

Intolerance Attitudes and Their Relationship to Tolerance Behavior among the Displaced Youth of Hasan Sham Camp

Roaa Ahmed Shawkat

roaamedeni@gmail.com

Department of Psychology/College of Arts/ Salahaddin University/ Erbil-Iraq

Prof. Dr. Yousif Hama Salih Mustafa

yousif.mustafa@su.edu.krd

Department of Psychology/College of Arts/ Salahaddin University/ Erbil-Iraq

Article History: Received: 25 May 2021; Revised: 1 June 2021; Accepted: 15 June 2021

Research Summary

The objective of the current research is to identify the levels of intolerance and tolerance attitudes among a sample of Hasan Sham U3 youth camp that the sample reached (107) young people of both genders and they have been selected randomly. As well as finding the indication of moral differences in the level of intolerance and tolerance attitudes according to the gender variable. Besides, find the differences between the cognitive and behavioral components in the intolerance attitudes of the sample as a whole.

In order to achieve the objective of the research and gather the required data from the sample, researchers had to prepare two measures, one on intolerance attitudes and the other on tolerance using the literature in this field and after it was done then verifying their psychometric properties.

After analyzing the data statistically by using the T-Test for one sample, the T-Test for two independent samples, the correlation coefficient of Pearson and the T-Test for the significance of the correlation coefficient, and the results showed the following:

1. The youth (males and females) in Hasan Sham camp enjoyed a significant level of intolerance and tolerance attitudes.
 2. The youth (males) are more heading to intolerance than their peer females.
 3. There is a positive correlation between intolerance and tolerance attitudes.
-

Introduction:

Human beings in general and throughout the history have not succeeded in dealing properly and rationally with these differences, which resulted in many scourges, wars

and crises that led to injustice, persecution and displacement. We can take the Iraqi society as a model for this ethnic, sectarian and ideological diversity. As its outcome was continuous conflicts and crises which negatively affected the composition of the Iraqi individual's personality. The ORB Center for Field Studies and Statistics, based in London, as well as the British magazine (The Lancet) which specializes in medicine, indicated that the outcome of those who lost their lives among Iraqis since March 2003 to August 2007 was (1.033) million. This tragedy has resulted in more than five million orphans which this equals to one third of the world's registered orphans according to the United Nations estimates, as well as the increase in the number of widows to more than two millions, as well as the administrative, financial and political corruption and ruining the country's infrastructure, which is expected to lead to many psychological and social problems for the Iraqi individual, such as deprivation, a sense of injustice, aggressive and diminished behavior in addition to many diseases and mental disorders.

In this research, we have dealt with the religious and sectarian conflicts considering that the religion is still the biggest engine in Iraqi society and the various religious interpretations are what led to these conflicts, but often politics was the root of the disease and was concealed in the name of religion and its interpretations to justify their positions. The last war against ISIS was entitled - in the most visible form - religious and sectarian par excellence. Although we can all agree that the practices of ISIS were far from the recommendations of any heavenly religion. These conflicts left behind fanatic religious and sectarian orientations from which we still suffer even though the field battle of ISIS has ended since 2017, but the intellectual, behavioral and emotional battle is still producing fanatical attitudes, whether on the part of the people who believe in the values of ISIS or those affected by ISIS. The prisons are still full of young men who are accused of being true or false followers of ISIS even though they were and still are not adults or adolescences who are difficult to judge that their religious and ideological orientations and identities have become ripe for making informed decisions about life. The widows whom their husbands were killed at the hands of ISIS are still teaching their children to avenge their parents, and ISIS families are still confined to camps under house arrest and strict protection. All these and a lot of others create community groups that educate and create believers of extremism ideas, societies closed on themselves and preparing to be human bombs that can be detonated at any time.

Importance of the Research

The increase in the rate of catastrophic events regionally and internationally since (1993) has necessitated the need for researchers to study the concept of tolerance on a large scale due to the importance of this concept, and its link to mental and physical health. Tolerance is an important step; to restore fractured relations and mutual trust between the two sides of the relationship in a more harmonious manner, as it contributes to solving existing problems and preventing future ones from occurring. **(McLaughlin and Associates 2015: 16).**

The scientific understanding of tolerance may be employed in improving many human behaviors. For instance, educational institutions may be able to successfully study tolerance skills as a method for reducing conflict and hostility, and also to enhance the understanding and respect of others. It may help the elderly to learn tolerance as one

of the methods that reduce feelings of unresolved abuse and pain, and burdening many elderly people in their later years of life **(McLaughline and Associates 2015: 22)** and may be useful for understanding and managing many conflicts and differences of views between components of the Iraqi people in general. This constitutes a peaceful and healthy start with those affected by ISIS with the aim of reintegrating them with society in particular.

Religious fanaticism is one of the most dangerous types of intolerance in human history, as it relates to the other intellectually, and depends on the differences, controversies and ideological conflicts between groups believing in different religions or multiple sects within one religion. Religious intolerance has intensified in recent years, and extremist political and religious movements have emerged that see armed confrontation as the only way to deal with the other who is different **(Deloye. 2008: 106)**, so it was necessary to conduct scientific research and shed light on this issue on the ground and in theory.

