Suggestibility among Intermediate School Students

Reseacher

Meitham Khamees Qasim maythamalgbore2@yahoo.com

Researcher

Prof. Dr. Hamed Qasim Rishan hamed.reshan@uobasrah.edu.iq

Department of Psychological Counseling and Educational Guidance, College of Education for Human Sciences, University of Basrah, Basrah, Iraq

Abstract

The research problem is identified by the following question: What is the level of suggestibility among intermediate school students? The research aimed to identify the level of suggestibility among intermediate school students and the differences in suggestibility between first-grade and third-grade students. To achieve this, the researcher selected a sample of 1,000 students, divided into two groups: 500 students as a sample for constructing the research tool, and 500 students as a sample for the final application. This sample was chosen randomly. The researcher then developed a scale and assessed its psychometric properties (validity, reliability). The final version of the scale consisted of (31) items. The scale was then applied to the individuals in the sample. After analyzing the data using the statistical package SPSS, the results showed the presence of the measured trait among the targeted sample, with first-grade students demonstrating higher suggestibility compared to third-grade students.

Keywords: suggestibility, intermediate school stage

Research Problem: Change is regarded as one of the characteristics of this time, and because of the rapid and successive changes that human life is going through, societies, including our own, are at a critical turning point in their history. This is under the influence of the rapid development surge that has led to a series of economic, psychological, and cultural changes in the lives of individuals within the community. Incorrect openness to other cultures and societies, and what these cultures entail in terms of ideas and behaviors, may be incompatible with the ideas and behaviors observed in our society. This openness, whether through the media, the information network, or direct interaction, may lead to blind imitation, which can result many problems. Those interested in educational and psychological affairs observe that this problem is increasingly growing in size and its danger is becoming evident, extending to the general public and especially students. It reflects the presence of a general readiness or inclination among many individuals to quickly believe in and surrender to the ideas, opinions, orientations, and beliefs of others, without critical thinking and insight into different matters. This is what we call suggestibility. Through suggestibility, individuals acquire the prevailing standards in society, which serve as the reference framework to which they turn from time to time. There are

situational factors that make individuals influence by the judgments of others. This influence does not occur as a result of individual experience alone, but rather as a result of exposure to interaction in a social situation. The suggestibility is a dangerous psychological phenomenon due to its negative effects on individuals and society. It exposes those who possess this suggestibility to severe deviations when temptation is directed towards negative role models, whether they are morally or ethically bad individuals in general. And its spread in a society is a clear indication that this society is intellectually disabled. This issue represents a major catastrophe that hinders the wheel of intellectual progress and the independence of critical thinking. Therefore, the research problem is defined as follows: the presence or absence of suggestibility among intermediate school students.

The Importance of the Research: The importance of research is determined by:

1-**Theoretical Importance**: The researcher will address theoretical concepts related to the main study variable (suggestibility).

2-Applied (practical) Importance: Providing a tool to measure suggestibility that possesses psychometric properties, with reliable procedures and reliance on its results.

Research Objectives: The research aims to identify the following:

1-The level of suggestibility among intermediate school students.

2- The difference in suggestibility between students in the first and third grades of intermediate school.

Limitation of the Study :

The research focuses on intermediate school students in the morning schools (governmental and private) affiliated with the General Directorate of Education in Basra Governorate for the academic years 2021-2022 and 2022-2023.

Terms Identification

First: Suggestibility is defined by Vandenbos (2015) as "the tendency to adopt the ideas, beliefs, positions, or actions of others easily and without criticism" (Vandenbos, 2015, p. 1048).

Second : The procedural definition of suggestibility refers to the individual's response to accepting ideas or actions without scrutiny or examination. It is measured by the overall degree to which the individual exhibits suggestibility in cognitive and behavioral domains.

