



Vol. 4 No. 3 (March) (2026)

Developing and Validating a Social Tolerance and Group Cohesion Scale for Higher Education Students

Hadia Noor

M. Phil Student, Department of Sociology, University of Gujrat, Gujrat, Pakistan

Email: hadiasoc22@gmail.com

Allah Ditta

PhD Scholar, Department of Sociology, Government College University Faisalabad,

Faisalabad, Pakistan Email: ad_mas09@yahoo.com

Muhammad Shoaib

Associate Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Gujrat, Gujrat, Pakistan

Email: shoaibsoc@uog.edu.pk

Abstract

The development of valid and reliable instruments is essential for accurately assessing social attitudes and interpersonal dynamics within higher education institutions. This study aimed to develop and validate a social tolerance and group cohesion scale for undergraduate students in higher education. A quantitative, cross-sectional research design was employed at a public sector university. The study population comprised undergraduate students enrolled in BS (4 Year) programs in the Faculty of Social Sciences. Using proportionate random sampling, 393 students were selected from six academic departments based on Yamane's (1967) sample size formula. Data were collected through a structured questionnaire following pilot testing to ensure clarity and reliability. The collected data were analyzed using SPSS and AMOS. Internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach's alpha, while confirmatory factor analysis was performed to establish construct validity. The findings indicated that the developed scale possesses satisfactory reliability and strong construct validity, confirming its suitability for measuring social tolerance and group cohesion among university students. The validated instrument provides researchers, educators, and policymakers with a standardized tool to assess students' social attitudes, evaluate institutional initiatives promoting inclusivity, and design evidence-based interventions that foster mutual respect, collaboration, and cohesive learning environments. Future studies should examine the scale's applicability across diverse educational institutions and cultural contexts to strengthen its generalizability.

Keywords: Social Tolerance, Group Cohesion, Scale Development, Confirmatory Factor Analysis, Reliability, Higher Education

Introduction

Social tolerance and group cohesion are fundamental dimensions of positive interpersonal relationships and democratic engagement within higher education institutions (Sarfraz, Shoaib, Kausar, & Abdullah, 2026; Shoaib, Nazir, & Rashid, 2026a; Shoaib, Nazir, & Sheraz, 2026a). Universities bring together students from diverse cultural, ethnic, religious, linguistic (Nazir, Shoaib, & Mubeen, 2026; Shoaib, Nazir, & Sheraz, 2026b), and socioeconomic backgrounds, creating opportunities for



Vol. 4 No. 3 (March) (2026)

interaction, collaboration, and mutual learning (Nazir, Shoaib, & Bukhari, 2026; Shoaib, Nazir, & Mir, 2026; Shoaib, Nazir, & Rashid, 2026b). In such settings, social tolerance promotes respect for differences, acceptance of diverse perspectives (Nazir, Shoaib, & Kausar, 2026; Shoaib, Nazir, & Iqbal., 2026; Shoaib, Nazir, & Kausar, 2026), and peaceful coexistence, while group cohesion strengthens students' sense of belonging, trust, cooperation, and collective responsibility (Nazir, Adnan, & Shoaib, 2026; Shoaib, Kausar, Sarfraz, & Abdullah, 2026b; Shoaib, Sarfraz, & Kausar, 2026a). Together, these constructs contribute to an inclusive academic environment that enhances student well-being (Sarfraz, Kausar, Shoaib, & Abdullah, 2026; Shoaib, Kausar, Sarfraz, & Abdullah, 2026c; Shoaib, Sarfraz, Kausar, & Abdullah, 2026a), academic success, and social integration (Sarfraz, Shoaib, & Kausar, 2026; Shoaib, Sarfraz, & Kausar, 2026b; Shoaib, Sarfraz, Kausar, & Abdullah, 2026b). Regardless of their significance, there is a lack of contextually relevant and psychometrically sound instruments specifically designed to measure social tolerance and group cohesion among higher education students (Sarfraz, Sheraz, Shoaib, & Abdullah, 2026; Sarfraz, Shoaib, & Sheraz, 2026b; Shoaib, Kausar, Sarfraz, & Abdullah, 2026a). Existing scales are often developed in different cultural settings and may not adequately capture the social dynamics and educational realities of university students in developing countries (Sarfraz, Shoaib, & Sheraz, 2026a; Shoaib, Abbas, Shamraiz, & Abdullah, 2026; Shoaib, Shamraiz, Abbas, & Abdullah, 2026). Consequently, there is a need to develop a valid and reliable measurement tool that reflects the multidimensional nature of these constructs within higher education (Ali, Abdullah, & Shoaib, 2026; Shoaib, Abbas, Ali, & Abdullah, 2026; Shoaib, Ali, Ditta, & Abdullah, 2026; Shoaib, Ali, Hassan, & Abdullah, 2026). The present study aims to develop and validate a Social Tolerance and Group Cohesion Scale by establishing its content validity, construct validity, and reliability. The resulting instrument is expected to provide researchers, educators, and policy makers with a robust tool for assessing students' social attitudes and fostering inclusive and cohesive university communities.

Review of Literature

Research scholars reported that territorial learning collaborations had improved group cohesion and social tolerance among students from multicultural backgrounds at higher education level in *Global South* and *Global North* (Aldossari, 2025; Ali, Shoaib, Shamraiz, & Abdullah, 2026; Shoaib, Abdullah, & Ali, 2026; Shoaib, Noor, Iqbal, & Abdullah, 2026; Shoaib, Noor, Mir, & Abdullah, 2026; Sirry, 2024; Zemestani, 2024). In the same way, the study findings asserted that respectful interactions among students were welcomed by cultural acceptance in university also promoted pleasant academic achievements and enhanced group cohesion throughout organizations (Chai, 2025). Uniformly, the analysis of the study revealed that group cohesion had enhanced collaboration in academia settings (Shoaib, Shamraiz, Noor, & Abdullah, 2026; Shoaib, Srosh, Mobeen, & Abdullah, 2026a), it had been encouraging a common goal, learning together, and strong academic interactions among students (Hampton, 2025). Corresponding, the result of the study pointed out that social tolerance had decreased inequality in institutions by supported equity, understanding, awareness of culture (Abdullah & Shoaib, 2021a; Shoaib, Srosh, Mobeen, & Abdullah, 2026b), and welcoming environments for all students (Jubas, 2025). In similar fashion, the argument of the study clinched that regional coordination among organizations had improved group cohesion by fostered solidarity (Abdullah & Shoaib, 2021b; Shoaib & Abdullah, 2021; Shoaib & Ullah, 2019; Ullah & Shoaib, 2021), common goals, collaboration, and



Vol. 4 No. 3 (March) (2026)

culturally diverse educational activities at higher education level (Khamidov, 2025). Specifically, the study findings indicated that group cohesion had been helping students to accomplished academic achievements through cooperation, mutual support, mutual responsibility, and inclusive classroom involvement in the university (Shahnaz, 2025; Shoaib, Abdullah, & Baneen, 2026b; Shoaib, Shamraiz, Baneen, & Abdullah, 2026c, 2026d). For instance, the conclusion of the study mentioned that social tolerance had fostered positive interaction among students by good listening, understanding of cultures, empathy improvement (Shoaib, Abdullah, & Baneen, 2026a; Shoaib, Shamraiz, Baneen, & Abdullah, 2026a, 2026b), and fair academic behavior in educational institutions (Susanto, 2025). Moreover, the study found that regional educational strategies had an impact on social tolerance also it had been creating equitable structure (Shoaib, Abdullah, & Baneen, 2026c; Shoaib, Iqbal, Baneen, & Abdullah, 2026b, 2026c), promoting multiculturalism, and fostering collaborative education across regions (Hathaway, 2002). Furthermore, the argument of researcher conveyed that group cohesion developed when students have similar academic objectives (Larijani, Shoaib, & Abedi, 2026; Shoaib, Iqbal, Baneen, & Abdullah, 2026a; Shoaib, Shamraiz, Abdullah, & Shahzadi, 2026), cultural awareness, respect, and active engagement in group learning at higher education level (Khan, 2007). Moreover, the study reported that social tolerance had enhanced emotional wellbeing by decreased discrimination also it had been improving understanding, interactions, solidarity, and encouraging respectful relationships among students in the university (Kronendorfer, 2009).

