

Supplementary File

Contextual Considerations	2
Table 1. Exclusion Characteristics based on the Study	2
Scale Development and Factor Structure of the Tolerance Scale Across Studies	3
Table 2. Fit Indices for Model Comparison	7
Table 3. Exploratory Factor Analysis of the General Tolerance Scale in Study 1	9
Table 4. Exploratory Factor Analysis of the Specific Tolerance Scale in Study 1	10
Table 5. Exploratory Factor Analysis of the General Tolerance Scale in Study 2a	11
Table 6. Exploratory Factor Analysis of the Specific Tolerance Scale in Study 2a	12
Table 7. Exploratory Factor Analysis of the General Tolerance Scale in Study 2b	13
Table 8. Exploratory Factor Analysis of the Specific Tolerance Scale Context 1 in Study 2b	14
Table 9. Exploratory Factor Analysis of the Specific Tolerance Scale Context 2 in Study 2b	15
Table 10. Descriptive statistics for Plain Tolerance Items in Study 2a and in Study 2b	16
Additional Analyses Using Plain Tolerance Items (Study 2a and 2b)	16
Hypothesis 1:	16
Study 2a Results:	16
Study 2b Results:	17
Hypothesis 2 and 3 for Study 2b:	17
Table 11. Descriptive Statistics for variables Education, Secularism, Ethnic Background and Religion for Study 1, Study 2a and Study 2b	19
Table 12. Prescriptive Equality-based Norms Across Studies	20
Table 13. Exemplary General Tolerance Items in across Studies (Presented below are items used in Study 2b)	21
Table 14. Specific Tolerance Items in Study 1	22
Table 15. Specific Tolerance Items in Study 2a	24
Table 16. Specific Tolerance (Context 1) Items in Study 2b	26
Table 17. Specific Tolerance (Context 2) Items in Study 2b	27
Table 18. Behavioral Intention Items in Study 1	28
Table 19. Behavioral Intention Items in Study 2a	29
Table 19.1. Passive form of tolerance behavioral intentions in Study 2a	30
Table 20. Behavioral Intention Items in Study 2b	30
Additional Analyses	32
Table 21. Regression Analysis of National and Acquaintance Equality-based Respect Norms on Types of Tolerance in Study 1	32
Table 22. Regression Analysis of National and Personal Environment Equality-based Respect Norms on Tolerance Types in Study 2b	33
Additional analyses: Testing Hypothesis 1 on the Types of Tolerance	34
Study 1 Results	34

Study 2a Results	34
Study 2b Results	35
Additional Analyses Controlling for Secularism in Study 1	36

Contextual Considerations

Study 1 was conducted before the Israel-Palestinian conflict. Study 2a was launched at the end of April of 2024, whereas at the beginning of the month a Polish aid worker was killed in Gaza by an Israeli airstrike which did not go without an echo in Poland (Asty et al., 2024; Gera, 2024; Khalil & Abualouf, 2024). Which could also be one of the reasons behind a sudden jump in google searches in Poland of “Israel” during that time (google trends, n.d.). Although Polish public opinion has generally leaned toward Israel (CBOS, 2023), recent data indicate a slight increase in negative sentiment toward Jews and growing sympathy for Palestinians among certain demographic groups, particularly younger respondents (CBOS, 2024). Study 2b was conducted during a relatively calm period in Poland, with no widely impactful events occurring that were likely to significantly influence the data collection process, aside from those occurring in prior months.

Table 1. Exclusion Characteristics based on the Study

<i>Exclusion Characteristics</i>	Study 1	Study 2a	Study 2b
Self-reported non-Polish identity	X	X	X
Failed one of the three attention checks	X		X
Identified as being of Jewish heritage		X	X
Practicing the Jewish faith	X	X	X
Did not declare disapproval towards Jewish practices			X

Scale Development and Factor Structure of the Tolerance Scale Across Studies

The scale measuring tolerance was designed to assess two dimensions: General Tolerance (GT) and Specific Tolerance (ST). This structure was informed by the theoretical expectation that higher levels of GT would facilitate or transfer to more effortful, context-specific expressions of tolerance (ST). These two dimensions were hypothesized to be correlated, reflecting their shared foundation in broader tolerance constructs while remaining distinct in their focus and application. The initial scale development included 18 items (9 for each dimension) in Study 2a and Study 1, which was later expanded to 27 items in Study 2b. This expansion included 9 items for GT and 18 for ST, with 9 items for each specific context: increased inclusion of content related to the history of Polish Jews in Polish textbooks and the preservation and care of heritage sites such as synagogues and Jewish cemeteries by local authorities.

In Study 1 ($N = 300$) and Study 2a ($N = 79$), EFAs were conducted to examine the scale's structure and refine the items. Sample sizes were adequate based on Mundfrom et al.'s (2005) recommendations, which suggest a minimum of 5–10 participants per item or 100–150 participants for datasets with moderate communalities and excellent agreement. Larger sample sizes, particularly for Studies 1 and 2, mitigated potential issues related to assumption violations and parameter precision (Flora et al., 2012). Bartlett's test of sphericity confirmed the appropriateness of the correlation matrix for factor analysis (Study 1: $\chi^2(153) = 5159, p < .001$; Study 2a: $\chi^2(153) = 1437, p < .001$), and the KMO measure of sampling adequacy was .91 (Study 1) and .90 (Study 2a), well above the recommended threshold of .70 (Watkins, 2018). Oblimin rotation was applied, and a two-factor solution was extracted based on theoretical considerations. In Study 1, the two factors explained 64.35% of the variance: Factor 1 (GT) accounted for 53.51%, while Factor 2 (ST) accounted for an additional 10.84%; in Study 2a, the two factors explained 69.03% of the variance: Factor 1 accounted for 59.45%, while Factor 2 accounted for 9.58%. Communalities ranged from 0.50 to 0.78 in Study 1 and from 0.35 to 0.81 in Study 2a, indicating moderate

to high shared variance. Items related to General Tolerance loaded primarily onto Factor 1, while items related to Specific Tolerance loaded onto Factor 2, with minor cross-loadings (e.g., appreciation tolerance items loading onto the ST factor) that did not hinder interpretability. The two factors were moderately correlated (Study 1: $r = .59$; Study 2a: $r = .59$), suggesting overlap.

Study 2b ($N = 439$) aimed to refine and further validate the tolerance scale by adopting a more structured approach to the contextual presentation of the Specific Tolerance items. Unlike Study 1 and Study 2a, which utilized a mixed-item format across contexts, Study 2b introduced a clear separation of contexts, facilitating a more targeted evaluation of the Specific Tolerance construct. The sample size was appropriate for EFA, adhering to established guidelines (Mundfrom et al., 2005). To explore the factor structure of tolerance across distinct contexts, we conducted two EFAs with oblimin rotation, analyzing each context of the Specific Tolerance scale separately. Context 1 addressed the inclusion of content on the history of Polish Jews in textbooks, while Context 2 focused on the preservation and care of Jewish heritage sites, such as synagogues and cemeteries, by local authorities. This design facilitated a comparison of factor structures across these distinct yet related contexts.

