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ABSTRACT

The present study aims to identify:

1. Intellectual tolerance of university students.

2. The significance of the differences in intellectual tolerance according to the variables:
   A. Gender (male, female).
   B. Stage (first, fourth).
   C. Specialization (scientific, humanities).

The current research sample consisted of (381) male and female students who were chosen in a random manner with a proportional distribution of university students. A number of statistical methods for data processing.

The research reached the following results:

University students enjoy intellectual tolerance, and there were statistically significant differences in intellectual tolerance according to the gender variable (males - females) and in favor of females, and no statistically significant differences were found in intellectual tolerance according to the variable of specialization (scientific, human), and there are statistically significant differences according to the stage variable and in favor of the first stage, according to the results of the research, a number of recommendations and suggestions were included.

I. RESEARCH PROBLEM :

The local and global community in general is experiencing a number of social, economic and psychological changes as a result of the internal and external global transformations in the system of values, methods and behaviors, so that the human being lives in a state of dissatisfaction and lack of confidence in his reality, and if we know that societies, especially the youth group, are the most affected by this reality, so young people live in a world fraught with tensions and rife with controversies and conflicts, and these turbulences are increasing day by day, and young people's feeling of isolation, violence and intolerance has become the dominant feature. The youth category is the most affected by changes at all levels, as they constitute an age stage characterized by vitality, activity and a strong desire for renewal and change, which makes them the most critical and rejecting of the life contradictions they face, especially as contemporary society is swept by different, disparate and conflicting currents, and is full of political, economic and social transformations and challenges that have made He suffers from successive crises, the most prominent of which is his feeling of alienation, indifference, deprivation and marginalization that ends with extremism and violence (Ammar, 2018: 4). Violence, extremism and intolerance are one of the dangerous phenomena that threaten the security of the individual and society in general. In fact, the extremism of some young people in their opinions, ideas and attitudes towards some social
and political issues is a phenomenon that has occupied its position in all societies since ancient times, but it took a new dimension in modern societies when extremism produced phenomena such as violence, terrorism, aggression and chaos of community security. In view of the importance of building a global value system that is concerned with promoting global security and peace within and between societies, the UNESCO General Conference in 1995 adopted the Declaration of Principles of Tolerance, which focused on the meanings of tolerance and the role of education in promoting the values of tolerance in people's lives. Tolerance also represents an intellectual, cultural and social discourse that needs a real identification of a continuous educational process that directs the loyalty of the individual through time stages, commensurate with the size of the process, as it raises his level of awareness in overcoming the obstacle of intersection of loyalties, for tolerance cannot be effective and influential in a society that still embraces and represents extremist values. Moral values from which it derives its existence and continuity, on the other hand, the multiplicity of sources of intolerance generates all kinds of social intolerance, which has repercussions in the emergence of societal violence (Al-Gharbawi: 2008, 26-34). Intellectual tolerance is described as a culture based on prudence that searches for reasons of deliberation and awareness of the importance of understanding between individuals. It may represent the optimal state of civil life, expressing the human need for peace and a secure life (Al-Zari, 2007: 209). The first step in the field of intellectual tolerance is dialogue, cultural encounter and increased acceptance of the common values, beliefs and practices of the people of society. Intellectual tolerance gives the individual the opportunity to adhere to his principles, beliefs and opinions. In return, he accepts that he adheres to others with their beliefs and opinions, and the recognition of human beings' different natures, appearances, languages, behavior, values and beliefs, and this leads us to the recognition Their right to live in peace without violence or discrimination (Al-Hilli and Al-Zubaidi, 2007: 376-375). And the 1998 study (Marguerit Wright, indicated that the culture of tolerance is acquired at an early age through the process of socialization represented by the comments and signals of adults that may contribute directly or indirectly to sowing seeds of hatred or ostracism, respect for and acceptance of others or devaluation and rejection of others) Enright & Coyle, 1998; Scull, 2009). A study (Campbell, 2017) indicated that intolerance has a negative impact on human life at the individual level, as it leads to doubts, withdrawal, anger, fear, poor health - avoidance, and feelings of guilt, in addition to feelings of pressure, stress and depression. The level of bilateral relations leads to avoidance, mistrust, blame, anger, rejection, frustration, revenge and at the group level leads to conflict and aggressive behavior towards others (Campbell, 2017: 28). At other times, intolerance leads to a clear distortion and imbalance in the mutual social relations with others, which works to push him to adopt the behavior of social withdrawal and isolation from others and lack of harmony or acceptance with them (Shamrock, 1997: 330). The study of (Fincham, et., 2004) indicated that intellectual intolerance between individuals leads to the spread of a culture of revenge, hatred and selfishness, which leads to an increase in violence between individuals (Fincham, et., .). Intolerance is one of the dangerous factors that cause tension, anger, resentment and bitterness, and increase the incidence of high blood pressure, heart diseases, chronic stress, ulcers, heart attacks and headaches (Barker, 2016: 21). Researchers in the field of intellectual tolerance believe that wars and violence create the idea of tolerance and intolerance. If the environment is safe and supportive, and state institutions contribute to providing this support, it increases the possibility of completing the intellectual tolerance process. An unsafe and unsupportive environment reduces the possibility of completing the process of intellectual tolerance between victims and abusers (Bender, 2014: 4-6). The study (Al-Nawaisah, 2020) indicated that there is a correlation between tolerance and the Big Five personality factors, and confirmed the positive correlation between tolerance and the extraversion factor, conscientiousness and openness to experience and acceptability, while tolerance was negatively correlated with the neurotic factor, which means that differences in Personality affects individuals' willingness to forgive themselves or others (Al-Nawaisah, 2020: 172). According to what was mentioned, the researcher felt the problem of the research, which is evident through the need for effective intellectual tolerance and peaceful coexistence between individuals more than ever before under the current circumstances, in order to prepare a generation capable of production and work away from violence and intellectual extremism.

