women (100%) - Education (G1 & G2): Primary (42.1%), secondary (51.3%) - SES (G1 & G2): Bottom (40%), middle (40%), upper middle/top (20%)	Survey Questionnaire (Legal Questionnaire Items)	1	3	1, 2, 3	0
Hlavka (2014)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Qualitative (analytical)	100	3-17	- General description: Sexually abused children - Gender: Women (50%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Caucasian (48%), Afro-American (18%), Native-American (12%), Latino (9%), other (6%)	Interview (semi-structured, open ended; narrative analysis)	1	1	5	0
Hongyan (2003)	China (continental)	Quantitative (descriptive)	4,554 (4,339 completed)	6-14	- General description: Children; data gathered from China Youth and Children Research Center - Gender: Women (52.4%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Han (91.1%), other (8.5%)	Survey Questionnaire	2	1	1	0
Horvath and Gier-Sorolla (2007)	UK (anglo-saxon)	S2 Mixed (experimental)	96	18-64 (M = 33.72±13.04)	- General description: Mainly police officers - Gender: Women (56.6%)	Vignettes (10 LC items)	2	2	1, 3	0
Hsiao (2013)	Taiwan (continental)	Quantitative (analytical)	500 (452 completed, 420 selected)	Not reported	General description: Tobacco consumers	Survey Questionnaire (Law Awareness Scale)	1	1	3	0
Hughes et al. (2014)	Australia (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (descriptive)	924 (823 selected)	19-65 (M = 39)	- General description: Drug addicts; data gathered from Illicit Drug Reporting System (2012) - Gender: Women (35.1%) - Occupation: Unemployed (83.7%)	Interview (y/n; 2 LC items)	1	1	3	0
Jaruseviciene et al. (2011) - OVL	Lithuania (continental)	Mixed (analytical)	785 (607 selected, 466 completed)	Not reported	- General description: General practitioners - Gender: Women (83%), not identified (3.4%)	Survey Questionnaire (cross-sectional; open ended, closed ended; 2 LC items)	2	2	3, 4	0
Jülich (2006)	New Zealand (anglo-saxon)	Qualitative (descriptive)	21	26-52	- General description: Adult survivors of child sexual abuse - Gender: Women (85.7%)	H: Observation, Focus Groups, Interview (unstructured)	1	1	4	0
Jurecska (2010)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (analytical)	140 (113 completed)	18-80 (M = 36.7)	- General description: Inmates - Gender: Women (14.2%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Caucasian (35.4%), Hispanic (25.7%), Afro-American (17.7%), Asian (10.6%), Native-American (10.6%)	H: Questionnaire I (The Competence Assessment to Stand Trial for Defendants with Mental Retardation, CAST-MR; 50 LC items); Questionnaire II (Malingered Incompetence of Legal Knowledge, MLK; 58 LC items); Interview (structured; MacArthur Competency Assessment Tool-Criminal Adjudication, MacCAT-CA; 22 LC items)	1	3	1, 2, 3	0

Appendix

Characteristics of All Reviewed Studies (continued)

