The Social Dominance and Its Relation to the Rigid Beliefs Among the Department Heads

By

Hadeel Faisal Rishan
Sociology Department / College of Arts / Al-Qadisiyah University/ Iraq
hadeel1979@gmail.com

Ahmed Abdulkadhim Johnni
Sociology Department / College of Arts / Al-Qadisiyah University/ Iraq
Ahmed.johni@qu.edu.iq

Abstract

The researchers sought to know the correlation between social dominance and the rigid beliefs of department heads through a set of objectives represented by identifying:

1   The Social dominance of department heads.
2   The rigid beliefs of department heads.
3   The correlative relationship between social dominance and the rigid beliefs of department heads.

To achieve the objectives of the research, the researchers built a measure of social dominance, which in its final form consisted of (28) items, and another scale for rigid beliefs, which in its final form consisted of (36) items, after verifying their validity and stability and analyzing their paragraphs statistically on the research sample of (300). Head and Head of Department at the University of Al-Qadisiyah, Babylon and Kufa, and they were chosen by random stratified method and in a proportional manner, and the research reached the following results:

The heads of the departments are not characterized by social domination.
Department heads have rigid beliefs.

There is a positive correlation and statistical significance between social dominance and the rigid beliefs of department heads.

Based on the results of the research, the researchers developed a set of recommendations and suggestions.

Keywords: social domination, rigid beliefs, department heads

The research problem

Two do not differ that man is a social being who lives and spends most of his life in a group that he influences and is affected by , and his behavior within this group is determined on the basis of customary social behavior. to which he belongs (Zahran, 1984: 15-17). Specialists in this field identify those biases with the desire and evaluation of some individuals by the necessity of group hierarchy based on the perceived social structure and predicting discriminatory tendencies and biases, which is known as social dominance (Singson, 2019:2).

In this regard, the results of the study of Pratto et al. (1994) confirmed that individuals who are characterized by social domination tend to prefer ideologies and policies that reinforce the hierarchical system in society, and they are in contrast to those who do not have this orientation and who prefer policies and ideologies that limit this Hierarchical relationships, which makes this individual differences variable able to predict the degree of acceptance or rejection of these ideologies and policies related to the group (Pratto et al., 1994: 742), while recognizing that the behavior of any individual is not isolated from his beliefs, but rather behaves in a manner consistent with those beliefs. About himself and the world around him with all the different events and situations in it, as beliefs are an important part of the trends and that beliefs and trends play a major role in guiding the behavior of the individual in many life situations, but the difference between them is that the trends include an emotional charge and take the character of motivation, while they are not characterized Beliefs in this capacity include an idea, or an opinion about a subject (Hammoud, 2016: 105).

The research importance

Researchers in social psychology indicated, through their study of the individual's belonging to the group, that there is an exciting topic for research in various groups, which is sovereignty or social dominance, since groups do not differ in the number of their members or the nature of their actions, but are different in terms of the behavior of their members and their willingness to sacrifice For its survival, and in terms of the behavior of competition to take roles among themselves according to the rules through which their behavior is evaluated within that group (Mubarak, 2012: 128). Just as the culture of any society produces social norms as determinants of the behavior of its members, we live in societies from which we acquire perceptions, ideas and many types of behavior within the framework of the so-called education process, as well as through the process of socialization that governs our individual and social behavior (Fayza, 2012: 89).) . While researchers from different theoretical directions indicated that ideological beliefs generally increase the role of hierarchy (social dominance) in groups, and in this regard, Pratto believes that it is necessary to identify the ideologies that reinforce the hierarchy between people from different religious and ideological groups and address them for what It has an impact on the individual and the group (Thomsen, 2010: 229). The results of the Al-Saadi study (2010), which aimed to identify the relationship between self-categorization and social significance, found a positive, statistically significant correlation between self-categorization and social dominance, in addition to that there are no differences in social dominance according to the variables of gender and academic specialization, and that social dominance It decreases with increasing awareness of the individual (Al-Saadi, 2010: 144). The belief system is also one of the main topics that affect the personal and social lives of individuals, where a group of religious, political and scientific elements interact on a personal basis, and these interactions affect how we live, and how we deal or depend on others 2): Banaj , 2018). Therefore, the research was interested in knowing the role of factors related to gender and academic specialization, which are two of the variables included in the current research as variables that may have an impact on the formation of rigid beliefs.

