

STUDENT TOLERANCE PROFILE IN BANDUNG

Muhammad Rezza Septian¹, Mamat Supriatna², Juntika Nurihsan³, Nandang Budiman⁴, Riesa Rismawati Siddik⁵

^{1,2,3,4} Bimbingan dan Konseling, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia

⁵ Bimbingan dan Konseling, Institut Keguruan dan Ilmu Pendidikan Siliwangi, Indonesia

rezza.septian25@gmail.com ^{1,2,3,4}

INFO ARTIKEL

Riwayat Artikel:

Diterima: 23-12-2023

Disetujui: 30-03-2024

Kata Kunci:

profil,
toleransi,
mahasiswa.

ABSTRAK

Abstrak: Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengeksplorasi profil toleransi pada mahasiswa di Bandung raya. Ruang lingkup penelitian ini mencakup konsep teori toleransi dan aspek toleransi. Metode yang digunakan ialah metode *cross-sectional survey* dengan pendekatan Kuantitatif. Populasi dalam penelitian ini ialah mahasiswa di fakultas keguruan dan ilmu pendidikan kampus-kampus swasta di Bandung raya. Pengambilan sampel penelitian menggunakan teknik *random sampling*. Adapun Sampel penelitian terdiri dari 846 mahasiswa. Pengumpulan data menggunakan instrumen toleransi. Analisis data yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini yakni menggunakan statistik deskriptif. Hasil penelitian ini menunjukkan profil toleransi mahasiswa yang terbanyak berada kategori sedang berjumlah 599 orang atau sekitar 70,8%, kedua, mahasiswa yang memiliki profil toleransi kategori tinggi yakni berjumlah 137 orang atau sekitar 16,2%. Terakhir, mahasiswa yang memiliki profil toleransi kategori rendah yakni 110 responden atau 13%. Begitupun aspek toleransi yang terdiri dari aspek kognitif, afektif, dan psikomotor berada pada kategori sedang. Hasil penelitian ini dapat menjadi bahan dan pertimbangan bagi penelitian selanjutnya untuk menyusun model atau program layanan bimbingan dan konseling yang secara empirik digunakan untuk mengembangkan toleransi.

Abstract: This research aims to explore the tolerance profile of students in Greater Bandung. The scope of this research includes the concept of tolerance theory and aspects of tolerance. The method used is a cross-sectional survey method with a quantitative approach. The population in this study were students from teaching and education faculties at private campuses in Greater Bandung. Research samples were taken using random sampling techniques. The research sample consisted of 846 students. Data collection uses tolerance instruments. Data analysis used in this research uses descriptive statistics. The results of this research show that the highest tolerance profile of students is in the medium category, amounting to 599 people or around 70.8%, secondly, students who have a tolerance profile in the high category are 137 people or around 16.2%. Finally, students who had a low tolerance profile were 110 respondents or 13%. Likewise, the tolerance aspect consisting of cognitive, affective and psychomotor aspects is in the medium category. The results of this research can be used as material and consideration for further research to develop a guidance and counseling service model or program that can be used empirically to develop tolerance.

A. INTRODUCTION

Plurality consisting of ethnic, tribal, cultural, linguistic and religious diversity certainly requires tolerance so that each individual can live peacefully side by side. Furthermore, tolerance and respect for differences are needed when recognizing and establishing relationships between one nation and other nations (Talib & Gill, 2012; Sudirman, 2019). Indonesia, being a plural country, requires a holistic approach in creating tolerance so that every individual can live in harmony amidst diversity

(Parker, 2014). Diversity is understood as the impact of minority and majority perspectives in every dynamic interaction in the dimensions of difference (Plaut, 2010). Tolerance can construct multicultural justice for peaceful coexistence (Verkuyten et al., 2020). Currently, the practice of tolerance is to recognize diversity and differences (Chistolini, 2017; Galeotti, 2015). However, on the other hand, pluralism and diversity can potentially give rise to social conflict which will threaten the integrity of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI) if its

attitude and management are not correct (Hikam, 2006).