The Theoretical Frame

The researcher adopted Festinger's perspective (Cognitive Dissonance Theory) to explain suggestibility, emphasizing two important aspects: the first one is the influence of group and social comparison in acquiring and changing behavior. The second one is the cognitive aspect and the role of cognitive dissonance in accepting behaviors and opinions. Comparison occurs through social interaction, which enables individuals to recognize the abilities, values, and ideas of others. Through positive interaction between the individual and the group, the individual can acquire these values and ideas, indicating a sense of belonging to them (Bakr, 2013, pp. 77-78). As Festinger pointed out, it is difficult for a person to hold onto an idea or opinion that significantly differs from the views of others he belongs to. This creates a powerful pressure to change his opinion, as an attempt to reduce dissonance (Festinger, 1962, p. 181-183). Social support has a relation with the role that other people play in shaping our ideas, beliefs, and behaviors and maintaining them through the support we receive from those around us (Schultz, 1983, p. 446). Festinger clarifies that one of the situations that increases cognitive dissonance and triggers behavior is when a person's cognitive aspects do not align with social standards. Therefore, individuals are forced by social pressures to agree to things that do not align with their positions. (Festinger, 1962, p.32).

Research Methodology and Procedures

Firstly: Approach of the Research

The researcher employed the descriptive survey method in the current research procedures in order to reach the results. This method is considered suitable for the nature of the research objective and aims to determine the current status of the phenomenon under study, and then describe it. It relies on studying the phenomenon as it exists in reality and focuses on providing an accurate description of it (Malham, 2002, p. 369).

Secondly: The Population of the Research

The research community consists of intermediate school students in government and private schools attending morning classes in Basra province for the academic year (2022-2023), totaling 84,920 students.

Thirdly: Research Samples:

Two samples were drawn, one for constructing the research measurement tool and the other for the final application. The following is a description of these two samples:

1-Construction sample: To assess the effectiveness of the scale items and their psychometric properties (validity, reliability), the researcher selected a random sample of middle school students in the schools of Basra province for the academic year (2021-2022). The sample size for the survey application was (50) students, and (400) students for the statistical analysis sample (differentiation, internal consistency), in addition to drawing a stability sample of (50) students.

2-Final Application Sample: The final application sample consisting of 500 students for the academic year (2022-2023) has been selected. Thus, the total sample size is 1,000 students, representing 1.17% of the total population, distributed across several categories as shown in Table 1.

Sample	Number
Survey Application	50
Item Discrimination	400
Reliability	50
Final Application	500
Total	1000

Table (1) The distribution of the research sample and the total number

Fourthly: Tool of the Research

In order to achieve the research objectives, it is requested to provide a tool for measuring suggestibility. Therefore, the researcher will follow the following procedures to fulfill these objectives:

The researcher, after reviewing several measures of suggestibility for various samples, did not find a scale that adequately measured this trait in line with the research sample, according to the researcher's knowledge. This prompted him to construct a scientifically and objectively based scale of suggestibility, and subsequently apply it to the sample for the intended purposes. The researcher adopted the definition provided by Vandenbos (2015), which defines suggestibility as "the tendency to adopt the ideas, beliefs, positions, or actions of others easily and uncritically." Based on this definition, the researcher identified two domains for the scale: "cognitive suggestibility " and "behavioral suggestibility." Then, the researcher formulated the scale items.

Psychometric Properties of the Suggestibility Scale

First: Validity: The validity of the tool has been verified by following the following:

1-Content Validity: This type of validity relies on the extent to which the scale represents the various dimensions of the trait being measured, as well as the balance between these dimensions. It is logical for the test content to be valid as long as it includes all the elements of the desired trait to be measured. This type of validity is determined by a group of specialists in the field of the trait being measured by this test (Abdulrahman, 2008, pp. 199-200).

After formulating the initial scenarios for each domain of the scale, by transforming the content and substance of each domain and translating them into behavioral and cognitive statements and situations, the degree of utilization by the respondent of these items or situations is represented, as well as their possession of this characteristic. The researcher presented the scale items to a group of experts and reviewers specialized in psychological counseling, educational guidance, and some experts in the field of psychological measurement from several Iraqi and Arab universities. The total number of experts and reviewers was 17. After transcribing the judges' responses regarding the scale items and subjecting them to statistical analysis, it was found that the validity of the scale items ranged from agreement (16-17) judges. The researcher determined the content validity using the Lawshe equation (Lawshe, 1975), which is designed for this purpose. The researcher presented the test to a group of experts and requested their judgment on the items. Then, the researcher collected their responses and identified the agreements on the validity of the items. Lawshe indicated that as the number of agreements exceeded 50%, the validity of the item increased. The formula for the equation is as follows:

