



ISSN: 2146-1740
<https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/ayd>,
Doi: 10.54688/ayd.1274908

Research Article



THE EFFECT OF GENDER AND INCOME DIFFERENCES ON SOCIAL DOMINANCE ORIENTATION: AN EXAMINATION OF YOUTH'S ATTITUDES TOWARDS SYRIANS UNDER TEMPORARY PROTECTION

Hamza Bahadır ESER¹ Koray ÇETİNCELİ² Mehmet Recai UYGUR³

Abstract

Article Info

Received:
31/03/2023

Accepted:
21/06/2023

In the study, the level of university students' hierarchy-enhancing ideologies was examined in terms of gender and income variables. The research was completed with a sample of 459 people. Significant differences were found between the Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) of the participants according to gender and income variables. It was found that (in both two sub-dimensions of SDO) male participants had higher levels of group-based dominance and opposition to equality than female participants. In addition, opposition to equality levels of the participants in the study differed significantly according to their income levels. But there is no significant difference in group-based dominance levels.



Keywords: Enhancing, Gender, Hierarchy, Income, Social Dominance Orientation, Syrians.

Jel Codes: F22, J15, O15

¹ Professor Doctor, Süleyman Demirel University, ORCID:0000-0003-4063-051X, bahadireser@sdu.edu.tr

² Assistant Professor, Süleyman Demirel University, ORCID:0000-0002-3745-0545, koraycetinceli@sdu.edu.tr

³ **Corresponding Author:** Lecturer, SMK University of Applied Science, ORCID:0000-0003-1872-0885, mehmetrecai.uygur@smk.lt

Ethical Statement: Permission was obtained from Süleyman Demirel University Social Sciences and Humanities Ethics Committee dated 11.11.2021 and numbered 113/1.

Cite: Eser, H. B., Çetinceli, K. & Uygur, M. R. (2023). The Effect of Gender and Income Differences on Social Dominance Orientation: An Examination of Youth's Attitudes Towards Syrians under Temporary Protection. *Akademik Yaklaşımlar Dergisi*, 14 (1), 240-258.



1. Introduction

Understanding the dynamics of Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) among young individuals, especially its relationship with attitudes toward Syrian refugees, is crucial. The formative years of youth are when perceptions of social norms and hierarchies can be strongly formed or changed. With increasing diversity and the presence of refugees in societies, it is vital to understand the interaction between these perceptions, attitudes towards refugees, and the role that gender and income differences play. This issue, if not addressed, can lead to conflict and (similar to the possible xenophobic consequences of anti-immigration attitudes, which is frequently seen in Europe, towards Syrian refugees, (Eser & Çiçek, 2020: 114-144) hostility among different segments (especially between the host community and immigrants) of the population in the near future.

Given the stated problem and the gap in the literature, this study aims to investigate the relationship between SDO, attitudes toward Syrian refugees, and the influence of gender and income differences among young individuals. Specifically, the study will investigate whether the SDOs of young people differ according to their gender and income status, and how these differences correlate with their attitudes towards Syrian refugees.

As an attitude that legitimizes intergroup hierarchy, the relationship between social dominance orientation (SDO) and gender is a subject that is frequently discussed in the literature (Sidanius et. all, 1994: 194-216, Levin, 2004: 31-48; Dambrun et. all, 2004: 287-297, Sidanius et. all, 2006: 1640-1653, Pratto et. all, 2006, Özkan, 2014, Bağcı & Gürler, 2018:1167-1180, Okumuşoğlu, 2017: 881-895). Similarly, the relationship between SDO and income level is another issue explored in the literature (Sidanius et. all, 1994: 998-1011, Pratto et. all, 2006: 271-320, Küpper et. all, 2010: 205-219, Carvacho et. all, 2013: 272-285, Whitt et. all, 2019, Fischer et. all, 2021). In Türkiye, even if several studies have considered gender and income differences on SDO (Eser & Uygur, 2019: 86-108, Yalçın, 2017: 44-59, Şingir et. all, 2022: 164-175, Kırıl Uçar et. all, 2019: 739-764), the studies on social dominance orientation are mainly based on general demographic variables political, ethnic identity, intergroup contact, and personality traits but not specifically on gender and income differences (Sarıdağ & Eser, 2023a: 418-445, Sarıdağ & Eser, 2023b: 687-701, Kablanoğlu & Kuşdil, 2020: 84-109, Hasta & Karaçanta, 2017: 23-34, Bağcı & Güler, 2018: 1167-1180, Okumuşoğlu, 2017: 881-8895). This study aims to close this gap by examining specifically the correlation between gender, income, and SDO on the behavior of the young population In Türkiye.

A large Syrian population (3,443,219 people as of 3,23,2023) lives in Türkiye. Most of the Syrians are under temporary protection status (<https://www.goc.gov.tr/gecici-koruma5638>). These people fleeing the political instability and civil war in their country are generally among the lower-income groups (Budak et al, 2018: 71, Akın & Bozbaş, 2020: 55) in our country and they receive a very small share of social welfare. Syrians mostly do low-paid jobs that are not in demand in society and work without insurance (Sayın et. all, 2016: 10, Yıldırım alp et. all, 2017: 115-116-119, Kocadaş, 2018: 11, Ilgazi, 2019: 108, Koca, 2019: 335-336, Aslan & Güngör, 2019: 1612, Bimay, 2020: 364, 365) and they live in unhealthy conditions (Cengiz, 2015: 117, Sönmez, 2016: 394-397, Sayın et. all, 2016: 10, Yıldırım alp et. all, 2017: 120, Babacan et. all, 2017: 275, Aslan & Güngör, 2019: 1616-1621). Similar to the accommodation conditions, in terms of healthy nutrition (Balcılar, 2016: 12-13), the situation of the Syrians presents a very problematic image when compared with the host society. Contrary to popular belief, Syrians face serious problems in accessing health services (due to language barriers, etc.) (Babacan et. all, 2017: 275, Aslan & Güngör, 2019: 1609). Similarly, the situation of Syrians in terms of access to education is not very encouraging (Sayın et. all, 2016: 11, Aslan & Güngör, 2019: 1617-1621, Bimay, 2020: 359-364). Undoubtedly, apart from the examples mentioned, there are also Syrians who have a very good economic situation, do their own business, provide employment, and have a high level of welfare (Sayın et. all, 2016: 10, Altundeğer & Yılmaz, 2016: 295). However, in a community of more than three million, these examples cannot go beyond the exception.

