T.C.
ANKARA YILDIRIM BEYAZIT UNIVERSITY
THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

PREJUDICE AND ITS RELATION TO THE SELF-ESTEEM OF YEMENI UNIVERSITY STUDENTS IN TURKEY

MASTER'S THESIS

AHMED GAMAL AHMED GAWAS

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

ANKARA, 2020

PREJUDICE AND ITS RELATION TO THE SELF-ESTEEM OF YEMENI UNIVERSITY STUDENTS IN TURKEY

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
ANKARA YILDIRIM BEYAZIT UNIVERSITY

BY

AHMED GAMAL AHMED GAWAS

PROF. DR. BILAL SAMBUR

SUPERVISOR

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

JULY 2020

APPROVAL PAGE

The thesis named “Prejudice and Its Relatıon to the Self-esteem of Yemeni University Students in Turkey” prepared by Ahmed Gamal Ahmed GAWAS was accepted unanimously as a master’s thesis by the jury below in the discipline of psychology in the graduate school of social sciences in Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University.

Name Surname	Institution	Signature
Prof. Dr. Bilal SAMBUR	AYBU, Psychology	
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Celal Deha DOĞAN	Ankara University, Educational Sciences	
Assist. Prof. Dr. Emine İNAN	AYBU, Psychology	

Thesis Defense Date: 09.07.2020

I affirm that it fulfills the requirements for having a Master's thesis in Department of Psychology in the Institute of Social Sciences at Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University.

Director of Institute of Social Sciences Assoc. Prof. Dr. Seyfullah YILDIRIM

I hereby declare that all information in this thesis has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work; otherwise I accept all legal responsibility.

Name, Last Name: Ahmed Gamal Ahmed GAWAS

Signature:

DEDICATION

To my beloved father, mother and my dear wife...

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

First of all, I would like to thank the supervisor Prof. Dr. Bilal SAMBUR for his valuable and seminal contributions, guidance and advice to my academic life during the course taking and during the thesis writing process. I would also like to thank the members of the examination committee, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Celal Deha DOĞAN and Assist. Prof. Dr. Emine İNAN for their criticism and contributions. Apart from that, I owe my thanks to Prof. Dr. Cem Şafak ÇUKUR, Head of the Department and to Assist. Prof. Dr. Gülten ÜNAL for their contributions to my academic life during the course taking process.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to my family for their precious support. My father and my mother have always supported me with love since my childhood until now. Other than that, my wife deserves great appreciation for her unconditional support and love.

Finally, I would like to thank the Turkish Scholarships (YTB) for giving me the opportunity to study in my second country, Turkey. It was a wonderful experience for me, where I learned and benefited a lot from living in Turkey and I will remain grateful for this experience.

ABSTRACT

PREJUDICE AND ITS RELATION TO THE SELF-ESTEEM OF YEMENI UNIVERSITY STUDENTS IN TURKEY

Gawas, Ahmed Gamal Ahmed

M. A., Department of Psychology

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Bilal Sambur

July 2020, 68 pages

The current study aims to examine the relationship between prejudice and self-esteem among Yemeni university students in Turkey. The differences on prejudice and self-esteem were also examined by gender, age, city of living, educational level, scholarship, academic specialization and academic achievement. The current study was conducted with 308 Yemeni university students studying in nine different Turkish cities. The prejudice scale and Rosenberg self-esteem scale were used to collect the data of study. Results have found that prejudice was negatively correlated with self-esteem. Prejudice is a major factor and has sub-factors, all of which are closely related. Moreover, it was found that there were significant differences on prejudice attributed to gender, age and scholarship, while the other variables did not show any differences on prejudice. There are also significant differences on self-esteem by gender and department of students, but the rest of the variables did not show significant differences on self-esteem. The findings of the study were discussed with the relevant literature.

Keywords**:** prejudice, self-esteem, Yemeni university students

ÖZET

ÖNYARGI VE TÜRKİYE'DE ÜNİVERSİTE EĞİTİMİ ALAN YEMENLİ ÖĞRENCİLERİN KENDİLERİNE BENLİK SAYGISIYLA İLİŞKİSİ

Gawas, Ahmed Gamal Ahmed

Yüksek Lisans, Psikoloji Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Bilal Sambur

Temmuz 2020, 68 sayfa

Bu çalışma, Türkiye'de üniversite eğitimi alan Yemenli öğrencileri arasında önyargı ve benlik saygısı arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. Öğrencilerin önyargı puanları arasındaki farklılıklar ile benlik saygısı puanları arasındaki farklılıklar cinsiyet, yaş, yaşanılan şehir, eğitim seviyesi, burs alıp almama durumu, akademik başarı ve uzmanlık alanı gibi değişkenler göz önünde bulundurularak incelenmiştir. Çalışma, Türkiye'nin dokuz farklı şehrinde öğrenim gören 308 Yemenli üniversite öğrencisi ile gerçekleştirilmiştir. Çalışma verilerini toplamak için önyargı ölçeği ve Rosenberg benlik saygısı ölçeği kullanılmıştır. Sonuçlar, önyargının benlik saygısı ile negatif bir ilişki gösterdiğini olduğunu ortaya çıkarmıştır. Önyargı önemli bir faktördür ve alt faktörlere sahiptir ve bu alt faktörlerin hepsi birbirleriyle ilişkilidir. Ayrıca, cinsiyet, yaş ve bursla ilişkilendirilen önyargıda anlamlı farklılıklar bulunurken, diğer değişkenlerin önyargıda herhangi bir farklılık göstermediği saptanmıştır. Ayrıca cinsiyet ve öğrencilerin okuduğu bölümlere bağlı olarak benlik saygısı konusunda farklılıklara rastlanılmış olmakla beraber, değişkenlerin geri kalanı benlik saygısı üzerinde herhangi bir farklılık göstermemiştir. Çalışmanın bulguları ilgili literatür ile tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar kelimeler: Önyargı, benlik saygısı, Yemenli üniversite öğrenciler.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM ..... **iii**
DEDICATION ..... **iv**
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT ..... **v**
ABSTRACT ..... **vi**
ÖZET ..... **vii**
TABLE OF CONTENTS ..... **viii**
LIST OF TABLES ..... **xi**
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS ..... **xii**
CHAPTER 1 ..... **1**
INTRODUCTION **1**
1.1. General Introduction 1
1.2. Prejudice 2
1.2.1. Prejudice in Psychology 2
1.2.2. Definition of Prejudice 3
1.2.3. Overlapping Concepts with the Concept of Prejudice 5
1.2.3.1. Ethnocentrism 5
1.2.3.2. Racism 5
1.2.3.3. Stereotypes 6
1.2.3.4. Discrimination 7
1.2.3.5. Social Distance 7
1.2.4. Components of the Prejudice Attitude 8
1.2.4.1. The Cognitive Component (Stereotypes) 8
1.2.4.2. Emotional Component 8
1.2.4.3. Behavioral Component 9
1.2.5. Theories of Prejudice 10
1.2.5.1. The Psychological Basics of Prejudice 10
1.2.5.2. The Social Dynamics of Prejudice 10
1.2.5.3. Transmission of Prejudice to Individuals 11
1.2.5.4. Individual Differences and Prejudice 11
1.2.6. Generalized Attitudes of Prejudice 12
1.3. Self-esteem 14
1.3.1. Definition of Self-esteem 15
1.3.2. Self-concept and Self-esteem 16

1.3.3. Factors Affecting the Self-esteem 16
1.3.3.1. Personal Factors 16
1.3.3.2. Environmental Factors 17
1.4. Aims of the study 19
1.5. Significance of the Study 20
1.6. Questions of Study 21
CHAPTER 2 22
METHOD 22
2.1. Research Model 22
2.2. Participants 22
2.3. Instruments 23
2.3.1. The Demographic Information Form 23
2.3.2. Scale of Prejudice 23
2.3.3. Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale 23
2.4. Procedure 24
2.5. Data Analysis 24
CHAPTER 3 25
RESULTS 25
3.1. Characteristics of Participants 25
3.2. Correlation between Prejudice and Self-esteem 27
3.3. Differences on Prejudice 28
3.3.1 Differences on Prejudice by Gender 28
3.3.2 Differences on Prejudice by Age 28
3.3.3 Differences on Prejudice by City of Living in Turkey 30
3.3.4 Differences on Prejudice by City of Living in Yemen 30
3.3.5 Differences on Prejudice by Funding of Study Expenses 30
3.3.6 Differences on Prejudice by Department of Students 31
3.3.7 Differences on Prejudice by Education Level of Students 31
3.3.8 Correlation between Prejudice and Grade Point Average (GPA) 32
3.4. Differences on Self-esteem 32
3.4.1. Differences on Self-esteem by Gender 32
3.4.2. Differences on Self-esteem by Age 32
3.4.3. Differences on Self-esteem by City of Living in Turkey 32
3.4.4. Differences on Self-esteem by City of Living in Yemen 33
3.4.5. Differences on Self-esteem by Funding of Study Expenses 33

3.4.6. Differences on Self-esteem by Department of Students 34
3.4.7. Differences on Self-esteem by Education Level 35
3.4.8. Correlation between Self-esteem and Grade Point Average (GPA) 35
3.5. Factors of Prejudice 36
CHAPTER 4 38
DISCUSSION 38
4.1. Correlation between Prejudice and Self-esteem 38
4.2. Differences in Prejudice 39
4.2.1. Differences on Prejudice by Gender 39
4.2.2. Differences on Prejudice by Age 40
4.2.3. Differences on Prejudice City of Living 40
4.2.4. Differences on Prejudice by Funding of Study Expenses 41
4.2.5. Differences on Prejudice by Department of Students 41
4.2.6. Differences on Prejudice by the Educational Level 42
4.2.7. Differences on Prejudice by Grade Point Average (GPA) 42
4.3. Differences on Self-esteem 42
4.3.1. Differences on Self-esteem by Gender 42
4.3.2. Differences on Self-esteem by Age 43
4.3.3. Differences on Self-esteem by City of Living 44
4.3.4. Differences on Self-esteem by Funding of Study Expenses 44
4.3.5. Differences on Self-esteem by the Department of Students 45
4.3.6. Differences on Self-esteem by the Educational Level 45
4.3.7. Differences on Self-esteem by Grade Point Average (GPA) 46
4.4. Factors of Prejudice 47
4.5. Conclusions 47
4.6. Limitations 47
4.7. Suggestions 48
REFERENCES 50
APPENDICES 62
APPENDIX A THE DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM 62
APPENDIX B SCALE OF PREJUDICE 63
APPENDIX C ROSENBERG SELF-ESTEEM SCALE 67
APPENDIX D AYBU ETHIC COMMITTEE APPROVAL FORM 68

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 The Distribution of Students by Cities 22
Table 2 The Distribution of Students by Gender 25
Table 3 The Distribution of Students by City of Living in Yemen 26
Table 4 The Distribution of Students by Departments 26
Table 5 The Distribution of Students by Education Level 27
Table 6 The Distribution of Students by Scholarship 27
Table 7 The Pearson Correlation between the Prejudice and Self-esteem 28
Table 8 ANOVA Result of Age on Prejudice 29
Table 9 Multiple Comparisons of Age 29
Table 10 ANOVA Result of City of Living on Prejudice 30
Table 11 ANOVA Result of Department of Students on Prejudice 31
Table 12 ANOVA Result of Department of Students on Prejudice 31
Table 13 ANOVA Result of Age on Self-esteem 32
Table 14 ANOVA Result of City of Living on Self-esteem 33
Table 15 ANOVA Result of Department of Students on Self-esteem 34
Table 16 Multiple Comparisons of Department 35
Table 17 ANOVA Result of Department of Students on Self-esteem 35
Table 18 Correlations between Factors of Prejudice 36
Table 19 Factor Analysis of Factors Prejudice 37

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AYBU	Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University
RES	Rosenberg self-esteem Scale
GPA	Grade Point Average
CoHE	Council of Higher Education
YSU	Yemeni Students Union

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1.General Introduction

It was expected that the scientific progress of the present century would lead humanity to get rid of the despicable partiality and to eliminate forms of racial, class, religious and sexual discrimination, but the reality was different. The rates of massacres, crimes and conflicts between groups have increased in the way that so that what happened in the last century became a modest crime compared to what is happening in the present century (Jazzar, 2011).

In the past century, prejudice has been one of the main topics in psychology (Sechrist & Stangor, 2005). Given the importance of its studies as a psychosocial subject, researchers in social psychology pay great attention to it in order to know its nature, causes and manifestations and try to mitigate its bad effects (Belle & Doucet, 2003).

Prejudice is one of the problems facing the human society in general and modern human beings in particular. Prejudice makes the whole world on the verge of abyss, conflict and fight, and it drives individuals, communities and governments to civil wars, sectarian strife and internal conflicts. In addition, prejudice is a major cause of social disintegration (Omar, 2005).