The suitability of the data for EFA was confirmed by Bartlett's test of sphericity (Context 1: $\chi^2(153) = 9446.52, p < .001$; Context 2: $\chi^2(153) = 10040.33, p < .001$) and high KMO values (Context 1: .95; Context 2: .95), both exceeding the recommended threshold of .70 (Watkins, 2018). Based on theoretical considerations, a two-factor solution was extracted for each context. For Context 1, the two factors explained 76.12% of the variance, with Factor 1 (GT) contributing 70.45% and Factor 2 (ST) contributing 5.67%. For Context 2, the factors explained 76.71% of the variance, with Factor 1 contributing 71.67% and Factor 2 adding 5.04%. Communalities ranged from 0.68 to 0.82 in Context 1 and from 0.66 to 0.85 in Context 2, indicating moderate to high shared variance. Items primarily loaded onto their respective factors, with General Tolerance items loading onto Factor 1 and Specific Tolerance items onto Factor 2.

Cross-loadings were observed in both contexts but did not hinder interpretability. For Context 1, some Appreciation Tolerance items cross-loaded onto Factor 2. In Context 2, several General Appreciation Tolerance items and one General Respect Tolerance item also cross-loaded onto the Specific Tolerance factor. The two factors were strongly correlated in both contexts ($r = .79$ for Context 1; $r = .76$ for Context 2), indicating substantial overlap.

To examine the robustness and distinctiveness of the hypothesized constructs, we conducted a CFA. The EFA revealed that a dominant general tolerance (GT) factor explained approximately 70% of the variance, suggesting the possibility of a unidimensional factor structure. This raised the question of whether specific tolerance (ST) factors are necessary to adequately model the data. To address this, we tested a simple structural model using the data from Study 2b that assigned all the items to a single general factor, conceptualized as tolerance (see Figure 1). The loadings onto the general factor were all positive and statistically significant (all $ps < .001$), with an average loading of .95 (Context 1) and .82 (Context 2). However, this model did not fit the data well (see Unifactor Table 2). Based on these results, we concluded that a single factor of tolerance is insufficient to adequately describe the data.

Given the high correlations between general and specific tolerance, we opted for a bifactor model to better understand the structure of tolerance. This approach conceptualizes tolerance as the overarching factor while allowing the levels of tolerance (general and specific) to operate as subfactors. Additionally, while the primary focus of this article is not on the types of tolerance (coexistence, respect, and appreciation), these dimensions were included in the model to help disentangle the overarching construct and provide a clearer understanding of the tolerance scale. Including both levels and types of tolerance within the bifactor framework ensures a more precise evaluation of the scale's multidimensional structure and its underlying components. The bifactor analysis showed substantially better fit indices compared with the unifactor and second-order models (see Bifactor Table 2), demonstrating that the overarching

tolerance factor and its subfactors (general and specific levels) provide a robust, multidimensional understanding of the data across contexts.

Table 2. Fit Indices for Model Comparison

Model	Context	χ^2	df	p	CFI	TLI	NFI	RMSEA	SRMR	AIC	BIC	GFI	AGFI
Unifactor	Context 1	1,924.73	135	<.001	0.81	0.79	0.80	0.174	0.056	23,347.12	23,494.16	0.64	0.54
	Context 2	2,220.71	135	<.001	0.79	0.77	0.78	0.188	0.057	23,289.07	23,436.11	0.61	0.50
Second-Order	Context 1	1,517.34	133	<.001	0.85	0.83	0.84	0.154	0.047	22,943.73	23,098.94	0.70	0.61
	Context 2	1,915.55	133	<.001	0.82	0.80	0.81	0.175	0.051	22,987.91	23,143.12	0.63	0.52
Bifactor	Context 1	535.62	99	<.001	0.95	0.93	0.94	0.100	0.025	22,030.01	22,324.09	0.89	0.80
	Context 2	464.61	99	<.001	0.96	0.94	0.96	0.092	0.028	21,604.97	21,899.06	0.90	0.83

Note. CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis index; NFI = normed fit index; RMSEA = root-mean-square error of approximation; SRMR = standardized root mean square residual; AIC = Akaike information criterion; BIC = Bayesian information criterion; GFI = goodness-of-fit index; AGFI = adjusted goodness-of-fit index.

For each level of tolerance, we additionally conducted an EFA to assess whether the different types of tolerance—coexistence, respect, and appreciation—could be grouped together within that level. As illustrated in Tables 3–9, the results indicate an overall lack of a clear and consistent distinction between these types. This finding supports the decision to aggregate them into a single scale measuring GT and ST for each study, ensuring a more cohesive and comprehensive assessment. In Study 1 for GT Respect and Appreciation items load onto a single factor, whereas Coexistence items form a separate factor. For the ST scale, the factor structure is context-dependent. Items associated with the statement “Jews in Poland should have the opportunity for their own religious education in public schools” and “Jews in Poland should have the opportunity for their own religious education in public schools” load onto Factor 1. While items related to the context “Jews in Poland should have access to a separate prayer room at work” load onto Factor 2. In Study 2a for the GT scale Respect and Coexistence items load onto a single factor whereas Appreciation items form a separate factor. For the ST scale, the factor structure is context-dependent. Items associated with the context “The preservation and care of heritage sites such as synagogues and Jewish cemeteries by local authorities” and “Increasing the inclusion of content related to the history of Polish Jews in Polish textbooks “ load onto one factor. While items related to the context “The introduction of religious symbols, such as a menorah during Hanukkah celebrations, into public spaces like the chambers of the Polish parliament” load onto a separate factor. In Study 2b for the GT scale all the items load onto one factor. Same for ST context 1 and context 2.

Table 3. Exploratory Factor Analysis of the General Tolerance Scale in Study 1

Item No.	Type of Tolerance	Items	Factor	
			1	2
8	Respect	Jews in Poland should be able to live as they wish because differences between social groups should be respected.	.96	-.09
2	Respect	Jews in Poland can live as they wish because they have the right to do so	.92	-.08
3	Appreciation	Jews in Poland can live as they wish because they enrich our culture	.87	.02
9	Appreciation	Jews in Poland should be able to live as they wish because they enrich society with a diversity of traditions and lifestyles.	.85	.06
5	Respect	Jews in Poland should be able to live as they wish because they should have the ability to shape their own identity.	.85	.09
6	Appreciation	Jews in Poland should be able to live as they wish because they encourage thinking about the world in a different way.	.71	.19
4	Coexistence	Jews in Poland should be able to live as they wish in order to avoid social conflicts.	-.04	.96
7	Coexistence	Jews in Poland should be able to live as they wish in order to maintain peace in society.	-.02	.94
1	Coexistence	Jews in Poland can live as they wish in order to reduce social tensions	.20	.75
Eigenvalues			6.11	1.07
% of Variance			67.84	11.92

Note. $N = 300$. The extraction method was principal axis factoring with an Oblimin Rotation.