Study	Country (legal system)	Study design	Sample size	Age range ($M \pm SD$)	Population (general description, gender, nationality/ethnicity, education, occupation, SES)	Method (specification for LC measurement)	P/S (1/2)	Complexity of LC	LC parts	T-B (1/0)
Kalinina (2014)	Russia (continental)	Quantitative (analytical)	60 (G1 30, G2 30)	21-23	General description: G1 (law students), G2 (humanities students)	Questionnaire (Test on legal and civic consciousness)	1	1	5	1
Kazyak (2015)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Qualitative (descriptive)	21	25-46	- General description: Parents from LGB community - Nationality/ethnicity: Caucasian (95%) - Education: Secondary > (5%), college (95%) - SES: Bottom (24%), middle (67%), upper middle (9%)	Interview (semi-structured, 1 LC item)	1	4	1, 2, 3, 4	0
Kilmer (2016)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Qualitative (descriptive)	43	22-72 ($M = 38$)	- General description: Prisoners released from jail - Gender: Women (23%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Afro-American (44%), Caucasian (42%), Hispanic (14%) - Education: Primary (25.6%), secondary (30.2%), vocational training (14%), college (30.2%) - Occupation: Employed (56%)	Interview (semi-structured)	1	1	5	1
Kim et al. (2007)	South Korea (continental)	Quantitative (analytical)	288	22-49 ($M = 26,7 \pm 3,11$)	- General description: Nurses - Gender: Women (100%)	Survey Questionnaire (Legal Awareness Questionnaire; true/false; 25 LC items)	1	3	1, 2, 3	0
Kim et al. (2016)	South Korea (continental)	Quantitative (analytical)	500 (459 completed, 420 selected); G1 250 (237, 220); G2 250 (222, 200)	Not reported	General description: G1 (students living in Korea), G2 (students living in USA)	Survey Questionnaire (Likert)	2	1	3	0
Kleefeld and Farnese (2015)	Canada (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (descriptive)	30	Not reported	General description: Students	Observation	2	1	3	0
Kramer et al. (2010)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (descriptive)	185	Not reported	- General description: Physicians - Gender: Women (45.1%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Caucasian (76.5%), other (23.5%)	Survey Questionnaire	1	1	3	0
Kramer et al. (2011)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (descriptive)	1,009 (676 completed, 546 selected)	Not reported ($M = 49.1 \pm 13.2$)	- General description: Cardiac patients - Gender: Women (47%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Caucasian (92.2%), others (7.8%) - Education: Secondary > (24%)	Survey Questionnaire	1	1	3	0
Kumar et al. (2013)	India (anglo-saxon + continental)	Mixed (analytical)	443 (89 selected)	Not reported	General description: Nursing staff	Survey Questionnaire: (multiple-choice, open ended; 25 LC items)	1	2	1, 3	0
Lageson (2017)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Qualitative (analytical)	67 (59 completed); G1 40 (32); G2 27 (27)	G1 20-70, G2 20-60	- General description: G1 (crime website publishers), G2 (criminal record expungement-seekers) - Gender: G1 (women 28%), G2 (women 37%) - Nationality/ethnicity: G1 (Caucasian 91%, Hispanic 3%, Afro-American 3%, other 3%), G2 (Afro-American 51%, Caucasian 41%, Indian 4%, Native-American 4%)	Interview (in depth)	1	2	4, 5	1
Lambie et al. (2010)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (analytical, PP)	64	21-55 ($M = 27.25 \pm 7.31$)	- General description: Counselor education students - Gender: Women (81.3%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Caucasian (84.4%), other (15.6%)	Survey Questionnaire (Ethical and Legal Issues in Counseling Questionnaire, ELICQ; multiple-choice; 50 LC items)	1	3	1, 2, 3	0

Appendix

Characteristics of All Reviewed Studies (continued)