If prejudice is spread to a high degree in a society, it becomes a cause of disruption of the community. This leads to a disruption in the balance of psychosocial health, which corrupts society and threatens its existence (Hemed, 2009).

The effects of prejudice in its various forms (religious, social, sexual, political, etc.) have been evident in the events of recent years in Yemen. This is evidenced by instances of

murder, incitement, and assault on places of worship. In addition to the cases of mass displacement, the spread of hate speech and the absence of the language of dialogue on various social issues.

1.2.Prejudice

Prejudice has been found in societies since the past. It is likely that prejudice will continue long periods in the future, perhaps to the end of the world (Belle & Doucet, 2003). Prejudice is a demeanor that treats people unfairly because of their membership in a group (Crocker & Major, 1989). These groups have been classified according to different and diverse criteria. Age, religion, sex, race and color are main salient criteria for people's classification (Bourdieu, 1987).

1.2.1. Prejudice in Psychology

Prejudice has been an important subject in social psychology since the last century. It has been addressed as an attitude that governs the interaction between individuals belonging to different groups, no matter this attitude is positive or negative. Negative prejudice has received considerable attention because of its negative social, economic and political impact on all human societies (Abdella, 2000).

The concept of prejudice emerged as a research problem in the 1920s within the field of social psychology (Samelon, 1987; Vaughan, 1988). Research grew slowly during the thirties and forties. Then, after the Second World War, there was a sudden surge in the study of prejudice (Fairchild & Gurin, 1978). For instance, Allport published his important study about the nature of prejudice in 1954, he reviewed a large number of studies about prejudice. Allport refers to refers to the fact that the concept of prejudice has undergone several changes in its meaning until it has reached its present meaning. These changes were in three stages (Duckitt, 1992):

1. The old meaning: It is the prior judgment based on decisions and actual experiences.
2. The concept then acquired the meaning of taking a decision about something in particular before testing and examining the available facts, which is a premature judgment.
3. Finally, the concept involved the emotional characteristic, whether preference or not preference to some subjects that accompanies the pre-ruling, which has no support to support it (Abdella, 1989).

1.2.2. Definition of Prejudice

Allport (1958) argues that the briefest definition of prejudice is the following definition: "bad thinking about others without sufficient evidence". Ehrlick (1973) concurs with this definition, adding that prejudice is an ethnic attitude characterized by no predilection, whereas (Krech et al., 1962) defines prejudice as a non-preference attitude that involves a set of highly general stereotypes and it is difficult to change it even after opposite information is provided.

Newcomb et al. (1965) view prejudice as an attitude of disinterest. It represents a willingness to think, feel and behave in a way that is counter to other people as members of particular groups. Sherif and Sherif (1965) see prejudice as a negative attitudes adopted by members of a particular group that derives from its existing standards and it is directed towards another group and its members. Zanden (1966) defined prejudice as a pattern of negative perceptions, feelings and attitudes related to members of a particular group.

All these definitions can be considered incomplete. Because they are referring to only one type of prejudice that is negative prejudice. They are oblivious to positive prejudice. People may be fanatical in their preference for others, and they maybe believe in good beliefs about them without sufficient evidence, just as they tend not to favor other people altogether.

That is why Secord and Backman (1964) define prejudice as an attitude to make his or her owner think, feel and behave in a preferred or non-preferred way towards some groups or individuals. Mc Donagh and Richards (1953) add that prejudice is preconceived judgments and misconceptions about specific people or subjects. In the same context, Klineberg (1954) sees prejudice as a particular emotion or reaction that distinguishes some people. They are a precedent to actual experience and not based on it. Perhaps, prejudice could be positive or negative and it can be oriented to any course of different topics.

From the above it should be noted that prejudice takes two main dimensions. The first one is negative prejudice which is prejudice against a subject, individual or group. The second is positive prejudice, which is prejudice in favor of subject, individual or group. This applies to forms and types of prejudice, except for racial intolerance which is only negative. Because it is characterized by hatred and aggression against an individual or people belonging to a particular ethnic group (Dienstbier, 1970).

Although many researchers have stressed the importance of positive prejudice along with negative prejudice, much research hasn't focused on positive prejudice. It was enough often to just study negative prejudice (Rokeach, Smith & Evans, 1960). Maybe the reason for this is that negative prejudice is the biggest problem that humanity has suffered throughout the history of fanaticism (Dienstbier, 1970).

Based on the previous presentation of some definitions and opinions on the concept of prejudice, the following can be observed:

1. Most researchers agree that prejudice is an attitude that has three components (cognitive, emotional and behavioral one), like the other psychological attitudes.
2. The prejudice can be preferred (prejudice with) and it can be a lack of preference (prejudice against), which is more discussed in previous studies and researches.

3. Prejudice plays an irrational function through the behaviors of a fanatic.

1.2.3. Overlapping Concepts with the Concept of Prejudice

In social sciences, researchers have used many terms to describe and explain the relationship and conflict between groups (Duckitt, 1992). Since prejudice is a complex concept and there is some variation in its definition as mentioned above, the most important concepts that can be similar and overlapped with the concept of prejudice are be clarified in order to not overlap the concepts.

1.2.3.1. Ethnocentrism

The concept of ethnocentrism refers to the belief of that the individual's fanatic group is the best among all groups and that it is the center of world, which means looking at the behaviors, customs and traditions that distinguish other groups through the perspective of the traditions and cultural values of the individual's community (Jazzar, 2011).

In other words, judging others on the basis of the individual group is called ethnocentrism, where the reference to this judgment, based on the individual's belief in the instinctive value and entitlement of the group to whom he belongs. It also includes the promotion of other groups as a group of less than his or her group (Duckitt, 1992; Taylor, Peplau & Sears, 1997).

1.2.3.2. Racism

Racism can be considered one of the most common concepts that overlap with the concept of prejudice. Some psychologists even see it as synonymous with prejudice (Milner, 1981). However, racism means believing that the cultural or racial heritage of a group outweighs the cultural heritage of other groups. This belief is accompanied by prejudice

attitudes against members of groups that have been classified as inferior to the individual's group (Skillings & Dobbins, 1991).

Duckitt (1992) adds that racism is an ideology that emphasizes the supremacy of race or its exploitation of other elements. This ideology includes two basic ideas: the first one is a framework for beliefs in the biological or cultural decline of a particular element. The second one is the use of such beliefs to justify the unfair treatment of members belonging to this group.

Accordingly, it can be said that racism is based on three foundations: a) Humanity is not due to one's breed but to several strains. b) These breeds are not equal in their characteristics, and some of them outperform the other. c) The manifestations of civilization and progress are related to the characteristics of breeds. Therefore, the candidate groups for the creation of civilization are the highest groups only. The rest of the groups must remain subordinate to or serve the higher breeds and should not desire the same status (Jazzar, 2011).

1.2.3.3. Stereotypes

The term of stereotype was used to refer to the underlying image that comes to mind when thinking about a group (Dovidio et al., 2010). We naturally classify people in groups and develop beliefs on the personalities, abilities and motivations about people in those groups (Franzoi, 1996). Stereotypes can be defined as a scheme of beliefs that attribute a set of traits to members of a social group (Wiggins, Wiggins & Zanden, 1994). These beliefs are characterized by excessive generalization, excessive simplification and inertia due to selective cognition and interpretation (Myers, 1996), and they are not accurate and are not gained by direct experience (Jazzar, 2011).

Ashmore and DelBoca (1981) added that stereotypes are not limited to descriptions of personality traits only. Stereotypes can include any personal, physical, emotional or behavioral character.

1.2.3.4. Discrimination

Dovidio and his colleagues (2010) believe that discrimination is generally a biased behavior. This behavior does not only mean actions that harm members of a group, but also an unfair preference for members of a group. In other words, it is a public or behavioral expression of what an individual thinks and feels towards members of a particular group, whether these beliefs and feelings with or against that group (Jazzar, 2011).

Many researchers have focused on negative discriminatory behaviors that appear on different forms of behavior. These behaviors may involve avoiding members of a group in the simple case of discrimination. On the other hand, it may include denial of some academic and functional rights or opportunities in cases of acute discrimination. In extreme cases of discrimination, it may reach to the killing of an individual simply because he or she is a member of a particular group (Franzoi, 1996).

1.2.3.5.Social Distance

The concept of social distance generally refers to the affinity or divergence of a person from members of other groups. It is part of the behavioral component of the attitude that individual believes towards those groups. The proximity of the person or his dislike of members of a group is considered one of the behaviors that reflects the attitudes towards them (Jazzar, 2011).

Bogardus is considered one of the first who studied social distance in 1925 as it is a manifestation of the degree of empathy and rapprochement among groups and individuals

(Duckitt, 1992). Both Simpson and Yinger (1985) refer that social distance should be defined as a reflection of the degree of closeness a person prefers in his contact and relations with members of other groups.

1.2.4. Components of the Prejudice Attitude

Since there is a broad agreement - as already seen - to view intolerance as a psychological attitude, this leads us to three components of prejudice attitudes in individuals:

1.2.4.1. The Cognitive Component (Stereotypes)

The cognitive components of prejudice are the perceptions, beliefs and ideas of an individual about objects or groups related to prejudice (Abu Ghali, 1999), which takes the form of stereotypes (Tahrawi, 2005).

There is an important point to be mentioned when talking about the cognitive component of prejudice. There are some ideas and beliefs that a person holds as a result of learning or misunderstanding, but he or she is ready to discuss and modify them radically. In this case, the person cannot be described as a fanatic or someone who has a stereotype. If a person accepts discussion or changes his thoughts without an emotional reaction, he cannot be considered as a prejudiced person. Because what distinguishes prejudice is the emotional response when discussing ideas and beliefs related to subject of prejudice. Therefore, it would not be true to consider all generalizations as fanatical (Tahrawi 2005).

1.2.4.2. Emotional Component

The emotional components of prejudice are the feelings of the individual towards the subject or group of prejudice. Whether these feelings are preference or lack of preference feelings to subject of prejudice. These feelings make the prejudice attitude as an emotional

style. In the positive prejudice, there are feelings of sympathy, love and admiration while in the negative prejudice there are feelings of contempt and reduction (Abu Ghali, 1999).

The emotional component is one of the most important indicators or components of prejudice. Without it there is doubt about the existence of prejudice. Because if the prejudgment lacks emotional content, it is difficult to say that it is prejudice (Abdella, 1989) and this component is similar to the emotional lining that encapsulates other contents. Depending on the degree of intensity and severity of the emotional component, this behavior may be called prejudice or not.

1.2.4.3. Behavioral Component

It is the outward appearance of behavior towards a particular group or subject as a result of individual's beliefs and stereotypes mixed with feelings and emotions towards the subject of prejudice (Tahrawi, 2005). This component consists of the forms and behavior of the individual towards members of the group who are prejudiced against them or with them. (Abdelrahman, 1970).

This component includes positive behaviors such as sacrifice, giving and preparing for death as in positive prejudice or includes negative behaviors such as assault, beating and insulting as in negative prejudice. But many researchers have focused on negative prejudice because this kind of behavior is the most dangerous to communities (Tahrawi, 2005).

In this context, Allport (1954) developed a gradual measure of the behavioral activities that an individual can exercise as a result of prejudice towards certain groups as follows: a) Refrain from verbal expression outside the boundaries of the group. b) Avoidance. c) Discrimination in behavior. d) Physical attack. e) Extermination and destruction (Tahrawi, 2005).

1.2.5. Theories of Prejudice

Psychologists in general and social psychologists in particular have presented many explanations that explain the phenomenon of prejudice. These theories were presented over different time periods. All attempts were to determine the grounds responsible for the occurrence of prejudice (Elliott & Merrill, 1961). Despite the abundance and diversity of these theories, they have not been able to give a single and comprehensive explanation to explain why prejudice occurs (Duckitt, 1992). This strengthens the argument that prejudice is a complex phenomenon and is determined by more than one factor (Ashmore,1970; Condor & Brown, 1988; Simpson & Yinger, 1985).

According to Duckitt (1992) there are four different causal processes in interpreting prejudice. These processes represent partial, but essential contributions to the interpretation of prejudice. An integrated framework which provide a comprehensive logical explanation of prejudice as an individual and social phenomenon together is presented. These basics and processes are explained below.

1.2.5.1. The Psychological Basics of Prejudice

Some common psychological processes represent preparations and the potential to be a prejudiced person, such as projection and frustration. The psychological foundations of prejudice also include cognitive processes such as social classification. The individual tends to classify himself and those around him into different groups. Whether this classification is voluntary or involuntary, it leads to some form of fanaticism in some way towards members of certain groups (Duckitt, 1992).

1.2.5.2. The Social Dynamics of Prejudice

The basic psychological processes determine the inner readiness for the individual to become prejudiced. But these processes do not operate separately from the social

environment in which prejudice occurs. Accordingly, there are some social dynamics necessary to show, shape and direct individual psychosocial preparations for prejudice in the forms of social patterns and hostile behavior toward some individuals or groups. For example, social construction contributes to the formation of prejudice through a number of factors like: Conflict of interest and competition between groups, and inequality between social groups in areas of social value. Additionally, other social conditions that make communal prejudice common and widespread such as communication and interaction between groups (Duckitt, 1992).

