



## "DETERMINANTS OF INTOLERANCE AMONG UNIVERSITY STUDENTS: STUDENT'S PERSPECTIVE"

Dr. Muhammad Tahir Nadeem<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Shaista Noreen<sup>2</sup>, Muhammad Arif<sup>3</sup>

### ABSTRACT

*This article aims at the depiction of collective and individual agony and problems faced by the modern society. The contemporary poetry is a portrayal of social differences and incidents that affect the conscious and subconscious of people. The ever-increasing rat race of materialism and lack of spirituality has drawn a deep chasm between the Modern Man, s soul and body. It has disrupted the harmony that existed before this chaos. The contemporary poetry defines the Man, s search for his identity, his deep-rooted self-doubt, sexual perversion and the disintegration of the basic structure of religion and morality through various poetic modes. This paper aims to analyze such images, metaphors and symbols used in the contemporary poetry in the same context.*

**Keywords:** Education, tolerance, behaviors, violence, peace

### Introduction

Pakistan is an Islamic country having 97% Muslim population. That is divided into four major ethnic groups Baloch, Pathan, Punjabi and Sindhi, based on diverse norms, customs and language (Khalid, & Mahmood, 2013). Nationalities are different in term of culture and language (Eldib, 2004). In this present scenario, Pakistan has to maintain its dignity and promote a peaceful society in the world. Tolerance is one of the basic principles in the society which helps a community to live peacefully with diversity and differences. Tolerance is admiration, receipt and gratitude of the rich diversity of our world's culture, our forms of expression and ways of being human. Tolerance is the appreciation of diversity and the aptitude to live with others. Tolerance is an ability to accept and to show respect to the believers of other religion, having different nationality, languages and practices and so on differs from one's own. Intolerance is not found in human genes. The root reasons of intolerance are ignorance and fear and these are engraved at very early age of human beings (Muhammad, Kayani, & Munir, 2013). Intolerance is increasing in society. Negative expectations of people with each other in society promote prejudices in social groups. Some people living in Pakistan are not loyal with it. They are trying to make pieces of Pakistan with the help of internal and external forces. To develop a stable society, it is essential to examine the roots and backgrounds of prejudices and hate that has been produced in the people of Pakistan. It can be done by Education system. With the implementation of educational proficiencies, the behavior like hate unwillingness racism and prejudices can be changed. Literature review of different researches shows that with the help of education and inspiration of teacher prejudices can be decreased (Trompenaars, & Hampden-Turner, 2011).

- i. Assistant Professor, Department of Education The Islamia University Bahawalpur Corresponding Author
- ii. Assistant Professor, Department of Education The Islamia University of Bahawalpur
- iii. Ph.D scholar, Department of Education The Islamia University Bahawalpur

Tolerance is not concession and not indifference. Pakistan needs tolerant, accountable and sincere citizen to become a strong society in the world (Irshad, 2011). The differences between sects, ethnic, religious and prejudices among provinces have created problems in Pakistan. Now Pakistan is facing big problems like massive killing of people in Karachi, sectarian clashes, political biasness and economic inequality. Internal and external forces are trying to demurral Pakistani people. Electronic and print Media is showing Pakistan is intolerant society. This situation is very horrible. These problems can be solved by tolerate people and it is need to exercise tolerate attitude in daily social re tune. In modern scenario, it is difficult to avoid influence of other countries culture, norm and traditions because they have different language, religious and ideology (Babbie, 2015). According to Chambers (2014), training of teacher about tolerance is very essential to promote tolerance in students. Education mean is human development which can bring change the mind of students, and create harmony in students. It seeks love, respect, accept and bear to other in diverse situations. Education condoms hate with other. It changes the attitude of people and able them to live with other who are different from them. It built a coherent society. Education is tool which can be used for peaceful world. Narrow mindedness is continually instilled in the unawareness and dread: trepidation of new, of alternate societies, countries, religions. Prejudice is likewise firmly connected to an exaggerated feeling of sense of pride and delight, whether individual, national or religious. Taking after portrayal of predisposition and the parts of inclination will help in comprehension the wonder of bigotry (Assefa, Shimelis, Punnuri, Sripathi, Whitehead & Singh (2014).

