

## EFFECT OF STUDIES ON ATTITUDES TOWARDS INMATES

**Tudor-Ștefan Rotaru \* Mihaela Pretula \*\* Ștefan Boncu \*\*\***  
*University Alexandru Ioan Cuza of Iași, Romania*

### *Abstract*

*None of the studies pertaining to what role education plays in shaping the attitudes toward inmates specifically addressed the differences between psychology and law as a fields of study with different philosophies. The purpose of this study was to examine the role of students' background and field of study on their attitudes toward prisoners. The participants filled in a questionnaire regarding their perception of inmates. The results suggest that psychology students have more tolerant attitudes towards prisoners than geography and law students. We found no differences between freshmen and seniors. We discussed the results in terms of a possible self-selection effect when choosing one's field of study but also in terms of different philosophies that are specific to psychology and law.*

Keywords: inmates, forensic psychology, attitudes, delinquency

### **Introduction**

Dostoevsky once mentioned that humanity from any civilization can be measured by the way in which its inmates are treated. The delinquency

---

Correspondence concerning this paper should be addressed to:

\* Ph.D., Teaching Collaborator, University Alexandru Ioan Cuza of Iași, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences. Address: Toma Cozma st., no. 3, Iași. Romania. E-mail: [tudor.rotaru@psihoterapeutiasi.ro](mailto:tudor.rotaru@psihoterapeutiasi.ro)

\*\* Student for Master Degree in Psychology, University Alexandru Ioan Cuza of Iași, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences. Address: Toma Cozma st., No. 3, Iași, Romania. E-mail: [mihaela109@yahoo.com](mailto:mihaela109@yahoo.com)

\*\*\* Ph.D., Associate Professor, University Alexandru Ioan Cuza of Iași, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences. Address: Toma Cozma st., No. 3, Iași, Romania. E-mail: [boncu@uaic.ro](mailto:boncu@uaic.ro)

phenomenon is an essential topic for psychology and law in building a better society. A first step in investigating this contemporary reality may be to measure the attitudes of those who will interact with it. Psychology and law students can be considered future practitioners who will interact with inmates along their careers. The purpose of this study is to verify in which way the field of bachelor studies, chosen by an individual, influences his/her attitude toward inmates.

The interaction between psychology and law in investigating inmates and their integration is complex and difficult. For instance, the statistics of criminality signify a delinquency phenomenon for the attorney, while for the psychologist they represent moral realities, social inequities, conducts, aspirations and human failures. For such reasons the present paper tries to investigate psychology and law students regarding their attitudes toward inmates. The purpose of this paper is to highlight differences in how future psychologists and future lawyers think about inmates. These conclusions may contribute to understanding and improving the social reality of inmates, mainly because it could suggest the need for greater involvement from the field of psychology in the legal area.

#### *The role of education in the attitude formation*

The process involved in the attitude formation depends on the kind of education we received. Some studies show that people who were raised by religious parents are more conservative in adulthood, regarding moral attitudes (towards abortion, premarital relationships) than those who were raised by parents who do not belong to any religious affiliation (Sheepers, Te Grotenhuis, & Van Der Slik, 2002). The same authors explain that the educational system is an important factor that contributes to the cognitive, moral and personal development of the human being. Research in this area that investigates the interaction between education and attitudes assumes that better educated people (in formative institutions) have more liberal views regarding different issues than people less educated. Other authors argue that the apparent liberalism of those with a better education is superficial. Arguably, it extends only to abstract principles and not to specific policies. Frederick (1985) investigated some national surveys from America and used the attitude toward anti-Semitism, as a dependent variable. He concluded that those with a better education didn't appear to be less anti-Semitic than those with poorer education. Other studies

show that the less educated people change their attitudes more often than the ones who have a better education (Visser & Krosnick, 1998).

