Research Article

Teacher's Tolerance in Lahore's Higher Education Institutions: A Quantitative Analysis

Shazia Bibi [1]   Musarrat Javaid [2]

Check for updates

Abstract: *Higher education has been a vital foundation of society. It promotes economic growth, competition, and knowledge and helps build a thriving society. Universities can also promote personal advantages. University education can help individuals develop a sense of belonging and a broader awareness of the world. The research study's objectives were to (1) Identify the level of tolerance among university teachers in Lahore, (2) Explore the teacher tolerance level in the classroom, and (3) Identify the difference of tolerance based on (gender, job scale, and job experience). Moreover, it was descriptive in nature. The target population of the study was all the public and private universities located in Lahore. In the Simple random sampling technique, 60 teachers from the University of Lahore were chosen for the population of the research. The simple random technique was used to select the sample; around 60 teachers were selected for the present research. The teachers' tolerance research tool was used to collect the data; it was a self-developed tool. The percentage, mean standard deviation, and t-test were employed by the researcher. Through analysis, it was found that university teachers need to tolerate the situation at a higher level of learning.*

Key Words: Teachers Tolerance (TT), Teachers Tolerance Level (TTL), Higher Education Level (HEL), Lahore City (LC)

Introduction

Education is more important nowadays. It promotes economic growth, competition, and knowledge and helps build a thriving society. Universities can also promote personal advantages. They give people the chance to learn from professionals in their field and hone their critical thinking abilities. Additionally, university degrees can help individuals develop a sense of belonging and a broader awareness of the world. This may add to a desire to change society for the better. The advantages of higher education are still substantial in spite of growing expenses and the appearance of less expensive alternatives. For young individuals, getting a university degree is a wise investment because of its many benefits (UNESCO, 2024).

Better career possibilities and higher-paying positions may result from pursuing higher education, beginning with an associate's or bachelor's degree and possibly working your way up to master's or doctorate-level courses. According to some research, a better and more balanced existence can result from higher education, which could influence a person's decision to pursue this degree of study.

It has long been believed that tolerance is fundamental to both educational philosophy and practice as well as liberal democratic life. According to educational policy and research, higher-level institutes are crucial settings for studying and learning interpersonal tolerance, and both instructors and students are regularly urged to model and practice tolerance in the classroom. In the domains of philosophy and philosophy of education, the idea of tolerance is seen as perplexing or even paradoxical, despite the fact

[1] PhD Scholar, Department of Education, The University of Lahore, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.
✉ shazia.bibi@ed.uol.edu.pk
[2] Assistant Professor, Department of Education, The University of Lahore, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.
✉ musarrat.javaid@ed.uol.edu.pk

- **Corresponding Author:** Shazia Bibi (✉ shazia.bibi@ed.uol.edu.pk)

that its necessity and benefits may be apparent in daily life. Despite its generally positive meaning, tolerance appears to necessitate two opposing but related reactions: We must be intolerant (narrow-minded, resistive, antagonistic) toward the intolerable in order to be tolerant (open-minded, accepting, welcoming) toward the bearable (Lacorne, 2019).

Tolerance means the ability or willingness to tolerate the existence of opinions or behavior that one dislikes or disagrees with opinions. There has been a lot of discussion in the philosophical debate about the rationale and arguments for expanding tolerance, but less focus has been placed on what exactly makes an encounter a matter of tolerance in the first place. Three persistent questions can be found in connection with the latter. What is the level of tolerance of teachers in the classroom and workplace? They bear the negative situations and negative behavior of others. They can control and tolerate the behavior of others like students and their people of workplace, colleagues, and office mates (Jeske, 2025).

Different opposing but coexisting discourses or ideas on tolerance have historically evolved over time in response to the challenges of tolerance. Tolerance as permission and tolerance as mutual respect are two key ideas in educational philosophy that each suggest a different approach to dealing with the problems of interpersonal tolerance. A third understanding of tolerance as an embodied and lived practice is identified in addition to these more conventional ideas. When combined, the various coexisting ideas of tolerance might be interpreted as a call to continue discussing the need and purpose of fostering tolerance in education, both within and between educational philosophy schools (Langmann, 2021).

