

Openness to Experience, Agreeableness, Spiritual Intelligence, Humility, and Prosocial Behaviors Influence Religious Tolerance

Fatima Naqvi

&

Imran Bukhari

National Institute of Psychology
Quaid-e-Azam University, Islamabad

Abstract

This study explored the role of inherent aspects of human nature, openness to experience, agreeableness, spiritual intelligence, humility, and prosocial behavior that would influence religious tolerance. A convenient sample of 220 male and 275 female ($N = 495$) adults completed scales that included the Big Five Inventory (BFI, John et al., 1991), Spiritual Intelligence Self-Report Inventory-24 (SISRI-24, King, 2008), Expressed Humility Scale (EHS, Owens, 2009), Prosocialness Scale for Adults (PSA, Caprara et al., 2005) and Religious Tolerance Questionnaire (RTQ, Broer et al., 2014). Results showed openness to experience, agreeableness, spiritual intelligence, humility, and prosocialness clearly and effectively predicted religious tolerance. Higher values of the predictors were associated with greater religious tolerance among Pakistani adults. The results of the study are discussed in light of the growing literature about religious tolerance in Pakistan.

Keywords: Agreeableness openness to experience, spiritual intelligence, humility, pro-socialness, religious tolerance, Pakistani adults

Pakistan is religiously diverse, but predominantly a Muslim country with 96.5% of Muslims living with some Christians, Hindus, and other religious minorities (Munir, 1975). Muslims themselves are divided into many denominations with two larger groups Sunnis (85-90%) and Shias (10-15%) and many other smaller denominations (CIA, 2022). Religious tolerance simply refers to the fact that people with different beliefs and faiths live harmoniously with each other. This harmony includes mentally accepting the religious values and opinions of others and allowing them to practice their religions without persecution, and victimization whether it is verbal or physical in nature. However, it does not mean religious ideas, and values of others need to be subscribed to, people simply need to accept and respect the religious views and practices of others (Ali et al., 2018). Saulius (2013) similarly believes tolerance in general includes, acknowledging all human beings in any society are equal entities, despite their different religions, opinions, and practices.

In modern psychology, personality is viewed as a cluster of traits, where people can have traits that can make them considerate, kind, and accepting towards others, and people can have traits that can make them narcissistic, sadistic, and psychopathic towards others. When traits are positive, this aids religious tolerance and when they are of the latter kind, they are resistive and intolerant towards others and the religious beliefs they hold. The big five models of personality traits make it a bit easier to select traits that are facilitative towards religious tolerance. Of the five personality traits, we chose openness to experience (OTE) and agreeableness (AGR) for the present study. The OTE trait is a tendency that seek new experiences and experiences that are diverse, including things, thoughts, values, and behavior (Diener & Lucas, 2021). It represents the tendency of an individual to be intellectual, flexible, and broad-minded. The AGR trait consists of compassion, being cooperative, warm, and caring towards others. Several studies suggest, AGR negatively associates with prejudice and therefore buffers against prejudicial attitudes (Carlson et al., 2019). And together, AGR and OTE are strong predictors of tolerance (Butrus & Wittenberg, 2013). Yet other studies (Awais et al., 2018; Muhid, 2020) suggest, that individuals who score high on the AGR and OTE are more tolerant towards other religious groups.

King (2008) suggests individuals and societies that have a deeper awareness [being spiritual] of their religion have higher levels of religious tolerance. Such people are more accepting and respectful towards others and their religious beliefs. Deeper levels of being religious can be measured by spiritual intelligence, a capability that reflects a deep

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to
Imran Bukhari,
National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-e-Azam University,
Islamabad
E-Mail: imranpsy@yahoo.com

understanding of one's self, of having high levels of compassion, conscience, and commitment towards human values, to have a socially significant purpose in life (Kumar & Mehta, 2011). Individuals with higher levels of spiritual intelligence are aware of human values, they welcome and accept diversity (Zohar, 2000) and are religiously tolerant.

Humility is one such virtue that has a central role in every religion. Humility encourages people to accept mistakes in themselves and acknowledge similar imperfections and flaws in others. It enables people to listen to others and give good advice in times of need without being critical. It makes such people appreciate the value of all things and appreciate ways other people can contribute to the world (Tangney, 2000). Humility has been a construct of interest in the field of psychology especially when it comes to exploring acceptance and tolerance towards others. Studies show, that humble people are less dogmatic and more tolerant of others (Leary et al., 2017), and have reduced xenophobia and prejudices against groups like, (Syrian) refugees (Captari et al., 2019). AlSheddi (2020) reports humility is negatively associated with prejudice towards refugees, religious minorities, and out groups. Humble people do not impose their beliefs on others for they truly believe everybody is equal despite differences in skin, religion, or race; this increases their tolerance for others (Savoie, 2018).