Based on all these negative conditions, it is possible to state that Syrian immigrants are a disadvantaged group. Understanding the attitudes towards Syrians is important in order to establish harmony between the host society and the immigrants in the long term on a healthy foundation. In this context, inequality between different socio-economic, ethnic, religious, cultural, and gender groups, which expresses the state of seeing the inequality as legitimate and normal (Sidanius et. all, 2004: 845-880) is discussed. In particular, variables such as the clustering of Syrians in lower-income groups and their differentiation from the host society in terms of language, culture, and origin make it meaningful to measure the SDO towards Syrians.

As of 2021, 15.3% of Türkiye's population is composed of young people (TÜİK, 2021). In this context, the main question of the study is how much the youth, who occupy a large place in the host society, are willing to share their status, power, wealth, and “advantageous” situation with the Syrians, who are a disadvantaged group.

In the study, the SDOs of young people with a university education were discussed. The main motivation for choosing this group is the high probability of reaching status professions

in the future. The relationship between gender and SDO is the first issue examined in the study. In this context, it has been examined whether there is a difference between the attitudes (SDO) of women and men toward establishing intergroup equality/maintaining inequality. The study also investigated whether there is a significant difference between the income levels of the participants and their attitudes towards defending the advantageous position of their group (host society) compared to the Syrians, with the thought that it will give an idea in terms of the socio-economic class they currently hold. The Turkish-validated Social Dominance Orientation scale was used to collect the study data.

Below, the theory of social dominance orientation will be discussed first, and then the literature leading to the research hypotheses will be examined. For this purpose, first of all, the relationship between gender, income level, and SDO will be discussed, and research hypotheses will be expressed under the relevant sections. Then the data will be analyzed, and the hypotheses will be tested. Afterward, the study findings will be discussed together with the leading literature findings and the study will be concluded.

1. Social Dominance Theory

Social dominance theory (SDT) is a widely studied concept in social psychology that explains the existence and maintenance of social hierarchies within societies. The theory posits that social hierarchies are a universal feature of human societies, as individuals naturally form groups and differentiate themselves from others based on various social categories such as race, gender, age, and nationality (Sidanius et. all, 2004: 845-880). Dominant groups, which are those with greater social status and power, tend to monopolize the most desirable resources and opportunities, while subordinate groups are often marginalized and subjected to negative treatment, such as social stigma and exclusion, discrimination, and violence (Sidanius et. all, 2003: 207-213).

One of the main questions in SDT is why individuals and groups tend to organize themselves into social hierarchies. According to the theory, social hierarchies arise from a combination of individual and structural factors. At the individual level, people have natural tendencies towards dominance and submission, which are shaped by various biological, psychological, and social factors. For example, individuals with high levels of testosterone, a hormone associated with dominance and aggression, may be more likely to seek positions of power and engage in behaviors that reinforce their dominance over others (Pratto et. all, 1994: 741-763). Similarly, socialization experiences, such as upbringing, education, and media

exposure, can influence people's attitudes and beliefs about social hierarchies, leading some individuals to view themselves as superior to others and to justify their privileged status.

At the structural level, social hierarchies are shaped by the distribution of power and resources within society. Economic, political, and cultural institutions often reinforce existing hierarchies by giving preferential treatment to dominant groups, while marginalizing or excluding subordinate groups. For example, economic policies that favor the wealthy can perpetuate wealth disparities between social groups, while laws and regulations that discriminate against certain groups can limit their access to political power and representation (Sidanius et. all, 2004: 845-880). Despite the variations in governance, belief systems, and social structures across societies, social dominance theory argues that social hierarchies are a common feature of societies. Even societies that have abolished formal forms of discrimination and inequality may still exhibit subtle or implicit forms of bias and discrimination that maintain existing hierarchies (Sidanius, 1999).

One way that social dominance theory helps to explain the persistence of social hierarchies is through the concept of legitimizing myths. Legitimizing myths are cultural beliefs and narratives that justify and reinforce existing hierarchies by portraying dominant groups as deserving of their privileged status, and subordinate groups as inferior or unworthy of equal treatment. For example, the myth of meritocracy suggests that individuals succeed or fail based on their abilities and efforts, rather than their social status or background. This myth can be used to justify the underrepresentation of certain social groups in positions of power or influence, as it suggests that those groups simply lack the necessary skills or qualifications (Sidanius et. all, 2004: 845-880).

Another way that social dominance theory helps to understand the persistence of social hierarchies is through the social identity concept. Social identity can be understood as how individuals derive their sense of self from their membership in social groups. People tend to identify strongly with groups that they perceive as being superior or more prestigious and to distance themselves from groups that they perceive as inferior or low status (Sidanius et. all, 1991: 691-721). This tendency can contribute to the constitution and maintenance of hierarchies, as individuals seek to associate themselves with dominant groups and avoid association with subordinate groups.