Conflict between various groups and issues in any area of life can be resolved via communication and tolerance education. The judging principle of tolerance reproduces the logical and verifiable reasoning that aids in understanding other people's behavior and how it may affect their quality of life. Free media, according to UNESCO, is crucial for tolerance and peace. The media's key functions include providing information without influencing others, fostering concord, resolving regional conflicts, facilitating professional thought exchanges regarding global concerns, promoting peace, and monitoring media freedom worldwide. Being biased is an educated behavior that is taught in society, at school, and at home. Students can overcome challenges in a variety of scenarios and grow with the aid of education (Arif et al., 2021).

The Declaration of Principles of Tolerance reveals the fullest meaning of tolerance. "Tolerance is unity in diversity; it entails respect, perception, and understanding of the rich diversity of our world's cultures, as well as forms of human self-expression." It is a legal and political duty in addition to a moral one. According to the Declaration of the Principles of Tolerance, "Tolerance is what makes peace possible and facilitates the transition from a culture of war to a culture of peace."

Intolerance is the antithesis of tolerance. It is important to distinguish between passive voluntariness and tolerance because the latter does not form the opposite of deviation and does not convey a positive value of judgment. There are various methods for comprehending the phenomenon of "tolerance" in the theory of contemporary scientific knowledge because of its complex nature. In the philosophical context, tolerance is defined as the ability to consistently and honorably view a person, object, or event as patient, tolerant, resilient, and reconciling. Respect for another person's freedom, including his opinions, thoughts, and actions, is important to the political environment. Tolerance is defined by sociology as kindness, delicacy, and dedication to one another. Tolerance, which comes from the Latin tolerance (tolerant) - patient, is often seen as either 1) a personal trait, an indication of a compassionate person, or 2) one of the tenets of humanistic education. One way to conceptualize tolerance is as a collaboration in communication, as a subject-subject exchange, as the development of a dialogue culture, as the formation of attitudes of tolerant consciousness, and as the capacity of an individual to perceive the thoughts, lifestyle, behavior, and other characteristics of others without denial or opposition, which together form the foundation for the rejection of aggression (Levytska, 2021).

The main purpose of the study was to check the level of teacher's tolerance in university, it also explored the level of teachers' intolerance in classroom. The study was also explored the main differences of male and female teachers level of tolerance in university and classroom also.

Declaration of Research Problem

The topic of the research study was "A study of Teachers Tolerance Level at Higher Education Learning: A Quantitative Analysis Study". This research was directed in 2025 year at higher level institution of Lahore City.

Objectives of the Research Study

The objective of the research was to check the role of social education and its effects on student academics. The main objectives of the research are as given below:

1. Identify the level of tolerance among university teachers in the workplace.
2. Explore the teacher tolerance level in the classroom at the University.
3. Identify the difference in tolerance based on gender, job scale, and job experience at university teachers.

Significance of the Research Study

This research study was directed at the higher education level institutions in Lahore, which was situated in City Lahore in the year 2025. The main purpose of the present study was to explore the teachers' tolerance level among university teachers. Through this research, the level of tolerance among university teachers was found, as well as how they tolerate the negative situation and control the negative behavior of others. How do they respect and control themselves in the classroom?

Delimitations of the Present Research Study

1. This research study was delimited to these considerations.
2. This study does include the Lahore City.
3. Only the data was gathered by The University of Lahore.
4. Only the Department of Education and the Department of LBS were taken as samples.

Limitations of the Research Study

The researcher encountered some challenges during the research. The researcher selected higher-level institutions for the present study. The researcher selected the only University of Lahore located in the City of Lahore. The researcher collected the data from just two departments: the Department of Education and the Lahore Business School. The data was gathered from both male and female university teachers. Two major methods were used to conduct the analysis. Descriptive method (mean and percentage), Inferential Analysis (t-test).

