

The Effects of Gender on Tolerance



Maha Elsinbawi¹, Donna Wolosin²

¹MPA, MA in Human Behavior, National University, San Diego. Maha Elsinbawi is currently a research coordinator at California State University Sacramento. ORCID number: 0000-0002-4689-7015

LinkedIn: www.linkedin.com/in/maha-s-00545479

²PhD, Adjunct Faculty, National University, San Diego. Dr. Donna Wolosin is also a lecturer at San Diego State University., ORCID number: 0000-0003-2109-650x

LinkedIn: www.linkedin.com/in/donna-wolosin-phd-0595371

ABSTRACT: The study provided an overview of the various effects of multiculturalism on society's tolerance to accept others different than themselves. This phenomenon is increasing due to geopolitical factors and changes in immigration, which have created more multicultural, super diverse, and convivial societies. It explored the effects of immigration on individual tolerance. Aiming for a global input, data was collected from 44 countries. Participants ($N = 601$), both female and male immigrants and nonimmigrants, completed a 52-item religious tolerance survey. Although tolerance has been defined in several ways and measured dissimilarly, this study focused on three aspects of tolerance: factor 1: Tolerance involves ethical behavior that must ensure respect and coexistence and emphasizes living differently and yet peacefully with others; factor 2: Tolerance involves reasonable arguments and free discussions that lead to the truth and factor 3: Tolerance implies a spectrum of behavior that leads to the acceptance of differences and respects the freedom of others' choices. A t-test and one-way ANOVA were used to test gender differences on the three factors of tolerance. Females were shown to be significantly more tolerant than males.

KEYWORDS: gender, tolerance, immigration, multi-religious, multiculturalism, social homogeneity, diversity.

THE EFFECTS OF GENDER ON TOLERANCE

Immigration waves have changed the world map. Wars, political refugees, and/or individuals searching for better life opportunities are a few reasons why people immigrate from one country to another. Immigration occurs not only physically (i.e., people moving from one place to the other), but immigrants also bring with them different cultures, norms, ideas, religions, and food. Immigrants may or may not become minorities in their new home, but regardless they need to coexist with the native population. Immigrants must interweave with a new fabric of society, and this process consequently has an enormous effect on the cohabitation of the people in the host countries (Clark, 2020). This effect can either make people more tolerant towards diversity and differences brought into the societies or cause alienation between the cultural groups.

TOLERANCE AS A RESULT OF MULTICULTURALISM AND SIMILAR CONCEPTS

Multiculturalism, conviviality, and super-diversity are social trends resulting from the fact that different individuals are trying to live together in a society. Immigration trends are one of the main reasons that caused these phenomena to arise. It is important to shed some light on the definitions of each concept, to understand the resulting effect that will test the level of tolerance of the society members.

The concept of multiculturalism is considered to be relatively new; Raz (1998) emphasized that the concept was to be found in the dictionaries around the 1950's and 60's of the last century, and defined multiculturalism to be "The coexistence of cultural, ethnic and religious communities within one political society, within one state (Raz, 1998). Raz (1998) also highlighted an important aspect that shapes the reason to study multiculturalism, which is the danger of defining moral truth and universal terms about others according to oneself, and from a narrow perspective, especially when the other is a stranger in one's country; we are at home, and "the other" is not. Multiculturalism was also defined by Rosado (1996) as being a "system" that defines human experience in today's world and is made of beliefs, principles, values, and conducts. This aspect of beliefs includes people's personal philosophies and what they believe about others, their ideas, and how these affects and are affected by various behaviors. This framework has several keywords that are crucial to its understanding: recognition and respect, acknowledging others, valuing, recognizing, engaging others, and celebrating diversity (Rosado, 1996). Nye (2007) argues that the definition of multiculturalism should be specifically studied based on the cultural and religious diversity issues of society. The dependencies of multiculturalism

The Effects of Gender on Tolerance

created by migration are described by Marino (2014) as a complex dynamic that needs to take into consideration the migrant status, access to funds and resources, the host country's policies, and relations with the migrants' homeland.

Wise and Velayuthum (2014) described conviviality as the concept that opened a new mindset and framework regarding diversity in daily life, as it effectively refers to the comfort of coexistence and accommodation; it's the joy of interacting with people who are different from us. To reach a state of cosmopolitan conviviality, Noble (2013) argues that the first step is to remove prejudice (which is a bad habit). The singular way to make this happen is through creating the habit of being tolerant (a good habit), which is a very complex social and cognitive process that can be achieved by the regular practice of tolerance.

Moving beyond the multiculturalism era concept is super-diversity. This concept, first mentioned by Vertovec (2007), became a controversial way of describing a society that is diverse, especially due to the immigrants who comprise the fabric of its society. Vertovec (2017) confirmed that super-diversity actually is a means to draw attention to the new social complexities that exist, especially because of the new migration-driven diversity that created new social patterns, forms, and identities. Super diversity also refers to the changing nature of the social concepts of "inequalities, prejudice including emergent forms of racism, new patterns of segregation, new experiences of space and "contact", new forms of cosmopolitanism and creolization (including what's more recently discussed in terms of conviviality and multiculturalism) (Vertovec, 2017)." But it is not synonymous with too much diversity; it is a much deeper notion that is multi-dimensional. Foner et al (2019) highlighted the importance of studying the role of continued and long-term inequalities, such as race and class, when analyzing super-diversity.

Whether we are talking about how migration caused societies' multiculturalism, conviviality, or super-diversity in their smaller or wider scopes of emphasis, the scope of this paper is to discuss the effect of these phenomena, which is that individuals from various cultures, races, religions, genders, and backgrounds are trying to coexist together in a new display. This will result in testing the ethics of those individuals in their new surroundings, whether they will be able to tolerate each other and respect their differences to create coherent communities.

