



مجلة كلية التربية . جامعة طنطا
ISSN (Print):- 1110-1237
ISSN (Online):- 2735-3761
<https://mkmgmt.journals.ekb.eg>
المجلد (٨٨) أكتوبر ٢٠٢٢ م



The Paradox of Tolerance and Psychological Well-being among University Students in the Light of Different Levels of Wisdom

Prepare

Dr Norah Abdulrahman Almotrefi

Assistant Professor, Department of Psychology, College of
Education and Human Development, Princess Nourah bint
Abdulrahman University, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia.

Email: naalmotrefi@pnu.edu.sa

Volume (88), October 2022

Abstract

The study aimed to investigate the different degrees of tolerance and psychological well-being on the wisdom scale (high-medium-low) among university students. Hence, the study sought to identify the relationships between the variables of tolerance, psychological well-being and wisdom among university students. The study sample consisted of (300) female students from Princess Noura Bint Abdulrahman University (Applied College) who specialize in Computer Science Programs (Programming/Information Technology/Multimedia Design), Tourism and Hospitality Programs (Tourism and Travel Management/Culinary Arts/Hospitality Management), and Administrative Sciences Programs, (Office Management/Marketing). Their ages ranged from 18 to 22 years with an average age of (20.51) and a standard deviation of (1.23). The researcher prepared the tolerance scale and the psychological well-being scale. In addition, the Wisdom scale (Brown & Greene, 2006) has been Arabized by the researcher. The study has concluded that there is a statistically significant difference in the average degrees of tolerance at different levels of wisdom (high, medium and low) among university students. Moreover, there is a statistically significant difference in the average psychological well-being scores with different levels of wisdom (high-medium-low) among university students. There is a statistically significant correlation between tolerance and psychological well-being in the study sample. There is a statistically significant correlation between tolerance and wisdom among the study sample. There is a statistically significant correlation between psychological well-being and wisdom among the study sample.

Keywords: Psychological well-being, Tolerance, Wisdom, University Students

1. Introduction

University students, as a social group, should be paid more attention from researchers in the field of education and psychology. Young people go through adolescence, in which they suffer from many problems and conflicts, which make it imperative to provide care for them and seek their psychological strengths. This helps them coping with stressful events, overcome crises, recovering from psychological trauma. In turn, such psychological strength will result in an increase in their ability to produce and create, which contributes to their self-realization and a sense of happiness, and psychological well-being.

Wisdom is one of the most important psychological assets and positive forces that contribute to an individual's compatibility and ability to face different pressures. It also contributes to individual's positive characteristics, including: cultural intelligence, psychological happiness, psychological resilience, compatibility, promotion of well-being, self-esteem, professional and psychological satisfaction (Nahed Fathi Ahmed, 2008; Faten Farooq Abdel Fattah; Sherry Mossad Halim, 2014; Afra Ibrahim Al-Obaidi, 2015; Ahmed Thabit; Ramadan; Alaa Saeed Al-Dars, 2017; Barber, etal., 2020; AliAhmed Tohari, 2020).

In the same context, wisdom is related to many positive psychosocial characteristics among young people such as self-safety, values and life trends, self-integration, self-enhancement values, sense of personal cohesion, and high levels of metacognitive thinking (Webster, 2019; Mohammed Khalifa Al-Shraida, 2015). In addition, Fatma Mahmoud Al-Zayat (2020) overviewed the importance of wisdom skills in developing different problem-solving skills among university students. By definition, Aladdin Abdel Hamid (2001, 6:207) views it as “an individual's deep understanding of himself and others, the active use of knowledge,

the ability to learn from ideas and the environment, with clarity of mind, insight, and the ability to make judgments.”

Many studies have manifested that there is a relationship between the variable of wisdom and some other variables, particularly tolerance (Maha Ali Yahya; Fatma Ismail; Doaa Wagdi, 2014; Milburn, 2015; Muhanna Khalaf Al-Omeirien; Ahmed Abdullah Al-Tarawneh, 2017). However, tolerant people are more calm, balanced, clear, and able to make their own decisions wisely and rationally. The researcher focused on tolerance is due to its link to mental and physical health. Tolerance is an important step to restore broken relationships and mutual trust between the two parties for greater harmony. It also contributes to solving many existing problems and preventing future problems (Michael Maclowet al., 2015:16).

Many scholars showed that tolerant people can be characterized by the following positive qualities such as: mental health, psychological compatibility, self-awareness, psychological security, interpersonal intelligence, orientation towards life, satisfaction with life, acceptance and mastery (Brannan & Diener, 2016; Mohammed Salim Al-Customer; Fawaz Nayel Al-Sulaihat, 2017; Asmaa Farooq Afifi, 2019; Jihan Shafiq Khalid, 2019; Hussein Ahmed Ahmed, 2019; Rasha Adel Ibrahim, 2019). Thus, tolerance is related to happiness, psychological well-being, psychological well-being, psychological safety, and quality of life among students (Bushra Ismail Arnout; Fink Amjad Fuad, 2012; Mervat Azmi Abdel Gawad, 2015; Tamer Shawqi Ibrahim, 2016; Amani Adel Ali, 2019; Halima Ibrahim Al-Faylakawi, 2019; Shadia Abdel Halim Metwally, 2019; Guchait, et al., 2019; Wlandari & Megawati, 2019). Accordingly tolerance variable has been associated with many positive variables that express psychological well-being and a peaceful and happy life.

Also, psychological well-being is a controversial concept varying in different cultures. However, it covers many meanings such as conviction, satisfaction with life, happiness, psychological security and self-realization. Diener asserts that the concept of psychological well-being is equivalent to mental health (Taylor, 2018). Based on global efforts to achieve psychological well-being, UNICEF has included the subject of well-being as a third goal of sustainable development called “achieving good health and well-being” and labelled it as one of the fundamental rights of individuals (UNICEF, 2015).

Psychological well-being is a state of happiness and satisfaction with low levels of distress for both physical and mental health. It consists of good quality of life (APA, 2015). It is also defined as a set of emotional and cognitive assessments related to an individual's life, including how good they feel, as well as an individual's thinking and feeling that their life is going well (Lucas & Diener, 2008).

Ryff (2007) investigated the concept of psychological well-being, its research methods, how to measure it, and the most important indicators to identify it. He developed a model of the six factors of psychological well-being, namely autonomy, environmental empowerment, personal development, positive relationships with others, meaningful life, and self-acceptance. Diener, Sub, Lucas & Smith (1999) showed that psychological well-being has three components: positive conscience, negative conscience, and life satisfaction.

The results of the studies varied in the relation of psychological well-being to gender. Some studies manifested that psychological well-being does not vary according to gender (Hamdi Yassin; Hayam Shaheen; Iman Mustafa, 2018). Conversely, some studies indicated that there are differences between males and



females in psychological well-being in favor of females (Hasnain, Wazid & Hasan, 2019).

Accordingly, it is likely that one of the main goals of positive psychology is to study psychological strengths and virtues that help individuals achieve psychological well-being. Therefore, the study sought to study differences in tolerance and psychological well-being among university students considering different levels of wisdom.

2. Problem of the Study

The problem of the study emerged from the researcher's observation that university students need to have a comprehensive set of positive psychological characteristics to enable them to be fully independent from their families, seek an independent job, prepare to choose a life partner and establish a new independent and equal life. Through interviewing some students, the researcher concluded that there may be some variables that influence psychological well-being, including wisdom and tolerance. This motivates the researcher thought to explore the different relationships between these variables, as well as to uncover the best model of causal relationships between them.

Belasheva & Petrova (2016) pointed out the importance of the tolerance variable as a criterion for the psychological well-being of personality among youth. Youth is an important stage in which young people face many academic, social and psychological problems and requirements. Its importance also stems from preparing individuals for independence, self-reliance, seeking work and life partner, and establishing a family, which requires an individual to enjoy tolerance, whether personally or socially. In addition, Rainey (2018) put that there are several negative effects associated with intolerance such as interpersonal disorder, poor social performance, poor physical health, disease and dysfunction



through continued stress, impaired cardiovascular recovery, and increased cholesterol levels in the blood.

Wisdom helps an individual solving his problems and increases an individual's ability to make appropriate decisions (Webster, Etal., 2017; Hosni Zakaria Al-Najjar, 2018). For the researcher, one of the motives beyond exploring the relationship between psychological well-being and wisdom is that there is a significant discrepancy in the results of studies that investigated the relationship between wisdom and both psychological and subjective well-being, as also confirmed (Zacher & Staudinger, 2018).

Moreover, Weststrate & Glück (2017) indicated that there is no positive relationship between psychological well-being and wisdom. On the contrary, there may be a negative relationship between them, as wise individuals have mostly formed this wisdom through difficult life experiences or through stressful situations and circumstances, and through painful experiences.

For psychological well-being, several scientific conferences have been held. The Second Regional Conference in the Middle East and North Africa in Community Psychology (American University in Cairo, 2020) aimed to identify national and regional policies to promote the psychological well-being of children. Youth and Families in the MENA Region and Applied Research aimed at studying factors that affect the psychological well-being and positive development of children, youth and families.

It is noted that several studies have dealt with the subject of well-being among scientists (Samira Abu Al-Ghazaleh, 2018; Manal Al-Hammalawi. 2019; Al-Dossary Street; Anwar Al-Rashidi, 2021). Other studies have discussed the well-being of high school and university students (Asim Ahmed, 2020; Rashid Al-Ajmi.2021; Amal Al-Nimrat. 2020; Mohammed Ababneh; Rafi Al-Zaghoul, 2021).

Ardelt (2003) also states that difficulties in a person's life do not necessarily lead to wisdom. Rather, these challenges may lead to psychological disintegration rather than wisdom. Mickler & Staudinger (2008) showed that there is no relation between wisdom and psychological well-being, while Walid Hassan Al-Khatib (2017) illustrated a relationship between wisdom and psychological well-being. In the same vein, Ardelt (2016) confirmed the existence of a relationship between wisdom and psychological well-being.

Study Questions

The objectives of the study can be identified in the light of the following questions:

1. Do the degrees of university students in the tolerance scale vary with varying levels of wisdom (high - medium - low) among university students?
2. Do the degrees of university students in the psychological well-being scale vary with varying levels of wisdom (high - medium - low) among university students?
3. What is the relationship between tolerance and psychological well-being among university students?
4. What is the relationship between tolerance and wisdom among university students?
5. What is the relationship between psychological well-being and wisdom among university students?

Study Objectives

The study aims to:

1. Understand and interpret the differences in the levels of tolerance, psychological well-being, and wisdom among university students on a (high-moderate-low) scale.
2. Identify the the relationships between the variables of tolerance, psychological well-being, and wisdom among university students.

Study Importance

The study proves important, for it:

1. Enriches the psychological theoretical frameworks of the current study variables: psychological well-being, tolerance, and wisdom.
2. Targets an important educational group, which is education college students, who deserve more attention due to the importance of their personal characteristics and their reflection on their students' personality.
3. focuses on the variable of psychological well-being, which affects students' behavior and individuals' lives and compatibility.
4. Develops a tolerance scale for university students that can be relied upon and used in future studies and research.
5. Utilizes the study's recommendations that benefit mental health counselors, parents, teachers, educators, and those in charge of educational institutions in developing guidance programs to promote tolerance and wisdom among students.
6. Utilizes the study's results to draw the attention of decision-makers, youth care providers to the importance of psychological well-being, tolerance, and wisdom.

Study Terms

- **Psychological well-being:** It is a mixture of feeling good and functioning well, experiencing positive emotions such as happiness and satisfaction, developing one's potential, controlling one's life, feeling purposeful, and experiencing positive relationships (Ruggeri et al., 2020). Procedurally, it is defined in the light of the degree an individual in a research sample score on the scale used in the study.
- **Wisdom:** is the ability to make judgments based on knowledge, experience, and interactions to achieve the individuals` goals they and choose the appropriate environment for life. It is a multidimensional concept that includes social, emotional, and cognitive dimensions, such as self-knowledge, emotional management, altruism, inspiring participation, judgment, knowledge

of life, life skills, and readiness to learn. It is defined procedurally by through degree individuals score on the wisdom scale used in the study.

- **Tolerance:** it is a cognitive and behavioral attitude that involves thanking oneself, others, and situations represented by a set of knowledge, beliefs, feelings, and behaviors that lead the individual to reconcile with oneself and others making them characterized by their commitment in different life situations (Zainab Shokir, 2010). Procedurally, it is defined by the degree scored by the individual while responding to the tolerance scale used in the study.

