

CONTENT OF PEDAGOGICAL TOLERANCE IN THE ENHANCEMENT OF SPECIAL QUALITIES OF THE FUTURE SPECIALISTS

Zhanat Bissenbayeva – Zhanzhumenov Rustam – Yergeshev Erzhan –
Nyrkassym Ashimbay – Abdulina Lyazzat

doi: 10.18355/PG.2020.9.1.9

Abstract

This research is devoted to the study of the psychological content of pedagogical tolerance as an essential professional quality of a teacher.

The relevance of this problem is determined by both the practical and theoretical nature. A necessary condition for successful pedagogical activity is dealing with the child in this way. A tolerant teacher, thanks to the special tactics in his behavior with children, achieves greater effectiveness. In modern school, the role of the personality of the teacher is significantly increasing.

All this, in our opinion, makes it necessary to analyze the problem of pedagogical tolerance as a professionally outstanding quality of a teacher.

The purpose of the work is to identify the specifics of communicative and pedagogical tolerance of a teacher in a comprehensive school-based on an analysis of the individual psychological qualities of the personality and subjective experience of the teacher.

In accordance with the purpose of the study, the following tasks were set:

To identify the main theoretical approaches to understanding the characteristics of tolerance and pedagogical tolerance in domestic and foreign psychology

To determine the impact of communicative and pedagogical understanding on the effectiveness of the teachers' teaching and educational activities and to substantiate the laws governing the development of pedagogical tolerance as a professionally outstanding quality in the process of teacher activity

To identify the relationship between communicative and pedagogical tolerance with the personal qualities of a teacher and determine the individual psychological characteristics that underlie the formation of pedagogical tolerance

To develop guidelines for the development of communicative and pedagogical tolerance of teachers.

Key words

content, development, pedagogical, psychological, special abilities, teacher, tolerance

Introduction

Úvod

The problem of tolerance is studied in various sciences. For example, the philosophical foundations of research are laid in the works of A. I. Ilyina, Yu. A. Tishkova, I. B. Hasanova. They suggest that the problem of tolerance and

the form of interaction with the world is expressed in tolerance of other people's opinions, in recognition and learning in the activity of the multidimensionality of social life. Tolerance is a practical norm of communication and is associated with self-determination of a person, its integrity in activity and communication.

In domestic psychology, tolerance as a phenomenon has been studied relatively recently. Understanding of the interpretation and recognition of equality, recognition of the multidimensionality and diversity of human culture, norms, values, rejection of the evidence of this diversity or the prevalence of any one point of view is reflected in the works of A. G. Asmolova. Tolerance, according to E. V. Magomedova, must be considered at two levels of human consciousness: on the rational-logical and emotional-sensual. The phenomenon of tolerance P. F. He considers three positions: in the context of the anthropological problem "I and You", in the axiological aspect of the value problem and in praxeology, in particular, in communication activities. And also P. F. Komogorov connects tolerance and communication, as the presence of two subjects is necessary for communication.

The problem of tolerance, in one way or another, is considered by psychologists as the humanistic direction affecting the development of the personal sphere and its correction. Z. Freud, E. Fromm associate intolerance with the problem of aggressiveness and hostility.

Pedagogical tolerance is considered in the works of M. Buber in the framework of the anthropological problem of I-you. P. F. Komogorov believes that pedagogical tolerance is associated with communication, and the teacher should have the ability to tolerate interaction with all subjects of the educational process.

The concept of tolerance is the subject of many sciences: philosophy, ethics, political science, medicine, pedagogy, psychology. Our task is to identify the common and distinctive in different interpretations of the concept of tolerance and on the basis of this to develop its understanding as a mental phenomenon. The issue of the content of the concept of tolerance is becoming increasingly relevant both for the individual himself and for the state and society. In the media, educational systems, the dominant are evaluative, uniform judgments, a tendency to use extreme measures.

In psychology, tolerance as a phenomenon has been studied relatively recently. The understanding of tolerance is as respect and recognition of equality, the rejection of dominance and violence, the recognition of the multidimensionality and diversity of human culture, norms, beliefs, and the refusal to reduce this diversity to uniformity.

The opposite is true with A. A. Reana when considering the relationship between the concepts of "tolerance" and "intolerance." He believes that the concept of tolerance is psycho-physiological which means a weakening of the response to any adverse factor as a result of a decrease in sensitivity to its effects.

According to A. A. Rean, the concept of "tolerance" includes tolerance and is more general. Tolerance is understood as a personality trait, which is

associated with the response to different opinions and open-mindedness in the assessment of people and events.

In the structure of the general phenomenon of tolerance A. A. Rean identifies two species associated with different mechanisms of tolerance:

1. Sensory personality tolerance is related to the personality's resistance to environmental influences and is associated with a weakened response to any adverse factor due to a decrease in sensitivity; this is "tolerance-callousness, tolerance-wall."

2. Dispositional tolerance of a person is characterized by a predisposition, a person's readiness for a tolerant reaction to the environment. Behind it are individual attitudes of the personality, the totality of its relations to reality; this is "tolerance-position, tolerance-attitude, tolerance-attitude."

In addition, there is a behavioral approach to the definition of tolerance, in which tolerance is considered, first of all, as a special behavior of a person. They also consider the problem of tolerance from the point of view of the cognitive approach, when tolerance basically has the knowledge and rational arguments.

An analysis of foreign and domestic works on tolerance demonstrates that the concept of tolerance cannot be unambiguously interpreted; from this point of view, a diversification approach is being implemented. Discussing this approach, I. Pettay talks about a certain dynamic in the development of tolerance and identifies several phases of the formation of tolerance.