Psychologically, tolerance according to Allport (1954) is called a tolerant personality or "the tolerant personality" meaning an individual who actively makes friends with all kinds of individuals and does not negate differences in race, skin color or belief, thereby expressing a friendly and trusting attitude towards other people. Tolerance is even described as an attitude that allows freedom of expression, a sense of peace and provides freedom for those who have disagreements regarding religion, race, ethnicity or customs (Galeotti, 2001; Kamen, 1967; Pasamonik, 2004). In the field of education, Vogt (1997) expresses tolerance as an individual's effort to restrain oneself in the face of anything that is disliked, threatening, or bad behavior in order to maintain the order of social relations and uphold harmony. Likewise, Fiala (2002) defines tolerance as a pragmatic response to the practical need to be able to coexist between individuals who have different conceptions of the good. The theoretical construct of tolerance from Allport (1954) and Vogt (1997) includes aspects of peace, respect for differences, and equality. The indicators of the peace aspect include caring, fearlessness and love. Indicators of aspects of respect for differences include mutual respect for each other, respect for other people's differences, and respect for oneself. Indicators of equality aspects include respecting the goodness of others, being open and receptive.

UNESCO (1995) declared tolerance to be a virtue of peace that is manifested in the form of respect, acceptance and appreciation for the world's rich cultural diversity, forms of expression and ways of being human that are fostered by knowledge, openness, communication and freedom of thought, conscience, and confidence. Meanwhile, Tillman (2004) stated the points of reflection on tolerance that lead to peace between individuals as follows: (a) peace as a goal; (b) tolerance is open and receptive to the beauty of differences; (c) tolerance respecting each individual and differences; (d) tolerance, namely mutual respect for each individual; (e) the seeds of intolerance are fear and indifference; (f) while the seed of tolerance is love; (g) if there is no love, there is no tolerance; (h) tolerance, knowing that you will appreciate the goodness in others and knowing the situations and conditions of having tolerance; (i)

tolerance, namely being able to face difficult situations; and (j) tolerance for life's discomfort by letting it go, being light, and letting others go.

For Walt (2012) tolerance is carried out by means of daily social interactions that treat individuals with respect and dignity. Education is one of the right approaches to developing tolerance, maintaining peace and overcoming problems of intolerance that occur in order to develop individual mental quality (Parker, 2014; Shajhelislamov, 2014). Furthermore, developed tolerance can be the key to being able to coexist peacefully (Walzer, 1997) and be active amidst differences, diversity, creating a mindset and peace consisting of peaceful behavior, life and culture in a tiered process starting from age level. from early childhood to higher education, even in formal, non-formal and informal education (Kartadinata, 2018).

Developing tolerance is one of the key strategic goals of 21st century education, meaning forming individuals who are caring and responsible, open, respect freedom, respect human dignity and individuality, and prevent and resolve conflicts without violence (Safina & Abdurakhmanov, 2016). At this time, the big challenge in education lies in empowering students to voice and motivate different and diverse students (Dulabaum, 2011). The pedagogical meaning of education for tolerance includes accepting ideologies, beliefs, life systems that are different from one's own and recognizing individual validity (Ricciardi, Ruocco, 1962). Education has a causal effect on the level of trust and tolerance. Despite the efforts made to understand the relationship between education, levels of trust and tolerance (Borgonovi, 2012). So education needs to prioritize various alternatives to respect basic rights regardless of the various differences that exist (Balint, 2010).

Educational institutions, especially schools, in the 21st century are characterized by increasing diversity (Purgason & Boyles, 2016). Diversity in the world of education requires students to understand not only personal representations such as opinions, attitudes, experiences and emotions (Mirza, 2019). However, educational experiences that take diversity into account are a cornerstone of the educational process (ÖZGEN, 2018). In diverse environmental situations, it is hoped that students will come into contact with values that are different from their own,

learn to live and work together, and respect each other (Aydin, 2013). Tolerance functions to foster students' multicultural competence. (Agus Supriyanto, 2017). Finally, developing tolerance becomes one of the strategic goals of an educational institution, teachers and students (Andrey A. Verbitsky, Irina F. Berezhnaya, Mariam D. Iliazova, 2019).