Table 4. Exploratory Factor Analysis of the Specific Tolerance Scale in Study 1

Item No.	Type of Tolerance	Items	Factor	
			1	2
5	Respect	Jews in Poland should have the opportunity for their own religious education in public schools because they should have the ability to shape their own identity.	.91	.11
4	Coexistence	Jews in Poland should have the opportunity for their own religious education in public schools in order to maintain peace in society.	.90	.10
6	Appreciation	Jews in Poland should have the opportunity for their own religious education in public schools because it would encourage Poles to think about the world in a different way.	.85	-.04
9	Appreciation	Jews in Poland should have the right to take a day off from work and school on Yom Kippur because they enrich society with a diversity of traditions and lifestyles.	.58	-.31
8	Respect	Jews in Poland should have the right to take a day off from work and school on Yom Kippur because they are entitled to it.	.56	-.30
7	Coexistence	Jews in Poland should have the right to take a day off from work and school on Yom Kippur in order to avoid social conflicts.	.48	-.33
1	Coexistence	Jews in Poland should have access to a separate prayer room at work, in order to help reduce social tensions.	-.08	-.96
2	Respect	Jews in Poland should have access to a separate prayer room at work because their needs are just as important as those of Poles.	-.04	-.87
3	Appreciation	Jews in Poland should have access to a separate prayer room at work, which would enrich the organizational culture.	.11	-.83
Eigenvalues			5.34	1.07
% of Variance			59.35	11.83

Note. $N = 300$. The extraction method was principal axis factoring with an Oblimin Rotation.

Table 5. Exploratory Factor Analysis of the General Tolerance Scale in Study 2a

Item No.	Type of Tolerance	Items	Factor	
			1	2
5	Respect	The possibility of Jews to live as they wish is supported by the fact that they should be able to shape their own identity.	.94	-.07
4	Respect	The possibility of Jews to live according to their own values is supported by the fact that they should have the same rights as I do.	.94	-.09
2	Coexistence	The possibility for Jews to live as they wish, can help reduce social tensions.	.87	-.03
6	Respect	Jews living freely according to their beliefs is supported by the fact that differences between social groups should be respected.	.77	.11
1	Coexistence	The possibility for Jews to live according to their own values, is crucial to ensure harmonious coexistence in society	.77	.17
3	Coexistence	Jews living freely according to their beliefs is conducive to maintaining peace in society in Poland.	.58	.35
9	Appreciation	Jews living freely according to their beliefs is supported by the fact that society benefits from the diversity of traditions and lifestyles.	.01	.94
8	Appreciation	The possibility of Jews to live as they wish is supported by the fact that they encourage thinking about the world in a different way.	-.01	.92
7	Appreciation	The possibility of Jews to live according to their own values is supported by the fact that they enrich our culture.	.04	.89
Eigenvalues			6.05	1.02
% of Variance			67.16	11.30

Note. $N = 79$. The extraction method was principal axis factoring with an Oblimin Rotation.

Table 6. Exploratory Factor Analysis of the Specific Tolerance Scale in Study 2a

Item No.	Type of Tolerance	Items	Factor	
			1	2
8	Appreciation	The preservation and care of heritage sites such as synagogues and Jewish cemeteries by local authorities is supported by the fact that they encourage thinking about the world in a different way.	.93	-.02
9	Appreciation	Increasing the inclusion of content related to the history of Polish Jews in Polish textbooks is supported by the fact that society benefits from a diversity of traditions and lifestyles.	.93	-.05
6	Respect	Increasing the inclusion of content related to the history of Polish Jews in Polish textbooks would contribute to building mutual respect among different social groups.	.86	.05
2	Coexistence	The preservation and care of heritage sites such as synagogues and Jewish cemeteries by local authorities can help reduce social tensions.	.86	-.07
3	Coexistence	Increasing the inclusion of content related to the history of Polish Jews in Polish textbooks is conducive to maintaining peace in society.	.82	.09
5	Respect	The preservation and care of heritage sites such as synagogues and Jewish cemeteries by local authorities is supported by the fact that they should be able to shape and nurture their own identity in this way.	.77	.07
1	Coexistence	The introduction of religious symbols, such as a menorah during Hanukkah celebrations, into public spaces like the chambers of the Polish parliament, is crucial to ensuring harmonious coexistence.	-.02	.93
4	Respect	The introduction of religious symbols, such as a menorah during Hanukkah celebrations, into public spaces like the chambers of the Polish parliament, is supported by the fact that Jews should have the same rights as I do.	-.05	.88
7	Appreciation	The introduction of religious symbols, such as a menorah during Hanukkah celebrations, into public spaces like the chambers of the Polish parliament is supported by the fact that they enrich our culture.	.15	.78
Eigenvalues			5.76	1.12
% of Variance			64.02	12.41

Note. $N = 79$. The extraction method was principal axis factoring with an Oblimin Rotation.

Table 7. Exploratory Factor Analysis of the General Tolerance Scale in Study 2b

Item No.	Type of Tolerance	Items	Factor 1
<i>The possibility for Jews to live according to their own values:</i>			
6	Respect	... would contribute to building mutual respect among different social groups.	.90
9	Appreciation	... is supported by the fact that they encourage thinking about the world in a different way.	.86
1	Coexistence	... is crucial to ensure harmonious coexistence in society.	.86
3	Coexistence	... is conducive to maintaining peace in society	.86
5	Respect	... is supported by the fact that they should be able to shape and nurture their own identity in this way.	.85
7	Appreciation	... is supported by the fact that society benefits from a diversity of traditions and lifestyles.	.85
8	Appreciation	... is supported by the fact that they enrich our culture.	.84
2	Coexistence	... can help reduce social tensions.	.83
4	Respect	... is supported by the fact that they should have the same rights as I do.	.81
Eigenvalues			6.05
% of Variance			72.44

Note. $N = 439$. The extraction method was principal axis factoring.

Table 8. Exploratory Factor Analysis of the Specific Tolerance Scale Context 1 in Study 2b

Item No.	Type of Tolerance	Items	Factor 1
<i>Increasing the inclusion of content related to the history of Polish Jews in Polish textbooks</i>			
6	Respect	... would contribute to building mutual respect among different social groups.	.90
9	Appreciation	... is supported by the fact that society benefits from a diversity of traditions and lifestyles.	.90
2	Coexistence	... can help reduce social tensions.	.90
5	Respect	... is supported by the fact that Jews should be able to shape and nurture their own identity in this way.	.89
3	Coexistence	... is conducive to maintaining peace in society.	.89
7	Appreciation	... is supported by the fact that they enrich our culture.	.89
1	Coexistence	... is crucial to ensure harmonious coexistence.	.88
8	Appreciation	... is supported by the fact that they encourage thinking about the world in a different way.	.87
4	Respect	... is supported by the fact that Jews should have the same rights as I do.	.85
Eigenvalues			7.07
% of Variance			78.54

Note. $N = 439$. The extraction method was principal axis factoring.

