

Tolerance and being tolerated: State of the field, challenges, and future directions

Kumar Yogeeswaran & Levi Adelman

Opening message

Throughout his illustrious career, Professor Maykel Verkuyten conducted in-depth research into ethnic, religious, and national identities and intergroup relations. With a voracious appetite for knowledge from across multiple disciplines, his work has been motivated by an intrinsic drive to make sense of the world with a complete disregard for the extrinsic rewards of academia. In early 2015, Maykel had a rare sabbatical that gave him the time to do some big picture thinking. It was during this time, he began thinking further about a noticeable gap in psychology on tolerance and toleration. Maykel traveled to New Zealand to visit Kumar Yogeeswaran and shared his thoughts about this topic he felt was lacking attention in psychological research. Toleration was a strategy for managing diversity, but differed considerably from the dominant prejudice-based perspective in psychology research. The topic emerging from political science and philosophy resonated with Kumar's understanding of Indian history and philosophy on religious tolerance going back centuries. As Maykel and Kumar worked on their first theoretical paper considering the social psychology of intergroup toleration, Maykel decided to apply for a large grant from the European Research Council because he had become bored of another grant application he had written a year earlier. After successfully getting this large grant to study intergroup toleration, Maykel had the funds to expand the tolerance team to bring in a postdoctoral scholar and three PhD candidates. This postdoctoral scholar,

Levi Adelman, would bring many things into Maykel's life over the next four years: intellectual stimulation, comic relief, and the occasional (or perhaps not so occasional) regret over his hiring decision. Nevertheless, the work they would do together would soon become a crown jewel in Maykel's research portfolio resulting in several publications in the very best psychology journals including *Psychological Review*, *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *European Review of Social Psychology*, and *Personality and Social Psychology Review*. This research would examine the importance of tolerance for pluralistic societies, its boundaries and limits, the necessity of an in-depth psychological, sociological, anthropological, and communications-based investigation into the nature of tolerance, and the implications of tolerance for those being tolerated. While suffering through such collaborators to achieve scientific greatness was doubtlessly more painful than simply being hit on the head by an apple, it nonetheless opened a new area of research, which we shall discuss in the following retrospective review and prospective theorizing.

“Regarding LGBT: I don’t want to say anything negative because we all live together in an open society where each one can choose the language they want to speak, their ethnicity, and their sexual orientation. Leave those people be, for God’s sake!”

– Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyy responding to a question about whether he would ban homosexuality and prostitution¹

In diverse and pluralistic societies, people with a multitude of values, beliefs, worldviews, and practices grounded in their religious, ethnic, national, or ideological group identities live side-by-side. While the presence of such diversity can offer many benefits to society (Carter & Phillips, 2017; Galinsky et al., 2015; Stahl et al., 2010; Verkuyten & Yogeeswaran, 2020), sometimes these beliefs and practices are incompatible and mutually exclusive. For example, how does a devout atheist reconcile their disapproval of a sibling choosing to religiously school their children when they personally feel that religion should have no role in schooling? How does an animal rights activist endure a cultural group wishing to practice ritual animal slaughter? How does a staunch feminist come to accept religious attire when they view it as a symbol of oppression? Pluralistic societies face an inherent quandary in trying to be a unified: we must allow difference to be pluralistic; but incompatible beliefs, values, and practices can undermine our ability to be unified. How can this be managed? How can diverse societies avoid conflict and maintain unity without sacrificing pluralism and diversity?

One answer to managing such irreconcilable differences that are inevitable in a truly pluralistic society is that of tolerance. Unlike acceptance of everything, which might prove impossible for a society with incompatible beliefs or practices, or rejection of all differences and forced assimilation, tolerance does not mandate that people give up their deeply held beliefs. Rather, tolerance acknowledges the disapproval and difference, but calls on people to reflect and act upon the reasons to nonetheless allow others to live their lives as they wish such as considering the outgroup’s right to free expression, their freedom of religion, etc.