2.1.Social Dominance Orientation and Gender

SDO is a phenomenon that has been observed across different cultures and societies. It refers to the tendency for some individuals to adopt hierarchical and authoritarian attitudes towards others. This can manifest in various forms, such as a desire for dominance over others,

prejudice towards certain groups, and the belief that some groups are inherently superior to others. Interestingly, in general, it can be expected that men tend to score higher on measures of SDO than women. This may be due to various factors, such as societal expectations of masculinity, and the belief that men should be dominant and assertive.

However, it is important to note that not all men have high levels of SDO, and not all women have low levels. There is a wide range of individual variations within each gender, and other factors such as upbringing, culture, and personal experiences can also play a role in shaping attitudes towards hierarchy and authority. It is also worth noting that SDO can have negative consequences for both individuals and society as a whole. When people adopt authoritarian attitudes, they may be more likely to justify discrimination and inequality, which can lead to social unrest and conflict. It is therefore important to promote values such as equality and respect for others, regardless of their gender, race, or social status. While there are some gender differences in SDO, it is important to recognize that individual variation and other factors can also play a role in shaping attitudes towards hierarchy and authority. It is also important to promote values of equality and respect, to create a more harmonious and just society.

SDO is a personality trait that explains the degree to which persons prefer and endorse social hierarchies and inequalities between different groups in society. It is considered a key predictor of prejudice and discrimination, as individuals with high SDO are more likely to support and justify intergroup inequalities (Pratto et. all, 2006: 271-320). While SDO can be expressed towards any social group, including race, religion, and nationality, research has shown that it is particularly relevant to gender relations (Pratto et. all, 2000:369-409). Gender differences in SDO have been extensively studied, with most research indicating that men tend to score higher on SDO than women (Sidanius et. all, 1994: 998-1011, Schmitt & Wirth, 2009: 485-497). This means that men are more likely to endorse social hierarchies and inequalities and justify them as natural and necessary for the functioning of society. Women, on the other hand, are more likely to reject these inequalities and advocate for more egalitarian social structures (Eagly & Steffen, 1984: 735-754). One explanation for these gender differences is socialization. From an early age, boys are taught to be competitive, assertive, and dominant, while girls are taught to be nurturing, supportive, and cooperative (Bem, 1981: 354-364). These gender roles can lead to the development of SDO in men, who may see themselves as entitled to hold power and authority over others, while women may be socialized to reject such hierarchies and advocate for more equal and cooperative relationships (Sidanius et. all, 1994:

998-1011). Another factor that may contribute to gender differences in SDO is the perception of threat. Research has shown that individuals who perceive their group as threatened or disadvantaged are more likely to score higher on SDO (Duckitt, 2006: 684-696). Men, as a group, may feel more threatened by the increasing social and economic power of women, leading them to endorse and justify patriarchal structures as a means of maintaining their own status and power (Pratto et. all, 2000: 369-409). Women, on the other hand, may be less likely to feel threatened by men's power, as they have historically occupied a lower position in society, and are therefore less invested in maintaining the status quo. While gender differences in SDO are well-established, it is important to point that these differences are not absolute. Some men reject hierarchical social structures and support gender equality, just as there are women who endorse and justify gender inequality (Pratto et. all, 2000: 369-409). Moreover, SDO is not the only predictor of attitudes toward gender relations. Other factors, such as political ideology, education, and personal experiences, can also play a role in shaping individuals' beliefs and values (Sidanius et. all, 1994: 998-1011).

In conclusion, SDO is a personality trait that refers to the endorsement and justification of social hierarchies and inequalities. While men tend to score higher on SDO than women, this difference is not absolute and can be influenced by socialization and perceptions of threat. It is important to recognize the role of SDO in shaping attitudes towards gender relations, as it can contribute to the maintenance of patriarchal structures and the justification of gender-based discrimination. Accordingly, this research comes up with 2 hypotheses to be tested, first is;
H₁: Social dominance orientation of the participants differs according to their gender.

2.2.Social Dominance Orientation and Income

As it has been mentioned above, social dominance orientation is a personality trait that refers to the endorsement and justification of social hierarchies and inequalities between different groups in society. One aspect that can impact an individual's SDO is income level. Individuals with higher incomes may be more likely to score higher on SDO, as they may see themselves as entitled to hold power and authority over others. One reason for this could be the sense of privilege that often comes with having a higher income. Those with higher incomes may have grown up with more resources and opportunities and therefore may have a stronger sense of entitlement to their position in society. This entitlement can translate into a belief that hierarchies and inequalities are natural and necessary for the functioning of society, and that those in positions of power deserve to be there. On the other hand, individuals with lower incomes may be more likely to reject hierarchies and inequalities, as they may have experienced firsthand the negative effects of such systems. They may feel disadvantaged and oppressed by

those in positions of power, and therefore may be more likely to advocate for more egalitarian social structures.

Another factor that can impact income differences in SDO is access to education and resources. Individuals with higher incomes may have had greater access to education and other resources that promote values such as competitiveness, assertiveness, and dominance - all traits that are associated with higher levels of SDO. They may also have greater exposure to media and other forms of information that reinforce hierarchical social structures and the idea that certain groups are naturally superior to others. Meanwhile, individuals with lower incomes may have had less access to education and resources, which can lead to a greater sense of marginalization and disempowerment. They may also have fewer opportunities to challenge or question the status quo, as they may be more focused on meeting their basic needs and survival. Income can be a significant factor in shaping an individual's SDO, with those with higher incomes more likely to endorse and justify social hierarchies and inequalities. This can be due to a sense of entitlement and privilege, as well as greater exposure to education and resources that reinforce hierarchical values. However, it is important to recognize that income is not the only factor at play and that individuals with different income levels can hold a range of attitudes toward social hierarchies and inequalities.