The results of a survey conducted in Sweden and then across continents in five countries, namely Australia, Denmark, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States, show that there are similarities in understanding tolerance, but individuals must try to respect differences, influence tolerance on behavior and the consequences of society and diverse cultures from each country (Hjerm et al., 2020). In Russia around 70% of students face manifestations of intolerance such as broadcasting attacks in the press, and moral insults of certain ethnic groups (Koriakina, 2019). Meanwhile, in the city of Bandung, Indonesia, the results of research by Hermawati et al., (2016) showed that 16.2% of respondents answered the perception of tolerance in the category of having experienced conflict, 17.2% of tolerance attitudes had experienced conflict triggered by personal problems or other issues that arising from social prejudice. In the educational context, in schools, intolerance occurs in classrooms, hallways, playgrounds in the form of insults, anger, creating social distance, demeaning, and rejecting other people's opinions in the class discussion process (Schweitzer, 2007).

In tolerance research, there has not been much research on inter-group relations that emphasizes individual identity and freedom (Verkuyten & Yogeeswaran, 2017). To a large extent, interactions between groups at school play a role in explaining the development of tolerance among adolescents aged 16 – 18 years (Balint, 2010). Intermediate. The results of other studies show that adolescent phase and educational level do not correlate with the level of tolerance (Dejaeghere et al., 2012; Janmaat & Keating, 2019). Apart from that, research is needed that examines the values of tolerance and their benefits for students (Aslan, 2018). Based on the background above, this research aims to explore the tolerance profile of students in the city of Bandung.

B. RESEARCH METHODS

This research is quantitative research with a survey method. The design used by the Cross-Sectional Survey is to collect data at one time (Cresswell, 2018). The subjects in this research were 846 students from the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education at private campuses throughout Greater Bandung consisting of students from FIP IKIP Siliwangi, STKIP Pasundan, FKIP Indonesian Adventist University, FKIP Islamic Nusantara University, FKIP Bale University Bandung, FKIP Langlangbuana University, FKIP Mandiri Insan Scholar University, Tarbiyah and Teacher Training Faculty, Bandung Islamic University, FKIP Ma'soem University. The research instrument used is the tolerance instrument which was developed by referring to several theories of tolerance from Gordon Allport (1953), Thomas Lickona (1991), Vogt (1997), Witenberg (2007), Butrus & Witenberg (2015), Verkuyten (2022). Theoretical constructs are synthesized by researchers without changing their meaning and substance. This instrument consists of several aspects and indicators. The aspects of tolerance in question are cognitive, affective, psychomotor. The cognitive aspect is characterized by flexible thinking, knowledge of diversity, understanding of differences. The affective aspect is characterized by enduring what is disliked, an attitude of respect, appreciation for diversity and differences, acceptance of diversity and differences, recognition of humanity. The psychomotor aspect is characterized by equal treatment, sorting of actions, demonstration of harmony, activation of social relations, acting humanely. The data collection procedures for this research are preliminary study, literature study, data collection, data analysis, and research conclusions. Data analysis in this research used descriptive statistics assisted by the SPSS application.

C. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based on data collection that was carried out using a survey method, then the data obtained was analyzed using the SPSS application, it was found that the tolerance category profile of students throughout

Table.1 Profile of Tolerance

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Low	110	13.0	13.0	13.0
	Average	599	70.8	70.8	83.8
	High	137	16.2	16.2	100.0
	Total	846	100.0	100.0	

Greater Bandung is described in table 1 as follows.

In table 1 above, it can be seen that the tolerance profile of students in the low category is 110 respondents or 13%. Then there are 599 students who have a tolerance profile in the medium category, or around 70.8%. There are 137 students who have a high tolerance profile or around 16.2%.

The cognitive aspect of tolerance, which is characterized by flexible thinking, knowledge of diversity, and understanding of differences, can be seen in table 2 below.

Tabel.2 Profile of Cognitive Aspect

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Low	66	7.8	7.8	7.8
	Average	617	72.9	72.9	80.7
	High	163	19.3	19.3	100.0
	Total	846	100.0	100.0	

Table 2 above shows the profile of cognitive aspects of student tolerance in the low category, namely 66 respondents or around 7.8%. Then students in the medium category were 617 respondents or around 72.9%. There were 163 students in the high category or around 19.3%. The affective aspect of tolerance, which is characterized by flexible thinking, knowledge of diversity, and understanding of differences, can be seen in table 3 as follows.