Although there have been extensive writings in political philosophy and political science on the nature of toleration and political tolerance (Cohen, 2004; Gibson, 2006; Forst, 2013; Furedi, 2011; Oberdiek, 2001; Sullivan et al., 1999; Vogt, 1997; Walzer, 1997), there had been little psychological research on the topic prior to Maykel Verkuyten’s exploration of the topic. This is rather surprising given the extant work on managing differences in pluralistic societies

¹ <https://twitter.com/Hromadske/status/1183378101788540928>

and research on diversity, prejudice reduction, and intergroup relations in psychology. Nevertheless, this noticeable gap, which may have left Maykel with many sleepless nights, allowed him to lay the foundation for what would become an important research area within social psychology. The current chapter will not delve deeply into exploring the meaning, implications, and varied understandings of tolerance and intolerance, as we have already written about this across multiple theoretical and review articles. For example, while our first foray into the topic (Verkuyten & Yogeeswaran, 2017) introduced the topic of intergroup tolerance to social psychology and examined its nature and components, our subsequent work considered the implications of intergroup toleration for culturally and religiously diverse societies (Verkuyten et al., 2019). We then contrasted a prejudice-reduction approach to improving intergroup relations with a toleration-based approach to achieving the same goal (Verkuyten et al., 2020a). And finally, we recently began to unpack different understandings of tolerance and intolerance by considering its intuitive and deliberative nature (Verkuyten et al., 2020b; Verkuyten et al., 2022a). However, in parallel to these theoretical writings, Maykel has worked with collaborators, including PhD students, to empirically delve into the nature and implications of toleration (e.g., Velthuis et al., 2022, 2021; Dangubic et al., 2022, 2021) and also consider developmental aspects of toleration (for a review, see Verkuyten & Killen, 2021). An overview of all this work can be found in a recent review article (Verkuyten et al., 2022c), while a comprehensive examination of the topic can be found in Maykel's upcoming book (Verkuyten, in press). Here we will instead focus on another branch of Maykel's research relating to intergroup tolerance, which considers the implications of being tolerated, or the psychological impact of being the object of toleration (see Verkuyten et al., 2020c). This chapter summarizes all of the recent empirical work on the implications of being a target of toleration.

Being tolerated

In this work, we define intergroup tolerance as forbearance, where a person disapproves or objects to an outgroup practice or belief, but considers reasons (such as freedom of expression, religion) why despite their disapproval, these should nevertheless be allowed in society. In doing so, the person may decide not to negatively interfere with the expressions of those practices and beliefs (Verkuyten et al., 2022b, 2019). For example, a person might strongly disapprove of ritual slaughter or animal sacrifice practiced within some religions, but they apply forbearance tolerance by reflecting on the importance of freedom of religion in a diverse society. After considering, both their disapproval, and their reasons

not to interfere, this person opts to be tolerant, not by eliminating their objection or their own values, but by carefully considering reasons not to interfere. This conception of tolerance maps onto a classical understanding of tolerance evident in extant writings from philosophy and political science (Cohen, 2004; Forst, 2013; Walzer, 1997). While the above conceptualization of tolerance fits well with extensive academic work on the topic, it is important to note that the meaning of tolerance over time has been very contextual. For example, tolerance during the Ottoman empire would be considered limited by modern standards, or “separate, unequal and protected”, where minority religions, while protected were mandated to remain separate and deferent to Islam (Barkey, 2005). However, at the time, it was perceived by minority religious groups as tolerant with some seeking refuge in the empire to avoid persecution elsewhere (Schmidt, 2001). In the following research review, we shall focus on tolerance as non-interference described above.

Why should we study the effects of being tolerated? After all, one might argue that, whether or not people are appreciative of others, tolerance is still better than rejection or exclusion, and provides a realistic alternative to relativism devoid of values. However, such an approach misses the reason for tolerance: tolerance seeks to stabilize unstable societies. A society where everyone is on the same page about all important issues is the most stable. There will be no need for conflicts, power struggles, or tolerance. But such a society will not exist without erasing diversity. With freedom of thought and action, it becomes necessary to find agreed-upon rules to manage the instability of difference. Tolerance seeks to offer that stability. Rather than a constant power struggle to restrict the beliefs, practices, and behaviors of others, which would inevitably lead to conflict, tolerance tries to strike a balance by accepting the diversity, but inserting the value of non-interference and respect. This tolerance will only be fit for purpose, if the people who are the target of that tolerance do indeed experience it as sufficiently good that they don't feel the need to resort to action to improve their position. Thus, it is crucial that the experience of being tolerated is, in itself, tolerable to those who are being tolerated, thus enabling relative stability. This is why it is so important to fully understand the experience of being tolerated and its consequences.