In rigid beliefs according to the variable of academic specialization (scientific, human) and in favor of the humanitarian specialization that individuals in scientific disciplines are more flexible in dealing with facts, with no such difference according to the gender variable (males, females) (Saleh, 2019: 148) . And the university being one of the social, educational and productive institutions that work to enrich knowledge and prepare trained and qualified manpower in knowledge, thought, morals and behavior, and therefore it needs a sound

administration that works to achieve its goals for which it was established. Used (Mohsen, 2011: 684), the importance of addressing scientific research to an important segment such as the heads of departments in universities comes because their role does not stop at making or taking decisions, but extends to implementing and following them up. In and through it, it is ensured that those goals are achieved (Al-Dahshan and Al-Sisi, 2005: 2). Academic departments in particular constitute the basic organizational unit in university institutions, as they bear the greatest role in achieving the goals of universities represented in the dissemination and development of knowledge through research. And its application in community service, so the academic department is the cornerstone of the university, as it represents to the university what the cell represents to the body (Al-Hujaili, 61: 2010).

Research Objectives

The research aims to identify:

1   Social dominance of department heads.
2   The rigid beliefs of department heads.
3   The associative relationship between social dominance and the rigid beliefs of department heads.

Define terms

Social Domination, defined by: Pratto (1994): "The individual's tendency to believe that society is composed of classes and that there are a number of individuals located at the top of the social hierarchy; subject to them" (741) Pratto et al, 1994.

Rigid Beliefs defined by Rokeach (1954): "a cognitive organization that starts from mental closure and ends with openness, and it is specific to the beliefs and beliefs of the individual, whether about facts, facts and authority, as well as tolerant and intolerant models with others" (Rokeach, 1954:194), The researchers define it procedurally by the total score obtained by the department head after answering the paragraphs of the social dominance scale that was built for this purpose.

Theoretical background

The Social Dominance:

The concept of social domination does not have a long history, but the beginnings of interest in this concept go back to both psychologists (1994) Pratto & Sidanius when they made an attempt to explain the distinction between groups as a response to other social theories that failed from their point of view to address how to create and perpetuate the problem of social oppression from Through a combination of psychological characteristics, social and ideological structure (Ibanez, 2016: 1)

On the other hand, some researchers in this field stress that social domination should not be understood as control, since control is based on the exercise of power in a unilateral and expansive manner. Intellectual and moral leadership - meaning - that hegemony from their point of view is an additional force for a dominant group that has its capabilities and ability to impose its will in social conflict (Khalil, 2020: 82), and they also indicated that there are two broad dimensions of how social hegemony is structured, namely: political and ideological, and These two dimensions

may sometimes be strongly related, but they are often unrelated and their expression is completely different in terms of core values or motivational goals, and social and environmental influences (Duckitt, 2009: 98 Psychologist Pratto (1994) presented the social dominance model as an attempt to combine psychological and social theories that explain social relations between groups and legitimize social inequality (Isiam, 2013:2). This theory is based on a major assumption that it is necessary to understand the processes that shape social domination. Preserving bias and discrimination at multiple levels of analysis, including ideologies, cultural policies, institutional practices, individuals' relationships with others inside and outside their groups, and individuals' psychological tendencies (Sidanius, 2010:272).This model also assumes that the most important of the individual differences variables is The trend towards social domination. Individuals who have this tendency tend to prefer ideologies and policies that enhance the hierarchical system in society. On the contrary, they are those who do not have this orientation and who prefer policies and ideologies that limit this hierarchy in relationships, which makes this individual differences variable able to predict the degree of acceptance or the rejection of these ideologies and policies (Pratto et al., 1 .). 994: 742. Pratto (1994) asserts that her theoretical model explicitly attempts to understand how psychological predispositions, social identities, social contexts, and cultural ideologies all intersect to produce and reproduce social inequality. Three qualitatively distinct systems of group-based hierarchy (Sidanius et al., 2004:849), and these systems are:

The age system: adults enjoy unequal social power according to the age groups.