While SDO can be expressed towards any social group, including race, religion, and nationality, research has shown that it is particularly relevant to economic class and income inequalities (Sidanius et. al, 1994: 998-1011). Studies have consistently shown that individuals with high income tend to score higher on SDO compared to those with low income (Pratto et. al. 2006: 271-320). This means that individuals with higher incomes are more likely to endorse social hierarchies and inequalities and justify them as natural and necessary for the functioning of society. This finding can be explained by several factors, including socialization, perceptions of threat, and economic self-interest. Socialization plays an important role in the development of SDO. Children from wealthy families are more likely to be exposed to messages that emphasize the importance of status, power, and dominance. They are also more likely to be taught that hard work and individual achievement is the key to success and social mobility (Erikson & Goldthorpe, 1992). These messages can lead to the development of SDO in individuals from high-income backgrounds, who may see themselves as entitled to hold power and authority over others. Perceptions of threat also contribute to higher levels of SDO among high-income individuals. Research has shown that individuals who perceive their group as threatened or disadvantaged are more likely to score higher on SDO (Duckitt, 2006: 684-696).

High-income individuals may feel threatened by the increasing social and economic power of low-income groups, leading them to endorse and justify hierarchical social structures as a means of maintaining their status and power. Economic self-interest is another factor that contributes to the relationship between income and SDO.

High-income individuals have a greater stake in maintaining the status quo and preserving the economic and social systems that benefit them. They are more likely to support policies and institutions that reinforce social and economic inequalities, such as tax cuts for the wealthy, deregulation of markets, and reduced social welfare spending (Pratto et. all, 2006: 271-320). These policies benefit high-income individuals at the expense of low-income individuals and reflect a desire to maintain the existing social hierarchy. The relationship between income and SDO has important implications for social and economic inequality. Higher levels of SDO among high-income individuals can contribute to the perpetuation of economic and social inequalities and can make it more difficult to implement policies that promote social justice and economic mobility. It is therefore important to understand the factors that contribute to the development of SDO and to develop interventions that promote more egalitarian values and attitudes.

Studies have consistently shown that individuals with high income tend to score higher on SDO compared to those with low income. It can be said that this finding can be explained by several factors, including socialization, perceptions of threat, and economic self-interest. Understanding the relationship between income and SDO is important for promoting more egalitarian values and attitudes, and for reducing social and economic inequalities. Accordingly, the second hypothesis of this research is;

H₂: Social dominance orientation of the participants differs according to their income level.

3. Method

Research hypotheses were purposefully tested in the sample of university students. The research was carried out with the permission of the Süleyman Demirel University Ethics Committee with the letter dated 12.11.2021 and numbered E-87432956-050.99-160323 and the decision numbered 113/1. The research was conducted with a Web-based survey (Google survey). Data collection took place between the end of 2021 and 2022. The data collection process lasted about 3 months. As a result of the study, 459 valid questionnaires were analyzed.

3.1. Sample Profile

The sample consisted of 61.7% female (n=283) and 38.3 % male (n=176) respondents, with ages ranging from 20 to 27 (M=1.62, SD=0.49). The income status of the participants is as follow; 14.6% of the participant, which is 67 of them, indicated their income between 0-

1500. The income of 13.1% of them which 60 participants is between 1501-2500. 98 of the participants, which is 21.4%, earn between 2501-3500, the income of 87 of them which is 19%, is 3501-5000, 69 of them which is 15%, is 5001-6500, 31 of them which is 6.8% is 6501-8000 and 47 of them which 10.2% is 8000 plus, (M=3.68, SD=1.82). All participants are university students.

3.2.Measure

The "Social Dominance Orientation Scale" (SDO Scale) developed by Pratto et al. (1994: 741-763) was used in the study. The scale, which was adapted into Turkish by Akbaş (2010), consists of a total of 16 statements and two sub-dimensions, group-based dominance and opposition to equality, with a 5-point Likert-type rating of "Strongly Disagree (1)" and "Strongly Agree (5)". In the Turkish adaptation study, Cronbach's alpha coefficient was found to be 0.81 for the group-based dominance dimension and 0.91 for the opposition to equality dimension (p.46)

4. Results

As a result of the reliability analysis, the internal consistency coefficient of the group-based dominance dimension was calculated as Cronbach Alpha 0.818. According to this result, it can be said that the measurement tool is highly reliable (Kayış, 2005: 206-222). In addition, skewness and kurtosis values were examined to determine the suitability of the scale size for normal distribution. According to the results of the analysis, the skewness value of the scale dimension was 0.444 and the kurtosis value was -0.706. Since these values are between -1 and +1, it can be said that the scale meets the assumption of normality distribution (Hair et al. 2018). In addition, if these values are in the range of -1.5 and +1.5 and -2 and +2, it is possible to say that the data provides the assumption of normality distribution (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013, George & Mallery, 2010). From this point of view, parametric analyzes (Independent sample t-test, Anova) were used in the study.

The Cronbach's alpha coefficient for the opposition to the equality dimension was found to be 0.901 and it was determined to be highly reliable. According to the results of the normality distribution analysis conducted to determine the suitability of the scale for normal distribution, it was determined that the Skewness value was 0.699 and the Kurtosis value was -0.559. According to these results, it can be said that the scale dimension meets the normality distribution assumption.

Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was used to reveal the factors formed by the variables in the scale used in the study independently of each other. The KMO test was applied

to determine whether the sample size was sufficient for factor analysis and the Barlett Sphericity Test was applied to determine whether the relationship between the variables was significant.

Table 1.

SDO Scale KMO and Bartlett Sphericity Test Table

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (KMO)		,907
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square (Ki-kare)	3256,034
	Df (degress of freedom)	120
	Sig.(p)	,000

According to the results of Table (1), it was determined that the sample size was sufficient (,907) and the relationship between variables was significant ($p<0.001$) (Gürbüz & Şahin 2018).

Table 2.

EFA Results of the SDO Scale

<i>Expressions</i>	<i>Factor Loads Group-Based Dominance</i>	<i>Opposition to Equality</i>
1- "Some groups of people are simply inferior to other groups."	,667	
2- "In getting what you want, it is sometimes necessary to use force against other groups."	,702	
3- "It's OK if some groups have more of a chance in life than others."	,555	
4- "To get ahead in life, it is sometimes necessary to step on other groups."	,695	
5- "If certain groups stayed in their place, we would have fewer problems."	,605	
6- "It's probably a good thing that certain groups are at the top and other groups are at the bottom."	,639	
7- "Inferior groups should stay in their place."	,664	
8- "Sometimes other groups must be kept in their place."	,694	
9- "It would be good if groups could be equal."		,695
10- "Group equality should be our ideal."		,786
11- "All groups should be given an equal chance in life."		,790
12- "We should do what we can to equalize conditions for different groups."		,838
13- "Increased social equality."		,825
14- "We would have fewer problems if we treated people more equally."		,767
15- "We should strive to make incomes as equal as possible."		,674
16- "No one group should dominate in society."		,672
<i>Eigenvalues</i>	<i>2.415</i>	<i>6.072</i>
<i>% of Variance</i>	<i>15.091</i>	<i>37.951</i>
<i>% of Cumulative Variance</i>	<i>53.042</i>	

According to the results of the EFA analysis, it was determined that the scale had a two-factor structure with eigenvalues greater than 1. The factors explained 53.042% of the total variance. Table (2) shows that the group-based dominance dimension of the scale explains 15.091% of the variance, while the opposition to equality dimension explains 37.951% of the variance. It is seen that the statement with the highest factor value in the scale belongs to the

statement " We should do what we can to equalize conditions for different groups" (0.838) in the opposition to equality dimension, while the statement with the lowest factor load belongs to the statement " It's OK if some groups have more of a chance in life than others" (0.555) in the group-based dominance dimension.

Table 3.

Mean, Standard Deviation and Correlation Table for Dimensions

Dimensions	N	\bar{X}	SS	1	2
1. Group-Based Dominance	459	2.19	0.87	1	
2. Opposition to Equality	459	1.91	0.87	,401**	1

**p<,01 significance level

When Table (3) is examined, it can be said that the participants' group-based dominance levels belonging to the SDO scale calculated on a 5-point Likert scale are moderate ($\bar{X}=2.19$ SD=0.87) and their opposition to equality averages are low ($\bar{X}=1.91$; SD=0.87). According to Pearson r values showing the relationship between variables, there is a significant positive relationship between the participants' group-based dominance levels and opposition to equality levels ($r=.401$; $p<,01$). The results of the independent sample t-test conducted to determine whether the variables differ according to gender are shown in Table (4).

Table 4.

Independent Sample T-Test Results Regarding the Difference of Variables According to Employee Gender

Variables	Gender	N	\bar{X}	S.S.	t	P
Group-Based Dominance	Male	176	2.41	,90	4.313	,000
	Female	283	2.05	,82		
Opposition to Equality	Male	176	2.16	,96	5.129	,000
	Female	283	1.75	,77		

According to the results of the independent sample t-test, it is seen that the participants' group-based dominance and opposition to equality levels differ according to gender ($p<0.05$). It was found that male participants had higher levels of group-based dominance ($\bar{X}=2.41$) and opposition to equality ($\bar{X}=2.16$) than female participants ($\bar{X}=2.05$; $\bar{X}=1.75$). H_1 is accepted. In order to determine whether the variables differed according to the income level of the participants, a single factor analysis of variance method was used. Table (5) shows the results of the One-Way ANOVA analysis.

Table 5.

Anova Analysis Results Regarding the Difference of Variables According to Income Levels

Variables	Income	N	\bar{X}	S.S.	F	p	Post Hoc
Group-Based Dominance	1.0-1500	67	2.21	,90	2.112	,051	
	2.1501-2500	60	2.31	,96			
	3.2501-3500	98	2.26	,86			
	4.3501-5000	87	2.06	,76			
	5.5001-6500	69	2.22	,89			
	6.6501-8000	31	1.77	,68			
	7.8000 and plus	47	2.33	,90			
Opposition to Equality	1.0-1500	67	1.55	,72	3.318	,003	1<3-4-5-7
	2.1501-2500	60	1.72	,71			
	3.2501-3500	98	2.04	,91			
	4.3501-5000	87	1.98	,87			
	5.5001-6500	69	2.01	,97			
	6.6501-8000	31	1.98	,83			
	7.8000 and plus	47	2.03	,90			

While it was observed that the opposition to equality levels of the participants in the study differed significantly according to their income levels ($p < ,05$), the difference in group-based dominance levels was not significant ($p > ,05$). Post-Hoc multiple comparison analysis was used to determine between which income groups the levels of opposition to equality differ. According to the results of the analysis, participants in the 0-1500 income group ($\bar{X}=1.55$; S.S.: ,72) have lower levels of opposition to equality than participants in the 2500-6500 ($\bar{X}=2.04$; $\bar{X}=1.98$; $\bar{X}=2.01$) and 8000 and plus ($\bar{X}=2.03$) income groups. H_2 is accepted.