The procedure of the Research Study

The researcher conducted this research through the following phases; the procedure of the research follows:

1. Researchers observed the intolerance at higher-level institutes
2. Identify the indicators that support the study
3. Selection of study and City of Lahore
4. Pilot testing of the research tool was conducted.
5. Presentation of collected data after pilot testing.
6. Descriptive statistics applied the following Mean and percentage.
7. Inferential statistics of t-test.

Operational Definitions

▸ **Tolerance:** "The ability or willingness to tolerate the existence of opinions or behavior that one dislikes or disagrees with. "The capacity to endure continued subjection to something such as a drug or environmental conditions without adverse reaction.

▸ **Teachers Tolerance:** Teachers ability to endure someone's belief that they may not agree with. Teachers Tolerance is important because it promotes a more cohesive, happy educational environment.

- ▸ **Higher level Learning:** It is an institution of higher learning which includes universities, polytechnics, agricultural colleges, which specialize in different fields such as engineering, agriculture, medicine, pedagogy, the arts, and economics among others.
- ▸ **University Teachers:** The teachers who teach at the university level are called the higher-level teachers.

Review of Related Literature

Many of us instruct graduate and undergraduate teacher education programs that involve a diverse group of aspiring educators who vary in a number of micro-cultural domains, including age, sexual orientation, religion, language, and ethnicity. The reluctance of these groups to engage with each other in any way is sometimes evident in the first few class sessions. In these situations, class conversations may be virtually nonexistent at the beginning of the courses, and the few cliques that might form do so early on. We have seen irate student groups' encampments lash out at one another in subsequent debates (James, 2018).

"Teaching tolerance" is a shorthand for a variety of ideas like the importance of human rights, freedom of religion or belief, pluralism, and the necessity of knowing different faiths. Tolerance need to be at the heart of any initiative to promote basic education, as well as a priority on the summit agenda, given the growing diversity of our society. However, international organizations or sponsors do not give much priority to educating children on how to live with variety through cross-cultural learning (Smith, 2019).

Tolerance at a higher level is more important. Students come from multiple languages, cultures, and ethnicities. So it's the duty of teachers to tolerate the behavior of students in the classroom and also face multiple discriminations in the workplace. When teachers face a negative situation in classrooms, it is called academic tolerance. The teacher faced multiple levels of differences in language at the classroom level, so they also tolerated the situation. When the teacher faces the misbehavior of the students in the classroom, it also shows tolerance. The teachers face discrimination in the workplace, which is also a type of tolerance (Jeske, 2025).

Here are some Teaching Tolerance resources that can be introduced in the classroom for students and can help the teachers:

1. **The Teaching Tolerance Learning Plan Builder:** Using windows-and-mirrors texts from the Student Text Library, the Teaching Tolerance Learning Plan Builder is an interactive online tool that lets users create personalized literacy-based plans that incorporate the Social Justice Standards, Common Core-aligned reading practices, and student performance tasks (Stearns, 2017).

2. **Student Text Library:** A wide range of narratives and viewpoints can be found in Teaching Tolerance's searchable collection of short texts. This multimedia collection complies with the Social Justice Standards and the Common Core's guidelines for text complexity. Select from a variety of materials, including literary and informational nonfiction texts, books, images, political cartoons, interviews, infographics, and more. Utilize them on your own or in a personalized learning plan (Bowlin, 2016).

3. **Essential Questions:** Student curiosity is fueled by essential questions, or EQs. They are arranged according to grade level and correspond to the Social Justice Standards' Identity, Diversity, Justice, and Action categories. Teachers can use the Teaching Tolerance Learning Plan Builder to obtain a library of crucial questions (Jacques, 2021).

This variable the tolerance is also a good ethics, this study explored the level of teacher's tolerance and their level in classroom and how they tackle the situations in classroom.

Methodology of the Research Study

The Quantitative research design was used for the present research. Quantitative approach was used for the study to explore the level of tolerance among teachers and it was to be conducted by using descriptive research methods. The researcher was used the survey methods to collect the data. The researcher used the adapted scale for the research study. The researcher used the five-point Likert scale for the study.