Several studies have been conducted that social tolerance had improved creativity in learners by promoted open-minded thinking (Shoaib, 2025a, 2025b; Shoaib & Ullah, 2026), cultural awareness, respectful conversations, peaceful emotions, and mutual engagement at higher education level in developed and developing countries (Dijker, 2013; Hadler, 2012; Karafantis, 2010). In the same way, the study findings asserted that cohesiveness among groups had decreased clashes through fostered collaborative work, solidarity, intercultural tolerance, a common objective, understanding of emotions (Shoaib, 2024e, 2025a, 2025b; Shoaib & Abdullah, 2025; Shoaib & Ullah, 2021), and strong students' relations in academic settings (Leroux, 2014). Uniformly, the analysis of the study revealed that regional relationships had improved social tolerance among students by encouraged mutual learning (Shoaib, 2023c, 2024a, 2024b, 2024c, 2024d), cultural interactions, local unity, welcomed beliefs, and educational collaboration at university level (Yingying, 2018). Corresponding, the result of the study pointed out that tolerance among students had fostered equal opportunity, understanding, equity, inclusiveness, cultural acceptance, and positive academic behaviors, any of these had been promoting the development of ethics in higher educational institutions (Shi, 2019). In similar fashion, the argument of the study clinched that territorial educational systems had an impact on group cohesion and it had been providing organized programs, open involvement, collaboration between regions, common objectives, and academic unity among students at university level (Aleksandar, 2019). Specifically, the study findings indicated that group cohesion had promoted confidence among students by common issues, collaboration, cultural connections, emotional assistance, educational solidarity, and group problem solutions in academic institutions (Brenner, 2020). For instance, the conclusion of the study mentioned that social tolerance had improved cultural development by educated students to diversity of viewpoints, social interactions, compassion, pleasant behaviors, and healthy interactions among cultures in educational institutions (Abbas, 2021). Moreover, the study found that group cohesion had enhanced



Vol. 4 No. 3 (March) (2026)

flexibility in academia through encouraged cooperation, a sense of balance, common determination, multicultural acceptance, mutual support, and group academic commitment among students (Bigiani, 2024). Furthermore, the argument of researcher conveyed that social tolerance had promoted academic cohesiveness by developed acceptance, awareness of culture (Shoaib, 2021, 2023a, 2023b), mental wellness, collaborative teamwork, and diverse involvement of students in educational institutions (Hodge, 2008). Moreover, the study reported that regional educational initiatives had fostered group cohesion through promoted coordinated events, regional programs, interactions between cultures, mutual progress, and integrated educational achievements at university level (Noordijk, 2010).

The existing body of literature had provided insights on group cohesion that supported students' engagement and it had been fostering collaborative efforts, mutual commitment, understanding of culture, helpful communication, and strong academic participation at higher education level in *Global South* and *Global North* (Brian, 2015; Dasli, 2017; Singh, 2011). In the same way, the study findings asserted that social tolerance had fostered positive settings for learning by lowered prejudices, promoted equal opportunities, fostered kindness, acceptance of multiculturalism, and developed student interactions in academic settings (Clark, 2019). Uniformly, the analysis of the study revealed that regional educational organizations had an impact on group cohesion through controlled social inclusion programs, facilitated cultural events, increased fairness, secured interaction, and strengthened relationships among students at university level (Ryzhova, 2019). Corresponding, the result of the study pointed out that group cohesion had improved academic success by supported collaborative duty, collaborative efforts, emotional assistance, cultural diversity, inspiration solidarity, and mutual work in educational institutions (Wang, 2020). In similar fashion, the argument of the study clinched that social tolerance had fostered acceptable interaction by decreased nervousness, improved kindness, increased open communication, created connection, and developed respect among students at higher educational level (Hartmann, 2022). Specifically, the study findings indicated that universities encouraged dialogue between different cultural groups, also it had increased understanding and reduced conflicts among students at territory level (Benstead, 2025). For instance, the conclusion of the study mentioned that social tolerance promoted mutual respect among diverse students and developed solidarity through group cohesion across academic communities in higher education (Bertrand, 2025). Moreover, the study found that faculty members encouraged inclusive policies it had fostered acceptance and promoted collaboration among students from varied backgrounds in academic settings (Chai, 2025). Furthermore, the argument of researcher conveyed that students nurturing programs improved trust among participants and strengthened group cohesion throughout academic departments and organizations at university level (Jubas, 2025). Moreover, the study reported that programs for equality promoted by administrative leadership had a positive effect on perception of students about acceptance and diversity among different cultural groups on campus (Khamidov, 2025).

Data and Methods

This study employed a quantitative research design to examine the psychometric properties of the Social Tolerance and Group Cohesion Scale among higher education students. The research was conducted at a public sector university, targeting undergraduate students enrolled in BS (4 Year) programs within the Faculty of Social Sciences. The study population comprised male and female students from the 1st, 3rd,



Vol. 4 No. 3 (March) (2026)

5th, and 7th semesters across the Departments of Economics, Education, Pakistan Studies & History, Political Science & International Relations, Psychology, and Sociology. A proportionate random sampling technique was adopted to ensure representative participation from each department. Using Yamane (1967) sample size formula with a 5 percent margin of error, a sample of 393 students was selected. Data were collected through a cross-sectional survey using a structured questionnaire (*Appendix-A*). Following a pilot study, the instrument was refined and administered. Pilot testing has been done on 30 randomly selected students to check the reliability of the measurement tool. The Cronbach's Alpha values have been presented in the Table 1. The analysis revealed that the values of Alpha has ranging from .711 to .894. Further, the overall analysis has confirmed the value of Alpha as .947 that is highly acceptable in social sciences. The collected data were analyzed using SPSS and AMOS. Reliability was assessed through Cronbach's alpha, while confirmatory factor analysis was conducted to establish construct validity of the developed scale.

Table 1

Reliability Test (n=30)

Sr. No.	Variable Names	Codes	Items	Alpha Value
i	Acceptance and Respect	ACAR	8	.713
ii	Ethical Reflection	ETRE	8	.731
iii	Bilateral Tolerance	BITO	8	.717
iv	Civic Tolerance	CITO	8	.727
v	Political Tolerance	POTO	8	.735
vi	Religious Tolerance	RETO	8	.711
vii	Ethnic Tolerance	ETTO	8	.741
viii	Social Tolerance (i+ii+iii+iv+v+vi+vii)	SOTO	56	.861
ix	Interpersonal Interaction	ININ	8	.721
x	Group Pride	GRPR	8	.737
xi	Group Commitment	GROC	8	.723
xii	Sense of Weness	SEOW	8	.733
xiii	Willingness to Work	WITW	8	.743
xiv	Trust Worthiness	TRWO	8	.725
xv	Sense of Inclusion	SEOI	8	.747
xvi	Group Cohesion (ix+x+xi+xii+xiii+xiv+xv)	GRCO	56	.894
	Overall		112	.947

Results and Discussion

Confirmatory Factory Analysis (CFA): This section had provided the results of CFA of all variables references to items/statements.