Tolerance as an expression, hassles every individual among different individuals from society, in an open situation, perceiving the distinctions of every individual. Social tolerance requires that all the individuals of the society can express their ideas freely and can live their life according to their customs without passionate unsettling influences. Social tolerance is a fundamental viewpoint for promising vote based systems and can be utilized as a key thought as a part of mounting societal arrangement (Owen & Sweeney (2002). Affective Reaction Distinctive exploration examinations suggest that people are more often than not biased in term of gender, religion, race or ethnicity. Individuals of a specific position, racial or religious minority are segregated because of this refinement, specialists are situated at the second rate rank (Berry, DeMeritt, & Esarey, 2010). The term predisposition represents a slope towards a particular point of view, philosophy or result particularly when that slope is an obstruction to the capacity to be fair-minded, fair-minded or target. Taking after depiction of predisposition and its parts will be useful in seeing how and why individuals demonstrate a biased conduct and feel negative about the individuals who are not the same as them (Bowler, Donovan & Brockington, 2003). Partiality generally is characterized as a negative mentality, despite the fact that scholars remain clashed on the exact way of the fundamental attributes that escort such demeanors. Clarification of bias for instance is saturated with psychological stipulations and alludes to a negative state of mind, in light of broken or unbendable speculations, that is foreseen for an individual or bunch. In any case, depend on gathering participation, accentuating that individuals make appraisals and assessments of others in light of their states of mind or perspective about the bunch to which the individual distinguishes (Colomer, 2005).

According to Arteta, 2001) explain the discrimination, the last segment of predisposition, includes an unjustifiable negative behavior toward individuals from a particular racial gathering. Separation happens when people or gatherings are prevented equality from securing conduct, regardless of their need or wish for such fair-mindedness. The origination of tolerance infer

acknowledgment of differing personalities, goals and ways of life alongside ethnic, racial religious, sex, sexuality, class, and aptitude positions. Then again, prejudice is portrayed as the judgment of separation by of the already laid out components or every one of them (Christie & Dawes, 2001). Intolerance and language however, we do not request that others complete us, to make us as human's entire. In light of the fact that we think as of now have that wholeness without others (Judge & Welbourne, 1999). In Social Justice and Legal Equality Skills the essential rights and obligations to be allocated by the fundamental political and social foundations and they control the division of advantages emerging from social participation and assign the weights important to maintain it (Inglehart & Welzel, 2005). Tolerance perceives the all-inclusive human rights and crucial opportunities of others. Individuals are normally different; no one but tolerance can guarantee the survival of blended groups in each area of the globe (Norris, 2004).

In many countries tolerance education has been new zone; it develops harmony, peace and mutual understanding among different group of people. Tolerance education leads to nation a stable and progressive path. Tolerance has democracy values which build prosperous human society (Alzyoud, Khaddam & Al-Ali, 2016).. Every nation of the world is more focusing on peaceful attitudes and rational behaviors to stop extremism in human relationship (Safina, Rezida, Abdurakhmanov & Mirzatilla, 2016). In formal system of education is working on community, and civic based education to reduce behaviors like discrimination, hate, biasness and prejudices attitudes (Castro & Nario-Galace, 2008). As a human beings gender is basic type of tolerance in society. It is very difficult to remove racial, language and gender discrimination from a nation in political basis people have to behave as tolerate person and support moral values. Equally illustrations of pertinent sorts of cause we might consider appreciation for others guarantee to live peacefully (Weldon, 2006). Religious origination of the creature lines of persons as limited, slight and uncertain - drives us to expect human mistake, maybe particularly about matters of central human concern. Human animals do not have the god's-eye perspective as are uncertain, yet they are in any case made in God's picture (Mayorga, 2014). Tolerance is ability to accept and respect others but few decades there is lack of tolerance in our society. There is atmosphere of intolerance in our country and previous research's shows that tolerance is very necessary for a stable and coherent society. The aim of the research was to find out the elements that affect tolerance of university students in Pakistan. This study will help the institutions in the promotion of tolerance level among students.