1.2.5.3. Transmission of Prejudice to Individuals

Prejudice can be interpreted as a collective or social phenomenon based on the characteristics of the social structure of the communities and the nature of their relations. But prejudice is still an individual experience. This led to the crucial question of how prejudice is acquired or transmitted as a collective and social phenomenon to members of different groups? (Duckitt, 1992).

The theories that explain how prejudice shifts to generations assume two processes that provide a clear explanation for the acquisition of prejudice attitude. The first one is the process of socialization - social learning in early life. The second one is the process of adhering to the prevailing social norms, which may include compliance with the criterion of prejudice as a condition for the continuation of membership in the group (Duckitt, 1992).

1.2.5.4. Individual Differences and Prejudice

Some theories emphasize the idea that the individual does not simply acquire prejudice from the social environment, but the acquisition is influenced by the individual characteristics of that individual (Newcomb, Turner & Converse, 1969). In other words, the individual does not acquire prejudice from the social background automatically, but he is

influenced by the individual characteristics of the "personal factors" that characterize that individual. This can be explained by the apparent disparity in the susceptibility of some individuals to prejudice more than those who share with them the same environment (Jazzar, 2011).

This interpretation of prejudice emerged clearly after the Second World War and the campaigns of genocide which have drawn attention to the personality disorder that could do such horrendous acts during and after the war (Franzoi, 1996). The classic theory of social psychology promoted the notion that intolerance is a problem of personality. This is the theory of "authoritarian personality" developed by Adorno and his colleagues (1950). It emphasizes that the individual's social and political attitudes form a coherent pattern. This pattern expresses deep personal tendencies in the personality of individual (Hewstone et al.,1993).

All the above emphasizes the importance of individual factors as an important determinant of an individual's susceptibility to prejudice. That is the evidence which indicates the generality of prejudice attitudes namely the tendency of intolerance. It is a general attitude (generalized) describes the attitudes of the individual not only to one out-group but also to most out-groups (Haddock, 1991; Hassan & Khalique, 1981; Khalique, 1981).

1.2.6. Generalized Attitudes of Prejudice

Humanity has experienced and continues to experience various forms of prejudice. Such as ethnic, racial, religious, national, sexual, sporting, political or social (Jazzar, 2011). This leads to an important question: Are the attitudes of prejudice that the individual has them in various areas are same or are they qualitative attitudes linked to one area of prejudice without other areas? Jazzar (2011) states that there is no difference in religious, national or

ethnic prejudice. A few thoughts show that prejudice attitudes despite its multiplicity of forms, they do not differ in their structure or meaning.

In the same context, Adorno and his research group (1950) refers that research on authoritarian personality has found that prejudice is a generalized interrelated pattern, and that prejudice is not only a specific direction towards a specific subject or group, but rather a way of thinking about the different external groups in general. Jazzar (2011) adds that if the structure of prejudice is one, and this structure determines the features of the method of dealing with the variant in general, it is likely that the responses of fanaticism to different people will be the same, regardless of those people are different in religious, political or sexual factors.

On the other hand, there are a few studies whose results are inconsistent with the results of studies that have reached the generality of the attitudes of prejudice. For example, Campbell (1967) concludes that the five types of intolerance he studied were not so closely related to one variable.

However, several studies have confirmed the generality of the prejudice attitudes (Haddock, 1991; Khalique, 1981; Shafei, 1997; Sinha & Hassan, 1975; Weigel & Howes,1985). These studies also revealed that the important point in the generality of the attitudes is not the content of the belief, but the method of belief (Jazzar, 2011).

Rokeach (1985) adds that the method of dealing with beliefs determines the degree of individual's prejudice, whether it is rigid, flexible or tolerant. In addition, the method represents a reflection of the individual's beliefs that tend to be consistent in different subjects. This may explain why fanaticism in some field is intolerant in other areas (Shafei, 1997).

In addition to that, whether prejudice is general prejudice or in a specific area. Generally, it affects the individual's psychological health (Hightower, 1997). This effects on the personality and psychological security of the individual. Hillman et al. (1998) say that some people use prejudice as a way of defending themselves. In other words, prejudice is used to defend the self-esteem.

Verkuyten (1996) refers to a correlation between prejudice and self-esteem among young people. Ruttenberg et al. (1996) added that collective self-esteem is the most predictive dimension of prejudice.

1.3. Self-esteem

Self has occupied a prominent place in psychological research, and psychologists have been interested in searching for its meaning and what it is. This led to the emergence of many researches related to the self (Amer, 2015).

The attention given to the concept of self is due to the fact that self-esteem is one of the most important variables that helps in achieving the individual to an appropriate level of mental health and psychological and social compatibility. Self-esteem was emphasized dramatically by supporters of the humanistic school of psychology. Maslow believes that there is an urgent need for self-esteem of individual by others (Alalwan, 2015).

The concept of self as used by specialists is a set of sentiments and contemplative processes that are evidenced by visible or apparent behavior. According to this definition, the concept of self is an assessment of the individual to himself/herself as a whole in terms of appearance, origins, abilities, feelings and tendencies, and reaches its peak when it becomes a force directed at the behavior of the individual (Latife & Hayah, 2012).

Self-esteem can be defined as a positive feeling by the individual towards himself. It is an important part of the personality that was formed in the early years (Deb &

Bhattacharjee, 2009) and it consists of self-assessment of one's personal achievements and expectations of evaluating others for him or her (Kernis, 2005). This is consistent with Rhodes's view that self-esteem is a product of an individual's self-esteem of other important people. It is also a result of an individual's sense of ability and competence. The first function of self-esteem is social gratification while the second function is a sense of power and efficiency (Rhodes et al., 2004).

1.3.1. Definition of Self-esteem

The term "self-esteem" was used by scientists as a set of personal judgments that the individual sees as the result of his emotional, mental and physical characteristics. It is closer to the term self-evaluation through behavioral and emotional components (Carlson, Uppal & Prosser, 2000). Winer et al. (1981) stress that self-esteem is the way individuals perceive themselves in their relationships with others (Qmer, 2015).

According to Lawrenco (1981) self-esteem is evaluation of individual to himself, whether it was a positive or negative assessment. Positive evaluation refers to the high self-esteem of the individual whereas the negative assessment refers to the low self-esteem of the individual.

Shalabi (1993) believes that self-esteem is an individual's assessment of himself based on his experience of success and failure compared to his ambition and comparison with others. Shalabi (1993) believes that self-esteem is an individual's assessment of himself based on his experience of success and failure compared to his ambition and comparison with others. Gray and Hafdahl (2000) see that self-esteem is self-confidence, satisfaction and respect the individual to himself/herself, being proud of his/her opinion and accepting all his/her qualities. Maria and Harnish (2000) define self-esteem as the individual's feeling of

positiveness about himself/herself represented in the efficiency, power, admiration of self and deservedness of love.

1.3.2. Self-concept and Self-esteem

Coopersmith (1959) introduced a distinction between self-concept and self-esteem. According to him the self-concept includes a person's view for himself. While self-esteem includes the assessment that puts the individual for himself (Hafez, 1982). This means that the self-concept is the awareness of the qualities of the self, while self-esteem is an evaluation of these qualities. In other words, self-concept includes an objective or cognitive understanding of the self, however self-esteem is an emotional understanding of the self that reflects self-confidence (Blascovich & Tomaka, 1991; Smith & Betz, 2000).

In the same context, Dosari (2001) distinguished the descriptive term (self-concept) and the emotional term (self-esteem) and she concluded that self-concept refers to self-description through the use of a series of new sentences such as (I am a man, I am a student) to formulate a multifaceted personal image. Self-esteem involves the evaluative element of self-concept. Individuals formulate and pass judgment on their personal value as they see themselves. In other words, the concept of self allows the individual to describe himself in an exciting experience, whereas the self-esteem is the emotional value that the individual connects to his performance through that experience.

1.3.3. Factors Affecting the Self-esteem

There are many factors that have a role in influencing an individual's self-esteem. These factors vary in the degree of impact depending on individuals, age and daily circumstances of individual life. These factors can be summarized into two categories:

1.3.3.1.Personal Factors

These factors relate to the individual himself and they include:

1.3.3.1.1. Body image

The image of the body and external appearance plays an important role in the self-esteem of the individual. Body image is the body weight, height and skin color as well as physical disability. The effect of these factors varies depending on the sex of the individual (Dweider, 1999). In the same context, Tahan (1995) emphasizes that the deficient physical organs always affect a person's psychological health, because it may diminish the value of himself and increase his sense of insecurity.

1.3.3.1.2. Intelligence

An individual's intelligence, personal traits, age and educational level affect his self-esteem (Mahdi, 2000). A person who has a high level of intelligence and a good degree of awareness and understanding of things often sees himself better than a person who has a low level of intelligence. The society also plays a great role in that both positively and negatively (Zahran, 2005).

1.3.3.1.3. Anxiety

Some studies have found that the anxiety is one of the variables that has a significant impact on self-esteem. A normal person who does not have anxiety has a high degree of self-esteem. The results also found that increased anxiety led to a serious change in the self-esteem of the individual negatively (Kaoud, 1992).

1.3.3.2. Environmental Factors

These factors relate to society and the environment in which people live, such as, the conditions of socialization, type of education and family status. These factors can be summarized in following points:

1.3.3.2.1. Parents

Parental treatment of children plays an important role in building an individual's personality and letting him feel that he is an important person and vice versa. The parents' effect is clearly demonstrated by type of behavior, amount of affection and tenderness within the home, and how a child is brought up. This "in turn" is reflected in the self-esteem of the individual (Al-Anwar, 2005).

1.3.3.2.2. Social Factors

Society's view to the individual affect his self-esteem. If the individual is not accepted and respected by others in the social environment which he lives in, he feels frustrated, inferior and distrustful. This leads to the withdrawal of the individual from many social relations that did not satisfy his need to appreciate himself. Also, the social norms prevailing in society also affect the interaction of the individual with his or her society and thus the formation of a shaky or good image of the individual about himself (Zahran, 2005).

1.3.3.2.3. School

Buunk and Collins (1993) point out that school plays a big role in self-esteem. They emphasize that the school is the second most important factor -after the family- for the children in impact on the image composition of the children about themselves. Also, school plays a role in self-acceptance and self-rejection of individual to himself/herself (Buunk & Collins, 1993). In the same context, school style, school system and the relationship between teachers and students affect self-esteem of the individual (Diener & Diener, 2009).

In general, it can be stated that self-esteem is influenced by environmental conditions surrounding the individual. If the environmental conditions are positive, self-esteem

becomes positive. Nevertheless, if the environment is frustrating, the individual will feel inferior and therefore will underestimate himself (Morgan & Byron, 1990).

In addition to the above, the individual's relationships with people of psychological importance for him affect his self-esteem. Because individual interacts with these people constantly and the individual through this interaction supports the sense of belonging, competence and appreciation (Kafafi, 1989). It should be noted here that self-esteem gradually grows through real experiences with others in addition to the responding way resulting from the internal psychological factors of the individual in experiences (Malkah, 1989).

As summary of the above, there are many factors that influence self-esteem of the individual. Some of them related to the individual himself such as his/her preparations, abilities and opportunities which he or she can exploit in order to benefit from them. On the other hand, other factors are related to the external environment and people whom the individual deals with (Mohammed, 2010). Similarly, self-esteem growth is not only influenced by environmental factors but is also influenced by personal psychological factors such as intelligence, mental abilities, personality traits, age and educational levels experienced by the individual (Salama, 1987).

1.4. Aims of the study

The main objective of this research is to study the nature of the relationship between prejudice and self-esteem of Yemeni university students who live in Turkey. Moreover, it aims to discover the prejudice attitudes towards the different religious, social and gender groups. Also, this study attempts to examine the effect of some important demographic variables such as: gender, age, city of living in Turkey, city of living in Yemen, academic specialization, level of education (Undergraduate - Graduate), funding of study expenses

(scholarship or not) and grade point average (GPA) on the prejudice and self-esteem of Yemeni students living in Turkey. In addition, this study attempts to test the generality of prejudice and whether it express one major factor with sub-factors (religious, social and gender prejudice) or it is a number of factors that do not have any significant correlations between them?

1.5. Significance of the Study

The field of psychological problems of university students has attracted the interest of many researchers in psychology. Some studies dealt with the phenomenon of prejudice among young people and its relation to some personal, social and political variables, such as: Aktas, Tepe and Persson (2018), Allen and Sherman (2011), Awad (2009), Bochnke, Hegan and Hefler (1998), Darwish et al. (2015), Jordan (2005), Qmar (2015), Rayes (2018), Simoni (1996) and Verkuten et al. (1996). In spite of these studies, there are very few studies (Bady, 2012; Jomaai, 1995) dealing with the phenomenon of prejudice among the Yemeni university students, especially with the increasing incidence of violence and conflict in Yemen last years.