Ne= number of supporters

N= total number of experts

$$_{\rm CVR} = \frac{{\rm ne} - N/2}{{\rm N}/2}$$

Lawshe (1975) made it clear that the minimum acceptable value is 0.62, and according to this equation, all scale items obtained a value exceeding 0.62. This indicates that all scale items are valid (Cohen et al., 1988, p. 127-128) as shown in Table 2.

no	Item number	Ν	Ne	CVR	Accepted value	Decision
1	1,2,4,5,6,7,9,10,11, 12,13,14,15,16,19, 20,21,22,23,24,25, 26,27,28,29,30,32	17	17	1	0,62	Accepted
2	3,8,17,18,31	17	16	0,882	0,62	Accepted

Table (2) Number of items, the supporter and objector experts and CVR value for the items in the suggestibility scale

2- *Face validity*: refers to the clarity of scale instructions and understanding of its statements (Sample Survey).

After completing the procedures for presenting the scale to expert reviewers (content validity), and to ensure the linguistic formulation clarity of the scale items for the respondents, and to measure the time taken to answer them, the scale was administered to a sample of (50) intermediate school students. It was found that all the items were clear and understandable to the students. The researcher found that the time taken to answer the scale items ranged from (8-16) minutes, with an average of (12) minutes.

3- *Construct Validity*: was done by the researcher through following several methods, which are as follows:

- A- The discriminative power of scale items: To verify construct validity, the researcher should determine the discriminant power of the scale items by:
- 1- Arranging the collected data from the responses of a sample of 400 students in descending order, from highest to lowest scores.
- 2- Selecting a proportion of 27% from the questionnaires that obtained the highest scores for the upper group, and also selecting a proportion of 27% from the questionnaires that obtained the lowest scores for the lower group. This is done in order to represent two extreme groups with the largest size, or the maximum possible contrast and differentiation. Naturally, this is based on the fundamentals of psychological measurement, which suggest that the use of the highest and lowest 27% of scores, responses, or questionnaire distributions represents the two extreme groups (Alem, 2000, p. 284).

And accordingly, the total number of forms for both the upper and lower groups reached 216 forms, (108 forms for each group).

Using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), the researcher employed statistical analysis for the independent samples t-test. The calculated p-value was used as an indicator of differentiation between the performance of the higher and lower groups for each item on the scale. By comparing the calculated values with the tabulated value at a degree of freedom (214) and a significance level of (0.05) corresponding to (1.960), all of these values were greater than the tabulated value. This indicates the presence of statistically significant differences between the mean scores of the higher and lower groups, with all of these differences favoring the higher group. However, the item with sequence number (1) had a value of (1.549), which is lower than the mentioned tabulated value. Thus, (31) items maintained their position in the scale due to their discriminatory ability between the extreme groups, while item no (1) was excluded from the scale due to its inability to discriminate between the two groups, as illustrated in Table (3).

Item	ItemUpper GroupLower Group			Significance		
Number	Moon	Std.	Moon Std		Calculate	Level
	Ivitali	Siu. Deviation	Mean	Siu. Deviation	d t Value	0.05
		Deviation		Deviation		
1	2,370	0,768	2,213	0,724	1,549	Not significant
2	2,342	0,810	1,194	0,420	13,065	significant
3	2,148	0,746	1,379	0,575	8,473	significant
4	2,305	0,662	1,944	0,382	4,907	significant
5	2,138	0,754	1,064	0,282	13,854	significant
6	2,148	0,653	1,305	0,462	10,940	significant
7	2,175	0,771	1,240	0,509	10,516	significant
8	2,240	0,695	1,250	0,531	11,762	significant
9	2,194	0,689	1,416	0,495	9,518	significant
10	2,268	0,780	1,370	0,522	9,937	significant
11	2,138	0,802	1,231	0,445	10,275	significant
12	2,138	0,754	1,296	0,516	9,578	significant
13	2,222	0,714	1,379	0,524	9,877	significant
14	2,111	0,701	1,583	0,513	6,307	significant
15	2,240	0,759	1,287	0,493	10,939	significant
16	2,194	0,766	1,416	0,513	8,757	significant
17	2,268	0,718	1,185	0,476	13,060	significant

