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**Introduction**

 Intolerance, in various forms has been a troublesome and ongoing aspect of civilization that has resulted in stigmatization, violence, death, political inequality, and all forms of marginalization based on group differences in belief, race, ethnicity, social status, economic status, and political affiliation. Intolerance is seen in the history of western civilization even since the high to late middle ages, where Jews, Muslims, and alternative branches of Christianity such as the Cathari, were systematically blamed for larger problems, more difficult to deal with, such as famine, invasions from the north, and the black plague, resulting in attempts at genocide, war, and systematic violent oppression (McCammon, 2013).

 This pattern persists through modern times, and across cultures, taking various forms, some of which are not terribly dissimilar from the past. Researchers from multiple disciplines strive to engage this issue in hopes to find an amenable approach to coexistence in an increasingly diverse global society. One major problem with this is that researchers have used a variety of methods to engage tolerance and intolerance, with various ideas about what define tolerance, and how to deal with it as a societal issue. The result of this divergence is both beneficial and disadvantageous simultaneously.

 On one hand, several poignant theories paramount to the understanding of social tolerance and intolerance have been developed, shedding light on various phenomena occurring as a result of tolerance and intolerance in various settings. On the other hand, several conflicting, sometimes incompatible modes of research have provided outcomes that are difficult to compare and generalize from. In essence, what may have occurred in one setting, may not apply to another.

 This melting pot of research methodologies has helped lay a favorable groundwork for theoretical approaches to intolerance, but as of yet has failed to discover mechanisms that provide real-world solutions. The purpose of this article will be to address multiple theoretical frameworks for tolerance, intolerance, and social acceptance, as well as to propose an instrument design that could be used in various cultural settings, on either in-groups or out-groups to discover where various aspects of both intolerance and tolerance may converge, interact, and impact facets of society.

***Establishing the Framework***

 Sociological frameworks that help to define contexts for intolerance are numerous, but there are a few that are used more widely than others. Structural functionalism, defined by Calhoun, Gerteis, Moody, Pfaff and Indermohan (2012) is the idea that society is an interactive group of systems and subsystems working toward solidarity and stability. This idea frames tolerance and intolerance as functions of larger societal structures in an attempt to unify people in a stable understanding of what it means to be the in-group in society, and that out-grouping is basically a consequence of that structure. This appears to be true on certain levels, as unifying against common enemies has been a normative mechanism fostering solidarity through many societies throughout history. However, structural functionalism fails to address solutions to integrating out-groups on level footing in the arena of civilization. Out-groups are merely a result of advancing stability, rather than marginalized victims of a prejudiced society.

 Marcionis’s (2010) definition of social conflict theory states that conflict and resolution are generated automatically by society as a mechanism for change. This idea frames tolerance as a final result of conflict, and intolerance as a growing-pain for social change. The merit of this theory is that it helps to guide and inform people who are interested in studying specific social factors are related to inequality in a given societal setting. This theory is however limited, in that it does not provide for an interrelationship between tolerance and intolerance. Rather, the two concepts seem to exist in this theoretical framework as two separate entities. This may be problematic in addressing where specific tolerance concepts such as Prislin and Filson’s (2009) conversion tolerance may give way to acts of violence or intolerance. This theory also is incapable of handling the tolerance paradox: the act of being intolerant to the intolerant.

 A third theory to consider is Festinger’s (1954) theory of Social Identity. This theory holds that members of any group self-evaluate based on their relative position within a group based on ever-changing normative mechanisms in relation to out-groups. This theory provides a dynamic framework by which to evaluate individual characteristics of tolerance, as well as within and between-groups aspects of tolerance and intolerance. A limitation of this particular theory is that it does not facilitate reductive factors and mechanisms that may be teased out from these relativistic positions within and between groups. There however may be a synthetic approach to resolving this.

 One way to conceptualize these theories is in an inclusive synthesis, where the interaction of social structures moving toward stability generate conflict and affect change, which in turn, impact how individuals self-evaluate as norms change over time. These three theories are not incompatible, and may be best viewed as a holistic theory of social monitoring. However, operationalizing these theories under one conceptual framework has not yet been done in a formal way that would allow researchers from various disciplines to contribute information to the study of social tolerance. For that, an instrument that works well for all typical methodologies would need to be in place that would allow gaps between disciplines to be bridged and for a more progressive approach to generating solutions for societies struggling with intolerance for marginalized groups.