3. Literature Review

3.1 Psychological well-being

The American Psychological Association states that there are more than (55) specialized sections in psychology. Positive psychology comes in section number (17), specialized in counseling psychology to offers what is revolutionary and constructive for human capabilities and the pursuit of human flourishing at the individual and collective levels (Mohamed Younis, 2016).

According to Martin Seligman, psychological well-being is one of the positive psychological concepts, which is at the forefront of the topics raised by positive psychology. It has been the focus of attention in the past decades. Positive psychology is a new field in psychology that views that humans carry strength and weakness within them, and their lives are determined by them. Our experiences shape and define our personalities. Some experiences are unchangeable, while others can be modified. Positive psychology focuses on enriching human communities that are adaptable as a gateway to achieving psychological well-being (2002).

Well-being is often used interchangeably with happiness, despite the existence of several official definitions of happiness. Well-being is a broad term. It includes the individual's feelings and perceptions formed through our cognitive and emotional evaluation of life and specific life domains. Under this broad term falls: emotional well-being, which includes positive and negative effects, life satisfaction, and happiness. Additionally, psychological well-being includes independence, control and influence over the environment, personal growth, positive relationships, life purpose, and self-acceptance. Social well-being includes social acceptance, cohesion, and integration. Physical and mental well-being includes freedom from physical and mental illnesses (Morgan & Luthans, 2014).

The importance of psychological well-being

Psychological well-being is one of the most important axes that positive psychology seeks to improve, due to its impact on many psychological, functional, and social aspects of individuals. Sivapragasam & Raya (2014) enumerated many positive effects of psychological well-being, including: reducing stress, having a vital positive mood, committing tasks, feeling happy, satisfied with life, feeling secure, independent, having positive relationships with others, having a worthwhile task, feeling self-importance and acceptance, possessing high morals, physical health and physical activity, preserving the environment, promoting the economy and achieving development.

Dimensions of psychological well-being

Ryff & Keyes classified psychological well-being into six basic dimensions, which are: (Ryff & Keyes, 1995)

- Autonomy: means "feeling independent and unique that you have self-motivation decide what you want according to your own

standards rather than responding to social pressures like others. The individual can face social pressures and think and act in their own ways (Ryff & Keyes, 1995).

- Environmental accessibility: means that you feel responsible for managing your daily life, can take advantage of new opportunities, organize your daily life and work to suit your needs, and involves managing the challenges of the world around the individual. This ability requires the most potential or competence to create and maintain environments appropriate to the individual's personal needs that can be accessed through personal effort and action (Aspinol; Studinger, 2016).
- Personal maturity: means that you feel better and evolve over time, exploit your potential for self-realization, and be open to new experiences. It also means the ability to continuously develop an individual's talent and potential. (Ryff, 1989).
- Positive relationships with others: means being able to form warm human relationships with others based on compassion, understanding, and affection. Providing positive relations with others is one of the most important indicators of mental health and psychological well-being. (Ryff & Singer, 1998).
- Purposefulness in Life: means that you have specific goals for your life, a sense of direction towards these goals, and you have beliefs that support your sense of the purposefulness of your life in general, as well as the ability to create meaning and direction in an individual's experience, as well as the ability to act and machine to achieve the goals in life (Asim Ahmed, 2020).
- Self-Acceptance: means that it the individual must feel self-satisfaction not reject or hate himself because self-absorbing and self-hatred entails the inability of the individual to accept others genuinely. Therefore, it does not mean passive self-acceptance, but rather that such acceptance does not prevent the individual from self-criticizing and holding the individual accountable and constantly assessing his or her behaviour until he or she reaches an individual's self-development status (Manal Al-Hamalawy, 2019).

3.2 Tolerance

Tolerance is one of the important variables in positive psychology. It helps individuals to live better as individuals and with others around them. Green, Burnette & Davis (2018) defined tolerance as a deliberate process involving a shift from passive response to positive response, "by transforming his emotions, ideas, and negative behaviour towards abuser into more positive emotions, ideas, and behaviors, regardless of the abuser's reactions, as an apology for the abuser's right."

Additionally, tolerance is "a cognitive and spiritual component of attitude towards one another which are a combination of knowledge, beliefs, principles, feelings and behaviors that lead to reconciliation with one another and make it tolerant in different life situations" (Zainab Mahmoud Shaqir; Tahiya Mohammed Abdel-Aal, 2013: 91).

The study also agreed with Khalid Abdellatif Imran (2017) and Soad Mohammed Omar (2017: 486) on defining tolerance as a set of ideas, principles and beliefs that guide the student`s behaviour towards respect, appreciation and diverse human qualities. A set of studies agreed on support of the recognition by the educated individual of the right of others to freedom and the expression of their ideas and beliefs, and in a manner that does not interfere with the principles, characteristics and human unity of society." Moreover, tolerance is defined as a "value orientation towards difference" and is better understood as a three-dimensional concept, which includes acceptance, respect, and appreciation of difference (Hjerm, etal., 2019: 897).

Halima Ibrahim Al-Filkawi (2019: 9) identified tolerance as positive changes in one's feelings, ideas, and behavior towards someone who has abused him. Fatima Abdulrahim Al-Nawaisse and Abdur Rahim Al-Nawaisah (2020: 154-155) classified two patterns

of tolerance: the true pattern of tolerance, which involves a real change in the thoughts of the individual and his feelings towards those who have abused him, where he is rid of feelings of anger. Moreover, the right to revenge those who have abused him is a real process that is transforming both the individual to him and the abuser." The second pattern is superficial tolerance, which is expressed behaviorally only. The individual exhibits behaviors that express tolerance in response to pressures from others and in conformity with social norms. It occurs when the individual who has been wronged is forced to forgive the offender. Superficial tolerance means that the harm done to the individual has not healed with the emotional pain of the offense and negative feelings towards the offender have not been eliminated.

accordingly, the researcher discerns that some have approached the concept of tolerance behaviorally while others have approached it psychologically. Behaviorally, tolerance can be seen as forgiveness, choosing to refrain from retaliating against harm or injury inflicted upon them by another hostile person while being fully capable of doing so. However, this concept has not delved into the extent of psychological transformation. One may be superficially tolerant while experiencing an internal sense of hatred or anger towards those who have wronged them. Others have emphasized that tolerance is a state of change at the psychological, behavioral, and cognitive level towards those who have acted in a harmful manner.

Considering tolerance, researchers have divided themselves into two schools of thought. The first believes that individuals should relinquish negative emotions and ideas towards those who have wronged them, whereas the second advocates the display of positive emotions and ideas towards these individuals to exemplify the highest forms and expressions of tolerance.

Dimensions of Tolerance

Many scholars have pointed out the dimensions of psychological tolerance. For example, Kamel Desouki Al-Husari (2017: 149) has pointed out cultural tolerance, religious tolerance, and political tolerance. Moreover, Nadia Mohamed Al-Omari (2019: 338) has investigated the dimensions of tolerance as positive thinking, inner peace, flexibility, and love of life. Naaman Mohammed Al-Mousawi (2019: 54) has labeled intellectual tolerance, family tolerance, professional tolerance, and social tolerance. Maryam Nazal Al-Anzi (2020: 198) has referred to cognitive dimension, emotional dimension. Moreover, Hala Mohamed Chamboulia (2020: 548) referred to forgiveness, equality, accepting and dialogue with the other. Meanwhile, a plethora of scholars agreed on two fundamental dimensions of psychological tolerance: tolerance towards oneself, and tolerance towards others (Mervat Azmi Abdel Gawad, 2015; Tamer Shawki Ibrahim, 2016; Norah Saad Al-Baqmi, 2017; Asmaa Farouk Afifi, 2019; Amani Adel Ali, 2019). The current research adopts those two dimensions.

Interpretive Theories of Tolerance

Various theoretical approaches have been proposed to interpret tolerance, however, the current study adopts Theodor Lipps' Theory. It is consistent with the procedural concept of tolerance including two fundamental dimensions of tolerance: tolerance of oneself and tolerance of others. Also, these two dimensions are embraced by the researcher in the current study. According to Lipp`s theory, tolerance is an individual's ability to make accurate judgments about the feelings of others, while fully accepting differences in their emotions. In addition, it emphasizes the role of empathy as a way of understanding the spirit and mind of others, not just their emotions. Empathy with others may also help us to know ourselves better, and is a means of self-reflection; thus, increasing self-tolerance (Nowak, 2011: 322).

3.3 Wisdom

The concept of wisdom is one of the important variables of positive psychology due to its significant impact on various aspects of an individual's academic, social, and professional life. It is a multidimensional term that there is no general consensus on its definition. Some argue that wisdom relates to an individual's self-reflective judgment or wisdom in different situations, while others add that it also extends to others and the environment. Some scholars argue that wisdom is the highest level of judgment for society and the environment. Martin Seligman (2005: 186) defines it as a combination of personal strengths such as curiosity, worldliness, love of learning, critical thinking, openness of mind, ingenuity, creativity, practical, social, personal, and emotional intelligence, as well as a keen insight into matters.

Staudinger (2016: 75) pointed out that wisdom is a "complex phenomenon used to describe the ideal human perception and personality. It describes personal wisdom with knowledge and judgment related to an individual's life, while it describes general wisdom with knowledge and judgment of fundamental issues in the lives of others. Khalid Nahas Al-Otaibi (2017: 205) defined it as a three-dimensional composition that reflects the ability to act in the context of using knowledge and experience to determine causes, effects, appropriate means, and methods to deal with situations and others.

Wisdom is not only about maximizing the individual or another person's self-interest, but also achieving a balance between different personal self-interests and the interests of others (outside the individual), such as the city, country, environment, or even religious beliefs. Therefore, the wise see beyond their personal interests and towards the interests of others and society as well (Sternberg, et al., 2019: 17).



According to Ali Ahmed Touhiri (2020: 260), critical thinking is the ability to utilize higher order thinking skills for accurate judgments in various life affairs, and to find appropriate solutions to problems based on wisdom, insight, and personal experience. Meanwhile, Juhara Saleh Al-Marshoud (2020:5) views it as the capacity of the student to understand oneself and others, and the ability to deal with life situations effectively, and making rational judgments on events.

While Hussein Mohammed Bakheet (2020: 129) defines it as "the individual's response to stimuli of knowledge, making decisions, managing emotions, and problem-solving. Ramadan Ashour Suleiman & Hani Fouad Suleiman (2020: 117) define it as "a fusion of cognitive abilities and personal traits that crystallize in the individual's ability to make accurate decisions, issue judgments, balance good personal and public goals in the best possible light, in light of good awareness of reality with all its implications". In addition, wise individuals are those who manage and overcome obstacles that confront them, attempt to understand the problems and their consequences. These individuals endorse the method of judicial or rational thinking, always attempting to comprehend why things are judged good or bad. Moreover, their personalities are characterized by a strong internal drive to seek out all that is good for themselves and those around them (Staudinger, 2018: 112).

Accordingly, it is likely that some scholars have approached the concept of wisdom as a complex composite of dimensions. Meanwhile, other scholars have viewed it as a set of personal traits that represent strengths for the wise individual. It is defined as a set of skills used by the individual to independently solve personal problems. Moreover, some scholars have postulated that wisdom is defined by the skills used by the individual for the benefit of others. Conversely, scholars have emphasized that the comprehensive concept of wisdom is the use of a blend of positive personal

characteristics and abilities to achieve benefits for society and the environment as a whole.

Dimensions of wisdom

Scholars have mentioned many dimensions of wisdom. For instance, Daren Abdullah Al-Shawwara (2017) and Ismail Mahmoud Al-Sa'oub (2018) agreed on the following dimensions: cognitive, affective, and contemplative. Meanwhile, Wafaa Osman, Fatima Al-Jassim & Musa Al-Nabhani (2018) added the dimensions of contemplation and dialogue. On the other hand, some studies concluded eight dimensions of wisdom: self-knowledge, emotion management, altruism, ability to inspire, judgment, life experience, life skills, and desire for learning (Greene & Brown, 2019; Faten Farouk Abdel-Fattah, Sherry Masoud Halim, 2014; Qusai hajaj Dheiby, 2017; Mayson Zaher Al-Rawi, 2018; Abdulrahman Zafer Dahim, 2019; Saleha Ahmad, Mohammed Khalifa Al-Sharidah, 2020; Fatima Mahmoud Al-Ziyat, 2020). Consequently, the present study adopted these dimensions whilst integrating the dimensions of life experience and life skills into the "life experience and skills" dimension to enhance comprehensiveness and clarity.