Table (3)Numbers of scale items, mean values, standard deviations, and the calculated tvalue to explain the differences between the lower and upper groups

18	2,277	0,746	1,638	0,754	6,254	significant
19	2,166	0,648	1,074	0,296	15,923	significant
20	2,324	0,721	1,194	0,501	13,363	significant
21	2,037	0,722	1,083	0,309	12,610	significant
22	2,287	0,785	1,361	0,662	9,363	significant
23	2,259	0,688	1,129	0,364	15,071	significant
24	2,203	0,720	1,055	0,267	15,527	significant
25	2,296	0,645	1,101	0,303	17,409	significant
26	2,148	0,694	1,101	0,333	14,114	significant
27	2,259	0,702	1,277	0,449	12,231	significant
28	2,101	0,796	1,064	0,247	12,922	significant
29	2,120	0,693	1,157	0,413	12,394	significant
30	2,083	0,643	1,074	0,263	15,095	significant
31	2,370	0,649	1,129	0,337	17,609	significant
32	2,305	0,676	1,148	0,356	15,732	significant

Internal Consistency:

To obtain the reliability coefficients for the scale items in their correlation with the total score of the domain, which were derived from the scores of a sample of (400) students, their aggregated data was subjected to statistical analysis using the Pearson correlation coefficient. By comparing the calculated values with the table value at degrees of freedom (398) and a significance level of (0.05), was (0.098), all of these values were statistically significant, indicating the consistency of the scale items (31) with their domain. As shown in Table (4): Table (4) **The Value of the Correlation Coefficient with its Field and Scale**

Item	Field	correlation	The	the	The	Significance
Number		coefficient	calculated t	correlatio	calculated t	Level
		with the	value of the	n	value of the	0.05
		field	correlation	coefficien	correlation	
			coefficient	t with the	coefficient	
				scale	with the	
					scale	
1	Cognitive	0,595	14,769	0,561	13,520	t significant
2	suggestibilit	0,472	10,681	0,404	8,811	significant
3	У	0,442	9,830	0,482	10,975	significant
4		0,626	16,015	0,625	15,973	significant
5		0,548	13,070	0,508	11,766	significant
6		0,578	14,131	0,480	10,916	significant
7		0,589	14,540	0,539	12,766	significant
8		0,533	12,567	0,476	10,798	significant
9		0,524	12,274	0,450	10,053	significant
10		0,569	13,804	0,512	11,891	significant
11		0,557	13,380	0,486	11,094	significant
12		0,544	12,934	0,377	8,120	significant
13		0,466	10,507	0,528	12,403	significant
14		0,576	14,057	0,455	10,193	significant
15		0,527	12,371	0,591	14,616	significant
16		0,651	17,109	0,390	8,450	significant
17		0,439	9,748	0,541	12,833	significant
18		0,562	13,555	0,614	15,519	significant
19		0,662	17,621	0,568	13,768	significant
20		0,593	14,692	0,444	9,886	significant
21		0,436	9,665	0,600	14,962	significant
22		0,602	15,041	0,670	18,005	significant
23	Behavioral	0,720	20,698	0,652	17,155	significant
24	Suggestibilit	0,695	19,284	0,594	14,731	significant
25	У	0,643	16,749	0,511	11,860	significant
26		0,558	13,415	0,632	16,270	significant
27		0,685	18,758	0,567	13,732	significant
28		0,631	16,227	0,654	17,247	significant
29		0,696	19,338	0,647	16,928	significant
30		0,684	18,706	0,645	16,839	significant
31		0,684	18,706	0,636	16,442	significant

Secondly: Reliability

Stability refers to the consistency of the scale's measurements in regularly measuring what is supposed to be measured. (Maloney & Ward, 1980:60)

According to Alaam (2017), the concept of test score stability refers to its freedom from non-systematic errors that affect measurement. It means the extent to which the test measures the true value of the characteristic it aims to measure. Test scores are considered reliable if the test measures a specific trait consistently under varying conditions that may lead to measurement errors. Reliability, in this sense, refers to the consistency or accuracy of the measurement (Alaam, 2017, p. 139).