The distinction between being tolerated versus accepted or rejected

People can feel that they are merely tolerated when beliefs, norms, or practices emerging from their ethnic, cultural, sexual, religious, or ideological outgroup identities are disapproved of, but nevertheless endured by others. Being tolerated differs from being rejected or discriminated against, and it also differs from feeling fully accepted or included. Being tolerated, for example, is distinct from

rejection or discrimination because although it shares a negative attitudinal component, it refers to a negative attitude toward one's group-based beliefs, norms, or practices and not toward a category of people. Importantly, it is also distinct from discrimination or rejection because it involves behaviorally granting them the same rights and freedoms without interference despite the negativity. By contrast, it is distinct from full scale acceptance because despite behavioral inclusion, it follows from disapproval of one's beliefs, norms, or practices.

Although we had called for research into the psychological implications of being tolerated, or being the object of toleration back in our 2017 theoretical paper (Verkuyten & Yogeeswaran, 2017), it was not until 2020 that we published a more comprehensive model examining the implications of being tolerated (Verkuyten et al., 2020c). In this work, we proposed that being tolerated can threaten social identity needs to self-esteem, belonging, control, and certainty, and this can have downstream effects for those tolerated at the intrapersonal (i.e., well-being, identity management), interpersonal (i.e., social costs, withdrawal), and intergroup levels (i.e., collective action, perceived injustice). For those being tolerated, the perceived devaluation of one's beliefs, values, or practices, as well as the nature of non-interference (depending on whether this is seen as arbitrary and an expression of dominance on the part of the tolerator) can affect the extent to which tolerated people are negatively impacted.

Implications of being tolerated with real-world minority groups

While theoretical discussions of the experience of being tolerated have been rather rich (Brown, 2006; Verkuyten et al., 2020c), empirical research into how people actually experience tolerance had been non-existent. A signature trait of Maykel Verkuyten's career is his willingness to use any, and all, possible methodologies to answer research questions of interest. In this fashion, Maykel worked with a number of collaborators on a broad range of empirical studies to better understand the psychological implications of being tolerated. For example, in collaboration with a PhD student, Sara Cvetkovska, they qualitatively explored how gender non-binary people in the Netherlands understood and experienced being tolerated in a country with a long and rich history of being tolerant or at least perceiving itself as tolerant (Cvetkovska et al., 2022). Their work revealed three main components of the experience of being tolerated: tolerance can perpetuate inequity, tolerators often do not understand the targets and what they're tolerating, and that people take a range of strategies to cope with being tolerated (e.g., isolating, protesting, or educating). In other work with a Master's thesis student, Rachel Kollar, Maykel examined discursive usage of both tolerance and intolerance and this was examined for those who tolerate and those who are

tolerated. Specifically, they found that people flexibly use varied understandings of both tolerance and intolerance to make distinctions between ‘us’ and ‘them’, and they find that different cultural meanings of these concepts can be used for progressive or oppressive purposes (Verkuyten & Kollar, 2021).

Alongside such work, many correlational and experimental studies from multiple nations have furthered our understanding about the implications of being tolerated. For example, using members of three stigmatized groups in Turkey including LGBTI people, people with disabilities, and ethnic Kurds, Bagci and colleagues (2020) showed that perceived tolerance of one’s group was associated with threats to social identity needs, including to one’s esteem, meaning, belonging, continuity, and efficacy, even while accounting for perceived discrimination. These increased threats were in turn related to reduced positive well-being (captured by measures of global self-worth and flourishing), and higher negative well-being (captured by measures of anxiety and depression). These studies further demonstrated that being tolerated and being discriminated both had independently negative implications for minority groups.

In other work using a nationally representative sample of ethnic minority group members in the Netherlands, Cvetkovska and colleagues (2020) found that the experience of being tolerated was related to greater well-being through increased national identification, while controlling for the experiences of being accepted or rejected. However, compared to perceiving one’s group as accepted in society, seeing one’s group as tolerated resulted in lower national identification and reduced well-being (see also Cvetkovska et al., 2021, Study 1, involving U.S. racial and ethnic minorities). Across all of these correlational studies using varied minority groups from different countries, perceived experiences with being tolerated were seen as distinct from both being discriminated against, and from being accepted; and such experiences related to negative outcomes for minority groups.