Theoretical interpretations of wisdom

Explicit theories have been adopted in current studies of wisdom because they provide comprehensive explanations of the concept. They indicate that wisdom can be measured through its cognitive, social, and contemplative dimensions, which are consistent with the dimensions of wisdom. Moreover, they integrate with the three-dimensional model of wisdom proposed by Ardelt (2004). Explicit theories of wisdom are presented as follows:



The explicit theories of wisdom are based on the assumption that wisdom is a multi-component construct that goes beyond people's common understanding. These components include: firstly, the cognitive component referring to the intellectual ability, knowledge, and practical expertise that can be applied in life; secondly, the social component involving sensitivity, empathy, and social skills; and thirdly, the reflective and openness component, which is about self-examination and learning from mistakes. (Glück et al., 2005: 198).

3.4 Previous studies

- Amina Mohammed Abdelsamie's (2018) aimed to elucidate the correlational relationship between tolerance and wisdom. The study sample consisted of 195 participants, divided into 100, whose ages ranged between 18 to 21 years. The results showed a positive and statistically significant correlation between scores on tolerance scales and wisdom.
- Abdullah Abdulhadi Al-Anzi's (2020) aimed to explore the relationship between wisdom and psychological tolerance, and uncover the differences in the variables of wisdom and tolerance relating to social gender and specialization. Additionally, the study aimed to predict personal wisdom scores through psychological tolerance and its dimensions among the students of Jouf University. The study revealed the existence of a relationship between wisdom and tolerance within a sample of university students. Moreover, wisdom was considered one of the most important basic human virtues, while tolerance was considered one of the various character strengths that constitute an essential human virtue, namely that of renunciation.
- Samah Mahmoud (2016) aimed to construct a causal model of the relationships between wisdom, moral intelligence, personal intelligence, and social intelligence among a sample of female college students. The study sample consisted of 232 students in the



College of Education at Majmaah University in Saudi Arabia. The study manifested the existence of a correlational relationship between tolerance as an aspect of moral intelligence and wisdom among university students.

- Paradise & Kernis (2020) aimed to examine the relationship between self-esteem and well-being. The study sample consisted of 123 students at the University of Georgia in Athens, including 19 males and 104 females. It indicated a correlational relationship between higher levels of self-esteem and higher levels of well-being, while lower self-esteem was associated with lower levels of well-being. The study also suggested that self-esteem has a significant influence on independence and adaptation to the environment. Moreover, there was a significant interaction between self-esteem, self-acceptance, and personal growth.
- Augusto-Landa, Martos & López-Zafra (2020) examined the relationship between emotional intelligence, personality traits, and well-being. The results indicated that low scores in extraversion were significantly associated with all dimensions of well-being, whereas high scores in buoyancy were significantly associated with all dimensions of well-being and were the strongest predictors. The results also suggested that emotional intelligence dimensions, such as clarity and emotional regulation, were related to well-being and acted as predictors for all dimensions.

In the light of the afore-mentioned studies, it is likely that the present study is concerned with directly exploring the correlation between tolerance, wisdom, and psychological well-being, rather than via one of its components or related variables. Moreover, the study has sought to propose at a causal model that investigates the relationship among the three variables: psychological well-being, tolerance, and wisdom.

3.5 Study Hypotheses

Considering both the research framework and study variables, it is possible to formulate the following hypotheses:

1. There is a statistical variation in the mean levels of tolerance scores among university students, with variation in wisdom levels (high, medium, low).
2. There is a statistical variation in the mean levels of psychological well-being scores among university students, with variation in wisdom levels (high, medium, low).
3. There is a statistically significant relationship between tolerance and psychological well-being in the study sample.
4. There is a statistically significant relationship between tolerance and wisdom in the study sample.
5. There is a statistically significant relationship between psychological well-being and wisdom in the study sample.

4. Methodology and Procedure of the Study

4.1 Methodology of the Study

The researcher has adopted the comparative descriptive method, as it is suitable for the nature of the subject through studying the contrast between tolerance and psychological well-being among university students considering the variation in wisdom levels.

4.2 Sample of the Study

The present study sample is divided into:

- Pilot sample which is used to verify the validity and stability of the study tools, where the researcher applied the study tools on a pilot sample consisting of (100) female students from Princess Nourah Bint Abdulrahman University (College of Applied Studies) from various majors such as Computer Science Programs (Programming/Information Technology/Multimedia Design), Tourism and Hospitality Programs (Tourism and Travel



Management/Culinary Arts/Hospitality Management), and Administrative Sciences Programs, (Office Management/Marketing), ranging from 18 to 22 years. The sample was selected randomly to calculate the psychometric characteristics of study tools.

- The primary study sample was composed of 300 female students from Princess Nourah Bint Abdulrahman University (Applied College) majoring in Computer Science Programs (Programming/Information Technology/Multimedia Design), Tourism and Hospitality Programs (Tourism and Travel Management/Culinary Arts/Hospitality Management), and Administrative Sciences Programs, (Office Management/Marketing). Their ages ranged from 18 to 22 years old, with an average age of 20.51 and a standard deviation of 1.23.

4.3 Tools of the Study

4.3.1 Tolerance Scale

The Purpose of the Scale

The objective of the scale is to measure the level of tolerance among the students of Princess Nourah Bint Abdulrahman University. Procedurally, the scale has been previously established in the study's terminology.

Steps for Developing the Scale

The Tolerance Scale was developed after reviewing the theoretical frameworks related to tolerance and its measurements, including the Heartland Tolerance Scale (Hfs) by Thompson & Synder, (2003), study by Thomae et al., (2016), Khaled Abdullah Altayeb Imran (2017), Mohammed Almutawakel Ali Allah Suleiman (2017), Mohammed Salim Alzayoun and Fawaz Nael (2017), and the study by Jehan Shafik Khalid (2019).

The initial form of the scale

Considering previous studies and measurement tools, the researcher has devised a tolerance scale consisting of 22 items distributed across two dimensions. Each item is followed by five responses: always, mostly, sometimes, rarely, and never. Table (1) illustrates the number of items in each dimension in the initial form.

Table (1) The number of singular items for each dimension of the tolerance scale in its initial form

The dimensions of the scale	Self-tolerance	Tolerance of others	Total
Number of Phrases	11	11	22

Verification of the psychometric properties of the tolerance scale

The tolerance scale was reviewed by the arbitrators, who agreed on deleting (3) items, because the percentage of agreement on them was less than 80%. After arbitration, the initial copy became (19) item. Then, the researcher applied the scale to 200 students of Princess Nourah bent Abdulrahman University (Applied College) for calculating internal consistency, honesty, and stability.

Calculation of the internal consistency of the tolerance scale

The internal consistency of the vocabulary and dimensions of the scale was calculated by calculating the values of the correlation coefficients between the scores of the sample members on the vocabulary of the scale and the sum of their scores on the dimension and on the total of their scores on the scale as a whole. Table (2) and Table (3) show the results of internal consistency as follows:

Table (2) the values of the correlation coefficients between the score of each item and the sum of the scores of the dimension to which the tolerance scale belong

Self-tolerance		Tolerance of others	
Phrase	Correlation coefficient	Phrase	Correlation coefficient
1	0.629**	10	0.660**
2	0.530**	11	0.464**
3	0.623**	12	0.690**
4	0.635**	13	0.507**
5	0.539**	14	0.682**
6	0.746**	15	0.697**
7	0.609**	16	0.555**
8	0.626**	17	0.662**
9	0.747**	18	0.576**
		19	0.746**

**Significant at 0.01

Table (2) manifests that there are positive statistically significant correlations between the scores of the sample members on the items of each of the two dimensions, and the total degree of the dimension, all of which are a function at the level of (0.01). Therefore, it is an indicator of the internal consistency of the tolerance scale.

Table (3) Correlation coefficients between the score of each item and the overall score of the tolerance scale

Phrase	Correlation coefficient	Phrase	Correlation coefficient
1	0.466**	11	0.313**
2	0.518**	12	0.521**
3	0.372**	13	0.441**
4	0.389**	14	0.554**
5	0.530**	15	0.447**
6	0.468**	16	0.519**
7	0.372**	17	0.501**
8	0.467**	18	0.419**
9	0.473**	19	0.576**
10	0.433**		

**Significant at 0.01

Table (3) manifests that there are statistically significant correlations between the scores of the sample members on each item, and the total score of the scale, all of which are a function at the level of (0.01). Thus, the results of the correlation coefficients are an indicator of the internal consistency of the tolerance scale.

The values of the correlation coefficients between the total scores of each dimension and the total score were also calculated. Table (4) shows the results of the correlation coefficients between the degree of each dimension and the total score of the tolerance scale.

The dimensions	Correlation coefficient
Self-tolerance	0.701**
Tolerance of others	0.756**

**Significant at 0.01

In the light of table (4), there are statistically significant positive correlations between the degree of each dimension and the total degree of the scale, which is an indicator of the consistency of the scale with tolerance, which indicates the structural integrity of the scale.

The validity of the tolerance scale

The validity of the scale was calculated in three ways:

The validity of the arbitrators: The tolerance scale was presented in its initial form to a number (7) of the arbitrators specialized in the field of educational psychology and mental health to verify its validity to measure tolerance. Some items were modified based on the amendments of the arbitrators. The researcher calculated the percentages of the arbitrators' agreement on each item of the scale. The arbitrators' agreement on the validity of the items of the scale ranged between (83% - 100%), and the average

percentage of Loshi validity of the scale as a whole (0,80), indicating that the scale has an acceptable level of validity.

Factor analysis

Some measures were taken to determine the scalability of the scale for exploratory factor analysis, which are the correlation coefficients and most of them were greater than (0.3). it is noted that the absolute value of the correlation matrix determinant is greater than (0.00001), the Kaiser-Mayer-Olkin test (KMO), and the Bartlett S test of sphericity are statistically significant.

Through the follow-up of statistics, it was likely that most of the correlations are greater than (0.3), and that the absolute value of the correlation matrix determinant is equal to (0.001), and for the Kaiser test for the efficiency of the number of sample members is equal to (0.793). that is it is suitable for conducting factor analysis. The value of the Bertlett test is statistically significant and its value is (1426.83) as in Table (5) :

Table (5) The value of the Kaiser test and the Bertellet test for the tolerance meter

Sample suitability indicators for factorial analysis	
The value of the Kaiser-Mayer-Oaklen coefficient to fit the sample	0.793
Bertlett test value	1426.83
Degree of freedom	171
Significance level	0.01

Accordingly, a first-order factor analysis was performed using the Hotellingg basic components analysis to derive the underlying factors that make up the scale, and the use of the latent root test to extract the factors, with a perpendicular rotation in the Variimax method, and the saturation test of the single was ≥ 3 , keep items that are saturated to 3 or more.

The results of the factor analysis concluded that there are two factors that explain 42.04% of the total variation of tolerance as follows:

- The first is tolerance with others. (22.45%) of the variation is explained by tolerance before rotation, and (22.67) after rotation, and the value of its latent root is (4.26). It consists of (10) items whose saturations ranged from (0.307 to 0.781). The high score on this factor stipulates that "the student's tendency to overlook the lapses of others, find excuses for them, forgive what he has wronged and reconcile with them, accept others and their differences, and transform his negative feelings towards others into positive."
- The second is self-tolerance. (19.59%) of the variation is explained by tolerance before rotation, and (19.27%) after rotation, and the value of its latent root is (3.72). It consists of (9) items whose saturations ranged from (0.501 to 0.775), and the high score on this factor states the tendency to reconcile and accept the student's self, compassion, compassion, and self-forgiveness, in situations where he makes mistakes or fails in them, and the constant pursuit of self-acceptance and getting rid of the permanent feeling guilt and self-flagellation, and turning his negative feelings about himself into positive." Table (6) shows the saturations of each item on the factors in the tolerance scale.

Table (6) Values of saturation of each phrase in the tolerance scale

First dimension (Tolerance of others)		Second dimension (Self-tolerance)	
Phrase	Correlation coefficient	Phrase	Correlation coefficient
10	0.68	1	0.6
11	0.307	2	0.505
12	0.692	3	0.629
13	0.351	4	0.665
14	0.736	5	0.509
15	0.74	6	0.758
16	0.419	7	0.602
17	0.73	8	0.577
18	0.613	9	0.775
19	0.781		

The validity of the test: The researcher verified the validity of the scale by comparing it with the tolerance scale of Jihan Shafiq Khaled (2019), which consists of (18) singles. It was concluded that the result of the correlation with the current scale was (0.76), which is a high value indicating the validity of the scale in terms of the chosen test.