To calculate the reliability coefficient of the research tool, the researcher employed the following methods

1-Test-Retest Method:

It is one of the most reliable methods that involves administering the test twice to the same group of respondents, with a time interval between the two tests, and then calculating the correlation coefficient between the them. The reliability of the test and its retest is referred to as test-retest reliability. If the correlation coefficient is (1), there will be complete reliability, indicating that the respondents obtained exactly the same result in both tests. This rarely happens (except by chance) in psychological or educational settings. However, if the correlation coefficient between the tests is (0), the test has no reliability at all. Whatever result was obtained in the first time has no relationship with the result in the second time, and this also rarely happens. Generally, the correlation coefficient is usually bounded between (0, 1), and the higher it is, the better (Rust & Golombok, 2009, p71-72). To verify the stability of the respondents' answers on the suggestibility scale across different application periods, the researcher applied the scale to a reliability sample consisting of 50 students. Then, the test was reapplied after two weeks from the initial application. After analyzing and statistically processing the data of the both applying time by using the Pearson correlation coefficient, the calculated value (r) was (0.937). When comparing these values to the tabulated value which is (0.340), at degrees of freedom (48) and a significance level of (0.05), it was found that the calculated correlation coefficients are greater than the tabulated value. To determine the level of significance of the correlation coefficient value, the researcher found the critical value of the correlation coefficient at a degree of freedom of 48 and a significance level of 0.5. The calculated value was 18.583, and when compared to the tabulated value (2.011) for a two-tailed test, it was found that the calculated value is greater than the tabulated value. This indicates the presence of a statistically significant correlation between the results of the two tests.

2- Cronbach Alpha Reliability:

Using the Cronbach's alpha method to analyze the data from the second application of the reliability sample, which consisted of 50 students, the reliability coefficient for the measure was found to be (0.828). Based on the agreement among experts in the field of educational and psychological measurement, criteria indicate that a reliability coefficient:

- If it is greater than 0.75 is considered high.
- Reliability coefficients ranging between (0.50-0.75) are considered acceptable.
- Reliability coefficients less than (0.49) are considered rejected. (Abdul-Hadi, 2001, p. 388)

Therefore, the calculated reliability coefficient of the scale is higher compared to the acceptable values. Consequently, the scale exhibits good reliability that can be relied upon, and its results can be trusted.

Statistical Indicators for the Suggestibility

The statistical indicators of the suggestibility scale demonstrate consistency with the statistical indicators of a normal distribution, as the means, medians, and modes are somewhat close to each other. Additionally, the convolution (Skewness) degree (-0.554) is close to zero, indicating a very slight right-convolution (Skewness) in the distribution.

As for the value of kurtosis (0.657-), which is less than 3, this indicates that the distribution is kurtosis, suggesting that the selected sample represents the underlying population accurately. Therefore, the results of the measurement can be relied upon, and the findings of the research can be generalized based on this sample. There are several indicators through which results can be compared, thus confirming their safety and accuracy. This safety and accuracy indicate good alignment, as shown in Table (5).

....

-

1

INO.	Index name	value of inde	X	Degree of		
		Before	After	•		
		modification	mounication			
1	The ratio between the	1,853	1,679	Less than (5)		
	values of (x^2) and (dr) .					
2	The square root of the	0,046	0,041	Less than		
	average discrepancy			(0,08-0)		
	(RMSEA).					
3	Comparative Fit Index	0,897	0,919	(0-1)		
	(CFI).					
4	Goodness-of-Fit Index	0.880	0,893	(0-1)		
	(GFI).					
5	Adjusted Goodness-of-	0,863	0,876	(0-1)		
	Fit Index (AGFI).					
6	Tucker-Lewis Index	0,890	0,912	(0-1)		
	(TLI).					
7	Normed Fit Index (NFI).	0,803	0,822	(0-1)		
8	Root Mean Square	0,26	0,25	(0-1)		
	Residual (RMR).					