Tabel.3 Profile of Affective Aspect

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Average	590	69.7	79.2	79.2
	High	155	18.3	20.8	100.0
	Total	745	88.1	100.0	
Missing	System	101	11.9		
Total		846	100.0		

Table 3 above shows the profile of the affective aspect of tolerance of students who have a tolerance profile in the medium category, namely 590

respondents or around 69.7%. There were 155 respondents or around 18.3% of students who had a high tolerance profile. The affective aspect is characterized by enduring what is disliked, an attitude of respect, appreciation for diversity and differences, acceptance of diversity and differences, and recognition of humanity, which can be explained in table 4 as follows.

Tabel.4 Profile of Psychomotor Aspect

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Low	108	12.8	12.8	12.8
	Average	585	69.1	69.1	81.9
	High	153	18.1	18.1	100.0
	Total	846	100.0	100.0	

Table 4 above shows the profile of the psychomotor aspects of student tolerance in the low category, namely 108 respondents or around 12.8%. Students in the medium category amounted to 585 respondents or around 69.1%. There were 153 respondents who had a high tolerance profile or around 18.1%. The psychomotor aspect is characterized by equal treatment, sorting of actions, demonstration of harmony, activation of social relations, acting humanely.

Based on the research results above, it can be seen that the tolerance profile of students in the city of Bandung is in the medium category, this is different from research from Akhwani, Kurniawan & Wahyu (2021), namely that Unusa teaching students show an attitude of tolerance in every element. 51% of Unusa teaching students are very tolerant, 39% are tolerant and 8% are quite tolerant and the remaining 2% are less tolerant. Meanwhile, research from Septian & Budiman (2021) shows that the results of the categorization of the tolerance profile of State Madrasah Aliyah students affiliated with the Muhammadiyah and Nahdlatul Ulama religious organizations obtained results of 73.4% being in the high category with the number of students being 47 people, while 26.6% is in the medium category. with 17 students.

For students in Ambon, the research results showed normal or positive data, this was based on dividing the skewness value by the error of skewness where the Tolerance variable was $0.565/0.302=1.87$. This value shows normal because it has a position between -2 and +2, reinforced by survey data in the field showing that the average student we meet does

not agree with things that support Intolerance and is more supportive of Tolerance, so they do not choose things that challenge the value of Tolerance. (Nanlohy, Abdin & Background, 2023). The results of research from Hermawati et al., (2016) show that 16.2% of respondents answered the perception of tolerance in the category of having experienced conflict, 17.2% of tolerance attitudes have experienced conflict triggered by personal problems or other problems that arise due to social prejudice. namely, based on an assessment based on certain stereotypes towards individuals or groups with different identities due to the existence of social prejudices which are vulnerable to triggering conflicts of dissatisfaction in social relations.

Male students generally show tolerance compared to female students who generally respond to the norms of a patriarchal society, where women are expected to know their place. The home environment for women separates them from the enriching experience of full social interaction, so the impact of family affiliation is difficult to deny. Therefore, women's tolerance values tend to be lower than men's tolerance values (Shaukat & Pell, 2020).

The decline in tolerance among millennials is not clearly visible, except among universities. A recent survey conducted by the Knight Foundation and the Newseum Institute of college students in the United States found that 78 percent of them agree that offensive and biased speech should be allowed on college campuses, compared with only 66 percent of those who do. adults in the US (Gallup, 2016). Although this new generation is theoretically more tolerant than previous generations, they still seem to place limits on tolerance: the same survey found that almost half, 49%, of students think it is acceptable to deny journalists access to protests if they think the reporting will be biased (Bosch, 2020).

Millennials are therefore generally not seen as less tolerant than the generations of Americans before them, but the most educated group of millennials – and generation X – are less willing than older Americans with the same level of education to tolerate far-right speech. Whether this is an age effect, due to the younger generation's lower tolerance for right-wing extremism (Sullivan et al. 1993), or actually a cohort effect, remains to be seen in future research.