The development of tolerance behavior for members of society is an important aspect and of common benefit. In terms of reducing the severity of revenge conflicts, those conflicts that lead to fractions in relations and increase the intensity of conflicts between members of society, and the consequent misjudgment of the amount of revenge necessary to restore the harmony of the gender* and based on that, if the retaliatory reactions approach the lethal level, tolerance may - objectively - save the individual's life. Moreover, the tolerant individual may acquire an important advantage represented by the social support resulting from the influential bias that occurs among the observers towards the tolerant, and in general, the social advantages of tolerance and its advantages for the tolerant individual outweigh the risks that arise in the individual who is relatively rarely tolerant, and the tolerant also benefits emotionally of this behavior. **(McLaughline and Associates 2015: 205)**

Human experiences generally indicate the existence of two types of interaction and relationship between the different ethnic components of societies: The first type is that form of negative interaction represented by the rule of intolerance, the manifestations of which were embodied in the processes of conflict and wars that took place between peoples, or between followers of different religions, or even between belonging to different sects in one religion. These conflicts have inflicted heavy losses on these societies, as there are millions of people, who have become victims of these conflicts, and those societies have remained in a state of social, political and economic backwardness and they have failed to achieve development in its comprehensive sense. As for the second type of interaction, it was positive and based on tolerance and coexistence between the ideologically and ethnically different people, which increased progress and prosperity. Fanatism and inability to accept the other and the absence of the concept of true partnership have always posed a social and political challenge, and the threat was not only against the entity of the state, but it exceeded its unity and contributed to weakening social cohesion and obstructing development efforts in its societies. **(Deloye. 2008: 7-8)**.

Hence, the importance of the current research in dealing with very important variables **(Intolerance and Tolerance Attitudes)**, which are psychosocial and social variables that concern every member of the community who seeks safety and stability in life,

especially the victims of ISIS who are young people living in Hasan Sham camp and who have not had enough from scientific studies such as the current one.

Research Objectives:

In the current research, the two researchers aim to identify the following:

1. The levels of intolerance and tolerance attitudes of the sample as a whole, and checking the indications of the differences by comparing its arithmetic means with the default ones.

*Gender harmony: is the perceived non-class relationship between a particular individual and a group of others in the group.

2. The indication of the moral differences in the level of intolerance and tolerance attitudes according to the gender variable.
3. The differences between the cognitive and the behavioral components within the intolerance attitudes of the sample as a whole.

Research Outlines:

The current research is limited to the youth of Hasan Sham camp and those accused of crimes (4 – terrorism) after they were released innocently and young widows whose husbands have been killed by ISIS killers or they were wives of those killers, whose ages ranged between (18-35) years and of both genders.

Among the most important concepts covered in this research are:

First: Intolerance attitudes

It's defined by each of:

1. Hamid Zahran (1977)

"It is a static psychological attitude that is emotionally charged, or it is a doctrine or a prejudice with or - often - against a group, a thing or a subject, and it is not based on a reasonable base or sufficient knowledge or scientific fact, but it is based on myths or superstitions, and it is difficult to amend it, as it makes a person to see only what he should see, and not to see what he does not like to see".

(Zahran, 2000: 213)

2. Bakman (2007)

"It is an unjustified attitude or position, in which a person is ready or prepared to believe, perceive, feel and act in a way that supports or opposes a certain group of people, or one of them".

(Salama. 2007: 82)

3. Arthur S. Reber & Emily Reber 2008

"Judgment or prejudice and partiality indicate a negative view of a certain group or a cultural background, as it indicates the lack of fair treatment of the individual, and his

treatment based on the stereotype or a form of his social or cultural group, and it expresses an unfair prejudice based on incomplete information."

(Reber. 2008: 501)

The two researchers believe that (prejudiced attitudes) are psychological and behavioral attitudes of the individual charged with strong negative emotions about everything that contradicts his opinions, beliefs, and general tendencies of life.

Second: Tolerance

It is defined by all and as following:

1. Andrew Newberg (2015)

"A complex neurocognitive and emotional process, with multiple forms, and is increasingly recognized as an important aspect of psychotherapy and behavioral change. Therefore, a full understanding of tolerance requires knowledge of the neuropsychological mechanisms that form the basis of tolerance, especially those related to self-feeling and self-directed pain perception and the behavior of revenge, and this in turn requires a review of the process of tolerance, and a scientific description of its phenomena.

(McLaughlin and Associates 2015: 193)

2. Brewer (2010)

"Avoiding any classifications or divisions that make the individual takes an opposing stance towards a group and tolerance is a commitment to neutrality and a flexible worker with all members of society with equality."

(Brewer 2010: 11)

3. Hassan Shehata & Zainab Al-Najjar (2003)

"A position in which the willingness is shown to accept what is unfamiliar even if we do not agree with this difference, and tolerance is linked to diversity and gives freedom a wide scope in the society so that individuals can harmonize within the society."

(Shehata & Najjar 2003: 126)

The two researchers define (tolerance) as a psychological behavioral attitude that is flexible, balanced and calm towards others away from distortion and the spirit of revenge and retaliation.