Such data suggests that the formal educational system is the main instrument used by a society for sharing its ideology. What is learned in schools is passed on in the world as ideas, values and attitudes. This is the reason why we expect different fields of studies to influence differently the attitude students have on those punished by society for trespassing law. Studies represent the first basis which, ideologically, creates differences in how lawyers and psychologist think about delinquency. For further investigation on this topic we will take into account two areas of studies: psychology and law. We analyze the way in which the information received during the experience of formal learning influences a student or practitioner's attitude toward inmates.

#### *Attitudes of Psychology and Law students and practitioners*

On the surface it would seem as if law and psychology share common concerns in that they both try to understand and predict human behavior. However, beyond this common focus, closer inspection would seem to reveal that the two disciplines appear to diverge at the levels of values, basic premises, models, approaches, criteria of explanation and methods (Clifford, 1995). In this paper we will focus specifically on the values and attitudes that are formed within the bachelor studies of each domain.

One of the most important divergent factors between Psychology and Law refers to the philosophical view upon human behavior. The psychologist believes to some degree in determinism (or causality), whereas the lawyer believes in freewill. Thus, while the psychologist tends to talk in terms of *causes* of behavior, the lawyer talks in terms of *reasons for* behavior. The law conceives that people are freely and consciously controlling their own behavior, choosing their actions and thus taking responsibility for them (Clifford, 1995). Psychologists take into account the fact that people act under different influences which can be intrinsic as well as extrinsic. For example, they consider genetic predispositions, quality of education received from parents, and some other factors.

Fewer studies have investigated the attitudes of law and psychology students or practitioners. De Wolfe (1974) compared responses of law students with those of undergraduates and mental health professionals when it came to applying the "mental illness" label to various types of behavioral acts. The data

indicated that law students tended to apply the label more narrowly than undergraduates and much more narrowly than mental health professionals. These findings seem to indicate that the attitudes of lawyers are related to the amount of information they have about certain topics (Yuker, 1986).

Elger (2005) investigated the attitudes of law and psychology students toward the use of genetic testing in order to detect criminal behavior. The results suggest that there are no differences between the attitudes of students from both areas of study. Students have a critical view of this practice for the same reasons: they are influenced by the belief that criminal behavior cannot be influenced only by genetic predispositions and that this genetic determinism cannot be measured accurately by genetic testing. To a lesser degree, students' attitudes seemed to have been influenced by the idea that criminal behavior is not a self-explained behavior but is caused by societal norms that vary over time (Elger, 2005). These findings do not draw specific and pertinent conclusions. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to investigate the attitudes of psychology and law students toward inmates.

#### *Attitudes toward inmates – common and different aspects of studies*

There are various studies involving attitudes toward inmates which, indeed, suggest that this is an important element of and for society. Historically, public representations of the “criminal” seem to reflect certain ambivalence toward perpetrators of criminal activity. During certain societal periods, some criminals have been considered innovators and heroes than villains. Consequently, rates of imprisonment have declined accordingly. Other times, largely due to the social construction by agents of a normative order, the criminal becomes the villain, a “public enemy”, and becomes morally repugnant to authority and the public alike. Not surprisingly, at such times the use of imprisonment as punishment rises. As such, from a sociological perspective, it seems reasonable to assume that public attitudes toward crime and justice may reflect the socio-economic dynamics of a given culture (Wood & Viki, 2004). The literature in this field approaches the investigation of attitudes toward prisoners when it comes to their interaction with various variables including gender, age, education, the ideological beliefs of the respondent, type of offense etc. The present paper will exhibit the conclusions regarding age, education and ideological beliefs, which are included in our hypothesis.

Regarding age, research has shown that older people (above 60 years) plead for longer sentences for inmates over younger people (below 60) (Hough & Moxon, 1985). Thus, differences in attitudes to crime attributed to age may, in reality, be a function of the differences in the experience of fear of crime and people's self-perceived vulnerabilities. With respect to education, studies have suggested that those who received a better education were more tolerant toward inmates than those who were poorly educated (Grasmick, Cochran, Bursik Jr., & Kimpel, 1993). On the other hand, some authors have concluded that education doesn't have this kind of effect. Dull & Wint (1997) investigated in a longitudinal study the attitudes toward inmates of students from the first year of studies and then the attitudes of the same students when they were in their last year. The data suggests that the attitude toward prisoners became less tolerant in the course of their four year of study.