Calculation of the stability of the tolerance scale

The stability of the scale was calculated through the Cronbach alpha coefficient. The researcher calculated it for the scale as a whole and its value was (0.89), which is an acceptable value and indicates a high stability coefficient. The researcher also calculated the stability coefficient of the scale when omitting the value of the vocabulary and the coefficient of the scale dimensions as shown in Table (7) and Table (8).

Table (7) Tolerance scale stability coefficients when omitting the value of the phrases

Tolerance of others		Self-tolerance	
Phrase	Correlation coefficient	Phrase	Correlation coefficient
1	0.797	10	0.799
2	0.807	11	0.820
3	0.798	12	0.795
4	0.798	13	0.818
5	0.807	14	0.796
6	0.780	15	0.795
7	0.800	16	0.813
8	0.799	17	0.799
9	0.781	18	0.810
		19	788

Table (8) Values of Cronbach alpha stability coefficient for tolerance scale dimensions

Dimension	Coefficient of stability
Self-tolerance	0, 815
Tolerance of others	0, 820

It is clear from Table 7 and 8 that the tolerance scale has a high degree of stability and can therefore be trusted.

The final form of the scale

The scale in its final form consists of (19) items divided as follows, as in Table (9).

Table (9)

Dimension	phrases	Number
Self-tolerance	1 – 9	9
Tolerance of others	10 - 19	10

How to estimate the scale's scores?

It is estimated according to the Likert five-point scale, which is: (always, often, sometimes, rarely, never). When correcting the scale, they are converted to degrees (5, 4, 3, 2, 1) respectively for the positive items and vice versa in the negative items. Hence, the grades become (1, 2, 3, 4, 5). Eventually, the items of the scale after verifying the psychometric properties reached (19) items. The scale has a total score of (19 - 95). The high score indicates a high level of tolerance among university students, while the low score indicates a low level of tolerance among the university student.

4.3.2 Psychological well-being scale

Steps to translate the scale

The scale (Ryeff, 1995) for psychological well-being was translated into Arabic then was presented to translators specialized in English to make Back Translation of the Arabic version of the scale to

ensure the appropriateness of the translation. This occurs for the end of not prejudicing the original meaning of the items of the scale.

Scale Description

The scale in its initial form consists of (52) items distributed over six dimensions as follows:

- 1- Autonomy means a sense of self-determination including items (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9).
- 2- Mastery of the environment means the ability to effectively manage one's life and the world around him including items (10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16).
- 3- Personal growth means a sense of continual growth and development as a person including items (17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24).
- 4- Having positive relationships with others means the ability to possess quality relationships with others including items (25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33).
- 5- The purpose dimension of life means the belief that one's life is purposeful and meaningful including items (34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42).
- 6- Post self-acceptance means positive evaluations about oneself and one's past life including items (43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52).

The researcher has determined the responses to each item according to the five-point Likert scale, so that the individual answers each item by choosing one alternative, which is (always applicable - often applicable - sometimes applicable - rarely applicable - never applicable). These alternatives were given degrees (1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5). It is likely that number (5) indicates the degree of full approval of the content of the item which decreases whenever the number decreases, where the number (1) indicates the complete rejection of the content of the item.

Method of correcting the scale

A degree ranging between (1 – 5) is allocated according to the individual's choices in front of each item. The individual's choice of alternative (3) in front of each item indicates the existence of an average degree of psychological well-being. If the degree exceeds (3), it is in the direction of increasing the level of psychological well-being of the individual. If the degree falls below (3), it is in the direction of the low level of psychological well-being of the individual, and the combination is used to calculate the total score obtained by the examined person on the scale, which ranges between (52 – 260) degrees. If the individual obtains a score equivalent to (156), this indicates the existence of an average level of psychological well-being in the individual. If the total degree of the individual on this scale exceeds (156), this indicates a high degree of psychological well-being in the individual. If the total score of the individual on this scale falls below (156), this indicates a low degree of psychological well-being in the individual.

Psychometric properties of the scale

To ensure the psychometric efficiency of the scale, the validity and stability coefficients of the scale were calculated on a sample of (100) students of Princess Nourah Bint Abdulrahman University (Applied College) in the following ways:

Validity of the scale

The validity of the psychological well-being scale was verified using the following evidence of truthfulness:

The sincerity of the arbitrators

To ensure the sincerity of the arbitrators of the psychological well-being scale, the researcher presented the scale in its initial form to (7) arbitrators from specialists in psychology in some Saudi universities such as King Saud University and Princess Nourah Bint Abdulrahman University, as well as from specialists in psychology



in psychiatric clinics such as King Abdulaziz Medical City in Riyadh, where the arbitrators were introduced to the objectives of the study and the components of the scale, and were asked to kindly review the scale. The arbitrators agreed on the validity of the scale for application in the current study and its suitability for the local environment. Some amendments to the scale items were provided, such as the item (I tend to worry about what others think about me) was amended to (I am concerned about what others think about me), the item (I tend to be influenced by people regarding opinions or big issues) was amended to (I tend to be influenced by people regarding opinions or big issues), and the item (maintained on Close relationships is difficult and frustrating for me), has been amended to "Maintaining close relationships is difficult and frustrating for me". In addition, some items have been deleted, such as: "There is a truth to the saying you cannot teach a big dog new tricks."

The validity of the test

The researcher verified the validity of the scale by comparing it with the psychological well-being scale Khoury Nisreen (2019), which consists of (42) items. The result of the correlation with the current scale was (0.901), which is a high value indicating the validity of the scale in terms of the chosen test.

Internal consistency

The researcher verified the validity of internal consistency of the psychological well-being scale by applying the scale to the sample members (100) of Princess Nourah Bint Abdulrahman University students (Applied College) and calculating the correlation coefficients of the degree of each item of the dimension with the total degree of the dimension as shown in Table (10).

Table (10) Pearson's correlation coefficients for the items of the psychological well-being scale with the total degree of the dimension to which they belong

No	Correlation coefficient	No	Correlation coefficient	No	Correlation coefficient
1	0.520**	18	0.174	35	0.103
2	0.402**	19	0.761**	36	0.505**
3	0.420**	20	0.409**	37	0.591**
4	0.495**	21	0.677**	38	0.666**
5	0.295*	22	0.048	39	0.714**
6	0.565**	23	0.749**	40	0.333*
7	0.493**	24	0.607**	41	0.598**
8	0.582**	25	0.199	42	0.574**
9	0.585**	26	0.569**	43	0.804**
10	0.331*	27	0.834**	44	0.777**
11	0.520**	28	0.448**	45	0.257
12	0.289	29	0.181	46	0.459**
13	0.533**	30	0.250	47	0.523**
14	0.490**	31	0.558**	48	0.283
15	0.0689	32	0.634**	49	0.548**
16	0.349*	33	0.420**	50	0.567**
17	0.607*	34	0.366*	51	0.629**

** significant at level (0.01)

* significant at level (0.05)

According to table (10), it is likely that the values of the correlation coefficient of each item with its dimension are positive and statistically significant at the level of (0.01) or the level of (0.05). This indicates the consistency of each item with its dimension, except for items No. (12, 18, 22, 25, 29, 30, 35, 45, 48), which had the values of its correlation coefficient with its dimension is statistically insignificant at the level of (0.05). such values indicate its inconsistency with its dimension and therefore it was deleted.

Table (11) Pearson's correlation coefficients for the items of the psychological well-being scale with the total score of the scale

NO	Correlation coefficient with the total score of the scale	NO	Correlation coefficient with the total score of the scale
1	0.351*	27	0.509**
2	0.307*	28	0.280
3	0.448**	29	0.137
4	0.327*	30	0.180
5	0.163	31	0.481**
6	0.392**	32	0.553**
7	0.505**	33	0.327*
8	0.330*	34	0.245
9	0.394**	35	0.010
10	0.047	36	0.533**
11	0.265	37	0.514**
12	0.104	38	0.543**
13	0.228	39	0.407**
14	0.483**	40	0.153
15	0.184	41	0.529**
16	0.368*	42	0.433**
17	0.491**	43	0.396**
18	0.263	44	0.261
19	0.514**	45	0.587**
20	0.373*	46	0.458**
21	0.366*	47	0.587**
22	0.142	48	0.458**
23	0.484**	49	0.260
24	0.410**	50	0.211
25	0.144	51	0.307**
26	0.399**	52	0.307**

** significant at level (0.01)

* significant at level (0.05)

In Table (11), it is likely that the correlation coefficients of each item with the total score of the scale are positive and statistically significant at a level of (0.01) or (0.05), indicating the reliability of their consistency with the scale, except for items (5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 18, 22, 25, 28, 29, 30, 34, 35, 40, 44, 49, 50), for which the correlation coefficients of each item with the scale were not statistically significant at a level of (0.05). This indicates the

lack of reliability of the consistency of these items with the scale, and thus these items were deleted.

"As Pearson's correlation coefficient was calculated to determine the internal reliability of the scale's dimensions, the correlation coefficient was calculated between each dimension's score and the total score of the scale, as shown in Table 12."

Table (12) Correlations of Pearson for the dimensions of the psychological well-being scale with the total degree of the scale.

No	Correlation coefficient with the total score of the scale	No	Correlation coefficient with the total score of the scale
The self-rule	0.767**	4- Positive relationships with others	0.725**
Mastery of the environment	0.534**	5. Purpose of life	0.774**
Personal growth	0.745**	6. Self-acceptance	0.734**

** significant at level (0.01)

It is clear from Table (12) that the values of the correlation coefficient of each dimension with the total score of the scale are positive and statistically significant at the level of (0.01), which indicates their consistency with the scale. Thus, the measure of psychological well-being in its final form consists of 30 items as in Table (13):

Table (13) Correlation coefficients for the items of the psychological well-being scale in its final form

No	Correlation coefficient	No	Correlation coefficient	No	Correlation coefficient
1	0.351*	11	0.491**	21	0.533**
2	0.307*	12	0.514**	22	0.514**
3	0.0448**	13	0.373*	23	0.543**
4	0.327*	14	0.366*	24	0.407**
5	0.392**	15	0.484**	25	0.529**
6	0.505**	16	0.410**	26	0.423**
7	0.330*	17	0.399**	27	0.396**
8	0.394**	18	0.481**	28	0.458**
9	0.483**	19	0.553**	29	0.587**
10	0.368*	20	0.327*	30	0.307**

** significant at level (0.01)

* significant at level (0.05)

Stability of the scale

The researcher applied the psychological well-being scale on the sample members (100) of Princess Nourah Bint Abdulrahman University students (Applied College) and calculated the value of the scale stability coefficient using the Cronbach alpha method. Its value was (0.86), which is a high value indicating that the scale has an appropriate degree of stability.

Table (14) Cronbach alpha coefficient for measuring the stability of the study instrument

The Scale	dimensions	No of phrases	Dimension stability or Scale
psychological well-being	Self-control	9	0.5802
	Mastery of the Environment	7	0.4322
	Personal Growth	7	0.5402
	Positive Relationships	9	0.6283
	Purpose of Life	9	0.5822
	Self-Acceptance	10	0.6862
	Total	52	0.8614

According to Table 14, the scale's general constant factor is high, with a value of 0.86 per measure of psychological well-being.

4.3.3 Measuring Wisdom Readiness (Brown & Greene, 2006)

The scale of wisdom was prepared after referring to theoretical frameworks and some previous literature dealing with wisdom and some of its measurements, including: Webster (2003); Talat Mansour Gabriel et al., (2016); Darren Abdullah Al-Shawrah (2017); Qusay Ajai (2017); Ismail Mahmoud al- suoub (2018); Saad al-Shammari (2018); and Dortaj et al. (2018).

Initial form of the scale

In the light of previous studies and scales, the researcher has prepared a scale of wisdom, incorporating (70) items in his initial form distributed over seven dimensions. Each dimension was followed by five responses: (Always - Often - Sometimes - Nadda - Never). Table 15 shows each dimension of the scale of wisdom in its initial form.

Table (15)

Scale dimensions	Self-knowledge	Emotion Management	Altruism	Ability to inspire	Judgment	Life experience	desire to learn	Total
No of Phrases	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	70

Checking the psychometric properties of the wisdom scale

The scale of wisdom was presented to the arbitrators, and three items were deleted because the percentage of agreement on them was less than 80%. The arbitrators indicated the possibility of merging the sixth dimension with the seventh dimension in one dimension labelled as "life experience and the desire to learn" to reduce the number of dimensions and items of the scale to be proportional, as well as for the similarity of the vocabulary of each of the two dimensions. The researcher made this amendment, and

thus the scale composed of six dimensions. After the arbitration, the scale consisted of (59) items. Table (16) shows the number of items of each dimension of the wisdom scale in its final form after arbitration.