### **Objectives of the Study**

Study was designed to achieve following objectives:

1. To find out the factors of intolerance among university students.
2. To compare the tolerance level among students with different variables like: gender, faculty, university, semester, mother tongue and habitation.

### **Research Design**

The research was descriptive in nature. Questionnaire was developed for the collection of data for the study after in-depth review of literature. Statements were added in the questionnaires about determinants of promotion of tolerance among university students. The questionnaire was based on basic causes of intolerance. Questionnaire was comprise of three parts, part 1 was about demographic variable i.e. area of residence and gender, part 2 was consisting of close ended

questions and the 3<sup>rd</sup> part was consisting of open-ended question i.e. causes of intolerance in university students. Pilot study was conducted to calculate the validity and reliability of the tool. After pilot study, the questionnaire was revised accordingly and irrelevant statements were removed. After modification, the final questionnaire was applied to the sample of the study. The students of five general public sector universities were the population of the study. One University from each province was selected but due to large population, two universities were selected from the Punjab. These universities were i.e. The Islamia University of Bahawalpur and University of the Punjab from Punjab, University of Karachi from Sindh, and University of Baluchistan from Baluchistan University of Peshawar from Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (KPK)

At the stage two, 200 hundred students were selected from each selected university. The sample was further divided into arts and science faculties on equal number. Total 100 students were further divided into male and female groups and 50 students were selected from each gender through convenient sampling technique. Detail of the sample is given in the table below.

Table 1.1. *Distribution of Sample*

Sr#	Name of Institute	Province	Art & humanities		Science group		Total
			Female	Male	Female	Male	
1	The Islamia University of Bahawalpur	Punjab	50	50	50	50	200
2	University of the Punjab	Punjab	50	50	50	50	200
3	University of Karachi	Sindh	50	50	50	50	200
4	University of Baluchistan	Baluchistan	50	50	50	50	200
5	University of Peshawar	KPK	50	50	50	50	200
<b>Total</b>			<b>250</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>1000</b>

### Data Collection and Analysis

The aim of the study was to identify factors of intolerance among university students in Pakistan. Researcher personally visited the sample of the study to collect data to collect qualitative data. Questionnaire was distributed among the respondents. The respondents were given freedom of time and confidentiality of their given responses. Total 987 questionnaires were answered and received. The collected data was analyzed by using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 20) and frequencies, mean value, and significance were drawn, Thematic analysis was done to draw the conclusions of both responses of respondents on interview and open ended questions.

### Results of the study

Results of the study are as under

Table 1.2. *Causes, which promote intolerance in university students*

S No	Causes	f	%	G. Total
<b>Determinants related to Peer</b>				
1	Cast and color	15	1.5%	<b>52.0%</b>
2	Abusive language	30	3.0%	
3	Criticism	39	3.9%	