The finding is that women are less tolerant than men (Golebiowska, 1999; Skitka, Bauman, and Mullen, 2004; Sullivan et al. 1993). Golebiowska (1999) found that women are less committed to abstract norms and perceive threats more than men. Although the research results did not find that estimates of physical, emotional and social adverse impacts were mediating factors for gender differences in tolerance (Bosch, 2020). The factors of peace and love make a big contribution in forming tolerance (Septian et al, 2023)

D. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The picture of student tolerance in greater Bandung is in the medium category, amounting to 599 people or around 70.8%, secondly, students who have a tolerance profile in the high category are 137 people or around 16.2%. Finally, students who had a low tolerance profile were 110 respondents or 13%. The tolerance aspect consisting of cognitive, affective and psychomotor aspects is in the medium category. The results of this research can be used as material and consideration for further research to develop models or programs of guidance and counseling services that empirically develop tolerance.

REFERENCE

- Akhwani, . and Kurniawan, Moh Wahyu (2021) *Potret Sikap Toleransi Mahasiswa Keguruan dalam Menyiapkan Generasi Rahmatan Lil Alamin*. Edukatif: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan, 3 (3). pp. 890-899.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The Nature of Prejudice*. Addison-Wesley Pub. Co.
- Andrey A. Verbitsky, Irina F. Berezhnaya, Mariam D. Iliazova, A. R. A. (2019). *Forein Students Education: Tolerance And Mosaicity Structure Of International Groups*. *The European Proceedings of Social & Behavioural Sciences EpSBS*.
- Balint, P. A. (2010). *Avoiding an Intolerant Society : Why respect of difference may not be the best approach*. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 42(1). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2008.00470.x>
- Bosch, A. (2020). *The Limits of Tolerance: Extreme Speakers on Campus*. *Social Problems*, 042020, 39, 1–21 doi: 10.1093/socpro/spaa019
- Butrus, N., & Witenberg, R. T. (2015). *Some personality predictors of tolerance to human diversity: The roles of openness, agreeableness, and empathy*. *Australian Psychologist*, 48, 290–298 (Published on line in 2013). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.17429544.2012.00081.x>.
- Chistolini, S. (2017). *Education and the Paradigm of Tolerance*. *The European Journal of Educational Sciences*, 04(01), 42–52. <https://doi.org/10.19044/ejes.v4no1a42>
- Dulabaum, N. L. (2011). *A Pedagogy for Global Understanding – intercultural dialogue : from theory to*