Table (16) The number of phrases of each dimension of the wisdom scale in its final form after arbitration

Scale dimensions	Self-knowledge	Emotion Management	Altruism	Ability to inspire	Judgment	Life experience and desire to learn	Total
No of Phrases	9	9	10	9	10	12	59

Then, the researcher applied the scale to (100) female students at Princess Nourah Bint Abdulrahman University (Applied College) with the aim of calculating internal consistency, validity, and stability.

Calculation of the internal consistency of the scale of wisdom

The internal consistency of the items and dimensions of the scale was calculated through the values of the correlation coefficients between the scores of the sample members on the items of the scale and the sum of their scores on the dimension to which they belong, and on the sum of their scores for the scale as a whole. Table (17) and Table (18) show the results of internal consistency as follows:

Table (17) Values of correlation coefficients between the score of each item and the sum of the scores of the dimension to which the scale of wisdom belongs

Self-knowledge		Emotion Management		Altruism		Ability to inspire		Judgment		Life experience and desire to learn	
phrase	Correlation coefficient	phrase	Correlation coefficient	phrase	Correlation coefficient	phrase	Correlation coefficient	phrase	Correlation coefficient	phrase	Correlation coefficient
1	0,693**	10	0.570**	19	0.704**	29	0.529**	38	0.600**	48	0.694**
2	0.787**	11	0.659**	20	0.595**	30	0.628**	39	0.695**	49	0.495**
3	0.774	12	0.379**	21	0.663**	31	0.484**	40	0.364**	50	0.669**
4	0.606**	13	0.541**	22	0.712**	32	0.565**	41	0.645**	51	0.530**
5	0.351**	14	0.306**	23	0.651**	33	0.623**	42	0.582**	52	0.615**
6	0.622**	15	0.639**	24	0.420**	34	0.468**	43	0.588**	53	0.717**
7	0.757**	16	0.481**	25	0.667**	35	0.654**	44	0.417**	54	0.701**
8	0.702**	17	0.727**	26	0.589**	36	0.462**	45	0.557**	55	0.680**
9	0.708**	18	0.432**	27	0.366**	37	0.701**	46	0.403**	56	0.430**
				28	0.562**			47	0.564**	57	0.406**
										58	0.574**
										59	0.501**

** significant at level (0.01)

* significant at level (0.05)

Table (17) manifests that there are statistically significant correlation relationships between the scores of the sample members on the items of each of the six dimensions, and the total degree of the dimension, all of which are a function at the level of (0001). Therefore, this is an indicator of the internal consistency of the wisdom scale.

Table (18) Values of correlation coefficients between the score of each individual and the overall score of the wisdom scale

Phrase	Correlation coefficient	phrase	Correlation coefficient	phrase	Correlation coefficient	phrase	Correlation coefficient	phrase	Correlation coefficient
1	0.563**	13	0.387**	25	0.475**	37	0.574**	49	0.489**
2	0.642**	14	0.552**	26	0.483**	38	0.526**	50	0.602**
3	0.577**	15	0.283**	27	0.365**	39	0.563**	51	0.600**
4	0.508**	16	0.271**	28	0.395**	40	0.255**	52	0.515**
5	0.266**	17	0.459**	29	0.512**	41	0.389**	53	0.392**
6	0.521**	18	0.776**	30	0.514**	42	0.305**	54	0.499**
7	0,510**	19	0.625**	31	0.370**	43	0.456**	55	0.406**
8	0,418**	20	0.453**	32	0.544**	44	0.329**	56	0.752**
9	0,604**	21	0.562**	33	0.522**	45	0.449**	57	0.650**
10	0,537**	22	0.534**	34	0.282**	46	0.538**	58	0.718**
11	0,466**	23	0.457**	35	0.594**	47	0.358**	59	0.807**
12	0,259**	24	0.574**	36	0.277**	48	0.607**		

** significant at level (0.01)

* significant at level (0.05)

Table (18) shows that there are statistically significant positive correlation relationships between the scores of the sample members on each item, and the total degree of the scale, all of which are a function at the level of (0.01). Thus, the results of the correlation coefficients are an indicator of the internal consistency of the wisdom scale.

The values of the correlation coefficients between the total scores of each of the six dimensions and the total score were also calculated. Table (19) shows the results of the correlation coefficients between the degree of each dimension and the total score of the wisdom scale.

Table (19) Values of correlation coefficients between the score of each dimension and the overall score of the wisdom scale

Phrase	Correlation coefficient
Self-knowledge	0.752**
Emotion Management	0.650**
Altruism	0.718**
Ability to inspire	0.807**
Judgment	0.776**
Life experience and desire to learn	0.851**

** significant at level (0.01)

* significant at level (0.05)

According to table (19), it is noted that there are statistically significant positive correlations between the degree of each dimension and the total degree of the scale, which is an indicator of the consistency of the scale, which is (wisdom), which indicates the consistency of the scale.

Calculating the validity of the scale of wisdom

The validity of the scale was calculated by following the following methods:

The validity of the arbitrators

The wisdom scale was presented in its initial form to seven arbitrators specialized in the field of educational psychology and mental health to verify its validity and reliability to measure wisdom. Some items were modified based on the amendments of the arbitrators. The researcher calculated the percentage of agreement of the arbitrators on each item of the scale and the percentages of the arbitrators' agreement on the validity of the vocabulary of the scale ranged between (83% - 100%), and the average percentage of Loshi validity of the scale as a whole (0, 85), indicating that the scale has an acceptable level of validity.

Factor Analysis

Some scales were taken to determine the scalability of the scale for exploratory factor analysis, which are the correlation coefficients. Most of them were greater than (0.3), and the absolute value of the correlation matrix determinant is greater than (0.00001), the Kaiser-Mayer-Olekin test (KMO), and the Bartlett s test of phericity are statistically significant.

Through the follow-up of statistics, it was concluded that most of the correlations are greater than (0.3), and that the absolute value of the correlation matrix determinant is equal to (0.001), and for the

Kaiser test for the efficiency of the number of sample members is equal to (0.829) and it is suitable for conducting factor analysis, and the value of the Bertlett test is statistically significant and its value is (6328, 943) as in Table (20).

Table (20) The value of the Kaiser test and the Bertlett test for the wisdom scale

Sample suitability indicators for factorial analysis	
The value of the Kaiser-Mayer-Oaklen coefficient to fit the sample	0.829
Bertlett test value	6328.934
Degree of freedom	1711
Significance level	0.01

Accordingly, a first-order factor analysis was performed by the method of analyzing the basic components of Hotelling to extract the basic factors that make up the scale. The underlying root test was used to extract the factors, with orthogonal rotation by the Varimax method. The saturation test of the items was ≥ 0.3 , while retaining the item whose saturation reaches 0.3 or more.

The results revealed that there are six factors that explain 47.98% of the total variation of wisdom as follows:

1- Self-knowledge:

(23.19%) of the variation is explained by wisdom before rotation, and (12.33%) after rotation, and its latent root value is (7.27). It consisted of (9) items whose saturations ranged from (0.373 to 0.718), and the high score on this factor states that "the student's knowledge of his abilities, potentials, and interests, and the identification of the values and principles that he believes in accurately, his goals well, and his strengths and weaknesses."

2- Emotion management:

(7.98%) of the variation is explained by wisdom before rotation, and (8.72%) after rotation, and the value of its latent root is (5.14). It consists of (9) items whose saturations ranged from (0.372 to 0.622),

and the high score on this factor expresses the student's control over his negative and positive emotions, his feelings in different situations, and the regulation of his emotions in stressful situations.

3- Altruism:

(5.19%) of the variation is explained by wisdom before rotation, and (8.13%) after rotation, and the value of its latent root is (4.79). It consisted of (10) item whose saturations ranged from (0.364 to 0.59), and the high score on this factor states "the student's tendency to take into account the benefit of others, and to act for the benefit and good of others, without waiting for a return."

4- The ability to inspire:

(4.39%) of the variation is explained by wisdom before rotation, and (7.46%) after rotation, and the value of its latent root is (4.40). It consisted of (9) items whose saturations ranged from (0.454 to 0.718), and the high score on this factor expresses the student's ability to positively influence others, be a source of motivation for them, and a source of confidence.

5- Judgment:

(3.82%) of the variation is explained by wisdom before rotation, and (6.73%) after rotation, and the value of its latent root is (3.97). It consisted of (10) items whose saturations ranged from (0.45 to 0.64), and the high score on this factor states that "the student's ability to make the right decisions in different and emergency situations, enjoy insight into things, and the possibility of predicting the situations and behaviors of others."

6- Life experience and the desire to learn:

(3.41%) of the variation is explained by wisdom before rotation, and (4.59%) after rotation, and the value of its latent root is (2.71). It consists of (12) items whose saturations ranged from (0.375 to 0.728), and the high score on this factor expresses "the student's ability to benefit from his experiences in different and new situations, and employ his experiences to find appropriate solutions

to the problems, with his interest in learning, and the desire to see and research, to know everything that is new, strive to learn new skills."

Table (21) shows the saturations of each item on the factors in the wisdom scale

Self-knowledge		Emotion Management		Altruism		Ability to inspire		Judgment		Life experience and desire to learn	
Phrase	Saturation	Phrase	Saturation	Phrase	Saturation	Phrase	Saturation	Phrase	Saturation	Phrase	Saturation
1	0.718	10	0.52	19	0.364	29	0.718	38	0.45	48	0.569
2	0.634	11	0.589	20	0.42	30	0.634	39	0.46	49	0.634
3	0.551	12	0.543	21	0.511	31	0.518	40	0.55	50	0.436
4	0.489	13	0.372	22	0.454	32	0.614	41	0.64	51	0.52
5	0.527	14	0.524	23	0.543	33	0.551	42	0.48	52	0.549
6	0.518	15	0.506	24	0.524	34	0.527	43	0.62	53	0.728
7	0.569	16	0.622	25	0.49	35	0.622	44	0.63	54	0.622
8	0.436	17	0.614	26	0.59	36	0.506	45	0.59	55	0.42
9	0.373	18	0.549	27	0.45	37	0.454	46	0.62	56	0.589
				28	0.52			47	0.52	57	0.375
										58	0.489
										59	0.511

The validity of the scale: The researcher verified the validity of the scale by comparing it with the wisdom scale of Qusai Ajaj Al-Dhiabi (2017), which consists of (64) items. The result of the correlation with the current scale was (0.92), which is a high value indicating the validity of the scale in terms of the chosen test.

Calculation of the stability of the scale of wisdom

The stability of the scale was calculated through the coefficient of alpha Cronbach. The researcher calculated it for the scale as a whole and its values were (0.924), which is an acceptable value and indicates a high stability coefficient. The researcher also calculated the stability coefficient of the scale when deleting the value of the item and the coefficient of stability of the dimensions of the scale as shown in Table (22) and Table (23).

Table (22) Values of the stability coefficients of the wisdom scale when omitting the value of the vocabulary

Self-knowledge		Emotion Management		Altruism		Ability to inspire		Judgment		Life experience and desire to learn	
Phrase	Coefficient of stability	Phrase	Coefficient of stability	Phrase	Coefficient of stability	Phrase	Coefficient of stability	Phrase	Coefficient of stability	Phrase	Coefficient of stability
1	0.818	10	0.639	19	0.734	29	0.707	38	0.679	48	0.780
2	0.806	11	0.615	20	0.752	30	0.686	39	0.658	49	0.801
3	0.807	12	0.677	21	0.741	31	0.718	40	0.710	50	0.783
4	0.828	13	0.647	22	0.733	32	0.699	41	0.671	51	0.797
5	0.864	14	0.672	23	0.743	33	0.687	42	0.682	52	0.788
6	0.827	15	0.622	24	0.761	34	0.724	43	0.681	53	0.778
7	0.811	16	0.674	25	0.743	35	0.680	44	0.715	54	0.781
8	0.819	17	0.595	26	0.751	36	0.729	45	0.689	55	0.782
9	0.817	18	0.675	27	0.769	37	0.669	46	0.714	56	0.802
				28	0.756			47	0.686	57	0.809
										58	0.793
										59	0.804

The coefficients of the scale if the item is deleted are all suitable except for the item number (5) and it was (0.864), which is greater than the value of the stability coefficient after the scale, which was (0.839), so that single must be deleted. The coefficient of stability of the dimensions of the scale was also calculated as in Table (29).