Prejudice represents the most recent real challenges facing Yemeni youth, regardless of the fact that they are inside or outside Yemen because young people and university students are particularly at the center of development in any society. Therefore, this study attempts to understand the phenomenon of prejudice towards the different religious, social and gender groups of Yemeni students living in Turkey and its relation to one of the important factors in the psychology of personality, which is self-esteem. In addition, the results that were be reached in this study will be used to design practical programs for reducing the spread of this phenomenon among Yemeni students in Turkey.

1.6. Questions of Study

1. Is there a significant correlation between prejudice and self-esteem?

2 .Do prejudice (scores) significantly differ by gender, age, city of living in Turkey, city of living in Yemen, departments of students, level of education, funding of study expenses (scholarship or not) and grade point average (GPA)?

3 .Do self-esteem (scores) significantly differ by gender, age, city of living in Turkey, city of living in Yemen, departments of students, level of education, funding of study expenses (scholarship or not) and grade point average (GPA)?

4. Does prejudice express one major factor with sub-factors (religious, social and gender prejudice) or it is a number of factors that do not have any significant correlations between them?

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

In this chapter, the methodological aspect of study is presented. It contains the study sample, scales that are used for data collection, procedures and data analysis.

2.1. Research Model

Since the present research seeks to measure the level of prejudice and self-esteem and the relationship between them among Yemeni university students in Turkey, the model of research is “survey”. It is best to achieve the objectives of the current study.

2.2. Participants

To answer research questions, 308 Yemeni university students participated in this study. They were randomly selected from nine different Turkish cities (see Table 1 for the distribution of students by cities). They have different educational levels.

Table 1

The Distribution of Students by Cities

City	*N* (Students)	*Percent* %
İstanbul	74	24.0
Ankara	69	22.4
Bursa	15	4.9
İzmir	14	4.5
Karabük	66	21.4
Muğla	14	4.5
Aksaray	21	6.8
Zonguldak	26	8.4
Sakarya	9	2.9
Total	308	100%

2.3. Instruments

In order to collect data for the current study, a demographic information form, scale of prejudice and Rosenberg self-esteem scale were used.

2.3.1. The Demographic Information Form

The demographic information form in the present study was developed by the researcher in order to collect socio-personal information about the participants (see Appendix A). It contains questions about gender, age, city of living in Yemen, city of living in Turkey, educational level, scholarships, and grade point average.

2.3.2. Scale of Prejudice

The prejudice scale was developed by Abdelsahib (2011) for Arab community in order to measure the prejudice attitudes of university students (see Appendix B). The scale contains three factors (religious, social and gender prejudice), and each factor contains 12 items. Half of items are positively worded, and the other half is negatively worded. It is a good way to observe participants response while answering the scale (Comrey, 1988). The alternatives to answer the scale consist of five alternatives as a Likert-type. It starts from strongly agree that means 5 degrees, and even strongly disagrees that means one degree, the evaluation way is reflected in the negative items. The scale developer calculated the reliability of the scale that was (0.83) by using test-retest method, and the value of Cronbach's alpha was (0.87).

2.3.3. Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale

Rosenberg self-esteem scale was developed by Rosenberg (1965) to measure global self-worth (See Appendix C). It is a uni-dimensional scale designed to measure positive and negative feelings about the self (Gray-Little, Williams & Hancock, 1997). It has been used in many studies and it has also been translated into more than one language (Baumeister et al, 2003; Emil, 2003; Nemcek, Kracek & Perackova, 2017). The scale consists of 10 items,

five of them are positive and the other five are negative. The response categories of scale consist of four alternatives (strongly agree means three degrees, agree means two degrees, disagree means one degree and strongly disagree means zero degrees). Since the mother language of the participants is Arabic, the Arabic version that was translated by Zayed (2004) was used. Murad (2007) and Zayed (2004) tested the reliability of scale in their study. It was 0.87 and 0.84 using the test-retest method. Also, Jaradat (2006) tested the value of Cronbach's alpha that was 0.78 in his study.

2.4. Procedure

In the beginning, ethical approval was gotten from Ankara Yıldırım Beyazıt University Ethical Committee (See Appendix D). After that, contact was made with the Yemeni Student Union in Turkey to know where the students are spread in Turkish cities. The idea of study was explained to participants by the researcher.

2.5. Data Analysis

In order to calculate the level of prejudice and self-esteem, descriptive statistics were used (such as repetitions, percentages, etc.). Pearson correlation coefficient was used to calculate the relationship among variables of study. In addition, t-test and One-Way ANOVA test were used to calculate the differences by demographic variables. Also, the exploratory factor analysis was used to examine whether prejudice is one main factor with sub-factors or it is a number of unrelated factors. Moreover, 0.05 significance level was adopted as the significance level in the interpretation of statistical results.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

First of all, results of current study were reached by analyzing the data using the 24th edition of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows. Before conducting the statistical analyses, the normality of data was tested. It was found that the Skewness and Kurtosis values were (0.323) and (–0.119) respectively according to the variable of prejudice. Also, the Skewness and Kurtosis values were (–0.740) and (0.636) respectively according to the variable of self-esteem. They are values that reflect the normal distribution of data. Because they should be between(- 1.5) and (+1,5) (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013).

The results were reported according to the sequence of research questions that were created in the first chapter. Before that, the descriptive statistics regarding participants were presented according to the demographic information form.

3.1. Characteristics of Participants

Based on the demographic information form gender, age, city of living in Yemen, city of living in Turkey, department, educational level, funding of study expenses (scholarships or not), and grade point average (GPA) were determined. Regarding the age of participants, the range of age was between 18 and 41 and the mean was (23,68) (*SD*= 4,22). 241 participants were male (78,2%) and 67 participants were female (21,8%) (see Table 2).

Table 2

The Distribution of Students by Gender

Gender	*N*	%
Male	241	78,2
Female	67	21,8
Total	308	100%

Regarding the city of living in Yemen of participants, 118 participants were from the province of Jened (38,3%), 60 participants were from the province of Azal (19,5%), 43 participants were from the province of Hadhramout (14%), 39 participants were from the province of Tehama (12,7%), 33 participants were from the province of Aden (10,7%) and 15 participants were from the province of Saba (4,9%) (See Table 3).

Table 3

The Distribution of Students by City of Living in Yemen

Province	N	%
Azal	60	19,5
Tehama	39	12,7
Jened	118	38,3
Saba	15	4,9
Aden	33	10,7
Hadhramout	43	14,0
Total	308	100%

Also, participants were from different departments. 48 students were from the departments of medical and natural sciences, 153 students were from the departments of engineering and applied sciences and 107 students were from the departments of human sciences. Table 4 shows the departments of participants.

Table 4

The Distribution of Students by Departments

Department	*N*	%
Medical and natural sciences	48	15,6
Engineering and applied sciences	153	49,7
Human sciences	107	34,7
Total	308	100%

Table 5 shows the educational level of participants. Participants from the bachelor's candidates were 238 students (77,6%), 51 students from the master's candidates (16,6%) and 18 students from PhD level (5,8%).

Table 5

The Distribution of Students by Education Level

Education level	*N*	%
Bachelor	239	77,6
Master's	51	16,6
Doctorate	18	5,8
Total	308	100%

Regarding the grade point average (GPA) of participants, the range of (GPA) was between 26 and 100 and the mean was (80,96) (SD= 13,28). Also, there were 107 students from the participants who have a scholarship (34,7%) and 201 students don't have any kind of scholarship (65,3%) (see Table 6).

Table 6

The Distribution of Students by Scholarship

Scholarship	N	%
No	201	65,3
Yes	107	34,7
Total	308	100%

3.2. Correlation between Prejudice and Self-esteem

In order to answer the first question of the study that was "Is there a significant correlation between prejudice and self-esteem?" the correlation between prejudice and self-esteem was investigated using Pearson correlation coefficient. The result shows that there was negative significant correlation between the prejudice and self-esteem, r = -0.242, N =

308, $p < .01$, with high levels of prejudice associated with lower levels of self-esteem (see Table 7).

Table 7

Pearson Correlation between the Prejudice and Self-esteem

	Prejudice	Self-esteem
Prejudice	1	
Self-esteem	-,242**	1

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

3.3. Differences on Prejudice

3.3.1 Differences on Prejudice by Gender

To test whether there were statistical significant differences on prejudice by gender; an independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare prejudice in male Yemeni university students and female Yemeni university students conditions. There was a significant difference between the scores for male (M=2.38, SD= 0.48) and female (M=2.24, SD=0.45) conditions; $t(306) = 2.18$, $p = 0.03$, r = 0.84. This result suggests that male Yemeni university student are more prejudiced than female.

3.3.2 Differences on Prejudice by Age

To test the effect of age on prejudice of Yemeni university students in Turkey, participants' ages were divided into four categories, after that One-Way ANOVA was conducted. Result shows that there is significant difference in the scores of prejudice by age $F(3,304) = 3.58$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .034$ (see Table 8).

Table 8

ANOVA Result of Age on Prejudice

	Sum of Squares	*df*	*Mean Square*	*F*	*p*
Between Groups	2,369	3	,790	3,582	,014
Within Groups	67,030	304	,220		
Total	69,399	307			

Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the age (18–23) condition (*M* = 2.45, *SD* = 0.47) was significantly higher than age (36–41) condition (*M* = 2.23, *SD* = 0.41). However, the age (24–29) condition (*M* = 2.32, *SD* = 0.51) and the age (30-35) condition (*M* = 2.30, *SD* = 0.49) did not significantly differ from the age (18–23) and (24–29) conditions (see Table 9).

Table 9

Multiple Comparisons of Age

(I) Age	(J) Age	*Mean Difference (I-J)*	*Std. Error*	*P*
Age 18-23	Age 24-29	,13157	,07218	,265
	Age 30-35	,15064	,07405	,178
	Age 36-41	,22420 *	,07327	,013
Age 24-29	Age 18-23	-,13157	,07218	,265
	Age 30-35	,01907	,08340	,996
	Age 36-41	,09263	,08271	,678
Age 30-35	Age 18-23	-,15064	,07405	,178
	Age 24-29	-,01907	,08340	,996
	Age 36-41	,07356	,08435	,819
Age 36-41	Age 18-23	-,22420 *	,07327	,013
	Age 24-29	-,09263	,08271	,678
	Age 30-35	-,07356	,08435	,819

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

3.3.3 Differences on Prejudice by City of Living in Turkey

To examine the effect of the city of living in Turkey on prejudice, Turkish cities were divided into two categories. (1) Big cities, which have a population of 3 million or more. They include İstanbul, Ankara, İzmir and Bursa. (2) Small cities, which have a population of no more than one million, they include Sakarya, Karabük, Muğla, Zonguldak and Aksaray. After that an independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare prejudice in big cities and small cities conditions. There was no significant difference between the scores for big cities (M = 2.30, SD = 0.47) and small cities (M = 2.40, SD = 0.47) conditions; $t(306)$= -1.945, p = 0.053.

3.3.4 Differences on Prejudice by City of Living in Yemen

To examine the effect of the city of living in Yemen on prejudice, Yemeni cities were divided into six categories according to regions in Yemen. After that, One-Way ANOVA was conducted; $F(5,302) = 0.980$, $p > .05$. Result shows that there is no significant difference in the scores of prejudice by the city of living in Yemen (see Table 10).

Table 10

ANOVA Result of City of Living in Yemen on Prejudice

	Sum of Squares	*df*	*Mean Square*	*F*	*p*
Between Groups	1,108	5	,222	,980	,430
Within Groups	68,291	302	,226		
Total	69,399	307			

3.3.5 Differences on Prejudice by Funding of Study Expenses

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare prejudice among Yemeni university students by funding of study expenses (scholarship or not) conditions. There was a significant difference in the scores between students who have a scholarship (M=2.25, SD=

0.49) and students who don't have a scholarship (*M*=2.40, *SD*=0.46) conditions; *t*(306) = 2.75, *p* = 0.006, *r* = 0.89. This result suggests that Yemeni university students who do not have a scholarship are more prejudiced than students who have a scholarship.

3.3.6 Differences on Prejudice by Department of Students

To examine the effect of department of students on prejudice, One-Way ANOVA was conducted; $F(2,305) = 1.096$, $p > .05$. Result shows that there is no significant difference in the scores of prejudice according to the department of students (see Table 11).

Table 11

ANOVA Result of Department of Students on Prejudice

	Sum of Squares	*df*	*Mean Square*	*F*	*p*
Between Groups	,495	2	,248	1,096	,336
Within Groups	68,904	305	,226		
Total	69,399	307			

3.3.7 Differences on Prejudice by Education Level of Students

One-Way ANOVA was conducted to test the effect of education level of students on prejudice $F(2,305) = 2.816$, $p > .05$ .Result shows that there is no significant difference between the scores of prejudice by the education level of Yemeni university students in Turkey (see Table 12).