Study	Country (legal system)	Study design	Sample size	Age range (M ± SD)	Population (general description, gender, nationality/ethnicity, education, occupation, SES)	Method (specification for LC measurement)	P/S (1/2)	Complexity of LC	LC parts	T-B (1/0)
Lambie et al. (2011)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (analytical)	229 (186 completed)	24-68 (M = 46.12±11.4)	- General description: School counselors - Gender: Women (12.1%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Caucasian (80%), Hispanic (3.8%), Afro-American (1.9%), other (4.8%) - Education: Primary (37.6%), secondary (45.7%), other (16.7%)	Survey Questionnaire (Ethical and Legal Issues in Counseling Questionnaire, ELICQ; multiple-choice; 50 LC items)	1	3	1, 2, 3	0
Landry (2009)	China (continental)	Quantitative (analytical, between groups)	7,750 (G1 571, G2 7179)	18-65	General description: G1 (Chinese communist party members), G2 (not members)	H: Survey Questionnaire, Vignettes	1	4	1, 2, 3, 5	0
Lazarus et al. (2008) - OVL	Lithuania (continental)	Mixed (analytical)	785 (607 selected, 466 completed)	Not reported	- General description: General practitioners - Gender: women (83%), not identified (3.4%)	Survey Questionnaire (cross-sectional; open ended, closed ended; 2 LC items)	2	2	3, 4	0
LeBlang et al. (1985)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (analytical, PP)	88 (80 completed)	Not reported	General description: Students	Survey Questionnaire: (Likert, 50 LC items)	1	3	3, 4, 5	0
LoGalbo and Callahan (2001)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (analytical, PP)	111	Not reported	General description: Juvenile offenders in Teen Court program	Survey Questionnaire: [Likert, Likert-type scale (feeling thermometers 0-100); 22 LC items]	1	2	2, 3	0
Lubsky et al. (2016)	Russia (continental)	Quantitative (descriptive)	Not reported	Not reported	- General description: Students - Education: Secondary (100%)	Survey Questionnaire (Likert, 12 LC items)	1	3	1, 3, 4	1
Maguire and Johnson (2015)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (analytical)	11,155	Not reported	General description: Data gathered from UNDP Citizen Security Survey	Survey Questionnaire: (Likert, 11 LC items)	1	1	4	1
Maier (2007)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Qualitative (descriptive)	58	18-60	- General description: Rape victim advocates - Gender: Women (mostly/all) - Nationality/ethnicity: Caucasian (69%), Afro-American (12%), Hispanic (8%), other (11%) - Education: College (100%)	Interview (in depth, open ended)	1	2	3, 4	0
Maunsell et al. (2000)	Ireland (anglo-saxon)	Qualitative (analytical)	360 (173 completed, 160 selected)	4-75 (M = 21.6)	- General description: Children and adults - Nationality/ethnicity: Irish (100%) - SES: Bottom (34.9%), middle (30.9%), upper middle/top (34.7%)	Survey Questionnaire (Legal Knowledge and Perception of Court Interview Schedule, LKPCIS; verbal; semi-structured; 60 LC items)	1	2	1, 2	1
Maxwell et al. (2003)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (analytical)	476	15-18	- General description: Students - Gender: Women (51.7%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Caucasian (85.9%), other (14.1%)	Questionnaire (Legal Knowledge Scale; true/false; 7 LC items)	2	2	1, 3	0
McLoughlin and Lelles (1997)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (descriptive)	705 (335 completed)	Not reported	- General description: Members of Ohio School Psychologists Association (OSPA) - Gender: Women (68.4%)	H: Questionnaire & vignettes (Survey of Children's Legal Rights; Likert; 35 LC items; vignettes 11 LC items)	1	1	3	0
McLoughlin and Sametz (1983)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (descriptive)	39 (G1 17, G2 22)	Not reported	General description: G1 (trainees students), G2 (interns students)	H: Questionnaire & vignettes (Survey of Children's Legal Rights; Likert; 39 LC items; vignettes 11 LC items)	1	1	3	0
McLoughlin et al. (1983)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (descriptive)	248	Not reported	- General description: Students - Gender: Women (73%)	H: Questionnaire & vignettes (Survey of Children's Legal Rights; Likert; 39 LC items; vignettes 11 LC items)	1	1	3	0
Militello et al. (2009)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (descriptive)	8,000 (717 answered, 493 completed)	Not reported	- General description: Principals of secondary schools - Gender: Women (36%)	Questionnaire (The Principals' Education Law Survey; true/false/unsure; open ended; 35 LC items)	1	2	3, 4	0
Mohamadinejad and Mirsafian (2015)	Iran (Sharia)	Mixed (analytical, between groups)	322 (180 completed, only 40 interviewed)	26-58 (M = 38.57±8.15)	- General description: Coaches - Gender: Women (45%) - Education: Secondary (33%), college (67%)	H: Interview (in depth); Questionnaire (modified version of Grayand McKinstrey's scale Risk Management Behaviors of Coaches; 48 LC items)	1	1	3	0

Appendix

Characteristics of All Reviewed Studies (continued)