The gender-based system: in which males have unequal social, political and military power compared to females.

Arbitrary group system: This system is built on foundations that are not related to the human life cycle and with varying access to things of negative and positive social value (Kawanaka, 1982:364).

Fixed Beliefs
The emergence of the concept of rigid beliefs is due to the psychologist Rokeach (1960) when he pointed out that the individual should not be described as rigid on the basis of his belief in a certain set of ideas and beliefs, but on the basis of his method of dealing with and accepting these ideas and beliefs. Other researchers in this field believe that beliefs Rigid means that the individual is unable to like the opinions or ideas of others, and it also implies a tendency to perseverance, which means that the individual cannot tolerate change and is unable to adapt to new ideas, and thus a rigid individual can be described as an individual who shows inability to modify his behavior With a changing environment (Adil, 2020: 2-3.(

The concept of belief and non-belief is the main concept in the theory of belief systems, where the belief system represents all the conscious and unconscious tendencies and expectations that an individual accepts at a particular time as the reality of the world in which he lives. Jaber and Hamid, 2012: 165), and although beliefs are among the issues that an individual adopts and accepts, and non-beliefs are what he rejects and sometimes attacks, both of them can be imagined on a continuous basis of acceptance and rejection, bearing in mind that there are some beliefs that the individual rejects more strongly than others (Abdul Sahib) , 2011: 55). Thus, the belief system extends through a bipolar continuum. Different individuals fall between these two extreme categories. The individual with rigid beliefs (closed-minded), cannot accept or understand the ideas of others, while the individual (open-minded) can do so without any difficulties despite their different content. With him (Karam Allah, 2019:597), rigid beliefs are the beliefs we hold about ourselves, others and the world in which we live. These beliefs are often at the heart of thoughts and mental images, and some of our beliefs may

remain reasonably unconscious and require a little work to reveal them. Other beliefs may be quite noticeable and easily recallable in our minds (Morris & Mansell, 2018: 3).

The research community and its sample

The current research community is determined by the department heads, deans' assistants, and divisional officials in the universities (Al-Qadisiyah, Babylon, and Kufa) for the academic year 2021-2022, and their number is (656) department head, assistant dean, and divisional officer, (422) males, (234) females, and (256) males in the scientific specialization, (166) males in the humanitarian specialization, (132) females in the scientific specialization, and (102) of them in the humanitarian specialization.

The sample was chosen by the Stratified Random Sample and in a proportional manner. This type of sampling is most appropriate for the disparate communities, where the sample is representative of all categories of the research community (Melhem, 2002: 251), where (300) heads and department heads were chosen at a rate of 45.731%) from The research community consisted of (193) department heads and (107) department heads, and the percentage of males reached (64.333%), while the percentage of females was (35.666%) of the research sample. 120) at a rate of (40%), and table (1) shows this.

Table (1) The research sample is distributed according to the variable of type and specialization

| No. | Position | Al-Qadisiyah University | | | | Total |
| | | Males | | Females | | |
		Scientific	humanistic	Scientific	humanistic	
1	Head of Department	10	14	05	04	31
2	Deputy Dean	05	04	05	03	15
3	Division officer	14	14	10	17	54
	Total	29	32	20	24	105
		Babylon University				
No.	Position	Males		Females		Total
		Scientific	humanistic	Scientific	humanistic	
1	Head of Department	16	05	05	—	26
2	Deputy Dean	10	04	04	02	20
3	Division officer	18	14	9	9	50
	Total	44	23	18	11	96
		KUFA University				
No.	Position	Males		Females		Total
		Scientific	humanistic	Scientific	humanistic	
1	Head of Department	15	03	09	05	32
2	Deputy Dean	07	05	04	02	18
3	Division officer	23	12	11	3	49
	Sub. Total	44	45	24	10	99
	Grand total	118	75	62	45	300

The research tools :

In order to measure research variables; The appropriate procedures were determined to build appropriate measures by making use of the theoretical framework and previous relevant studies in addition to the ideas and opinions of the supervising professor and some specialized professors in the field of psychology. In order to verify and reassure the adequacy of this scale to measure the social dominance of department heads, the researchers carried out a number of procedures. Which :

The conceptualization of concepts:

The theoretical definition of the concept was determined by adopting Pratto's definition (1994) and adopting Rokeach's (1954) theoretical definition according to what was previously mentioned.