DEFINITIONS OF TOLERANCE

Those who defend the concept of multiculturalism are convinced they are also protecting individual identities and respecting them. They also allege that this will foster tolerance and communal harmony in society. The others who reject multiculturalism and all the other synonymous concepts are at risk of supporting the old ideal of assimilation and consequently rejecting tolerance (Van Der Veer, 1994). The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 1995) defined tolerance according to Article 1.1. as: "tolerance is respect, acceptance, and appreciation of the rich diversity of our world's cultures, our forms of expression and ways of being human...Tolerance is harmony in difference." Von Bergen et al (2012) emphasized the general definition of (social) tolerance as being explained by the relationship between tolerance and battling prejudice in multicultural (or super diverse) societies. They highlighted the classical definition of tolerance, that others are entitled to their opinions and have the right to express them. Although individuals may disagree with these opinions, one can still coexist peacefully. Several studies have focused on religious tolerance and coexistence, specifically as a crucial intervention technique to be introduced to youth in primary education (Al Sadi & Basit, 2013; Knauth, 2011; Reiss, 2004; Saeed, 1999; Bar-Tal, 2004).

Rutland and Killen (2015) also highlighted that prejudice emerges slowly during early childhood and adolescence. Musolf (2018) discussed the attitude towards immigrants by native individuals of a host country (UK) and concluded that most natives blame immigrants for problems of cultural integration, specifically targeting communication and language barriers, and thus may become less tolerant towards them. Although contrary to the stated norm, Hjerm et al (2020) emphasized a crucial distinction between two concepts: (in)tolerance and prejudice. Prejudice is a feeling or impression of liking or disliking others, mostly without a valid or logical reason, and is especially directed towards others who are different in some characteristics, such as race or religion; one does not need to have a prejudice to be tolerant or intolerant. For example, with immigrants living in the same society, a feeling of like or dislike does not predict a tolerant or intolerant attitude. Although prejudice inevitably extends to the measurement of tolerance, they argue that an analytical distinction exists between both and that tolerance is defined in an abstract way as "a value orientation towards difference" (Hjerm et al, 2020). Additionally, this conceptualization does not encapsulate attitudes towards specific out-groups, ideas, or behaviors, which will allow for the analysis of tolerance within and between societies. This study builds on this concept of tolerance because we believe that comparing attitudes within and between societies should be the proper means to emphasize the concept of tolerance.

TOLERANCE IN YOUNGER-AGED INDIVIDUALS

Diversity and tolerance, in general, have been studied from various perspectives. One dimension emphasized by Paas and Halapuu (2012) was ethnically diverse societies. This study generated several highlighted points on the reasons behind Europeans' attitudes towards ethnically diverse immigrants. These attitudes were: 1) the personal characteristics of the immigrants, 2) the country of origin's characteristics of the immigrants, and 3) the attitudes of people towards country institutions and socio-economic security, such as unemployment rates in their own countries and their economic status. Another perspective of tolerance was discussed from children's points of view regarding tolerance; Verkuyten and Killen (2021) desired to discover how and why children are asked to

The Effects of Gender on Tolerance

be tolerant. Among other findings, one major finding stands out; tolerance does not develop through a sequence of stages but through relevant developmental changes affecting tolerant attitudes (Verkuyten & Killen, 2021).

TOLERANCE AND GENDER

Additional research by Verkuyten and Slooter (2007) tackled religious tolerance and specifically the tolerance of ethnic Dutch adolescents aged 12-18 years towards Muslims living in the Netherlands. This paper emphasized that age and gender are effective elements of tolerance; while the sample was of younger age, adolescent females showed less prejudice than males but were less tolerant when it came to females' being unjustly treated by their (mostly immigrants) parents (Verkuyten & Slooter, 2007). Donato et al., (2014) addressed immigration gender differences in the labor market and emphasized that female immigrants in some countries in the study may have equal opportunities for work as men if they were married, as opposed to being single or unmarried.

In their study regarding attitudes towards immigrants in Europe, Hainmueller and Hiscox (2007) concluded that higher educated were more welcoming of immigrants, but they specifically found out from their analysis that females were more tolerant than men of immigrants coming from poorer countries and were less tolerant than men of those immigrants coming from richer countries. They emphasized the fact that their female sample was not as highly educated as their male counterparts, something (education) that plays the most significant effect on their results (Hainmueller & Hiscox, 2007). Francois and Magni-Berton (2013) did, however, study the gender differences towards immigration in France, being in the top five countries with the greatest number of immigrants in Europe. They specified the attitudes towards first the number of immigrants in France if the French thought there were too many immigrants, and the second measure tackled the question if they thought that immigrants would become a threat in the future. Their results were directed towards three theories in regard to gender effects: the competition hypothesis, to which males and females are not different. The contact theory, in which they emphasized that only females become more tolerant when they meet and deal with immigrants in their daily lives and not males, the third was the immigrants' sex ratio, Women are more empathetic to immigrants when the proportion of men among immigrants is higher than in the native population, and, men were more tolerant when the proportion of women among immigrants is higher (Francois & Magni-Berton, 2013). They also highlighted another important result which was that the reasons that influence the strong rejection of immigrants do not per se equates to the feeling of empathy with them (Francois & Magni-Berton, 2013). This idea is mirrored in our research that emphasizes the importance of factors other than empathy when measuring tolerance, and we included (as will be described later): Ethical Behavior, Reasonable Arguments, and Freedom from Bigotry. Francois and Magni-Berton (2013), however still conclude that women were less tolerant than males, something that our research will challenge in the results.

The percentage of females immigrating reported by the United Nations Population Division (2019) was nearly 47% percent of international migrants in 1960 and has increased marginally over the years to nearly 50% in 2019. Immigrant women have long been viewed as dependents, wives, mothers, or daughters of male migrants (Docquier et al, 2009). Although the latest statistics of the time 1990-2019 estimated that women marginally exceeded men in immigration to developed areas with a percentage of 51.2% (UN Population Division, 2019). While most literature has focused on male immigration, less research has addressed the effects and consequences of female immigration, which is poignant as the percentage of females in international migration have increased over the last several periods.