Table 12

ANOVA Result of Department of Students on Prejudice

	Sum of Squares	*df*	*Mean Square*	*F*	*p*
Between Groups	1,258	2	,629	2,816	,061
Within Groups	68,141	305	,223		
Total	69,399	307			

3.3.8 Correlation between Prejudice and Grade Point Average (GPA)

To test the correlation between grade point average (GPA) and prejudice, Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated, r = -0.009, N = 308, p > .05. The result shows that there was no significant correlation between the grade point average (GPA) and prejudice.

3.4. Differences on Self-esteem

3.4.1. Differences on Self-esteem by Gender

In order to test whether there was a statistically significant difference on self-esteem by gender an independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare self-esteem in male Yemeni university students and female Yemeni university students conditions. There was a significant difference between the scores for female (M=2.35, SD= 0.44) and male (M=2.13, SD=0.48) conditions; t(306) = -3.48, p = 0.001, r = 0.93. This result suggests that female Yemeni university students have a higher self-esteem than male university students.

3.4.2. Differences on Self-esteem by Age

To examine the effect of age on self-esteem of Yemeni university students in Turkey, One-Way ANOVA was conducted. Result shows that there is no significant difference in the scores of self-esteem according to age F(3,304) = 2.41 , p > .05 (see Table 13).

Table 13

ANOVA Result of Age on Self-esteem

	Sum of Squares	*df*	*Mean Square*	*F*	*p*
Between Groups	1,655	3	,552	2,410	,067
Within Groups	69,573	304	,229		
Total	71,227	307			

3.4.3. Differences on Self-esteem by City of Living in Turkey

To test the effect of the city of living in Turkey on self-esteem, Turkish cities were divided into two categories. (1) Big cities, which have a population of 3 million or more.

They include İstanbul, Ankara, İzmir and Bursa. (2) Small cities, which have a population of no more than one million, they include Sakarya, Karabük, Muğla, Zonguldak and Aksaray. After that an independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare self-esteem of Yemeni university students in big cities and small cities conditions. There was no significant difference in the scores the city of living in Turkey for big cities (*M*=2.20, *SD*= 0.47) and small cities (*M*=2.15, *SD*=0.50) conditions; *t*(306) = 0.902, *p*=0.368.

3.4.4. Differences on Self-esteem by City of Living in Yemen

To examine the effect of the city of living in Yemen on self-esteem, Yemeni cities were divided into six categories according to regions in Yemen. After that, One-Way ANOVA was conducted; $F(5,302) = 1.399$, $p > .05$. Result shows that there is no significant difference in the scores of self-esteem according to the city of living in Yemen (see Table 14).

Table 14

ANOVA Result of City of Living in Yemen on Self-esteem

	Sum of Squares	*df*	*Mean Square*	*F*	*p*
Between Groups	1,613	5	,323	1,399	,224
Within Groups	69,615	302	,231		
Total	71,227	307			

3.4.5. Differences on Self-esteem by Funding of Study Expenses

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare self-esteem of Yemeni university students by funding of study expenses (scholarship or not) conditions. There was no significant difference in the scores of funding of study expenses for students who have a scholarship (*M*=2.19, *SD*= 0.47) and students who don't have a scholarship (*M*=2.17, *SD*=0.49) conditions; *t*(306) = -0.437, *p* = 0.637.

3.4.6. Differences on Self-esteem by Department of Students

To examine the effect of department of students on their self-esteem One-Way ANOVA was conducted; $F(2,305) = 3,329$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .022$. Result shows that there is a significant difference in the scores of self-esteem according to the department of students (see Table 15).

Table 15

ANOVA Result of Department of Students on Self-esteem

	Sum of Squares	*df*	*Mean Square*	*F*	*P*
Between Groups	1,522	2	,761	3,329	,037
Within Groups	69,706	305	,229		
Total	71,227	307			

Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for the medical and natural sciences condition ($M = 2.33$, $SD = 0.41$) was significantly different than human sciences condition ($M = 2.12$, $SD = 0.48$). However, engineering and applied sciences condition ($M = 2.17$, $SD = 0.50$) did not significantly differ from the medical and natural sciences and human sciences conditions (see Table 16). This result suggests that Yemeni university students who study at the departments of medical and natural sciences have a higher self-esteem than students who study at the departments of human sciences.

Table 16

Multiple Comparisons of Department

(I) Department	(J) Department	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	*P*
Medical and natural sciences	Engineering and Applied Sciences	,1646	,0791	,095
	Human sciences	,2126*	,0830	,029
Engineering and Applied Sciences	Medical and natural sciences	-,1646	,0791	,095
	Human sciences	,0480	,0602	,706
Human sciences	Medical and natural sciences	-,2126*	,0830	,029
	Engineering and Applied Sciences	-,0480	,0602	,706

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

3.4.7. Differences on Self-esteem by Education Level

One-Way ANOVA was conducted to test the effect of education level of students on their self-esteem $F(2,305) = 2.731$, $p > .05$ .Result shows that there is no significant difference in the scores of self-esteem according to the education level of Yemeni university students in Turkey (see Table 17).

Table 17

ANOVA Result of Department of Students on Self-esteem

	Sum of Squares	*df*	*Mean Square*	*F*	*p*
Between Groups	1,253	2	,627	2,731	,067
Within Groups	69,974	305	,229		
Total	71,227	307			

3.4.8. Correlation between Self-esteem and Grade Point Average (GPA)

To test the correlation between grade point average (GPA) and self-esteem, Pearson correlation coefficient was calculated, $r = 0.026$, $N = 308$, $p > .05$. The result shows that

there is no significant correlation between the grade point average (GPA) of students and their self-esteem.

3.5. Factors of Prejudice

In order to examine whether prejudice contains one factor under which some sub-factors fall into or that it is a number of unrelated factors, correlation coefficients between the three factors of prejudice in this study (religious, social and gender prejudice) were calculated. The results indicate a statistically significant correlation between the three factors and the scale as a whole (see Table 18). That means factors are strongly correlated with each other.

Table 18

Correlations between Factors of Prejudice

	Religious prejudice	Social prejudice	Gender prejudice	Prejudice as a whole
Religious prejudice	1			
Social prejudice	,345**	1		
Gender prejudice	,346**	,306**	1	
Prejudice as a whole	,753**	,770**	,709**	1

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

Then, the exploratory factor analysis for the factors of prejudice was conducted. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was measured to measure sampling adequacy which was 0,637 and it was more than 0.60, which means the adequacy of the sample for conducting the factor analysis (Pallant, 2013). Also, Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant (χ^2 (3) = 90,985, $p < .05$), indicating that it was appropriate to use factor analysis. The result showed one factor that explains 55.46% of the total variance (see Table 19).

Table 19

Exploratory Factor Analysis of Prejudice Factors

Factors of prejudice	Factors extracted	Latent root	The percent of variance
Religious prejudice	,623		
Social prejudice	,550	1,664	55.46%
Gender prejudice	,557		

From the results of Table 18 and Table 19, it shows that prejudice expresses one main factor and some other sub-factors fall into it. Prejudice cannot be considered a number of factors without any correlation between them. In other words, a person who is religiously prejudiced is socially and gender-based prejudiced person, and vice versa.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

In this chapter, results of the study that were reviewed in the third chapter are addressed, and these results are discussed according to previous relevant studies with a focus on similarities and differences between the results of the current study and the results of previous relevant studies. Results will be discussed according to the sequence of research questions.

4.1.Correlation between Prejudice and Self-esteem

The results of the current research have found a statistically significant negative correlation between prejudice and self-esteem among participants in this study. This finding is consistent with the results of Allen and Sherman (2011), Awad (2009), Mohammad (2010) and Qmar (2015), Simoni (1996) and Verkuten et al. (1996). All of them indicated a negative correlation between prejudice and self-esteem. However, result of the current study was not consistent with the results of studies of Bochnke, Hegan and Hefler (1998), Jordan (2005) and Streitmatter and Pate (1989).

Based on the theoretical framework of the nature of relationship between prejudice and self-esteem, it can be stated that the relationship between the two variables is a reciprocal relationship. This means when the prejudice of student increases, his or her self-esteem decreases. In other words, when the student estimates himself and respect it, his or her prejudice toward other subjects becomes little. The reason for this is that prejudice may be one of the ways that an individual uses in order to feel high position in his group.

This leads to a hope point in alleviating the effects of prejudice. The degree of prejudice of some individuals can be reduced by increasing their self-esteem in other ways

than prejudice. This, in turn, helps to increase individuals' awareness of themselves and benefit from this in the treatment of misinformation about the issues of prejudice.

4.2.Differences in Prejudice

4.2.1. Differences on Prejudice by Gender

The results of the current research yielded statistically significant differences in prejudice by the gender variable. Male participants were found to be more prejudiced than females. This result is consistent with the results of Akrami et al. (2006), Aktas, Tepe and Persson (2018), Boyd (2010), Butryn (2000), Darwish et al. (2015), Fredawi (2013) and Meyahi (2014). However, the result of the current study is not consistent with the result of Aamri (2018), Abdulraouf (2007), Hemed (2009), Mubark (2013), Tayar and Shamri (2009) and Zayed (2014), which indicated that there are no differences between males and females in prejudice. Also, current results are in contrary to the results of Rajeeb (2001), Shakah (2004) and Wahidiy (2017) which concluded that females are more prejudiced than males.

The reason for the different results of prejudice between males and females is due to the different countries and societies that previous studies were conducted, in addition to the different measures, tools and approaches that used to measure prejudice. When looking at the studies conducted on Yemeni community, it is clear that the result of the current study is not different from the results of Bady (2012) and Jomaai (1995), which were conducted on the Yemeni university students. All of them found that Yemeni males are more prejudiced than females. The reason for that is the masculinity in Yemeni society (Farran, 2016). Most social roles are assigned to males but not females. This makes males more vulnerable to social and daily stress than females. This means that women in Yemeni society often become subordinate to men. Although the participants in the current research were university students studying outside Yemen, but the result did not differ from the results of students studying inside Yemen.

4.2.2. Differences on Prejudice by Age

Regarding the age variable, the results of current study have shown that older students are less prejudiced than younger students. This result is consistent with the results of study of Dawos (2011), Shakah (2004) and Simoni (1996). However, the current result contradicts the results of studies of Abdulbaqi (2014) and Awad (2009), which indicated that the older persons are more prejudiced than younger persons. Also, the result of the current study is not consistent with the results of the study of Jomaai (1995) and Wahidi (2015), which did not result in any differences attributable to the age variable.

The current result can be explained by the fact that the individual who grows in Yemen in a cultural environment has a number of manifestations of prejudice. Such as prejudice to the tribe, religious groups and contempt for women ... etc. However, when the individual gets older, his knowledge and education increase. So, his view of many issues changes. The participants in the current study are Yemeni university students in Turkey, and younger students who have come recently from Yemen. So, they need more time to change their ideas and conviction. Therefore, the present result can be considered a reasonable result.

4.2.3. Differences on Prejudice City of Living

The results of the current study concluded that there are no statistical differences due to the variable of the city of living, whether in Turkey or in Yemen. This result is consistent with the results of the study of Abdulbaqi (2014), Bedy (2012) and Shallah (2010), which concluded that there are no statistically significant differences attributable to the city of living. On the other hand, the current result contradicts the results of Awad (2009), Darwish et al. (2015) and Hemed (2009), which indicated that rural students (who live small cities) were more prejudiced than students who live in big cities. The reason for the present result is that prejudice is more related to the thoughts of person than to his or her lifestyle. Thus,

the increase or decrease of prejudice attitudes is more related to the information and feelings of the individual about other groups and subjects than to the place which the individual lives in.

4.2.4. Differences on Prejudice by Funding of Study Expenses

The results of the current study concluded that the scholarships affect the prejudice attitudes of students. The results show that students who have scholarships are less prejudiced than students who do not have any scholarships. This result can be similar to the results of Rayes (2018) study, which concluded that low-income students are more prejudiced than middle and high-income students. Returning to the current result, scholarships are the source of income for most scholarship students. Consequently, students who do not have scholarships bear the expenses of living and university, which means more pressure on them, and it reflects as prejudice attitudes against other groups.

4.2.5. Differences on Prejudice by Department of Students

The results of the current study resulted in the absence of any differences in prejudice due to the academic specialization. This result is similar to the results of the study of Abdulsaheb (2011), Freedawi (2013), Jomaai (1995) and Shallah (2010). However, this result is not similar to the results of the studies of Awad (2009), Meyahi (2014) and Wahidiy (2017), which indicated that students who study in human sciences were more prejudiced than students who study in applied and medical departments. It can be said that prejudice represents information with feelings towards a group, and therefore the department of students does not affect an individual's thoughts toward other groups. This explains the absence of any differences in the degree of prejudice among students according to their departments in the current study.