The extent to which ideological beliefs influence attitudes toward inmates can be analogous to the extent in which a society influences the same attitudes. Studies have shown that those who have a religious affiliation have less tolerant attitudes toward inmates than those who claim no religious affiliation (Grasmick, Cochran, Bursik Jr., & Kimpel, 1993). A study examined the relationship between religious beliefs, political conservatism and the philosophical belief in free-will, as well as the attitudes towards the use of insanity or mental illness as a defense in court (Tygart, 1992). The results revealed that individuals who were highly religious, politically conservative or held philosophical beliefs in "free-will" were less likely to accept an insanity plea as a defense. Other results regarding political affiliation suggest that the democrats in the U.S. are less likely to consider that the law should increase in rigidity than the republicans and they support in a lesser manner the implementation of capital punishment for adults (Grasmick, Cochran, Bursik Jr., & Kimpel, 1993). The theoretic perimeter of attitudes toward inmates in general is broader than the data exposed above and that could suppress any intent of generalizing in terms of how people feel about crime, punishment and offenders.

The purpose of this study is to verify in which way the field of bachelor studies, chosen by an individual, influences his/her attitude toward inmates. The investigation of attitudes towards inmates using the field of studies will compare two major and philosophically opposite fields: psychology and law.

## **Objectives**

There is a certain amount of literature pertaining to the differences in attitudes toward inmates and other social concerns based on education. None of them addressed specifically the difference between psychology and law as field of studies in shaping this attitude. In this present study we investigate whether the attitude towards inmates is influenced by field of studies, background and year of bachelor's studies. We test whether there is a significant difference between Law and Psychology students concerning their attitude toward inmates. These two areas of study were chosen because the information involved in the curriculum is related to the phenomenon of delinquency, and has different philosophical points of view. The second purpose of this study was to verify if the background of the respondent influences his/her attitude toward inmates. We predicted certain differences that arise between people who come from the city and those coming from the countryside. Furthermore, we expect differences between the scores obtained by freshmen students and students in their last year of study, given the presumed effect of higher education.

## **Method**

### *Participants*

The participants for this study consisted of 379 volunteer students from a convenience sample, 81 males and 298 females. They were studying Psychology (N=154), Law (N=116), and Geography (N=109). This last area of study was considered a neutral group because the topics involved in the academic curriculum have less to do with delinquency. The participants primarily consisted of freshmen (N=172) and students from the last year of study (N=207). Almost half of them were born in the countryside (N=171), and the rest have their background in the city (N=208).

### *Instruments*

For this research we used the Attitude toward Inmates questionnaire that was designed by Lorraine, Gramling, Melvin and Gardner (1985). The

questionnaire contains 36 items that can be responded to using a 5 point Likert scale, 1 meaning strong disagreement, 2 disagreement, 3 indecision, 4 agreement, and 5 strong agreement. The score can take values between 36 and 180, 36 meaning the least tolerant attitude toward inmates (example of item: "*Inmates are just plain immoral*") and 180 meaning the most tolerant attitude toward inmates (example of item: "*Most inmates have a capacity for love*"). The questionnaire was translated into Romanian and was pre-tested on 90 participants (30 from each area of study). After the pre-test, we obtained an internal consistency coefficient Alpha Cronbach of .88, a mean of scores of 120,07 and a standard deviation of 16,87.

#### *Procedure*

The study was a 3 x 2 x 2 with independent samples. The independent variables were taken from areas of studies (psychology, law and geography), background (countryside or city) and year of study (first or last year of study) and the dependent variable was the attitude toward inmates. Each participant was approached in the 10 minutes breaks between classes or during the last twenty minutes of their courses. They filled in the questionnaire, indicating on the 5 point Likert type scale how they feel about each sentence presented.