4	Disrespect and Interference	111	11.1%	
5	Lack of patience	23	2.3%	
6	Misbehave and Misunderstanding	120	12.0%	
7	Ego, Aggression, age difference and jealousy	112	11.2%	
9	Poverty	16	1.6%	
10	Lack of co- operation	36	3.6%	
11	Over confidence	18	1.8%	
Total		<b>520</b>	<b>52.0%</b>	
Determinants related to Family				
5	Guidance and facilities	47	4.7%	<b>9.7%</b>
6	Family background	50	5.0%	
Total		<b>97</b>	<b>9.7%</b>	
Determinants related to Teacher and administration				
1	Teacher and Administration behaviors	74	7.4%	<b>2.7%</b>
2	Favoritism by teachers	65	6.5%	
Total		<b>27</b>	<b>2.7%</b>	
Determinants related to Religion				
1	Distance from Islam and teaching of Prophet Muhammad (PBUH)	70	7.0%	<b>8.0%</b>
2	Lack of ethical values	10	1.0%	
Total		<b>80</b>	<b>8.0%</b>	
Determinants related to Curriculum				
	Lengthy syllabus	10	1.0%	<b>7.6%</b>
	Education system	22	2.2%	
	Lack of awareness and tolerance education	44	4.4%	
Total:		<b>76</b>	<b>7.6%</b>	
Determinants related to Community				
1	Biasness and inequality	10	1.0%	<b>20.0%</b>
2	Injustice	39	3.9%	
3	Culture	10	1.0%	
4	Media	77	7.7%	
5	Political parties	26	2.6%	
6	Poverty, Promise breaking and Selfishness	17	1.7%	
7	Unemployment	21	2.1%	
Total:		<b>200</b>	<b>20.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Table 1.2 shows the causes, which promote intolerance in students described by the respondents. Peer related causes were, Cast and Color (1.5%), Abusive language (3.0%), Criticism (3.9%), Disrespect and Interference (11.1%), Lack of patience (2.3%), Misbehave and Misunderstanding (9.4%), Ego, Aggression, age difference and jealousy (11.2%), Poverty (1.6%) Lack of co-operation (3.6%) and over confidence (1.8%).

In determinants related to family, Guidance and facilities (4.7%) and Family background were (5.7). In determinants related to teacher and administration, Teacher and Administration behaviors (7.4%) and favoritism by teachers was (6.5%). When it was about the determinants related to Religion then Distance from Islam, teaching of Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) was

(7.0%), and lack of ethical values was (1.0%). When respondents were asked about the determinants related to curriculum, 1.0% of the respondents said that curriculum is lengthy, 2.2% of the respondents responded about education system and 4.4% responded that there is lack of awareness and tolerance education.

In determinants related to community, 1.0% responded that there was biasness and inequality, 3.9% pointed out about injustice, 1.0% indicated about culture, 7.7% think that media is a big determinant, 2.6 pointed out about political parties, 1.7% pointed out about Poverty, Promise breaking and Selfishness and 2.1% pointed out that unemployment is the important determinant of community.

Table 1.3. *Impact of gender on tolerance level of University students*

Sr#	Variable	Mean	F	Sig.
1	I like to know the traditions of various social groups.	0.137	2.539	0.011
2	Students stop conversation when they get angry with peer.	0.240	4.420	0.000
3	Students are courteous towards their seniors.	0.114	2.242	0.022
4	I avoid such activities, which are irritating for my fellows.	0.200	3.979	0.000
5	I respect the opinion of my fellows.	0.243	2.425	0.000
6	Students agitate when there is no light in the classroom.	0.224	2.539	0.000

Table: 1.3 displays that male students were more tolerate then female to like the traditions of various social groups, significance difference was (Sig. =.011). Female students stop conversation with their friends when they get angry with peer, they have significance no significant difference from male (Sig.=0.000). Male students were more courteous towards their seniors instead of female, significance difference was (Sig. =.022).Male students avoid such activities which were irritating for their fellows than male, significance was (Sig. =. 000). It also table specify that male respondents more admiration of the opinion of their fellows significance difference was (Sig. =.000) instead of female. Female students were low level of tolerating than male while we talk about the statement about un-availability of light in classroom, significance difference was (Sig. =.000).

Table 1.4. *Impact of Faculty on tolerance level of university students*

Sr.No	Dependent Variable	Independent Group (I)	Independent Group (J)	Mean Difference	Std. Error	df	F	Sig.
1	I feel pleasure in sharing the pain and joy of others.	Art	Science	.23348	.05805	998	4.022	.000
3	I enjoy the festivals of various social groups.	Art	Science	.20183	.05361	998	3.765	.000
4	I like to learn local language of my area.	Art	Science	.19775	.05233	998	3.779	.000

Table 1.4: Describe that Art students were more tolerate than Science students. They feel pleasure in sharing the pain and joy of other the significance difference was (Sig. =.000). Trend

to enjoy the festival of various social groups was found more in Art students instead of Science the significance difference was (Sig. =.000). Art students were more tolerant than Science to learn local languages of their area, the significance difference was (Sig. =.000). Overall Art students were more tolerant than Science students. The frequency was 4.022.