Docquier et al, (2009) also highlighted the contribution of females as highly skilled labor in the host countries to which they emigrated to. Saharso (2003) researched the effects of female migration by addressing the issue of Muslim female immigrants from the lens of multiculturalism and the tolerance of some feminist issues that do not align with the feminist definition of the west, specifically in Europe. The article argues that what seems to be counterfeminism resulting from immigration and reflecting multiculturalism may fall under the category of feminism if we understand the contexts, the reasons, and the roots of some phenomena, specifically wearing a headscarf and hymen construction, a surgical procedure that repairs the vaginal membrane (Saharso, 2003). Volopp (2001) also emphasized the fact that multiculturalism and feminism are not opposites, but the need to understand the context and the meaning of differences is what will close the gap of understanding that feminism and diversity go hand in hand.

Most of the research that tackled male immigration did not highlight the tolerance of society in relation to gender. While a few research studies focused on the effects of male immigration and the study of a second language, whether in areas where more than one language is popular such as Belgium (Van Tubergen & Wierenga, 2011), or Canada (Chiswick & Miller, 2001); they concluded that male immigrants are more likely to study the more internationally recognized language among the choices (Van Tubergen & Wierenga, 2011). Additionally, the choice of language that the male immigrants choose to study in an area where two languages are spoken is affected by several elements. These elements have the most impact on their choices: the younger the age at migration, the longer the duration of residence, the higher the educational attainment, the further the country of origin from Canada, and the linguistically closer is the mother tongue to English or French (Chiswick & Miller, 2001). Borjas (1982) discussed the effects of Hispanic males' immigration to the USA on earnings. He concluded that males immigrating as political refugees were likely to earn more than economic immigrants because they were more ready to adapt to the US labor market. Price (1999) also tackled a similar perspective in England, as he discussed employment equality while emphasizing the factors that affect employment

The Effects of Gender on Tolerance

by comparing white and non-white immigrants to UK white natives, to be education, experience, country of birth, and family characteristics. One of his findings was that the country of birth is more important than the race, which made white male immigrants coming from the west and Kenya more likely to be employed than white male immigrants coming from Jamaica, Pakistan, West Europe, Turkey, and Bangladesh (Price, 1999).

It seems that a gap in the literature exists to study the effects of gender on tolerance in adults; this study will attempt to discover if gender differences affect tolerance in newly created societies because of immigration.

MEASURING TOLERANCE

Several researchers have suggested several ways to measure tolerance; while some focused on measuring political tolerance and how civil liberties can be achieved by connecting political intolerance with general support (Gibson, 2013), other efforts have been made in the social science area as well. For example, Von Tongeren et. al, (2015) focused their research on religious tolerance. They used the concept of quest religiousness orientation as exemplified by tolerance of complexity in existential seeking, openness to personal change, and comfort with doubt that leads to resistance of simple dichotomizing of ideas and groups of people may translate to more tolerance of individuals from different religious beliefs. Other researchers measured tolerance from a qualitative perspective but highlighted it from the intolerance behavior definition regarding students in religious schools in Indonesia.

For example, Juwita et. al., (2018) defined intolerance from the perspective of students in a religious-based school. They emphasized the behaviors of intolerance as frequently teasing or mocking others, discriminatory actions, and provocation with the slightest mistakes. They concluded that older male students showed more intolerant behaviors (especially from the respect aspect) than their female counterparts (Juwita et al, 2018).

Self-reporting questionnaires to measure tolerance have been utilized in the past; Hay et al, (2021) developed a measure, the Tolerance of Uncontrollability Questionnaire (TOUQ). They argued that it is very different from other related concepts, such as intolerance of uncertainty, perception and level of control, learned helplessness, and global beliefs such as religion and spirituality, optimism and pessimism, mindfulness, and distress tolerance (Hay et al, 2021). The final version of this questionnaire consists of 19 items that load onto one factor, with very high internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.97$). Results from this questionnaire were moderately related to intolerance of uncertainty and optimism and weakly related to specific mindfulness factors.

Potgieter et al, (2014) suggested 5 main features that define tolerance:

- 1- Tolerance involves decision-making based on specific values.
- 2- Tolerance involves ethical behavior that must ensure respect and coexistence.
- 3- Tolerance involves reasonable arguments and free discussions that lead to the truth.
- 4- Tolerance implies differences, and if not applied, will lead to exclusion.
- 5- Tolerance implies a spectrum of behavior that leads to acceptance.

After analyzing the literature, three factors were selected that best defined the concept of tolerance for this study:

Factor 1: Tolerance involves ethical behavior that must ensure respect and coexistence; it emphasizes living differently and yet peacefully.

Factor 2: Tolerance involves reasonable arguments and free discussions that lead to the truth.

Factor 3: Tolerance implies a spectrum of behavior that leads to the acceptance of differences and respects the freedom of choices of others.

When developing their questionnaire to measure tolerance, Hjern et al, (2020) concluded that tolerance is best understood as a three-dimensional concept, which includes acceptance of, respect for, and appreciation of difference. Although this study is based on the survey developed by Broer et al, (2014), which contained 52 questions, the focus on measuring the concept of tolerance that we chose, was also constructed from the questions that reflected these three factors.

METHODS

Overview of Design

An online survey consisting of 52 questions regarding tolerance was administered to both immigrants and non-immigrants in various countries around the world to determine their attitudes toward tolerance.

Participants

Our target population is global: men and women above the age of 18 years with access to the internet, English language fluency, and a willingness to share their thoughts about tolerance. The sample consisted of 601 participants, (451) self-identified as females, (144) self-identified as males, and (4) others who refused to state their gender identity, indicating that females represented (75%) of the sample. However, only males and females were used in this study. The female sample had 132 immigrants and 319 non-immigrants or living in their country of birth. The male sample had 44 immigrants and 100 non-immigrants or living in their country of birth.

The Effects of Gender on Tolerance

The weighting of the data sample

We aimed for a global population sample, which is according to the United Nations DESA/ Population division in 2017, the percentage of males is 49.6 %, and females is 50.4%, to which we rounded up to a 50- 50 % (UN. Department of Economics and Social Affairs, 2017).