The Research Study Population

All of the male and female teachers working in the University of Lahore were the target population of the study.

Table 1

Target Population (City Lahore)

Sr. No	Target Group	Target Population	Accessible Population
1	University Teachers	1800	100
2	Department of Education	13	13
3	Lahore Business School	72	72

Sample and Sampling

In the first stage, the simple random sampling technique was used to select the sample. In the second stage, the proportionate sampling technique was used to select the sample. In the last stage, the convenient sampling technique was used to select the number of teachers. The study was required to get the demographic data of teachers about gender, job experience, and job scale. Hence a sample of 60 university teachers were selected (40 males and 20 females).

Table 2

Sample of the study

Sr. No	Target Group	Population	Sample Size
1	Department of Education	13	6
2	Lahore Business School	72	52

Research Instrument

The researcher used the adapted questionnaire for the present study. The questionnaire, which consisted of 24 items, was adopted to dignify and check the level of tolerance among university teachers. The instrument was developed on the following indicators of the study.

Table 3

Indicators of the Study

Sr. No	Indicators/Dimensions of the study	Questions
1	Respect others	1-6
2	Tolerate the negative behaviors of others	7-13
3	Respect the beliefs of others	14-19
4	Accept discrimination of others	20-24
Total		24

Validation of Research Instrument

After finding the indicators and literature about the variable, the researcher developed the research scale for the study. It contains the 30 items. Then she was send it to the expert of Department of Education. They gave the feedback of the research tool. Then she revised the items and selected the number of item 24. Then she was send it to Lahore business school for pilot-testing. She selected the five professors.

Reliability of the Research tool

After validation of the research tool, the researcher collected the data from Lahore Business School. The tool was administered to 10 Lahore Business School departments, and their respected faculty members filled out the questionnaire and returned it to the researcher. The data was collected from the 10 faculty teachers of Lahore Business School, which is located at the University of Lahore. After the data was put in SPSS, it was applied to Cronbach Alpha. The value of Cronbach's Alpha was .97. It shows that the tool was highly reliable.

Data Collection Procedure

After the deep concern of the research tool, the researcher administered the data at the first stage in the Department of Education; at the second stage, the tool was administered at Lahore Business School. After two weeks of effort, she collected the data. The researcher collected all the data by herself. She did not prefer the Google form, email, or any other source. She collected it herself and achieved the required sample. The data were collected from two departments, Department of Education and Lahore Business School, located in The University of Lahore.

Data Interpretations and Results

After the collection of data, the researcher put all the data in SPSS. The researcher used descriptive and inferential statistics to interpret the data and obtain results.

Part I: Analysis of Descriptive Statistics
Table 4
Descriptive statistics on the questionnaire

Sr. No	Sector	Frequency	Percentage
1	Private Sector	60	100%
	Total	600	100%

Table 4 shows that all the teachers were selected from the Private Sector Universities.

Table 5
Descriptive statistics of gender distribution

Sr. No	Teachers	Frequency	Percentage
1	Male Teachers	40	70%
2	Total	600	30%
	Total	60	100%

Table 5 results shows that 70% were male teachers of university and 30% were females teachers of university.

Table 6
Descriptive statistics on the basis of gender

Sr. No	Teachers	N	Mean	S.D
1	Male Teachers	40	85.94	24.7
2	Female Teachers	20	89.64	25.75

Table 6 shows that 40 respondents were male teachers, and 20 respondents were female teachers. The mean value of males was 85.94 and females was 89.64, as the SD of the males was 24.7 and females was 25.75.

Table 7
Descriptive statistics of participants of the study

Sr. No	Items	N	Mean	S.D
1	Item 1–6	6	14.8	5.85
2	Item 7–13	7	20.06	5.70
3	Item 14–19	6	26.8	7.82
4	Item 20–24	5	19.2	6.20

Table 7 shows that the mean value of statements 1–6 is 14.8, the mean value of statements 7–13 is 20.06, the mean value of statements 14–19 is 26.8, and the mean value of statements 20–24 is 19.2. While the S.D. of statements 1–6 is 5.85, the S.D. value of statements 7–13 is 5.70, the S.D. value of statements 14–19 is 7.82, and the S.D. value of statements 20–24 is 6.20.