Table 9. Exploratory Factor Analysis of the Specific Tolerance Scale Context 2 in Study 2b

Item No.	Type of Tolerance	Items	Factor 1
		<i>The preservation and care of heritage sites such as synagogues and Jewish cemeteries by local authorities:</i>	
6	Respect	... would contribute to building mutual respect among different social groups.	.91
1	Coexistence	... is crucial to ensure harmonious coexistence.	.90
5	Respect	... is supported by the fact that Jews should be able to shape and nurture their own identity in this way.	.90
2	Coexistence	... can help reduce social tensions.	.90
3	Coexistence	... is conducive to maintaining peace in society.	.89
7	Appreciation	... is supported by the fact that they enrich our culture.	.89
8	Appreciation	... is supported by the fact that they encourage thinking about the world in a different way.	.89
9	Appreciation	... is supported by the fact that society benefits from a diversity of traditions and lifestyles.	.88
4	Respect	... is supported by the fact that Jews should have the same rights as I do.	.86
		Eigenvalues	7.15
		% of Variance	79.48

Note. $N = 439$. The extraction method was principal axis factoring

Table 10. Descriptive statistics for Plain Tolerance Items in Study 2a and in Study 2b

Dataset	Variable	Full Item	Mean	SD
Study 2a	GT	Jews in Poland should have the freedom to live according to their own beliefs and traditions.	5.89	1.55
Study 2a	ST	In public places, such as the chambers of the Polish parliament, symbols of the Jewish religion, such as a menorah during the celebration of Hanukkah, should also be present.	3.18	1.99
Study 2a	ST	In all localities where synagogues and Jewish cemeteries are located, local authorities should care for this heritage as they would any other sacred site.	5.72	1.79
Study 2a	ST	Content related to the history of Polish Jews should be included to a greater extent in Polish textbooks.	4.86	1.72
Study 2b	GT	Jews in Poland should have the freedom to live according to their own beliefs and traditions.	3.43	1.79
Study 2b	ST	Content related to the history of Polish Jews should be included to a greater extent in Polish textbooks.	3.24	1.73
Study 2b	ST	In all localities where synagogues and Jewish cemeteries are located, local authorities should care for this heritage as they would any other sacred site.	3.74	1.86

Additional Analyses Using Plain Tolerance Items (Study 2a and 2b)

We ran additional analyses for Studies 2a and 2b using only the plain tolerance items (i.e., items without the types of tolerance embedded within them). These analyses provide an overview of just the participants' levels of general tolerance (GT) and specific tolerance (ST).

Hypothesis 1:

Study 2a Results:

Using a paired samples t-test, the results revealed a significant difference between general tolerance ($M = 5.89$, $SD = 1.55$) and ST context 1 ($M = 3.18$, $SD = 1.99$), with a large effect size ($d = 1.41$, 95% CI [1.099, 1.724]). This suggests that participants rated general tolerance significantly higher than their specific tolerance toward the issue related to the placement of Jewish religious symbols in public spaces.

No significant difference was found between GT ($M = 5.89$, $SD = 1.55$) and ST context 2 ($M = 5.72$, $SD = 1.79$; $d = 0.12$, 95% $CI [-0.099, 0.343]$). Participants' levels of general and specific tolerance toward the issue of local authorities caring for Jewish heritage sites were similar.

A significant difference was found between GT ($M = 5.89$, $SD = 1.55$) and ST context 3 ($M = 4.86$, $SD = 1.72$), with a moderate effect size ($d = 0.69$, 95% $CI [0.443, 0.934]$). This suggests that participants expressed greater general tolerance than specific tolerance regarding the inclusion of Polish Jewish history in textbooks.

Study 2b Results:

A small but significant difference was observed between general tolerance ($M = 3.43$, $SD = 1.79$) and ST context 1 ($M = 3.24$, $SD = 1.73$), with a small effect size ($d = 0.10$, 95% $CI [0.007, 0.195]$). This suggests that participants showed a slightly higher general tolerance compared to their specific tolerance on the issue of including content about Polish Jewish history in textbooks.

No significant difference was found between general tolerance ($M = 3.43$, $SD = 1.79$) and ST context 2 on the topic of caring for Jewish heritage sites ($M = 3.74$, $SD = 1.86$; $d = -0.18$, 95% $CI [-0.271, -0.082]$).

The analyses using only the plain tolerance items generally show similar patterns to the original analyses. The results confirm that the inclusion of the type of tolerance did not substantially change the overall conclusions.

Hypothesis 2 and 3 for Study 2b:

We examined the correlations between personal environment respect norms, national respect norms, and the measures of plain general tolerance (GT) and plain specific tolerance (ST context 1 and ST context 2). Both personal environment respect norms and national respect norms showed positive correlations with each of the tolerance measures. Specifically, we found that personal environment respect norms were positively correlated with GT, $r(438) = .54$, $p < .001$, as were national respect norms $r(438) = .51$, $p < .001$. Though the correlation between personal environment respect norms and GT was slightly stronger than the correlation between national respect norms and GT, Fisher's Z test indicated that the difference was not statistically significant, ($Z = 1.09$, $p = .276$).

For ST context 1, the correlation with personal environment respect norms was $r(438) = .35$, $p < .001$, and national respect norms was $r(438) = .35$, $p < .001$, however there was no significant difference ($Z = 0.10$, $p = .920$). Similarly, for ST context 2, with personal environment respect norms ($r(438) = .400$, $p < .001$), and national respect norms ($r(438) = .383$, $p < .001$), however there was no significant difference ($Z = 0.30$, $p =$

.767). In both cases, personal environment norms showed a slightly stronger correlation with ST context 1 and ST context 2 than national norms, though no significant difference between the correlations.

Next, we conducted regression analyses to further examine the relationships between national respect norms, personal environment respect norms, and the tolerance measures (controlling for education, attitudes towards Jews and disapproval). For GT, both national respect norms ($\beta = .18, p = .007$) and personal environment respect norms ($\beta = .28, p < .001$) were significant predictors. For ST context 1, national respect norms ($\beta = .15, p = .044$) was a significant predictor whereas personal environment respect norms ($\beta = .08, p = .322$) was not. Finally, for ST context 2, national respect norms were a significant predictor ($\beta = .18, p = .012$) which was not the case for personal environment respect norms ($\beta = .10, p = .195$). The results across these models were consistent, however with the exception of personal environment norms being non-significant in the specific tolerance scales.