There was an oversampling of the females in our collected data, so in order to adjust the samples to resemble population proportion, we conducted a weighting case of the data sample. As stated above, the percentage of the female sample was higher than 50 % (overrepresented), and the male was lower than 50% (underrepresented). We gave the oversampled cases less weight and the under-sampled cases more weight using this formula:

Weight = $\frac{\% \text{ stratum in population}}{\% \text{ stratum in sample}}$, we calculated one weight for the females and one for the males' samples, and they turned out as follows: females= 0.65 and males= 2.06. We created a new variable with the weighted data (see table for the new frequencies) and based our statistical method (T-test), in this case, on the new variable.

The main reason we chose to weight our data sample is to attempt to generalize the data because, when non-random samples are representative (compare the socio-demographic characteristics of the sample subjects with the target population), generalization may be possible.

Data Collection Procedures

After receiving an IRB exemption, the survey was published online using an electronic platform for collecting data. A link to the survey was sent to participants, stating the purpose of the research, any potential harm, and consent. Once participants clicked on the consent, they were then directed to the survey. Data was collected over the course of 8 weeks in 2019.

Snowball technique

We used the snowball technique, which is a chain-referral sampling method. We nominated primary data sources, who sent the survey link to other subjects to generate additional subjects interested in filling out the survey. We specifically adopted the exponential non-discriminative snowball sampling techniques. Subjects of the sample group distributed the online survey to their referrals which in turn, also provided the survey link to multiple new referrals until a sufficient number of samples was collected. We did not have access to the referral's contact in order to protect the privacies of the potential participants. The particular characteristic of research interest in our case was the access to the online survey for immigrants and non-immigrant populations in various countries. The survey was distributed only in English, which also added a specific English language mastery level of the sample. This will entail the non-generalized results of this pilot research.

Measures

A 52-item survey developed by Broer, De Muynck, Potgieter, Wolhuter, and Van der Walt (2014) was initially used to measure the level of tolerance of university students of various nationalities and cultures in their final year of education (see Appendix A). The Likert format questions ranged from: 1= Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree. Twenty-six questions were used to construct the three 3 factors of tolerance in this study.

RESULTS

Reliability, Validity, and Bias

The authors of the survey established construct validity; and formulated questions to measure the hypothetical constructs of religious tolerance (Broer, et al, 2014). A Split-Half reliability for the 52-item survey was computed using the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula and yielded a coefficient of ($r = .73$).

Internal Reliability Analysis

An internal reliability analysis revealed the following Cronbach's Alpha for the three tolerance factors:

Factor 1: Ethical Behavior, $\alpha = 0.66$, number of items = 9.

Factor 2: Reasonable Arguments, $\alpha = 0.63$, number of items = 8.

Factor 3: Freedom from Bigotry, $\alpha = 0.66$, number of items = 9. (See table 1 for the questions included in each factor.)

Statisticians have debated what constitutes an acceptable size for Cronbach's alpha (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994; DeVellis, 2003). By convention, an alpha of .65-.80 is often considered "adequate" for a scale used in human dimensions research (Green et al., 1977; Spector, 1992; Vaske, 2008). Pallant (2001) states a Cronbach's alpha value above 0.6 is considered high reliability and an acceptable index, whereas a value of Cronbach's alpha is less than 0.6 is considered low. Nunnally and Bernstein (1994) state that alpha Cronbach values in the range of 0.60 - 0.80 are considered moderate but acceptable. Therefore, it was determined that the three factors' Cronbach's alpha values were acceptable.

Test of H_1 : Females are significantly more tolerant than Males

The independent variable was gender, and the dependent variables were the three measures of tolerance. Although there are three dependent measures of tolerance, the design is not factorial (two groups); therefore, a *t*-test for Independent Samples is the appropriate test (Huang, 2020).

The Effects of Gender on Tolerance

Levene's test for equality of variances was found to be not significant for Ethical Behavior ($p = .480$), and Reasonable Arguments, ($p = .186$). However, Freedom from Bigotry, ($p = .041$) violated Levene's test of equality of variances.

Factor 1: Ethical Behavior and factor 2: Reasonable Arguments were both tested using a t -test for Independent Samples. Results indicated that females were significantly higher ($F = 4.02$, $SD = .47$) than males ($M = 3.90$, $SD = .45$), $t(588) = 3.07$, $p = .001$ in Ethical Behavior, and they were more able to coexist with individual differences in a peaceful way. Results also indicated that females were significantly higher ($F = 4.01$, $SD = .39$) than males ($M = 3.95$, $SD = .43$), $t(588) = 3.54$, $p < .001$) in their ability to hold reasonable discussions.

Factor 3: Freedom from Bigotry was tested by a One-Way ANOVA using the Welch test. Females ($F = 3.84$, $SD = .41$) were found to significantly respect others' freedom of choice more than males ($M = 3.77$, $SD = .47$), $t(581) = 5.25$, $p = .022$).

DISCUSSION

The present study examined tolerance and gender. The rationale for this study was based on the premise that societies today expose people to multiculturalism and various beliefs and norms that are different from their own personal beliefs.

It appears that females were more tolerant than males, a result also highlighted by Verkuyten and Slooter (2007), but for the age bracket of 12–18 years old and specifically for people living in the Netherlands. The three measures of tolerance showed that females appeared to be more tolerant than males; Ethical Behavior, which focuses on the concept that Tolerance involves ethical behavior that must ensure respect and coexistence, emphasizes living differently and yet peacefully. The measure of ethical behavior entails that females seem to focus on their personal affairs and interfere as little as possible with other people. Also, more so than males, females appear to be more comfortable getting along with people who adhere to norms and values different from their own. They also appear to believe that people should be able to get along with one another, regardless of which norms and values are important to them. Females appear to have a more holistic perception of religion and beliefs than males. They disregard the different details of each religion to conclude that they eventually all lead to one truth. This shows that a higher level of tolerance is congruent with the concept of religious plurality, which argues that all religions are different ways to reach the same truth; all religions may have a different methodology, but each aim at the same absolute truth (Kar, 2014). Females also seem to be more respectful of individual differences that exist among people in society as compared to males.