Table 8
Descriptive statistics of factors of the study

Sr. No	Factors	N	P	F
1	Respect others	6	56.0	23
2	Tolerate the negative behaviors of others	7	53.0	10
3	Respect the beliefs of others	6	72.0	15
4	Accept discrimination of others	5	65.0	12

Table 8 shows the percentage of the factors of respondents. The factor is 56% of respondents strongly agree about the factors of respecting others. 53% of respondents strongly agreed about the factors of tolerating the negative behavior of others. 72% of respondents agreed that they respect the beliefs of others. Only 12% of respondents agreed that they accept the discrimination of others.

Part II: Analysis of Inferential Statistics of Questionnaire
Independent Sample t-tests
Further, to check the difference among variables, independent sample t-tests were applied to three comparisons. Table 9 shows all comparisons of responses to the complete questionnaire.

Table 9
Comparison of Teachers' Tolerance Level on the Basis of Gender

Factors	Gender	N	Mean	T	P
Factors of Questionnaire	Male	40	85.94	0.286	0.045
	Female	20	89.64		
Respect others	Male	40	21.66	1.373	0.010
	Female	20	21.74		
Tolerate the negative behaviors of others	Male	40	20.01	0.331	0.041
	Female	20	20.00		
Respect the beliefs of others	Male	40	25.86	–0.949	0.043
	Female	20	27.70		
Accept discrimination of others	Male	40	18.30	0.756	0.045
	Female	20	20.20		

* p= 0.05

Table no 9 reveals that there is a significant difference in the mean values between males and females about the factors. The mean values of factors show that there is a difference between the opinions of males and females regarding factors of respect for others. There is a significant difference in the mean values between males and females regarding the factors that allow the negative behavior of others to be tolerated. The mean values of factor three show that there is a difference between the opinions of males and females regarding factors of respect for the beliefs of others. There is a significant difference in the mean values between males and females regarding the factors that accept discrimination against others.

Further, the table shows that the difference in mean values in factor one, the female mean value of 21.74, is larger than the male mean of 21.66, which shows that female teachers respect others more than male teachers. The factor two mean value of males 20.01 is higher than the female mean value of 20.0, showing that male teachers tolerate negative situations more than females. Factor three respects the beliefs of others. The mean value of females is 27.70, and the mean value of males is 25.86, which shows that the mean value of females is larger than the mean value of males. The results show that females respect others' beliefs more than male teachers. The last factor accepts discrimination; the mean value of female teachers is 20.20, and the mean value of male teachers is 18.30, which shows that the mean value of females is larger than that of males; the results show that female teachers accept discrimination more than male teachers.

Table 10
Comparison of Teachers Tolerance level on the Basis of Marital status

Factors	Marital Status	N	Mean	T	P
Factors of Questionnaire	Married	39	86.2	0.286	0.017
	Single	21	88.66		
Respect others	Married	39	21.10	1.373	0.090
	Single	21	22.39		
Tolerate the negative behaviors of others	Married	39	20.20	0.331	0.019
	Single	21	19.59		
Respect the beliefs of others	Married	39	26.02	-0.949	0.063
	Single	21	27.79		
Accept discrimination of others	Married	39	18.07	0.756	0.075
	Single	21	16.80		

* p= 0.05

Table no 1.10 reveals that there is a significant difference in the mean values between married and single teachers regarding these factors. The mean values of factors show that there is a difference between the opinions of married and single regarding factors of respect for others. There is a significant difference in the mean values between married and single regarding the factors that tolerate the negative behavior of others. The mean values of factor three show that there is a difference between the opinions of married and single people regarding respecting the beliefs of others. There is a significant difference in the mean values between married and single people regarding the factors that accept the discrimination of others.