Theorizing and Literature (Intolerance Attitudes)

The religious, sectarian, ethnic and cultural diversity of the Iraqi society composition is witnessing a remarkable prosperity in terms of interaction and coexistence between members of the same community in many areas of life in the years following the founding of the Iraqi state. However, this diversity had a negative effect in fueling the fire of conflicts and fragmenting society, especially after the fall of Saddam's regime in (2003).

(Al-Khayoun) mentions that religious fanaticism often emerges between social groups of low-educated and enlightened intellectual culture, as they are groups that suffer

cultural and social isolation and lack of access to the spiritual and human worlds of other groups outside their social and cultural boundaries. **(Al-Khayoun, 2008: 45).**

Intolerance attitudes have three components (cognitive, behavioral, and emotional), which are as below:

1. **The cognitive component** of intolerance is the perceptions, beliefs and expectations of any group. Since intolerance occurs in the form of prejudice, excessive generalization, or thinking about stereotypes, and the refusal to amend the opinion, which requires the criterion of rationality, which was defined by **(Powdermaker)** as continuous attempts made to preserve accurate information, correct wrong information received by a person, and make distinctions and limitations in order to be logical in his elicitations as well as aware of his inferences. **(Powdermaker 1944).**
2. **The behavioral component** includes beliefs about what should be done with regard to groups such as attention, and the behavioral attitudes of the individual towards the members of this group, and for this it is sometimes called the policy of orientation. And because intolerance presents itself in the indicator of inequality in treatment - with the exception of individual differences, differentiation of capabilities, and forms of achievement that are functionally linked to the requirements of the situation - then it is called discrimination and rejects the "standard of justice", so a person must avoid discrimination, be aware of it and oppose it when he sees it directed to a third party.
3. **The emotional component** (corrective) of the prejudiced attitude on all the topics involved in the continuum of affection (general friendship) - hostility towards the topic of the attitude - and the different qualitative feelings that give the intolerance the emotional (corrective) form. Either the positive side of this continuum is about admiration or close relationships, or the negative side is about feelings such as fear, envy, and contempt. This requires the standard of human feelings, which is one of the necessary criteria in accepting others, regardless of their various qualities and beliefs, and this acceptance is a direct, positive personal response to others, whether on the level of feelings or behavior. **(Abdullah. 1990: 46-48)**

The three components of intolerance attitudes, if they are directed educationally, socially and politically with positive directions and in accordance with productive human standards, then turn into personal characteristics of common interest that are reflected in the behavior of the individual in the form of cooperation, love and respect.

Religious and Sectarian Intolerance

It is a cognitive orientation that rejects the intellectual peculiarities of other religions or sects, and it is negative feelings based on coercion and hatred towards the adherents of groups, sects, and doctrines existing in one religion or towards the followers of other religions, and this belief and feelings result in behaviors opposed to them that take different forms of hatred and violence. **(Deloye. 2008: 91)**

The sects and sectarian groups have historically formed on the basis of their own understanding of religion and their separation from the main group. This understanding formed an interpretation of religion different from the prevailing

interpretation, or the interpretation of the majority, or the interpretation of the original group. In Christianity, the disagreement occurred, which resulted in the formation of the Christian sects regarding the nature of Christ (peace be upon him), and with time it took on the nature of violence and annulment. In Islam, the dispute occurred over the best man to succeed the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him), and with the passage of time this dispute took the character of violence, abuse and an attempt of liquidation **(Qabbani 1997: 184)**.

The appropriate approach to understanding religious and sectarian intolerance is to distinguish and differentiate between a doctrine (dogma) in its content, that is, in its specificity as understood by a sect or a group, and a doctrine in its relationship to other beliefs of sects and groups in the same religion or between religions. Doctrine, in its content is an internal affair for its followers, represented in the acts of worship and rituals confined between them and their God (Lord), or so it should be. As for the second aspect of belief in its relationship with other religious beliefs, it is the negative side of it because it is the exclusionary side of the rights of others and preventing them from their religious privacy. In particular, if this peculiarity is dissenting or different with a special understanding about the main religion group. **(Qabbani. 1997: 185)**.

Intolerance is one of the dimensions of the stereotypical, static and authoritarian personality. There is no intolerance sense, but rather there is an educated willingness to intolerance. This intolerance is a belief or a tendency acquired in learning, but it is acquired early in childhood, starting at the age of three years, and then reinforced by school, daily practices and the media, directly or indirectly. So it becomes a psychosocial orientation and it grows with social normalization, so discrimination appears in treatment, and in group-specific behaviors, which results in preconceived ideas and prejudices that lead to hatred and underestimation of the other group and thus to religious and sectarian intolerance and sectarian oppression. **(Sadiq, 2001)**

The fanatic personality: an authoritarian personality, a solid opinion, characterized by rigidity of thought, dogmatic rigidity, static in attitudes and inflexibility, and its owner cares about social status and power and is easily influenced by the holders of centers of power. And the most important appearances of ideological and sectarian fanaticism are:

1. The fanatic believes that he is right and the other is wrong. The Holy Qur'an refers to that: **"Every party is happy with it has"** Surat al-Mu'minun.
2. The ideological fanatic transformed mosques from houses of monotheism and worship to arenas of strife, quarrels and disagreements between preachers over minor issues.
3. One of the manifestations of intolerance is that the Muslim to be victorious for his sect, his call to God and his religion, or his party, whether on right or wrong, as he believes that he is right along the way, even if the deniers did evidences.
4. Some fanatics see his school as sacred and not others, and its men are infallible angels, even if they were committed actions that caused delay of Islam and he does not agree with the scholars of the other team, even if they are right. **(Abbas, 2016: 90)**

As for the other variable of the research (**tolerance**), there are two points of view. The first believes that tolerance is: "A person relinquishes his right to take revenge on those who have offended him, and overcome feelings of resentment, bitterness, and anger" or it is "mental separation from negative emotions, thoughts and behaviors towards the offender." Supporters of the second group believe that tolerance includes not only reducing negative emotions, thoughts and behaviors towards the offender, but also the occurrence of positive changes in the offended towards the abuser. Tolerance is defined among the supporters of the second group as "a change that occurs when the offender has towards the abuser, reflected in the desire to giving up his right in anger and rage, passing negative judgments, and indifferent behavior towards those who caused him unjust harm, and showing all forms of compassion, pity and goodness towards him" (**Barbee.2008: 22**). The tolerant individual tries with all efforts to transform his negative emotions, behaviors and thoughts towards the offender into more positive emotions, thoughts and behaviors, regardless of the abuser's actions, which results in abandoning the idea of revenge and retaliation against the offender.

Based on the above, tolerance includes three components:

1. **The cognitive component (or mental):** It is represented in the individual making a decision to tolerate the offender, and it includes all the positive thoughts that were formed after making the decision to forgive.
2. **The emotional component:** It is represented in the crystallization of the individual's positive feelings towards the offender after making the decision to forgive.
3. **The behavioral component:** It is represented in translating the decision and positive feelings into a practical reality, where all the positive behaviors that the individual undertakes towards the offender, such as his good treatment, honor, respect ... etc.

So tolerance is shown through the following two aspects:

First: The individual abandoning of negative feelings, thoughts and behaviors such as anger, rage and resentment, and the desire for revenge and harm to the offender.

Second: the growth of positive emotions, thoughts, and behaviors towards the offender, such as closeness, courtship, good behavior and intent.

(Mako and Associates. 2015: 11)

(Enrett) and the Evolutionary Psychology Group classify the types and stages of tolerance and its advancement according to the inference related to tolerance, namely are:

1. **Tolerance with retaliation tendency:** I can forgive a person who made mistakes with me, only if I could hurt him the same he he has done with me.
2. **Conditional or compensatory tolerance:** If I can recover everything that was taken from me, then I can forgive.
3. **Expected tolerance:** I can forgive if others pressured me to show tolerance. I forgive because others expecting from me.

4. **Expected legal tolerance:** I forgive because my philosophy in life or religious education urges me to do so.
5. **Tolerance as social harmony:** I forgive in order to restore harmony or good relations with others in society. Forgiveness is the way to maintain a secure relationship.
6. **Tolerance as love:** I forgive because tolerance enhances the true feeling of love, and since I should genuinely care for every human being, so offend against me did not change my sense of this love. Such relationships increase the likelihood of reconciliation between the two parties of the relationship: the offender and the offended, and suppress feelings of revenge and retaliation.

Tolerance as a psychological process includes the elimination of sin psychologically, so the personal expression of tolerance conveys this meaning to others (the disappearance of sin from the perspective of the victim), and it may involve some financial losses, so the victims give up their claim in the sense that they give up their right, so there are reasons that hinder the initiative to express on tolerance from the point of view (McLaughlin, 2015: 239-240), including:

1. **Fear of repetition of offense:** The most common fear of tolerance relates to whether tolerance opens the way for future assaults. Especially for people who have difficulty trusting others and those who have been severely and repeatedly hurt, the more likely possibility is their fear of the personal risks of expressing tolerance.
2. **The victim's fear to look weak:** It is represented that those who express their tolerance may appear weak, or be subject to criticism, whether from others or themselves, so the expression of tolerance is seen as a concession of rights, and this awakens feelings of weakness and inferiority among the victims. It is more likely that they will seek revenge, and demand a situational restoration.
3. **The belief that justice will not help:** Some individuals believe that forgiving a sin is a violation of justice. For example, partial justice rules are based on the eye for eye rule and are based on reciprocity in dealing; (responding to the offense why it's offence for us) with little mercy - if any - towards the perpetrator of violence, and requires compensatory justice, such as compensation for the victim, such as a form of apology or a form of privileges. If partial justice is provided, the victims may be reluctant to exempt the perpetrator of violence from his crime without demanding his punishment or compensation. In such situations, tolerance is seen as a difficult matter, and also does not have a ethical value.
4. **Loss of the victim the benefits associated with his status as a victim:** Despite of many emotional and motivational problems that accompany the victim, the portrayal of oneself as a victim may have important advantages. Individuals who get the title of "victims" may occupy the best moral high status because they are offended. His victim status provides him with the strength to generate feelings of guilt on the perpetrator of violence, to demand an apology, and compensation. The perception by others of the individual as a victim may be an effective tool to show support and understanding on their part, and the victim will lose these benefits if he gives up the exercise of his role as a victim. The individuals who are masochistic - those who relish the feeling of persecution - may constantly portray themselves as victims. Therefore; it is

difficult for some individuals to resort to tolerant behavior. That is why we find some individuals that it is very difficult for them to reach tolerance. **(McLaughlin, 2015: 294-302)**

Intolerance and Tolerance Attitudes from Psychological Perspectives:

Modeling Theory (Pandora)

This theory focuses on the importance of social interaction, social norms, context and social conditions in the occurrence of learning, and this means that learning does not take place in a vacuum but in a social setting. It has been proven for many individuals that behavioral, social and other patterns are acquired through simulation and learning by observation through the modeling process, which is the child's imitation of the behaviors of important models in their lives, such as their parents.