Table 11. Descriptive Statistics for variables Education, Secularism, Ethnic Background and Religion for Study 1, Study 2a and Study 2b

Variables	Labels	Study 1	Study 2a	Study 2b
Education	Elementary	1% (N=3)	N=0	1.6% (N=7)
	Vocational	1.3% (N=4)	2.5% (N=2)	7.3% (N=32)
	Secondary	10.7% (N=32)	13.9% (N=11)	41% (N=180)
	Incomplete higher education	40.3% (N=121)	35.4% (N=28)	5.2% (N=23)
	Higher	46.7% (N=140)	48.2% (N=38)	44.9% (N=197)
Religion	Christianity	46% (N=138)	38% (N=30)	79.5% (N=349)
	Atheism	25.3% (N=76)	25.3% (N=20)	11.6% (N=51)
	Agnosticism	18.7% (N=56)	25.3% (N=20)	3.2% (N=14)
	Other	10% (N=30)	11.4% (N=9)	5.7% (N=25)
	Judaism	Exclusion Criterion	Exclusion Criterion	Exclusion Criterion
Jewish Ethnic Background		Not Measured	Exclusion Criterion	Exclusion Criterion
Secularism		4.94 (SD=1.66)	2.72 (SD=2.11)	Not Measured

Table 12. Prescriptive Equality-based Norms Across Studies

Study	Variable	Original Item	English Translation
Study 1	Equality-based National Norms	Większość Polaków uważa, że zawsze powinno się traktować Żydów jako osoby o równej wartości	Most Poles believe that Jews should always be treated as people of equal value.
	Equality-based National Norms	Większość Polaków uważa, że powinno się traktować Żydów jako osoby posiadające równe prawa	Most Poles believe that Jews should be treated as people with equal rights.
	Equality-based Acquaintance Norms	Większość moich znajomych uważa, że zawsze powinno się traktować Żydów jako osoby o równej wartości	Most of my acquaintances believe that Jews should always be treated as people of equal value.
	Equality-based Acquaintance Norms	Większość moich znajomych uważa, że powinno się traktować Żydów jako osoby posiadające równe prawa	Most of my acquaintances believe that Jews should be treated as people with equal rights.
Study 2b	Equality-based National Norms	Same as in Study 1	Same as in Study 1
	Equality-based Personal Environment Norms	Większość osób w moim najbliższym otoczeniu uważa, że zawsze powinno się traktować Żydów jako osoby o równej wartości.	Most people in my personal environment believe that Jews should always be treated as people of equal worth.
	Equality-based Personal Environment Norms	Większość osób w moim najbliższym otoczeniu uważa, że powinno się traktować Żydów jako osoby posiadające równe prawa.	Most people in my personal environment believe that Jews should be treated as people with equal rights.

Table 13. Exemplary General Tolerance Items in across Studies (Presented below are items used in Study 2b)

Variable	Original Item	English Translation
General Content Prompt	Możliwość życia Żydów zgodnie z ich własnymi wartościami...	The possibility for Jews to live according to their own values...
Social General Coexistence Tolerance	... jest kluczowa aby zapewnić harmonijne współistnienie w społeczeństwie.	... is crucial to ensure harmonious coexistence in society.
Social General Coexistence Tolerance	... może sprzyjać zmniejszeniu napięć społecznych.	... can help reduce social tensions.
Social General Coexistence Tolerance	... może sprzyjać utrzymaniu pokoju w społeczeństwie.	... is conducive to maintaining peace in society.
Social General Respect Tolerance	... można uzasadnić tym, że powinni mieć takie same prawa jak ja.	... is supported by the fact that they should have the same rights as I do.
Social General Respect Tolerance	... można uzasadnić tym, że powinni móc kształtować i pielęgnować w ten sposób własną tożsamość.	... is supported by the fact that they should be able to shape and nurture their own identity in this way.
Social General Respect Tolerance	... przyczyniłoby się do budowania wzajemnego szacunku wobec różnych grup społecznych.	... would contribute to building mutual respect among different social groups.
Social General Appreciation Tolerance	... można uzasadnić tym, że dzięki nim społeczeństwo korzysta z różnorodności tradycji i stylów życia.	... is supported by the fact that society benefits from a diversity of traditions and lifestyles.
Social General Appreciation Tolerance	... można uzasadnić tym, że wzbogacają naszą kulturę.	... is supported by the fact that they enrich our culture.
Social General Appreciation Tolerance można uzasadnić tym, że skłaniają do myślenia o świecie w inny sposób.	... is supported by the fact that they encourage thinking about the world in a different way.

Table 14. Specific Tolerance Items in Study 1

Variable	Original Item	English Translation
Social Specific Coexistence Tolerance	Żydzi w Polsce powinni mieć dostęp do osobnego pokoju modlitewnego w pracy, co pozwoliłoby na zmniejszenie napięć społecznych	Jews in Poland should have access to a separate prayer room at work, in order to help reduce social tensions.
Social Specific Respect Tolerance	Żydzi w Polsce powinni mieć dostęp do osobnego pokoju modlitewnego w pracy, ponieważ ich potrzeby są równie ważne jak potrzeby Polaków	Jews in Poland should have access to a separate prayer room at work because their needs are just as important as those of Poles.
Social Specific Appreciation Tolerance	Żydzi w Polsce powinni mieć dostęp do osobnego pokoju modlitewnego w pracy, co wzbogaciłoby kulturę organizacyjną	Jews in Poland should have access to a separate prayer room at work, which would enrich the organizational culture.
Social Specific Coexistence Tolerance	Żydzi w Polsce powinni mieć możliwość własnej edukacji religijnej w szkołach publicznych, aby utrzymać pokój w społeczeństwie	Jews in Poland should have the opportunity for their own religious education in public schools in order to maintain peace in society.
Social Specific Respect Tolerance	Żydzi w Polsce powinni mieć możliwość własnej edukacji religijnej w szkołach publicznych, ponieważ powinni mieć możliwość kształtowania własnej tożsamości	Jews in Poland should have the opportunity for their own religious education in public schools because they should have the ability to shape their own identity.
Social Specific Appreciation Tolerance	Żydzi w Polsce powinni mieć możliwość własnej edukacji religijnej w szkołach publicznych, ponieważ to skłoniłoby Polaków do myślenia o świecie w inny sposób	Jews in Poland should have the opportunity for their own religious education in public schools because it would encourage Poles to think about the world in a different way.
Social Specific Coexistence Tolerance	Żydzi w Polsce powinni mieć możliwość dnia wolnego od pracy i szkoły w Jom Kipur, aby uniknąć konfliktów społecznych	Jews in Poland should have the right to take a day off from work and school on Yom Kippur in order to avoid social conflicts.
Social Specific Respect Tolerance	Żydzi w Polsce powinni mieć możliwość dnia wolnego od pracy i szkoły w Jom Kipur, ponieważ mają do tego prawo	Jews in Poland should have the right to take a day off from work and school on Yom Kippur because they are entitled to it.