Study	Country (legal system)	Study design	Sample size	Age range ($M \pm SD$)	Population (general description, gender, nationality/ethnicity, education, occupation, SES)	Method (specification for LC measurement)	P/S (1/2)	Complexity of LC	LC parts	T-B (1/0)
Morita et al. (2006)	Japan (continental)	Quantitative (analytical)	5,794 (3,222 completed, 3,061 selected); G1 5,000 (2,670, 2,548); G2 794 (552, 513)	G1 40-79, G2 not reported	- General description: G1 (general population), G2 (bereaved family) - Gender: Women (53.5%)	Survey Questionnaire (cross-sectional; 3 LC items)	1	1	3	0
Mullen et al. (2016)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (analytical)	4,500 (287 completed)	24-70 ($M = 45,13 \pm 11,34$)	- General description: School counselors - Gender: Women (84.3%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Caucasian (90.6%), Afro-American (4.5%), other (4.9%)	Questionnaire (Ethical and Legal Knowledge Assessment – Revised, ELICA-R; multiple-choice; 35 LC items)	1	3	1, 2, 3	0
Murdock (2013)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (experimental, PP)	356 (103 completed, IG1 78, CG2 25)	11-17 ($M = 14,12 \pm 1,79$)	- General description: IG1 (students of Juvenile Competency Court School curriculum, JCCS), CG2 (students) - Gender (IG1 & CG2): Women (21%) - Nationality/ethnicity (IG1 & CG2): Hispanic (37%), Afro-American (26%), Caucasian (26%), other (7%)	Interview (structured; MacArthur Competency Assessment Tool-Criminal Adjudication, MacCAT-CA; 22 LC items)	2	3	1, 2, 3	1
Nicholson et al. (1988)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (analytical, PP)	140	Not reported ($M = 31,4 \pm 12,4$)	- General description: Defendants - Gender: Women (8.6%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Afro-American (63.6%), Caucasian (35.7%), Native-American (0.7%)	Questionnaires (The Competency Screening Test, CST; open-ended; 22 LC items; Georgia Court Competency Test-Mississippi State Hospital Revision, GCCT-MSH; open ended; 21 LC items)	1	2	1, 2	0
Nivelstein et al. (2008)	Netherlands (continental)	Mixed (analytical)	60		General description: Students of law courses	Cards (card sorting tasks, 30 LC items)	1	2	1, 3	1
Otto et al. (2011)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (analytical)	120	18-68 ($M = 35,02 \pm 12,48$)	- General description: Defendants - Gender: Women (11.7%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Afro-American (57.5%), Caucasian (32.5%), Hispanic (8.3%), other (1.6%)	Survey Questionnaire/performance test (Inventory of Legal Knowledge, ILK; true/false; 61 LC items)	2	3	1, 2, 3	0
Park et al. (2016)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Qualitative (descriptive)	51	31-60 ($M = 41$)	- General description: Parents from LGB community - Gender: Women (53%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Caucasian (90%) - Education: College (87%)	Interview (in depth; Grounded theory)	1	2	3, 4	1
Paul (2015)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (analytical, between groups)	281 (G1 141, G2 140)	25+	- General description: G1 (legal facilitators), G2 (general population) - Gender: G1 (women 66%), G2 (women 60%) Nationality/ethnicity (G1 & G2): Caucasian (90%)	Questionnaire (Likert; 36 LC items)	1	1	4	0
Pennington (2015)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Qualitative (descriptive, longitudinal)	30 families (2 selected)		General description: Families with experience in the juvenile justice system	Interview (semi-structured, open ended, Grounded theory); Observation	1	2	4, 5	1
Pennington (2017)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Qualitative (descriptive, longitudinal)	30 families		General description: Families with experience in the juvenile justice system	Interview (in depth, semi-structured); observation	1	2	4, 5	1
Pereira and Monteiro (2017)	Portugal (continental)	Qualitative (descriptive)	610 (427 completed)	34,48+11,54	- General description: LGB community members - Gender: Women (13.5%) - Education: College (70%)	Interview (semi-structured)	1	3	3, 4, 5	0
Perry-Hazan and Birnhack (2016)	Israel (anglo-saxon)	Qualitative (descriptive)	41		- General description: School principals, municipal officials and managers of security companies - Gender: Women (39%)	Interview (semi-structured)	2	1	3	1

Appendix

Characteristics of All Reviewed Studies (continued)