Table (23) Stability coefficients of the dimensions of the wisdom scale

Phrase	Coefficient of stability
Self-knowledge	0.839
Emotion Management	0.677
Altruism	0.774
Ability to inspire	0.726
Judgment	0.715
Life experience and desire to learn	0.807
Total Grade	0.924

Table (23) illustrates that the values of the scale dimensional stability coefficient are high, so the scale has good stability, and can be trusted.

The final form of the scale

The scale in its final form consists of (58) items divided as follows, as in Table (24).

Table (24) Distribution of the items of the scale of wisdom in its final form

Dimensions	phrases	Number
Self-knowledge	1 – 8	8
Emotion Management	9 - 17	9
Altruism	18 - 27	10
Ability to inspire	28 - 36	9
Judgments	37 – 46	10
Life experience and desire to learn	47 - 58	12

How to estimate scale scores?

It is estimated according to the Likert five-point scale, which is: (always, often, sometimes, rarely, never). When correcting the scale, it is converted to degrees (5, 4, 3, 2, 1) respectively for the positive items and vice versa in the negative vocabulary. Thus, the degrees become (1, 2, 3, 4, 5), and the number of items of the scale after verifying the psychometric properties reached (58) items. The scale possesses a total score of (58-290). A high score indicates a high level of wisdom in a university student, while a low score indicates a low level of wisdom among university students.

5. Results

5.1 The results of the first hypothesis

To test the validity of the first hypothesis, which states " There is a statistical variation in the mean levels of tolerance scores among university students, with variation in wisdom levels (high, medium,

low), the method of analysis of single variance was used to reveal the significance of the differences between the average scores of university students in tolerance and its dimensions according to the levels of wisdom (low, medium, high). The following table shows the results.

Table (25) Results of unidirectional variance analysis in tolerance and its dimensions according to wisdom levels (low, medium, high

Dimensions	Contrast source	Sum of squares	Degrees of freedom	Average squares	Value of "f"	Significance level
Self-tolerance	Between groups	31278.127	2	15639.063	422.695	.000
	Inside groups	10988.540	297	36.998		
	Total	42266.667	299			
Tolerance of others	Between groups	17505.672	2	8752.836	438.892	.000
	Inside groups	5923.074	297	19.943		
	Total	23428.747	299			
The scale as a whole	Between groups	94768.450	2	47384.225	575.606	.000
	Inside groups	24449.230	297	82.321		
	Total	119217.680	299			

The results in Table (25) indicate that there are statistically significant differences in tolerance and its dimensions between the arithmetic averages according to the three levels of wisdom (low,

medium, high). Where the value of "P" (575.606), which is statistically significant at the level of significance (0.01). To reveal the source of these differences, the Scheffe test was used for multiple comparisons. Table (16) shows these results.

Table (26) Scheffe values to indicate the differences between the average tolerance scores and its dimensions according to wisdom levels (low, medium, high)

Variables	Groups	Average	Low	Medium	High
Self-tolerance	Low	18.25	-	-11.177 [*]	-24.527 [*]
	Medium	29.43	-	-	-13.350 [*]
	High	42.78	-	-	-
Tolerance of others	Low	19.48	-	-11.862 [*]	-18.787 [*]
	Medium	31.34	-	-	-6.925 [*]
	High	38.27	-	-	-
The scale as a whole	Low	37.73	-	-23.039 [*]	-43.315 [*]
	Medium	60.77	-	-	-20.276 [*]
	High	81.05	-	-	-

* Significant at level (0.05)

In the light of the table above, there is a difference between the average tolerance scores with different levels of wisdom (low, medium, high). There is a statistically significant difference between the average degrees of tolerance and its dimensions according to the different levels of wisdom (low, medium, high) in favor of the average and high level of wisdom with the highest average.

This can be interpreted as follows. The researcher attributes the existence of differences according to the variable of the level of wisdom among students, as wisdom is one of the most important psychological reservoirs and positive forces, as it is one of the variables that contribute to the compatibility of the individual, and his ability to face various pressures. In addition, it contributes to the enjoyment of individuals with some positive characteristics, including: cultural intelligence, psychological happiness, psychological resilience, compatibility, promoting well-being and self-esteem, professional and psychological satisfaction (Nahed Fathi Ahmed, 2018; Faten Farouk Abdel Fattah; Sherry Massad Halim, 2014; Afra Ibrahim Al-Obaidi, 2015; Ahmed Thabet Ramadan; Alaa Saeed Al-Dars, 2017; Barber, et al., 2020 ; Ali Ahmed Tohri, 2020).

The researcher also attributes this result to the importance of tolerance, and its relation to mental and physical health. Moreover, tolerance is an important step to restore fractured relationships, and mutual trust between the two parties to the relationship towards greater harmony. It also contributes to solving many existing problems, and prevents future problems (Michelle McClow et al., 2015: 16). Wisdom is one of the human characteristics that help the individual to solve his problems; and increase the individual's ability to make appropriate decisions (Webster, et al., 2017; Hosni Zakaria Al-Najjar, 2018).

5.2 The results of the second hypothesis

To test the validity of the second hypothesis, which states " There is a statistical variation in the mean levels of psychological well-being scores among university students, with variation in wisdom levels (high, medium, low), the method of analysis of single variance was used to reveal the significance of the differences between the average scores of university students in psychological well-being

and its dimensions according to the levels of wisdom (low, medium, high). The following table shows the results.

Table (27) The results of the unidirectional analysis of variance in psychological well-being and its dimensions according to wisdom levels (low, medium, high)

Dimensions	Contrast source	Sum of squares	Degrees of freedom	Average squares	Value "F"	Significance level
Self-referee	Between groups	15251.713	2	7625.856	452.979	.000
	Inside groups	4999.967	297	16.835		
	Total	20251.680	299			
Mastery of the environment	Between groups	1501.149	2	750.574	408.513	.000
	Inside groups	545.688	297	1.837		
	Total	2046.837	299			
Personal growth	Between groups	10219.087	2	5109.543	486.143	.000
	Inside groups	3121.580	297	10.510		
	Total	13340.667	299			
Positive relationship	Between	10028.659	2	5014.329	435.67	.000

s	groups				7	
	Inside groups	3418.258	297	11.509		
	Total	13446.917	299			
Purpose of life	Between groups	14327.984	2	7163.992	478.313	.000
	Inside groups	4433.374	296	14.978		
	Total	18761.358	298			
Self-acceptance	Between groups	4195.887	2	2097.944	348.511	.000
	Inside groups	1787.860	297	6.020		
	Total	5983.747	299			
The scale as a whole	Between groups	298862.893	2	149431.446	518.472	.000
	Inside groups	85599.837	297	288.215		
	Total	384462.730	299			

The results in Table (28) indicate that there are statistically significant differences in psychological well-being and its dimensions between the arithmetic averages according to the three levels of wisdom (low, medium, high), where the value of "P" (518.472), which is statistically significant at the level of

significance (0.01). To detect the source of these differences, the Scheffe test was used for multiple comparisons and Table (16) shows these results.

Table (29) Scheffe values to indicate the differences between the average degrees of psychological well-being and its dimensions according to the levels of wisdom (low, medium, high)

Variables	Groups	Average	Low	Medium	High
Self-referee	Low	16.09	-	-8.932 [*]	-17.331 [*]
	Medium	25.03	-	-	-8.399 [*]
	High	33.42	-	-	-
Mastery of the environment	Low	2.28	-	-2.404 [*]	-5.364 [*]
	Medium	4.68	-	-	-2.960 [*]
	High	7.64	-	-	-
Personal growth	Low	6.07	-	-7.224 [*]	-14.173 [*]
	Medium	13.29	-	-	-6.949 [*]
	High	20.24	-	-	-
Positive relationships	Low	6.27	-	-7.252 [*]	-14.055 [*]
	Medium	13.52	-	-	-6.803 [*]
	High	20.32	-	-	-
Purpose of life	Low	7.43	-	-8.713 [*]	-16.829 [*]
	Medium	16.14	-	-	-8.116 [*]
	High	24.26	-	-	-
Self-acceptance	Low	6.13	-	-5.057 [*]	-9.141 [*]

	Medium	11.19	-	-	-4.084 [*]
	High	15.27	-	-	-
The scale as a whole	Low	44.27	-	-39.581 [*]	-76.726 [*]
	Medium	83.85	-	-	-37.145 [*]
	High	120.99	-	-	-

* Significant at level (0.05)

The table above states that there is a statistically significant difference between the average degrees of psychological well-being and its dimensions according to the different levels of wisdom (low, medium, high) in favor of the average and high level of wisdom with the highest average.

This can be explained as follows. The researcher attributes these differences to the fact that the concept of psychological well-being is one of the most important axes that positive psychology seeks to improve, due to the impact of this concept on many psychological, functional and social aspects of individuals. Sivapragasam and Raya (2014) mentioned many positive effects resulting from owning psychological well-being, including: reducing stress, possessing a vital positive mood, commitment to perform tasks, sense of happiness, satisfaction with life, sense of security, independence, positive relationships with others, having a worthwhile task, feeling and accepting self-importance, having high morals, physical health and physical activity, preserving the environment, promoting the economy and achieving development.

Staudinger (2016: 75) defined wisdom as "a complex phenomenon used to describe the idealism of human and personal insight. Personal wisdom is described as knowledge and judgment about one's life, while general wisdom is described as knowledge and judgment on fundamental issues in the lives of others."

5.3 The results of the third hypothesis

To test the validity of the third hypothesis, which states: "There is a statistically significant correlation between tolerance and psychological well-being in the study sample, the researcher calculated the correlation coefficient between tolerance and psychological well-being in the study sample, which is determined by the following table:

Table (30) Correlation coefficient between tolerance and psychological well-being scale among the study sample n = (300)

Psychological well-being / tolerance	Self-tolerance	Tolerance of others	Total Grade
Self-referee	.924**	.892**	.946**
Mastery of the environment	.925**	.871**	.937**
Personal growth	.932**	.897**	.953**
Mastery of the environment	.935**	.889**	.951**
Purpose of life	.933**	.898**	.954**
Self-acceptance	.906**	.875**	.927**
The scale as a whole	.947**	.907**	.966**

** significant at level (0.01)

It is evident from the previous table that there is a statistically significant positive relationship between tolerance and its dimensions and psychological well-being and its dimensions at the level of significance 0.01. The values of the correlation coefficients ranged between (0.871-0.966), which are positive and high correlation values. It shows the strength of the relationship between tolerance and its dimensions and psychological well-being and its dimensions.

This result can be explained in light of the findings of studies of (Brannan & Diener, 2016; Mohammed Salim Al-Zaboun; Fawaz Nayel Al-Sulaihat, 2017; Asmaa Farouk Afifi, 2019; Jihan Shafiq Khaled, 2019; Hussein Ahmed Ahmed, 2019; Rasha Adel Ibrahim, 2019) indicating that tolerance is of great importance. Tolerant people have the following positive qualities such as: mental health, psychological adjustment, self-awareness, psychological security, interpersonal intelligence, orientation towards life, life satisfaction, acceptance, and mastery.

Tolerance is associated with happiness, good psychological life, psychological bliss, psychological well-being, psychological safety, and quality of life for students (Bushra Ismail Arnaout; Fink Amjad Fouad, 2012; Mervat Azmi Abdel Gawad, 2015; Tamer Shawky Ibrahim, 2016; Amani Adel Ali, 2019; Halima Ibrahim Al-Failakawi, 2019; Shadia Abdel Halim Metwally, 2019; Guchait, et al., 2019; Wlandari & Megawati, 2019).

5.4 The results of the fourth hypothesis

To test the validity of the fourth hypothesis, which states: "there is a statistically significant correlation between tolerance and wisdom in the study sample", the researcher calculated the correlation coefficient between tolerance and wisdom in the study sample, which is determined by the following table:

Table (31) Correlation coefficient between tolerance and wisdom scale among the study sample n = (300)

Tolerance Wisdom	Self-tolerance	Tolerance of others	Total Grade
Self-knowledge	.914**	.887**	.938**
Emotion Management	.851**	.901**	.906**
Altruism	.922**	.856**	.928**
Ability to inspire	.854**	.862**	.891**
judgments	.914**	.843**	.918**
Life experience and desire to learn	.889**	.922**	.938**
The scale as a whole	.939**	.926**	.969**

** significant at level (0.01)

According to the previous table, there is a statistically significant positive relationship between tolerance and its dimensions and wisdom and its dimensions at the level of significance 0.01. The values of the correlation coefficients ranged between (0.843-0.969), which are positive and high correlation values. It shows the strength of the relationship between tolerance and its dimensions and wisdom and its dimensions.