Research importance

Intellectual tolerance is of great importance in the life of the individual and society because of its moral and social nature that is linked to the interactive relationship with other individuals, and also has a preventive role, as it protects from conflicts in the future. If tolerance prevails between members of one society and other societies without distinction or preference, social stability will be. It is the dominant and distinguishing feature in these tolerant societies, which is reflected on the mental health of the members of the community and provides a greater opportunity for prosperity and progress (Watson, 1973: 123). The international community organizations have paid attention to the value of intellectual tolerance and its importance for coexistence between different
religions, sects and races and among all people, if UNESCO (UNESCO, 1995) considers the sixteenth of December of each year as the International Day for Tolerance, as it is the starting point for coexistence, and made this day The world is an opportunity for individuals and states to make the world free and safe, away from violence. The importance of tolerance for the individual and society appears in several aspects. Its importance is represented in its role as an officer and guide of human relations and as a practitioner to preserve the rights of others intellectually, ideologically and in existence, a value that pushes its owner to transcend abuse and reciprocate, and on the contrary, the absence of intellectual tolerance from the lives of individuals and groups leads to the emergence of problems Dangerous, the most prominent of which are malice, hatred and wars (Al-Ghaweiri, 2006: 36). Spreading the spirit of tolerance, peace and acceptance of the other's opinion and existence is the effective weapon for eliminating human violence and strengthening the foundations of understanding in the social environment (Mahfouz, 2007: 44). The importance of tolerance also comes in the need to show the character of good and get rid of the character of evil in the souls of individuals, as tolerance is a human trait and a tendency stemming from instinct, and as much as tolerance shows its tendency to good in the self, it at the same time suppresses the tendency of evil (Rye, 2001: 98). Here it appears that intellectual tolerance is a positive state experienced by diverse societies, represented in the prevalence of manifestations of reassurance between the different social groups and a sense of responsibility towards the nation in the light of an agreed upon political system, and that this coexistence leads to the prevalence of manifestations of political stability as the result of this coexistence and eliminates manifestations of violence and rebellion (Al-Jabbary, 2013: 38). The study of Morris and Martin (Martin & Morris, 1982) showed that the intellectually tolerant is open-minded and ready to welcome new ideas and actions and accept them with great flexibility. (Martin & Morris, 1982: 377) Davidson also made it clear that intellectually tolerant individuals direct their feelings towards others more than they are directed towards the self, and that he has the ability to forgive and forgive those who have wronged him (Davidson, 1992: 746). And the study (MaseIko, 2003), which showed an important correlation between the ability to forgive and each of the degree of psychological suffering, personal happiness, and family happiness, and it was found that people who enjoy the highest level of tolerance and forgiveness, are very happy compared to those without them. And (Madsen, 2009) believes that intellectual tolerance is one of the basic elements to achieve an appropriate climate in the state institutions in which they work, people belonging to different intellectual and religious orientations. Tolerance contributes to achieving effectiveness and achievement in work (Madsen, 2009: 254). Tolerance is not an easy process, but rather a difficult and complex practice that involves various practical and cognitive demands, as it can be said that tolerance includes aspects represented in accepting the other according to the principle of difference, as represented in the belief in the necessity of the existence of the other, and freedom of expression, as a right exercised in various activities of life. Social, and considers the necessity of civilized development for human life itself (Watfa, 2004: 14). Based on the foregoing, the researcher believes that the concept of intellectual tolerance is a new and fertile field for study, as cultural and intellectual diversity in Iraq has become one of the most important topics in social and political sciences and psychology, after the crises that occurred in (2003), where this year is considered a year of crises. Clearly, which raises the need for the emergence of research directives in order to spread a culture of intellectual tolerance in all societies.

Research aims:

The present study aims to identify:

1 – Intellectual tolerance of university students.

2 – The significance of the differences in intellectual tolerance according to the variables:

A – Gender (male, female).

B – Stage (first, fourth).

C – Specialization (scientific, humanities).

Search limits:
The current research is determined by the students of the University of Baghdad of both sexes (females, males) and the academic specialization (scientific, human) for the (first, fourth) stage of the academic year (2020/2021).

Define terms

Intellectual Tolerance
Arafa (Worthington, 1998)

An overlapping process in which the individual exerts an effective effort to understand the other individual's awareness of a personal event he lived together and his tendency to perceive himself as equal to the self of others, so he has a new idea about himself and the other as a result of a change and the development of his understanding of himself and his awareness of the position of abuse from a new perspective (Worthington, 1998:95).

The researcher adopted a definition (Worthington, 1998) as a theoretical definition of the concept of intellectual tolerance

As for the procedural definition, it is the total score obtained by university students on the scale of intellectual tolerance prepared by the researcher.

Theoretical framework:

The concept of intellectual tolerance

Tolerance is one of the old modern concepts, and if we want to search for the meaning of tolerance, the Arab and Islamic culture emphasized some of the requirements and principles of tolerance in the Qur’anic texts and in the Prophetic Sunnah, but the term tolerance was not mentioned in the Holy Qur’an, but Islamic Sharia went to what it means and approximates or indicates its meaning, as the call to piety, solidarity, mutual advice, compassion, acquaintance, forgiveness and forgiveness has been made, as in the Almighty’s saying: {And if you forgive and pardon and forgive, then God is Forgiving, Most Merciful} (Al-Taghabun 14). As for the West, tolerance as a concept entered the door of thought that expresses social conflict, so the word Tolerance appeared to denote the meaning of tolerance, which means obedience, flexibility, acceptance and respect for the opinions and beliefs of others. In Europe, the word “tolerance” appeared in the writings of philosophers in the seventeenth century AD during the conflict between the Protestant and the Catholic Church, when those called for freedom of belief and demanded the Papal Church to stop interfering between God and man (Baghdadi, 13:2008).

He found many philosophers of the Enlightenment era in both France and England who called for tolerance. We find (John Locke), one of the pioneers of philosophy and political thought in France, in his book (Letters on Tolerance), which he issued following the issuance of the Tolerance Law by the English government in (1689) motivated by the necessity of separation between the state and the church, he emphasized Locke's doctrine of tolerance towards (to live and let others live), where he stated that people who do not cause harm to others when practicing their religion must be tolerant of them. (Luke, 1999:10) The concept of tolerance in Europe passed through two stages: The first is religious: it continued throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and was associated with religious reform movements, such as (Martin Luther King, Calvin, John Locke, and Voltaire) with their well-known position on tolerance and its relationship to religions and the relationship of other religions to it. As for the second, civil: it begins in the eighteenth century, associated with liberal philosophy and calls for democracy, as the concept of tolerance was established at this stage as a basic human value, without which human beings cannot progress, and democracy cannot be achieved without it. ) who developed and confirmed their intellectual and cognitive content, which is based on the meaning of relativism and that no one has a monopoly on the truth and that rational dialogue is capable of correcting human thoughts that are produced by fanaticism (Asfour, 81: 2006). In our contemporary time, we note that the United Nations General Assembly, based on the General Conference of UNESCO, in its twenty-eighth session (1995), declared the general
principles of tolerance, and in its first article, the meaning of tolerance was defined, which refers to respect, acceptance and appreciation for the rich diversity of world cultures, forms of expression and human qualities. Which is enhanced by knowledge, openness, communication, freedom of thought, conscience and belief, and its features and social dimensions were defined, as well as the role of the state according to the following:

1. Tolerance does not mean equality, concession, or leniency. Rather, tolerance is taking a positive stance that recognizes the right of others to enjoy universally recognized human rights and fundamental freedoms.