Social Specific Appreciation Tolerance	Żydzi w Polsce powinni mieć możliwość dnia wolnego od pracy i szkoły w Jom Kipur, ponieważ dzięki nim społeczeństwo korzysta z różnorodności tradycji i stylów życia	Jews in Poland should have the right to take a day off from work and school on Yom Kippur because they enrich society with a diversity of traditions and lifestyles.
---	--	--

Table 15. Specific Tolerance Items in Study 2a

Variable	Original Item	English Translation
Social Specific Coexistence Tolerance	Wprowadzenie symboli religijnych, takich jak świecznik podczas obchodów Chanuki, do miejsc publicznych, jak sale sejm i senat, jest kluczowe aby zapewnić harmonijne współistnienie.	The introduction of religious symbols, such as a menorah during Hanukkah celebrations, into public spaces like the chambers of the Polish parliament, is crucial to ensuring harmonious coexistence.
Social Specific Coexistence Tolerance	Zachowanie i pielęgnowanie dziedzictwa miejsc takich jak synagogi i cmentarze Żydowskie przez władze lokalne, może sprzyjać zmniejszeniu napięć społecznych.	The preservation and care of heritage sites such as synagogues and Jewish cemeteries by local authorities can help reduce social tensions.
Social Specific Coexistence Tolerance	Uwzględnienie w większym stopniu treści dotyczących historii polskich Żydów w polskich podręcznikach, może sprzyjać utrzymaniu pokoju społecznego.	Increasing the inclusion of content related to the history of Polish Jews in Polish textbooks is conducive to maintaining peace in society.
Social Specific Respect Tolerance	Wprowadzenie symboli religijnych, takich jak świecznik podczas obchodów Chanuki, do miejsc publicznych, jak sale sejm i senat, można uzasadnić tym, że Żydzi powinni mieć takie same prawa jak ja.	The introduction of religious symbols, such as a menorah during Hanukkah celebrations, into public spaces like the chambers of the Polish parliament, is supported by the fact that Jews should have the same rights as I do.
Social Specific Respect Tolerance	Zachowanie i pielęgnowanie dziedzictwa miejsc takich jak synagogi i cmentarze Żydowskie przez władze lokalne, można uzasadnić tym, że Żydzi powinni móc kształtować i pielęgnować w ten sposób własną tożsamość	The preservation and care of heritage sites such as synagogues and Jewish cemeteries by local authorities is supported by the fact that they should be able to shape and nurture their own identity in this way.
Social Specific Respect Tolerance	Uwzględnienie w większym stopniu treści dotyczących historii polskich Żydów w polskich podręcznikach przyczyniłoby się do budowania wzajemnego szacunku wobec różnych grup społecznych	Increasing the inclusion of content related to the history of Polish Jews in Polish textbooks would contribute to building mutual respect among different social groups.

Social Specific Appreciation Tolerance	Wprowadzenie symboli religijnych, takich jak świecznik podczas obchodów Chanuki, do miejsc publicznych, jak sale sejm i senat, można uzasadnić tym, że wzbogacają naszą kulturę	The introduction of religious symbols, such as a menorah during Hanukkah celebrations, into public spaces like the chambers of the Polish parliament is supported by the fact that they enrich our culture.
Social Specific Appreciation Tolerance	Zachowanie i pielęgnowanie dziedzictwa miejsc takich jak synagogi i cmentarze Żydowskie przez władze lokalne, można uzasadnić tym, że skłaniają do myślenia o świecie w inny sposób	The preservation and care of heritage sites such as synagogues and Jewish cemeteries by local authorities is supported by the fact that they encourage thinking about the world in a different way.
Social Specific Appreciation Tolerance	Uwzględnienie w większym stopniu treści dotyczących historii polskich Żydów w polskich podręcznikach jest uzasadnione tym, że dzięki nim społeczeństwo korzysta z różnorodności tradycji i stylów życia	Increasing the inclusion of content related to the history of Polish Jews in Polish textbooks is supported by the fact that society benefits from a diversity of traditions and lifestyles.

Table 16. Specific Tolerance (Context 1) Items in Study 2b

Variable	Original Item	English Translation
Specific Context 1 Prompt	Uwzględnienie w większym stopniu treści dotyczących historii polskich Żydów w polskich podręcznikach...	Increasing the inclusion of content related to the history of Polish Jews in Polish textbooks...
Social Specific Coexistence Tolerance Context 1	... jest kluczowe aby zapewnić harmonijne współistnienie.	... is crucial to ensure harmonious coexistence.
Social Specific Coexistence Tolerance Context 1	... może sprzyjać zmniejszeniu napięć społecznych.	... can help reduce social tensions.
Social Specific Coexistence Tolerance Context 1	... może sprzyjać utrzymaniu pokoju w społeczeństwie.	... is conducive to maintaining peace in society.
Social Specific Respect Tolerance Context 1	... można uzasadnić tym, że Żydzi powinni mieć takie same prawa jak ja.	... is supported by the fact that Jews should have the same rights as I do.
Social Specific Respect Tolerance Context 1	... można uzasadnić tym, że Żydzi powinni móc kształtować i pielęgnować w ten sposób własną tożsamość.	... is supported by the fact that Jews should be able to shape and nurture their own identity in this way.
Social Specific Respect Tolerance Context 1	... przyczyniłoby się do budowania wzajemnego szacunku wobec różnych grup społecznych.	... would contribute to building mutual respect among different social groups.
Social Specific Appreciation Tolerance Context 1	... można uzasadnić tym, że wzbogacają naszą kulturę.	... is supported by the fact that they enrich our culture.
Social Specific Appreciation Tolerance Context 1	... można uzasadnić tym, że skłaniają do myślenia o świecie w inny sposób.	... is supported by the fact that they encourage thinking about the world in a different way.
Social Specific Appreciation Tolerance Context 1	... można uzasadnić tym, że dzięki nim społeczeństwo korzysta z różnorodności tradycji i stylów życia.	... is supported by the fact that society benefits from a diversity of traditions and lifestyles.

Table 17. Specific Tolerance (Context 2) Items in Study 2b

Variable	Original Item	English Translation
Specific Context 2 Prompt	Zachowanie i pielęgnowanie dziedzictwa miejsc takich jak synagogi i cmentarze żydowskie przez władze lokalne...	The preservation and care of heritage sites such as synagogues and Jewish cemeteries by local authorities...
Social Specific Coexistence Tolerance Context 2	... jest kluczowe aby zapewnić harmonijne współistnienie.	... is crucial to ensure harmonious coexistence.
Social Specific Coexistence Tolerance Context 2	... może sprzyjać zmniejszeniu napięć społecznych.	... can help reduce social tensions.
Social Specific Coexistence Tolerance Context 2	... może sprzyjać utrzymaniu pokoju w społeczeństwie.	... is conducive to maintaining peace in society.
Social Specific Respect Tolerance Context 2	... można uzasadnić tym, że Żydzi powinni mieć takie same prawa jak ja.	... is supported by the fact that Jews should have the same rights as I do.
Social Specific Respect Tolerance Context 2	... można uzasadnić tym, że Żydzi powinni móc kształtować i pielęgnować w ten sposób własną tożsamość.	... is supported by the fact that Jews should be able to shape and nurture their own identity in this way.
Social Specific Respect Tolerance Context 2	... przyczyniłoby się do budowania wzajemnego szacunku wobec różnych grup społecznych.	... would contribute to building mutual respect among different social groups.
Social Specific Appreciation Tolerance Context 2	... można uzasadnić tym, że wzbogacają naszą kulturę.	... is supported by the fact that they enrich our culture.
Social Specific Appreciation Tolerance Context 2	... można uzasadnić tym, że skłaniają do myślenia o świecie w inny sposób.	... is supported by the fact that they encourage thinking about the world in a different way.
Social Specific Appreciation Tolerance Context 2	... można uzasadnić tym, że dzięki nim społeczeństwo korzysta z różnorodności tradycji i stylów życia.	... is supported by the fact that society benefits from a diversity of traditions and lifestyles.