Study	Country (legal system)	Study design	Sample size	Age range ($M \pm SD$)	Population (general description, gender, nationality/ethnicity, education, occupation, SES)	Method (specification for LC measurement)	P/S (1/2)	Complexity of LC	LC parts	T-B (1/0)
Peterson-Badeli and Abramovitch (1992)	Canada (anglo-saxon)	Qualitative (analytical, between groups)	192	9-23	- General description: Children and young adults - Gender: Women (50%) - SES: Bottom (33,3%), middle (33,3%), upper middle/top (33,3%)	H: Vignettes (4 LC items); Interview (semi-structured)	1	3	1, 2, 3	1
Peterson-Badeli et al. (1997)	Canada (anglo-saxon)	Qualitative (analytical, between groups)	67	7-12	- General description: Children - Gender: Women (34%)	H: Vignettes (2 LC items); Interview (semi-structured)	1	3	1, 2, 3	1
Pinski et al. (2001)	Brazil (continental)	Quantitative (analytical)	2,166 (2,004 completed)	18-26	- General description: Candidates for driver license - Gender: Women (47.9%)	Questionnaire (true/false; Likert; 14 LC items)	2	3	3, 4, 5	0
Pleasence and Balmer (2012)	UK (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (analytical)	3,806	16 <	General description: Data gathered from English and Welsh Civil and Social Justice Panel Survey (CSJPS, 2010)	Vignettes	1	1	3	1
Preiss et al. (2016)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (analytical)	5,490 (3,800 completed, only 131 interviewed)	Not reported	- General description: Students of 9th and 11st grade - Gender: Women (58%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Caucasian (57%), Latino (16.4%), Afro-American (11.6%), Asian (4.3%) other (10.7%)	H: Survey Questionnaire (Civil Litigation Research Project); Interview (in depth); Observation (ethnographic)	1	4	2, 3, 4, 5	1
Preston-Shoot and McKimm (2012)	UK (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (analytical, longitudinal, PP)	938 (638 responded)	Not reported	- General description: Social work students - Education: College (100%)	H: Concept map (mind maps); Survey questionnaire (Likert, 75 LC items)	1	5	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	1
Preston-Shoot and McKimm (2013)	UK (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (analytical, longitudinal, PP, between groups)	1,792 (IG1 1,154, IG2 638)	Not reported	General description: IG1 (medical students), IG2 (social work students)	H: Concept map (mind maps); Survey questionnaire (Likert)	1	5	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	0
Preston-Shoot et al. (2011)	UK (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (analytical)	2,509 (1,154 completed)	Not reported	General description: Medical students attending law courses	H: Concept map (mind maps); Survey questionnaire (Likert, 75 LC items)	1	5	1, 2, 3, 4, 5	0
Preston-Shoot et al. (2013)	UK (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (analytical, PP, between groups)	938 (638 completed, IG1 399, IG2 239)	Not reported	- General description (IG1 & IG2): Social work students - Education (IG1 & IG2): College (100%)	Survey Questionnaire (Likert, 55 LC items)	1	2	4, 5	0
Quinn et al. (2014)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (analytical, between groups)	72 (IG1 40, IG2 32)	Not reported	- General description: IG1 (patients with familiar risk for hereditary cancer), IG2 (biomedicine and behavioral researchers) - Gender: IG1 (women 92.5%), IG2 (women 93.7%) - Nationality/ethnicity: IG1 (Caucasian 100%), IG2 (Caucasian 56.3%, Afro-American 28.1%, other 15.6%) - Education: IG1 (secondary 5%, college 95%), IG2 (college 100%) - Occupation: IG1 (employed 85%), IG2 (employed 100%)	Focus groups (comparative and content analysis)	2	2	2, 3	0
Rafky and Sealey (1975)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (descriptive)	1,166	Not reported	General description: Urban secondary school students in 11st grade	Survey Questionnaire (y/n; true/false; 26 LC items)	1	3	3, 4, 5	0
Ramkrishna Reddy et al. (2010)	India (anglo-saxon + continental)	Quantitative (descriptive)	133	Not reported ($M = 18.9 \pm 0.84$)	- General description: Medical students - Gender: Women (28%)	Survey Questionnaire (1 LC item)	2	1	3	0
Ranasinghe (2010)	Canada (anglo-saxon)	Qualitative (descriptive)	25	Not reported	General description: Members of Business Improvement Associations (BIAS)	H: Interview (semi-structured, open ended); document analysis	1	2	4, 5	1
Rao and Hari (2016)	India (anglo-saxon + continental)	Quantitative (descriptive)	200	Not reported	General description: Interns and post-graduate students	Survey Questionnaire (15 LC items)	1	1	3	0