Nausbaum (2012; Saulius, 2013) believes, tolerance stems from traits like empathy and compassion. Empathy promotes prosocial behavior or prosocialness (Eisenberg et al., 2006). Such prosocial behaviors are documented towards members of a society who are different (Johnston & Glasford, 2017). People who express heightened prejudice have lower prosocial motives toward out group members (Borinca et al., 2021).

Religious tolerance means to accept others, despite their disapproving thoughts and behaviors (Robinson et al., 2001). Religious tolerance acknowledges and supports the religious rights, beliefs, and practices of all. Tolerance is an act of recognizing and respecting others, and their different viewpoints, values, beliefs, and practices about their religion without oppression or discrimination (Ali et al., 2018). Tolerance constitutes a broad range of behaviors that can include dogmatic and rigid, fostering of religious intolerance, and different opinions and practices. Optimal tolerance, where one does not lose their own religious identity, can be a middle ground where respect for others, their beliefs, and ideas prevail (Van der Ven & Vermeer, 2004). In this study, we used this *respect* as a measure of religious tolerance, operationally defined by the Religious Tolerance Questionnaire (Broer et al., 2014).

Rationale & Hypotheses

In Pakistan, a few studies have looked at religious and less religious at educational institutions (Hanif et al., 2019; Nazar et al., 2017) and have found that students from institutions who were more religious were intolerant towards other religious minorities than students that came from less religious schools. Awais et al. (2018) report individuals with higher levels of extraversion (like OTE trait), showed better religious tolerance than those that are introverted. The present study extends these results, for

example, it adds the AGR and OTE traits should express higher religious tolerance. The study will also look at the influence of spiritual intelligence (for example see, Vaughan, 2002), humility (for example see, Hooks et al., 2016), and prosocialness on religious tolerance, factors not studied in Pakistani literature (Sood et al., 2012).

The pervasive, and extremely sensational role of media, tricks the minds of the people (Gitlin, 2003) making them believe that a few cases of religious intolerance (Mirza, 2020; Raja, 2017) are rules and not simply exceptions of such bizarre behavior. The world sees Pakistan as a religiously intolerant country, which the authors believe is largely a misconception that needs to be decomposed with a broader discussion on how the religious majority of the country tolerates others with their religious views and practices. The present study is the first of its kind in the Pakistani literature that takes a step towards questioning this through discussion. Based on the literature, the present study predicts OTE, AGR, spiritual intelligence, humility, and prosocialness will positively predict religious tolerance among Pakistani adults.

Method

Sample

A convenient sample of Pakistani adults comprising 220 males and 275 females ($N = 495$) was used in this study. The sample grouped into two, ranged in age from 19-40 and 41-65 years. A larger majority ($n = 300$) were undergraduates, and others ($n = 195$) were postgraduates. Their monthly income ranged from PKR 10-300K.

Instruments

Big Five Inventory (BFI)

Out of the many instruments that measure five personality traits we chose BFI, originally developed by John et al. (1991). The reasons for choosing this scale were based on the fact it was a shorter (44-item) scale compared to others and was freely available on the internet. The inventory measures Extraversion (8 items), AGR (9 items), Conscientiousness (9 items), Neuroticism (8 items) and OTE (10 items). For the present study, we used AGR and OTE subscales to assess two personality domains that would be related to tolerance for others whether religious or otherwise. Each item is measured on a 5-point agreement scale that ranges from 1 (*Disagree Strongly*) to 5 (*Agree Strongly*). Composite scores for AGR ranged from 9-45 (4 items reversed scored), whereas OTE was 10-50 (2 items reversed scored). Internal consistencies of the two subscales (Cronbach's alphas = .79 and .83) were acceptable (John & Srivastava, 1999).

Spiritual Intelligence Self-Report Inventory-24 (SISRI-24)

Developed by King (2008) SISRI-24 measures various aspects of spirituality with 24 items. These aspects divide SISRI-24 into four subscales named critical existential thinking (CET, 7 items), personal meaning production (PMP, 5 items), transcendental awareness (PA, 7 items, 1 item reversed scored), and conscious state expansion (CSE, 5 items). Each item is scored on a 5-point Likert scale with response options that range from 0 (*Not at all true of me*) to 4 (*Completely true of me*). The composite score range of SISRI-24 is 0-96, with other ranges for CET (0-28), PMP (0-20), PA (0-28), and CSE (0-20), where higher scores

represent higher spiritual intelligence. The average inter-item correlation ($r = .36$) of the scale is good, and so are split-half reliability ($r = .94$) and internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha = .95$) that was high (King, 2008; King & DeCicco, 2009; King et al., 2012). Subscale inter correlations ranged ($r = .42-.59$) from moderate to strong suggesting good construct validity across subscales (King, 2008). The subscales also correlated with several other instruments that presented adequate to strong ($r = .11-.67$) convergent validities (King, 2008; King & DeCicco, 2009; King et al., 2012).