Parents play the largest role in children's learning of prejudicial attitudes, or tolerance, as there is a consistent correlation between parents' attitudes towards children. Parents transmit these attitudes without direct direction through behavioral and attitudinal mechanisms, and they unconsciously perform a process in keeping with the prevailing trends in the culture in which they live. Consequently, children notice the attitudes of their parents and their behavior in different situations, and despite the parents' keenness not to explicitly express their intolerance or tolerance attitudes, it is the clearest models that children imitate their behavior and unite with them at an early age.

As children grow the importance of peer group increases. In most cases peer groups support the views of the parents, because there are similarities between them in the social and cultural background and the prevailing values.

From the same perspective, the media as an important channel plays a role in learning attitudes during the socialization process. Children tend, often to simulate the different forms of violence they see through films or the many means of public communication, and the feelings of hate or affection that may be contained in the media material for some persons or groups. **(Abdullah. 1990: 108-109)**

Belief Systems (Rocketech)

This perspective deals with the idea of the Belief System, in which Rocketech classifies people into two patterns that represent the cognitive structure of the individual that is based on a set of beliefs, namely are:

First: closed-minded, or mental stagnation: in which the thinking style is relatively rigid, resistant to change, does not tolerate ambiguity or confusion, he cannot accept or understand ideas other than he knows, his responses are characterized by either absolute acceptance or absolute rejection or people without roasting or examining that the individual. This intellectual stagnation is characterized by stagnation and opposition to new ideas. He can also include contradictory and fanatic ideas.

(Razuqi & Idan. 2016: 192)

Second: Open-Minded, in which the method of thinking is developing and growing that the individual is interested in knowing the ideas of others and their beliefs, and he has the ability to change his thoughts if they are proven wrong. The tolerant person is able to accept or understand the ideas of others because he has mental flexibility and system that allows him to accept what is unfamiliar and despite the differences between him and the others. **(Razzuqi & Idan. 2016: 192).**

Between these two extremes, different people fall on two opposite points in a straight and measurable line. Whereas, the cognitive formation of ideas and beliefs organized in a relatively closed pattern is represented in the way of thinking and behavior so that it appears with any ideological belief regardless of its content, meaning that the assertiveness is represented in an authoritarian view of life and in intolerance of opposing beliefs. i.e (Rocketech) believes that every person cognitive structure and beliefs about life, power, social, cultural and political relations. These beliefs are organized in an integrated format, and this overall pattern is what constitutes the learner's cognitive system, and this system is a variety of beliefs, attitudes, behaviors and ways of thinking, as well as this cognitive system is either described as closed and rigid, or it is open and has the ability to communicate with the ideas and beliefs of others and coexist with them. **(Razzuqi & Idan. 2016: 193)**

(Rokitech) believes that there are three important aspects that should be taken into consideration regarding the issue of belief formation, which are cognitive, ideological, and personal emotion. He describes these aspects that are correlated. It is used interchangeably on the basis of the assumption that any emotion has a cognitive appearance identical to it, and that any knowledge has an emotional appearance identical to it, in other words that the formation of beliefs has three basic patterns in terms of acceptance and rejection of closed and open-minded people, which are either acceptance or rejection of ideas, people and authority. The first pattern is the cognitive, which reflects the cognitive side, the second pattern represents intolerance and aversion that reflects the ideological aspect and the third pattern is the authority, which reflects the emotional side of the person.

(Abdullah, 1990: 105)

Every idea, when the individual translates it into behavioral situations, whether fanatic or tolerance attitudes, carries at the same time cognitive and emotional loads, depending on the strength of the behavior adopted on the strength and severity of these three aspects.

Procedures and Methodology

This part includes a description of the research methodology and the procedures carried out by the researchers in determining the research community and selecting its sample, the tool used in, as well as the statistical methods used in data processing. The researchers adopted the analytical descriptive method as it is the closest to achieving the goal of the research and answering its questions such as relying on opinion poll by sample members, which requires a field survey of community members. This can only be achieved through the descriptive analytical survey method.

The current research community is represented by the youth of Hassan Sham U3 camp who are accused of ISIS issues and young women who were widows whose husbands

were killed by ISIS or whose husbands were affiliated with ISIS for the year (2020), and their number (288) young men and women. The numbers of the displaced in the camp were approved by the camp administration, and the total number of the displaced in the camp was (288), (85) males and (203) females.

For the purpose of determining the basic sample for the research, the two researchers selected a stratified random sample of (107) young men and women, (64) females and (43) males, and the percentage was (37%) of the total number of (288).