While such studies provided valuable insights into the experiences and psychological correlates for real minority group members who feel their beliefs, norms, and practices are merely tolerated in society, the use of cross-sectional surveys limits our ability to establish causality. Therefore, we subsequently conducted various experimental studies to better understand the implications of being tolerated. For example, in one study (Cvetkovska et al., 2021, Study 2), racial and ethnic minority Americans were asked to recall an experience where they or someone they knew was merely tolerated, accepted, or discriminated against and participants spent a few minutes describing the situation (i.e., who was involved, where it happened, etc.) Participants then completed a series of well-being measures including those relating to positive and negative affect about

the situation they recalled, general measures of life satisfaction, self-esteem, and sense of control. Analyses revealed that reflecting on experiences of being tolerated led to situationally lower positive affect than reflecting on experiences of acceptance, but recalling experiences of discrimination resulted in the lowest positive affect of all. However, recalling experiences of being tolerated had no negative impact on relatively general aspects of well-being such as one's self-esteem, sense of control, and life satisfaction relative to being accepted suggesting that being tolerated may have more situationally negative implications for minority groups without spillover effects into their global self-assessments.

In another experimental study involving racial and ethnic minorities from the USA (Cvetkovska et al., 2021, Study 3), participants were randomly assigned to read a vignette and imagine themselves in the scenario. These vignettes described working in a new organization (that is predominantly White) where employees are allowed to dress as they wish for 'casual Fridays'. The scenario then described the participant wearing a t-shirt one of those Fridays with symbols of their ethnic group. In response, participants are told about one of three reactions that the shirt elicited from their boss: in the acceptance condition, participants are told their boss expresses approval of your decision to wear the shirt while affirming their support for diversity in the workplace. In the tolerance condition, participants are told their boss expressed disapproval of the shirt because they saw it as divisive, but they decided to nevertheless allow it because they believe in their freedom of expression. And in the discrimination condition, participants are told their boss rejects the shirt because they think it is too 'ethnic', and they are asked not to wear the shirt again to work. Following this, participants completed a series of measures assessing threats to their social identity needs, followed by positive and negative affect measures that were specific to the experience (and not general well-being measures). Data revealed that being tolerated resulted in more positive affect, and less negative affect compared to feeling discriminated against. However, being tolerated resulted in less positive affect and more negative affect related to feeling accepted. Importantly, these analyses revealed that higher threats to social identity mediated the link between being tolerated (relative to being accepted) and the increased negative affect, but not changes in positive affect.

Implications of being tolerated with experimental minority groups

While the above research was useful in better understanding the psychological implications of being tolerated for minority affect and well-being in the real-world, there are obvious limitations to relying on such hypothetical or recalled experiences of being tolerated. For example, our above experimental approach

relies on real-life minority groups describing a range of experiences or imagining themselves in specific scenarios that will have varying impact on individuals. To address this limitation, we developed a novel paradigm that would allow us to experimentally simulate the experience of being tolerated, and contrast this with simulated experiences of being rejected or accepted.

Across these studies, participants would initially complete some demographic questions about themselves before completing a brief questionnaire that we described as assessing their work style as “people-oriented” or “task-oriented”. Participants then waited as the computer program diagnosed their work style personality, and in all cases, the computer came back with a diagnosis that they were “people-oriented”. All participants were then asked how they felt about working with “task-oriented” people by choosing from one of three options where they could either indicate a willingness to work with anyone, disapproval for working with task-oriented teammates, but a willingness to nevertheless put up with them, or a complete unwillingness to work with task-oriented teammates. After participants selected their preference, they waited as the computer searched for other players on the platform before they were introduced to their three alleged teammates with whom they would complete the team activities. To introduce their teammates, the computer would provide a brief profile of each including their first name, age bracket, years of work experience, work style type, and their preference for who to work with using the options above (all of these were questions participants were themselves asked at the start of the study). It is at this stage that participants were randomly assigned to one of three conditions. While the information about the teammates including their name, age, years of work experience, and work style (i.e., that they were task-oriented) remained the same, we manipulated the team preferences using comic strips. In the acceptance condition, all three teammates indicated that they liked working with both task-oriented and people-oriented teammates as both bring something valuable to the table. In the tolerance condition, all teammates indicated that they did not like working with people-oriented teammates because they felt they were too focused on making other people happy, but they indicated that they would nevertheless put up with them as teammates. However, in the rejection/discrimination condition, all teammates indicated that they did not like working with people-oriented individuals because they are generally not as good, so they avoid working with them when possible.