Expressed Humility Scale (EHS)

Developed by Owens (2011) for his doctoral dissertation and later used (Wang et al., 2018) as another-reported instrument, EHS assesses other or self-expressed humility with nine items. The scale is divided into three subscales that show, willingness to view oneself accurately (WVOA, items 1-3), appreciation of others' strengths (AOS, items 4-6), and teachability (TCH, items 7-9). Each item is measured on a 5-point Likert scale with response options ranging from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 5 (*Strongly Agree*). The composite score for EHS ranges from 9-45, and for each subscale from 5-15, where higher scores represent higher humility. Internal consistency of EHS is high (Cronbach's $\alpha = .90$) and has good discriminant ($r = -.63$) and convergent validities ($r = .28-.62$), and adequate convergent validity ($r = .31$) with OTE (Owens et al., 2013).

Prosocialness Scale for Adults (PSA)

Developed by Caprara et al. (2005) PSA is based on actions of helping, sharing, taking care of, and feeling empathic with others" (Caprara et al., in press; Caprara & Pastorelli, 1993; Caprara et al., 2005). As a dimension scale PSA consists of 16 items and on each item the participant can indicate, on a 5-point Likert scale, whether the item was never/rarely true (coded as 1), occasionally true (coded as 2), sometimes true (coded as 3), often true (coded as 4), and almost always/always true (coded as 5). The range of composite scores is between 16-80 with higher scores indicating higher prosocialness. Caprara et al., (2005) report high internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha = .91$) and good item-total correlation ($r = .59$).

Religious Tolerance Questionnaire (RTQ)

Developed by Broer et al. (2014) RTQ is a 52-item questionnaire. Each item is measured on a 5-point Likert agreement scale from 1 (*Strongly disagree*) to 5 (*Strongly agree*). Composite higher scores represented greater religious tolerance. The authors selected one subscale named *Respect* (RES) to measure the construct of religious tolerance in the way the present study has conceptualized it (see introduction above). This subscale consists of 9 items with a range of composite scores between 9 and 45. Higher scores represent higher levels of respect, which is a component of religious tolerance. The internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha = .83$) for RTQ and RES (Cronbach's $\alpha = .78$) was acceptable (Broer et al., 2014).

Procedure

This study was carried out after getting approval from the National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad. All participants were individually or contacted online to take part in the study. After describing the study, if they decided to take part in it, they were asked to sign a consent form and complete the above scales (which were presented in English) and a short demographic sheet, which took 35-40 minutes to complete. At this point, they were asked if they had any questions or confusion, and if they did, answers were provided. All participants were assured their personal and data information would be kept confidential and anonymous and would be used for research purposes only. The participants were also told they had the right to withdraw from the study at any time without any penalty, and they had the right to know their results at the end of their session. All participants were thanked for their participation in the study.

Results

Table 1 shows descriptive statistics, internal consistency, and other data attributes about the scales and subscales. Internal consistencies of all scales and subscales were satisfactory and acceptable ($\alpha = .65-.91$), an alpha of .60 is considered acceptable (Taber, 2017). Since skewness and kurtosis were in acceptable ranges, other statistical analyses were carried out on the data.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics, Internal Consistencies, and Data Distribution Attributes for Scales and Subscales (N = 495).