Research tools: In order to achieve the goal of the research and answer its questions, this required tools through which it could be achieved, and according to the aim of the research, two measures were required, one of them for intolerance attitudes and a measure for tolerance. Thus, the two researchers resorted to preparing two measures for both variables in line with the nature of the sample, relying on the literature in this field and benefit from (Rokitech) theory, especially in its division of intolerance attitudes into three dimensions, namely (cognitive, behavioral and emotional). The sections of the two scales were formed in their initial form. The psychometric properties of the two scales were verified as follows:

Scale Validity: Two methods were used to extract the validity of the two scales, including:

a. Apparent Validity:

It is also called trustiness and this is confirmed through the judgment of experts in the field of the validity of the scale to measure the concept or concepts under its name. (Al-Najjar, 2018: 149) The two researchers presented the two scales in their initial form to a group of experts specializing in educational and psychological sciences, measurement and evaluation (Annex 1). The two researchers adopted (80%) and above as a criterion to indicate the apparent validity of the scale, as (Blume and his peers) indicated that if the scale item obtained an agreement of 75% or more, one could feel satisfaction in terms of honesty. (Blume and his peers, 1983): 126). And based on the opinions and observations of the experts, the initial number of the two scales' items was preserved. (Appendix 2)

b. Scale stability

It can be said that a stable data collection tool is one that is free from "measurement errors," as the error of measurement lead to the difference in the scores obtained by individuals from their true scores, which can be obtained using tight measures. (Fenk, 2015: 211) Then, consistency in retesting is the amount of correlation between the scores obtained by the examinee when applying the test the first time and his scores when applying the test the second time. (Jawda 2009: 198)

In order to extract the stability of the two scales, the method of application and re-application was adopted. The stability sample consisted of (30) young men and women chosen by the random stratified method for a period of two weeks for the first and second applications, and for both scales, the correlation coefficient for the (intolerance attitudes) scale was (0.82) and for the (tolerance) scale (0.83) which this coefficient is a good indication of the stability of the two scales.

Scale Correction:

The scale of intolerance attitudes consists of (16) items and the tolerance scale of (10) items with five-point alternatives to answer the items according to a five-response scale and its equivalent degree, which is (agree strongly = 5, agree = 4, neutral = 3, disagree = 2, strongly disagree = 1) noting that the highest score for the scale of intolerance attitudes is = (80), the lowest score for the scale is = (16), and the default average of the scale is = (48).

As for the tolerance scale, the highest score for the scale is = (50), the lowest score for the scale is = (10), and the default average for the scale is = (30).

Findings and discussion:

The results are displayed according to the research objectives as follows:

First Objective: identify the levels of intolerance attitudes and tolerance of the sample as a whole and to verify the indications of the differences by comparing its arithmetic mean with the default ones.

In order to achieve this goal, the data of the 107 male and female members of the research sample were processed, and after using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) to process the data, the following was found:

1. The arithmetic mean of the scores of the individuals of the sample as a whole for the tolerance scale was (33.1308) with a standard deviation of (3.77700) and after comparing it with the default average was (30) for the scale and it was found that the arithmetic mean is higher than the default mean and in terms of a specialist (0.05) and with a degree of freedom (106).
2. The arithmetic mean of the scores of the individuals of the sample as a whole for the scale of intolerance attitudes was (53.0748) with a standard deviation of (5.52644) and after comparing it with the default average was (48) for the scale, it was found that the arithmetic mean is higher than the default mean of the scale and in statistical terms (0.05) and with a degree of freedom (106) and the data were included in Table (1).

Table (1)

T-Test Results to Measure Tolerance Level of the Sample as a Whole

Scope	Quantity (Number)	Arithmetic mean	Default average	Standard deviation	T.Value		Indication
					Calculated	Tabular	
Tolaerance	107	33.1308	30	3.77700	8.574	1.984 (0.05) (106)	Significant at (0.05)
Intolerance attitudes		53.0748	48	5.52644	9.499		

It appears from the above table that the research sample showed levels indicating of both variables (intolerance attitudes and tolerance), in light of the conditions they were exposed to, such as displacement, wars, loss of loved ones, and traumas in its most horrific forms, in addition to imprisonment for the male category. All these and more thrust them into a valley difficult to get out of it, such as changing the values that

they believed in, increase their fear of the ruling authority under whatever name it was, and this is reflected in the increase in the percentage of tolerance they have, while it was assumed that their humanitarian reactions to everyone who hurt them embodied in revenge, but they chose to submit and deny the desire for revenge despite its presence in the their depths and this is evident through the percentage of levels of intolerance has all these consequences neglected by the local authority and international organizations without adequate treatment and preparation for normal coexistence with the others.

The harsh conditions that these IDPs were exposed to, from the effects of trauma, loss of loved ones, displacement and hardship, may have played an effective role in showing significant levels of intolerance towards those who caused them all these tragedies, despite of this, the sample showed a significant degree of tolerance and thus distinguished themselves as peaceful individuals who are different from other terrorists.

Second Objective: the significance of the moral differences in the level of intolerance attitudes and tolerance according to the gender variable.