The measure of Reasonable Arguments addresses the aspect of tolerance that involves reasonable arguments and free discussions that lead to the truth. Females were shown to have the ability to explain to others the values they regard as important considerably more than males, and they explain those values in a way that other people find acceptable. This shows that females' arguments appear to be not only reasonable but also smart in the sense that their opinions become acceptable to recipients. This comes from a deep trust that their personal religion/philosophy/life and worldview can be enriched through dialogue with other lifestyles/ religions/life philosophies. Females also seem to believe that personal freedom is the highest goal to strive for in life. Females are not only better at discussing critical differences that exist among people in society more so than males, but they also believe that people should seek ways to overcome these individual differences and be able to respectfully socialize with people who are different from themselves.

Finally, the measure of Freedom from Bigotry highlights the aspect of tolerance which implies a spectrum of behavior leads to the acceptance of individual differences. Females appear to respect and do not condemn others who are different from themselves and possess a higher level of empathy than their male counterparts. This measure of tolerance also includes a range of behaviors that lead to the acceptance of individual differences and respects the freedom of choice of others. They feel safe and secure when they encounter people different from themselves and desire to be on friendly terms, as well as to trust them. They also have the holistic approach of the concept that all people should be able to get along with one another, regardless of which norms and values are important to them. They respect and encourage others to have norms and values that are essential to them, even if these are different from their personal life views. Females appeared to be more empathetic to others with different religious beliefs than males; they believed they were contributing to the well-being of their fellow human beings when they demonstrated tolerance of ideas, lifestyle, and beliefs different from their own.

IMPLICATIONS FROM THE STUDY

Currently, Immigration still occurs in increased numbers in many countries, and the effects of coexistence are important for the homogeneity of society. Multiculturalism brings out the best of a country's economy; the diversity in cultures, religions and diversified products can strengthen an economy. With cultural diversity comes different perspectives of solving problems and different products, which opens new markets and enforces the full utilization of a society's potentials.

The exposure to and accommodation of different norms and traditions may be difficult from both the immigrant's and the native population's points of view. Many countries have numerous issues with minorities and racism, assuming that immigration and multicultural societies bring only undesirable effects on the people living there, and some argue that immigration has a negative impact on the economy and a modest impact on per capita growth, productivity, fiscal balance and mitigating population aging, and thus recommending a reduced immigration target to ease the macroeconomic pressure (Fry, 2014). Other research shows that

The Effects of Gender on Tolerance

diverse neighborhoods reduce White opposition to minorities and immigration; White residents who described their area as more diverse, are more tolerant to immigrants. However, many recent studies have found the reverse effect, such as that White majorities are more likely to leave a neighborhood with diverse population (Kaufmann & Harris, 2015; Ellis et al, 2018; Parisi et al, 2019). Fortunately, this issue has been addressed, and research appears to show that immigration has a positive effect on wages of the less educated native citizens and increased or left unchanged the average wages of native employees (Docquier, et., al, 2013).

GENERAL SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Previously, people were safe in their own comfort zone when each nation guarded its culture and traditions. The world is now changing; immigration and multiculturalism are altering the map of people's origins. Coexistence is becoming a must; how to accept each other's individual differences represents a base for the advancement global nations wish to see.

This study highlighted the effect of immigration and how it affects several factors of tolerance. Contrary to previous research, that gender did not affect tolerance, females showed a higher level of tolerance than their male counterparts in all three measures of tolerance; they are willing to tolerate others' ideas and beliefs to contribute to the wellbeing of society. Females also emphasized more respect for other religious beliefs compared to their males' counterparts and were less prone to bigotry than males. And although our research emphasized the fact that immigration is the trigger behind studying tolerance, our results could also be applied to any type of tolerance in societies (i.e.: religious or political), because of our broader adoption of the concept of tolerance.

The traditional view of societies has changed, and without a clear strategy as to where individuals stand in tolerating cultural and religious differences may prove it difficult for countries to live in peace and prosperity. Will humanity be restored or will war, and differences prevail? This is a question that only time will reveal.

LIMITATION AND FUTURE RECOMMENDATION

Although our study aimed to take into consideration both immigrants and non-immigrants, 70% of the participants were non-immigrants or living in their country of birth. For future research, we recommend a higher percentage of immigrants, in addition to including second generation of immigrants. We also recommend this research to be repeated using a data collection probability technique to confirm the generalization of the results.

DECLARATION OF INTEREST STATEMENT

No potential competing interest was reported by the authors.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author, upon reasonable request.

REFERENCES

- 1) Al Sadi, FH. & Basit, TN. (2013). Religious tolerance in Oman: Addressing religious prejudice through educational intervention. *British Educational Research Journal*, 39(3), 447-472. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01411926.2011.652071>
- 2) Bar-Tal, D. (2004). Nature, rationale, and effectiveness of education for coexistence. *Journal of Social Issues*, 60(2), 253-271.
- 3) Borjas, G. (1982). The earnings of male Hispanic immigrants in the United States. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 35(3). 0019-7939/82/3503-0343\$01 .00
- 4) Broer, N., De Myunck, B., Potgieter, F., Wolhuter, C., & Van der Walt, J. (2014). Measuring religious tolerance among final year education students: The birth of a questionnaire. *International Institute for Religious Freedom*, 7(1), 77-96. Retrieved from: http://www.academia.edu/16233592/Measuring_religious_tolerance_among_final_year_education_students_The_birth_of_a_questionnaire
- 5) Chiswick, B.R., & Miller, P.W. (2001). A model of destination-language acquisition: Application to male immigrants in Canada. *Demography* 38, 391–409. <https://doi.org/10.1353/dem.2001.0025>
- 6) Clark, W.A.V. (2020). *Human Migration*. West Virginia University: The research repository.
- 7) (Original year: 1986). Retrieved from: [Human Migration \(wvu.edu\)](http://www.wvu.edu)
- 8) DeVellis, R. (2003). *Scale development: Theory and applications*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 9) Docquier, F., Lowel, B., & Marfouk, A. (2009). A Gendered assessment of highly skilled Emigration. *Population and Development Review*, 35(2), 297– 321.
- 10) Docquier, F., Ozden, C., & Peri, G. (2013). The labour market effects of immigration and emigration in OECD countries. *The Economic Journal*, 124(579), 1106-1145. Doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/eoj.12077>