| Scale-Subscale | k | α | M | SD | Range | | Skewness | Kurtosis |
|----------------|----|----------|-------|-------|-----------|--------|----------|----------|
| | | | | | Potential | Actual | | |
| OTE | 10 | .67 | 37.28 | 5.23 | 10-50 | 18-50 | -.57 | .36 |
| AGR | 9 | .65 | 32.98 | 5.05 | 9-45 | 17-45 | .13 | -.42 |
| SISRI-24 | 24 | .91 | 61.17 | 14.41 | 0-96 | 17-96 | -.07 | -.28 |
| CET | 7 | .74 | 18.11 | 4.85 | 0-28 | 3-28 | -.19 | -.52 |
| PMP | 5 | .75 | 13.06 | 3.52 | 0-20 | 0-20 | -.16 | -.03 |
| TA | 7 | .74 | 18.41 | 4.50 | 0-28 | 2-28 | -.28 | .11 |
| CSE | 5 | .83 | 11.58 | 4.18 | 0-20 | 0-20 | -.19 | .01 |
| EHS | 9 | .84 | 38.07 | 4.28 | 9-45 | 19-45 | -.66 | 1.01 |
| WVOA | 3 | .68 | 12.41 | 1.59 | 3-15 | 6-15 | -.88 | 2.11 |
| AOS | 3 | .71 | 12.81 | 1.73 | 3-15 | 6-15 | -.73 | .80 |
| TCH | 3 | .74 | 12.84 | 1.74 | 3-15 | 6-15 | -.57 | .17 |
| PSA | 16 | .89 | 64.57 | 9.83 | 16-80 | 23-80 | -.68 | .46 |
| RES | 9 | .83 | 37.52 | 4.99 | 9-45 | 18-45 | -.88 | 1.45 |

Note. k = No. of items, α = Cronbach's Alpha, M = Mean, SD = Standard Deviation, OTE = Openness to experience, AGR = Agreeableness, SI = Spiritual Intelligence, CET = Critical Existential Thinking, PMP = Personal Meaning Production, TA = Transcendental Awareness, CSE = Conscious State Expansion, EHS = Expressed Humility Scale, WVOA = Willingness to View Oneself Accurately, AOS = Appreciation of Others' Strengths, TCH = Teachability, PSA = Prosocialness Scale for Adults, RES = Respect

Table 2

Correlations among Scales and Subscales ($N = 495$).

| S-Subscales | OTE | AGR | SISRI-24 | CET | PMP | TA | CSE | EHS | WVOA | AOS | TCH | PSA | RES |
|-------------|-----|-------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| OTE | - | .19** | .53** | .48** | .38** | .51** | .38** | .35** | .27** | .33** | .27** | .44** | .31** |
| AGR | - | - | .12** | .00 | .17** | .20** | .05 | .34** | .29** | .27** | .31** | .39** | .27** |
| SISRI-24 | - | - | - | .86** | .82** | .85** | .83** | .41** | .35** | .36** | .33** | .51** | .38** |
| CET | - | - | - | - | .60** | .66** | .59** | .33** | .28** | .29** | .26** | .41** | .37** |
| PMP | - | - | - | - | - | .61** | .65** | .36** | .33** | .29** | .28** | .45** | .30** |
| TA | - | - | - | - | - | - | .57** | .41** | .35** | .37** | .32** | .48** | .40** |
| CSE | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | .28** | .22** | .25** | .24** | .38** | .20** |
| EHS | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | .82** | .87** | .83** | .49** | .55** |
| WVOA | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | .60** | .50** | .41** | .49** |
| AOS | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | .58** | .41** | .45** |
| TCH | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | .43** | .45** |
| PSA | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | .36** |
| RES | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Note. S-Subscales = Scales and Subscales, OTE = Openness to experience, AGR = Agreeableness, SI = Spiritual Intelligence, CET = Critical Existential Thinking, PMP = Personal Meaning Production, TA = Transcendental Awareness, CSE = Conscious State Expansion, EHS = Expressed Humility Scale, WVOA = Willingness to View Oneself Accurately, AOS = Appreciation of Others' Strengths, TCH = Teachability, PSA = Prosocialness Scale for Adults, RES = Respect, ** $p < .01$

Table 2 shows scores on all scales and subscales i.e., OTE, AGR, EHS, SI, PSA, and RES correlated positively with each other. This analysis if taken in pairs simply suggests that higher OTE was associated with higher religious tolerance; higher AGR was associated with higher religious tolerance, and so on. In short, higher measures of

two personality domains, humility, spiritual intelligence, and prosocialness were associated with greater religious tolerance. This analysis was also similar for constructs (subscales) as they associated with religious tolerance positively supporting our hypotheses.

Table 3

Regression Analysis shows the influence of Humility, Spiritual Intelligence, Prosocial Behavior, Agreeableness, and Openness to Experience on Religious Tolerance ($N = 495$).

| Scale | Religious Tolerance | | | | | |
|----------|---------------------|------|---------|--------|------|--|
| | B | SE | β | 95% CI | | |
| | | | | UL | LL | |
| OTE | .29 | .04 | .31*** | .21 | .37 | |
| R^2 | .09 | | | | | |
| F | 53.58*** | | | | | |
| AGR | .26 | .04 | .27*** | .18 | .35 | |
| R^2 | .07 | | | | | |
| F | 39.03*** | | | | | |
| SISRI-24 | .13 | .01 | .38*** | .10 | .16 | |
| R^2 | .14 | | | | | |
| F | 86.12*** | | | | | |
| EHS | .64 | .04 | .55*** | .55 | .72 | |
| R^2 | .30 | | | | | |
| F | 216.76*** | | | | | |
| PSA | .18 | .02 | .36*** | .14 | .22 | |
| R^2 | .13 | | | | | |
| F | 75.60*** | | | | | |