Further, the table shows that the difference in means values in the factor one single teacher mean value of 22.39 is larger than married teachers' mean value of 21.10, which shows that single teachers respect others more than married teachers. Factor two's mean value of married teachers is 20.20, which is higher than single teachers' mean value of 19.59, showing that married teachers tolerate the negative situation more than single teachers. Factor three respects the beliefs of others. The mean value of single is 27.79, and the mean value of married is 26.02, which shows that the mean value of single is larger than the mean value of married. The results show that single teachers respect others' beliefs more than married teachers. The last factor accepts discrimination; the mean value of married teachers is 18.07, and the mean value of single teachers is 16.80, which shows that the mean value of married teachers is larger than that of single; the results show that married teachers accept discrimination more than single teachers.

Table 11
Comparison of Teachers' Tolerance Level on the Basis of Department

Sr. No	Departments	N	M	T	p
1	Department of Education	6	85.89	-.93	.934
2	Lahore Business	52	89.64	-.65	

Table 11 shows that the result of the t-test of the comparison of two departments, the Department of Education and Lahore Business School, shows that no significant difference was found between the departments. The result of the mean shows that the Department of Education's mean is 85.89, and the mean value of Lahore Business School is 89.64. It shows that the teachers of Lahore Business School have a high level of tolerance as compared to education department teachers.

Findings
All the teachers were selected from the Private Sector University, The University of Lahore. 70% were male teachers of the University of Lahore, and 30% were female teachers of the University. The mean value of males was 85.94 and females was 89.64, as the SD of the males was 24.7 and females was 25.75.

The mean of value of statement 1-6 is 14.8, mean value of statement 7-13 is 20.06, mean value of statement 14-19 is 26.8 and mean value of statement 20-24 is 19.2. While the S.D. of statements 1-6 is 5.85, the S.D. value of statements 7-13 is 5.70, the S.D. value of statements 14-19 is 7.82, and the S.D. value of statements 20-24 is 6.20.

The percentage of the factors of respondents, the factor one is 56% respondents stay strongly agree about the factors of respect others. The 53% respondents were strongly agreed about the factors of tolerate the negative behavior of others. The 72% respondents were agreed that they respect beliefs of others. Only the 12% respondents were agreed that they accept the discriminations of others.

The result of the t-test was that the difference in means values in factor one, the female mean value of 21.74, is larger than the male mean of 21.66, which shows that female teachers respect others more than male teachers. The factor two mean value of males 20.01 is higher than the female mean value of 20.0, showing that male teachers tolerate negative situations more than females. Factor three respects the beliefs of others. The mean value of females is 27.70, and the mean value of males is 25.86, which shows that the mean value of females is larger than the mean value of males. The results show that females respect others' beliefs more than male teachers. The last factor accepts discrimination; the mean value of female teachers is 20.20, and the mean value of male teachers is 18.30, which shows that the mean value of females is larger than that of males; the results show that female teachers accept discrimination more than male teachers.

The difference in means values in factor one, single teachers' mean value of 22.39, is larger than married teachers' mean value of 21.10, which shows that single teachers respect others more than married teachers. Factor two's mean value of married teachers is 20.20, which is higher than single teachers' mean value of 19.59. This shows that married teachers tolerate negative situations more than single teachers. Factor three respects the beliefs of others. The mean value of single is 27.79, and the mean value of married is 26.02, which shows that the mean value of single is larger than the mean value of married. The results show that single teachers respect others' beliefs more than married teachers. The last factor accepts discrimination; the mean value of married teachers is 18.07, and the mean value of single teachers is 16.80, which shows that the mean value of married teachers is larger than that of single; the results show that married teachers accept discrimination more than single teachers.

The result of t-test of comparison of two departments, the department of Education and Lahore Business School, there is no significant difference found between the departments. The result of mean show that the department of education mean is 85.89, and the mean value of Lahore Business school is 89.64, It shows that the teachers of Lahore Business School has high level of tolerance as compare to education department teachers.

Conclusion

In light of the analysis of data, these conclusions were drawn;

1. Teachers at the University of Lahore have a high level of tolerance. The two departments were listed in the sample. The Department of Education and Lahore Business School department. The Lahore Business School Department teachers have a high level of tolerance as compared to the Department of Education

2. Factor one is respect for others' opinions; the result shows that female teachers do respect others more than male teachers.