Table 2

CFA of Acceptance and Respect

Sr. No.	Statement	Para. Esti.	Stan. Error	T Statistic	Prob. Level
i	You accept the multiculturalism variations	0.150	0.037	4.091	0.000
ii	You give respect to students having different backgrounds	0.394	0.036	11.057	0.000
iii	You accept the views of others in classroom	0.389	0.038	10.195	0.000



Vol. 4 No. 3 (March) (2026)

iv	You give respect to students having different languages	0.479	0.041	11.584	0.000
v	You accept the cultural codes of others	0.416	0.037	11.140	0.000
vi	You accept the cultural values of others	0.523	0.040	13.149	0.000
vii	You give respect to students having different norms	0.441	0.040	10.947	0.000
viii	You accept the students having different dress style	0.365	0.045	8.072	0.000

Table 2 presented the confirmatory factors analysis of acceptance and respect. The CFA calculated the values of parameter estimate, standard error, t statistic and prob. level. Hence, the calculated values confirmed all the items significant for the abovementioned variable. Therefore, the data analysis indicated that all the items had been accepted for further analysis.

Table 3
CFA of Ethical Reflection

Sr. No.	Statement	Para. Esti.	Stan. Error	T Statistic	Prob. Level
i	You give respect the values of others as per ethics	0.268	0.045	6.025	0.000
ii	You accept the beliefs of others as true	0.289	0.049	5.934	0.000
iii	You practice ethical principles in classroom	0.370	0.043	8.642	0.000
iv	You have diverse perspective of thinking on the issue	0.277	0.047	5.939	0.000
v	You make maturity base decisions doing your study	0.367	0.048	7.611	0.000
vi	You judged the ethical values of friends on campus	0.237	0.054	4.399	0.000
vii	You present feelings in front of others positively	0.439	0.050	8.833	0.000
viii	You pretend good manners with students on campus	0.366	0.048	7.696	0.000

Table 3 presented the confirmatory factors analysis of ethical reflection. The CFA calculated the values of parameter estimate, standard error, t statistic and prob. level. Hence, the calculated values confirmed all the items significant for the abovementioned variable. Therefore, the data analysis indicated that all the items had been accepted for further analysis.

Table 4
CFA of Bilateral Tolerance

Sr. No.	Statement	Para. Esti.	Stan. Error	T Statistic	Prob. Level
i	You are interconnected with diverse social groups	0.379	0.047	8.073	0.000
ii	You tolerate differences of gender	0.508	0.047	10.765	0.000
iii	You accept differences based on gender	0.526	0.050	10.602	0.000
iv	You accept the challenges of cultural	0.454	0.043	10.506	0.000



Vol. 4 No. 3 (March) (2026)

	identities				
v	You approve the opinions of others	0.334	0.044	7.535	0.000
vi	You easily agree with the arguments of others	0.251	0.054	4.679	0.000
vii	You treat friends with dignity	0.280	0.043	6.556	0.000
viii	You respect physiological differences	0.244	0.050	4.859	0.000

Table 4 presented the confirmatory factors analysis of bilateral tolerance. The CFA calculated the values of parameter estimate, standard error, t statistic and prob. level. Hence, the calculated values confirmed all the items significant for the abovementioned variable. Therefore, the data analysis indicated that all the items had been accepted for further analysis.

Table 5
CFA of Civic Tolerance

Sr. No.	Statement	Para. Esti.	Stan. Error	T Statistic	Prob. Level
i	You have experience of living with your non-Muslim friend	-0.127	0.065	-1.946	0.052
ii	You try to improve social connections	0.204	0.041	4.997	0.000
iii	You accept the traditions of multiculturalism	0.331	0.041	8.035	0.000
iv	You respect the views of others	0.402	0.045	8.911	0.000
v	You respect the thoughts of your friends	0.448	0.044	10.123	0.000
vi	You accept the variations of students in classroom	0.470	0.045	10.424	0.000
vii	Your class have unity among variety of students	0.272	0.052	5.187	0.000
viii	You are encouraged practice the values of others	0.237	0.047	5.025	0.000

Table 5 presented the confirmatory factors analysis of civic tolerance. The CFA calculated the values of parameter estimate, standard error, t statistic and prob. level. Hence, the calculated values confirmed the 7 items significant for the abovementioned variable. Therefore, the data analysis indicated that all the 7 items had been accepted for further analysis. However, 1 statement had not been confirmed using CFA and were also not added to proceed for further data analysis.

Table 6
CFA of Political Tolerance

Sr. No.	Statement	Para. Esti.	Stan. Error	T Statistic	Prob. Level
i	You have patience to accept political views	0.279	0.050	5.606	0.000
ii	You tolerate political slogans	0.393	0.045	8.647	0.000
iii	You respect manifesto of political parties	0.425	0.050	8.522	0.000
iv	You have attended different political rallies	0.605	0.055	10.981	0.000
v	You respect all political leaders	0.476	0.051	9.394	0.000
vi	You are active political worker	0.547	0.052	10.485	0.000
vii	Political tolerance is very important for country	0.120	0.052	2.317	0.021



Vol. 4 No. 3 (March) (2026)

viii	You tolerate the decisions of political parties	0.280	0.049	5.763	0.000
------	---	-------	-------	-------	-------

Table 6 presented the confirmatory factors analysis of political tolerance. The CFA calculated the values of parameter estimate, standard error, t statistic and prob. level. Hence, the calculated values confirmed all the items significant for the abovementioned variable. Therefore, the data analysis indicated that all the items had been accepted for further analysis.

Table 7

CFA of Religious Tolerance

Sr. No.	Statement	Para. Esti.	Stan. Error	T Statistic	Prob. Level
i	You work together to create friendship	0.226	0.044	5.126	0.000
ii	You accept recognized differences of others	0.362	0.041	8.729	0.000
iii	You support religious differences	0.391	0.049	7.997	0.000
iv	Religious education promotes inclusivity	0.402	0.049	8.140	0.000
v	Respecting beliefs results to foster tolerance	0.344	0.047	7.356	0.000
vi	You accept diverse religious perspective	0.382	0.051	7.446	0.000
vii	You have interconnected with various religious groups	0.282	0.060	4.716	0.000
viii	Religious tolerance develop harmony	0.306	0.050	6.159	0.000

Table 7 presented the confirmatory factors analysis of religious tolerance. The CFA calculated the values of parameter estimate, standard error, t statistic and prob. level. Hence, the calculated values confirmed all the items significant for the abovementioned variable. Therefore, the data analysis indicated that all the items had been accepted for further analysis.

Table 8

CFA of Ethnic Tolerance

Sr. No.	Statement	Para. Esti.	Stan. Error	T Statistic	Prob. Level
i	You accept differences of custom	0.194	0.039	4.947	0.000
ii	You respect differences of traditions	0.379	0.037	10.330	0.000
iii	You value ideas of others	0.620	0.039	15.826	0.000
iv	You understand viewpoints of others	0.522	0.043	12.138	0.000
v	You are engaged in constructive dialogue	0.339	0.042	7.992	0.000
vi	You accept the attitude of others	0.145	0.050	2.889	0.004
vii	You have attended multi-cultural activities	0.025	0.050	0.505	0.614
viii	Positive social interaction results to reduce biases	0.215	0.045	4.797	0.000

Table 8 presented the confirmatory factors analysis of ethnic tolerance. The CFA calculated the values of parameter estimate, standard error, t statistic and prob. level. Hence, the calculated values confirmed the 7 items significant for the abovementioned variable. Therefore, the data analysis indicated that all the 7 items had been accepted for further analysis. However, 1 statement had not been confirmed using CFA and were also not added to proceed for further data analysis.