4.2.6. Differences on Prejudice by the Educational Level

The results of the current research did not result in any statistically significant differences attributable to the educational level. This means that undergraduate, master, and doctoral students have the same level of prejudice about external groups, whether the level of prejudice is low or high. This result is consistent with the study of Deloye (2008) and Shallah (2010). Because the participants in the current study are Yemeni students studying at Turkish universities. Thus, they are expatriates in Turkey. They live in similar conditions in terms of the educational environment. It is a new environment for them. Therefore, the prejudicial ideas they have are similar whether they are college students or graduate students.

4.2.7. Differences on Prejudice by Grade Point Average (GPA)

The results of the current research concluded that there was no correlation between prejudice and the grade point average (GPA) of participants. This result is consistent with the result of Wahidiy's (2015) study. However, it is not similar to the result of the study of Dawos (2011), which indicated that the increase in academic achievement leads to a decrease in the degree of prejudice. The current result can be explained by that academic achievement is linked to academic success, and prejudice is thoughts and feelings towards a group or subject that are not related to the individual's ability to academic success. This explains the lack of correlation between grade point average (GPA) of participants and prejudice in the current study.

4.3.Differences on Self-esteem

4.3.1. Differences on Self-esteem by Gender

Returning to the results of the current study on self-esteem, it was found that Yemeni female students had higher self-esteem than Yemeni male students. This result is consistent with the results of Ansary (2015), Mohammed (2010) and Zoabi (1996), which concluded that females had higher self-esteem than males. However, results of the current study

contradict the results of Aiman and Shaikh (2015), Arabiat and Zegoul (2008), Boubou and Zmourod (2016), Burnett (1994), Ferahat and Hamodah (2017), Jibril (1993), Loqman (2016), Madadha (2015), Masri (2014), Moajil (2010), Zayed (2004), Qmer (2015), which indicated that there are no differences in self-esteem between the males and females. The current result also contradicts the result of study of Fourchard (2013), which indicated that males were more respectable to themselves than females.

The reason for the difference between the results of the current study and the results of previous studies is the difference in the participants, countries and cultures which previous studies were conducted. In addition, scales and methodologies that were used in previous studies have a role in the difference of results. For the current study, the reason why female students were higher self-esteem than males is the personality of Yemeni female students studying in Turkey. Generally Yemeni culture doesn't have a positive look on a girl's travelling to another city alone in order to study as well as traveling outside the country. This means that the female participants in the current study exceeded this negative view, and were able to travel outside Yemen to continue their education. It means females take pride in their abilities and themselves, their existence in Turkey is proof of their ability to stick to their ambitions and challenge all societal and cultural obstacles. All of these a high level of self-esteem of female students. Thus, the result that was reached in this study is a logical result compared to the culture of Yemeni society.

4.3.2. Differences on Self-esteem by Age

Regarding the effect of the age factor on self-esteem, the current study concluded that the age of the participants had no effect on their level of self-esteem. This result is consistent with the result of Shakhtour (2004) study. On the contrary, the current result contradicts the results of Fourchard (2013), Masri (2014) and Zoabi (1996), which all concluded that there was an effect of age on self-esteem.

It can be said that the reason for the absence of statistically significant differences in self-esteem attributed to the age of the participants in the current study is due to the similarities in the conditions that Yemeni students live in Turkey. They do not live in their home country, they live in their second home (in Turkey). They are similar in their lifestyle in the country of study regardless of their age. This means that the view they hold about themselves in the country of study is similar.

4.3.3. Differences on Self-esteem by City of Living

The results of the current research concluded that there are no statistically significant differences for the city of living, regardless of in Turkey or Yemen on the self-esteem of participants. This result is consistent with the result of Boylu (2020). However, it contradicts the result of study of Abuhein (2001), which concluded that there were differences in self-esteem due to the place of living. The current result can be explained by the fact that self-esteem is related to the personality of the student than to the place in which he or she lives or lived. Thus, it represents some of information and feelings that the individual holds about him or herself. This view is not so much related to where he or she lives, but is related to the personal experiences of the individual.

4.3.4. Differences on Self-esteem by Funding of Study Expenses

Result of this study found that the student's holding a scholarship had no effect on his or her self-esteem. The results indicated that students who have scholarships and who do not have scholarships have a similar level of self-esteem. Because the scholarship covers the study and living expenses of student more than change the view of student about him or herself, although there are some non-academic training programs that seek to develop students in various aspects which are organized by management of scholarship.

4.3.5. Differences on Self-esteem by the Department of Students

The result of the current research found that there are differences between participants on self-esteem attributable to the departments of participants. The result indicated that students who study in medical and natural departments have higher self-esteem than students in other departments. This result is consistent with the study of Madadha (2015). In contrast, this result is not similar to the result of the study of Arabiat and Zegoul (2008), Boylu (2020), Ferahat and Hamodah (2017), Moajil (2010) and Salim (2015), all of which all indicated that there are no differences in self-esteem attributable to departments of students.

This result can be interpreted as acceptable if compared to the Yemeni society's view of medical and natural science students. For example, parents in Yemen are proud of their children who study in medical colleges more than their children who study in colleges of humanities, even if the student’s grade point average (GPA) in medical school is less than the (GPA) of a student in other colleges. This misconception was reflected in the way students perceived themselves in some way. This made these differences appear among students of medical colleges and other colleges. Despite this view, in recent years, this view began to change in Yemeni society, especially when a number of excellent students in high school chose some of the humanities. In addition to a number of associations organizing a number of awareness programs on the importance of human sciences and their integration with other sciences in the future of Yemen.

4.3.6. Differences on Self-esteem by the Educational Level

Returning to the results of the current research, it was found that there were no statistically significant differences in self-esteem due to the educational level of the participants (undergraduate - graduate students). This result is consistent with the study of Boubou and Zmourod (2016), Boylu (2020), Ferahat and Hamodah (2017), Gözel (2019)

and Masri (2014), all of which indicated that there were no differences in self-esteem due to the educational level of students. However, this result differs from the result of the study of Arabiat and Zegoul (2008), Madadha (2015) and Zayed (2004), which concluded that there are differences in self-esteem attributable to the educational level of students. This result can be explained by the fact that the participants in the current study are developed in the perception of themselves, whether they are undergraduate students or graduate students, and participants in the current study have been subjected to the experience of alienation from Yemen for the sake of education. Consequently, their view of themselves is similar due to the effect of the alienation factor, regardless of the educational level.

4.3.7. Differences on Self-esteem by Grade Point Average (GPA)

The results of the current research resulted in no correlation between self-esteem and grade point average (GPA) of participants. This result is consistent with the results of the study of Qmar (2015), which confirmed that there is no correlation between self-esteem and the grade point average (GPA). In contrast, the result of the current study differed with the results of the study of Arabiat and Zegoul (2008), Emil (2003), Ghamdi (2016), Jibril (1993) and Zayed (2004). The current result can be interpreted as acceptable according to the participants in the present study. Because the participants in the current study are considered as high performers students. They study outside their home country. Therefore, the academic capabilities of them in general are high. Because only students with high academic ability often are taught outside of their home country. But this rule is not absolutely correct. Thus, the difference in (GPA) of students participating in the current study does not reflect the difference between students with high and low average as much as it reflects the difference within some of high students in general. This resulted in the absence of correlation between self-esteem and grade point average (GPA) of participants.

4.4.Factors of Prejudice

It is clear from the results of the current study that the degree of religious, social and gender prejudice were very closed. There were no statistical differences in the mean scores of participants between religious, social and gender prejudice. This result is consistent with the results of Akrami, Ekehammar and Bergh (2011), Boehnke, Hagan and Hefler (1998), Jazzar (2010) and Shafei (1997). This means that prejudice represents one phenomenon and it has sub-factors under it, but all these factors constitute one concept. Religious or social prejudice cannot be considered a variable in itself from other forms of prejudice. This leads us to say that prejudice is like a way of thinking about different subjects more than having negative feelings or misconceptions about a specific group. In another word, a person who has prejudice attitudes against one group in a particular field often has prejudice attitudes against or with another group in another field.

4.5.Conclusions

In this thesis, the relationship between prejudice and self-esteem was examined. The differences on prejudice and self-esteem were also examined by gender, age, city of living, educational level, scholarships, academic specialization and academic achievement. Current results have found that prejudice was negatively correlated with self-esteem. Prejudice is a major factor and has sub-factors, all of which are closely related.

Moreover, it was found that there were differences on prejudice attributed to gender, age and scholarship, while the other variables did not show any differences on prejudice. There are also differences on self-esteem due to gender and department of students, and the rest of the variables did not show any differences on self-esteem.

4.6.Limitations

There are some limitations in this thesis. According to report issued by the Council of Higher Education in Turkey (CoHE) in 2019, there are 3078 Yemeni university students

studying in various Turkish universities and cities. Participants in the current study represent only 10% of the total number of Yemeni university students studying in Turkey. This makes it difficult to generalize the results of the current study. Moreover, the participants in the current study were chosen from only nine cities because the researcher could easily reach the participants in those cities. It may be useful in future studies to reach more participants than the current study.

The present study focused only on correlation relationships between variables. The deductive directions in the relationships between variables may not really be conducted. Therefore, an experimental approach could be utilized to variables can be better manipulated.

The scale used in this study focused on prejudice towards different religious, social and gender groups, but not towards a specific group. This makes it more general. In addition, the scale used in the current study measures three factors of prejudice (religious, social, and gender prejudice). There are other factors that have not been addressed in the current study, such as political and sports prejudice.

Finally, the current study did not focus on the influence of some important variables such as family, childhood experiences, and personality type. They are important factors and have an effect on prejudice and self-esteem.

4.7.Suggestions

Future studies should study the prejudice towards specific groups present in the Yemeni arena, whether it is religious, social or political groups, such as the Houthis, Hashemites and movement of Aqyal. In addition to conducting more studies on prejudice, using an experimental or qualitative approach could be used to understand the phenomenon of prejudice more deeply and determine the causal relationship between it and other variables.

It is suggested to conduct a study about prejudice and its relationship to other variables such as political, tribal, or religious affiliation, as well as its relationship to personality types and childhood experiences. The number of participants in future studies also should be increased to include Yemen.

REFERENCES

Aamri, A. M. (2018). Intellectual prejudice and its relationship to electronic violence among university students. *Journal of Arts, Literature, Humanities and Social Sciences, 28*(12), 320-339.

Abdella, M. S. (1989). *Attitudes of prejudice.* Kuwait: Almarifah Press.

Abdella, M. S. (2000) *Researches in Social and Personal Psychology*. (3th ed). Cairo: Darghraib for Printing and Publishing.

Abdelrahman, S. (1970). The process of social normalization and crises of prejudice and intolerance in our contemporary societies. *Journal of the World of Thought, 1*(1), 38 – 132.

Abdulbaqi, S. E. (2014). *Tribal prejudice of students in Shendi University and its relationship to psychological and social adjustment.* (Unpublished master's thesis). Omdurman Islamic University, Khartoum.

Abdulraouf, S. M. (2007). *Prejudice attitudes and their relationship to some cognitive methods.* (Unpublished master's thesis). Mansoura University, Egypt.

Abdulsaheb, S. J. (2011). *Intolerant attitudes and their relationship to some variables among the students of the university.* (Doctoral dissertation). St Clements University, Baghdad.

Aberson, C. L., Healy, M., & Romero, V. (2000). In-group bias and self-esteem: A meta-analysis. *Personality and social psychology review*, *4*(2), 157-173.

Abu Ghali, A. (1999). *Relationship between the trends of intolerance and methods of parental treatment as perceived by the children of university students* (Master's thesis). Al-Azhar University, Palestine.

Abu Hashim, E. K. (2014). *Childhood experiences and its relationship with tolerance against prejudice among high school students in Gaza strip governorates.* (Unpublished master's thesis). Al-Azhar University, Gaza.

Abuhein, F. (2001). Self-esteem and its relationship to psychological and social harmony among Palestinian youth participating in the Al-Aqsa Intifada. *Journal of Al-Aqsa University, (5),* 117-154.

Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). The authoritarian personality.

Aiman, A., & Shaikh, F. (2015). Self-esteem among University of Khartoum students and its relationship to personality traits. *Journal of the College of Arts,* (34), 181-196.

Akrami, N., Ekehammar, B., & Bergh, R. (2011). Generalized prejudice: Common and specific components. *Psychological Science*, *22*(1), 57-59.

Akrami, N., Ekehammar, B., Claesson, M., & Sonnander, K. (2006). Classical and modern prejudice: Attitudes toward people with intellectual disabilities. *Research in developmental disabilities*, *27*(6), 605-617.

Aktas, V., Tepe, Y. K., & Persson, R. S. (2018). Investigating Turkish university students' attitudes towards refugees in a time of Civil War in neighboring Syria. *Current Psychology*, 1-10.

Al-Anwar, M. I. (2005). *Effectiveness of a program to increase self-esteem among the hearing-impaired adolescents.* (Doctoral dissertation). Ain Shams University, Egypt.