Appendix

Characteristics of All Reviewed Studies (continued)

Study	Country (legal system)	Study design	Sample size	Age range (M ± SD)	Population (general description, gender, nationality/ethnicity, education, occupation, SES)	Method (specification for LC measurement)	P/S (1/2)	Complexity of LC	LC parts	T-B (1/0)
Redlich and Shteynberg (2016)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (analytical, between groups)	189 (IG1 89, IG2 100)	IG1 13-17, IG2 18-24	- General description: IG1 (juveniles), IG2 (young adults) - Gender: IG1 (women 48.3%), IG2 (women 49%) - Nationality/ethnicity: IG1 (Caucasian 27%), IG2 (Caucasian 41%)	H: Vignettes; interview (structured; MacArthur Competency Assessment Tool-Criminal Adjudication, MacCAT-CA; 22 LC items); manipulation checks (true/false/unsure; 3 LC items)	2	3	1, 2, 3	0
Richoz et al. (2011)	Switzerland (continental)	Mixed (descriptive)	7,753 (843 responded, 825 completed)	Not reported (M = 42.75 ± 10.64)	- General description: Physiotherapists - Gender: Women (72.7%)	Survey Questionnaire (closed ended, open ended; 36 LC items)	1	2	3, 4	0
Riley et al. (2015)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (analytical)	650 (259 completed)	Not reported	- General description: Physicians - Gender: Women (44.7%), not identified (23.6%) - Education: College (100%)	Survey Questionnaire (true/false, Likert-type scale)	1	2	3, 4	0
Ryo (2017)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (analytical)	565 (529 selected, 487 completed)	19-69 (M = 37 ± 9.2)	- General description: Long-term immigrant detainees - Gender: Women (7%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Hispanic (88%) - Education: No/primary (55%), secondary < (45%)	Interview (y/n; 2 LC items)	1	1	5	1
Santos et al. (2017)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (analytical)	689	10-14 (M = 12.06 ± 0.98)	- General description: Secondary school students - Gender: Women (51.2%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Latino (100%)	Survey Questionnaire (Likert; 1 LC item)	2	1	3	0
Sarat (1975)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (analytical)	220	18 <	Not reported	2 Questionnaires (Likert; 9 LC items; true/false; 10 LC items)	1	4	1, 2, 3, 5	1
Saucier et al. (2016)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (analytical, PP)	372 (316 completed)	18 <	- General description: Law enforcement officers - Gender: Women (82%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Caucasian (91.2%), other (8.9%)	Questionnaire (true/false/unsure; 1 LC item)	2	1	3	0
Schildmann et al. (2006)	Germany (continental)	Quantitative (analytical, between groups)	204 (102 selected, 85 completed)	Not reported (M = 25.5)	- General description: Medical students - Gender: Women (60%)	Questionnaire (Likert)	1	2	3, 4	0
Shabanzadeh et al. (2009)	Iran (Sharia)	Quantitative (descriptive)	418	22-55 (M = 31.98)	- General description: Nurses - Gender: Women (72%)	Questionnaire (4 LC items)	2	1	3	0
Şişli et al. (2016)	Turkey (continental)	Quantitative (analytical)	88 (74 completed)	65 <	- General description: Elderly persons - Gender: Women (55.4%) - Education: No (40.5%), primary (35.9%), secondary (10.8%), college (2.7%)	Questionnaire (closed ended; 8 LC items)	1	1	3	0
Smith (1985)	Canada (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (descriptive)	166 (96 completed)	Juveniles 14-17, other groups not reported	General description: Juveniles, probation officers, defense counsels, judges	Interview (structured, semi-structured)	1	3	1, 3, 4	0
Sproule (1992)	Canada (anglo-saxon)	Qualitative (descriptive)	110	Not reported	- General description: Adolescents, elderly persons, low-income persons, aboriginal persons, relevant minorities, immigrants, working persons - Gender: Women (69%)	Focus groups	1	4	1, 3, 4, 5	0
Stevens (2013)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (descriptive)	68	Not reported	- General description: Children - Gender: Women (56%) - Nationality/ethnicity: Caucasian (41%), Hispanic (24%), Afro-American (25%), Asian (9%), other (1%)	Interview (in depth; open-ended; 9 LC items; narrative analysis)	1	2	1, 5	1
Stewart (1998)	Australia (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (descriptive)	59 (48 completed)	Not reported	General description: School principals	Questionnaire (Principal's Questionnaire; 38 LC items)	2	1	3	0