Table 9



Vol. 4 No. 3 (March) (2026)

CFA of Interpersonal Interaction

Sr. No.	Statement	Para. Esti.	Stan. Error	T Statistic	Prob. Level
i	You interact with multiple behavioral students	0.215	0.045	4.745	0.000
ii	You have trust in your peer group	0.301	0.046	6.594	0.000
iii	You respect the values of your group members	0.325	0.101	3.212	0.001
iv	You respect the identity of group members	0.244	0.044	5.603	0.000
v	You accept the ideas of cross-cultural students	0.349	0.045	7.708	0.000
vi	You joined the group of different identities	0.441	0.048	9.270	0.000
vii	You have unity among cross-cultural group	0.539	0.049	11.083	0.000
viii	You shared common goals with the multiple cultural students	0.454	0.051	8.929	0.000

Table 9 presented the confirmatory factors analysis of interpersonal interaction. The CFA calculated the values of parameter estimate, standard error, t statistic and prob. level. Hence, the calculated values confirmed all the items significant for the abovementioned variable. Therefore, the data analysis indicated that all the items had been accepted for further analysis.

Table 10

CFA of Group Pride

Sr. No.	Statement	Para. Esti.	Stan. Error	T Statistic	Prob. Level
i	You feel proud to be a part of your group	0.330	0.042	7.860	0.000
ii	You accept the multiple behaviors in group	0.341	0.039	8.836	0.000
iii	You feel satisfied with the group member	0.523	0.039	13.268	0.000
iv	You easily achieved task with group members	0.520	0.042	12.352	0.000
v	You feel comfortable to interact with group members	0.485	0.043	11.388	0.000
vi	Your tolerance level increased to deal with multiple students	0.404	0.042	9.559	0.000
vii	You have joined the cultural activities	0.306	0.047	6.540	0.000
viii	You have celebrated success with group members	0.397	0.045	8.770	0.000

Table 10 presented the confirmatory factors analysis of group pride. The CFA calculated the values of parameter estimate, standard error, t statistic and prob. level. Hence, the calculated values confirmed all the items significant for the abovementioned variable. Therefore, the data analysis indicated that all the items had been accepted for further analysis.

Table 11



Vol. 4 No. 3 (March) (2026)

CFA of Group Commitment

Sr. No.	Statement	Para. Esti.	Stan. Error	T Statistic	Prob. Level
i	You have loyalty with group members	0.321	0.039	8.136	0.000
ii	You easily trust on group members	0.357	0.044	8.127	0.000
iii	You accept the cultural differences of group	0.527	0.039	13.369	0.000
iv	You cooperate with group members to complete the task	0.515	0.043	11.913	0.000
v	You respect different viewpoints of group members	0.455	0.040	11.334	0.000
vi	You feel group cohesion is exemplified	0.441	0.042	10.468	0.000
vii	You feel strong social bonding with group members	0.384	0.042	9.126	0.000
viii	You have completed the deadline of the group	0.381	0.042	9.113	0.000

Table 11 presented the confirmatory factors analysis of group commitment. The CFA calculated the values of parameter estimate, standard error, t statistic and prob. level. Hence, the calculated values confirmed all the items significant for the abovementioned variable. Therefore, the data analysis indicated that all the items had been accepted for further analysis.

Table 12

CFA of Sense of Weness

Sr. No.	Statement	Para. Esti.	Stan. Error	T Statistic	Prob. Level
i	You have self of unity among group	0.358	0.040	8.965	0.000
ii	You feel strengthen with social group	0.462	0.041	11.383	0.000
iii	You support each other as a group member	0.416	0.038	10.990	0.000
iv	Your group collectively achieved the task well on time	0.444	0.043	10.358	0.000
v	You have attended the cultural activities of group	0.388	0.045	8.626	0.000
vi	You have completed assignments for your group	0.408	0.039	10.533	0.000
vii	You feel strong to perform activity with group	0.383	0.042	9.129	0.000
viii	You feel loneliness without your group	0.321	0.052	6.143	0.000

Table 12 presented the confirmatory factors analysis of sense of weness. The CFA calculated the values of parameter estimate, standard error, t statistic and prob. level. Hence, the calculated values confirmed all the items significant for the abovementioned variable. Therefore, the data analysis indicated that all the items had been accepted for further analysis.

Table 13



Vol. 4 No. 3 (March) (2026)

CFA of Willingness to Work

Sr. No.	Statement	Para. Esti.	Stan. Error	T Statistic	Prob. Level
i	You collaborate for group assignments with friends	0.395	0.041	9.701	0.000
ii	Your group motivate you to complete the tasks	0.491	0.037	13.195	0.000
iii	You achieved difficult tasks easily with group support	0.499	0.040	12.346	0.000
iv	Your group activities show good results after completion	0.400	0.042	9.628	0.000
v	You are encouraged to participates in cultural activities	0.371	0.043	8.665	0.000
vi	You are willing to work hard for the success of group	0.411	0.039	10.514	0.000
vii	You feel discouraged by the variations of your group	0.215	0.049	4.419	0.000
viii	You enjoyed the company of class fellows	0.378	0.048	7.940	0.000

Table 13 presented the confirmatory factors analysis of willingness to work. The CFA calculated the values of parameter estimate, standard error, t statistic and prob. level. Hence, the calculated values confirmed all the items significant for the abovementioned variable. Therefore, the data analysis indicated that all the items had been accepted for further analysis.

Table 14

CFA of Trust Worthiness

Sr. No.	Statement	Para. Esti.	Stan. Error	T Statistic	Prob. Level
i	Your group members are reliable	0.308	0.040	7.636	0.000
ii	Your group members easily trust each other	0.394	0.041	9.555	0.000
iii	Trust based relations are long lasting	0.444	0.040	11.186	0.000
iv	You have fair dealing with group members	0.424	0.041	10.266	0.000
v	You feel trust is the key of group strength	0.394	0.040	9.872	0.000
vi	Group commitment increased the stability of group	0.385	0.038	10.248	0.000
vii	Your group worked smoothly together	0.447	0.043	10.353	0.000
viii	You try to develop trust among group members	0.348	0.041	8.494	0.000

Table 14 presented the confirmatory factors analysis of trust worthiness. The CFA calculated the values of parameter estimate, standard error, t statistic and prob. level. Hence, the calculated values confirmed all the items significant for the abovementioned variable. Therefore, the data analysis indicated that all the items had been accepted for further analysis.

Table 15



Vol. 4 No. 3 (March) (2026)

CFA of Sense of InclusionA

Sr. No.	Statement	Para. Esti.	Stan. Error	T Statistic	Prob. Level
i	You are accepted members of group	0.251	0.043	5.862	0.000
ii	You feel respect from others	0.334	0.038	8.769	0.000
iii	Students give values to your ideas	0.338	0.039	8.666	0.000
iv	You have strong sense of belongingness	0.423	0.042	10.086	0.000
v	You are treated fair in academia	0.355	0.042	8.416	0.000
vi	You are encouraged to practice in class activity	0.436	0.042	10.293	0.000
vii	Your experience has been acknowledged in class	0.405	0.042	9.768	0.000
viii	Your critical thinking has value	0.351	0.043	8.208	0.000

Table 15 presented the confirmatory factors analysis of sense of inclusion. The CFA calculated the values of parameter estimate, standard error, t statistic and prob. level. Hence, the calculated values confirmed all the items significant for the abovementioned variable. Therefore, the data analysis indicated that all the items had been accepted for further analysis

Conclusion

The present study successfully developed and validated the social tolerance and group cohesion scale for higher education students, providing a reliable and valid instrument for measuring these important social constructs within university settings. The findings demonstrated satisfactory psychometric properties, with strong internal consistency and acceptable construct validity confirmed through reliability analysis and confirmatory factor analysis. The validated scale effectively captures students' attitudes toward social tolerance and their perceptions of group cohesion, making it suitable for research and institutional assessment. The instrument offers valuable insights for educators, researchers, and policymakers seeking to promote inclusive learning environments, mutual respect, and collaborative relationships among students from diverse backgrounds. Furthermore, the scale support evidence-based interventions aimed at strengthening campus harmony and social integration. Future research should validate the instrument across different universities, academic disciplines, and cultural contexts to enhance its generalizability and establish measurement invariance across diverse student populations.