- practice. *Policy Futures in Education*, 9(1), 104–108. <https://doi.org/10.2304/pfie.2011.9.1.104>
- Galeotti, A. E. (2001). Do we need toleration as a moral virtue? *Res Publica*, 7, 273–292.
- Galeotti, A. E. (2015). The range of toleration: From toleration as recognition back to disrespectful tolerance. *Philosophy and Social Criticism*, 41(2), 93–110. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0191453714559424>
- Gallup. (2016). "Free Expression on Campus: A Survey of U.S. College Students and U.S. Adults." https://knightfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/FreeSpeech_campus.pdf
- Golebiowska, Ewa. (1999). "Gender Gap in Political Tolerance." *Political Behavior* 21(1):43–66.
- Hermawati, R., Paskarina, C., & Runiawati, N. (2016). Toleransi Antar Umat Beragama di Kota Bandung. *UMBARA : Indonesian Journal of Anthropology*, 1((2)).
- Hjerm, M., Eger, M. A., Bohman, A., & Fors, F. (2020). A New Approach to the Study of Tolerance : Conceptualizing and Measuring Acceptance , Respect , and Appreciation of Difference. *Social Indicators Research*, 147(3), 897–919. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-019-02176-y>
- Kamen, H. (1967). *The Rise of Toleration*. Weidenfeld & Nicolson.
- Kartadinata, S. (2018). EDUCATION IN THE INDUSTRY 4.0 ERA: BUILDING A CULTURE OF PEACE. *International Conference on Economics, Business, Entrepreneurship & Finance*.
- Koriakina, A. A. (2019). The Problem of Ethnic Tolerance Development among Students. *Educational Process: International Journal*, 8(1), 85–90. <https://doi.org/10.22521/edupij.2019.81.6>
- Mirza, N. M. (2019). Talking about cultural diversity at school: dialogical tensions and obstacles to secundarisation. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, November. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-019-00442-8>
- ÖZGEN, N. K. & N. (2018). Multiculturalism Concept and Its Reflections on Education : The Case of Turkey. *Review of International Geographical Education Online*, 8(3).
- Pasamonik, B. (2004). The paradoxes of tolerance. developing tolerant attitudes in students. *Social Studies*, 95, 206–210.
- Pradythia Aurellai Nanlohy, Maslan Abdin & Sjafrudin Latar. (2023). ToleransiMahasiswa: Studi Kasus diPoliteknik Negeri Ambon. *SCHOLARS: Jurnal Sosial Humaniora dan Pendidikan*, Vol. 1 No. 1
- Purgason, L. L., & Boyles, J. (2016). *Teaching Technology and Tolerance in Tandem: Culturally Responsive Classroom Guidance Interventions* Lucy L. Purgason, Jessica Boyles, and Cassidy Greene Appalachian State University. *Departamento de Seguridad Nacional*, 28.
- Shaukat, S. & Pell W.A. (2020). Religious Tolerance of Madrasa Students according to Their Religious Affiliation: An Empirical Investigation. *International Journal of Islam in Asia*. Volume 1: Issue 1 <https://doi.org/10.1163/25899996-01010005>
- Skitka, Linda, Christopher Bauman, and Elizabeth Mullen. (2004). "Political Tolerance and Coming to Psychological Closure following the September 11, 2001, Terrorist Attacks: An Integrative Approach." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 30(6):743–756.
- Safina, R. N., & Abdurakhmanov, M. A. (2016). The formation of students' tolerance in a multi-ethnic school. *International Journal of Environmental and Science Education*, 11(3), 269–277. <https://doi.org/10.12973/ijese.2016.310a>
- Septian, M. R., Supriatna, M., & Nurihsan, J. (2023). Contributive Factors of Tolerance among Senior High School Students. *Jurnal Kajian Bimbingan dan Konseling*, 8(1), 47–58. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um001v8i12023p47-58>
- Septian, M. R., & Budiman, A. (2021). Tolerance in Madrasah Students Based on Religious Organization Affiliates. *JOMSIGN: Journal of Multicultural Studies in Guidance and Counseling*, 5(2), 43–61. <https://doi.org/10.17509/jomsign.v5i2.35063>
- Sudirman, S. (2019). The 21st-Century Teacher: Teacher's Competence Within the Character Education Framework Towards A Cultural-Oriented Development and Promoting Tolerance. *International Education Studies*, 12(8), 21. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ies.v12n8p21>
- Sullivan, John, James Pierson, and George Marcus. (1993). *Political Tolerance and American Democracy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Talib, A. T., & Gill, S. S. (2012). Socio-Religious Tolerance: Exploring the Malaysian Experience. *Global Journal of Human Social Science*, 12(8).
- UNESCO. (1995). *Declaration of Tolerance*.
- Parker, L. (2014). Religious education for peaceful coexistence in Indonesia? *South East Asia Research*, 22(4).
- Plaut, V. C. (2010). Diversity science: Why and how difference makes a difference. *Psychological Inquiry*, 21(2), 77–99. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10478401003676501>
- Shajhelislamov, R F., S. K. S. & S. J. N. (2014). Designing the individual educational path for professional development of teachers. *Life Science Journal*, 11.
- Vogt, W. P. (1997). *Tolerance and education: Learning to live with diversity and difference*. Sage.
- Verkuyten, M., Yogeewaran, K., & Adelman, L. (2020). The Negative Implications of Being Tolerated : Tolerance From the Target ' s Perspective. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691619897974>
- Walzer, Michael. (1997). *On Toleration* Castle Lectures in Ethics, Politics, and Economics. Yale University Press.
- Thomas Lickona, (1991). *Educating for character: how our schools can teach respect and responsibility*. New York: Bantam.
- Verkuyten, M., (2022). *The social psychology of tolerance*. New York, NY: Routledge,
- Vogt, W. P. (1997). *Tolerance and education: Learning to live with diversity and difference*. Sage.
- Witenberg, R. (2019). *The Psychology of Tolerance: Conception and Development*. Melbourne: Springer.