Note. B = Standardized beta, SE = Standard Error, β = Standardized beta, LL = Lower limit, UL = Upper limit, OTE = Openness to experience, AGR = Agreeableness, SI = Spiritual Intelligence, EHS = Expressed Humility Scale, PSA = Prosocialness Scale for Adults, RT = Religious Tolerance based on RES or Respect subscale, *** $p < .001$

To show the directionality of association simple linear regression was carried out, setting OTE, AGR, SI, EHS,

and PSA as predictors and RES as the outcome variable. Results indicated that personality traits, OTE [$\beta = .31$,

$F(1, 493) = 53.58, p < .001$] and AGR [$\beta = .27, F(1, 493) = 39.03, p < .001$], SI [$\beta = .38, F(1, 493) = 86.12, p < .001$], EHS [$\beta = .55, F(1, 493) = 216.76, p < .001$] and PSA [$\beta = .36, F(1, 493) = 75.60, p < .001$] significantly

and positively predicted religious tolerance or RT (see Table 3). The analysis revealed OTE (9%), AGR (7%), SI (14%), EHS (30%), and PSA (13%) respectively explained RT.

Table 4
Differences in Graduate and Postgraduate Students over Scales and Subscales (N = 495).

| Scale-Subscale | Undergraduate (n = 300) | | Postgraduate (n = 195) | | T | 95% CI | | d |
|----------------|----------------------------|-------|---------------------------|-------|-------|--------|------|-----|
| | M | SD | M | SD | | LL | UL | |
| OTE | 37.39 | 5.10 | 37.12 | 5.43 | .57 | -.67 | 1.22 | |
| AGR | 32.65 | 5.00 | 33.47 | 5.11 | 1.76 | -1.73 | .09 | |
| SISRI-24 | 59.99 | 14.16 | 62.97 | 14.63 | 2.25* | -5.50 | -.38 | .20 |
| CET | 17.82 | 4.89 | 18.55 | 4.77 | 1.63 | -1.60 | .14 | |
| PMP | 12.81 | 3.55 | 13.45 | 3.44 | 1.95 | -1.20 | .00 | |
| TA | 18.03 | 4.55 | 19.01 | 4.36 | 2.37* | -1.70 | -.16 | .21 |
| CSE | 11.33 | 4.08 | 11.97 | 4.31 | 1.66 | -1.30 | .11 | |
| EHS | 37.91 | 4.33 | 38.33 | 4.20 | 1.08 | -1.20 | .34 | |
| WVOA | 12.33 | 1.61 | 12.53 | 1.57 | 1.33 | -.48 | .09 | |
| AOS | 12.70 | 1.74 | 12.98 | 1.71 | 1.79 | -.59 | .02 | |
| TCH | 12.86 | 1.72 | 12.81 | 1.77 | .35 | -.25 | .37 | |
| PSA | 64.26 | 10.05 | 65.05 | 9.48 | .87 | -2.50 | .98 | |
| RES | 37.16 | 4.93 | 38.08 | 5.03 | 2.01* | -1.82 | -.02 | .18 |

Note. d = Cohen's d, OTE = Openness to experience, AGR = Agreeableness, SI = Spiritual Intelligence, CET = Critical Existential Thinking, PMP = Personal Meaning Production, TA = Transcendental Awareness, CSE = Conscious State Expansion, EHS = Expressed Humility Scale, WVOA = Willingness to View Oneself Accurately, AOS = Appreciation of Others' Strengths, TCH = Teachability, PSA = Prosocialness Scale for Adults, RES = Respect
* $p < .05$

Table 4 shows a comparison between undergraduate and postgraduate students on the constructs measured by scales and their subscales. For most scales and subscales, the two educational groups are mostly similar, except postgraduate students scored significantly $t(493) = 2.25, p < .05$, higher ($M = 62.97, SD = 14.63$) than undergraduate students ($M = 59.99, SD = 14.16$) on overall SI. The authors think this is largely due to differences in the groups based on the subscale TA where postgraduate students scored significantly $t(493) = 2.37, p < .05$, higher ($M = 19.01, SD = 4.36$) than undergraduate students ($M = 18.03, SD = 4.55$). Postgraduate students also scored significantly $t(493) = 2.01, p < .05$ higher ($M = 38.08, SD = 5.03$) than undergraduate students ($M = 37.16, SD = 4.93$) on RT based on RES.