References

- Abbas. (2021). Is there a commitment in trainee teachers of Israel's Arab sector to educate for multiculturalism? *Intercultural Education*, 32(3), 311-325. doi:10.1080/14675986.2021.1882943
- Abdullah, F., & Shoaib, M. (2021a). Psychosocial impacts of COVID-19 pandemic: a cross-sectional study of Mirpur, Pakistan. *International Review of Sociology*, 31(3), 470-486.
- Abdullah, F., & Shoaib, M. (2021b). Women Academician and Higher Education in South Asia. In S. Mishra & A. Bhowmick (Eds.), *Education and Women Empowerment*. India: ABS Books.



Vol. 4 No. 3 (March) (2026)

- Aldossari, A. (2025). Sense of belonging: international students' experience of intercultural and cultural inclusion in Saudi universities. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 25(1), 61-75. doi:10.1080/14708477.2023.2257193
- Aleksandar. (2019). (Re)building Spaces of Tolerance: A "Symbiotic Model" for the Post-War City Regeneration. *Architecture and Culture*, 7(1), 113-128. doi:10.1080/20507828.2018.1556374
- Ali, R., Abdullah, F., & Shoaib, M. (2026). Feminist Standpoint Theory and Gendered Experiences in Educational Spaces. *Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)*, 4(3), 100–118.
- Ali, R., Shoaib, M., Shamraiz, S., & Abdullah, F. (2026). Gendered Cultural Capital Shaping Academic Success among Students at Higher Educational Institutions. *Annual Methodological Archive Research Review*, 4(3), 510-530.
- Benstead, L. (2025). Does COIL Build Social Capital? Trust, Tolerance, and Political Engagement Among Students in the USA and UAE. *Journal of Political Science Education*, 21(4), 656-674. doi:10.1080/15512169.2024.2444995
- Bigiani. (2024). Benefit of Cognitive Environmental Enrichments on Social Tolerance and Play Behavior in Bottlenose Dolphins (*Tursiops Truncatus*). *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science*, 27(2), 355-372. doi:10.1080/10888705.2023.2227563
- Brenner, L. (2020). Beyond the tolerance/intolerance dichotomy: incorporating attitudes and acceptability into a robust definition of social tolerance of wildlife. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife*, 25(3), 259-267. doi:10.1080/10871209.2019.1702741
- Brian. (2015). The role of social desirability bias and racial/ethnic composition on the relation between education and attitude toward immigration restrictionism. *The Social Science Journal*, 52(4), 459-467. doi:10.1016/j.soscij.2014.09.005
- Chai, K. (2025). The dangers of 'zero tolerance' towards students' experiences of hate crime and incidents in English universities: a case for restorative justice approaches. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 28(1), 69-88. doi:10.1080/10282580.2025.2511300
- Clark, D. (2019). Between Zero and One: Tolerances of Fabrication and Society in Architecture's Digital Materialism. *Architecture and Culture*, 7(1), 149-168. doi:10.1080/20507828.2019.1578113
- Dasli, M. (2017). Intercultural education of tolerance and hospitality. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 38(5), 676-687. doi:10.1080/01596306.2015.1135308
- Dijker, A. (2013). Stigmatization, Repair, or Undesirable Side Effect of Tolerance? Being Clear About What We Study and Target for Intervention. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 35(1), 22-30. doi:10.1080/01973533.2012.746149
- Hadler, M. (2012). The Influence of World Societal Forces on Social Tolerance. A Time Comparative Study of Prejudices in 32 Countries. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 53(2), 211-237. doi:10.1111/j.1533-8525.2012.01232.x
- Hampton, K. (2025). Disrupting echo chambers? How social media is related to social tolerance through network diversity: linked lives over a major life course event. *Information, Communication & Society*, 28(1), 150-168. doi:10.1080/1369118X.2025.2460556
- Hartmann, S. (2022). Tolerance for specific negative affective states and coping-oriented cannabis use motives among college student cannabis users. *Journal of American College Health*, 70(3), 911-917. doi:10.1080/07448481.2020.1781135



Vol. 4 No. 3 (March) (2026)

- Hathaway, A. (2002). From harm reduction to human rights: bringing liberalism back into drug reform debates. *Drug and Alcohol Review*, 21(4), 397-404. doi:10.1080/0959523021000023270
- Hodge. (2008). Promoting Tolerance: The Imago Dei as an Imperative for Christian Social Workers. *Journal of Religion & Spirituality in Social Work: Social Thought*, 27(3), 297-313. doi:10.1080/15426430802202203
- Jubas, K. (2025). Entertaining tensions: teaching with and learning from popular culture in professional education. *Pedagogy, Culture & Society*, 33(1), 123-140. doi:10.1080/14681366.2023.2205415
- Karafantis. (2010). A Comparison of the Multicultural and Colorblind Perspectives on the Intergroup Attitudes of College Students. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 20(5), 688-710. doi:10.1080/10911351003751876
- Khamidov, A. (2025). Islam and ethnic tolerance: assessing Kyrgyz' Muslim religiosity and acceptance of Uzbeks in Kyrgyzstan. *Central Asian Survey*, 44(1), 1-19. doi:10.1080/02634937.2024.2390857
- Khan. (2007). Delinquency, Deviance, and Tolerance in a Slum in India: A Quantitative Model. *Criminal Justice Studies*, 20(3), 269-280. doi:10.1080/14786010701617664
- Krondorfer, B. (2009). Kuefler, Mathew (ed.). 2006. The Boswell Thesis: Essays on Christianity, Social Tolerance and Homosexuality. *Theology & Sexuality*, 15(3), 349-351. doi:10.1558/tse.v15i3.349
- Larijani, M., Shoaib, M., & Abedi, M. (2026). Technology-based Education for Students with Disability: A Bibliometric Analysis. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Management Studies*, 19(2), 247-266.
- Leroux, K. (2014). Impact of the Arts on Individual Contributions to US Civil Society. *Journal of Civil Society*, 10(2), 144-164. doi:10.1080/17448689.2014.912479
- Nazir, L., Adnan, K., & Shoaib, M. (2026). Technology-Mediated Assessment, Feedback Practices, and Conceptual Understanding among Female Students in Pakistani Higher Education. *Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)*, 4(3), 476–493.
- Nazir, L., Shoaib, M., & Bukhari, I. (2026). Understanding Learning Outcomes through Third Space Pedagogy in Digital Learning Environments among Female Students in Pakistan Authors Laiba Nazir. *Shnakhat*, 5(1), 1045-1066.
- Nazir, L., Shoaib, M., & Kausar, N. (2026). A Sociological Scale of Third Space Pedagogy and Digital Learning Practices: Assessing Learning Outcomes among Female Students in Higher Education in Pakistan. *Journal of Management Science Research Review*, 5(1), 2765–2788.
- Nazir, L., Shoaib, M., & Mubeen, A. (2026). Digital Learning Practices and Third Space Pedagogy as Determinants of Educational Outcomes among Female Students in Pakistani Higher Education. *GUMAN*, 5(1), 542–561.
- Noordijk, P. (2010). Changing Values in Turkey: Religiosity and Tolerance in Comparative Perspective. *Turkish Studies*, 11(1), 9-27. doi:10.1080/14683841003746999
- Ryzhova. (2019). Trust and Ethnic Tolerance in the Face of Social Change. *Russian Social Science Review*, 60(1), 76-96. doi:10.1080/10611428.2019.1577081
- Sarfraz, J., Kausar, N., Shoaib, M., & Abdullah, F. (2026). Psychological Well-being and Willingness to Participate among Female Students in Tertiary Education: A Sociological Analysis. *Pakistan Journal of Social Science Review*, 5(3), 1250–1267.