Table 18. Behavioral Intention Items in Study 1

Original Item	English Translation
<i>W skali od 1 (mało prawdopodobne) do 7 (bardzo prawdopodobne), jak bardzo prawdopodobne jest, że...</i>	<i>On a scale from 1 (unlikely) to 7 (very likely), how likely is it that you would...</i>
Zareagujesz na antysemickie komentarze?	Respond to antisemitic comments?
Poszukasz więcej informacji na temat kultury żydowskiej?	Seek more information about Jewish culture?
Podpiszysz petycję w celu pomocy żydowskiej społeczności?	Sign a petition to support the Jewish community?
Pójdiesz na demonstrację w obronie praw osób żydowskiego pochodzenia?	Attend a demonstration in defense of the rights of Jewish people?
Wesprzesz osobę pochodzenia żydowskiego w wyborach?	Support a Jewish candidate in an election?

Table 19. Behavioral Intention Items in Study 2a

Original Item	English Translation
<i>W jakim stopniu zgadzasz się lub nie zgadzasz z każdym stwierdzeniem.</i>	<i>To what extent do you agree or disagree with each statement?</i>
Wyobraź sobie, że natknąłeś się na post w internecie promujący Żydowską kulturę. Czy był(a)byś skłonny/a polubić ten post?	Imagine you come across a post on the internet promoting Jewish culture. Would you be inclined to like this post?
Wyobraź sobie, że istnieje petycja do władz miejskich o pokrycie kosztów czyszczenia żydowskich cmentarzy. Czy byłbyś skłonny podpisać taką petycję?	Imagine there is a petition to the municipal authorities to cover the costs of cleaning Jewish cemeteries. Would you be inclined to sign such a petition?
Wyobraź sobie, że grupa studentów demonstruje w celu poparcia wystąpienia i prezentacji o konflikcie w Izraelu prowadzonej przez żydowskiego profesora. Czy byłbyś skłonny dołączyć do protestu?	Imagine a group of students demonstrating in support of a speech and presentation about the conflict in Israel by a Jewish professor. Would you be willing to join the protest?

Table 19.1. Passive form of tolerance behavioral intentions in Study 2a

We also measured a more **passive form of tolerance behavioral intentions** however due to a lower reliability we decided not to use it in the analysis ($\alpha = 0.57$).

Original Item	English Translation
<i>W jakim stopniu zgadzasz się lub nie zgadzasz z każdym stwierdzeniem.</i>	<i>To what extent do you agree or disagree with each statement?</i>
Wyobraź sobie, że natknąłeś się na mem w internecie promujący mowę nienawiści wobec Żydów. Czy byłbyś skłonny polubić ten post?	Imagine you came across a meme on the Internet promoting hate speech against Jews. Would you be willing to like the post?
Wyobraź sobie, że istnieje petycja przeciwko pokryciu kosztów czyszczenia żydowskich cmentarzy przez władze miejskie. Czy byłbyś skłonny podpisać?	Imagine that there is a petition against covering the cost of cleaning Jewish cemeteries by the city government. Would you be willing to sign?
Wyobraź sobie, że grupa studentów protestuje przeciwko wystąpieniu i prezentacji o konflikcie w Izraelu prowadzonej przez żydowskiego profesora. Czy byłbyś skłonny dołączyć do protestu?	Imagine a group of students protesting a speech and presentation about the conflict in Israel by a Jewish professor. Would you be willing to join the protest?

Table 20. Behavioral Intention Items in Study 2b

Original Item	English Translation
<i>W jakim stopniu zgadzasz się lub nie zgadzasz z każdym stwierdzeniem.</i>	<i>To what extent do you agree or disagree with each statement?</i>
Wyobraź sobie, że natknąłeś/natknęłaś się na post w internecie promujący Żydowską kulturę. Czy był(a)byś skłonny/a polubić ten post?	Imagine you come across a post on the internet promoting Jewish culture. Would you be inclined to like this post?
Wyobraź sobie, że istnieje petycja do władz miejskich o pokrycie kosztów czyszczenia żydowskich cmentarzy. Czy był(a)byś skłonny/a podpisać taką petycję?	Imagine there is a petition to the municipal authorities to cover the costs of cleaning Jewish cemeteries. Would you be inclined to sign such a petition?
Wyobraź sobie, że grupa studentów demonstruje w celu poparcia prezentacji prowadzonej przez profesora na temat kultury żydowskiej. Czy był(a)byś skłonny/a dołączyć do tej demonstracji?	Imagine a group of students is demonstrating in support of a presentation given by a professor on Jewish culture. Would you be inclined to join this demonstration?
Wyobraź sobie, że w Twoim mieście organizowana jest demonstracja w obronie praw osób żydowskiego pochodzenia. Czy był(a)byś skłonny/a dołączyć do demonstracji?	Imagine there is a demonstration in your city advocating for the rights of people of Jewish descent. Would you be inclined to join the demonstration?

Additional Analyses

Table 21. Regression Analysis of National and Acquaintance Equality-based Respect Norms on Types of Tolerance in Study 1

Outcome	Predictors	<i>b</i>	SE	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
General Coexistence Tolerance	National	0.04	0.06	0.70	.487
	Acquaintance	0.20**	0.06	3.15	.002
General Respect Tolerance	National	-0.01	0.05	-0.19	.853
	Acquaintance	0.31***	0.06	4.81	<.001
General Appreciation Tolerance	National	-0.01	0.06	-0.09	.931
	Acquaintance	0.29***	0.06	4.58	<.001
Specific Coexistence Tolerance	National	-0.06	0.07	-0.86	.389
	Acquaintance	0.16*	0.07	2.30	.022
Specific Respect Tolerance	National	-0.12	0.07	-1.83	.069
	Acquaintance	0.29***	0.07	4.16	<.001
Specific Appreciation Tolerance	National	-0.06	0.07	-0.84	.403

Acquaintance	0.22**	0.07	3.06	.002
--------------	--------	------	------	------

Note: Controlling for disapproval, education and attitudes towards Jews. Significance levels: *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$.

Table 22. Regression Analysis of National and Personal Environment Equality-based Respect Norms on Tolerance Types in Study 2b

Outcome	Predictors	<i>b</i>	SE	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
General Coexistence Tolerance	National	0.15*	0.06	2.42	.016
	Personal Environment	0.22***	0.06	3.66	<.001
General Respect Tolerance	National	0.31***	0.06	4.81	<.001
	Personal Environment	0.27***	0.06	4.43	<.001
General Appreciation Tolerance	National	0.20**	0.07	2.98	.003
	Personal Environment	0.13*	0.06	2.05	.041
Specific Coexistence Tolerance Context 1	National	0.26***	0.07	3.54	<.001
	Personal Environment	0.06	0.07	0.84	.401
Specific Respect Tolerance Context 1	National	0.22**	0.07	3.29	.001
	Personal Environment	0.19**	0.06	3.01	.003
Specific Appreciation Tolerance Context 1	National	0.16*	0.07	2.29	.023
	Personal Environment	0.15*	0.07	2.22	.027
Specific Coexistence Tolerance Context 2	National	0.24**	0.08	3.26	.001
	Personal Environment	0.08	0.07	1.12	.262
Specific Respect Tolerance Context 2	National	0.27***	0.07	3.91	<.001

	Personal Environment	0.21**	0.07	3.21	.001
Specific Appreciation Tolerance Context 2	National	0.17*	0.07	2.34	.020
	Personal Environment	0.18**	0.07	2.61	.009

Note: Controlling for disapproval, education and attitudes towards Jews. Significance levels: *** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$.