Discussion

The results of the present study suggest, that stronger openness to experience and agreeableness greater spiritual intelligence, more humility, and greater prosocialness predict greater religious tolerance in Pakistani adults. The greatest influence on religious tolerance was made by humility, followed by spiritual intelligence, prosocialness, openness to experience, and agreeableness, respectively. These findings replicate and verify previous studies with similar associations between openness to experience and agreeableness (Awais et al., 2018; Muhid, 2020), spiritual intelligence (Hughes, 2013), humility (Woodruff et al., 2014; Hook et al., 2016), prosocialness (Borinca et al., 2021) and religious tolerance.

The results of the study revealed postgraduate students had higher religious tolerance than undergraduate students a result that is aligned with the fact, that more education is positively associated with greater religious tolerance (Coenders & Scheepers, 1998), and that poor education plays a strong role in discriminatory and prejudicial attitudes which can give rise to religious intolerance (Chandler & Tsai, 2001; Guimond & Palmer, 2008). The reason we think education plays a role in religious tolerance could be based on spiritual intelligence, specifically transcendental awareness, which in our data was higher in postgraduate than undergraduate students. And though these interpretations look meaningful, and are aligned with other studies, we did not find other differences between undergraduate and postgraduate students, which begs the question if the differences in religious tolerance and spiritual intelligence were a simple statistical artifact. Nevertheless, if these findings are taken as true, they add to what is already known about education and religious tolerance in Pakistan, e.g., undergraduate institutions (*madrasas*) that represent greater religiosity tend to express less religious tolerance than those institutions (conventional schools) that are believed to be less religious (Nazar et al., 2017; Hanif et al., 2019). The sample used in the study expressed higher levels of religious tolerance ($M = 37.52, SD = 4.99$), which was higher than the midpoint (27.00) of the composite range (9-45) of the RES subscale. This difference of 10 points clearly shows that more educated people of Pakistan are more tolerant of other religions and religious minorities (Coenders & Scheepers, 1998). The authors also believe that if similar samples were drawn from other universities, religious tolerance in students

should be similar to what was found in this study, however, this needs to be tested in future studies. Overall, this result disfavors the generalized notion that people of Pakistan are religiously intolerant of others as highlighted by the media, a discussion that needs to be debated.

Conclusion

The study concludes religious tolerance in Pakistani adults is associated with inherent and innate aspects of human nature, like personality traits of openness to experience and agreeableness, spiritual intelligence, humility, and prosocial behaviors. And though these human aspects are not completely devoid of experience or social learning, the authors believe that some people by nature are more tolerant towards other religions than other people. And that more educated people of Pakistan are more religiously tolerant, an issue that needs more discussion.

Limitations and Future Recommendations

The authors point out that, the present study was correlational in nature, and since the data was based on self-reports, factors like social desirability, and perceptions about how subjects viewed themselves and assessed their religious tolerance could not be controlled as in a true experiment. Selected variables like personality traits, spiritual intelligence, humility, and prosocialness cannot easily be associated with religious tolerance without replications. Generalizations can only work if more data are collected and over time to show if such factors influence religious tolerance. To address these issues future studies can use qualitative methods to carry out in-depth analysis of religious tolerance through narratives, interviews, and other ethnographic approaches. In addition, such qualitative studies can also look at how minorities perceive religious tolerance and perceive majorities exercising their religious tolerance.

Implications

The study adds to the slowly growing literature published in Pakistan about religious tolerance. It adds to a discussion about the innate aspects of human nature that influence religious tolerance. The study also opens a discussion on the subject, of Pakistani adults are completely intolerant towards religions and the religious affairs of others.