#### **Results and discussions**

The purpose of this study was to verify in which way the field of bachelor studies, chosen by an individual, influences his/her attitude toward inmates. None of the studies pertaining to what role education plays in shaping the attitudes toward inmates specifically addressed the differences between psychology and law as a field of study with different philosophies. We predicted an interaction effect between the independent variables (area of study, background and year of study) upon the dependent variable (attitude toward prisoners). We assumed that psychology students would have a more tolerant attitude toward inmates than law students given the obvious differences in the academic curriculum. Furthermore, we predicted that freshmen students would have different attitudes toward inmates than students in their last year of study. Besides that, we assume the importance of a respondent's background in measuring their attitudes.

For the analysis of the interaction effect we conducted a one-way ANOVA (General Linear Model - Univariate). The interaction effect between the three variables did not prove significant ( $F_{(2,367)}=0,99$ ;  $p>.05$ ). However, the interaction between the field of study and background reached a level of significance ( $F_{(2,367)}=3,42$ ;  $p<.05$ ).

The statistical processing of the data revealed, besides the interaction effect, the main effect that each independent variable has on the attitude towards prisoners which we have mentioned below.

#### *The main effect of the field of studies*

We predicted that the area of studies would have a main effect on the attitude towards inmates. Thus, we wanted to verify in which way the field of bachelor studies, chosen by an individual, influences his/her attitude toward prisoners depending on their background and year of study. The results show the fact that the field of studies has a certain influence upon the attitude towards inmates ( $F_{(2,367)}=47,21$ ;  $p<.01$ ). Therefore, we can conclude that, next to other factors that can influence the attitude toward inmates, the field of bachelor studies is a relevant criterion for the way in which people perceive offenders. Moreover, we can observe that psychology students have more tolerant attitudes toward prisoners than law students. There, two areas of studies were chosen because both interact within the world of delinquency but in different ways as pointed out in literature (Clifford, 1995). The third level of the variable area of studies was geography. This field of study was chosen to fall between the scores obtained by psychology and law students and, as we predicted, it did so.

#### *The main effect of the background*

We also expected a main effect of the background of the respondents on their attitude towards inmates. There was a significant main effect for *background* ( $F_{(1,367)}=15,32$ ;  $p<.01$ ). This supports evidence from the literature that shows all kinds of differences between the people who were born and raised in the countryside and the people from the city.

#### *The main effect of the year of study*

We also predicted that we would find a main effect of the year of study of the respondents on their attitudes toward prisoners. We found no main effect



of the year study of the respondents upon their attitude towards inmates ( $F_{(2,367)}=0,19$ ;  $p=.891 >.05$ ). The impact of this variable is meaningless; therefore we didn't use this variable in the latter statistical processing. We chose this variable because we thought that the attitude toward prisoners would change over the course of the years of study, and the students from the first year of study would have different attitudes from the senior students.

Taking into account the fact that only the area of studies and the background of the respondents had an effect upon the dependent variable, the next step was to see the interaction effect of these two variables. The results showed that there is an effect of interaction ( $F_{(2,367)}=3,42$ ;  $p<.05$ ). Because we wanted to further investigate this effect we compared the scores of the areas of study for each background separately. In order to analyze these effects we used the orthogonal standardized contrasts Hellmert and Difference and then we calculated the effect size (d of Cohen).

In our sample, we found that:

1. Psychology students have a more tolerant attitude toward inmates than law students, no matter if they come from the countryside ( $t=6,92$ ;  $p<.01$ ;  $d=1,06$ ) or city ( $t=7,27$ ;  $p<.01$ ;  $d=1,01$ ).
2. Geography students have a more tolerant attitude toward inmates than law students no matter if they come from the countryside ( $t=5,50$ ;  $p<.01$ ;  $d=0,80$ ) or city ( $t=2,43$ ;  $p<.05$ ;  $d=0,31$ ).
3. Psychology students have a more tolerant attitude toward inmates than geography only when they come from the city ( $t=4,48$ ;  $p<.01$ ;  $d=0,58$ ), but not when they come from the countryside ( $t=0,89$ ;  $p>.05$ ;  $d=0,12$ ).
4. Psychology students have a more tolerant attitude toward inmates than the students from both law and geography combined when they come from the countryside ( $t=4,68$ ;  $p<.01$ ;  $d=0,67$ ) and when they come from the city ( $t=6,89$ ;  $p<.01$ ;  $d=0,95$ ).
5. Geography students have a more tolerant attitude toward inmates than psychology and law students combined when they come from the countryside ( $t=2,80$ ;  $p<.01$ ;  $d=0,39$ ) but not when they come from the city ( $t=1,09$ ;  $p>.05$ ;  $d=0,14$ ).
6. Law students have a less tolerant attitude towards inmates than the psychology and geography students, combined when they come from the countryside ( $t=7,01$ ;  $p<.01$ ;  $d=1,07$ ) and when they come from the city ( $t=5,49$ ;  $p<.01$ ;  $d=0,73$ ).

Psychology students seem to have a more tolerant attitudes toward inmates than law students when both groups come from the countryside ( $t=6,92$ ;  $p<.01$ ;  $d=1,06$ ) or from the city ( $t=7,27$ ;  $p<.01$ ;  $d=1,01$ ). The effect size is strong (above 0,80) in both cases. This result may be due, according to Clifford (1995), to the fact that psychologists believe to some degree in determinism (or causality) and that people's actions may be directed by other forces other than their own will. On the other hand, lawyers believe in freewill and free choice.

We also found that geography students have more tolerant attitudes towards inmates than those who study law. The effect size for those who come from the city is medium ( $t=2,43$ ;  $p<.05$ ;  $d=0,31$ ) and for those who come from the countryside is strong ( $t=5,50$ ;  $p<.01$ ;  $d=0,80$ ). This difference may be explained by the fact that those who live in the city are more familiar with the delinquency phenomenon, taking into account the assumption that places with more population (cities) have more offenders, and this could influence the tolerance that one experiences regarding inmates.

At the same time the results reveal that psychology students have a more tolerant attitude toward inmates than those who study geography when both groups come from the city ( $t=4,48$ ;  $p<.01$ ;  $d=0,58$ ) but not when they come from the countryside ( $t=,89$ ;  $p>.05$ ;  $d=0,12$ ). The effect size of the results registered for the students that come from the city is medium, indicating the fact that the lack of thorough information about the delinquency phenomenon doesn't necessarily imply a negative attitude toward inmates. This result can be correlated with the results obtained in the case when both groups came from the countryside, where geography students appear to have a more tolerant attitude toward inmates than those who study psychology, even if the size effect is small ( $t=,89$ ;  $p>.05$ ;  $d=.12$ ).

Even so, when we compared the scores obtained by the psychology students with the other two groups (law and geography) we observed that those studying psychology have more tolerant attitudes toward inmates when they come from the countryside ( $t=4,68$ ;  $p<.01$ ;  $d=0,67$ ) and when they come from the city ( $t=6,89$ ;  $p<.01$ ;  $d=0,95$ ). This result suggests that the high scores obtained by the geography department are in contrast the low scores obtained by the law students.

Other finding that we came across is the fact that geography students have more tolerant attitudes toward inmates than psychology and law students

combined when the groups come from the countryside ( $t=2,80$ ;  $p<.01$ ;  $d=0,39$ ) but not when they come from the city ( $t=1,09$ ;  $p>.05$ ;  $d=0,14$ ). These results confirm the data obtained until now, namely the fact that the low scores of the law students influence the high scores of the psychology students (with exception the case when the groups have their background in the city, although the effect size is small).

The last result that we found derives logically from the data exposed above and it refers to the fact that law students have less tolerant attitudes toward inmates than psychology and geography students combined when they come from the city ( $t=5,49$ ;  $p<.01$ ;  $d=0,73$ ) and also from the countryside ( $t=7,01$ ;  $p<.01$ ;  $d=1,07$ ). The effect size is strong in both cases.