The opinions of the arbitrators in the paragraphs of the two scales and their instructions:

The two scales in their initial form were presented to (15) arbitrators specialized in the field of psychology, and the approved theoretical definition of each concept, instructions and alternatives to answering the paragraphs for the purpose of expressing their opinions and after taking the opinions and observations of the arbitrators and adopting a percentage of (80%) or more for the purpose of accepting or rejecting the paragraph. The items of the adult social dominance scale were (28) items, and two items were deleted from the rigid beliefs scale to become (34) items after this procedure.

The statistical analysis:

The statistical analysis of the scale items is one of the basic requirements because it reveals the psychometric characteristics of the items, which shows their accuracy in measuring what they were set for its measurement. :408), and in this field, specialists in the field of psychometrics confirm the two methods of the two peripheral groups and the relationship of the paragraph degree with the total degree of the scale as two appropriate methods in achieving this.

The two terminal groups:

The discriminatory power calculation is defined by the extent of the paragraph's ability to distinguish between respondents who obtained high scores in answering the scale and their peers who obtained low scores on the same scale (Imam, 1990: 114), and for the purpose of analyzing the items of the two scales according to this method, the two scales were applied On the research sample, correcting the answers and arranging them in descending order and choosing a percentage (27%) for the purpose of forming the two groups, and by applying the T-test for two independent samples to test the significance of the differences between the means of the upper and lower groups for each of the two scales' items, it appeared that the calculated T value for all items at Comparing it with the tabular value of (1.96) and a degree of freedom (160) distinct at the level of significance (0.05), and table (3.2) shows that.

Finding the relationship of the paragraph's degree with the total degree of the scale is another method for analyzing paragraphs, and this method assumes that the total degree of individuals is an indication of the validity of the scale, and therefore the paragraph is deleted when the coefficient of its correlation with the total degree is not statistically significant because the paragraph does not measure the phenomenon measured by the entire scale (Anastasi, 1976). : 154). In order to extract the relationship of the paragraph degree with the total degree of the scale, the Pearson correlation coefficient was applied, and Table (3.2) shows that.

Table (2) The discriminatory power and the correlation of the items of the social dominance scale

No.	senior group		lower group		Calculated T-value	correlation coefficient	Indication level (0.05)
	the idle Arithmetic	Deviation standards	the middle Arithmetic	Deviation standards			
1	4.493	0.726	3.456	1.294	6.286	0.361	Function
2	2.296	1.187	1.444	0.806	5.340	0.409	Function
3	4.024	1.117	2.740	1.242	6.913	0.374	Function
4	2.308	1.056	1.728	0.724	4.076	0.247	Function
5	4.098	0.943	2.814	0.976	8.512	0.456	Function
6	3.271	1.183	2.111	1.204	6.186	0.326	Function
7	4.148	0.976	3.098	1.241	5.982	0.385	Function
8	3.456	1.118	1.987	0.980	8.887	0.482	Function
9	3.876	1.144	2.284	0.938	9.685	0.551	Function
10	3.592	1.348	1.963	1.100	8.425	0.499	Function
11	3.777	1.151	1.395	0.719	15.801	0.638	Function
12	2.740	1.282	1.666	1.024	5.889	0.357	Function
13	4.407	0.958	3.555	1.360	4.607	0.296	Function
14	2.642	1.186	1.938	0.966	4.139	0.245	Function
15	3.913	1.086	2.049	1.059	11.057	0.583	Function
16	2.987	1.409	1.493	0.808	8.274	0.465	Function
17	3.160	1.219	1.728	1.012	8.133	0.449	Function
18	4.308	0.875	2.814	1.342	8.388	0.489	Function
19	4.111	1.060	2.284	1.247	10.043	0.538	Function
20	3.654	1.266	2.395	1.393	6.019	0.379	Function
21	3.851	1.184	1.700	0.905	12.938	0.641	Function
22	3.888	1.072	1.901	1.019	12.088	0.589	Function
23	4.308	0.917	2.629	1.134	10.361	0.516	Function
24	2.666	1.224	1.518	1.050	6.405	0.380	Function
25	4.123	1.053	2.111	1.072	12.048	0.575	Function
26	2.592	1.191	1.407	0.905	7.129	0.447	Function
27	3.493	1.246	1.592	0.971	10.827	0.559	Function
28	2.321	1.302	1.296	0.697	6.244	0.368	Function