5. Conclusion

As it is known, there are millions of Syrians living in our country. Most of these people fleeing the civil war in Syria are under temporary protection status and continue their lives under difficult conditions. Understanding the attitudes towards Syrians is important in terms of the prevention of negative attitudes towards immigrants, which are strongly fed by the sharing of socio-economical welfare with immigrants (Eser & Çiçek, 2020: 114-144) and establishing harmony between the host society and the immigrants in the long term on healthy foundations. In this context, socio-economic dominance orientation, which expresses the state of seeing inequality between different socio-economic, ethnic, religious, cultural and gender groups as legitimate and normal, is discussed.

In the study, firstly, it was tested whether there was a difference between male and female participants in terms of SDOs, and it was seen that males had stronger SDOs than females (H_1 is accepted). These findings are in Pratto et. all, (1994:741-763), Sidanius et. all, (1994: 998), Dambrun et. all, (2004: 294), Sidanius et. all, (2006: 1640), It is in line with the

findings of Levin's (2004: 31) and Duckitt's (2006: 684-696) and also Bağcı and Gürler's (2018: 1177) studies. Fischer et. all, (2021: 448) found a significant negative relationship between more egalitarian policies towards women and SDO. From this point of view, it can be stated that attitudes towards sharing status with women are related to SDO and that women are mostly secondary or discriminated against in sharing power and authority. This situation makes it understandable that the tendency of social dominance towards Syrians under temporary protection status, which is another disadvantaged group, is lower in the female sample than in the male sample.

The study also examined the relationship between the income status of the participants and their SDO, and it was seen that there was a significant difference (H_2 is accepted) between the participants' opposition to equality levels. It was found that lower tension groups exhibited lower opposition to equality levels. While these findings overlap with the findings of Whitt et. all, (2019) and Pratto et. all, (2006) they differ with the study data of Sidanius et. all, (1994). A similar situation exists with the findings of the study conducted by Küpper et. all, (2010). In their study, they found that people from low-income groups exhibited a higher level of SDO and their anti-immigrant attitudes were more pronounced. This situation can be evaluated together with the possibility of low-income groups seeing immigrants as a threat to them in resource sharing. Carvacho et. all (2013: 272) found that education was a stronger determinant of prejudices than income and that right-wing authoritarianism and SDO had a mediating effect in the relationship between income and prejudices. In another study supporting these findings, it is emphasized that in economies with good economic parameters and low competition, SDO can be expected to be at a lower level if the national income is high (Fischer et. all, 2021: 441, 448).

The status between the subject genders should continue to be examined with subsequent studies examining the attitudes towards power sharing and dealing with these attitudes as well as the SDO. Similarly, the relationship between income level and SDO can be sustained in the future with a study focused on the theory of relative deprivation, which examines attitudes about the fairness of income distribution and whether individuals get the share they think they should receive from economic welfare. Again, the subject should continue to be examined in the future with a perspective that deals with intergroup relations in the context of integrated threat theory. As a result, the study data contributes to the field in understanding the attitudes towards immigrants, a disadvantaged group. Understanding the prejudices towards immigrants, together with the current study and other proposed studies, will contribute to the understanding of

attitudes that may prevent the two communities from living together and establish mutual harmony by establishing contact between the two communities.

Contribution Rate Statement: First author: 40% Second author: 35% Third author (Corresponding): 25%

Conflicts of Interest: There is no potential conflict of interest in this study.