Following this, participants were told they would complete a team-building exercise with their new teammates. Participants then proceeded to complete a cyberball game (Williams & Jarvis, 2006) where players tossed a virtual ball back and forth between each other. In both the acceptance and tolerance condition,

the ball was equally tossed between all the players involved in the game. However, in the rejection/discrimination condition, the participant was included only on the first set of trials and then the other players started to toss the ball only amongst themselves while excluding the real participant. Following this experience, participants completed a series of team tasks that involved one of their alleged teammates to strengthen the study's cover story. These involved various workplace situations designed around the prisoner's dilemma, and participants were asked to indicate how they would handle each situation (these tasks were simply distracters that promoted the cover story of the study). Participants were then asked to respond to a series of Likert type items about their experience and how they felt in the team including: (a) future expectations for how they would be treated, including how open-minded they felt their teammates would be to their suggestions, how much their teammates would value their opinions, etc.; (b) well-being and identity needs such as belonging, sense of control, self-esteem, and meaning; and (c) minority voice, or the extent to which participants were willing to speak about their treatment and experience (in one study, this was measured by asking participants to post on a fictitious website about their experience).

Across four studies using samples from the USA and Netherlands, and varied measures, we found that the experience of being tolerated was significantly better than the experience of being discriminated against or rejected for well-being and future expectations. By contrast, the experience of being tolerated was significantly worse for well-being and undermined future expectations relative to being accepted. Interestingly, despite the differentiation between the experience of being accepted and tolerated on well-being and future expectations, those tolerated were no more willing to speak out against their treatment than those accepted. This suggests that being tolerated, while better than the experience of discrimination or rejection, may have a depoliticizing effect where despite its negative impact for those tolerated does not increase the willingness to complain about one's treatment unlike discrimination and rejection that elicits a willingness to call out one's negative experience (Adelman et al., 2022).

Since this initial work examining the implications of experiencing tolerance (compared to discrimination and acceptance), we have conducted several other studies to better understand its nuances. For example, in one study, women experienced rejection, toleration, or acceptance from an all-male team similar to above before completing measures of their expectations for future treatment, voice, and collective action tendencies through assessing their intention to contact internal authorities, participate in a focus group, and show active support for gender equality organizations. As found with fictitious groups, being tolerated was more detrimental for future expectations than being accepted, but better

than being rejected. However, being tolerated led to increased willingness to voice one's grievances and recommend exclusion of one's teammates relative to being accepted, but less than being rejected. Interestingly, being tolerated had no impact on one's willingness to participate in a focus group to discuss such issues, contact authorities about one's treatment, and had no impact on support for gender equality organizations relative to both being accepted and rejected.

Taken together, it appears that being tolerated is a distinct experience from being discriminated against or rejected and also from being included or accepted. Being tolerated is a significantly better experience compared to being rejected or discriminated against, but it is more detrimental for well-being and the future expectations of minority group members than being accepted. While results seem equivocal on the impact of being tolerated for minority group members' willingness to speak out and take action, the implications for well-being are evident in both real groups as well as fictitious groups.

Future directions on the psychological implications of being tolerated

While our initial research using real minority groups and fictitious groups sheds some light on the implications of being tolerated for minority emotions, well-being, self-esteem, future expectations, and minority voice, this work has not examined the boundaries and moderating conditions of such effects. Moreover, relative to the large literature on the psychological implications of perceived discrimination, there remain many new venues for future exploration to examine when and why being tolerated has varying implications for minority groups. In the section below, we provide some potential directions for future work.