Table 1.5. *Impact of university on tolerance level of university students*

Sr.No	Dependent Variable	Independent Group (I)	Independent Group (J)	Mean Difference	Std. Error	Df	F	Sig.
1	I keep silent when my father gets angry with me.	IUB	U O Peshawar	.43500	.08933	998	3.678	.000
	I enjoy the festivals of various social groups.	IUB	UOB	.42500	.08409	998	2.332	.000
	I like to learn local language of my area.	UOK	U O Peshawar	.35500	.08229	998	4.543	.000
	Students agitate when there is no light in the classroom.	UOP	UOK	.28000	.08670	998	3.443	.013

Table 1.5 indicates the impact of university on tolerance of students. Table shows that IUB students were more tolerant than University of Peshawar they keep silent when their fathers get angry with them the significance difference between them was (Sig. =.000). IUB students enjoy festival of various social groups then UOB the significance difference between them was (Sig. =.000). The students of UOK like to learn local language than UOP (Peshawar) the significance difference between them was (Sig. =.000). The students who agitate when there was not light in classroom were from University of the Punjab instead University of Karachi, the significance difference between them was (Sig. =.000). The frequency was 4.543.

Table 1.6. *Impact of semester on tolerance level of university students*

S. No	Dependent Variable	Independent Group (I)	Independent Group (J)	Mean Difference	Std. Error	Df	F	Sig.
1	Students respect the opinion of their fellows.	2 <sup>nd</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	.23020	.07127	999	2.164	.036
2	I have biasness with people of other provinces.	7 <sup>th</sup>	1 <sup>st</sup>	.40099	.10584	999	2.158	.004
4	I enjoy the festivals of	5 <sup>th</sup>	7 <sup>th</sup>	.45089	.13363	999	3.299	.020

various social groups.								
------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Table 1.6 shows the impact of semester on student’s tolerance level. Table show that students from 2<sup>nd</sup> semester were more tolerates to respect the opinion of their fellows than 1<sup>st</sup>, its significance level was.036. The data displays that students from 7<sup>th</sup> semester have biasness with the people of other provinces were more intolerant than 1<sup>st</sup> semester, the significance difference between them was (Sig. =.004). The table indicate that the students from 5<sup>th</sup> semester were more tolerate to enjoy the festival of various socials groups than 7<sup>th</sup> semester the significance difference between them was (Sig. =.020). The frequency was 3.299.

Table 1.7. *Impact of mother tongue on tolerance level of University students*

Sr.No	Dependent Variable	Independent Group (I)	Independent Group (J)	Mean Difference	Std. Error	Df	F	Sig.
1	I have biasness with people of other provinces.	Urdu	Sindhi	1.00794	.25891	998	3.455	.002
	Students excuse for their mistakes.	Urdu	Pashto	.32240	.08379	998	2.198	.000
	I enjoy the festivals of various social groups.	Urdu	Balochi	.37390	.09054	998	1.576	.001

Table 1.7 indicate that the students mother’s tongue was Urdu have biasness with the people of other provinces instead of Sindhi mother’s tongue the significance difference between them was (Sig. =.002). The students mother’s tongue was Urdu were more tolerate to excuse for their mistakes than of Pashto mother’s tongue students, the significance difference between them was (Sig. =.000). The students enjoy the festival of various social were mother’ tongue of Urdu than Balochi mother’s tongue, the significance difference between them was (Sig. =.001).

Table 1.8: *Impact of habitation on tolerance level of university students*

Sr#	Dependent Variable	Mean	F	Sig.
1	I avoid biased conversation.	0.154	2.904	0.004
2	I like to know the traditions of social groups.	0.120	2.904	0.026

1.1 Table 1.8 show the impact of habitation on student’s tolerance level. The table indicate that rural areas students of university avoid biased conversation than of urban students the significance difference between them was (Sig. =.004). Whereas rural students were more tolerate to like to know the traditions of various social groups than urban students the significance difference between them was (Sig. =.026).