In order to achieve this goal, the arithmetic means and standard deviations of the research sample according to the gender variable (male and female) were concluded and to verify the significance of the differences in the two variables between the two genders, the T-Test was used for two independent samples of equal number, Table (2) and (3).

Table (2)
T-Test Results of Difference Significance in the Level of Tolerance According to the Gender Variable

Gender	Number	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation	T-Value		Significance (Indication)
				Calculated	Tabulated	
Male	43	33.1163	4.70668	0.033	1.985	No difference
Female	64	33.1406	3.03873		(0.05) (105)	

Table (3)
T-Test Results of Difference Significance in the Level of Intolerance Attitudes According to the Gender Variable

Intolerance attitudes	Number	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation	T-Value		Significance (Indication)
				Calculated	Tabulated	
Total Score	Male	43	55.8605	4.672	1.985	There is a significant difference in favor of male
	Female	64	51.2031		(0.05) (105)	

It is evident from the above table that the calculated T value for tolerance reached (0.033), which is less than the tabular T value (1.985) at the level of significance (0.05) and the degree of freedom (105). This means that there is no statistically significant difference between the average of tolerance with males and females.

Tolerance is a lofty human characteristic that people seek regardless of their gender. Therefore, both genders showed approximately equal and significant levels of tolerance, whether this was a theoretical acknowledgment of the sample or fear of the local authorities... through conducting some informal interviews and hearing stories after submitting the questionnaire they gave more explanations and there were many underlying stories that clearly indicated a desire for revenge, but fear and sometimes lack of knowledge of the aggressor prevented them from taking revenge. This is a very dangerous indication. At a time when we believe that tolerance exists, a desire for revenge is present but hidden. And when the opportunity arises, they will express this hidden violence in different ways, so whoever knows the aggressor will take revenge on him, but he who does not know the aggressor may have greater revenge because he will generalize and target the group to which the aggressor belongs, and we will fall into the cycle of repeated violence. What make matters worse are the local government's actions and the failure to take the transitional justice path. The measures to isolate ISIS families or those accused of belonging to ISIS, or even the slow process of deciding the cases of those accused of terrorism and ill-treatment, all increase the desire for revenge and intolerance instead of social integration and tolerance.

As for the intolerance attitudes, males showed significant intolerance attitudes and higher than females with a calculated T-value of (4,672) and a value of (0.05). This may be due to the fact that the psychological effects of the attacks on these displaced persons were more severe on males compared to females, and the data for this result are consistent with the nature of our Iraqi society, in which men play a more active role compared to women in most areas of life, especially in adopting opinions, beliefs and community movement, which is clearly reflected in the research sample of males compared to females. This is in harmony with the results of most research indicating that males are more prone to intolerance attitudes, and for this reason, feminization of leaderships is recommended to reduce the percentage of conflicts and intolerance attitudes .

Third Objective: the differences between the cognitive component and the behavioral component in the intolerance attitudes of the sample as a whole.

In order to achieve this objective, the arithmetic mean and standard deviations of the research sample were concluded according to the variable of the two components (cognitive & behavioral) and to verify the significance of the differences in the two variables. The following was found in Table (4).

Table (4)
T-Test Results to Measure the Level of Intolerance attitudes for the Sample as a whole

Scope	No.	Arithmetic mean	Default Average	Standard deviation	T-Value		Significance (0.05)
					Calculated	Tabulated	
Total score	107	53.0748	48	5.02644	9.499	1.984 (0.05) (106)	There is a significant difference by (0.05)
Cognitive Component		18.8879	18	3.25729	2.820		There is a significant difference
Behavioral Component		26.1121	24	3.27462	6.672		There is a significant difference

It is clear that the arithmetic mean of the scores of the individuals of the sample as a whole is (53.0748) with a standard deviation of (5.52644) and after comparing it with the default average is (48) with a degree of freedom (106). i.e there is a statistically significant difference for the sample as a whole. It's found that the arithmetic mean of the cognitive component is (18.8879), which is higher than the default average (18), and the arithmetic mean of the behavioral component is (26.1121), while the default average is (24) and this indicates that there is a statistically significant difference between the two components in favor of the behavioral component.

This indicates that most of the elements affiliated with ISIS are individuals who have beliefs specific to what should be done (behaviorally) rather than (beliefs and cognitive perceptions). Therefore, modifying behavior is often easier than modifying a conviction that requires a criterion of rationality, logical discussion, and probing into the depths of the mind and soul.

We can say that the results of this goal are of the happy and sad type at the same time. Happy because it is easier to treat prejudice attitudes and adjust them with tolerance behaviors. The individual here does not carry firm values, true faith and passion for beliefs that move him in a fanatical direction. It is sad because the relative bodies in the Iraqi government and political parties took wrong paths and consumed a lot of resources (lives, efforts, money, and time) and created other complex crises as a result of wrongly dealing with this file. It seems clear that their decisions are confused by improvisational and moody rather than scientific, based on the foundations of specialized studies and research. In addition, there is a lack of vision in how to deal with religious discourse in general and with these cases in particular. The first with those concerned, especially in the Ministry of Endowments and the Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research, was to work in depth through the platforms and through the colleges and institutes of Sharia and religious sciences on education and awareness of moderate thought and the consecration of the language of coexistence, that religion is a mercy for all people, encouraging and supporting the preachers among the people of moderation, that religion is not imposed by force, and that killing a person is greater with God Almighty than the demolition of Kaaba!