Table (3) The discriminatory power and the correlation of the items of the rigid beliefs scale

No.	senior group		lower group		Calculated T-value	correlation coefficient	Indication level (0.05)
	the middle Arithmetic	Deviation standards	the middle Arithmetic	Deviation standards			
1	4.617	0.734	3.777	1.024	5.993	0.381	Function
2	4.074	1.069	2.482	1.085	9.406	0.484	Function
3	3.333	1.183	1.851	1.001	8.602	0.477	Function
4	2.604	1.271	2.037	0.954	3.215	0.209	Function
5	4.049	1.035	3.246	1.066	4.857	0.286	Function
6	4.543	0.671	3.654	0.910	7.070	0.375	Function
7	4.012	1.042	3.123	0.940	5.697	0.464	Function
8	4.209	0.931	2.765	0.952	9.758	0.475	Function
9	4.111	0.987	2.679	0.905	9.618	0.268	Function
10	4.296	0.980	3.543	0.895	5.106	0.276	Function
11	2.345	1.246	1.765	0.762	3.573	0.281	Function
12	2.407	1.222	1.740	0.737	4.202	0.353	Function
13	3.888	1.095	2.938	1.143	5.402	0.329	Function
14	3.506	1.256	2.654	0.937	4.891	0.497	Function
15	4.172	0.959	2.679	0.905	10.191	0.420	Function
16	3.567	1.182	2.383	0.874	7.253	0.535	Function
17	3.592	1.292	1.839	0.967	9.774	0.393	Function
18	4.061	1.110	2.962	1.036	6.490	0.537	Function
19	3.604	1.221	1.938	0.826	10.170	0.373	Function
20	4.012	1.078	2.703	1.030	7.899	0.347	Function
21	4.407	0.984	3.271	1.162	6.712	0.369	Function
22	4.358	0.912	3.432	0.947	6.334	0.581	Function
23	4.296	0.941	2.456	0.949	12.383	0.505	Function
24	4.321	0.919	2.629	0.872	12.009	0.356	Function
25	3.419	1.331	2.370	0.967	5.740	0.461	Function
26	4.370	0.954	3.024	0.987	8.820	0.313	Function
27	3.543	1.294	2.654	1.152	4.615	0.213	Function
28	3.728	1.265	3.160	1.156	2.983	0.419	Function
29	4.000	1.000	2.790	1.201	6.967	0.379	Function
30	4.049	1.047	3.037	1.017	6.238	0.442	Function
31	4.148	0.936	2.703	1.145	8.787	0.438	Function
32	3.506	1.370	2.024	0.961	7.965	0.314	Function
33	3.642	1.238	2.765	1.028	4.902	0.474	Function
34	3.642	1.287	2.049	1.150	8.303	0.348	Function

By conducting the two methods of statistical analysis mentioned above, the social dominance scale consisted of (28) items, and the rigid beliefs scale consisted of (34) items.

Psychometric properties of the two scales:

The Honesty:

Psychometrics specialists see the necessity of verifying some standard characteristics in the preparation of scales, whatever the purpose of their use (Abu Allam, 1986: 159). The truthful is the scale that measures what is intended to be measured. The construction validity of the two scales has been verified by the following indicators:

Two-way group method.

The method of the relationship of the degree of each paragraph with the total degree of the scale.