Appendix

Characteristics of All Reviewed Studies (continued)

Study	Country (legal system)	Study design	Sample size	Age range (M ± SD)	Population (general description, gender, nationality/ethnicity, education, occupation, SES)	Method (specification for LC measurement)	P/S (1/2)	Complexity of LC	LC parts	T-B (1/0)
Thomson (2014)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (analytical)	44	Not reported	- General description: Artists - Gender: Women (36%)	Interview (structured)	2	2	3, 4	1
Tie (2014)	Malaysia (anglo-saxon+Sharia)	Quantitative (analytical)	109	Not reported	- General description: School administrator - Gender: Women (58.7%)	Survey questionnaire (20 LC items)	1	2	1, 3	0
Valentine and Harris (2016)	UK (anglo-saxon)	Qualitative (descriptive)	30	Not reported	- General description: LGB community members - Nationality/ethnicity: Caucasian (mostly) - SES: middle (50%)	Interview (in depth; open-ended; 2 LC items)	1	2	3, 4	0
Vermeulen (1998)	Canada (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (analytical, between groups)	241 (G1 120, G2 121)	G1 13-17 (M = 15.17±1.44); G2 13-17 (M = 15.29±1.39)	- General description: G1 (secondary school students), G2 (young offenders) - Gender: G1 (women 56.7%), G2 (women 39.7%)	H: Interview (open-ended; 9 LC items); Vignettes (2 LC items); Questionnaire & Cards (Young Offenders' Test of Charter Cautions, YoToCC; open-ended)	1	2	1, 3	1
Viljoen et al. (2002)	Canada (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (analytical, between groups)	1,564 (212 completed, IG1 44, IG2 42, IG3 54, IG4 72)	Not reported (IG1 M = 34.4±9.9; IG2 M = 32.6±9.8; IG3 M = 29.6±9; IG4 M = 31.2±10.1)	- General description: IG1 (defendants with psychotic disorder), IG2 (defendants with affective disorder), IG3 (defendants with substance abuse disorder), IG4 (defendants without any disorder) - Nationality/ethnicity: IG1 (Caucasian 84%), IG2 (Caucasian 83%), IG3 (Caucasian 78%), IG4 (Caucasian 82%) - Education: IG1 (secondary < 34%), IG2 (secondary < 30%), IG3 (secondary < 32%), IG4 (secondary < 46%) - Occupation: IG1 (unemployed 58%), IG2 (unemployed 60%), IG3 (unemployed 49%), IG4 (unemployed 44%)	H: Questionnaire (Test of Charter Comprehension, ToCC); Interview (semi-structured; Fitness Interview Test, FIT)	1	3	1, 2, 3	1
Viljoen et al. (2005)	Canada (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (analytical, between groups)	152	11-17 (M = 14.52±1.68)	- General description: Young adult defendants - Nationality/ethnicity: Caucasian (60%), Afro-American (26.3%), Hispanic (7.9%), other (5.3%)	H: Interview (semi-structured; Fitness Interview Test, FIT); Questionnaire (Comprehension of Miranda Right/ recognition/ vocabulary, CMR/CMR-R/CMR-V); Vignettes	1	3	1, 2, 3	0
Wadoo et al. (2011)	UK (anglo-saxon)	Mixed (analytical)	100 (60 completed)	Not reported	- General description: Psychiatry trainees - Gender: Women (61.7%)	Interview (semi-structured, open-ended)	1	2	2, 3	0
Watson and Kivisto (2017)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (analytical, between groups)	32 (IG1 24, IG2 8)	Not reported (IG1 M = 38.12±15.59; IG2 M = 39.13±10.36)	- General description: IG1 (adults with intellectual disabilities; honest group), IG2 (adults with intellectual disabilities; fake bad group) - Gender: IG1 (women 54.2%), IG2 (women 62.5%); - Nationality/ethnicity: IG1 (Caucasian 70.8%), IG2 (Caucasian 62.5%)	Survey Questionnaire/performance test (Inventory of Legal Knowledge, ILK; true/false; 61 LC items)	2	3	1, 2, 3	0
White et al. (2014) - OVL	Australia (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (analytical)	2,702 (867 completed)	Not reported	- General description: Medical doctors - Gender: Women (34.4%)	Survey Questionnaire (true/false, Likert-type scale)	1	2	3, 4	0
White et al. (2016) - OVL	Australia (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (analytical)	2702 (867 completed)	Not reported	- General description: Medical doctors - Gender: Women (34.4%)	Survey Questionnaire (true/false, Likert-type scale)	1	2	3, 4	0
White et al. (2017)	Australia (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (analytical)	2104 (649 completed)	Not reported	- General description: Medical doctors - Gender: Women (35.5%)	Survey Questionnaire (true/false, Likert-type scale)	1	2	3, 4	0