Relevance of normative social context

One avenue we believe that is ripe for future research is examining whether the normative context of intergroup relations moderates the impact of being tolerated (relative to being discriminated against or accepted) for minority outcomes. While being tolerated may have more negative implications for minority well-being, self-esteem, and emotions relative to being accepted, we recently found these effects were moderated by the normative expectations of minority group members. Using the fictitious paradigm described earlier, we found that when participants had low expectations that they would be treated well during the game (manipulated through alleged online comments of fellow ingroup members), the negative effects of being tolerated for minority identity needs, emotions, and future expectations were blunted relative to when they expected to be treated fairly during the game (Yogeeswaran et al., 2022). It may be that the negative implications of being

tolerated are more pronounced in contexts where the normative expectation is one of intergroup acceptance and the climate is one that claims to be egalitarian. By contrast, in normatively anti-egalitarian or hierarchical contexts, being tolerated may be less detrimental for minority outcomes as minority group members perceive discrimination as the widespread alternative which makes tolerance a relatively preferable option. Future work should delve further into examining the role of the perceived normative context for considering the implications of being tolerated on minority outcomes by not only examining these effects in artificial contexts as we have, but also by testing whether the implications of being tolerated (relative to acceptance and rejection) vary depending on the hierarchical versus egalitarian social norms present across contexts (i.e., neighborhoods, communities, or countries).

Examining the antecedents of perceptions of tolerance

Another important avenue for future research is to better understand the antecedents of perceptions of being tolerated. Tolerance is an inherently difficult experience to identify and respond to because it involves disapproval of one's group-based beliefs, norms, or practices, but without negative interference. While there is a large literature on perceptions of discrimination and its antecedents that highlight the role of psychological factors such as vigilance bias, minimization, and stigma consciousness (Kaiser & Major, 2006; Pinel, 1999; Ruggiero & Taylor, 1997), no research to our knowledge has shed light on how targets become aware that they are merely tolerated rather than accepted or rejected by others. This is a crucial area of inquiry, as, in its purest form, one might expect tolerance to be somewhat hidden as it involves equal treatment in behavior. However, in practice tolerance is often unlikely to be so hidden. The tolerated may become aware of others' disapproval, or respond to the absence of statements of explicit support or value. However, it is likely to be the case that the experience of being tolerated requires judgments and interpretations of an opaque space where the intentions and beliefs of the tolerators is not unambiguously understood. Therefore, future research would benefit from building on the literature regarding the antecedents of perceived discrimination to shed light on the factors that might lead members of minority and marginalized groups to feel that they are tolerated, and to develop an understanding of how people determine that they are being tolerated.

Unpacking different meanings of being tolerated

Another important direction for future work is to examine the implications of being tolerated when tolerance has different meanings and takes on varied forms. As described in the wider literature on tolerance (Forst, 2013), tolerance can take

on multiple forms. In addition to the fairly hierarchical permission-based form of tolerance where the dominant group gives ‘permission’ to a less powerful minority group to have their disapproved beliefs, norms, or practices in society, tolerance can also be based on the principled belief that all individuals have equal rights, dignity, and civil liberties (i.e., respect-based tolerance), or tolerance can be based on a more pragmatic acceptance of minority way of life in order to avoid conflicts and maintain the peace (i.e., coexistence-based tolerance; Forst, 2013; Velthuis et al., 2021). While Maykel has conducted research examining the implications of these differing forms of tolerance for the acceptance of minority group practices (Velthuis et al., 2021), future work would benefit from examining how the psychological implications of being tolerated may differ depending on how minority group members feel they are tolerated by others. While our earlier work did not systematically explore these distinctions, our paradigms largely reflect a more hierarchical permission-based form of tolerance that reinforces the unstable and condescending nature of being tolerated by the majority. Therefore, it is possible that the earlier described findings are specific to this form of tolerance and the implications of being tolerated in its respect-based form may be more benevolent than earlier work suggests. Future work would greatly benefit from systematically exploring the implications of being tolerated depending on whether tolerance is perceived to be in its permission, respect, or coexistence forms.

Implications for minority identification

Finally, another venue worthy of future exploration is understanding the implications of being tolerated for minority group identification. While previous research on the rejection-identification model (e.g., Branscombe et al., 1999) reveals that perceived discrimination among racial and ethnic minorities increases racial and ethnic group identification, it is less clear how perceived toleration or experiences of toleration influence minority group identification. In a related vein, while research on the rejection-disidentification model (Jasinskaja-Lahti et al., 2009) reveals that perceived discrimination decreases national identification among immigrant minority groups, it is unclear how being tolerated as a minority group member within a superordinate group (irrespective of whether that is a team in our experimental work, or a national identity in the context of immigrant or ethnic minority groups) impacts superordinate group identification. On the one hand, the disapproval involved in toleration may result in similar effects to that found in the rejection-(dis)identification literatures. However, on the other hand, the equal behavioral treatment involved in toleration may limit any changes in group identification at the subgroup or superordinate level. Future

work would benefit from examining whether toleration sits between acceptance and discrimination, or if they relate more to the experiences of one or the other.