Additional analyses: Testing Hypothesis 1 on the Types of Tolerance

Study 1 Results

A series of t-tests were conducted. Participants reported significantly higher General Coexistence Tolerance ($M = 5.06$, $SD = 1.45$) compared to the Specific Coexistence Tolerance ($M = 4.04$, $SD = 1.56$), with a large effect size, Cohen's $d = 0.81$, 95% CI [0.682, 0.944].

Participants reported significantly higher General Respect Tolerance ($M = 5.94$, $SD = 1.31$) compared to the Specific Respect Tolerance ($M = 4.80$, $SD = 1.70$), with a large effect size, Cohen's $d = 0.83$, 95% CI [0.698, 0.961].

For General Appreciation Tolerance ($M = 5.14$, $SD = 1.62$) again participants reported significantly higher scores compared to the Specific Appreciation Tolerance ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 1.75$), with a large effect size, Cohen's $d = 0.90$, 95% CI [0.763, 1.032].

All in line with Hypothesis 1.

Study 2a Results

The same analyses were conducted in Study 2a, yielding similar patterns.

For General Coexistence Tolerance ($M = 4.97$, $SD = 1.66$) participants had significantly higher scores compared to the Specific Coexistence Tolerance ($M = 4.03$, $SD = 1.57$), with a medium-to-large effect size, Cohen's $d = 0.78$, 95% CI [0.514, 1.017].

For General Respect Tolerance ($M = 5.99$, $SD = 1.41$) again showed significantly higher reported tolerance than for Specific Respect Tolerance ($M = 4.98$, $SD = 1.68$), with a large effect size, Cohen's $d = 0.83$, 95% CI [0.572, 1.084].

Participants reported significantly higher General Appreciation Tolerance ($M = 5.08$, $SD = 1.72$) compared to the Specific Appreciation Tolerance ($M = 4.47$, $SD = 1.77$), with a medium effect size, Cohen's $d = 0.61$, 95% CI [0.372, 0.853].

Study 2b Results

For General Coexistence Tolerance ($M = 3.42$, $SD = 1.53$) participants reported slightly higher tolerance compared to the Specific Coexistence Tolerance Context 1 scale ($M = 3.21$, $SD = 1.64$), but the effect size was small, Cohen's $d = 0.17$, 95% CI [0.076, 0.264]. A comparison with the alternative Specific Coexistence scale but for Context 2 ($M = 3.36$, $SD = 1.68$) was not statistically significant, Cohen's $d = 0.05$, 95% CI [-0.041, 0.147].

For Respect Tolerance, for the General level ($M = 3.70$, $SD = 1.66$) participants had significantly higher scores than for Specific Respect Tolerance Context 1 ($M = 3.36$, $SD = 1.61$), with a medium effect size, Cohen's $d = 0.35$, 95% CI [0.255, 0.448]. When compared to the alternative Specific Respect Tolerance scale but for Context 2 ($M = 3.60$, $SD = 1.69$), the effect was small, but also significant Cohen's $d = 0.12$, 95% CI [0.024, 0.212].

For Appreciation Tolerance, the difference between General Appreciation Tolerance ($M = 3.15$, $SD = 1.58$) and Specific Appreciation Tolerance Context 1 ($M = 3.21$, $SD = 1.60$) was not significant, Cohen's $d = -0.06$, 95% CI [-0.153, 0.034]. The same comparison but with Specific Appreciation Tolerance Context 2 ($M = 3.32$, $SD = 1.66$) showed a small effect, Cohen's $d = -0.18$, 95% CI [-0.273, -0.084].

Additional Analyses Controlling for Secularism in Study 1

Hypothesis 1: A repeated measures ANCOVA was conducted to examine differences in General and Specific Tolerance scores, controlling for secularism. Descriptive statistics indicated that participants scored higher on General Tolerance ($M = 5.38$, $SD = 1.30$) than on Specific Tolerance ($M = 4.28$, $SD = 1.54$). The analysis revealed a significant main effect of Tolerance Type, $F(1, 298) = 6.69$, $p = .010$, $\eta^2 = .022$, indicating that the difference in tolerance scores remained significant after controlling for secularism. Additionally, there was a significant interaction between Tolerance Type and Secularism, $F(1, 298) = 8.39$, $p = .004$, $\eta^2 = .027$, suggesting that the effect of tolerance type varied depending on participants' levels of secularism.

Hypothesis 2 and 3: To test Hypotheses 2 and 3, we investigated the associations between National and Acquaintance Equality-based Respect Norms with both General and Specific Tolerance while controlling for secularism. We found that the correlation between National Respect Norms and General Tolerance was significantly lower than that of Acquaintance Respect Norms and General Tolerance ($r(297) = .292$, $p < .001$ vs. $r(297) = .477$, $p < .001$), supporting Hypothesis 2 ($z = -2.66$, $p = .008$).

Similarly, the correlation between National Respect Norms and Specific Tolerance was significantly weaker than Acquaintance Respect Norms with ST ($r(297) = .144$, $p = .013$ vs. $r(297) = .365$, $p < .001$), confirming Hypothesis 3 ($z = -2.90$, $p = .004$).

Regression Analysis of Levels of Tolerance on Behavioral Intentions controlling for Secularism

Compared to Study 2a and 2b, in Study 1, both GT and ST were significant predictors of behavioral intentions. This exception may be explained by the characteristics of the study 1 sample: attitudes toward Jews were overwhelmingly positive, and a disproportionately small proportion of participants expressed disapproval (12%, $N = 35$). In study 1, a preliminary version of the specific tolerance measure was employed, wherein all three contexts of specific tolerance were simultaneously embedded within a religious framework. This design differed from subsequent iterations, which isolated and assessed only one specific context at a time. The earlier approach may have inadvertently conflated specific tolerance with broader notions of secularism, as items such as "allowing time off for Yom Kippur," "separate religious education in schools," or "individual prayer rooms" likely overlapped conceptually. When controlling for secularism ($R^2 = .404$, $F(3, 296) = 66.77$, $p < .001$), specific tolerance ($\beta = 0.32$, $p <$

.001) did demonstrate a slightly stronger predictive relationship with behavioral intentions than general tolerance ($\beta = 0.31$, $p < .001$), however the difference between the two predictors was not statistically significant. Which is consistent with the pattern observed in the article.