***Conceptualization of an Inclusive Hypothesis of Tolerance***

 Moore and Walker’s (2011) work carried out a concept analysis on social tolerance across disciplines including medicine, social sciences, and theology. This study emphasized an antecedent, criteria, and consequence structure that examines how cultural contact, morality, and cultural differences precipitated various aspects of tolerance, and the consequences that follow each criterion, such as reconciliation, broadened perspective, and harmony, or unity between groups. This theoretical conception provides a sound basis for an interdisciplinary approach to tolerance theory construction, though the factors listed appear to be one-directional and positive, and appears to be more of a way to evaluate positive changes rather than a change in general tolerance, and will serve as a scaffolding in the construction of an instrument to measure tolerance across settings and cultures.

*Subscales for Tolerance*

 For the purpose of this article, tolerance is going to be defined in the following framework as criteria for instrument design: 1) Tolerance Boundaries (TB) are the thresholds of what a person or group can tolerate before impacting acceptance, or fostering intolerance. This definition is derived from Kanisaukas via Moore & Walker (2011) and will serve as a mitigating factor between tolerance and intolerance. 2) Acceptance: Acceptance will be defined in one of two ways: a) Segregational Acceptance (SA) - where tolerance is based on segregated coexistence in one societal framework, and b) Homogeneous Acceptance (HA) - where tolerance is based on homogenized coexistence in one societal framework. Prislin and Filson’s (2009) definition of Conversion Tolerance, where a sufficient number of group members are convinced to change their preferences to foster a group conversion to tolerate a social factor will be considered as a primary factor in this conceptualization in order to tease out where tolerance methods and intolerance methods may converge. These will be divided into two categories: 1) Passive Conversion Seeking (PCS), where group conversion is deferred to power structures, authorities, or other group members, and 2) Active Conversion Seeking (ACS) where conversion is pursued with direct action toward others. These various definitions of tolerance will be used to construct tolerance subscales in the design of this study.

*Subscales for Intolerance*

 Intolerance, rather than existing on a spectrum with tolerance, will be defined as a set of factors expected to relate to the aforementioned tolerance factors. Intolerance will be evaluated in terms of classism (CL), racism (RA), ethnocentrism (ET), xenophobia (XE), stereotypy (ST), and prejudice (PR). Classism will defined as a hostile disposition toward social classes outside that of the informant. Racism will be defined as a hostile disposition toward target race(s) outside that of the informant. Ethnocentrism will be defined as a hostile disposition toward targets outside the ethnic background of the informant. Xenophobia will be defined as a hostile disposition to foreigners or parties considered to be foreign in the informant’s home country. Stereotypy will be defined as generalized notions regarding out-groups, and lastly prejudice will be defined as the belief that an out group is inferior, or deserves an inferior status to that of the informant. Using these simple definitions, several dimensions and scales will be derived to test tolerance across settings and cultures.

*Moral Fluidity*

 Since tolerance and intolerance are ultimately a result of the adaptability of group norms, a component of morality was included in the measure. Moral fluidity (MF) is how a group ranges in accommodating diverse cultures in a society. Moral fluidity is a continuous, spectral phenomenon which would range from rigid morality (below average fluidity), morally balanced (average fluidity) to morally accommodating (above average fluidity). This subscale is intended to serve as a predictive subscale for the other subscale domains of the IGTM.

 The inclusion of these criteria in instrument design will allow for an inclusive theoretical framework, where the measure will be able to be embedded in a variety of research settings both in the lab, and in the field. This study will address instrument design, construction, applications, and how the instrument can be adapted, utilized, and interpreted across disciplines as well. This sort of instrumentation may be paramount to approaching a concept such as social tolerance which has both a global scope and impact.

**Methodology**

 Because approaches to measuring tolerance have been varied and diverse, a statistical method of analyzing dimensions across various studies, such as factor analysis, was not feasible. Instead, a literature review was carried out over various studies of tolerance supplied in a Sociology Class *Tolerance and Acceptance* were evaluated and reviewed for commonalities, convergent, and disparate factors in operationalizing tolerance. This literature review was used to help guide and inform constructing an interdisciplinary instrument used to measure common tolerance factors across settings. The Interdisciplinary Global Tolerance Measure (IGTM, Appendix 1) was constructed as a brief questionnaire, with a lengthy pre-research worksheet to determine interchangeable items based on theoretical framework, social context, and research design. (See Appendix 2). A sample demographic questionnaire to be paired with the measure is included (See Appendix 3). The IGTM is a 24 item questionnaire designed to measure various aspects of tolerance and intolerance over several subscale domains (see Appendix 1). Each item rates on the three main domains of the study: Moral Fluidity which measures the ability of the rater to accommodate cultures with conflicting moral values, tolerance, and intolerance which measure the subscale domains mentioned in the previous section of this article and in Appendix 1.