Conclusion

“Toleration makes difference possible; difference makes toleration necessary” (Walzer, 1997, p.xii). Throughout his career, Maykel Verkuyten has made important contributions to our understanding of the psychology of tolerance, a millennia old conception for how to live with difference. Tolerance is a necessary ingredient for a pluralistic society to manage conflict. While this chapter cannot do justice to all the extensive contributions of Maykel’s research on this topic, here we have zoomed in on his work specifically exploring the implications of being tolerated. Using a range of methodologies and data from multiple populations, this work examines the psychological consequences for those who are the target of toleration. Maykel’s contributions to the topic of toleration reflect his complex scientific mind that is able to both see the promise and pitfalls of any approach. The academic disciplines Maykel has contributed to will have a difficult time filling in the large intellectual gap that his retirement will leave.

References

- Adelman, L., Yogeeswaran, K., & Verkuyten, M. (2022). The unintended consequences of tolerance: The experience and repercussions of being tolerated. *Manuscript under review*.
- Bagci, S., Verkuyten, M., Koc, Y., Turnuklu, A., Piyale, Z., & Bekmezci, E. (2020). Being tolerated and being discriminated against: Links to psychological well-being through threatened social identity needs. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 50*(7), 1463-1477. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2699>
- Barkey, K. (2005). Islam and toleration: Studying the Ottoman imperial model. *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society, 19*(1), 5-19. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10767-007-9013-5>
- Branscombe, N. R., Schmitt, M. T., & Harvey, R. D. (1999). Perceiving pervasive discrimination among African Americans: Implications for group identification and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*(1), 135-149. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.77.1.135>
- Brown, W. (2006). *Regulating aversion: Tolerance in the age of identity and empire*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Carter, A., & Phillips, K. (2017). The double-edged sword of diversity: Toward a dual pathway of model. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 11*(5), e12313. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12313>
- Cohen, A.J. (2004). What toleration is. *Ethics, 115*, 68-95.
- Cvetkovska, S., Verkuyten, M., & Adelman, L. (2020). Being tolerated and minority well-being: The role of group identifications. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 74*, 161-173. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2019.10.010>

- Cvetkovska, S., Verkuyten, M., Adelman, L., & Yogeeswaran, K. (2021). Being tolerated: Implications for well-being among ethnic minorities. *British Journal of Psychology*, *112*(3), 781-803. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjop.12492>
- Cvetkovska, S., Jaspal, R., Verkuyten, M., & Adelman, L. (2022). Coping with being tolerated: Transgender experiences. *Psychology of Sexual Orientation and Gender Diversity* (forthcoming).
- Dangubic, M., Yogeeswaran, K., Verkuyten, M., & Sibley, C. (2022). The rejection and acceptance of Muslim minority practices: A person-centered approach. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/13684302211067967>
- Dangubic, M., Verkuyten, M., & Stark, T. (2020). Rejecting Muslim religious practices in six West European countries: A case of discriminatory intolerance? *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *43*, 306-326. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2020.1792525>
- Forst, R. (2013). *Toleration in conflict: Past and present*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Furedi, F. (2011). *On tolerance: A defence of moral independence*. London, UK: Continuum Books.
- Galinsky, A., Todd, A., Homan, A., Phillips, K., Apfelbaum, E., Sasaki, S., Richeson, J., Olayon, J., & Maddux, W. (2015). Maximizing the gains and minimizing the pains of diversity: A policy perspective. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *10*(6), 742-748. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691615598513>
- Gibson, J. L. (2006). Enigmas of intolerance: Fifty years after Stouffer's communism, conformity, and civil liberties. *Perspectives on Politics*, *4*(1), 21-34. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S153759270606004X>
- Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., Liebkind, K., & Solheim, E. (2009). To identify or not to identify? National disidentification as an alternative reaction to perceived ethnic discrimination. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *58*(1), 105-128. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2008.00384.x>
- Kaiser, C., & Major, B. (2006). A social psychological perspective on perceiving and reporting discrimination. *Law and Social Inquiry*, *31*(4), 801-830.
- Oberdiek, H. (2001). *Tolerance: Between forbearance and acceptance*. Lanham, MA: Rowman & Littlefield Pub.
- Pinel, E. C. (1999). Stigma consciousness: The psychological legacy of social stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *76*(1), 114-128. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.76.1.114>
- Ruggiero, K., & Taylor, D. (1997). Why minority group members perceive or do not perceive the discrimination that confronts them: The role of self-esteem and perceived control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *72*(2), 373-389.
- Schmidt, B. (2001). *Innocence Abroad: The Dutch Imagination and the New World, 1570-1670*. Cambridge University Press.
- Stahl, G., Maznevski, M., Voigt, A., & Jonsen, K. (2010). Unraveling the effects of cultural diversity in teams: A meta-analysis of research on multicultural work groups. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *41*, 690-709. <https://doi.org/10.1057/jibs.2009.85>
- Sullivan, J. L., & Transue, J. E. (1999). The psychological underpinnings of democracy: A selective review of research on political tolerance, interpersonal trust, and social capital. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *50*, 625-650. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.50.1.625>
- Taylor, D., Wright, S., Moghaddam, F., & Lalonde, R. (1990). The personal/group discrimination discrepancy: Perceiving my group, but not myself to be a target for discrimination. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *16*(2), 254-262. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167290162006>