Many studies agreed with the study`s results that there is a relationship between the variable of wisdom and some other variables such as tolerance (Maha Ali Yahya, Fatima Ismail, Doaa Wagdy, 2014; Milburn, 2015; Muhanna Khalaf Al-Amiriyin; Ahmed Abdullah Al-Tarawneh, 2017). However, tolerant people are calmer, more balanced, clearer, and able to make their own decisions wisely and rationally.

5.5 The results of fifth hypothesis

To test the validity of the fifth hypothesis, which states that "there is a statistically significant correlation between psychological well-being and wisdom in the study sample", the researcher calculated the correlation coefficient between tolerance and psychological well-being in the study sample, which is determined by the following table:

Table (32) Correlation coefficient between the scale of tolerance and psychological well-being among the study sample n = (300)

Wisdom Psychological well-being	Self-knowledge	Emotion Management	Altruism	Ability to inspire	judgments	Life experience and desire to learn	Total Grade
Self-referee	.945**	.877**	.928**	.871**	.926**	.926**	.962**
Mastery of the environment	.927**	.855**	.922**	.849**	.927**	.908**	.947**
Personal growth	.938**	.887**	.927**	.870**	.930**	.931**	.964**
Mastery of the environment	.933**	.878**	.931**	.868**	.924**	.924**	.959**
Purpose of life	.944**	.893**	.929**	.885**	.928**	.938**	.969**
Self-acceptance	.908**	.862**	.898**	.852**	.885**	.912**	.935**
The scale as a whole	.956**	.897**	.943**	.887**	.940**	.945**	.979**

** significant at level (0.01)

The table shows a statistically significant positive relationship between wisdom and its dimensions and psychological well-being and its dimensions at the level of significance 0.01. The values of the correlation coefficients ranged between (0.862-0.979), which are positive and high correlation values. This shows the strength of the

relationship between wisdom and its dimensions and psychological well-being and its dimensions.

This result supports the acceptance of the fifth hypothesis in the current research, which states that "there is a statistically significant correlation between psychological well-being and wisdom in the study sample."

It is likely that wisdom has to do with many positive psychosocial characteristics in young people such as self-safety, values and life attitudes, self-integration, self-strengthening values, in addition to a sense of personal cohesion, and high levels of metacognitive thinking (Webster, 2019; Mohammed Khalifa Al-Sharida, 2015). Fatima Mahmoud Al-Zayat (2020) referred to the importance of wisdom skills in developing various problem-solving skills among university students. Alaa El-Din Abdelhamid Ayoub (2016: 207) as "an individual's deep understanding of himself and others, active use of knowledge, the ability to learn from ideas and the environment, with perspicacity, insight, and judgment."

6. Recommendations and Suggestions for Future Research

Some recommendations can be made as follows:

1. Providing counseling programs and training courses for undergraduate students to develop tolerance, wisdom, and psychological well-being.
2. Holding educational seminars for parents, teachers and students on the importance of tolerance, wisdom and psychological well-being, and how to develop it among different groups of society.
3. Developing education curricula is not limited to accumulating knowledge, but providing students with skills and experiences that increase their level of wisdom, which helps to achieve tolerance and psychological well-being for them.



The study also suggests the following research:

1. The effectiveness of a cognitive-behavioral program to develop wisdom among a sample of university students.
2. Tolerance and its relationship to mental alertness among university students.
3. The effectiveness of a counseling program using wisdom-based thinking in reducing the severity of aggressive behavior among a sample of university students.
4. Wisdom and its relationship to negative emotional sensitivity among a sample of university students.
5. A comparative study of gifted and ordinary university students in both psychological bliss and quality of life.
6. Psychological structure, characteristics, and personality dynamics of those with a high level of wisdom "a psychometric - clinical study".



References

- Ababneh, Muhammad & Rafi al-Zaghloul. (2021). Biographical memory and its relationship to psychological well-being among Yarmouk University students, *Al-Quds Open University Journal for Research and Psychological and Psychological Studies*, 12(37), 36-18.
- Abdel Fattah, Faten Farouk & Sherry Massad Halim. (2014). Psychological resilience among university students and its relationship to both wisdom and self-efficacy. *Journal of the Faculty of Education*, Port Said University, 15, 90-134.
- Abdel Samie, Amna Mohamed. (2018). The upward perception of tolerance and wisdom for late adolescence and middle adulthood. *Unpublished Master's Thesis*, Faculty of Arts, Benha University.
- Abdel-Gawad, Mervat Azmi. (2015). Tolerance and optimism as a predictor of good psychological life among a sample of adolescents, *Journal of the Faculty of Education*, Alexandria University, 25(5), 363-423.
- Abu Al-Ghazaleh, Samira. (2018). A counseling program to improve communication skills and deal with work stress and its impact on the degree of job commitment and negative well-being among workers in the Sultanate of Oman, *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 26(3), 75-344.
- Afifi, Asma Farouk. (2019). Tolerance and its relationship to self-awareness and psychological security among university students. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Studies*, 105, 163-213.
- Ahmed, Asim. (2020). Profiles of emotional self-efficacy and its relationship to psychological well-being among students of the General Diploma in Education. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, 28(2), 50-1.
- Ahmed, Hussein Ahmed. (2019) The effectiveness of a selective integrative program in promoting the values of tolerance to improve the orientation towards life among a sample of Syrian university youth. *Third Annual International Conference for the Graduate Studies and Research Sector: Integrative Research. Development Road*, Faculty of Girls for Arts, Science and Education - Ain Shams University Volume 2, 910-933
- Ahmed, Nahed Fathy. (2018). Cultural intelligence and its relationship to wisdom and the five major factors of personality: an Egyptian version of the cultural intelligence scale. *Journal of Arab Studies in Psychology*, 11(3), 419-467.
- Ahmed, Salha & Mohammed Khalifa Shraideh. (2020). The impact of a training program based on reflective thinking on the development of wisdom



among female students of King Khalid University in Abha. *Islamic University Journal of Educational and Psychological Studies*, 28(3), 427-449.

- Al-Ajmi, Rashid. (2021). Emotional regulation and academic competence as a predictive indicator of psychological well-being among a sample of secondary school students in Ahmadi Governorate, State of Kuwait. *Nordic Academy of Science and Scientific Research*, 3(11), 168-141.
- Al-Anzi, Maryam Nazzal. (2020). Tolerance and ambition among middle-aged girls according to the variables of marriage and work in Qurayyat Governorate, a comparative study *Journal of Arts, Literature, Humanities and Sociology*, 49, 189-207.
- Al-Buqami, Noura Saad. (2017). Tolerance and revenge and their relationship to personality traits among a sample of university students. *Islamic University Journal of Educational and Psychological Studies*, 25(3), 190-207 .
- Al-Dhiabi, Qusai Ajaj. (2017). Wisdom-based thinking among graduate students in the College of Education. *Journal of the Professor*, 220(1), 465-512.
- Al-Enezi, Abdullah Abdulhadi. (2020). Personal wisdom and its relationship to psychological tolerance among students of Al-Jouf University in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, *Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences*, 21(2), 465-0501
- Al-Failakawi, Halima Ibrahim. (2019). Tolerance and gratitude between spouses and its relationship to the sense of psychological well-being of the family. *Journal of Educational Sciences*, Faculty of Graduate Studies for Education, Cairo University, 27(1), 1-48
- Al-Hamalawy, Manal. (2019). Stress coping methods as a mediating variable between psychological capital and teachers' psychological well-being, *Journal of Psychological Studies*, 29(2), 07-217.
- Al-Hosary, Kamel Desouki. (2017). The level of tolerance among students of the Faculty of Education and its relationship to some variables *International Conference of the Educational Association for Social Studies: Tolerance and Acceptance of the Other*, Educational Association for Social Studies in cooperation with Ain Shams University, 1, 139-157
- Ali, Amani Adel. (2019). The structural model of the relationships between hope, tolerance and psychological bliss Graduate Students at the Faculty of Education, *Egyptian Journal of Psychological Studies*, 29(102), 25-75



-
- Al-Khatib, Waleed Hassan. (2017). Causal relationships between the five factors of personality, wisdom and psychological bliss among university students. *Journal of the Faculty of Education in Psychological Sciences*, Faculty of Education, Ain Shams University, 41, 282-321.
 - Al-Marshoud, Jawhara Saleh. (2020). The relative contribution of the dimensions of wisdom in predicting mental alertness and life effectiveness skills among female students of Qassim University. *Journal of King Abdulaziz University Arts and Humanities*, 28(9), 1-45.
 - Al-Mousawi, Noman Mohammed. (2019). Building a tool to measure the attitude towards tolerance among kindergarten teachers in the light of the Rush model. *Journal of Arab Childhood*, Kuwait Society for the Advancement of Arab Childhood, 21(18), 31-54.
 - Al-Najjar, Hosni Zakaria. (2018). The relative contribution of decision-making styles, cognitive flexibility and social self-efficacy in predicting wisdom among university students, *Journal of the Faculty of Education*, 29 (113), 537
 - Al-Nawaisa, Fatima Abdul Rahim. (2020). Tolerance and its relationship to major personality factors among regular court auditors in Karak Governorate. *Journal of Education*, Al-Azhar University, 186(2), 151-177.
 - Al-Nimrat, Amal. (2020). Humor patterns and their relationship to psychological well-being and body image among university students, *unpublished master's thesis*, Yarmouk University, Faculty of Education.
 - Al-Obaidi, Afra Ibrahim. (2015). Wisdom and its relationship to psychological happiness among a sample of students of the University of Baghdad. *Arab Journal for the Development of Excellence*, 6(10), 181-201.
 - Al-Omari, Nadia Mohammed. (2019). Social compatibility and its relationship to tolerance and self-culture among single mothers. *Islamic University Journal of Educational and Psychological Studies*, 27(2), 329-354.
 - Al-Otaibi, Khalid Nahis. (2017). The structural model of the relationship between burnout, personal wisdom and psychological happiness among a sample of teachers. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 45(2), 197-222.
 - Al-Rashidi, Anwar. (2021). The degree to which the leaders of public schools in Riyadh practice toxic leadership and feed it with the level of psychological well-being of teachers from their point of view, *Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences*, 5(6), 18-1.
-



-
- Al-Rawi, Maysoon Zahir. (2018). Measuring Wisdom among Students of the Counseling Department at the College of Basic Education, *Journal of Arts, Literature, Humanities and Sociology*, Emirates College of Educational Sciences, 28, 175-189.
 - Al-Saoub, Ismail Mahmoud. (2018). The factor construction of the scale of wisdom according to the theory of measurement of classicism. *Unpublished Master's Thesis*, Deanship of Graduate Studies, Mutah University.
 - Al-Shawawra, Dareen Abdullah. (2017). Successful intelligence and its relationship to wisdom and religiosity among students of Mutah University. *Unpublished Master's Thesis*, Deanship of Graduate Studies, Mutah University.
 - Al-Sulaihat, Fawaz Nayel. (2017). Psychological adjustment and its relationship to tolerance among Jordanian university students, *Journal of Studies of the University of Amar Teleji Laghouat*, Algeria, 57, 92-105.
 - Al-Tarawneh, Ahmed Abdullah. (2017). Tolerance and its impact on decision-making among secondary school principals in Karak Governorate. *Unpublished Master's Thesis*, Faculty of Graduate Studies, Mutah University.
 - Al-Zayat, Fatima Mahmoud. (2020). The effectiveness of a program based on wisdom skills to develop the skill of solving classroom problems among student teachers, *Educational Journal*, Sohag University, 78, 2209-2263 .
 - American Psychological Association. (2015). *APA dictionary of psychology*, 2ed, American Psychological Association.
 - Ardel, M. (2003). *Empirical assessment of a three-dimensional wisdom scale*. *Research on Aging*, 25 (3), 275 - 324.
 - Ardel, M. (2004). Wisdom as expert knowledge system: A critical review of a contemporary operationalization of an ancient concept. *Human Development*, 47, 257 - 285.
 - Ardel, M. (2016). Disentangling the relations between wisdom and different types of well- being in old age: Findings from a short -term longitudinal study. *Journal Happiness Stud*, 17, 1963 - 1984.
 - Arnout, Bcharre Ismail & Fink Amjad Fouad. (2012). Tolerance and Happiness: A Cross-Cultural Study on University Students in Egypt and Iraq, *Egyptian Journal of Psychological Studies*, 22(76), 175-221.
 - Aspenwall, Stodinger. (2016). *The psychology of human forces*. Translated by Safaa Al-Aleft-handed. 2nd Floor, Cairo: Supreme Council of Culture.