References

- Ali, S. R., Alam, T., & Ali, H. (2018). Construction of Scale: Analysis of the Available Scales on Tolerance. *Pakistan Journal Peace & Conflict Studies Vol, 3*(2), 39-49.
- AlSheddi, M. (2020). Humility and bridging differences: A systematic literature review of humility about diversity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 79*, 36-45. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2020.06.002
- Awais, S., Masood, A., & Qaisar, S (2018). Personality Traits, Tolerance towards Ethnic Minorities and Egalitarian Political Values of University Students. *Journal of Politics and International Studies, 4*(2), 43-58.
- Borinca, I., Falomir-Pichastor, J. M., Andrighetto, L., & Durante, F. (2021). Outgroup prejudice and perceptions of prosocial intergroup behaviors. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 51*(1), 40-53. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2712
- Broer, N. A., De Muijnck, B., Potgieter, F. J., Wolhuter, C. C., & Van der Walt, J. L. (2014). Measuring religious tolerance among final year education students-the birth of a questionnaire. *International Journal for Religious Freedom, 7*(1), 77-96.
- Butrus, N., & Witenberg, R. T. (2013). Some personality predictors of tolerance to Human Diversity: The roles of Openness, Agreeableness, and empathy. *Australian Psychologist, 48*(4), 290-298. doi:10.1111/j.1742-9544.2012.00081.x
- Carlson, M. M., McElroy, S. E., Aten, J. D., Davis, E. B., Van Tongeren, D., Hook, J. N., & Davis, D. E. (2019). We welcome Refugees. Understanding the relationship between religious orientation, religious commitment, personality, and prejudicial attitudes toward Syrian refugees. *The International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 29*(2), 94-107. doi:10.1080/10508619.2019.1586067
- Caprara, G. V., Steca, P., Zelli, A., & Capanna, C. (2005). A new scale for measuring adults' prosocialness. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 21*(2), 77-89. https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759.21.2.77
- Captari, L. E., Shannonhouse, L., Hook, J. N., Aten, J. D., Davis, E. B., Davis, D. E., Ranter Hook, J. (2019). Prejudicial and welcoming attitudes toward Syrian refugees: The roles of cultural humility and moral foundations. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 47*(2), 123-139. doi:10.1177/0091647119837013
- Central Intelligence Agency. (2016). Pakistan. In *The World Factbook*. Retrieved from https://www.cia.gov/the-world-factbook/countries/pakistan/#people-and-society
- Chandler, C. R., & Tsai, Y. (2001). Social factors Influencing IMMIGRATION attitudes: An analysis of data from the General Social Survey. *The Social Science Journal, 38*(2), 177-188. doi:10.1016/s0362-3319(01)00106-9
- Coenders, M., & Scheepers, P. (1998). Support for ethnic discrimination in the Netherlands 1979-1993: Effects OF Period, cohort, and individual characteristics. *European Sociological Review, 14*(4), 405-422. doi: 10.1093/oxfordjournals.esr.a018247
- Diener, E. & Lucas, R. E. (2021). Personality traits. In R. Biswas-Diener & E. Diener (Eds), *Noba textbook series: Psychology*. Champaign, IL: DEF publishers. http://noba.to/96u8ecgw
- Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., & Spinrad, T. L. (2006). Prosocial Development. In N. Eisenberg, W. Damon, & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Social, emotional, and personality development* (pp. 646-718). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Gitlin, T. (2003). *The Whole World Is Watching: Mass Media in the Making and Unmaking of the New Left*. United Kingdom: University of California Press.
- Guimond, S., & Palmer, D. L. (2008). Education, academic program, and intergroup attitudes. *Canadian Review of*