- Velthuis, E., Verkuyten, M., & Smeekes, A. (2021a). The different faces of social tolerance: Conceptualizing and measuring respect and coexistence tolerance. *Social Indicators Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-021-02724-5>
- Velthuis, E., Van der Noll, J., & Verkuyten, M. (in press). Tolerance of Muslim minority identity expression: The roles of social context, type of action, and cultural continuity concern. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology* (forthcoming). <https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2605>
- Verkuyten, M. (in press). *The social psychology of tolerance*. Routledge.
- Verkuyten, M., Adelman, L., & Yogeeswaran, K. (2020b). The psychology of the intolerant: Unpacking diverse understandings of intolerance. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 29, 467-472. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721420924763>
- Verkuyten, M., Adelman, L., & Yogeeswaran, K. (2022a). Tolerance as forbearance: Overcoming intuitive versus deliberative objections to cultural, religious, and ideological differences. *Psychological Review*, 129(2), 368-387. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/rev0000228>
- Verkuyten, M., & Killen, M. (2021). Tolerance, dissenting beliefs, and cultural diversity. *Child Development Perspectives*, 15(1), 51-56. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12399>
- Verkuyten, M., & Kollar, R. (2021). Tolerance and intolerance: Cultural meanings and discursive usage. *Culture and Psychology*, 27(1), 172-186. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354067X20984356>
- Verkuyten, M., Yogeeswaran, K., & Adelman, L. (2022b). The social psychology of tolerance and intolerance. *European Review of Social Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2022.2091326>
- Verkuyten, M., Yogeeswaran, K., & Adelman, L. (2020a). Tolerance and prejudice-reduction: Two ways of improving intergroup relations. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 50(2), 239-255. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2624>
- Verkuyten, M., Yogeeswaran, K., & Adelman, L. (2020c). The negative implications of being tolerated. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 15, 544-561. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1745691619897974>
- Verkuyten, M., Yogeeswaran, K., & Adelman, L. (2019). Intergroup toleration and its implications for culturally diverse nations. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, 13(1), 5-35. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/sipr.12051>
- Verkuyten, M., & Yogeeswaran, K. (2020). Cultural diversity and its implications for intergroup relations. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 32, 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2019.06.010>
- Verkuyten, M., & Yogeeswaran, K. (2017). The social psychology of intergroup toleration: A roadmap for theory and research. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 21(1), 72-96. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1088868316640974>
- Vogt, W. P. (1997). *Tolerance and education: Learning to live with diversity and difference*. London: Sage.
- Walzer, M. (1997). *On toleration*. New Haven; Yale University Press.
- Williams, K., & Jarvis, B. (2006). Cyberball: A program for use in research on interpersonal ostracism and acceptance. *Behavior Research Methods*, 38, 174-180. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03192765>
- Yogeeswaran, K., Adelman, L., Lee, S., & Verkuyten, M. (2022). Normative expectations moderate the impact of being tolerated on minority outcomes. *Manuscript in preparation*.