***Proposed Design, Procedure, and Predicted Results:***

 A series of two pilot studies for the IGTM is to be carried out on a large sample ( n > 200 ) in the raw, untampered, psychometric version of the measure. The measure will be paired with the demographic questionnaire (Appendix 3). It is hypothesized that the measure will show significant relationships between each subscale domain and moral fluidity. Higher levels of Moral Fluidity should predict higher levels of tolerance, and lower levels of intolerance. A goodness of fit analysis and inter-item correlation will be run to assess the relationships between the IGTM subscale domains. A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) will be run to assess interrelationships within and between subjects with moral fluidity as the independent variable. Participant scores on moral fluidity will be converted to a grouping variable where below average, average, and above average moral fluidity will be grouped according to position from the sample mean, and used to run a second MANOVA against the subscale domains. Chronbach’s alpha, and split half reliability will be assessed with the measure. Researchers predict that both analyses will have a coefficient of .75 or greater.

 The second pilot study will be to test and compare how the IGTM functions between divergent groups of researchers including sociologists ( n > 30) , psychologists (n > 30), and anthropologists (n > 30). Each researcher will be instructed to pilot the IGTM on a small sample of people to test embedding the measure into their existing methodologies. These studies can be contrived, as long as the informants filling out the measure are doing so honestly, and the researchers used the worksheet provided to specify items on the measure according to their proposed sample. Each participant will be asked to share their thoughts on the measure, written in a couple of brief paragraphs, and submit it, and their worksheets, and results back to the researchers with a detailed account on their use of the measure. Next a MANCOVA will be conducted with researcher type as the independent variable to test for significant differences in researcher type when using the questionnaire. Inter-rater kappa will be calculated for all three sample groups to assess reliability which is predicted to be greater than .75 between all three groups.

**Discussion**

 Assuming results for the proposed studies are valid and reliable, the IGTM may serve as a valuable interdisciplinary tool to assess the various subscales of tolerance, and allow for them to be conceptualized in a completely new way, as well as introducing the concept of moral fluidity to the research arena. Moral fluidity also serves as a built-in quasi-independent variable, but can also be used as a separate subscale domain, which allows for a variety of study designs to be carried out with this measure alone. In spite of this, the measure is designed to be embedded in other field research techniques found in sociology, and anthropology to assess tolerance within a cultural framework. Currently, limitations cannot be ascertained until the proposed study is completed, but one possibility is that the scales may not translate well across disciplines, theoretical frameworks, or cultures. Researchers think these limitations are remote possibilities and cannot be speculated further upon until data have been analyzed.

 Another feature of the IGTM is that certain generalized words in the measure can be specified and curtailed to specific cultures using the pre-research worksheet and optional demographic questionnaire, which also serve to begin building qualitative narratives, and may help to guide and inform interview and observation trajectories. This facilitates very specific, contextualized data to be pulled from most kinds of research methodologies. In addition the rich and rigorous narratives used in purely qualitative studies can be supplemented by having informants complete this brief instrument during one, or a few of their sessions.

 This allows not only for embedding empirical methodologies into qualitative research, but also facilitates the rich narrative data to be supported by empirical data, as can be found in McCammon & Dull’s (2013) interdisciplinary study on the therapeutic benefits of Poi (fire dancing) performance. This study embedded a repeated measures, longitudinal psychometric study design in Anthropological grounded theory and participant observation. The result were several significant main effects supported by rich narrative, and ethnographic video data( McCammon & Dull; 2013) that interrelated based on perceived belongingness to their group. Mixed methods studies such as these are rare, but serve to bridge interdisciplinary gaps in understanding and theoretical conflicts.