Allen, T. J., & Sherman, J. W. (2011). Ego threat and intergroup bias: A test of motivated-activation versus self-regulatory accounts. *Psychological Science*, *22*(3), 331-333.

Allport, G. (1958). The nature of prejudice. Garden. *City, NY, Anchor*, 28-63.

Alwan, B. A. (2015). Self-esteem and its relationship to aggressive behavior among Jordanian university students, a comparison study between practitioners and non-practitioners of sports activity. *Journal of Sports Science, 7*(22), 1-19

Amer, A. (2015). *Psychological stress and its relation to self - esteem in diabetics* (Master's thesis). Kasdi Merbah Ouargla University, Algeria.

Ansary, A. R. (2015). Depression and its relationship to optimism, pessimism and self-esteem among university students. *Maysan Research Journal*, *11*(22), 106-130.

Arabiat, A., & Zegoul, E. (2008). Differences in the level of self-esteem of Mutah University students according to gender, specialization and academic level. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences, 9*(1), 37-53.

Ashmore, R. D., & Del Boca, F. K. (1981). Conceptual approaches to stereotypes and stereotyping. *Cognitive processes in stereotyping and intergroup behavior*, *1*, 35.

Ashmore, R. (1970). *The problem of intergroup prejudice*. In BE Collins (Ed.), Social psychology (pp. 245–296).

Awad, A. (2009). *Prejudice and its relationship to the concept of self and quality of life among students of public universities in Khartoum*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Omdurman Islamic University, Khartoum.

Baumeister, R. F., Campbell, J. D., Krueger, J. I., & Vohs, K. D. (2003). Does high self-esteem cause better performance, interpersonal success, happiness, or healthier lifestyles?. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, *4*(1), 1-44.

Bday, N. A. (2012). *Prejudice attitudes and their relationship to methods of socialization and some demographic variables among a sample of students at the University of Sanaa.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Assiut University, Egypt.

Belle, D., & Doucet, J. (2003). Poverty, inequality, and discrimination as sources of depression among US women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *27*(2), 101-113.

Blascovich, J. & Tomaka, J. (1991). Measures of self-esteem. *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes*, *1*(3), 115-160.

Boehnke, K., Hagan, J., & Hefler, G. (1998). On the development of xenophobia in Germany: The adolescent years. *Journal of Social Issues*, *54*(3), 585-602.

Boubou, M., & Zmourod, A. (2016). Psychometric properties of the Adult Edition of Toulouse Self-Esteem Scale. *Tishreen University Journal for Research and Scientific Studies*, *38*(5), 111-133.

Bourdieu, P. (1987). What makes a social class? On the theoretical and practical existence of groups. *Berkeley journal of sociology*, *32*, 1-17.

Boyd, B. M. (2010). *Group identity and expressions of prejudice among Mexican heritage adolescents*. (Master's thesis). Arizona State University, Arizona.

Boylu, M. A. (2020). *Investigation of the correlation between level of altruism and empathic tendency and self-esteem of university students.* (Master's thesis). Cag University, Mersin.

Burnett, P. C. (1994). Self-concept and self-esteem in elementary school children. *Psychology in the Schools*, *31*(2), 164-171.

Butryn, M. F. (2000). *Racial prejudice and physical aggression. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation).* University of Georgia, Georgia.

Buunk, B. P. & Collins, R. B. (1993). *The affective consequences of social comparison. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*(3), 1238 – 1249.

Campbell, D. T. (1967). Stereotypes and the perception of group differences. *American psychologist*, *22*(10), 817 – 829.

Carlson, C., Uppal, S., & Prosser, E. C. (2000). Ethnic differences in processes contributing to the self-esteem of early adolescent girls. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, *20*(1), 44-67.

Comrey, A. L. (1988). Factor-analytic methods of scale development in personality and clinical psychology. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, *56*(5), 754.

Condor, S., & Brown, R. (1988). Psychological processes in intergroup conflict. In *The social psychology of intergroup conflict* (pp. 3-26). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.

Coopersmith, S. (1959). A method for determining types of self-esteem. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *59*(1), 87-94.

Crocker, J., & Major, B. (1989). Social stigma and self-esteem: The self-protective properties of stigma. *Psychological review*, *96*(4), 608 – 630.

Darwish, A. M., Hodaybi, M. A., Hasan, H., S., & Ali, H. A. (2015). Prejudice and its relationship to demographic and psychological variables for secondary school students. *Journal of Faculty of Education, Assiut University*, *31*(5), 241-282.

Dawos, K. (2011). *Sports media and its relationship to sports prejudice.* (Unpublished master's thesis). King Saud University, Riyadh.

Deb, S. & Bhattacharjee, A. (2009). Self – esteem of depressive patients. Journal of Indian Academy of Applied Psychology, 25(2), 239- 244.

Deloye, H. (2008). *Prejudice attitudes between ethnic groups*. Iraq: Khanah Press.

Diener, E., & Diener, M. (2009). Cross-cultural correlates of life satisfaction and self-esteem. In *Culture and well-being* (pp. 71-91). Springer, Dordrecht.

Dienstbier, R. A. (1970). Positive and negative prejudice: Interactions of prejudice with race and social desirability 1. *Journal of Personality*, *38*(2), 198-215.

Dosari, S. A. (2001). *Acknowledgment of parental acceptance and control of university students and their relation to self-esteem and self-efficacy*, (Master thesis). King Saud University, KSA.

Dovidio, J. F., Hewstone, M., Glick, P., & Esses, V. M. (2010). Prejudice, stereotyping and discrimination: theoretical and empirical overview. *The SAGE handbook of prejudice, stereotyping and discrimination*, 3-29.

Duckitt, J. H. (1992). *The social psychology of prejudice*. Praeger Publishers/Greenwood Publishing Group.

Dweider, A. (1999). Psychology of the relationship between self-concept and attitudes. Lebanon: Dar al-Nahda al-Arabiya.

Ehrlick, H. (1973). The Social Psychology of Prejudice. London: John Wiley & Sons.

Elliott, M & Merrill, F. (1961). *Social disorganization*, (4th. ed.) New York: Harper & Brothers.

Emil, S. (2003). *Self-esteem and stressful life events of university students.* (Unpublished master's thesis). Middle East Technical University, Ankara.

Fairchild, H. H., & Gurin, P. (1978). Traditions in the social-psychological analysis of race relations. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *21*(5), 757-778.

Farran, S. A. (2016). *Literary text culture - Readings in the Yemeni contemporary literary narration.* Jordan: Academic for Publishing and Distribution.

Fein, S., & Spencer, S. J. (1997). Prejudice as self-image maintenance: Affirming the self through derogating others. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology*, *73*(1), 31.

Ferahat, A., & Hamodah, W. (2017). *The relationship between self-esteem and psychological compatibility of the university student*. (Unpublished master's thesis). University of El Oued, Algeria.

Fourchard, A. (2013). Neuropsychiatry of Childhood and adolescence. *Elsevier Masson, 61*(6), 94-333.

Franzoi, S. L. (1996). Social psychology, Brown & benchmark Publishers.

Freedawi, A. A. (2013). Prejudice and its relationship to the religious commitment of Baghdad University students. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences*, (101), 568-612.

Ghamdi, A. S. (2016). Self-esteem, its relationship to some variables among students of the Department of Physical Education at Umm Al-Qura University. *International Interdisciplinary Journal of Education, 5*(2), 1-16.

Glaser, J., & Knowles, E. D. (2008). Implicit motivation to control prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *44*(1), 164-172.

Gözel, M. (2019). *Investigation of anxiety levels on the self-esteem of university students.* (Master's thesis). Halic university, Istanbul.

Gray, B. & Hafdahl, A. R. (2000). Factors influencing racial comparisons of self-esteem: A quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin, 126*(1), 26 – 54.

Gray-Little, B., Williams, V.S.L., & Hancock, T. D. (1997). An item response theory analysis of the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,* 23, 443-451.

Haddock, G. (1991). Assessing the Determinants of Prejudicial Attitudes.

Hafez, L. A. (1982). Scale of self-assessment for children and adults, Cairo: Dar Al-Nahda.

Hassan, M. K., & Khalique, A. (1981). Religiosity and its correlates in college students. *Journal of Psychological Researches, 25*(3), 129-136

Hemed, A. H. (2009). *Prejudice and its relationship to the thinking patterns of Imam Mahdi University students.* (Unpublished master's thesis). Omdurman Islamic University, Khartoum.

Hewstone, M., Stroche, W., Codol, J. & Stephenson, G. M. (1993). *Introduction to social psychology: A European perspective.* (1st ed.). Oxford Blackwell Publishers.

Hightower, E. (1997). Psychosocial characteristics of subtle and blatant racists as compared to tolerant individuals. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *53*(4), 369-374.

Hillman, S. B., Wood, P. C., & Sawilowsky, S. S. (1998). The protective style questionnaire: self-protective mechanisms among stigmatized adolescents. *Social Behavior and Personality: an International Journal, 26*(1), 29-38.

Jama'an, S. A. (2018). Intolerance of university students and its relation to patterns of family upbringing. *Journal of Basra Research for Human Sciences, 43*(2), 22-59.

Jaradat, A. (2006). The relationship between self-esteem and irrational trends of university students. *The Jordanian Journal of Educational Sciences, 2*(3), 143-153.

Jazzar, H. (2011). Identity Crisis and prejudice, (1st. ed.) Cairo: Hala publishing.

Jibril, A. M. (1993). Self-esteem among excellent and non-excellent students. *Journal of Studies at the University of Jordan, 2A* (2), 195-219.

Jomaai, S. A. (1995). *Attitudes of students in the University of Sana'a towards some social issues.* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Baghdad, Iraq.

Jordan, C. H., Spencer, S. J., & Zanna, M. P. (2005). Types of high self-esteem and prejudice: How implicit self-esteem relates to ethnic discrimination among high explicit self-esteem individuals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*(5), 693-702.

Kafafi, A. (1989). Self-esteem and its relation to parenting and psychological security. *Journal of Arab Human Sciences, 7(*30), 33 – 50.

Kaoud, M. A. (1992). *Self-esteem and its relation to some psychological variables in adolescents,* (Master's thesis). Zagazig University, Egypt.

Kernis, M. H. (2005). Measuring self-esteem in context: The importance of stability of self-esteem in psychological functioning. *Journal of Personality, 73*(6), 1569-1605.

Khalique, A. (1981). Extent of prejudice in Muslim school student. *Journal of Psychological Research, 25*(1), 37 – 41.

Klineberg, O. (1954). *Social Psychology*, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Krech, D., Crutchfield, R. S., & Ballachey, E. L. (1962). Individual in society. New York: McGraw Book Company.

Kubaisi, A. O., & Musa, E. H. (2018). Measuring the level of prejudice among Anbar University students. *Journal of Anbar University for Humanities, 2*(4), 162-181.

Latife, B. & Hayah, B. (2012). *Self-esteem and its relationship to aggressive behavior "field study on secondary students"* (Bachelor's thesis). Kasdi Merbah Ouargla University, Algeria.

Lawrenco, G. (1981). The development of self-esteem questionnaire. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 51*(12), 245 – 257.

Loqman, A. Y. (2016). *The relationship between self-esteem and happiness of Dhamar University students.* (Unpublished master's thesis). Dhamar University, Yemen.

Madadha, F. (2015). *The relationship of psychological stress to academic achievement, intellectual extremism, and self-esteem among Mu'tah University students.* (Unpublished master's thesis). Mutah University, Jordan.

Mahdi, D. S. (2000). *The child's attitude toward work and its relationship to aggression and self-esteem in rural and urban areas,* (Master's thesis). Ain Shams University, Egypt.

Malkah, T. N. (1989). Depression in woman Psychoanalytic Concepts. *Psychiatric Clinic of North America,* 12(1), 212 – 230.

Maria, K. & Harnish, D. (2000). Self-Esteem in Children. *Journal of Education Psychology, 70*(8), 229 – 242.

Masri, E. S. (2014). Self-esteem and its relationship to mental health among students of social work at Al-Quds Open University. *Psychological and Educational Studies,* (13), 131-148.

Mc Donagh, E. & Richards, E. (1953). *Ethnic Relations in the United States,* New York: Appleton- Century Crofts.

Meyahi, A. F. (2014). Sports prejudice for university students. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences, 106*(A), 533-566.

Milner, D. (1981). Racial prejudice. *Intergroup behaviour*, (*pp*102-143). Oxford: Blackwell.

Moajil, S. M. (2010). Despair and its relationship to self-esteem among university students. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Research,* (24), 304-344.

Mohammed, S. N. (2010). *Feeling of security & Self –Esteem and their relation with some prejudicial attitudes for university youths,* (Unpublished master's thesis). Zagazig University, Egypt.

Moore, J. W., Hauck, W. E., & Denne, T. C. (1984). Racial prejudice, interracial contact, and personality variables. *The Journal of experimental education, 52*(3), 168-173.