2. The practice of tolerance does not conflict with respect for human rights. Therefore, it does not mean accepting social injustice or abandoning one’s beliefs. Rather, it means that human beings are different in their appearance, colors, languages, and values, and they have the right to live in peace, and this is what was specified in Articles one and two.

3. The state’s role in ensuring justice and impartiality has been defined in laws and legislation and applied without any discrimination or marginalization, and what goes against them leads to frustration, aggression and intolerance, and to ratify international agreements that affirm human rights and guarantee equality and equal opportunities for all groups of society.

4. Not to marginalize the vulnerable groups from social or political participation and the practice of violence, discrimination and racial prejudice against them, the society has the right to be different from each other (Enright & Coyle, 1998: 161).

5. Tolerance was dealt with by researchers from several angles, each according to his scientific and cognitive field, and scholars set out in defining tolerance from various premises according to their intellectual doctrines. There is religious tolerance that is established by recognizing the previous monotheistic religions by allowing followers of those religions to practice their religious rituals freely Leaving religious fanaticism, intellectual openness towards other religions, and safety from grudges and renunciation of violence (Al-Mashhadani, 232: 2006). As for social tolerance, it is represented through social relations between individuals, and as a result, some negative values arise, such as hatred and malice, which represent social diseases and which pose a threat to society. It should not be contrary to the religion, values, customs and traditions prevailing in society (Hassan, 22:2014). While economic tolerance refers to mercy, leniency and compassion in material transactions by facilitating people in cases of poverty and facilitating them in cases of age, as represented by the state distributing gains among citizens fairly and creating job opportunities for the unemployed.

6. As for political tolerance, it means respect for international conventions and treaties, respect for state sovereignty, and assistance for afflicted and affected countries. It also allows political pluralism, political participation, respect for others, freedom of expression, respect for human rights, rejection of injustice and violence, and respect for diversity (Adly, 2000: 23).

Principles of Intellectual Tolerance:

1. Acknowledging the existence of the other, respecting him, recognizing him and not being stereotyped.

2. Acknowledging the existence of the other, respecting him, recognizing him and not being stereotyped.

3. Cooperation and coexistence between people.

4. Realizing the importance of openness and awareness of the damages of closing.

5. Realizing the importance of openness and awareness of the damages of closing.

6. Realizing that forgiveness does not mean belittling the other.

7. Mutual respect and belief in dialogue and free opinion.

8. The willingness to accept the opinion of the other if it is correct, and respect it if it is not.

And (Buber Karle, 1902-1994) derived three principles from the concept of intellectual tolerance that was introduced by 'Fluter' and founded it from a Socratic view that says 'I know that I do not know and I hardly know this', and this is enough for us to demand that we should be intellectually tolerant. With each other reciprocally,
Voltaire believes that intellectual tolerance must be reciprocal and based on the principle of interaction, and 'Popper' asserts that the search for truth and approach it through mutual criticism is not possible without a large degree of mutual tolerance, and the principles derived by 'Popper' she:

I may be wrong and you may be right.

Through our understanding about things in a rational manner, we may arrive at correcting our mistakes.

If we understand things rationally, we may come close together to the truth. (Al-Jarjani, 1985: 108)

**Objectives of intellectual tolerance**

1. Mutual respect between both parties in all matters.
2. Respect for human rights and freedoms.
3. Strengthen the bonds of love and human relations.
4. Overcoming sad, intolerant and prejudiced situations.
5. Difference of opinion without resorting to insult, attack or fanaticism.
6. Overcoming sad, intolerant and prejudiced situations.
7. Difference of opinion without resorting to insult, attack or fanaticism.
8. Forgiveness, pardon, and forgiveness, which are among the best of God’s blessings, and which are the highest goals of tolerance.
9. Increasing awareness, knowledge and logical thinking, this would weaken the factors of hatred and intolerance (Al-Kilani, 2010: 243-244).

**Explanatory theories of intellectual tolerance:**

**The Worthington Model (Worthington, 1998)**

Worthington designed a modern social cognitive model in tolerance with the aim of integrating the multiple theoretical directives of the concept of tolerance and understanding the emotional and subconscious motives of the individual and the predominant emotions on him. He also shed light on the implicit beliefs that underlie the process of tolerance and postulated three concepts represented by understanding, humility, and commitment.

Tolerance is achieved through the understanding that the individual shows towards others, and through humility, tolerance is strengthened and expanded through the commitment that the individual shows towards those who abuse his right or who differ from him intellectually and ideologically (McClough et al., 365: 2015).

He sees that tolerance is an intertwined process in which the individual makes an effective effort to understand the other individual's awareness of a personal event he lived together, and his tendency to realize himself as equal to the same other individuals, so he has a new idea about himself and the other as a result of a change and development of his understanding of himself and his awareness of the position of abuse from a new perspective.

Worthington mentioned three dimensions of tolerance:

Understanding: Worthington considers it the core of his model, and it means making an effective effort on the part of the individual to understand the other person, or the event, putting himself in the place of the other party and making a decision based on that instead of judging the behavior of the other from the perspective of his own experiences of that event (Worthington, 1998: 73).

The correct understanding of the situation of the occurrence of abuse or difference requires receiving complete information and increasing experiences so that the individual can communicate with others and acknowledge their diversity and differences and respect that difference (Borba, 2002:213).
Individuals’ understanding of the various qualities of others and openness of mind towards beliefs and innovations will make it work to push the intellectually tolerant individual to deal with others with kindness. Intolerance, responding differently, and deciding to control behavior toward others (Worthington, 2007: 276).

Understanding is a psychological characteristic that accompanies social processes, which is the ability of individuals to imagine and imagine themselves in the situation of others, and in the absence of understanding, individuals are allowed to abuse and harm others without any sense of the feelings of others (Datu, 2014: 265).