- Sociology/Revue Canadienne De Sociologie*, 26(2), 193-216. doi:10.1111/j.1755-618x.1989.tb00418.x
- Hanif, S., Ali, M. H., & Carlson, J. (2020). What Predicts Religious Tolerance? Education or Religiosity in Pakistan's Multi-religious Society. *International Journal on Minority and Group Rights*, 27(3), 530–554. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15718115-02702005>
- Hook, J. N., Farrell, J. E., Johnson, K. A., van Tongeren, D. R., Davis, D. E., & Aten, J. D. (2016). Intellectual humility and religious tolerance. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 12(1), 29–35. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2016.1167937>
- Hughes, P. (2013). Spirituality and religious tolerance. *Implicit Religion*, 16(1), 65-91. doi:10.1558/imre.v16i1.65
- John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). *The Big-Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives*. Berkeley: University of California.
- Johnston, B. M., & Glasford, D. E. (2017). Intergroup contact and helping: How quality contact and empathy shape outgroup helping. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 21(8), 1185-1201. doi:10.1177/1368430217711770
- King, D. B. (2008). *Rethinking claims of spiritual intelligence: A definition, model, and measure* (Unpublished master's thesis). Trent University, Peterborough, Ontario, Canada.
- Krumrei-Mancuso, E. J., & Newman, B. (2020). Intellectual humility in the sociopolitical domain. *Self and Identity*, 19(8), 989-1016. doi:10.1080/15298868.2020.1714711
- Kumar, V.V., & Mehta, M. (2011). Gaining adaptive orientation through spiritual and emotional intelligence. In A.K. Chauhan & S.S.Nathawat (Eds.), *New Facets of Positivism*(pp 281-301).Delhi: Macmillan Publishers India.
- Leary, M. R., Diebels, K. J., Davisson, E. K., Jongman-Sereno, K. P., Isherwood, J. C., Raimi, K. T., Hoyle, R. H. (2017). Cognitive and interpersonal features of intellectual humility. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 43(6), 793-813. doi:10.1177/0146167217697695
- Mirza, J. A. (2020, March 16). Religious minorities in 'Naya Pakistan'. <https://thediplomat.com/2020/03/religious-minorities-in-naya-pakistan/>
- Muhid, A. (2020). Religious tolerance among college students: How it's influenced by religious orientation and personality traits? *HUMANITAS: Indonesian Psychological Journal*, 17(1), 55. <https://doi.org/10.26555/humanitas.v17i1.12222>
- Munir, M. (1975). Constitution of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan: Being a Commentary on the Constitution of Pakistan, 1973. Law Publishing Company. p. 78. Retrieved 30 April 2024.
- Nazar, N., Österman, K., & Björkqvist, K. (2017). Religious Tolerance, Gender Equality, and Bellicose Attitudes: A Comparative Study of Three Educational Systems in Pakistan. *European Journal of Social Sciences Education and Research*, 11(1), 126-135. <https://doi.org/10.26417/ejser.v11i1.p126-135>
- Nussbaum, M. (2012). *The New Religious Intolerance: Overcoming the Politics of Fear in an Anxious Age*. England: Harvard University Press.
- Owens, B. P. (2011). *Humility in organizational leadership* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Washington, United States.
- Owens, B. P., Johnson, M. D., & Mitchell, T. R. (2013). Expressed humility in organizations: Implications for performance, teams, and leadership. *Organization Science*, 24(5), 1517-1538.
- R. H. (2017). The problem of Raja, is religious intolerance in Pakistan. https://www.huffpost.com/entry/post_10574_b_8620162
- Savoie, B. (2018, April 23). How humility can improve your life: The psychology behind being humble. <https://millennialmagazine.com/2017/06/22/how-humility-can-improve-your-life-the-psychology-behind-being-humble/>
- Saulius, T. (2013). What is “tolerance” and “tolerance education”? Philosophical perspectives. *Baltic Journal of Sport and Health Sciences*, 2(49-56).
- Smith, S. (2004). Exploring the interaction of trauma and spirituality. *Traumatology*, 10(4), 231-243. doi:10.1177/153476560401000403
- Sood, S., Bakhshi, A., & Gupta, R. (2012). Relationship between personality traits, spiritual intelligence and well-being in university students. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 3(10), 55-60.
- Taber, K. S. (2017). The Use of Cronbach's Alpha When Developing and Reporting Research Instruments in Science Education. *Research in Science Education*, 48(6), 1273–1296. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11165-016-9602-2>
- Tangney, J. P. (2000). Humility: Theoretical Perspectives, Empirical Findings and Directions for Future Research. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 19(1), 70–82. <https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2000.19.1.70>
- Vaughan, F. (2002). What is Spiritual Intelligence? *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 42(2), 16–33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022167802422003>
- Van der Ven, J., & Vermeer, P. (2004). Looking at the Relationship Between Religions.An Empirical Study Among Secondary School Students. *Journal of Empirical Theology*, 17(1), 36–59. <https://doi.org/10.1163/1570925041208899>
- Visintin, E. P., & Rullo, M. (2021). Humble and Kind: Cultural Humility as a Buffer of the Association between Social Dominance Orientation and Prejudice. *Societies*, 11(4), 117.
- Wang, L., Owens, B. P., Li, J. J., & Shi, L. (2018). Exploring the affective impact, boundary conditions, and antecedents of leader humility. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 103(9), 1019.
- Wigglesworth, C. (2006). Why spiritual intelligence is essential to mature leadership. *Integral Leadership Review*, 6(3), 1-17
- Woodruff, E., Van Tongeren, D. R., Davis, D. E., McElroy, S., & Hook, J. N. (2014). Humility and religion: Benefits, difficulties, and a model of religious tolerance. Chapter for C. Kim-Prieto (Ed.), *Positive psychology of religion and spirituality across cultures* (pp. 271–285). New York, NY: Springer.

- Yusuf, A. A., Shidiq, A. R., & Hariyadi, H. (2019). On Socio-Economic Predictors of Religious Intolerance: Evidence from a Large-Scale Longitudinal Survey in the Largest Muslim Democracy. *Religions*, *11*(1), 21-30.
- Zohar, D., Marshall, I., & Marshall, I. N. (2000). *SQ: Connecting with our spiritual intelligence*. Bloomsbury Publishing: USA

Received: June 2, 2023

Revision Received: October 15, 2024