Vol. 4 No. 3 (March) (2026)

- Sarfraz, J., Sheraz, M., Shoaib, M., & Abdullah, F. (2026). Gendered Slang as a Socio-Linguistic Practice: Empirical Insights into Its Psychological and Social Impacts on Female Students. *Journal of Management & Social Science*, 3(1), 1722-1740.
- Sarfraz, J., Shoaib, M., & Kausar, N. (2026). Discursive Practices and Gender Inequality: The Psychological and Social Effects of Gendered Slang on Female Students. *Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)*, 4(1), 475–492.
- Sarfraz, J., Shoaib, M., Kausar, N., & Abdullah, F. (2026). A Sociolinguistic Analysis of Gendered Slang: Types, Frequency, and Context of Use among Tertiary-Level Female Students. *Journal of Management & Social Science*, 3(1), 1672-1690.
- Sarfraz, J., Shoaib, M., & Sheraz, M. (2026a). Gendered Slang as a Socio-Linguistic Tool: Scale Development for Assessing Psychological and Social Impacts on Female Students in Higher Education. *Journal for Current Sign*, 4(1), 2047–2069.
- Sarfraz, J., Shoaib, M., & Sheraz, M. (2026b). Gendered Slang, Context of Use, and Psychological Responses: An Analysis of Social Interaction among Female Students at Tertiary Level. *Pakistan Journal of Social Science Review*, 5(1), 1157–1176.
- Shahnaz, A. (2025). Semiotic analysis of university prospectuses in Pakistan: marketization, identity, and power dynamics. *Social Semiotics*, 35(2), 208-227. doi:10.1080/10350330.2023.2286452
- Shi. (2019). Economic description of tolerance in a society with asymmetric social cost functions. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja*, 32(1), 2584-2593. doi:10.1080/1331677X.2019.1642784
- Shoaib, M. (2021). *Sociological Analysis of Teachers Perspectives on Students Academic Performance in Higher Education in the Punjab*. (PhD Thesis). International Islamic University Islamabad, Central Library.
- Shoaib, M. (2023a, September 22). Galvanising Bourdieu's typology with Pakistani education and social class. *The Nation*, p. 4.
- Shoaib, M. (2023b, December 05). Gender Differences in Academic Performance. *The Nation*.
- Shoaib, M. (2023c). Leisure and Psychological Well-being of the Elderly: Nexus of Mass Media and Modern Technology. *Pakistan Journal of Law, Analysis and Wisdom*, 2(2), 1042–1053.
- Shoaib, M. (2024a, January 09). Gender Disparity in Education. *The Nation*.
- Shoaib, M. (2024b). Gender Diversity and Inclusion in Higher Education in Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Law, Analysis and Wisdom*, 3(1), 207-222.
- Shoaib, M. (2024c, April 30). Gendered Space in Higher Education. *Daily Parliament Times*, p. 3.
- Shoaib, M. (2024d). Gendering Bourdieu's Cultural Capital in Higher Education in Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Law, Analysis and Wisdom*, 3(2), 265-278.
- Shoaib, M. (2024e). Tailoring Theoretical Lens and Nudging Bourdieu's Cultural Capital on Gender and Academic Performance. *Journal of Social Sciences Review*, 4(4), 87–101.
- Shoaib, M. (2025a). Academic Achievement and Gender Inequality in Higher Education: A Systematic Review of Muslim Majority Nations. *Sociology & Cultural Research Review* 3(02), 373–380.
- Shoaib, M. (2025b). A Systematic Review of Gender Disparities in Academic Achievement in Higher Education Across Muslim Countries. *Advance Social Science Archive Journal*, 3(02), 1622–1639.



Vol. 4 No. 3 (March) (2026)

- Shoaib, M., Abbas, A., Ali, M., & Abdullah, F. (2026). Gender Socialization Influencing Classroom Interactions Among Students in Contemporary Schooling Environments. *International Journal of Social Sciences Bulletin*, 4(3), 360-377.
- Shoaib, M., Abbas, A., Shamraiz, S., & Abdullah, F. (2026). The Sociology of Gender and Academic Outcomes in Pakistani University Spaces. *Journal of Media Horizons*, 7(3), 296-314.
- Shoaib, M., & Abdullah, F. (2021). Gendered Historical Writings and Theorizing Patriarchy in Education: Factors and Gender as a Category of Analysis. In A. Bhowmick & R. Sain (Eds.), *Women from Tradition to Modernity*. India: Mittal Publications.
- Shoaib, M., & Abdullah, F. (2025). Artificial Intelligence in Education: A Sociological Analysis of Gender Inequalities in Technology-Mediated Learning Environments. *Al-Anfal*, 3(4), 85-115.
- Shoaib, M., Abdullah, F., & Ali, R. (2026). Feminist Sociological Perspectives on Gender Inequality and Knowledge Production in Education. *Journal for Current Sign*, 4(1), 1232-1252.
- Shoaib, M., Abdullah, F., & Baneen, U. (2026a). Digital Learning and Gendered Capital: Reconfiguring Educational Advantage in the Knowledge Society. *GUMAN*, 9(1), 266-281.
- Shoaib, M., Abdullah, F., & Baneen, U. (2026b). Gendered Expectations of Teachers and the Social Production of Academic Self-Concept. *Journal for Current Sign*, 4(1), 1063-1081.
- Shoaib, M., Abdullah, F., & Baneen, U. (2026c). Institutional Patriarchy and Pedagogical Practices: Gendered Power Relations in Contemporary Schooling. *Pakistan Journal of Social Science Review*, 5(2), 608-625.
- Shoaib, M., Ali, R., Ditta, A., & Abdullah, F. (2026). Sociology of Knowledge Perspectives on Gendered Curriculum and Educational Authority. *Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)*, 4(3), 119-137.
- Shoaib, M., Ali, R., Hassan, M., & Abdullah, F. (2026). Structural Functionalism and Gendered Role Socialization in Educational Institutions. *Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)*, 4(3), 81-99.
- Shoaib, M., Iqbal, S., Baneen, U., & Abdullah, F. (2026a). From Access to Agency: Gendered Educational Trajectories in the Era of Neoliberal Reform. *Research Consortium Archive*, 4(1), 928-945.
- Shoaib, M., Iqbal, S., Baneen, U., & Abdullah, F. (2026b). Intersectional Classrooms: Gender, Social Stratification, and the Reproduction of Educational Inequality. *Annual Methodological Archive Research Review*, 4(2), 385-403.
- Shoaib, M., Iqbal, S., Baneen, U., & Abdullah, F. (2026c). Symbolic Violence and Gendered Aspirations: A Bourdieusian Study of Educational Choice and Achievement. *Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)*, 4(2), 849-866.
- Shoaib, M., Kausar, N., Sarfraz, J., & Abdullah, F. (2026a). Everyday Language and Gendered Experience: A Sociological Analysis of Gendered Slang among Female Students. *Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)*, 4(3), 449-467.
- Shoaib, M., Kausar, N., Sarfraz, J., & Abdullah, F. (2026b). Gendered Slang and Social Inequality: A Sociological Study of Psychological and Social Impacts on Female Students in Higher Education. *Research Consortium Archive*, 4(1), 1386-1404.
- Shoaib, M., Kausar, N., Sarfraz, J., & Abdullah, F. (2026c). A Sociological Study of Interaction Avoidance and Response Behavior among Female Students in Higher Education. *Journal of Management & Social Science*, 3(1), 1691-1707.