Appendix

Characteristics of All Reviewed Studies

Study	Country (legal system)	Study design	Sample size	Age range (M ± SD)	Population (general description, gender, nationality/ethnicity, education, occupation, SES)	Method (specification for LC measurement)	P/S (1/2)	Complexity of LC	LC parts	T-B (1/0)
Withey (2010)	UK (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (S1 analytical; PP; S2 analytical; PP; between groups; S3 analytical)	464 (S1 206, S2 208); IG1 pre 113, post 51; IG2 pre 95, post 83; S3 50	Not reported	- General description: S1 (college students and pupils), S2 [IG1 (freshmen college students), IG2 (second year college students)], S3 [IG1 (freshmen college students with 6-week intervention), IG2 (second year college students with 6-week intervention)] - Gender: S1 (women 63%), S2 [IG1 (women 65.5%), IG2 (women 74.5%)], S3 [IG1 (women 74%), IG2 (women 66%)]	Questionnaire (Knowledge Relating to the Law Governing Rape, KLR-25; true/false; 25 LC items)	1	1	3	1
Yeon et al. (2016)	Malaysia (anglo-saxon + Sharia)	Mixed (descriptive)	6,053 (4,747 completed; IG1 53 (44); IG2 6,000 (4,703))	15-40	- General description: IG1 (Policy makers and management from ministries, youth departments, agencies and societies), IG2 (Malaysian population) - Gender (IG2 only): Women (44.4%)	IG1: Interview IG2: Survey Questionnaire	1	2	1, 3	0
Zajdel et al. (2013)	Poland (continental)	Quantitative (analytical)	700 (445 completed, 328 selected)	Not reported (M = 45.4 ± 10.3)	General description: Medical doctors	Survey Questionnaire (y/n; 30 LC items)	1	4	1, 2, 3, 4	0
Zarzeka et al. (2015)	Poland (continental)	Quantitative (descriptive)	84	Not reported	- General description: Students of nursing - Gender: Women (96%)	Survey Questionnaire (y/n, multiple-choice; 42 LC items)	1	2	1, 3	0
Zucker and Barth (2017)	USA (anglo-saxon)	Quantitative (descriptive)	1,300 (138 completed)	Not reported	General description: Radiologists	Survey Questionnaire (y/n, multiple-choice; 13 LC items)	1	2	3, 4	0

Note. PP = study with pre/post design; G = group; IG = intervention group; CG = control group; S = study; OVL = overlap in sample; LGB = lesbian, gay, bisexual; LGBT = lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender; LGBTQ = lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer; LC = legal consciousness; y/n = yes/no; M = mean; SD = standard deviation; SES = socioeconomic status; H = hybrid method (combination of various methods, except for observation); P/S = Primary/secondary outcomes; T-B = Theory-based.