The Effects of Gender on Tolerance

- 13) Donato, K., Piya, B., & Jacobs, A. (2014). The double disadvantage reconsidered: Gender, immigration, marital status, and global labor force participation in the 21st century. *International Migration Review*, 48(S1), S335- S376. DOI: 10.1111/imre.12142
- 14) Ellis, M., Wright, R., Holloway, S., & Fiorio, L. (2018). Remaking white residential segregation: Metropolitan diversity and neighborhood change in the United States. *Urban Geogr*, 39(4): 519–545. DOI: [10.1080/02723638.2017.1360039](https://doi.org/10.1080/02723638.2017.1360039)
- 15) Foner, N., Duyvendak, J., & Kasinitz, P. (2019). Introduction: Super-diversity in everyday life. *Ethnic And Racial Studies*, 42(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2017.1406969>
- 16) Francois, A., & Magni-Berton, R. (2013). individual gendered attitudes toward immigrants. Empirical evidence from French surveys. *The Social Science Journal* 50(3), 321-330. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soscij.2013.02.004>
- 17) Fry, J. (2014). *Migration and macroeconomic performance in New Zealand: Theory and evidence*. St. Louis: Federal Reserve Bank of St Louis. Retrieved from <https://nuls.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.nuls.idm.oclc.org/docview/1698840602?accountid=25320>
- 18) Gibson, J. (2013). Measuring political tolerance and general support for pro-civil liberties policies notes, evidence and cautions. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 77(Special Issue), 45–68. DOI:10.1093/poq/nfs073
- 19) Green, S. B., Lissitz, R. W., & Mulaik, S. A. (1977). Limitations of coefficient alpha as an index of test unidimensionality. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 37, 827–838.
- 20) Hainmueller, J., & Hiscox, M. (2007). Educated preferences: Explaining attitudes toward immigration in Europe. *International Organization*, 61(2), 399-442. DOI:10.1017/S0020818307070142
- 21) Hay, A., Barthel, A., Moskow, D., & Hofmann, S. (2021). Defining and measuring tolerance of uncontrollability. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10608-021-10259-9>
- 22) Hjerm, M., Eger, M.A., Bohman, A., & Conolly, F. (2020). A new approach to the study of tolerance: Conceptualizing and measuring acceptance, respect, and appreciation of difference. *Social Indicator Research*, 147, 897–919. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-019-02176-y>
- 23) Huang, F. (2020). MANOVA: A procedure whose time has passed? *Gifted Child Quarterly Vol 64 (1)*, 56-60.
- 24) Juwita, W., Salim, A., & Winarno, W. (2018). Students' tolerance behavior in religious-based primary school: Gender perspective. *International Journal of Educational Research Review*, 3(3), 51-58. Retrieved from: <http://www.ijere.com/>
- 25) Kaufmann, E. & Harris, G. (2015). “White Flight” or positive contact? Local diversity and attitudes to immigration in Britain. *Comparative Political Studies*, 48(12), 1563-1590.
Doi: <https://doi-org.nuls.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/0010414015581684>
- 26) Kar, S. (2014). BÜTÜN DİNLER AYNI HAKİKATE Mİ GÖTÜRÜR?
- 27) TANRI ANLAYIŞLARI BAĞLAMINDA BİR DEĞERLENDİRME [Do all the religions take the same truth? An understanding in the context of God's understandings]. Retrieved from: <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/31214>
- 28) Knauth, T. (2011). Tolerance- A key concept for dealing with cultural and religious diversity in education. *The European Wergeland Centre*, 18. Retrieved from: www.ukr.theewc.org
- 29) Marino, S. (2014). Surviving mechanisms of power in immigration strategies: embracing Otherness and pluralisms. *Journal of International Political theory*, 11(2), 167-183. Doi: <https://doi-org.nuls.idm.oclc.org/10.1177/1755088214550115>
- 30) Musolf, A. (2018). The “legitimation” of hostility towards immigrants' languages in press and social media: Main fallacies and how to challenge them. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics*, 14(1), pp. 117-131. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/lpp-2018-0006>
- 31) Noble, G. (2013). Cosmopolitan habits: The Capacities and habitats of intercultural conviviality. *Body and Society*, 19(2&3), 162-185. DOI: 10.1177/1357034X12474477
- 32) Nunnally, J., & Bernstein, I. (1994). *Psychometric theory*. (3rd ed.) New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- 33) Nye, M. (2007). The challenges of multiculturalism. *Culture and Religion*, 8(2), 109-123. DOI: 10.1080/14755610701458915
- 34) Paas, T., & Halapuu, V. (2012). Attitudes towards immigrants and the integration of ethnically diverse societies. *Eastern Journal of European Studies*, 3(2), 161-176. Retrieved from: https://www.norface-migration.org/publ_uploads/NDP_23_12.pdf
- 35) Pallant, J. (2001). *SPSS survival manual: a step-by-step guide to data analysis using SPSS for Windows (Version 10)*. Buckingham, UK.
- 36) Parisi, D., Lichter, D., & Taquino, M. (2019). Remaking metropolitan America? Residential
- 37) mobility and racial integration in the Suburbs. *Socius: Sociological Research for a Dynamic World*, 5, 1–18, DOI: 10.1177/2378023119854882
- 38) Price, S. (2001). The employment adjustment of male immigrants in England. *The Journal of Population Economics* 14, 193-220.