The tolerant individual is the one who can understand others who differ with him in opinion, religion or social class, and thus avoid conflict with them (Rogers, 1957:95).

In cases in which the individual seems unable to understand, the so-called Alexithymia appears, which shows the inability to perceive, distinguish or express emotions, and those who lack understanding appear to have an antisocial personality disorder, which involves an imbalance in ways of thinking and perceiving situations. And contact with others, as they do not evaluate standards of right and wrong, and often ignore the desires and feelings of others, and tend to infringe on others, violate their rights, treat them harshly or indifference, and may act violently or recklessly. The behavior of those who commit violence towards others and those who are intolerant of their thoughts and beliefs (Abdul Karim, 2008: 204-268).

Humility: expresses openness to the opinions of others and abandoning rigidity and arrogance with regard to beliefs and opinions (Worthington, 1998:88) and that openness and acceptance of others without restrictions, and makes himself equal to others, even if he finds objective differences between him and others in physical aspects, abilities and skills Social): 109 Halling et al, 1994.

Being humble does not mean that he has a simple opinion about himself, but rather an opinion that is neither better nor worse than the opinions of other individuals, but rather generates a solid sense of self, pride and pride in it (Bryant, 1998:33).

Humility also produces a feeling of affection and compassion that leads the individual to flexibility in dealing with others, including acceptance and tolerance of others, in order to reach the general positivity in life (Crandell, 2008: 16).

Individuals who are humble in their tolerance within limited patterns and contexts have an increased sense of comfort and security, compared to individuals who are not tolerant, while the lack of humility leads to difficulty perceiving the needs and feelings of others (McClau et al., 2015: 401).

The intellectually humble individual has the ability to pay attention to his accomplishments and talents according to their relative importance, and the individual has a sense of self-acceptance and awareness of his potential and liberation from low self-esteem and arrogance (American psychiatryassociation, 1994:352).

Despite the importance of humility in expressing tolerance, some of them deviate from it. It may come to the minds of others as weakness and low self-esteem. The potential dangers from this logic of thinking are the belief that it is not possible to respond with a similar action to the perpetrator, since humility It gives the individual the power of influence so that he does not harm the one who committed the guilt, and this act leads to behavior predictive of several factors, the first of which is the ability to self-control, and secondly, the individual’s desire not to repeat a similar offense to others (Exline, et.al, 1998:230).(Exline and Geyers, 2005) indicated that a person with high self-esteem and a low level of narcissism can be considered intellectually modest, as the humble person is seen as well organized and self-respecting. It is equal to others without arrogance or arrogance (25 Exline, 2005:).

The undertaking: Worthington believes that the undertaking results through the formation of the individual with a new idea of himself and others due to a change and development in his understanding of himself and others and his understanding of situations of abuse and difference, thus drawing a new image and realizing a new content of the original position according to a new perspective and vision (Worthington, 1998: 92). The idea of abuse or assault and its impact on the life of the tolerant intellectually is different at the end of the tolerance process from its beginning, where the tolerant person is able to realize that the other party is a person who has weaknesses and strengths, and the tolerant realizes that he did the best and strongest behavior through his effort in trying to reach To the end of the forgiveness process (McClinger et al.: 365:366-2015). (Troung, 1991) referred to the tolerance model within these stages and considered the pledge as a last stage for tolerant individuals, due to the change and
development in awareness and struggle to reach tolerance, and this corresponds to the idea of forming a new perspective on self and others (Trouong, 1991:65). And (Worthington, 2007) pointed out that the individual’s understanding of the negative situation without going through the pledge or humility, so tolerance is a behavioral response in which the individual is forced to him as a result of the pressures exerted on him or in keeping with the social norms and traditions prevailing in society, or when the individual is not prepared for that, then there is no The individual experiences the cognitive and affective processes that indicate the occurrence of true tolerance for him (Worthington, 2007: 276). Where this type is called superficial (false) tolerance, it does not improve the relationship between the individual and others, and this has serious physical and psychological consequences for the individual (Klevnick, 2008:18). The Worthington model was used to help individuals who were exposed to stressful traumatic circumstances and events, where he used (understanding, humility, pledge) as strategies to confront traumatic events or calamities through a greater understanding of the justifications for traumatic events, and crystallization of awareness towards the offending party in humility and abandoning his right to punish the other party and pledge With behaviors that show respect and acceptance of the offender or the offender (Worthington & McCullough, 2000: 37) As soon as individuals begin to tolerate according to the model (Worthington, 1998, understanding, humility and commitment), individuals will look at a new perspective capable of understanding and awareness in a more realistic manner. To undertake positive behaviors (Worthington, 1998:93).

Second: previous studies

Study (Sawari, 2017) intellectual tolerance and its relationship to mental health among students of Kirkuk University in Iraq.

The study aimed to identify the level of intellectual tolerance and mental health among students of the University of Kirkuk in Iraq to identify the differences in intellectual tolerance according to the variables: nationalism (Arab, Turkmen and Kurdish), religion (Muslim, Christian), sect (Shia, Sunni) and gender (female, male) for the year in the academic year (2016-2017), a stratified random sample of (801) students was selected. The results of the research showed that there is a decrease in the level of intellectual tolerance, a high level of mental health, and no differences in intellectual tolerance according to the variables (religion, nationality, sect, gender).

Research Methodology:

The approach that has been adopted in the current research is the descriptive correlative approach, which aims to describe the phenomenon accurately, and also aims to study the phenomenon as it exists in reality and describes it accurately (Van Dalen, 1985: 312).

Research community:

Population means all the vocabulary of the phenomenon that the researcher studies, and thus the research community is all the individuals who are included in the subject of the research and whose results will be generalized to them (Odeh and Malakawi, 1992:196). The current research community consisted of Baghdad University students for the academic year (2020-2021), as The total number of students reached (53928)* male and female students, and the number of males reached (22047) and the number of females (31881), with (20944) male and female students in the humanitarian faculties, and (32984) male and female students in the scientific faculties.

Samples of the Research:

A sample is a set of items or items that are drawn from the population to be studied, and are known to be part of a whole. (Al-Jadri, 2003: 27).