 The IGTM accomplishes this in a variety of ways. It allows for several empirical and qualitative mixed methods designs, as well as single case designs. The measure can be used cross-sectionally and longitudinally, as well as to compare divergent cultural groups. This has potential to reveal great amounts of previously unseen data for groups in the midst of conflict, separated by language, belief, prejudice, social caste, geography, or other boundaries. This high level of methodological compatibility would make the IGTM invaluable for comparing results from multiple fields of study, as well as to foster collaboration between disciplines in the study of tolerance, possibly resulting in an eventual increase in effective social programs to intervene in instances of conflict and generate more effective outcomes.
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**APPENDIX 1: Interdisciplinary Global Tolerance Measure: Raw Psychometric Version (INGT-P)**

Instructions to Informant: Please rate all of the following, as honestly as possible, in terms that relate to how you feel in the present moment.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Undecided | Somewhat Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1.I abide by the rules laid out for me by authorities in how I treat others who follow inferior rules. (MF-) (PCS+) (ET+) | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 2. I accept the presence of different kinds of people in society. (MF+) (HA+) (PR-) |  |
| 3.I feel that others deserve punishment for infringing on my personal rights. (MF-) (TB+) (PR+) |  |
| 4.I consider people from foreign countries to be inferior to those in our country. (MF-) (HA-) (XE+) |  |
| 5.I accept diversity in my country as long as I don’t have to deal with it on a day to day basis. (MF+) (SA+) (PR-) |  |
| 6.I have difficulty tolerating people with different skin colors because they are generally amoral. (MF-) (TB+) (RA+) |  |
| 7.In tolerating other cultures, I accept things until I feel threatened by them. (MF+) (TB+) (CL+) |  |
| 8. I actively participate in activities to convert people of other views to my own because their views are wrong. (MF-) (ACS+) (ET+) |  |
| 9.I hope authorities deal with other cultures, because most of them tend to act like degenerates. (MF-) (PCS+) (ST+) |  |
| 10. It is ok for people to express themselves culturally even if it interferes with my cultural practices. (MF+) (TB-) (ET-) |  |
| 11. If foreigners are to move into this country, they should abide by the customs of this country. (MF-) (PCS+) (XE+) |  |
| 12. It is acceptable for people of diverse races to live in my neighborhood. (MF+) (HA+) (RA-) |  |
| 13. I don’t mind people of other religions as long as they practice their customs in their own space. (MF+) (SA+) (ET-) |  |
| 14.I think that people of other cultures should act more like my culture, because their culture is generally inferior. (MF-) (PCS+)(ST+) |  |
| 15. I would like to teach foreigners how to act more like us, so they will be better. (MF-)(ACS+)(CL+) |  |
| 16.If our country is strong enough, it should invade other countries to rule them. (MF-) (PCS+) (XE+) |  |
| 17. Other races should not hold the same status that mine does. (MF-)(HA-) (RA+) |  |
| 18. I find political discussions with people of inferior views to be silly. (MF+) (ACS-) (ST+) |  |
| 19.It is fine for foreigners to live here as long as I don’t have to see them. (MF+) (SA+) (XE+) |  |
| 20.I believe that all members of outside cultures should be removed from society. (MF-) (HA-) (PR+) |  |
| 21.I often try to convert people to my religious beliefs because we hold all the power in this country. (MF-) (ACS+) (CL+) |  |
| 22. I believe that it is okay for the poor to live exclusively in their own neighborhoods. (MF+) (SA+)(CL+) |  |
| 23. I accept that people of different races in my town attend the same local schools. (MF+) (SA+) (RA+) |  |
| 24.I regularly try to save people of other cultures from their criminal natures. (MF-) (ACS+) (ST+) |  |

**How to Score:** All items rate on various dimensions and subscales. Each item is followed by the subscale designation in parentheses followed by a + or a – sign. Items with + are scored normally for each subscale. Items with a – are reverse scored for that subscale. domains are:

**Moral Fluidity (MF)**: This subscale which weighs on all items, measures the rater’s adaptability to cultural exposure. It is meant to be either a continuous variable for frequency data, or as a quasi-independent variable for factorial designs. If used for frequencies, in a non-experimental, or non-factorial design, then MF is included in tolerance domains, or as a third raw domain.