The Effects of Gender on Tolerance

- 39) Potgieter, F., van der Walt, J., & Wolhuter, C. (2014). Towards understanding (religious) (in)tolerance in education. *HTS Theologiese Studies/Theological Studies* 70(3), DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4102/hts.v70i3.1977>
- 40) Raz, J. (1998). Multiculturalism. *Ratio Juris*, 11(3), 193-205.
- 41) Reiss, W. (2004). Education for religious tolerance in the Middle East. Retrieved from: <http://folk.uio.no/leirvik/OsloCoalition/Reiss0904.doc>
- 42) Rosado, C. (1996). Toward a definition of multiculturalism. Retrieved from: www.academia.com
- 43) Rutland, A. & Killen, M. (2015). A developmental science approach to reducing prejudice and social exclusion: Intergroup processes, social-cognitive development, and moral reasoning. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, 9(1), 121-154. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sipr.12012>
- 44) Saeed, A. (2007). Towards religious tolerance through reform in Islamic education: The case of the state institute of Islamic Studies of Indonesia. *Indonesia and the Malay World*, 79, 177-191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13639819908729941>
- 45) Saharso, S. (2003). Culture, tolerance and gender: A contribution from the Netherlands. *The European Journal of Women's Studies*, 10(1), 7-27, DOI: 1350-5068(200302)10:1;7-27;030786
- 46) Spector, P. E. (1992). *Summated rating scale construction*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- 47) United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division (2017). The 2017 World Population Prospects. https://population.un.org/wpp/publications/files/wpp2017_keyfindings.pdf
- 48) United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). (1995). A global quest for tolerance—1995 United Nations year for tolerance. <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/social-and-human-sciences/themes/fight-against-discrimination/promoting-tolerance/1995-united-nations-year-for-tolerance/>.
- 49) UNESCO Global Education Monitoring Report (2013/4), (Wednesday, 29 January, 2014).
- 50) United Nations, Population Division, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, International Migration Stock, (2019). Retrieved from: <https://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/data/estimates2/estimates19.asp>
- 51) Van der Veer, P. (1994). Syncretism, multiculturalism and the discourse of tolerance. *Syncretism/anti-syncretism: The politics of religious synthesis*, 196-211.
- 52) Van Tubergen, F., & Wierenga, M. (2011). The language acquisition of male immigrants in a multilingual destination: Turks and Moroccans in Belgium. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 37(7), 1039-1057, DOI: 10.1080/1369183X.2011.57247
- 53) Vaske, J. J. (2008). *Survey research and analysis: Applications in parks, recreation and human dimensions*. State College, PA: Venture.
- 54) Verkuyten, M., & Killen, M. (2021). Tolerance, dissenting beliefs, and cultural diversity. *Child Development Perspective*, 15(1), 51-56, DOI: 10.1111/cdep.12399
- 55) Verkuyten, M., & Slioter, L. (2007). Tolerance of Muslim beliefs and practices: Age related differences and context effects. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 31(5), 467- 477. DOI:10.1177/0165025407081480
- 56) Vertovec, S. (2007) Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 30(6), 1024-1054, DOI: 10.1080/01419870701599465
- 57) Vertovec, S. (2017). Mooring, migration milieus and complex explanations. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 40(9), 1574-1581.
- 58) Volopp, L. (2001). Feminism versus multiculturalism. *Columbia Law Review*, 101(5), 1181-1218. Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1123774>.
- 59) Von Bergen, C. W., Von Bergen, B. A., Stubblefield, C., & Bandow, D. (2012). Authentic tolerance: Between forbearance and acceptance. *Journal of Cultural Diversity*, 19(4), 111-117. Retrieved from: <http://web.b.ebscohost.com.nuls.idm.oclc.org/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=2&sid=86cf5b21-35b2-4a18-b482-4d87d78eddbd%40sessionmgr103>
- 60) Von Tongeren, D., Hakim, S., Hook, J., Johnson, K., Green, J., Hulsey, T., & Davis, D. (2015).
- 61) Toward an understanding of religious tolerance: Quest religiousness and positive attitudes toward religiously dissimilar others. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 26(3), 212-224. DOI:10.1080/10508619.2015.1039417
- 62) Wise, A., & Velayutham, S. (2014). Conviviality in everyday multiculturalism: Some brief comparisons between Singapore and Sydney. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 17(4) 406–430. DOI: 10.1177/1367549413510419

APPENDIX A:

1. My religion/philosophy/life and worldview defines everything in a series of rules and dog-mas.
2. I live strictly according to the rules of my religion/philosophy/life and worldview.
3. When having to take an important decision, I am strongly aware of my religion and/or my beliefs which are part of my religion/philosophy/life and worldview.
4. In general I feel safe and secure when I encounter other people.
5. I concentrate on my own affairs and interfere as little as possible with other people.

