



## II. BUDGET

	<b>Amount</b>
<b>A. Salaries and Wages</b> ( <i>students and other personnel paid through University payroll</i> ) <i>specify no. of hours and hourly wage</i>	0
<b>A. Total Salaries &amp; Wages</b>	0

### **III. BUDGET JUSTIFICATION** (one page)

The only cost for this research is to pay participants for their participation. In research using factual questions, like multiple-choice items, questions differ on difficulty, discriminability, and the amount of guessing at the correct answer. However, these factors can be accounted for when using a 3PL Item Response Theory (IRT) Model. In addition to a 3PL model, a 1PL and 2PL model will also be used and compared, in order to determine the best fit model. For 3PL models, greater sample sizes (i.e., number of participants) are usually required (De Mars, 2010), with most recommending at least 1,000 for proper estimation of the guessing parameter. 500 participants would be the minimum needed to create each model (with 1,000 being the ideal goal) and 100% of the budget would go towards paying participants for participation in the study. Most participants for this study will be recruited from Prolific Academic. Prolific Academic participants are paid \$3.50 each. This is because the minimum pay for

#### **IV. NARRATIVE** (maximum six pages)

##### **Background and Significance**

Legal knowledge has been assessed in a variety of domains, such as knowledge about medical marijuana laws in their own state (Mauro et al., 2019) and students

compliance perspective of understanding what the government can and cannot do, where and when, and to whom, should concern every person in the United States (van Rooij, 2021).

Third, just as it is important to understand what citizens know, it is important to understand what

Kalafatis (1999) used 40 multiple choice questions to test the search and seizure knowledge of 91 school principals in Virginia. Topics were specifically relevant to this population including locker searches, metal detectors, vehicle searches, and drug testing. Results indicated that knowledge tended to be low. A score of 29 out of 40 was determined a priori to demonstrate minimal competency; however, only 35% of participants scored at least that high.

Based on the past research of lay legal knowledge, and the research on school knowledge of relevant search and seizure law, it is likely that both college students and people in the general population have a limited understanding of search and seizure law. Furthermore, some evidence indicates that people assume and make guesses about law based on what they personally believe should be true (Darley et al., 2001). Thus, it is

## **Objectives of the Research Project**

Major areas of search and seizure knowledge include: The Fourth Amendment and its historical relevance, what is a search and/or seizure, the standing requirement, warrants, plain view vs. open view, and the exclusionary rule and other remedies. It is these knowledge areas that will be tested in students, police officers, and those in the general population. Search and seizure is an expansive legal area and it is not feasible to test individuals on every aspect. Considerations were given to basic terms such as search and seizure, fundamental aspects like when a warrant is required, and routine applied contexts, such as what evidence can be admitted as search incident to a lawful arrest.

The goal of this research is primarily to describe the legal knowledge base of students, police officers, and those in the general population. We expect that students and those in the general population will





Wales. *Modern Law Review*, 80(5), 836-59. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2230.12290>

Sarat, A. (1975). Support for the legal system: An analysis of knowledge, attitudes, and behavior. *American Politics Quarterly*, 3(1), 3-24.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1532673X7500300101>

Saunders, L.E. (1975). Collective ignorance: Public knowledge of family law. *Family Coordinator*, 69-74. <https://doi.org/10.2307/583053>

van Rooij, B. (2021). Do people know the law? Empirical evidence about legal knowledge and its implications for compliance. In B.V.R & D.S. (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of compliance* (pp. 467-488). Cambridge University Press

U.S. Const. amend. IV

Weeks v. United States. 232 U.S. 383 (1914)

White, B., Willmott, L., Cartwright, C., Parker, M. H., & Williams, G. (2014).

knowledge of the law on withholding and withdrawing life-sustaining medical

treatment. *Medical Journal of Australia*, 201(4), 229-232. <https://doi.org/10.5694/mja13.00217>