Vol. 4 No. 3 (March) (2026)

- Shoaib, M., Nazir, L., & Iqbal, T. (2026). Learning Agency and Empowerment in Digital Learning Environments: A Study of Collaborative Knowledge Construction in Pakistani Higher Education. *Journal of Management Science Research Review*, 5(1), 2743–2764.
- Shoaib, M., Nazir, L., & Kausar, N. (2026). Cultural Knowledge Integration and Dialogic Learning Practices: Bridging Theory and Real-World Contexts among Female Students in Pakistani Universities. *Journal of Management Science Research Review*, 5(1), 2789–2810.
- Shoaib, M., Nazir, L., & Mir, B. A. (2026). Third Space Pedagogy, Hybrid Learning Spaces, and Educational Achievement among Female Students in Pakistani Higher Education. *GUMAN*, 9(1), 562–582.
- Shoaib, M., Nazir, L., & Rashid, R. (2026a). Critical Thinking Skills, Application of Knowledge, and Skill Development among Female Students in Pakistani Higher Education. *Pakistan Journal of Social Science Review*, 5(3), 1328–1346.
- Shoaib, M., Nazir, L., & Rashid, R. (2026b). Understanding Educational Outcomes through Third Space Pedagogy and Digital Learning Practices among Female Students in Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Social Science Review*, 5(3), 1347–1366.
- Shoaib, M., Nazir, L., & Sheraz, M. (2026a). Digital Collaboration Tools and Technology-Mediated Learning Practices among Female Students in Higher Education. *Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)*, 4(3), 494–512.
- Shoaib, M., Nazir, L., & Sheraz, M. (2026b). Third Space Pedagogy in Digital Learning Environments: An Analysis of Learning Outcomes among Female Students in Pakistan. *Shnakhat*, 5(1), 1026-1044.
- Shoaib, M., Noor, A., Iqbal, T., & Abdullah, F. (2026). Intersectionality Reinforcing Gender Inequality Across Higher Education Institutions in Contemporary Societies. *Annual Methodological Archive Research Review*, 4(3), 531-550.
- Shoaib, M., Noor, A., Mir, B. A., & Abdullah, F. (2026). Patriarchy Shaping Gendered Power Relations within Educational Institutions and Academic Knowledge Production. *Annual Methodological Archive Research Review*, 4(3), 551-571.
- Shoaib, M., Sarfraz, J., & Kausar, N. (2026a). Gendered Slang and Psychosocial Consequences: A Study of Female Students in Higher Education. *Research Consortium Archive*, 4(1), 1360-1373.
- Shoaib, M., Sarfraz, J., & Kausar, N. (2026b). Gendered Slang as a Sociolinguistic Practice and Social Interaction Dynamics: An Analysis of Gender Bias among Female Students in Higher Education. *Annual Methodological Archive Research Review*, 4(1), 545-564.
- Shoaib, M., Sarfraz, J., Kausar, N., & Abdullah, F. (2026a). Intent Perception, Level of Explicitness, and Perspective of Respect among Female Students in Pakistani Higher Education Institutions. *Pakistan Journal of Social Science Review*, 5(2), 805–824.
- Shoaib, M., Sarfraz, J., Kausar, N., & Abdullah, F. (2026b). Understanding the Interplay of Gender Bias, Safety Perceptions, and Psychological Responses among Female Students in Higher Education. *Dialogue Social Science Review (DSSR)*, 3(2), 476–493.
- Shoaib, M., Shamraiz, S., Abbas, A., & Abdullah, F. (2026). Digital Divide, Gender, and the Transformation of Educational Inequality in Pakistani Higher Education. *International Journal of Social Sciences Bulletin*, 4(3), 627-645.



Vol. 4 No. 3 (March) (2026)

- Shoaib, M., Shamraiz, S., Abdullah, F., & Shahzadi, S. (2026). Gender Constructs and the Social Production of Learning Achievement: A Qualitative Study in Educational Contexts. *Journal of Media Horizons*, 7(2), 55-71.
- Shoaib, M., Shamraiz, S., Baneen, U., & Abdullah, F. (2026a). Epistemic Inequality in Schooling: Gender, Knowledge Production, and the Politics of Recognition. *Journal for Current Sign*, 4(1), 1063–1081.
- Shoaib, M., Shamraiz, S., Baneen, U., & Abdullah, F. (2026b). Hidden Curricula and Gender Regimes: A Sociological Analysis of Power, Identity, and Achievement in Educational Institutions. *Journal of Management & Social Science*, 3(1), 848-864.
- Shoaib, M., Shamraiz, S., Baneen, U., & Abdullah, F. (2026c). Negotiating Masculinities and Femininities in the Classroom: A Sociological Analysis of Gendered Pathways to Learning and Achievement. *Journal of Management & Social Science*, 3(1), 883-900.
- Shoaib, M., Shamraiz, S., Baneen, U., & Abdullah, F. (2026d). Performing Merit: Gendered Habitus and the Social Construction of Academic Excellence in Higher Education. *Pakistan Journal of Social Science Review*, 5(2), 660–677.
- Shoaib, M., Shamraiz, S., Noor, A., & Abdullah, F. (2026). Gendered Habitus Influencing Educational Mobility among Students in Stratified Social Contexts Globally. *Pakistan Journal of Social Science Review*, 5(3), 455–469.
- Shoaib, M., Srosh, S., Mobeen, M., & Abdullah, F. (2026a). Intersectional Feminist Sociological Analysis of Gender, Class, and Educational Mobility. *Pakistan Journal of Social Science Review*, 5(3), 470–490.
- Shoaib, M., Srosh, S., Mobeen, M., & Abdullah, F. (2026b). Social Reproduction Reinforcing Gendered Learning Experiences within Contemporary Education Systems Globally. *Pakistan Journal of Social Science Review*, 5(3), 491–510.
- Shoaib, M., & Ullah, H. (2019). Female and Male Students' Educational Performance in Tertiary Education in the Punjab Pakistan. *The Pakistan Journal of Social Issues*, 10, 83-100.
- Shoaib, M., & Ullah, H. (2021). Classroom Environment, Teacher, and Girl Students' Learning Skills. *Education and Urban Society*, 53(9), 1039-1063. doi:10.1177/00131245211001908
- Shoaib, M., & Ullah, H. (2026). Gender differentials in academic performance in Pakistani higher education*. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 31(1-2), 1-21.
- Singh, S. (2011). The Surprising Non-Impact of Radical Right-Wing Populist Party Representation on Public Tolerance of Minorities. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties*, 21(3), 313-331. doi:10.1080/17457289.2011.588333
- Sirry. (2024). Teachers' perspectives on tolerance education in Indonesian high schools. *British Journal of Religious Education*, 46(4), 505-519. doi:10.1080/01416200.2024.2345213
- Susanto, T. (2025). Ethnography of harmony: local traditions and dynamics of interfaith tolerance in Nglinggi Village, Indonesia. *Asian Anthropology*, 24(2), 146-150. doi:10.1080/1683478X.2024.2434988
- Ullah, H., & Shoaib, M. (2021). Trend of Research Visualization of Sociology of Education from 2001 to 2020: A Bibliometric Analysis. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 1-24.
- Wang. (2020). Attitudes Toward Religion and Believers in China: How Education Increases Tolerance of Individual Religious Differences and Intolerance of



Vol. 4 No. 3 (March) (2026)

Religious Influence in Politics. *Religion & Education*, 47(1), 98-117.
doi:10.1080/15507394.2019.1626211

Yamane, T. (1967). An Introductory Analysis of Statistics. In: New York: Harper and Row.