-
- Augusto-Landa, J. M., Martos, M. P. & López-Zafra, E. (2020). Emotional intelligence and personality traits as predictors of psychological well-being in Spanish undergraduates. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 38 (6), 783-793
 - Ayoub, Alaa Eldin Abdel Hamid. (2016). The effect of a training program to develop wisdom-based thinking in improving coping strategies to solve stressful problems among university students. *Egyptian Journal of Psychological Studies*, 77(22), 201-240
 - Bakhit, Hussain Mohammad. (2020). Wisdom and Self-Awareness among South Valley University Faculty: A Comparative Predictive Study, *Egyptian Journal of Psychological Studies*, 30(107), 123-176.
 - Barber, S., Kireeva, D., Seliger, J. & Jayawickreme, E. (2020). *Wisdom once gained is not easily lost: Implicit Theories About Wisdom and Age-related cognitive declines*. *Innovation in Aging*, 4(2), 1 - 11.
 - Belasheva, I. & Petrova, N., (2016). Psychological stability of a personality and capability of tolerant interaction as diverse manifestations of tolerance. *International Journal of Environmental & Science Education*, 11(10), 3367-3384.
 - Brannan, D. & Diener, R. (2016). *The science of forgiveness: Examining the influence of forgiveness on mental health*. *Encyclopedia of Mental Health*, 2, 253 - 256.
 - Choucair, Zeinab Mahmoud & Tahia Mohamed Abdel Aal. (2013). Contributions of unemployment to achieving psychological security and tolerance among graduate students, "A Descriptive and Predictive Study", *Journal of Arab Studies in Education and Psychology*, 43(1), 71-103.
 - Choucair, Zeinab. (2010). *Tolerance Diagnostic Scale (Adolescence - Medium of Adulthood - Middle Age)*, Cairo: Anglo-Egyptian Library.
 - Dahim, Abdulrahman Dhafer. (2019). Wisdom-based thinking as a predictor of the five major personality factors of gifted students at the secondary level in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, *Journal of Special Education and Rehabilitation*, 8(28), 77-113.
 - Diener, E., Sub, E., Lucas, R. & Smith, I. (1999). *Subjective well-being: Three decades of progress*, *Psychological Bulletin*, 125 (2), 276- 302
 - Glück, J., Bluck, S. & McAdams, D. (2005). The wisdom of experience: Autobiographical narratives across adulthood. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 29 (3), 197 - 208.



-
- Green, J., Burnette, J., & Davis, J. (2018). *Third-party forgiveness: Not forgiving your close other betrayer*. Society for Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 1 - 12.
 - Greene, J. & Brown, S. (2019). The wisdom development scale: Further validity investigations. *The international journal of aging and human development*, 68 (4), 289 - 320.
 - Guchait, P., Abbott, J., Lee, C., Back, K. & Manoharan, A. (2019). The influence of perceived forgiveness climate on service recovery performance: The mediating effect of psychological safety and organizational fairness. *Journal of hospitality and tourism management*, 40, 94 - 102.
 - Hasnain, N.; Wazid, S. & Hasan, Z. (2019). Optimism, hope, and happiness as correlates of psychological well-being among young adult assamese males and females. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 19(2), 44-51.
 - Hjern, M., Eger, M., Bohman, A. & Connolly, F. (2019). *A new approach to the study of tolerance: conceptualizing and measuring acceptance, respect, and appreciation of difference*. Social indicators research, 147, 897 - 919.
 - Ibrahim, Rasha Adel. (2019). The relative contribution of gratitude and tolerance to predicting life satisfaction among university students. *Journal of Scientific Research in Education*, 20(13), 367-398 .
 - Ibrahim, Tamer Shawky. (2016). Structural modeling of psychological tolerance in relation to gratitude, the five major personality factors, and self-happiness among university students, *Journal of Psychological Counseling*, 46(3), 310-233.
 - Ibrahim, Tamer Shawky. (2017). The Structure of Human Virtues and Moral Forces and their Relationship to Academic Integration among University Students, *Journal of Education, Al-Azhar University*, 169(3), 106-189.
 - Ivan, S., Bjerre, M., Carsten, H., Line, N., Ai, K., Steinar, K., Lee, k. & Vibeke, k. (2019). *Formal volunteer activity and psychological flourishing in Scandinavia: findings from two cross-sectional rounds of the European social survey*. Currents Social, 6(3), 255 - 269.
 - Khaled, Jihan Shafik. (2019). Tolerance and self-esteem as predictors of interpersonal intelligence among a sample of Alexandria University students. *Journal of Arab Studies*, 18(2), 335-396.
 - Lucas, R. E., Diener, E., & Suh, E. (1996). Discriminant validity of well-being measures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71(3), 616–628. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.71.3.616>

-
- Mahmoud, Samah. (2016). Structural modeling of the relationships between wisdom, moral intelligence, personal intelligence, and social intelligence among undergraduate students. *Journal of Arab Studies in Education and Psychology*, 76, 69-109.
 - McClo, Michelle, Kenneth Parguement, & Carl Thorsen. (2015). *Tolerance "theory, research and practice"*. Translation: Abeer Mohamed Anwar, Cairo: National Center for Translation .
 - Mickler, C., & Staudinger, U. (2018). Personal wisdom: validation and age - related differences of a performance measure. *Psychology and Aging journal*, 23(4), 787-799.
 - Milburn, M. (2015). "To forgive is to be sane and realistic": contributions of REBT to the psychology of forgiving. *J Rat-Emo Cognitive - Behav Ther*, 33, 325-340.
 - Morgan, Y. & Luthans, F. (2014). Psychological Capital and Well-being. *Journal of Stress and Health*, 31: 180–188
 - Nowak, M. (2021). The complicated history of einfühlung. *Biannual philosophical journal*, 1, 301 - 362.
 - Omar, Suad Mohamed. (2017). A proposed vision in light of the requirements of smart learning and digital citizenship to develop the values of tolerance among the student teacher in the Department of Philosophy, Faculty of Education, *International Conference of the Educational Association for Social Studies: Tolerance and Acceptance of the Other*, Educational Association for Social Studies in cooperation with Ain Shams University, 1, 479-513.
 - Omran, Khalid Abdullatif. (2017). Social media addiction and its impact on the values of tolerance and acceptance of the other among students of the Faculty of Education, Sohag University from their point of view, *International Conference of the Educational Association for Social Studies: Tolerance and Acceptance of the Other*, Educational Association for Social Studies in cooperation with Ain Shams University, 1, 72 - 108
 - Othman, Wafa Naji, Fatima Ahmed Al-Jassem, & Mousa Mohammed Al-Nabhan. (2018). The Impact of a Training Program on the Development of Wisdom among Gifted Students at the Secondary Stage, *International Journal for the Development of Excellence*, 9(17), 25-50.
 - Paradise, A. & Kernis, M. (2020). Self-esteem and psychological well-being: Implications of fragile self-esteem. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 21 (4), 345– 361



-
- Rainey, C. (2018). *Are individual forgiveness interventions for adult more effective than group interventions? A meta-analysis*. Dissertation Prepared for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education, College of human science, Florida State University.
 - Ramadan, Ahmed Thabet & Alaa Saeed Al-Dars. (2017). Developing Wisdom as an Entry Point to Improve Psychological Resilience among Mentally Outstanding Secondary School Students, *Journal of Special Education*, Zagazig University - Faculty of Disability and Rehabilitation Sciences - Educational, Psychological and Environmental Information Center, 21, 83-170
 - Ruggeri, K., Garzon, E., Maguire, A., Matz, S., & Huppert, F. (2020). *Well-being is more than happiness and life satisfaction: a multidimensional analysis of 21 countries*. Health and Quality of Life Outcomes, 18 (192), 1-16.
 - Ryff, C. (2007). Happiness is ever thing, or is it? Exploration on the meaning of Psychological Well-Being, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57.
 - Ryff, C. D. & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 69(4), 719
 - Ryff, C. D. & Singer, B. H. (2008). Know thyself and become what you are: A eudemonic approach to psychological well-being. *Journal of happiness studies*, 9(1), 13-39
 - Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 57(6), 1069.
 - Seligman, Martin. (2002). True Happiness, translated by Safaa Al-Asir and others, Cairo: Dar Al-Ain.
 - Seligman, Martin. (2005). *True happiness "Use talk in positive psychology to see what you have for a more accomplished life."* Translation: Safaa Al-Asar, Alaa Al-Din Kafafi, Aziza Al-Sayed, Faisal Younis, Fadia Alwan, Suhair Ghobashy, Cairo: Dar Al-Ain Publishing.
 - Shamboulia, Hala Mohammed. (2020). Self-management skills in high and low tolerance adolescents of both sexes: a predictive difference study. *Educational Journal*, Faculty of Education - Sohag University, 74, 525-564.
 - Shraideh, Mohammed Khalifa. (2015). The level of metacognitive thinking and wisdom among a sample of university students and the relationship between them. *Jordanian Journal of Educational Sciences*, 11(4), 403-415.



-
- Sivapragasam, P., Raya, R. (2014). Exploring the Link Between Job Quality and Employee Well-Being. An Empirical Study. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Management Research and Innovation*, 10(4) 267-277
 - Staudinger, U. (2016). *Wisdom*. Encyclopedia of Mental Health, 4, 375 – 381.
 - Staudinger, U. (2018). A Psychology of wisdom: History and recent developments. *Research in Human Development*, 5(2), 107 - 120.
 - Sternberg, R., Kaufman, J., & Roberts, A. (2019). *The relation of creativity to intelligence and wisdom*. Cambridge handbook of creativity (2nd Ed). New York: Cambridge University Press.
 - Suleiman, Ramadan Ashour & Hani Fouad Suleiman. (2020). The Relative Contribution of Gratitude and Forgiveness to Predicting Wisdom among a Sample of University Students, *Journal of Scientific Research in Education*, 21(7), 111-170.
 - Taylor, D. (2018). Wellbeing and Welfare: A Psychosocial Analysis of Being Well and Doing Well Enough. *Journal of Social Policy*, 40, 777- 794.
 - Tohri, Ali Ahmed. (2020). Wisdom in life and its relationship to professional and psychological satisfaction among the school counselor in the schools of the Jazan Education Administration, *Educational and Psychological Studies*, 106, 257-296.
 - UNICEF. (2015). *UNICEF and the Sustainable Development Goals*.
 - Webster, J. (2019). Wisdom and positive psychosocial values in young adulthood. *Journal of adult development*, 17, 70 - 80.
 - Webster, J., Weststrate, N., Ferrari, M., Munroe, M., & Pierce, T. (2017). *Wisdom and meaning in emerging adulthood*. *Emerging Adulthood*, Original Manuscript, 1- 19.
 - Weststrate, N., & Glück, J. (2017). *Wiser but not sadder, blissful but not ignorant: Exploring the co-development of wisdom and well-being over time*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
 - Wulandari, I., & Megawati, F. (2019). *The role of forgiveness on psychological well-being in adolescents: A review*. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 395, 5th ASEAN Conference on Psychology, Counselling, and Humanities, 99-103.
 - Yahya, Maha Ali, Fatima Ismail, & Doaa Wagdy. (2014). The Concept of Intolerance according to Richard Hare: A Contemporary Philosophical Vision. *Journal of Scientific Research in Arts*, 15(1), 185-208.



مجلة كلية التربية . جامعة طنطا
ISSN (Print):- 1110-1237
ISSN (Online):- 2735-3761
<https://mkmgmt.journals.ekb.eg>
المجلد (٨٨) أكتوبر ٢٠٢٢ م



-
- Yassin, Hamdi Mohammed, Hiam Saber Shaheen, & Iman Mustafa. (2018). Friendship and psychological well-being among a sample of university students. *Journal of the Faculty of Education, Benha University*. 25(2), 352-29.
 - Younis, Muhammad. (2016). *Positive Psychology for All*, Cairo: Anglo-Egyptian Library.
 - Zacher, H., & Staudinger, U. (2018). *Wisdom and well-being. Noba Scholar handbook series: Subjective well-being*. Salt Lake City, UT: DEF publishers.