REFERENCES

- Akbaş, G. (2010). Social Identity and Intergroup Relations: The Case of Alevis and Sunnis in Amasya (master's thesis). Middle East Technical University.
- Akin, M. H. & Bozbas, G. (2020). Suriye'den Türkiye'ye Göçün Sosyolojik Sonuçları: Suriyeli Göçmenler Üzerine Uygulamalı Bir Saha Araştırması, *Liberal Düşünce Dergisi*, 25(97), 47-65. <https://doi.org/10.26650/LiberalDusunce.2020.25.97.0003>
- Altundeğer, N. & Yılmaz, M. E. (2016). İç Savaştan Bölgesel İstikrarsızlığa: Suriye Krizinin Türkiye'ye Faturası. *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 21(1), 289-301.
- Aslan, G. G. & Güngör, F. (2019). Suriyeli Sığınmacıların Türkiye'ye Göç Sonrası Yaşadığı Sorunlar: İstanbul örneği. *OPUS Uluslararası Toplum Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 9(11), 1602-1632.
- Babacan, B., Coşkun, M., Öztürk Dönmez, R. & Mermer, G. (2017). Hatay'a göç eden Suriyeli sığınmacıların ev yaşam koşulları, sağlık durumları ve sağlık hizmeti kullanma özellikleri. *Türkiye Klinikleri*, 9(4), 272-279.
- Bağcı, S.Ç. & Gürler, C. N. (2018). Yabancı Öğrencilere Karşı Tutum ve Davranışsal Eğilimler: Ulusal Kimlikler ve Sosyal Baskınlık Yöneliminin Yordayıcı Rolü. *Elektronik Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 17(67), 1167-1180.
- Balcılar, M. (2016). Türkiye'deki Suriyeli Mültecilerin Sağlık Durumu Araştırması: Türkiye'de Yaşayan Suriyeli Mültecilerde Bulaşıcı Olmayan Hastalık Risk Faktörleri Sıklığı. AFAD, T.C. Sağlık Bakanlığı, Dünya Sağlık Örgütü. 1-82.
- Bem, S. L. (1981). Gender Schema Theory: A Cognitive Account of Sex Typing. *Psychological Review*, 88(4), 354-364. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.88.4.354>
- Bimay, M. (2020). Onuncu Yılında Suriyeli Sığınmacıların Kente Entegrasyonu ve Gelecek Beklentileri: Batman Örneği, *Mukaddime*, 11(2), 348-381. <https://doi.org/10.19059/mukaddime.694372>
- Budak, F., Ozer, O. & Yanardag, M. Z. (2018). Suriyeli Sığınmacıların Fiziksel Sağlık Algılarını Etkileyen Faktörlerin İncelenmesi, *Celal Bayar Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 5(3), 68-75. <https://doi.org/10.30728/cbu-sbed.420742>
- Carvacho, H., Zick, A., Haye, A., González, R., Manzi, J., Kocık, C. & Bertl, M. (2013). On The Relation Between Social Class and Prejudice: The Roles of Education, Income, and Ideological Attitudes. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 43, 272-285.
- Cengiz, D. (2015). Zorunlu Göçün Mekânsal Etkileri ve Yerel Halkın Algısı; Kilis Örneği. *International Periodical for the Languages, Literature and History of Turkish or Turkic*, 10(2), 101-122.
- Dambrun, M., Duarte, S. & Guimond, S. (2004). Why Are Men More Likely to Support Group-Based Dominance Than Women? The Mediating Role of Gender Identification. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 43, 287-297.
- Duckitt, J. (2006). Differential Effects of Right-Wing Authoritarianism and Social Dominance Orientation On Outgroup Attitudes and Their Mediation By The Threat From and Competitiveness To Outgroups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32(5), 684-696. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167205284281>
- Eagly, A. H. & Steffen, V. J. (1984). Gender Stereotypes Stem from The Distribution of Women and Men into Social Roles. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46(4), 735-754. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.46.4.735>
- Erikson, R. & Goldthorpe, J. (1992). *The Constant Flux: A Study of Class Mobility In Industrial Countries*. Oxford University Press.
- Eser, H. B. & Uygur, M. R. (2019). Suriyeli Mültecilere Yönelik Tutumların Sosyal Baskınlık Yönelimi Doğrultusunda İncelenmesi, Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi örneği. *Dicle Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, (22), 86-108.

- Eser H.B. & Çiçek A. (2020), Avrupa’da Aşırı Sağın Ayak Sesleri: Zenofobinin Patolojik Normalleşmesi, *Alternatif Politika*, 12 (1), 114-144.
- Fischer, R., Hanke, K. & Sibley, C. G. (2012). Cultural and Institutional Determinants of Social Dominance Orientation: A Cross-Cultural Meta-Analysis of 27 Societies. *Political Psychology*, 33(4), 437-467.
- George, D. & Mallery, M. (2010). SPSS for Windows Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference, 17.0 update (10th Ed.) Boston: Pearson
- Gürbüz, S. & Şahin, F. (2018). Sosyal Bilimlerde Araştırma Yöntemleri, Felsefe-Yöntem-Analiz (5th ed.). Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J. & Anderson, R. E. (2018). Multivariate Data Analysis (8th ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Hasta, D. & Karaçanta, H. (2017). Yetkecilik, Sosyal Baskınlık Yönelimi ve Siyasal Görüş. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 20(40), 23–34.
- Ilgazi, A. (2019). Suriyeli Sığınmacıların Emek Piyasasına Etkileri, Gaziantep ve Şanlıurfa Örneği. *Econharran Harran Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 3(4), 93-123. <https://doi.org/10.29067/egfh.v3i4.43>
- Kablanoğlu, A. & Kuşdil, M. E. (2020). Liderlik Etme Motivasyonu, Karanlık Üçlü, Değerler, Sosyal Baskınlık Yönelimi ve Sağ-Kanat Yetkeciliği Arasındaki İlişkilere Yönelik Bir İnceleme. *Eğitim Bilim Toplum Dergisi* 18(70), 84-109.
- Kayış, A. (2005). Güvenilirlik Analizi. In Ş. Kalaycı (Ed.), SPSS Uygulamalı Çok Değişkenli İstatistik Teknikleri (pp. 206-222). Asil Yayınevi.
- Kıral Uçar, G., Gezici Yalçın, M. & Özdemir, G. (2019). İklim Değişikliği İnkarnın Ekolojik Adil Dünya İnancı ve Sosyal Baskınlık Yönelimi İle İlişkisi. *Uludağ Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 20(37), 739-764. <https://doi.org/10.21550/sosbilder.535560>
- Koca, Ş. N. (2019). Suriyeli Sığınmacıların Türk Emek Piyasasına Katılım Süreçlerinin Toplumsal Boyutları. *Göç Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 5(2), 314-357. <https://doi.org/10.33206/mjss.586029>
- Kocadaş, B. (2018). Suriyeli Sığınmacılar ve Çalışma Hayatı: Sorunlar, Tespitler ve Öneriler. *Sosyolojik Düşün*, 3(1-2), 1-13.
- Küpper, B., Wolf, C. & Zick, A. (2010). Social Status and Anti-Immigrant Attitudes in Europe: An Examination from the Perspective of Social Dominance Theory. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence*, Vol. 4(2), 205 – 219.
- Levin, S. (2004). Perceived Group Status Differences and the Effects of Gender, Ethnicity, and Religion on Social Dominance Orientation. *Political Psychology*, 25(1), 31-48.
- Okumuşoğlu, S. (2017). Sosyal Baskınlık Yöneliminin Kişilik Özellikleri İle İlişkisi. *Uulakbilge*, 5(12), 881-895.
- Özkan, K. (2014). Kadınların Kolektif Eylem Yöneliminin Yordayıcıları: Kültürel Benlik Kurguları, Kadın Kimliği İle Özdeşleşme, Kadınların Sosyal Baskınlık Yönelimi Ve Sistemi Meşrulaştırma Eğilimi [master’s thesis, T.C. Uludağ Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Psikoloji Anabilim Dalı].
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M. & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social Dominance Orientation: A Personality Variable Predicting Social and Political Attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 741-763. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.67.4.741>
- Pratto, F., Liu, J. H., Levin, S., Sidanius, J. & Shih, M. (2000). Social Dominance Orientation and The Legitimization of Inequality Across Cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 31(3), 369-409. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022100031003007>