The results revealed the fact that the variable year of study has no effect on the attitude toward inmates which might suggest that higher education doesn't change the way that prisoners are perceived. This is contrary to the findings from the longitudinal study of Dull and Wint (1997). These authors found that the attitudes of the senior students were quite different from the attitudes that the same students held in their freshmen year. Moreover, the review published by Wood and Viki (2004) contained information about the fact that people change their attitudes over the course of time. Our study didn't reveal a significant result in this matter. The reason for this could be the lack of a longitudinal study that would have captured the attitudes of the same respondents. However, this result could suggest the presence of a predisposition to follow a certain career, a predisposition that could be influenced by external factors (influence of family, the job of the parents and all kinds of relevant circumstances) as well as internal factors (traits of personality, values, beliefs etc.). Therefore, further investigation upon this predisposition might be conducted.

On the other hand, the results revealed a significant effect of the area of study upon the attitude toward inmates. The most important conclusion of our study is the fact that psychology students have more tolerant attitudes toward inmates than law students, a fact which is in contradiction with Grasmick et al. (1993) 's conclusion. In the case of the law students, in this present study, having better education doesn't make people's perceptions more tolerant regarding prisoners. On the other hand, the mentioned study could have implied a longer period of studies than in our case.

In this present study we revealed the fact that psychology students have a more tolerant attitude toward inmates than law students when they come from the countryside or city. This conclusion is supported by the literature (Clifford, 1995) that specifies the different premises used by psychologists and lawyers regarding the motivations for one's behavior. Therefore, the attitude of the psychology students may be influenced by the belief that some inmates are victims of the unfavorable circumstances that occur in the context of a society which contains extreme social classes (people who are very rich and people who are very poor). Psychology is a science of multi determinism, and this can modify the attitude of a person upon their criminal act. For the attorney, the norm is unique, and besides the lack of judgment there is no excuse for the criminal act, maybe just some circumstances with a limited effect.

Other motivations invoked by the psychologists when it comes to considering the causes of certain behaviors may be of genetic nature. Moreover, because of the frequent informational contact with the pathology of society, the attitudes of the psychology students may be influenced by the belief that some prisoners committed certain offenses or crimes without the direct intention of doing so. On the other hand, the literature indicates that lawyers, for example, tend to dichotomize. Both concepts and facts (to indulge in a dichotomy) are pressed into categories, particularly alternatives. It is one thing, although dangerous in many senses, for people to be pressed into categories, such as 'mentally disordered' or not, criminal damage or not, but it extends right through to reasonable or unreasonable behavior. Lawyers and the law have great difficulty with relative concepts (Carson, 1995). On the other hand, psychologists are trained to analyze them with the purpose of obtaining a just and pertinent conclusion. The establishment of the mental condition is a controversial element of the interaction between psychologists and lawyers and one of the legal contexts in which psychologists have great influence. All this information explains at a certain level the scores obtained by the psychology and law students on the attitude scale. Yet, it is possible that the reported attitudes aren't representative for future psychologists and lawyers. There is a certain necessity of investigating the attitudes of those who already work in each area. These results may help us withdraw more pertinent conclusions.

As seen above, the psychology students have more tolerant attitudes toward prisoners than law students when they come from the countryside or city. However, for the direct observation of the effect that the background has

on the attitudes, for example, the differences on attitudes between psychology students that come from the countryside and psychology students that have their background in the city, further investigation is necessary.

The purpose of this study was to verify in which way the field of bachelor studies, chosen by an individual, influences his/her attitude toward inmates considering their background and year of study. The lack of a main effect of the year of studies is, probably, due to the fact that, in our study, both freshmen and senior students are different people. Perhaps we could have found a significant effect if we had done a longitudinal study investigating the same students. We will consider this a limit of our study. On the other hand, we can observe a main effect of the area of study, a fact that could suggest that people have certain predispositions for certain jobs. This predisposition may be influenced by different sources (genetics, parental influence, mass-media influence etc.)