Table (5) Indexes and values of matching quality before modification and after modification, and the degree of compliance

D

C

TT 1

C · 1

(Teague, 2012, pp. 243-258)

The Final Form of the Scale:

After a series of procedures followed by the researcher to prepare the scale, the scale has become, in its final form, composed of (31) items distributed across two domains. The first domain is cognitive suggestibility, consisting of (15) items, and the second domain is behavioral suggestibility, consisting of (16) items. Each item corresponds to three situations indicating the suggestibility, which are rated on a scale of (3) degrees. A neutral situation is rated (2) degrees, and a situation indicating the opposite of suggestibility is rated (1) degree. The researcher made these situations in a random order, varying from item to item, with an assumed mean of 62. Through the scientific procedures of validity and reliability followed by the researcher in developing this scale, and the statistical indicators that emerged, it indicates that the scale possesses a quality that can be relied upon in measuring the specific characteristic it is intended to measure.

Presenting the Results and Interpretation:

1. Identifying the level of suggestibility among intermediate school students

To achieve this goal, the researcher applied the suggestibility scale on a research sample consisting of 500 students. After analyzing the data using the statistical package SPSS, the mean value of the scale was found to be (64.34), with a standard deviation of (10.97). In order to determine the quality of the differences and their significance level between the calculated sample mean and the hypothetical mean of the scale, the researcher employed statistical treatment using a one-sample t-test. The calculated t-value was (2.731) and comparing this value to the tabulated value at a degree of freedom of 499 and a significance level of 0.01, which is (2.576) for a two tails test, so it can be observed that the calculated value is greater than the tabulated value. This indicates the presence of statistically significant differences between the sample mean and the hypothetical mean, favoring the sample mean. This means that they possess the measured attribute. This is also illustrated in Table 6.

Table (6) The mean, standard deviation, median, t- value, and significance of differences on the suggestibility scale within the total research sample

The scale	Sampl	mean	standard	Hypothetical	Т	t-	Level of
	e size		deviation	mean	calculated	table	significance
					value	value	differences
suggestibility scale	500	64,3 4	10,97	62	2,731	2.57 6	Significant differences at level 0.01

The researcher attributes this result to the stage of adolescence and the mysterious situations that teenagers faced while they are in the process of forming their personalities. They are greatly influenced by their peers, as confirmed by literature on the role of age in suggestibility. As one's age increases, their suggestibility decreases. Additionally, Festinger pointed out the influence of social comparison and group dynamics in shaping and changing behavior and accepting ideas. School students observe their friends and peers engaging in certain behaviors and adopting specific ideas, leading them to lean towards adopting those as well. They are also influenced by what is presented on social media and the models they see, prompting them to imitate or adopt the ideas of others in order to reduce cognitive dissonance arising from differences in behavior or adopted ideas from others. This requires them to abandon their own behaviors and ideas. This result agreed with previous studies that confirmed the presence of

suggestibility among intermediate school students, such as the study by Abdulrahman (2014), the study by Raji'a (2015), the study by Al-Arkwazi (2017), the study by Abarrah (2018), the study by Mohammed (2019), the study by Askar (2020), the study by Ammar (2022), and the study by Agarwal and Pandean (1987)."

2-The Difference in Suggestibility between First Grade Intermediate Students and Third Grade Intermediate Students:

In order to achieve this goal and to identify the differences between students in the first and third grades of intermediate school on the suggestibility scale, the researcher sought to verify the validity of the following question: Are there statistically significant differences in the mean scores of students in the first and third grades of intermediate school on suggestibility scale? (Agarwal & Pandean, 1987)

In light of the stage variable (first-third), the average of each stage was respectively (62.074, 66.69), with standard deviations of (11.528, 9.794) respectively. To determine the significance of the differences between them, the researcher utilized an independent samples t-test. The obtained t-value was (4,824). By comparing the calculated value with the tabulated value at degrees of freedom (498) and a significance level of (0.01) for a two-tailed test, which is (2.576), we observe that the calculated value is larger than the tabulated value. This indicates the presence of statistically significant differences between the students in the first grade and the students in the third grade. Based on the mean of the two samples, it is evident that the mean value of students in the first grade is higher than that of students in the third grade. This indicates the third grade. As shown in Table (7):

Table (7) The values of the means, standard deviations, calculated t values, t table values,
and the level of significance of differences between students in the first grade and students
in the third grade in terms of suggestibility scale.