### Discussion and Conclusions

After Analysis, discussion and conclusions were drawn. The first objective of the research was to identify the factors of intolerance among university students. It was observed from qualitative data of the students that following reasons promote intolerance in students. The causes, which



promote intolerance among university students peer related, were biasness, cast and color, rude language of students. criticism, comments on others, irrespective, bad behaviors of students and interference, no patience and ignoring others, misbehaviors, bad environment and misunderstanding, ego, aggressive, bad behaviors, abuse language, anger, age difference and jealousy, to call bad name and jocks on others, conversation and comments on others, Criticism and poverty, misbehaviors and misunderstanding, no patience and co- operation, over confidence. Family related were, lack of guidance and facilities, family backgrounds and lack of basic needs. Teacher and administration related were, teacher and administration behaviors, discrimination, favoritism by teacher and teacher behaviors. Islam related were, distance from Islam and teaching of Prophet Muhammad (PBUH), lack of ethics. Curriculum related were lengthy syllabus, four percent education system, lack of awareness and tolerance education. Miscellaneous were biasness and inequality, injustice system, culture media and society, political parties, poverty, promise breaking and selfishness, no caring of others and unemployment. Students have biasness, bad attitude, no patience, abuse language, degree and family background, lack of parents and teacher guidance, irrespective and injustice, lack of education, facilities and morality, language, lengthy lecture and teaching method, violence and political parties, no co-operation and jealousy, media, society, religious and economic system. Many researchers have been done on this objective of the study. This research has similar results, which has been done “To Analyze the Factors Enhancing Intolerance among University Students (Kaukab, 2014).

The second objective of the paper was to compare the tolerance level among male and female university students. The results are same with the research conducted on the topic “Males' greater tolerance of same-sex peers” (Benenson, 2009). The research confirmed inequality that males have a higher inception of tolerance for heritably unconnected same-sex persons than women ensure. Acceptance of the stresses and anxieties within relationships are associated with tolerance. Male students were more tolerate then female to like the traditions of various social groups, stop conversation with their friends when they got angry with them, and male students were more courteous towards their seniors instead of female. Male students avoided such activities, which were irritating for their fellows than female and were more respected the views of fellows than of females. Female students were less tolerate than male when they were asked about electricity in classroom. The third objective of the paper was to compare the tolerance level among rural and urban university students. Similar research on the topic of “Tolerance of ambiguity, perfectionism and resilience are associated with personality profiles of medical students oriented to rural practice” was conducted the results shows that More than seventy tow percent rural area students have high level of ambiguity and high flexibility in tolerant behavior (Eley, 2017). Rural areas students of university avoided biased conversation than of urban students. Whereas rural students were more, tolerate to like to know the traditions of various social groups than urban students. Rural students have high tolerate level than urban university students. The results also shows that as student study in university their level of tolerance increased as they enrolled in next semester it indicate that university have impact in developing tolerance of students.

## **1.2 Recommendations**

Keeping in view data analysis and findings of the study some, recommendations were given as. Student should avoid behaviors like Misbehave and Misunderstanding, Ego, Aggression and jealousy. Parents should provide basics needs and should guide their children how to lead a good

life. Teacher and administrations have good behave with students. Teachers have no discrimination and should guide students. University should provide good environment to the students. Child is the birth of the society. There is need for good behaviors of society. Society has to play its role to promote tolerance among university students. Justice is necessary for a peaceful society

Government should provide job opportunities and basic needs to the students. Political parties' interference should be ban in universities and Political parties need a sincere leadership. Universities should promote co-curriculum activities. Curriculum developers and policy makers should give importance to tolerance education to build a peaceful society in the global world.