The Effects of Gender on Tolerance

6. I could not care less what other people think and feel.
7. I desire to be on a friendly foot with other people.
8. I do not feel threatened by the world around me.
9. I can comfortably get along with someone who adheres to norms and values different from my own.
10. All people should be able to get along with one another, regardless of which norms and values are important to them.
11. There are norms and values which should be important to all people, regardless of their own religion/life-views.
12. I share particular norms and values with people who adhere to a religion/philosophy/life and worldview totally different from my own.
13. In my encounters with other people I always adhere to my own norms and values.
14. Values and norms which stem from a religion/philosophy/life and worldview other than my own cannot give direction to my life.
15. The values which are important to me, all stem from my religion/life-view.
16. The values and norms which are important to me cause me to see myself as quite different from other people.
17. The values which are now important to me are not much different from the values that I adhered to as a child.
18. The values which I regard as important today, were imbued in me by my parents when I was a child.
19. The values which I today regard as important were imbued in me by the school(s) that I attended.
20. I am able to explain to others those values that I regard as important.
21. I can explain the values that are important to me in such general terms that other people can also find them acceptable.
22. I do not care what other people think and do.
23. I feel quite comfortable in the company of a person who acts in accordance with the rules of his own religion/life-view.
24. I do not care what other people think and do based on their religion/life-view.
25. I am not concerned with the ideas and actions of other people based on their own religion/life-view.
26. I think that I am contributing to the wellbeing of my fellow human beings when I tolerate their ideas and beliefs.
27. I often tolerate behavior in other people, even when I myself do not hold it in high regard and/or which I myself do not find acceptable.
28. I can imagine adhering to a religion/philosophy/life and worldview totally different from my own.
29. I have a strong tendency to trust people of religions/life-philosophies other than my own.
30. I have a deep trust in my own beliefs.
31. I am of the view that other people should have the right to their own beliefs, even if I do consider them to be wrong.
32. I believe in a society where all people share one and the same set of beliefs.
33. I believe that my own religion/philosophy/life and worldview is the only correct one.
34. I think that people can arrive at the truth only via my religion/philosophy/life and worldview.
35. I believe that all religions/life-views in the end lead to one and the same truth.
36. I am convinced that my own religion/philosophy/life and worldview can be enriched through dialogue with other religions/life-philosophies.
37. In my view, personal freedom is the highest goal to strive for in life.
38. I am convinced that people should adhere to principles contained in the Holy Scriptures of their religion.
39. I am of the view that people should live and behave according to principles not flowing from a particular religion/life-philosophy.
40. I respect the religious beliefs of people with convictions quite different from mine.
41. Based on my own religion/philosophy/life and worldview, I feel unhappy with some of the measures taken by Government.
42. I do not care whether my country is governed by Christians, Muslims, Hindus, Buddhists or New Age followers.
43. I feel I should participate in society if that does not result in conflict with my religious views.
44. I would like to become a member of a society where everyone's approach to life is the same as mine.
45. I am convinced that differences between people are so pronounced that peaceful co-existence in one and the same society is impossible.
46. I am of the view that people should have so much trust in one another that peaceful co-existence between them can be possible.
47. I am convinced that people should seek ways to overcome the differences that exist among people in society.
48. I am of the opinion that people should respect the differences that exist among different people in society.
49. I find it very difficult to imagine myself living according to the thought system of people who adhere to a set of beliefs totally different from my own.
50. I respect and do not condemn people whose beliefs are different from mine.
51. I am convinced that people who see themselves as belonging to an organized religious grouping are also searching for a higher/supernatural power.
52. I feel free to respectfully socialize with people who hold beliefs quite different from mine.

The Effects of Gender on Tolerance

Table 1. Internal Reliability Analysis of the Factors of Tolerance

Factors of Tolerance	Questions
<p>Factor 1: Ethical Behavior</p> <p>$\alpha = .660$</p> <p>Highlights ethical behavior that must ensure respect and coexistence, it emphasizes the idea to live differently and yet peacefully.</p>	<p>Q5 Q9 Q10 Q31 Q35 Q40 Q46 Q48 Q50</p> <p>Q5. I concentrate on my own affairs and interfere as little as possible with other people.</p> <p>Q9. I can comfortably get along with someone who adheres to norms and values different from my own.</p> <p>Q10. All people should be able to get along with one another, regardless of which norms and values are important to them.</p> <p>Q31. I am of the view that other people should have the right to their own beliefs, even if I do consider them to be wrong.</p> <p>Q35. I believe that all religions/life-views in the end lead to one and the same truth.</p> <p>Q40. I respect the religious beliefs of people with convictions quite different from mine.</p> <p>Q48. I am of the opinion that people should respect the differences that exist among different people in society.</p> <p>Q50. I respect and do not condemn people whose beliefs are different from mine.</p>
<p>Factor 2: Reasonable Argument</p> <p>$\alpha = 0.631$</p> <p>Reflects the reasonable arguments and free discussions that lead to the truth.</p>	<p>Q20 Q21 Q36 Q37 Q47 Q48 Q50 Q52</p> <p>Q20. I am able to explain to others those values that I regard as important.</p> <p>Q21. I can explain the values that are important to me in such general terms that other people can also find them acceptable.</p> <p>Q36. I am convinced that my own religion/philosophy/life and worldview can be enriched through dialogue with other religions/life-philosophies.</p> <p>Q37. In my view, personal freedom is the highest goal to strive for in life.</p> <p>Q47. I am convinced that people should seek ways to overcome the differences that exist among people in society.</p> <p>Q48. I am of the opinion that people should respect the differences that exist among different people in society.</p> <p>Q50. I respect and do not condemn people whose beliefs are different from mine.</p> <p>Q52. I feel free to respectfully socialize with people who hold beliefs quite different from mine.</p>
<p>Factor 3: Freedom from Bigotry.</p> <p>$\alpha = 0.661$</p> <p>Implies a spectrum of behavior that leads to acceptance of differences and respects the freedom of choices of others.</p>	<p>Q4 Q7 Q10 Q11 Q12 Q23 Q26 Q27 Q29</p> <p>Q4. In general, I feel safe and secure when I encounter other people</p> <p>Q7. I desire to be on a friendly foot with others.</p> <p>Q10. All people should be able to get along with one another, regardless of which norms and values are important to them.</p> <p>Q11. There are norms and values which should be important to all people, regardless of their own religion/life-views.</p> <p>Q12. I share particular norms and values with people who adhere to a religion/philosophy/life and worldview totally different from my own.</p> <p>Q23. I feel quite comfortable in the company of a person who acts in accordance with the rules of his own religion/life-view.</p> <p>Q26. I think that I am contributing to the wellbeing of my fellow human beings when I tolerate their ideas and beliefs.</p> <p>Q27. I often tolerate behavior in other people, even when I myself do not hold it in high regard and/or which I myself do not find acceptable.</p> <p>Q29. I have a strong tendency to trust people of religions/life-philosophies other than my own.</p>

of 1 = 53.8% of the variance



There is an Open Access article, distributed under the term of the Creative Commons Attribution–Non Commercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0) (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits remixing, adapting and building upon the work for non-commercial use, provided the original work is properly cited.