First into	ermediate	class Third intermediate class			T. value	T table value	Level of significance	
sample	Mean	Std.	sample	Mean	Std.			Significant at
250	66.69	9.794	250	62.074	11.528	4.824	2.576	0.01

The researcher found the result that students in the intermediate school stage have a higher level of suggestibility, as indicated by the literature, such a result suggests that there is a kind of an inverse relationship between age and suggestibility. In other words, the older they get, the less suggestibility they have. Furthermore, third-grade students are more mature and experienced compared to first-grade students, and that was the real reason that third stage students have a lower level of suggestibility than the first-grade students. Conclusions: The researcher has reached a set of conclusions, which are as follows:

1-Students in intermediate schools have a level of suggestibility, making them vulnerable to being drawn into extremist or illogical opinions and ideas.

2-Students in the first grade of intermediate school have a higher level of suggestibility compared to students in the third grade of intermediate school.

Recommendations: Based on the results of this research, the researcher recommends the following:

1-It is necessary for the educational counselors to conduct regular and ongoing screening for students who show suggestibility, to identify them, and provide assistance to them before they adopt ideas and behaviors that do not align with the values and principles of society. Thus, counseling does its right work, preventive and developmental, rather than being forced to treat.

2-Educational counselors, social researchers, and community police organize seminars and workshops for parents about the adolescent stage and its dangers. They emphasize that it is a phase where it is difficult to predict the thoughts and behaviors of teenagers. If parents do not find the appropriate way to deal with and guide them towards the right path, teenagers may take bad friends as role models and acquire information from them and reach incorrect conclusions upon which they build their lives.

3-School administrations and officials in the Ministry of Education, Ministry of Culture, and Ministry of Information are concerned about the ideas and behaviors that are being discussed among students in schools and those being presented in the media, which contradict our literary and religious heritage and affect negatively on the ethics of our children.

Suggestions: The researcher proposed some suggestions to the researchers, which are as follows:

1-Conducting studies to investigate the variable of suggestibility among a sample of intermediate school female students.

2. Conducting studies to investigate this research variable on different samples, such as preparatory school students or university students.

- 3- Conduct a survey study to assess the level of suggestibility among students in Iraq.
- 4- Conduct comparative studies between Arab students and students from other nationalities to examine their suggestibility.

Arabic References

Evaluation. 6th ed. Cairo, Egypt: Dar Al fikr Al Arabi for Publishing and Printing.

- Abdul Hadi, Nabil. (2001). **Measurement and Evaluation and its Use in Classroom Teaching**. 2nd edition. Amman, Jordan: Wael Publishing House.
- Abdulrahman, Saad. (2008). Psychometric Measurement: Theory and Application. 5th ed.Cairo, Egypt: Hebat Al-Nil Al-Arabiya for Printing and Publishing.
- Bakr, Joan Ismail. (2013). Quality of Life and its Relationship with Belonging and Social

Acceptance, Amman, Jordan: Dar Al-Hamid for Publishing and Distribution.

- Malmah, Sami Mohammed. (2016). **Research Methods in Education and Psychology**. 8th edition. Amman, Jordan: Dar Al-Maseera.
- Shultz, D. (1983). Personality Theories. (Translated by Hamad Dali Al-Karbouli and Abdul Rahman Al-Qaisi). Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research, Iraq: Baghdad University Press. (Original work published in 1981).
- Teghza, Mohammed Bouziane. (2012) . **Exploratory and Confirmatory Factor Analysis** . Amman, Jordan: Dar Al-Maseera.

Foreign References

- Festinger, Leon. (1962). Theory of Cognitive Dissonance. U.S.A.: Stanford University, Prenu.
- Malony, P. M and ward P.M. (1980). Psychological Assessment Conceptual Approach. New York: Oxford university press.
- *Rust*, John and Golombok, Susan. (2009). *Modern Psychometrics : the Science of Psychological Assessment*– 3rd ed, USA and Canada: Routledge.
- VandenBos, G. R. (2015), APA Dictionary of Psychology. 2nd edition. USA: American Psychological Association.