Eser, H. B., Çetinceli, K. & Uygur, M. R. / Effect of Gender and Income Differences on Social Dominance Orientation: An Examination of Youth's Attitudes Towards Syrians Under Temporary Protection

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J. & Levin, S. (2006). Social Dominance Theory and The Dynamics of Intergroup Relations: Taking Stock and Looking Forward. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 17(1), 271-320. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463280600805776>

Sarıdağ, S. & Eser, H. B. (2023a). Gruplar Arası Temas, Sosyal Baskınlık Yönelimi ve Zenofobi Arasındaki İlişkide Algılanan Tehdidin Rolü: İzmir-Konak Örneği. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 10(1), 418-445.

Sarıdağ, S. & Eser, H. B. (2023b). Sosyal Baskınlık Yönelimi, Tehdit Algısı, Gruplararası Temas ve Zenofobik Tutumların Siyasal Eğilim, Etnik ve Dini Kimlikler İle İlişkisi, *Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Vizyoner Dergisi*, 14(38), 687-701.

Sayın, Y., Usanmaz, A. & Aslangiri, F. (2016). Uluslararası Göç Olgusu ve Yol Açtığı Etkiler: Suriye Göçü Örneği. *KMÜ Sosyal ve Ekonomik Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 18(31), 1-13.

Schmitt, M. & Wirth, J. (2009). Evidence That Gender Differences in Social Dominance Orientation Result from Gendered Self-Stereotyping and Group-Interested Responses to Patriarchy. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 33(4), 485-497.

Sidanius, J. (1999). *Social dominance: An Intergroup Theory of Social Hierarchy and Oppression*. Cambridge University Press.

Sidanius, J., Pratto, F. & Bobo, L. (1996). Racism, Conservatism, Affirmative Action, and Intellectual Sophistication: A Matter of Principled Conservatism or Group Dominance? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(3), 476-490.

Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., Van Laar, C. & Levin, S. (2004). Social Dominance Theory: Its Agenda and Method. *Political Psychology*, 25(6), 845-880.

Sidanius, J., Pratto, F. & Bobo, L. (1994). Social Dominance Orientation and The Political Psychology of Gender: A Case of Invariance? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67(6), 998-1011.

Sidanius, J., Pratto, F., Martin, M. & Stallworth, L. M. (1991). Consensual Racism and Career Track: Some Implications of Social Dominance Theory. *Political Psychology*, 12(4), 691-721.

Sidanius, J. & Pratto, F. (2003). Social Dominance Theory and The Dynamics of Inequality: A reply to Schmitt, Branscombe & Kappen and Wilson & Liu. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 42, 207-213.

Sidanius, J., Pratto, F. & Robinowitz, J. L. (1994). Gender Ethnic Status and Ideological Asymmetry a Social Dominance Interpretation. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 25(2), 194-216.

Sidanius, J., Sinclair, S. & Pratto, F. (2006). Social Dominance Orientation, Gender, and Increasing Educational Exposure. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 36(7), 1640-1653.

Şingir, H., Sözel, H. & Şentürk, Z. S. (2022). Üniversite Öğrencilerinde Sosyal Baskınlık Yönelimi İle Yabancı Düşmanlığı (Zenofobi) Arasındaki İlişki. In 13. Uluslararası Bilimsel Araştırmalar Kongresi (UBAK) (pp. 164-175). Ankara, Türkiye.

Sönmez, M. E. (2016). Suriyeli Sığınmacıların Gaziantep Şehrindeki Mekânsal Dağılışı ve Geleceği. TÜCAUM Uluslararası Coğrafya Sempozyumu. 13-14 Ekim 2016, Ankara, 392-400.

Tabachnick B.G. & Fidell L.S. (2013). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (6th Ed.) Pearson, Boston.

Turkish Statistical Institute. (2021). İstatistiklerle gençlik 2021. Retrieved March 31, 2023, from <https://data.tuik.gov.tr/Bulten/Index?p=İstatistiklerle-Gençlik-2021-%2045634#:~:text=T%C3%BCrkiye%20n%C3%BCfusunun%20%15%2C3',15%2C3'%C3%BCn%C3%BC%20olu%C5%9Fturdu>.

Whitt, C. M., Gore, J. S. & Jiang, T. (2019). Social Dominance Orientation Moderates the Effects of Socioeconomic Status on Well-Being. *The American Journal of Psychology*, 132(2), 237-244.

Yalçın, Ö. (2017). Sosyal Baskınlık Yönelimi Ahlakı Standartları Farklı Ahlakı Temeller Boyunca Perdeler: Ahlakı Geri Çekilmede Bireysel Farklılıklar. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 32(80), 44-59.

Yıldırım, S., İslamođlu, E. & İyem, C. (2017). Suriyeli Sığınmacıların Toplumsal Kabul ve Uyum Sürecine İlişkin Bir Araştırma. *Bilgi*, 35(2), 107-126.