The stability:

The stability is one of the conditions that must be met in psychological scales, since the stability of the scale indicates its freedom from error, and although the honest scale is a fixed scale, the stability is a necessary measure and an indicator of the objective scale because it indicates consistency in the set of degrees of the items that were actually measured. What should be measured (Ebel, 1972: 332) and the fixed scale is a reliable and reliable measure. The stability, according to Cronbach's opinion, refers to the consistency of the response scores across a series of measurements (Faraj, 2017: 232). Therefore, the stability of the two scales was verified using Cronbach's alpha coefficient, which The score for the social dominance scale was (0.88) and (0.81) for the rigid beliefs scale.

Presentation, interpretation and discussion of the results:

Knowing the social dominance of department heads.

The statistical treatments indicate that the arithmetic mean of the degrees of department heads on the social dominance scale was (67.336) and with a standard deviation of (14,758), while the hypothetical mean was (72). It was found that the calculated t-value (-5.532) is greater than the tabular t-value of (1.96) at the level of significance (0.05) and the degree of freedom (299), which indicates that the heads of departments are not characterized by social dominance, and table (4) shows this.

Table (4) the significance of the difference between the arithmetic and hypothetical means on the scale of social dominance

0.05	Tabular T-value 0.05	Freedom Calculated T-value	hypothetical degree	middle norm	Arithmetic deviation	middle sample	number of people
Function	1.96	-5.532	299	72	14.758	67.336	300

This result may be due, according to the adopted theory, to the fact that the heads of departments are socially conscious segments, where the theory indicated that social dominance decreases by increasing the cognitive and cultural awareness of individuals. The targeted

research, the results of which showed that social dominance decreases with increasing awareness of the individual.

Know the rigid beliefs of department heads.

The statistical treatments indicate that the arithmetic mean of the degrees of department heads on the rigid beliefs scale was (97.853) and with a standard deviation of (14.915), while the hypothetical mean was (90) and when comparing the arithmetic mean of the research sample with the hypothetical mean of the scale, and testing the difference between them using the T-test for one sample. It was found that the calculated t-value (9.097) is greater than the tabular t-value of (1.96) at the level of significance (0.05) and the degree of freedom (299), which indicates that the heads of departments have rigid beliefs, and table (5) shows this.

Table (5) The significance of the difference between the arithmetic and hypothetical means on the scale of rigid beliefs

0.05	Tabular T-value 0.05	Freedom Calculated T-value	hypothetical degree	middle norm	Arithmetic deviation	middle sample	number of people
Function	1.96	9.097	299	90	14.915	97.853	300

This result may be due, according to the adopted Rokish theory, to the fact that the system includes (beliefs-not-beliefs system), as on the first side is a series of patterns of beliefs accepted by the individual, and on the second end is a chain of patterns of non-beliefs that the individual rejects. This means that beliefs and non-beliefs represent a two-sided connection that begins with closing and ends With openness - meaning - each individual has a building of knowledge and special beliefs about life and work. Therefore, this result of the heads of departments came due to the nature of the work they practice, as it imposes on them a certain level of thinking that is characterized by rigidity, such as compliance with laws and instructions.

This result can be explained through Rokich's point of view, in which he pointed out that rigid belief is nothing but a closed method of thinking linked to any ideology regardless of its content and an authoritarian view of life characterized by the individual's intolerance to ambiguity and to individuals who differ or oppose his beliefs and tolerance With individuals who hold similar beliefs to what he believes.

The correlation between social dominance and the rigid beliefs of department heads.

In order to identify the correlation between the two variables, the Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated between the degrees of the heads of departments on the scale of each variable, it was found that the correlation coefficient between them (. 18.452) which is greater than the tabular t-value of (1.96) at the significance level (0.05) and the degree of freedom (298), and this indicates that the correlation between the two variables is positive and statistically significant, and table (6) shows that.

Table (6) Correlation between social dominance and rigid beliefs

0.05	Degree Freedom	Table T-value	Calculated T-value	Connection factor	Variables
Function	298	1.96	18.452	6790	Social domination/fixed beliefs

The recommendations

Based on the results of the current research, the researchers recommend the following:

1   That the university organizes, in a planned manner, seminars and scientific conferences on social equality and introduces the dangers of social domination in a way that ensures its decline among the various individuals who belong to it.