 **Tolerance Domains:**

**Tolerance Boundaries (TB):** This subscale represents the threshold of acceptability before action is taken against out-groups or oppressors. Items 3, 6, 7, 10

**Segregational Acceptance (SA):** This subscale represents the rater’s perceived ability to accept diversity that is not homogenized in their society. Items 5,13, 19, 22, 23

**Homogeneous Acceptance (HA):** This subscale represents the rater’s ability to accept diversity that is homogeneous in their society. Items 2, 4, 12, 17, 20

**Passive Conversion Seeking (PCS):** This subscale measures how the rater desires conversion of out-groups by authoritarian societal forces. Items 1, 9, 11, 14, 16

**Active Conversion Seeking (ACS):** This subscale measures how the rater perceives their own level of activity in converting out-groups. Items 8, 15, 18, 21, 24

**Global Tolerance Score:** Sum TB+SA+HA+PCS+ACS

 **Intolerance Domains:**

**Classism (CL):** Measures power differential and perceived class superiority. Items 7,15,21,22

**Racism(RA):** Measures hostile disposition toward other races. Items 6, 12, 17, 23

**Ethnocentrism (ET):** Measures hostile disposition toward ethnic out-groups. Items 1,8,10,13

**Xenophobia (XE):** Measures hostile disposition to foreigners. Items 4, 11, 16, 19

**Stereotypy (ST):** Measures generalizations made regarding out-groups. Items 9,14, 18, 24

**Prejudice (PR):** Measures hostile disposition to all out-groups. Items 2,3,5,20

**Intolerance Global Score:** Sum CL+RA+ET+XE+ST+PR

**APPENDIX 2: IGTM Pre-Research Worksheet**

 If you are using the IGTM outside of a laboratory, or need it to serve a more specific research purpose, complete the following worksheet by doing preliminary field or background research on the group(s) you are studying. Use the answers in the following sections to curtail highlighted areas in the raw IGTM template.

Groups studied:

In Group(s): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Out-Group(s): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Relationship of power between Groups: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Location(s):\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Structural Factors:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | Conflict(s):\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ | Social Identity Factors:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

Historical Narrative of Conflict [attach additional sheets if necessary]

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Current Affairs Narrative of Conflict [attach additional sheets if necessary] \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\*Using these narratives, substitute specific names, concepts, and agencies where appropriate in highlighted areas of IGTM. Example: If studying intolerance from Christians to minority groups, item one might read: *I abide by the Ten Commandments in how I treat non-Christians who follow worldly laws.*

Specify Study Design (Check all that apply):

Empirical\_\_

Qualitative\_\_ (I am only using the measure to support claims in a larger narrative)

Mixed Methods\_\_ (qual / quan hold equal meaning)

Repeated Probes\_\_

Longitudinal\_\_

Cross Sectional\_\_

Small Group Case Study\_\_

Expected Large Sample n\_\_

Assessment(pre-post)\_\_

Other Pre-Post\_\_\_

Multivariate:\_\_\_

Other (please specify):\_\_\_

Analysis Options: For qualitative, non-experimental, or single case designs, a simple descriptive analysis of domains will best suit the study. For Repeated Measures designs, R-ANOVA, R-MANOVA, or R-MANCOVA can all be utilized from this measure. For multivariate, paired measures, or between groups designs, ANOVA, MANOVA, and MANCOVA can all be utilized with this measure. Please keep in mind that the IGTM measure can be used alone, but is suited to be paired with both qualitative and quantitative measures for mixed methods interdisciplinary designs.

**IMPORTANT: IF YOU USE THIS WORKSHEET TO SPECIFY IGTM ITEMS, BE SURE TO EITHER INCLUDE IT IN YOUR PUBLICATION, OR EMAIL A COPY OF THE WORKSHEETS, THE MODIFIED QUESTIONNAIRE, AND RESULTS TO THE INSTRUMENT DESIGNER FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS. JUSTIN MCCAMMON: navigator.j@gmail.com**

**APPENDIX 3: Sample Demographic Questionnaire for IGTM**

Informant ID code (do not fill in):\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date of Birth:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Sex:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Gender:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Orientation:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Years of Education:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Highest Degree Completed:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Occupation:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Religion:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Political Affiliation:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Province/ Region:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Attitudes: Rate yourself from one (pertains least)to ten (pertains most):

1. I am a tolerant person:\_\_\_\_\_
2. I enjoy diversity in people:\_\_\_\_\_\_
3. I hold my own views above others:\_\_\_\_\_\_
4. I am politically active:\_\_\_\_\_
5. I engage in charity work:\_\_\_\_\_
6. I love my country:\_\_\_\_\_
7. I love other countries:\_\_\_\_\_
8. I think the opposite sex is equal:\_\_\_\_\_
9. The poor deserve the same quality of life as me:\_\_\_\_\_
10. These days, I consider myself to be happy:\_\_\_\_\_

In one paragraph, please describe your relationship with (out-group): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_