### **Conclusions**

None of the studies pertaining to what role education plays in shaping the attitudes toward inmates addressed specifically the difference between psychology and law as field of studies with opposing philosophies. The purpose of this study was to highlight the differences in attitudes toward inmates of psychology students and law students as the future practitioners in their fields, considering the subjects' background. Our data suggests that background influences one's attitude toward inmates more than the field of bachelor studies. Psychology students seem to be more tolerant in their attitudes toward inmates than law students. The different beliefs in freewill and determinism, respectively, could account for such differences in the attitudes toward inmates of psychology and law students. We found no difference between freshmen and seniors in the measures of our dependent variable. This might suggest that differences in attitudes toward inmates might be explained more easily thanks to an effect of self-selection when choosing the field of studies and less through an effect of education itself. More longitudinal studies and inclusion of younger subject might bring more information on the subject.

#### *Limits of the study*

The first limit of our study regards the lack of influence of the variable year of study upon the attitude toward inmates. Thus, in order to highlight the

effect of higher education there is a need to investigate the attitudes of the same students in different temporal moments (for example students in the first and then the last years of study). Another important limit of our study is the fact that the reported attitudes of students might not reflect the attitudes of future psychologists and attorneys. Also, the number of the respondents diminished when this interaction 3 x 2 x 2 was done. Consequently, there is a difficulty when it comes to creating a representative sample of subjects which restrains the possibility of generalizing the results to the whole population. Other limits of our study refer to the possible influence of some confounding variables (for example, some personality traits that influence one's decision to pursue a certain career and could influence one's attitude) as well as the reduced number of male respondents. Future studies could bring more precision through a longitudinal analysis and measures beginning earlier in the life of respondents.

### References

- Carson, D. (2003) "Psychology and Law, a Subdiscipline, an Interdisciplinary Collaboration or a Project". In D. Carson & R. Bull (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology in Legal Contexts* (pp. 1-30). 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- Clifford, B. (2003). Methodology: law's adopting and adapting to Psychology's Methods and Findings. In D. Carson & R. Bull (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology in Legal Contexts*. (pp. 605-624). 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons.
- Cucoş, C. (1996). *Pedagogie* [Pedagogy]. Iaşi: Polirom.
- Elger, B. S. (2005). Attitudes of Future Lawyers and Psychologists to the Use of Genetic Testing for Criminal Behavior. *Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics*, 14(3), 329-345.
- Frederick, W. (1985). The variable effects of education on liberal attitudes: A comparative-historical analysis of anti-Semitism using public opinion survey data. *American Sociological Review*, 50(4), 458-474.
- Grasmick, H. G., Cochran, J. K., Bursik Jr., R. J., & Kimpel, M. (1993). Religion, punitive justice and support for the death penalty. *Justice Quarterly*, 10(2), 289-314.

- Hough, M., & Moxon, D. (1985). Dealing with offenders: Popular opinion and the views of Victims. *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 24(3), 160-175.
- Sheepers, P., Te Grotenhuis, M., & Van Der Slik, F. (2002). Education, religious and moral attitudes: Explaining Cross-National Effect Differences. *Sociology of Religion*, 63(2), 157-176.
- Stănculescu, A. (2010). *Rolul educației în socializare* [Education role in socialization]. Craiova: Print Xpert.
- Tygart, C. E. (1992). Public acceptance/rejection of the insanity defence for defendants in criminal homicide case. *Journal of Psychiatry and Law*, 20, 375-389.
- Visser, P. S., & Krosnick, J. A. (1998). Development of attitude strength over the life cycle surge and decline. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75(6), 1389-1410.
- Wood, J. L., & Viki, G. T. (2004). Public perceptions of Crime and Punishment. In J. Adler (Ed.), *Forensic Psychology: Concepts, Debates and Practice* (pp. 16-36). United Kingdom: Willan Publishing.
- Yuker, H. E. (1986). Disability and the Law: Attitudes of Police Lawyers and Mental Health Professionals. *Rehabilitation Psychology*, 31(1), 13-25.

Received October 21, 2013  
Revision November 10, 2013  
Accepted November 21, 2013