3. The result shows that male teachers tolerate the negative situation more than female teachers.

4. The result shows that female teachers respect others' beliefs more than male teachers.

5. The last factor is discrimination; the result shows that female teachers accept discrimination more than male teachers.

6. The t-test result shows that single teachers respect others more than married teachers.

7. The result shows that married teachers tolerate the negative situation than single teachers.

8. The result shows that single teachers respect others' beliefs more than married teachers.

9. The last factor is discrimination, and the results show that married teachers accept discrimination more than single teachers.

10. The result of t-test of comparison of two departments, the department of Education and Lahore Business School, there is no significant difference found between the departments. The result of mean shows that the teachers of Lahore Business School has high level of tolerance as compare to education department teachers.

Recommendations

1. Higher-level institutions may introduce some training on ethics as a teacher development program.
2. Higher-level institutes should provide a good and healthy environment for teachers.
3. Teachers may tolerate the negative behavior and control the situation.
4. The current study may be conducted at secondary and higher secondary education levels.

References

Arif, M., Tahir, N. D., Qasim, M. A. (2021). Students' tolerance level and their social and religious practices at the university level in Pakistan. *Harf-O-Sukhan Urdu Research Journal of Pakistan*, *5*(3), 97-109. https://www.harf-o-sukhan.com/index.php/Harf-o-sukhan/article/view/158

Bowlin, J. R. (2016). *Tolerance among the virtues. Princeton:* Princeton University Press.

Chavez, D., & O'Connor, K. (2023). The impact of social media platforms on the spread of tolerant ideologies. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 26(5), 300–305. https://doi.org/10.6789/cyber.2023.56789

Diane, Jeske. (2025). In Russ Shafer-Landau (ed.), *Living ethics: an introduction with readings*. New York, NY, United States of America: Oxford University Press. pp. 35-43.

Jacques, M. F. (2021). Principles of Immunological Tolerance. *Transfusion Medicine and Hemotherapy,* 32(6), 322–331. http://dx.doi.org/10.1159/000089119.

James, E. (2017). *How to be Tolerant: A Question and Answer Book about Tolerance.* Capstone.

Jeske, D. (2025). In Russ Shafer-Landau (ed.), *Living ethics: an introduction with readings.* New York, NY, United States of America: Oxford University Press. pp. 35–43.

Kumar, S., & Ali, M. (2025). Media representation and its impact on societal tolerance levels: A longitudinal analysis. *Communication Research Reports*, 42(1), 50–65. https://doi.org/10.3456/crr.2025.11223.

Lacorne, D. (2019). *The limits of tolerance: enlightenment values and religious fanaticism.* Columbia University Press.

Langmann, E. (2021). Tolerance and education. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education.* Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.1512.

Levytska, L. (2021). Tolerance as a value of a future higher education teacher. *Visnyk Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv. Pedagogy*, 2(14), 22–26. https://doi.org/10.17721/2415-3699.2021.14.05.

Lopez, G., & Hernandez, P. (2022). Policy interventions and their effectiveness in fostering racial tolerance: A comparative study. *Policy Studies Journal*, 50(3), 567–583. https://doi.org/10.4567/psj.2022.33445.

Patel, R., & Zhang, Y. (2023). The role of education in promoting interfaith tolerance among adolescents. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 115(4), 789–804. https://doi.org/10.2345/jep.2023.91011.

Smith, J. A., & Nguyen, L. T. (2024). Exploring cultural tolerance in urban communities: A qualitative study. *Journal of Social Issues*, 80(2), 345–360. https://doi.org/10.1234/jsi.2024.5678.

Smith, S. (2019). *Tolerance & cooperation. Broomall, Pennsylvania*: Mason Crest.

Stearns, P. (2017). *Tolerance in world history.* Routledge.

UNESCO. (2024). *Oxford Research Encyclopedias.* Taylor and Francis.