2   Officials in higher education institutions should work on creating open critical mindsets in order to prepare qualified cadres for good dealings characterized by a spirit of discussion and acceptance of dissenting opinions and building opinion based on experimentation, logic and proof, emphasizing the values of our tolerant Iraqi society and investing an open mind towards fruitful work and progress in All levels.

References

Abu Allam, Salah El-Din Mahmoud (1986): Contemporary Developments in Psychological and Educational Measurement, Al-Qabas Commercial Press, Kuwait.

Al-Hujaili, Nasr Muhammad (2010): The views of the heads of academic departments at Dhamar University towards their administrative and academic tasks, Damascus University volume, volume (26), Damascus, Syria.

Al-Saadi, Kazem Shannon Kazem (2010): Self-categorization and its relationship to orientation towards social dominance among university students, unpublished master's thesis, Baghdad, Iraq.

Abdul-Sahib, Salem Jumaa (2011): Intolerant tendencies and their relationship to some variables among university students, published doctoral thesis, Baghdad, Iraq.

Adil , Adnan (2020) : Rigidity as Mediator Metween Temperaments And Social Adjustment: A Comparative Study Of Teachers Of Madaris And Schools Of Pakistan, University of Sargodha, Pakistan.

Anastasi,A.(1976): Psychological Testing, New York, Macmillan.

Banaj ,Viola (2018) : HOW DOES BELIEF SYSTEM AFFECT THE SOCIETY ,

Duckitt , john (2009) : A Dual-Process Motivational Model of Ideology, Politics, and Prejudice , Publisher Psychology Press Informa , Wales , Britain .

Ebel ,R.L. (1972): Essentials of Educational   Measurement   New   York , U.S.A .

Fayza, Asaad (2012): Social customs and traditions in the urban environment between tradition and modernity, published MA thesis, Oran University

Imam, Mustafa Mahmoud (1990): Evaluation and Measurement, Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research, University of Baghdad.

Ibanez, V. Barraso (2016): Will Critically Examine the Contribution of Social Dominance Theory to Our Understanding of Racism, Journal of Political Psychology, No (2).

Khalil, Marwa (2020): The concept of hegemony in international relations theories, Alexandria University, Egypt.

Karam Allah, Idan Shahaf (2019): Intellectual stagnation (tugmatism) and its relationship to behavioral problems among middle school students, Journal of Educational and

Psychological Research, Volume (61), Issue (61) Iraq.

Mubarak, Bushra Inad (2013): Intolerance and its relationship to social identity and social status among the unemployed, Al-Fath Magazine, No. 53, Diyala, Iraq.

Mohsen, Muntaha Abdul-Zahra (2011): The reality of the administrative performance of department heads in the colleges of education at the University of Baghdad from the point of view of the teachers, Journal of the College of Education, No. (4), Volume (2), Baghdad, Iraq.

Morris, Mansell & Lydia, Warren (2018): A Systematic Review Of The Relationship Between Rigidity/Flexibility And Transdiagnostic Cognitive And Behavioral Processes That Maintain Psychopathology, Journal of Experimental Psychopathology, Manchester, UK.

Pratto , et al (1994) : Social Dominance Orientation: A Personality Variable Predicting Social and Political Attitudes , Journal of Personality and Social Psychology , Vol (67) , No (4).

Saleh, Ghazwan Ramadan (2019): Intellectual rigidity and its relationship / cognitive style (risk-caution) among university students, Al-Farahidi Journal, No. 63), Iraq.

Sidanius, Jim (2004): Social Dominance Theory: Its Agenda and Method, Political Psychology, Vol (25), No (6).

Sidanuius, Jim (2010): Social Dominance Theory And The Dynamics Of Intergroup Relations: Taking Stock And Looking Forward, European Association of Experimental Social Psychology, University of Connecticut, U.A.S.

Singson , Mary Lyn (2019) : Measures of Stereotyping and Prejudice 1 Measures of Stereotyping and Prejudice: Barometers of Bias , North Princeton University , USA .

Thompson , Michael j , (2010) : Collective Intentionality, Social Domination, and Reification , William Paterson University, USA.

Zahran, Hamed Abdel Salam (1984): Social Psychology, Book Science for Publishing and Distribution, 1st Edition, Cairo, Egypt.