Yingying. (2018). Neutral agents and social tolerance: a dynamic perspective based on economic interaction model with local social cost functions. *Applied Economics Letters*, 25(20), 1416-1420. doi:10.1080/13504851.2017.1422597

Zemestani, M. (2024). Associations between Sleep Disturbance and Suicidal Ideation Severity in Iranian University Students: Evaluating Emotion Regulation Difficulties and Distress Tolerance. *Archives of Suicide Research*, 28(2), 454-470. doi:10.1080/13811118.2023.2190366

Appendix-A

Developing and Validating a Social Tolerance and Group Cohesion Scale for Higher Education Students (Questionnaire)

A) Identification of the Students

i) Semester _____ ii) Program _____ iii)
Subject _____

B) Socio-economic Characteristics of the Student

Q.1 Gender i) Male ii) Female
Q.2 Age (in completed years) _____
Q.3 Family occupation _____
Q.4 Family monthly income (PKR) _____
Q.5 Number of siblings _____
Q.6 Family size _____
Q.7 Family type _____
Q.8 Residential area i) Rural ii) Urban

C. Social Tolerance

Strongly Agree = SA to Strongly Disagree = SD

S. No.	Statement	SA	A	D	SD
C.1	Acceptance and Respect				
i	You accept the multiculturalism variations	4	3	2	1
ii	You give respect to students having different backgrounds	4	3	2	1
iii	You accept the views of others in classroom	4	3	2	1
iv	You give respect to students having different languages	4	3	2	1
v	You accept the cultural codes of others	4	3	2	1
vi	You accept the cultural values of others	4	3	2	1
vii	You give respect to students having different norms	4	3	2	1
viii	You accept the students having different dress style	4	3	2	1
C.2	Ethical Reflection				
i	You give respect the values of others as per ethics	4	3	2	1
ii	You accept the beliefs of others as true	4	3	2	1
iii	You practice ethical principles in classroom	4	3	2	1



Vol. 4 No. 3 (March) (2026)

iv	You have diverse perspective of thinking on the issue	4	3	2	1
v	You make maturity base decisions doing your study	4	3	2	1
vi	You judged the ethical values of friends on campus	4	3	2	1
vii	You present feelings in front of others positively	4	3	2	1
viii	You pretend good manners with students on campus	4	3	2	1
C.3 Bilateral Tolerance					
i	You are interconnected with diverse social groups	4	3	2	1
ii	You tolerate differences of gender	4	3	2	1
iii	You accept differences based on gender	4	3	2	1
iv	You accept the challenges of cultural identities	4	3	2	1
v	You approve the opinions of others	4	3	2	1
vi	You easily agree with the arguments of others	4	3	2	1
vii	You treat friends with dignity	4	3	2	1
viii	You respect physiological differences	4	3	2	1
C.4 Civic Tolerance					
i	You have experience of living with your non-Muslim friend	4	3	2	1
ii	You try to improve social connections	4	3	2	1
iii	You accept the traditions of multiculturalism	4	3	2	1
iv	You respect the views of others	4	3	2	1
v	You respect the thoughts of your friends	4	3	2	1
vi	You accept the variations of students in classroom	4	3	2	1
vii	Your class have unity among variety of students	4	3	2	1
viii	You are encouraged practice the values of others	4	3	2	1
C.5 Political Tolerance					
i	You have patience to accept political views	4	3	2	1
ii	You tolerate political slogans	4	3	2	1
iii	You respect manifesto of political parties	4	3	2	1
iv	You have attended different political rallies	4	3	2	1
v	You respect all political leaders	4	3	2	1
vi	You are active political worker	4	3	2	1
vii	Political tolerance is very important for country	4	3	2	1
viii	You tolerate the decisions of political parties	4	3	2	1
C.6 Religious Tolerance					
i	You work together to create friendship	4	3	2	1
ii	You accept recognized differences of others	4	3	2	1
iii	You support religious differences	4	3	2	1
iv	Religious education promotes inclusivity	4	3	2	1
v	Respecting beliefs results to foster tolerance	4	3	2	1
vi	You accept diverse religious perspective	4	3	2	1
vii	You have interconnected with various religious groups	4	3	2	1
viii	Religious tolerance develop harmony	4	3	2	1
C.7 Ethnic Tolerance					
i	You accept differences of custom	4	3	2	1
ii	You respect differences of traditions	4	3	2	1
iii	You value ideas of others	4	3	2	1
iv	You understand viewpoints of others	4	3	2	1



Vol. 4 No. 3 (March) (2026)

v	You are engaged in constructive dialogue	4	3	2	1
vi	You accept the attitude of others	4	3	2	1
vii	You have attended multi-cultural activities	4	3	2	1
viii	Positive social interaction results to reduce biases	4	3	2	1

D. Group Cohesion

Strongly Agree = SA to Strongly Disagree = SD

D.1	Interpersonal Interaction				
i	You interact with multiple behavioral students	4	3	2	1
ii	You have trust in your peer group	4	3	2	1
iii	You respect the values of your group members	4	3	2	1
iv	You respect the identity of group members	4	3	2	1
v	You accept the ideas of cross-cultural students	4	3	2	1
vi	You joined the group of different identities	4	3	2	1
vii	You have unity among cross-cultural group	4	3	2	1
viii	You shared common goals with the multiple cultural students	4	3	2	1
D.2	Group Pride				
i	You feel proud to be a part of your group	4	3	2	1
ii	You accept the multiple behaviors in group	4	3	2	1
iii	You feel satisfied with the group member	4	3	2	1
iv	You easily achieved task with group members	4	3	2	1
v	You feel comfortable to interact with group members	4	3	2	1
vi	Your tolerance level increased to deal with multiple students	4	3	2	1
vii	You have joined the cultural activities	4	3	2	1
viii	You have celebrated success with group members	4	3	2	1
D.3	Group Commitment				
i	You have loyalty with group members	4	3	2	1
ii	You easily trust on group members	4	3	2	1
iii	You accept the cultural differences of group	4	3	2	1
iv	You cooperate with group members to complete the task	4	3	2	1
v	You respect different viewpoints of group members	4	3	2	1
vi	You feel group cohesion is exemplified	4	3	2	1
vii	You feel strong social bonding with group members	4	3	2	1
viii	You have completed the deadline of the group	4	3	2	1
D.4	Sense of Weness				
i	You have self of unity among group	4	3	2	1
ii	You feel strengthen with social group	4	3	2	1
iii	You support each other as a group member	4	3	2	1
iv	Your group collectively achieved the task well on time	4	3	2	1
v	You have attended the cultural activities of group	4	3	2	1
vi	You have completed assignments for your group	4	3	2	1
vii	You feel strong to perform activity with group	4	3	2	1
viii	You feel loneliness without your group	4	3	2	1
D.5	Willingness to Work				
i	You collaborate for group assignments with friends	4	3	2	1



Vol. 4 No. 3 (March) (2026)

ii	Your group motivate you to complete the tasks	4	3	2	1
iii	You achieved difficult tasks easily with group support	4	3	2	1
iv	Your group activities show good results after completion	4	3	2	1
v	You are encouraged to participates in cultural activities	4	3	2	1
vi	You are willing to work hard for the success of group	4	3	2	1
vii	You feel discouraged by the variations of your group	4	3	2	1
viii	You enjoyed the company of class fellows	4	3	2	1
D.6 Trust Worthiness					
i	Your group members are reliable	4	3	2	1
ii	Your group members easily trust each other	4	3	2	1
iii	Trust based relations are long lasting	4	3	2	1
iv	You have fair dealing with group members	4	3	2	1
v	You feel trust is the key of group strength	4	3	2	1
vi	Group commitment increased the stability of group	4	3	2	1
vii	Your group worked smoothly together	4	3	2	1
viii	You try to develop trust among group members	4	3	2	1
D.7 Sense of Inclusion					
i	You are accepted members of group	4	3	2	1
ii	You feel respect from others	4	3	2	1
iii	Students give values to your ideas	4	3	2	1
iv	You have strong sense of belongingness	4	3	2	1
v	You are treated fair in academia	4	3	2	1
vi	You are encouraged to practice in class activity	4	3	2	1
vii	Your experience has been acknowledged in class	4	3	2	1
viii	Your critical thinking has value	4	3	2	1

Suggestion on social tolerance

Suggestion to improve group cohesion

Date: _____

Name (Optional): _____