The sample of the current research was chosen in a random manner with a proportional distribution, as it amounted to (381) male and female students, and at a rate of (1%) of the research community, distributed over (11) colleges, including (5) colleges for scientific specialization and (6) colleges for humanitarian specialization, with a number of (177) students. And female students for the first stage and (204) male and female students for the fourth stage, and table (1) shows this:

| Table (1) |
| The final research sample is distributed according to the variables of gender and specialization |
Third: the search tool: In order to achieve the objectives of the current research, the researcher prepared a tool to measure intellectual tolerance. The following describes the tool and extract its psychometric properties for them:

**Intellectual Tolerance Scale:**

After the researcher reviewed the literature and previous studies related to the issue of intellectual tolerance, such as the study (Al-Jubouri, 2014), the study (Aziz, 2017), the study (Sawary, 2017) and the study (Al-Khamisi, 1993). The researcher found that the standards of these studies do not fit with the objectives of the current research, either because of differences in the characteristics of the sample or the difference in the theory that was adopted, so the researcher prepared a measure of intellectual tolerance according to the scientific steps followed in the numbers of standards.

**Steps for preparing the Intellectual Tolerance Scale:**

The researcher proceeded to follow the steps indicated by (Allen & Yen), which are:

- Planning and organizing the scale by defining its dimensions.
- Drafting the scale items, which must include each of the scale dimensions.
- Verify all paragraphs of the scale and its instructions.
- Drafting the paragraphs in a clear and understandable manner that suits the age and intellectual levels of the sample.
- Apply the scale items to a representative sample of the community.
- Extracting the psychometric properties of honesty and stability.

The researcher relied on the previous steps in the process of preparing the intellectual tolerance scale, as the literature and previous studies related to the topic of the research were reviewed, and appropriate evidence was provided for it. The following steps were adopted:

**Defining the concept and its dimensions:**

The researcher adopted the definition of the (Worthington, 1998) model of intellectual tolerance, and identified its dimensions: Others, accepting them and respecting their opinions, beliefs and tendencies of all kinds.

It has three dimensions.
The first dimension: Understanding: It is the ability of individuals to understand other people, of a public or personal event, so he puts himself in the place of the other party and makes a decision based on that, instead of making judgments on the behavior of other individuals from the perspective of his own experiences of this event.

The second dimension: Humility: It is the process of openness of the individual to the opinions and ideas of others, and not rigidity in ideas or arrogance in his personal beliefs, ideas and opinions.

The third dimension: The undertaking: It is the individual’s formation of a new idea of himself and of other individuals, as a result of changes and developments in the processes of understanding himself and others, and his understanding of situations of abuse, so he draws or creates a new image of the situation and realizes a new content of the original position (Worthington, 1998:73-88-92).

Paragraph drafting:
For the purpose of formulating the paragraphs, the researcher reviewed the previous standards and literature related to intellectual tolerance, which were mentioned previously.

The researcher applied an open questionnaire to a randomly selected sample of university students, where their number was (60) male and female students distributed according to specialization, gender and stage. The students were asked in the open questionnaire to describe their feelings, thoughts and opinions towards those who differ from them intellectually and ideologically, and the students mentioned their answers in the form of statements after The researcher explained the characteristics of the individual who has intellectual tolerance through the definition presented to them in the questionnaire.

Some items were derived from the students’ responses to the open questionnaire, and the researcher also formulated items proportional to the nature of the dimension, as the number of items in its initial form was (31) items distributed on the three dimensions of the scale, after understanding it included (11) items, and after humility it included On (10) paragraphs, and after the undertaking, the undertaking included (10) paragraphs, covering the theoretical definition of each of the dimensions, Annex (3).

In formulating the paragraphs, the researcher was keen on the following:
That the scale consists of positive and negative items, and the purpose of this procedure is to reduce the tendency of the respondent to respond first on the scale.

The content of the paragraph should be explicit, clear and direct.

That the paragraph expresses one and clear idea, and is subject to only one interpretation.

Excluding negation, prohibition and assertiveness tools as much as possible to avoid confusion in the process of answering the scale items.

The content of the paragraphs should be clear and explicit. (Thorndike and Higgin, 1989: 205).

3-Preparing alternatives and weights of the intellectual tolerance scale:
The Likert method was adopted in constructing the intellectual tolerance scale by developing five alternatives to answer the scale as one of the methods used in constructing psychological scales for the following reasons:

Ease of construction and scale correction. (Marei and Belqis, 1984: 172).

It allows for the greatest number of variances among the respondents on the scale.

Allow the respondent to indicate the degree or intensity of his feelings. (Stanle & Hopkins, 1972:289)
Scale instructions numbers:

The scale’s instructions are the guide that the respondent uses during his response to the scale’s paragraphs, so it was taken into account when drafting the paragraphs that they should be clear and understandable (Abdul Rahim, 1983: 69), and it was emphasized the need to choose the appropriate response that expresses an explicit opinion about the content of the scale’s paragraphs. He also explained the purpose of applying the scale and how to answer, as an illustrative example was set that helps the respondent to identify how to respond correctly and how to choose the alternative that suits his response. However, only the researcher will see the response, and it will be used for scientific research purposes only.

Virtual validity:

Eble indicated that the best way to ascertain the validity of the paragraphs of the scale is for a number of experts to assess their validity in measuring the quality for which they were developed. (Eble, 1972: 555)

Where the paragraphs of the scale with the definitions for each of the dimensions, the instructions for the answer, and the validity of the alternatives approved for responding to each paragraph, were presented to (30) arbitrators in the educational and psychological sciences, measurement and evaluation appendix (4), and each expert was left free to make any modification to the paragraphs and their alternatives. For the purpose of judging its suitability and validity, the opinions of the arbitrators were statistically analyzed using (chi-square) for one sample. Thus, the number of paragraphs of the scale became (30) paragraphs.

Scale correction:

The researcher used the Likert method to determine the answer alternatives for all items of the scale, as it is one of the best and most common methods used in psychological research, by placing five (applies to a lot, applies to often, applies to sometimes, applies to rarely, no Never apply). Upon correction, the scores were given from (5-1) respectively for the positive items, and reflected for the negative items, where the scores were given from (1-5) respectively.

Statistical analysis of the items of the intellectual tolerance scale:

The main objective of item analysis is to obtain data through which the discriminatory power of the scale items is calculated. The discriminatory power is the extent to which the item is able to distinguish between individuals who are distinguished in the trait measured by the scale, and individuals who are low in the same trait, and then it works to keep The good items in the scale (Eble, 1972: 392). The method of the two extreme groups (peripheral equilibrium) and internal consistency (the relationship of the paragraph degree with the total degree of the scale) are two appropriate measures in the process of analyzing the paragraphs, and thus the researcher resorted to both methods in analyzing the paragraphs of the intellectual tolerance scale, as follows:

Discriminatory power: For the purpose of conducting the analysis in the light of this method, the researcher selected a statistical analysis sample of (400) male and female students from the original community at the University of Baghdad.