Conclusions, Recommendations and Proposals

Conclusions

In light of the results, the two researchers came up with the following conclusions:

1. Youth (males and females) in Hasan Sham camp possess a significant level of intolerance attitudes and tolerance.
2. Youth (males) are more prone to intolerance attitudes than their female peers.
3. Youth (females) are more inclined to tolerant behavior than their male counterparts.
4. There is a positive correlation between intolerance attitudes and tolerance.
5. The possibility of modifying behavior is easier than modifying convictions, thought and knowledge.
6. The approaches of the relative bodies in the Iraqi government with this case have led to more fanatic behaviors than to reduce intolerance or increase tolerance and consecrate peaceful coexistence.
7. The isolation of ISIS suspects and / or their families in camps without correct and healthy treatments for social integration and their rehabilitation makes them time bombs of anger that no one can predict when they will explode.

Second: Recommendations

In light of the above results, the researchers recommend the following recommendations to the relevant authorities:

1. Informing the camp management on the necessity of opening centers for psychological and intellectual rehabilitation, modifying fanatic behavior, and focusing on tolerance behavior through intensive awareness programs and practical activities developed by experts in this field.
2. Directing civil society organizations to intensify long-term projects targeting young people accused of belonging to ISIS, to develop their behavior of tolerance and reduce their intolerance.
3. Opening centers for sustainable human development, creating job opportunities and trying to integrate them with the society.
4. Directing the local media and places of worship to focus efforts towards the seriousness of intolerance attitudes and the importance of developing tolerance behavior among youth.
5. The issuance of decisions by the Ministry of Interior and the respective authorities on the necessity of expediting and deciding the cases of ISIS suspects, and in the event that the evidence is not proven, they should go directly to prepare them for integration into society and reparate them at least to ensure their behavior in the future.
6. Conduct face to face sessions between those who have been found guilty of crimes and the victims or their relatives, and make the courts public and open in order to spread a sense of justice and stabilize the souls of the victims and their

families and not to increase the desire for revenge or the perceptions that the right is lost.

7. Reviewing the educational curricula in the colleges and institutes of Sharia and the acceptance rates of students to these institutions in the first place, emphasizing the moderate discourse and emphasizing the idea that religion belongs to everyone and is not owned by anyone or any party. Religious people have the right to practice politics, but the religion should not be politicized.

Third: Proposals:

To complete the current research, the two researchers suggest conducting an experimental future study (the effect of a cognitive behavioral program to modify the behavior of intolerance attitudes among the youth of Hasan Sham camp)

Sources

- 1) Jawda, Ma'afudh. 2009, Statistical Analysis using SPSS, 2nd Edition, Wael Publishing House, Jordan.
- 2) Al-Khayoun, Rasheed. 2008, Iraqi society, the heritage of Tolerance and Hatred, publications of the Institute for Strategic Studies, Baghdad - Erbil - Beirut.
- 3) Deloye, Hiwa Haji. 2008, Intolerance attitudes among ethnic groups, Erbil - Iraq.
- 4) Salameh, Abdul-Hafidh. 2007, Social Psychology, Al-Yazouri Scientific House for Printing, Publishing and Distribution, Amman.
- 5) Razuqi, Ra'ad Mahdi. & Suhail, Jamila Idan. 2016, Thinking and Its Patterns, Part Two, Dar Al-Kutub Al-Ilmiyah - Beirut.
- 6) Reber, Arthur S. & Reber, Emily. Psychiatric Dictionary (English - Arabic) Translated by: Abd Al-Ali Al-Jasmani & Ammar Al-Jasmani. (2008) 1st Edition, the Arab Science House Publishers - Saudi Arabia.
- 7) Zahran, Hamid. 2000, Social Psychology, 6th Edition, The World of Books, Cairo.
- 8) Shahata, Hassan & Al-Najjar, Zainab. (2003), Glossary of educational and psychological terms, the Egyptian Lebanese House - Cairo.
- 9) Abbas, Nawal Qasim. 2016, Ideological and Sectarian Intolerance , its psychological causes, methods of treatment, Educational and Psychological Research Center - University of Baghdad, Issuance No. (48)
- 10) Abdullah, Muataz Sayid. 1990, Intolerance attitudes, The World of Knowledge.
- 11) Fenk, Arlene. Translated by A'atif Madkour. 2015, Review of Research Heritage in Behavioral Sciences, National Center for Translation - Cairo.
- 12) Qabbani, Abdul-Aziz. 1997, Intolerance the Structure of the Arab Society, Dar Al-Afaq Al-Jadeeda, Beirut.
- 13) Mako, Michelle A. & Others, 2015, Tolerance Theory, Research, and Practice, translated by Abeer Mohammad Anwar, National Center for Translation - Egypt.
- 14) Al-Najjar, Fayiz Juma'a and others, 2018, 5th Edition, Scientific Research Methods / Applied Perspective, Dar Al-Hamid - Amman.
- 15) Barbee, K. 2008. Agreeableness facets and forgiveness of others, PhD, Dissertation, Faculty of the school of psychology & counseling, Regent University.