Morgan, J. & Byron, D. (1990). Building self-esteem through family relationships dissertation. *Abstracts International*, *50*(7), 465 –525.

Mubark, B. (2013). Prejudice and its relationship to social identity and social standing among the unemployed. *Journal of Fateh*, (53), 71-117.

Murad, N. Y. (2007). Self Esteem for Female Students at the Department of Physical Education and its Relation with Academic Level. *Tikrit University Journal for Human Sciences, 14*(4), 111-132.

Nemček, D., Kraček, S., & Peráčková, J. (2017). Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale analyses among elite and competitive athletes, recreational athletes and inactive individuals. *Journal of Physical Education and Sport, 17*, 2305-2310.

Newcomb, T. M., Turner, R. H., & Converse, P. E. (1969). *Social psychology: the study of human interaction,* (2nd ed.). London: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.

Newcomb, T.M. et al., (1965). Social Psychology: The Study of Human Interaction, New York: Holt & Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Omar, M. K. (2005). *Social disintegration,* (1st. ed.). Jordan: Shorok Library.

Pallant, J. (2013). *SPSS survival manual*, (4th ed.) UK: McGraw-Hill Education.

Qmer, M. A. (2015). *Self-esteem and its relation to aggressive behavior, future anxiety and some demographic variables*, (Doctoral dissertation). University of Dongola, Sudan.

Rajeeb, Y. (2001). Prejudice attitudes and their relationship to some demographic variables among a sample of Egyptian society. *Journal of Contemporary Psychology and Humanities, 13*(4), 177- 199.

Ray, J. J., & Lovejoy, F. H. (1986). The generality of racial prejudice. *The Journal of social psychology*, *126*(4), 563-564.

Rayes, K. H. (2018). *Prejudice and its relation with personality traits among Palestinian universities' students in the Gaza strip.* (Master's thesis). Islamic University, Gaza.

Rhodes, J., Roffman, J., Reddy, R., & Fredriksen, K. (2004). Changes in self-esteem during the middle school years: A latent growth curve study of individual and contextual influences. *Journal of School Psychology*, *42*(3), 243-261.

Rodrigues Bezerra, m. (2017). Self-respect and prejudice: an enquiry into self-respect as a predictor of prejudice and discrimination towards sufferers of eating disorders. (Master's thesis). University of Chester, United Kingdom.

Rokeach, M, Smith, P. W., & Evans, R. I. (1960). Two kinds of prejudice or one? In M. Rokeach, The open and closed mind. New York: Basic Book.

Ruttenberg, J., Zea, M. C., & Sigelman, C. K. (1996). Collective identity and intergroup prejudice among Jewish and Arab students in the United States. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 136*(2), 209-220.

Salama, F. A. (1987). Comparison of IQ and Self-esteem in childhood and adolescence: A Field Study. *Journal of the Faculty of Education in Zagazig University, 2*(3), 28 – 44.

Salim, A. M. (2015). *Attitude towards political participation and its relationship to self-esteem among university students.* (Unpublished master's thesis). Helwan University, Cairo.

Samelson, F. (1978). From “race psychology” to “studies in prejudice”: Some observations on the thematic reversal in social psychology. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences, 14*(3), 265-278.

Sechrist, G. B., & Stangor, C. (2005). Prejudice as social norms. In *Social psychology of prejudice: historical and contemporary issues/edited by Christian S. Crandall, Mark Schaller. Lawrence, Kan.: Lewinian Press, c2005.*. Lawrence, Kan.: Lewinian Press.

Secord, P. & Backman, C. (1964). *Social Psychology*, New York McGraw-Hill.

Shafei, I. (1997). *Impact of two proposed programs on the trends of intolerance: a global diagnostic study,* (Doctoral dissertation). Tanta University, Egypt.

Shakah, A. (2004). Prejudice among An-Najah National University students and its relationship to some variables. *Journal of the Federation of Arab Universities*, (44), 237-276.

Shakhtour, S. (2004). *A comparative study of deprived and non-deprived children in anxiety and self-esteem in the Bethlehem region*. (Unpublished master's thesis). Al-Quds University, Palestine.

Shalabi, A. I. (1993). *The relationship between the difference between the causal interpretation of achievement motivation and self-esteem and the tendency towards private lessons among secondary students*. (Master's thesis). Mansoura University, Egypt.

Shellah, A. A. (2010). *Methods of Partisan breeding and their relation to fanatical trends among students in the universities of Gaza Governorates.* (Unpublished master's thesis). Al-Azhar University, Gaza.

Sherif, M. & Sherif, C. (1965). *Problems of youth: Transition to adulthood in a changing world*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing.

Sherif, M. & Sherif, C., (Eds.) (1965). Problems of Youth: Transition to Adulthood in A changing World, Chicago Aldine.

Simoni, J. M. (1996). Pathways to prejudice: Predicting students' heterosexist attitudes with demographics, self-esteem, and contact with lesbians and gay men. *Journal of College Student Development*, *37*(1), 68-78.

Simpson, G. E., & Yinger, J. M. (1985). Types of majority-minority situations. In *Racial and Cultural Minorities* (pp. 3-25). Springer, Boston, MA.

Sinha, R. R., & Hassan, M. K. (1975). Some personality correlates of social prejudice. *Journal of Social and Economic Studies*, *3*(2), 225-231.

Skillings, J. H., & Dobbins, J. E. (1991). Racism as a disease: Etiology and treatment implications. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, *70*(1), 206 – 212.

Smith, H. M., & Betz, N. E. (2000). Development and validation of a scale of perceived social self-efficacy. *Journal of Career Assessment*, *8*(3), 283-301.

Streitmatter, J. L., & Pate, G. S. (1989). Identity status development and cognitive prejudice in early adolescents. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, *9*(1-2), 142-152.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). Using multivariate statistics, 6th edn Boston. *Ma: Pearson.*

Tahan, L. I. (1995). *Self-esteem and its relation to some concerns of the aged child,* (Master thesis). Ain Shams University, Egypt.

Tahrawi, J. H. (2005). *Prejudice attitudes and their relationship with some psychological variables* (Doctoral dissertation). Ain Shams University, Egypt.

Tayar, N. & Shamri, N. (2009). Prejudice and its relationship to aggression among university students. *Journal of Faculty of Education*, *4*(1), 1-36.

Taylor, S. E., Peplau, L. A., & Sears, D. O. (1997). Social psychology (9th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ, US: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Vaughan, G. M. (1988). The psychology of intergroup discrimination. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, *17*(1), 1-14.

Verkuyten, M. (1996). Personal self-esteem and prejudice among ethnic majority and minority youth. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *30*(2), 248-263.

Wahidiy, S. J. (2017). Prejudice among Palestinian university students. *Journal of reading and knowledge at Ain Shams University, 7*(184), 191-206.

Weigel, R. H., & Howes, P. W. (1985). Conceptions of racial prejudice: Symbolic racism reconsidered. *Journal of Social Issues*, *41*(3), 117-138.

Wiggins, J. A., Wiggins, B. B. & Zanden, J. V. (1994). Social psychology. (5th ed.), New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Winer, D. L., Bonner, T. O., Blaney, P. H., & Murray, E. J. (1981). Depression and social attraction. *Motivation and Emotion*, *5*(2), 153-166.

Zahran, H. A. (2005). Developmental psychology, (6th ed.) World of Books, Egypt.

Zakaria, F. (1971). Intolerance of argumentative angle. *Journal of Contemporary Thought, Egyptian General Authority for authoring and publishing, 74* (1), 2-9

Zanden, J. (1966). *American Minority Relations*. New York: Ronald Press.

Zayed, K. (2004). Self-esteem among students of the department of sports education at Sultan Qaboos University and its relationship to the level of academic achievement. *Journal of Studies at the University of Jordan*, (*Special issue*). 321-333.

Zayed, K. M. (2014). *Psychological identity and its relationship to wisdom and dogmatism among university students.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Yarmouk University, Jordan.

Zoabi, A. M. (1996). Self-acceptance and its relationship to acceptance of others at Sana'a University students. *Journal of Educational Research and Development, 4*(112), 63-85.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

THE DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM

1. Gender:

   Male □ Female □

2. Age ( )

3. Your living city in Yemen:

   Jened ( ) Azal ( ) Hadhramout ( )

   Aden ( ) Saba ( ) Tehama ( )

4. Your living city in Turkey ( )

   İstanbul ( ) Ankara ( ) İzmir ( ) Bursa ( )
   Sakarya ( ) Karabük ( ) Muğla ( ) Zonguldak ( ) Aksaray ( )

5. Your department:

   Medical and natural sciences ( )

   Human sciences ( )

   Engineering and applied sciences ( )

6. Current educational level:

   Bachelor □ Master □ Ph.D. □

7. Do you have a scholarship?

   Yes □ No □

8. Your (GPA) in last semester: ( )

APPENDIX B

SCALE OF PREJUDICE

Dear Student:

In your hands, there is a scale that contains items that describe some social attitudes. They are related to prejudice. Kindly read each of the sentences of the questionnaire with a focus and then put a sign (√) on the answer that you feel matches your reality and situation.

Remember that there is no right and wrong answer, but an answer that describes your situation. So, be frank and honest in your answer. And make sure that your answer is confidential and not seen by anyone except the researcher because it will be used only for the purpose of scientific research.

Items	Strongly agree	Agree	Moderately agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. I think it is better for individuals to have at least an initial knowledge of other religions.					
2. It is better for all people to belong to one religion, which is my religion.					
3. I tolerate with those who have religious beliefs that are different from my beliefs.					
4. I prefer the manager in my work to be someone from my religion.					
5. It is better that our friends are of the same religion.					
6. Other religions do not mean anything to me.					
7. It is my duty to defend my religion in any forum whenever possible.					
8. I don't mind marriage between people of different faiths.					
9. I would like to help people from different religions.					
10. I visit friends from other religions if there is a relationship between us.					
11. I don't want to make friendships with people from other religions.					
12. It is best that members of each religion work independently from others in all fields.					

13. I think my tribe / social class is the most authentic tribe among the others.					
14. I work hard with members of my tribe / social class to raise their place/affairs among tribes and social classes.					
15. Being committed to the people of my tribe / social class is always a duty that I have to adhere to.					
16. I feel comfortable when I share with my tribe / social class good and bad situations.					
17. I am happy when a member of my tribe / social class is government official.					
18. I want men to marry women from different tribes / social classes.					
19. If you follow the customs of my tribe / social class and its social values, it will lead to the development of society.					
20. I believe that a person's sense of security is associated with a commitment to the customs of the tribe / social class.					
21. Adhering to the customs and traditions of my tribe / social class strengthens the state.					
22. The tendency of the individual to his tribe / class leads to the spread of connections consideration.					
23. I prefer to step aside from the tribe / social class if it tries to hurt others.					
24. Working with the values and beliefs of the tribe and social class leads to conflict between tribes and social classes.					
This section just for men					
25. I think women are inferior to men.					
26. I think that women do not trust us as men.					
27. I think women striving to take away our responsibilities as men.					

28. I believe that we can equate men and women with rights and obligations.					
29. I think that the taking responsibility is not limited to one sex only.					
30. Women are collapsing when they are exposed to the simplest problems.					
31. Women see social relationships as a means of personal gain.					
32. I think women less flexible in dealing with others.					
33. I think that the woman seeks to take my status and responsibilties as a man.					
34. I am worried when talking to a teacher if she is a woman.					
35. In many situations, woman deliberately obliterates my personality.					
36. Many women praise their peers and underestimate us as men.					
This section just for women					
25. I think men are inferior to women.					
26. I think that men do not trust us as women.					
27. I think men endeavor to take away our responsibilities as women.					
28. I believe that we can equate men and women with rights and duties.					
29. I think that taking responsibility is not limited to one sex only.					
30. Men are collapsing when they are exposed to the simplest problems.					
31. Man see social relationships as a means of personal gain.					
32. I think men less flexible in dealing with others.					
33. I think that the man seeks to take my status and responsibilties as a woman.					
34. I am worried when talking to teacher if he is a man.					

35. In many situations, man deliberately obliterates my personality.					
36. Many men praise their peers and underestimate us as women.					

APPENDIX C

ROSENBERG SELF-ESTEEM SCALE

Dear Student:

In your hands, there is a scale that contains items that describe some social attitudes. They are related to self-esteem. Kindly read each of the sentences of the questionnaire with a focus and then put a sign (√) on the answer that you feel matches your reality and situation.

Remember that there is no right and wrong answer, but an answer that describes your situation. So, be frank and honest in your answer. And make sure that your answer is confidential and not seen by anyone except the researcher because it will be used only for the purpose of scientific research.

Items	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.				
2. At times I think I am not good at all.				
3. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.				
4. I am able to do things as most other people.				
5. I feel that I do not have much to be proud of.				
6. I certainly feel useless at times.				
7. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.				
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.				
9. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.				
10. I have a positive attitude towards myself.				