Determining the total score for each form, which is (400) forms.

Arrange the forms from the highest score to the lowest score.

Determining (27%) of the questionnaires with the highest scores on the scale and (27%) of the questionnaires with the lowest scores on the scale, which represent two groups with the largest size and maximum possible differentiation. (Mehrens & Lehman, 1984: 192)

Since the sample of the statistical analysis is (400) male and female students, the number of forms that represent the percentage (27%) of the forms that obtained the higher grades is (108) forms, and the degree limits in them ranged from (116-143) while the number of forms for the lower group was (108...
The limits of the scores in it ranged from (82-102). The forms of the two groups were (216) forms. The arithmetic mean and standard deviation for each paragraph in the two higher groups were extracted using the T-test for two independent samples to calculate the significance of the differences between the averages of the upper and lower groups on each paragraph. Table (2) This explains:

### Table (2)
The discriminatory power of the items of the intellectual tolerance scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th>Senior group</th>
<th>Lower group</th>
<th>T value Calculated</th>
<th>Significance at (0.05) level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Arithmetic mean</td>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>Arithmetic mean</td>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,22</td>
<td>0,99</td>
<td>3,39</td>
<td>1,03</td>
<td>6,06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,69</td>
<td>0,69</td>
<td>3,69</td>
<td>1,13</td>
<td>7,76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,48</td>
<td>0,87</td>
<td>3,32</td>
<td>1,04</td>
<td>8,87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,56</td>
<td>0,81</td>
<td>3,41</td>
<td>1,08</td>
<td>8,92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,39</td>
<td>1,05</td>
<td>3,32</td>
<td>1,04</td>
<td>7,49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,34</td>
<td>1,33</td>
<td>2,33</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>0,05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,7</td>
<td>0,69</td>
<td>3,43</td>
<td>0,98</td>
<td>11,11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,72</td>
<td>0,72</td>
<td>3,53</td>
<td>1,04</td>
<td>9,83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,31</td>
<td>1,32</td>
<td>2,73</td>
<td>1,1</td>
<td>3,47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,94</td>
<td>0,37</td>
<td>4,18</td>
<td>0,99</td>
<td>7,44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,36</td>
<td>1,26</td>
<td>2,44</td>
<td>1,08</td>
<td>-0,52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,09</td>
<td>1,36</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>1,09</td>
<td>-1,82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,37</td>
<td>1,03</td>
<td>3,06</td>
<td>1,12</td>
<td>8,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,83</td>
<td>0,54</td>
<td>3,63</td>
<td>1,09</td>
<td>10,29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,2</td>
<td>1,09</td>
<td>3,1</td>
<td>1,16</td>
<td>7,19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,94</td>
<td>0,33</td>
<td>3,59</td>
<td>1,05</td>
<td>12,76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,75</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>2,57</td>
<td>1,14</td>
<td>0,97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,44</td>
<td>0,89</td>
<td>3,18</td>
<td>1,08</td>
<td>9,45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,61</td>
<td>0,77</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>0,98</td>
<td>9,25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,78</td>
<td>1,37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,08</td>
<td>4,63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,56</td>
<td>0,81</td>
<td>3,27</td>
<td>1,05</td>
<td>10,09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,61</td>
<td>0,77</td>
<td>3,28</td>
<td>0,97</td>
<td>11,22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,01</td>
<td>1,24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,26</td>
<td>5,93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,59</td>
<td>1,42</td>
<td>2,29</td>
<td>1,37</td>
<td>3,48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,76</td>
<td>0,62</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>11,93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,78</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>3,37</td>
<td>0,97</td>
<td>12,79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,52</td>
<td>0,85</td>
<td>3,59</td>
<td>0,97</td>
<td>7,48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,65</td>
<td>0,7</td>
<td>3,55</td>
<td>0,95</td>
<td>9,69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,61</td>
<td>0,81</td>
<td>3,56</td>
<td>0,92</td>
<td>8,96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,51</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td>2,39</td>
<td>0,95</td>
<td>0,739</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By observing the table, and after comparing the calculated t-value with the tabular t-value of (1.96), with a degree of freedom (214) and a significance level (0.05), it was found that all the paragraphs are statistically significant except for the paragraph (30,17,12,11,6). It is not a function, and it was deleted because its calculated t-values are less than the tabular t-value.

**Internal consistency (constructive validity):**

It is a method used in the analysis of test vocabulary, which expresses the extent of the paragraph’s sincerity, by finding the correlation coefficient between the degree of each paragraph and the total degree in the test, as the total degree expresses what the test actually measures, and therefore the quality of the test increases if it includes vocabulary that is highly correlated with the total degree (Lindquist, 1951: 268)

The researchers resort to this method to find out if each of the scale items follows the same path as the scale as a whole. Therefore, this method is considered one of the most accurate methods adopted in
calculating the internal consistency of the scale items (Isawy, 1985: 95) and (Anstasi, 1976) points out. That the total score of the scale is the best internal test when the external test is not available (Anstasi, 1976:206), so the researcher used Pearson correlation coefficient to extract the correlation between the score of each item and the total score of the scale. The results showed that the correlation coefficients for all items are statistically significant when compared to the value of the correlation The table amounting to (0.098), with a significance level of (0.05) and a degree of freedom (398), and Table (3) shows that:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indication</th>
<th>Correlation coefficient value</th>
<th>Paragraph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>16-0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fell into discrimination</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>17-0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>18-0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>19-0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>20-0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fell into discrimination</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>21-0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>22-0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>23-0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>24-0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fell into discrimination</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>25-0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>26-0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fell into discrimination</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>27-0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>28-0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>29-0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fell into discrimination</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>30-0.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relationship of the degree of the paragraph with the degree of the field to which it belongs:

To achieve this, the researcher extracted the correlation between the degree of each paragraph of the intellectual tolerance scale and the total degree of the dimension to which it develops, depending on the degrees of the sample members as a whole. (0.05) and the degree of freedom (398), except for paragraph (30), which were omitted during the extraction of the discriminatory power because it is not statistically significant, and table (10) shows that:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>the field</th>
<th>Factor link</th>
<th>indication</th>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>the field</th>
<th>Factor link</th>
<th>indication</th>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>the field</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>function</td>
<td>11-</td>
<td>understanding</td>
<td>fell into discrimination</td>
<td>21-</td>
<td>pledge</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>function</td>
<td>12-</td>
<td>humility</td>
<td>fell into discrimination</td>
<td>22-</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>function</td>
<td>13-</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>function</td>
<td>23-</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>function</td>
<td>14-</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>function</td>
<td>24-</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>function</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4- The relationship of the degree of the field to the field and the field to the total degree of the scale:

Correlations of sub-domains with the overall score of the scale are essential measures of homogeneity because they help define the domain of behavior to be measured. (Anastasi, 1976: 155)

This was achieved by finding the correlation between the scores of the sample members within each domain of the scale and the total score of the scale, as well as the correlation of each domain with the other, depending on the scores of the sample members as a whole. The table amounting to (0.098) at the level (0.05) and the degree of freedom (398), and the table (5) shows this

Table (5)
The correlation coefficients of the degree of dimension with the dimension and the dimension with the total degree of the intellectual tolerance scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>the field</th>
<th>understanding</th>
<th>Humility</th>
<th>Pledge</th>
<th>Total marks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humility</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pledge</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E - Indicators of the stability of the intellectual tolerance scale:

The stability of the intellectual tolerance scale was calculated using the Facronbach equation, as it is one of the most common equations in calculating the stability coefficient because it shows the strength of the correlation between the items of the scale. In addition to that it gives evidence of the accuracy of the scale, and it is also called (the coefficient of internal consistency) (Awda and Al-Khaili, 1988: 355). The method is adopted for the standard deviation of the scale and the standard deviation of the single items. To achieve this, (100) questionnaires were adopted and the Facronbach equation was applied, where the scale stability coefficient was (0.86), which is a good parameter and can be relied upon (Allam, 2000: 158).

The final formula for the intellectual tolerance scale:

In its final form, the intellectual tolerance scale consists of (25) items, the highest score for the scale is 125, and the lowest score for the scale (25) is distributed over three dimensions, which are in the following sequence: The first domain (understanding) consists of (9) items, and the second domain is (humility). It consists of (7) paragraphs, the third field (the pledge) consists of (9) paragraphs, and in front of each paragraph there are five alternatives (applies to me often, applies to me often, applies to me sometimes, applies to me rarely, never applies to me) corresponding to degrees (1, 2, 3, 4, 5) for the positive items and scores (5, 4, 3, 2, 1) for the negative items.

The final application of the intellectual tolerance scale
After confirming the validity and reliability of the intellectual tolerance scale, the researcher applied it electronically via Classroom on the final research sample of (381) male and female students, from the period 3/10/2021 to 3/18/2021.

Presentation and discussion of the results:

The first goal: To know the intellectual tolerance of university students.

To achieve this goal, the researcher applied the measure of intellectual tolerance to the research sample of (381) students. Balancing the arithmetic mean with the hypothetical average. The t-test was used for one sample. It was found that the calculated T value (36.29), is greater than the tabular value of (1.96) at the significance level (0.05) and the degree of freedom (380), which indicates that the research sample has a tolerance Think and Table (6) illustrates this.

Table (6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>SMA</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Hypothetical Mean</th>
<th>Calculated T-value</th>
<th>Table T-value</th>
<th>Degree of Freedom</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Students</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>96.73</td>
<td>11.69</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>36.29</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This statistical result indicates that the current research sample enjoys high intellectual tolerance, and this result can be interpreted according to the model (Worthington, 1998) that the ability to correctly understand the situation of disagreement or abuse helps to receive complete information and increase experiences and information so that the individual can communicate with other individuals and acknowledge With their differences and diversity and respect for this difference, and open-mindedness towards innovations and beliefs works to push intellectually tolerant individuals to deal with others with kindness and kindness. Resisting intolerance and responding differently, and humility contributes to ensuring patterns and contexts that increase the feeling of reassurance and security compared to individuals who are not tolerant. Once the individual is able to understand and perceive more realistically, and His new view produces greater awareness and humility and a sense of comfort when expressing feelings of humility, which is the basis for generating tolerant relationships that prepare the individual to undertake positive behaviors towards those who differ in opinion or belief (Worthington, 1998:93).

It differed with the study (Sawari, 2017). The researcher can explain this result, through the possibility of development and cultural and scientific openness witnessed by Iraqi universities and the openness of university students to the great scientific and cultural development that contributes to raising awareness and developing tolerance, as well as what educational and cultural institutions play in spreading The spirit of love and cooperation between the members of society, and access to the values and cultures of other societies through openness to the world and ease of movement and travel between countries, and knowledge of the customs and traditions of others through social media, and the participation of others in opinions and ideas develops the values of tolerance represented by respecting the traditions and customs of others Regardless of their national or sectarian affiliations.

The second objective: to identify the differences in intellectual tolerance according to the variables (gender, stage and specialization).

For the purpose of verifying this goal, the researcher analyzed the responses of the research sample amounting to (381) male and female students on the scale of intellectual tolerance, and after processing the statistical data, where the average scores of the sample members were extracted on the scale according to gender (male, female), specialization (scientific, human) and stage (First, Fourth) To confirm the differences in intellectual tolerance according to gender, specialization and stage, the researcher used the Three Way Anova analysis, and the results were as shown in Table (7).

Table (7)
Arithmetic averages and standard deviations of the intellectual tolerance scale according to the variables of gender, stage and specialization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>standard deviation</th>
<th>SMA</th>
<th>the number</th>
<th>Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.99</td>
<td>94.31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>first scientific male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>96.87</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Fourth scientific male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.24</td>
<td>95.55</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.29</td>
<td>97.15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>first human male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.59</td>
<td>91.64</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Fourth human male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.28</td>
<td>93.93</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.60</td>
<td>95.87</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>first male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.05</td>
<td>93.48</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>fourth male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.86</td>
<td>94.57</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>all male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.07</td>
<td>99.47</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Female scientific first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.97</td>
<td>95.70</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Fourth scientific female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.29</td>
<td>97.30</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.31</td>
<td>102.21</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>first human female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>95.32</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Fourth human female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.16</td>
<td>98.74</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>101.33</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>female first</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.67</td>
<td>95.46</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>fourth female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.57</td>
<td>98.23</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>Entire female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.78</td>
<td>96.97</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>first scientific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>96.16</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>fourth scientific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>96.54</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.68</td>
<td>100.43</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>first human</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>93.73</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Fourth human</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.70</td>
<td>96.85</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.19</td>
<td>99.14</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>first all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.73</td>
<td>94.64</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>fourth total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.69</td>
<td>96.73</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three way Anova analysis was used for degrees of intellectual tolerance according to gender (male - female), specialization (scientific - human) and stage (first - fourth), and table (8) illustrates this.