### References

- Arteta, G. (2001). *Dollarization in Ecuador: Experiences, challenges and lessons. Americas' Insights, September.*
- Alzyoud, M. S., Khaddam, A. F., & Al-Ali, A. S. (2016). The impact of teaching tolerance on students in jordanian schools. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences, 15*(1).
- Assefa, M., Shimelis, B., Punnuri, S., Sripathi, R., Whitehead, W., & Singh, B. (2014). Common Bean Germplasm Diversity Study for Cold Tolerance in Ehtiopia. *American Journal of Plant Sciences, 5*(13), 1842.
- Babbie, E. R. (2015). *The practice of social research.* Nelson Education.
- Benenson, J. F., Markovits, H., Fitzgerald, C., Geoffroy, D., Flemming, J., Kahlenberg, S. M., & Wrangham, R. W. (2009). Males' greater tolerance of same-sex peers. *Psychological Science, 20*(2), 184-190.
- Berry, W. D., DeMeritt, J. H., & Esarey, J. (2010). Testing for interaction in binary logit and probit models: is a product term essential? *American Journal of Political Science, 54*(1), 248-266.
- Bowler, S., Donovan, T., & Brockington, D. (2003). *Electoral reform and minority representation: Local experiments with alternative elections:* Ohio State University Press.
- Castro, L. N. C., & Nario-Galace, J. (2008). *Peace education: A pathway to a culture of peace.* Center for Peace Education, Miriam College.
- Chambers, R. (2014). *Rural development: Putting the last first.* Routledge.
- Christie, D. J., & Dawes, A. (2001). Tolerance and solidarity. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 7*(2), 131.
- Colomer, J. M. (2005). It's parties that choose electoral systems (or, Duverger's laws upside down). *Political Studies, 53*(1), 1-21.
- Eldib, M. A. B. (2004). Language learning strategies in Kuwait: Links to gender, language level, and culture in a hybrid context. *Foreign Language Annals, 37*(1), 85-95.
- Eley, D. S., Leung, J. K., Campbell, N., & Cloninger, C. R. (2017). Tolerance of ambiguity, perfectionism and resilience are associated with personality profiles of medical students oriented to rural practice. *Medical teacher, 39*(5), 512-519.
- Inglehart, R., & Welzel, C. (2005). *Modernization, cultural change, and democracy: The human development sequence.* Cambridge University Press.
- Irshad, M. (2011). Terrorism in Pakistan: Causes & Remedies. *Dialogue (Pakistan), 6*(3).
- Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Pucik, V., & Welbourne, T. M. (1999). Managerial coping with organizational change: A dispositional perspective. *Journal of applied psychology, 84*(1), 107.

- Kaukab, R. S. (2014). The Changing Landscape of RTAs and PTAs: Analysis and Implications. *Lahore Journal of Economics*, 19(Special Edition), 411-438.
- Khalid, S., & Mahmood, N. (2013). A Measure of Students' and Teachers' Level of Tolerance Towards Religious and Social Factors. *Pakistan Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 11(2), 77.
- Mayorga-Gallo, S. (2014). *Behind the white picket fence: Power and privilege in a multiethnic neighborhood*. UNC Press Books.
- Muhammad, M., Kayani, & Munir, M. (2013). Exploring the factors causing aggression and violence among students and its impact on our social attitude.
- Norris, P. (2004). *Electoral engineering: Voting rules and political behavior*. Cambridge university press.
- Owen, W., & Sweeney, R. (2002). Ambiguity tolerance, performance, learning, and satisfaction: A research direction. *School of Computer and Information Sciences*.
- Safina, R. N., & Abdurakhmanov, M. A. (2016). The Formation of Students' Tolerance in a Multi-Ethnic School. *International Journal of Environmental & Science Education*, 11(3).
- Trompenaars, F., & Hampden-Turner, C. (2011). *Riding the waves of culture: Understanding diversity in global business*. Nicholas Brealey Publishing.
- Weldon, S. A. (2006). The institutional context of tolerance for ethnic minorities: A comparative, multilevel analysis of Western Europe. *American journal of political science*, 50(2), 331-349.