Table (8)
The results of the three-way variance analysis to reveal the significance of differences in intellectual tolerance according to the variables of gender, stage and specialization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>indication</th>
<th>Sig (0.05)</th>
<th>q value F</th>
<th>mean squares MS</th>
<th>degree of freedom DF</th>
<th>sum of squares s.of.s</th>
<th>Contrast source s.of.v</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>function</td>
<td>6.764</td>
<td>864.60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>864.60</td>
<td>sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non - Function</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>Specialization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>function</td>
<td>7.768</td>
<td>992.913</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>992.913</td>
<td>stage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non - Function</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>120.365</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120.365</td>
<td>gender * specialty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nonfunction</td>
<td>2.482</td>
<td>317.216</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>317.216</td>
<td>gender * stage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>function</td>
<td>5.234</td>
<td>669.085</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>669.085</td>
<td>Specialization * Stage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non - Function</td>
<td>1.026</td>
<td>131.104</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>131.104</td>
<td>Gender * Specialization * Stage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>127.823</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>47677.984</td>
<td>The error</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>3616786</td>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the three-way variance analysis showed the following data:

sex variable
It was found that the calculated t value equals (6.764), which is greater than the tabular maxima value of (3.84) at the significance level (0.05) and the degree of freedom (1,373), which indicates that there are statistically
significant differences according to the gender variable and in favor of females. This result can be explained according to (Worthington) theory, as the model indicates that the ability to understand others, and the ability to put oneself in the place of the other party and make a decision based on that, rather than making judgments on the behavior of others from the perspective of self-experience, and humility that gives the ability to Being open to the opinions of others, abandoning rigidity and arrogance regarding private beliefs, and accepting others unconditionally on the grounds that the individual's self is equal to the same others, even if he finds objective differences between him and others in physical abilities, social skills, or intellectual or ideological forms of tolerance towards others. Worthington, 1998:88)) It seems that the females possessed this amount of understanding, humility and commitment more than the males. This result is consistent with the study (Swari, 2017), which did not find significant differences between males and females in intellectual tolerance. The researcher explains this result to the fact that females are more sympathetic and merciful from a biological point of view and their future role as a mother is the source of kindness, tenderness and tolerance, in addition to the nature of the social and cultural upbringing of Eastern society in which females are raised on compassion and tenderness and away from harshness and rigidity. Females on a socially acceptable pattern.

the specialization variable

It was found that the calculated maximal value (0), which is less than the tabular maximal value of (3.84) at the level of significance (0.05) and the degree of freedom (1,373), which indicates that there are no statistically significant differences in intellectual tolerance according to specialization (Scientific-humanitarian). The researcher attributes this result to the fact that intellectual tolerance is a universal human value that includes all human beings and is not determined by a specific quality and is not limited to a specific group or specialization, and this is the essence of intellectual tolerance that emphasizes the acceptance of the other despite the difference.

The stage variable shows that the calculated tangential value is (7,768), which is greater than the tabular categorization of (3.84) at a significance level of (0.05) and a degree of freedom (1,373), which indicates the existence of statistically significant differences in favor of the first stage variable according to the averages. Arithmetic. The researcher attributes this result to the fact that intellectual tolerance is acquired through the process of socialization, especially the family, as it is the one who germinates the seeds of respect and acceptance of the other, and it forms the frame of reference for the individual. That it changes with the influence of the group or the impact of the university, because the studies indicate what confirms that educational institutions, especially the university, change the basic experiences on issues that form trends and values towards different topics, including tolerance.

As for the interactions between the variables, they are as follows:

There is no significant interaction between the two variables (gender, specialization), as the calculated t-value was (0.942), which is less than the tabular t-value of (3.84) at the significance level (0.05) and the degree of freedom (1,373).

There is no significant interaction between the two variables (gender, stage), as the calculated value reached (2,482) which is less than the tabular value of (3.84) at the level of significance (0.05) and the degree of freedom (1,373)

There is a significant interaction between the two variables (specialization, stage), as the calculated t value reached (5,234), which is greater than the tabular t value of (3.84) at the significance level (0.05) and the degree of freedom (1,373).

It is clear from what was presented above that there is no interaction between gender, specialization and stage, while there is interaction between specialization and stage.

In order to find out the significance of the differences between all the variables of specialization and stage, the researcher conducted a Scheffe test for dimensional comparisons (binary), and table (9) illustrates this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table (9)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate the differences between the circles and Scheffe critical values to know the differences in intellectual tolerance according to the variable of specialization and stage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparisons</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The results showed that there is no significant interaction between the variables (gender, specialization and stage) in the degrees of intellectual tolerance variable, as the calculated t value reached (1.026), which is less than the tabular t value of (3.84) at the level of significance (0.05) and the degree of freedom (1.373).

The above result can be explained that the process of dealing with and assimilating the environment in which the individual lives is extremely important, as we find university students dealing with the same stimuli that surround them and they deal with the same different environmental pressures in a common environment, as they deal with variables (economic, social, cultural). On the other hand, the cognitive processes and mental and cognitive functions of the two sexes are similar to some extent, and the intellectual tolerance has been formed in the advanced stages of life, so it does not seem that gender, specialization, or stage affected it.

Recommendations:

Through the results obtained in this research, the researcher recommends the following:

1. Emphasizing the education of free conversation for view exchanging to develop intellectual tolerance.

2. Emphasis on the role of media in supporting the intellectual tolerance of the university students.

3. Encouraging cultural forums for discussing intellectual tolerance topics and the respect of each other opinions.

4. Activating the role of the school and the university by reviewing the academic curricula and emphasizing the principles and foundations of all tolerance kinds.

Suggestions:

1. Conducting correlational studies between intellectual tolerance and other variables such as self-determination and the meaning of life.

2. Conducting a correlational study between intellectual tolerance and major personality factors among university students.

3. Conducting the same study on other samples (teachers, middle school students......).
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