80

Moreover, it cannot be clearly stated that a higher level of tolerance is always preferable. Sharing the point of view of M. Walzer on the limits of tolerance, it should be noted that an excessive increase intolerance can lead to a weakening of resistance and an increase in the vulnerability of a person, a decrease in his differential sensitivity, to threats to individuality, identity, etc. The specifics of pedagogical activity can be determined through its highest, ultimate goal, motive-goal, which is the result of the assignment by the subject of a socially-historically determined function of pedagogical activity. Achieving the ultimate goal of pedagogical activity - the formation and development of a child's personality, can only happen with cooperative interaction between teachers and students. And the task of the teacher is not to adapt the student to the teaching material, but "subordinate the entire content of education to its development as the highest goal."

In the plan, we are interested in assessing the effectiveness of the teacher's activity; the issue of the structure of pedagogical activity, its components, and functions is of particular importance.

In the pedagogical activity, N. V. Kuzmina identified several major interconnected components. She describes constructive, organizational, and communicative activities. Somewhat later N.V. Kuzmina described the fourth component of pedagogical activity - the Gnostic.

In his study, A.E. Shteimets identifies 4 functions of pedagogical activity: constructive, research, communicative, and reflective.

Methodology

The research methodology was based on the following scientific principles and concepts:

- Philosophical and ethical provisions of the concept of tolerance;
- The main provisions of the psychological theory of tolerance;
- The principles of psychology and pedagogy of non-violence;
- The principles of psychology and pedagogy of cooperation.
- Principles of a system-genetic approach to the formation of personality;

Research methods and techniques: At different stages of the work, the following methods were used: theoretical analysis of the literature, observation, ascertaining experiment, questionnaires, purposes of statistical processing of empirical data, including descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, cluster, factorial, multiple regression analysis.

Reliability and validity were provided by a comprehensive analysis of the problem in determining the initial theoretical and methodological principles; a combination of empirical and theoretical methods adequate to the goals and objectives of the study; a combination of quantitative and qualitative analysis of materials; using methods of mathematical statistics; compliance with the requirements of validity; using standard and reasonable psycho-diagnostic methods.

The experimental base of the study: The study was conducted from 2016 2018 with 80 teachers of the universities in Shymkent and Almaty; with 20 first-year students of al Farabi KAZNU.

The scientific novelty is determined by a comprehensive theoretical and applied approach to the study of pedagogical tolerance of a teacher. It was revealed that the effectiveness of the educational and teaching activities of a teacher is influenced by communicative and socio-cultural tolerance. It is shown that a high level of teacher tolerance is provided by a different combination of personality traits, according to Kettell.

It has been established that tolerant and intolerant teachers have different cognitive characteristics; in particular, tolerant teachers use differentiated assessments of the student's personality. It is shown that pedagogical tolerance is dynamic and reaches a peak at 4–7 years and 20–40 years of professional experience as a teacher.

The structure of communicative and pedagogical tolerance is specific for teachers with different work experience.

The pedagogical activity is multi-structural and multi-level in nature, aimed primarily at the development of another person. It performs four main functions: constructive, research, communicative, and reflective. From the point of view of pedagogical tolerance as a personality trait of a teacher, manifested in interaction, the two types of professional activities of a teacher are most interesting - it is educational and educational. Both of these activities are aimed at developing the ability of students to organize and carry out joint activities that are diverse in content. The specifics of this type of activity reflect:

- the purpose of the activity, its content and organization methods;
- motives for participation in the activities of both the teacher and the student;
- the nature and style of the pedagogical interaction of the teacher with students;
- the position of the teacher in relation to students;

Therefore, by pedagogical tolerance we mean the possession of the skills and abilities of tolerant interaction with all subjects of the educational process; installation on tolerance as an active position in the formation of tolerance of their personality, the identity of students and their parents; as a quality of personality; as the norm of their behavior, which is one of the components of pedagogical ethics. Pedagogical tolerance is a social category and is manifested in the attitude towards the acceptance of another person, empathic understanding, and open and confidential communication.

Pedagogical tolerance acts as an integrating form, bearing the features of all types and levels of tolerance, determined by the goals, objectives, and characteristics of the teacher's pedagogical activity and the whole variety of pedagogical situations encountered, is a teacher's professional and personal quality.

The experiment conducted under the natural conditions of teachers' pedagogical activity, aimed at studying the current level of pedagogical tolerance, the psychological content of pedagogical tolerance, the individual-typical features of tolerant and intolerant teachers determining the effectiveness of the teaching and educational activities of teachers.

To study pedagogical tolerance, the following empirical data collection methods were used:

determination of the total indicator of tolerance D.V. Zinoviev;

definition of communicative tolerance V. V. Smartly.

Mathematical processing of empirical data was carried out by mathematical and statistical methods in the program STATISTICA 6.0, SPSS 10.0. For the purpose of a short description of the group, the primary descriptive statistics used were: mean, percentiles, variance, standard deviation, data standardization, frequency distribution graphs. To assess the linear relationship of the studied parameters, the r-Pearson direct correlation method was used, this criterion is possible since the data are close to the normal distribution curve. To group the data used hierarchical cluster analysis, the common communication method, interval data: Euclidean distance. In order to study the relationship between the dependent variable and several independent variables, the multiple regression method was used: stepwise inverse. In order to move from the set of initial variables to factors, we used the method of factor analysis: the main components with varimax rotation. To assess the significance of the differences, the U-Mann-Whitney test was used.

We turn to the description of specific methods. At the initial stage of the work, we used methods and techniques for identifying pedagogical tolerance; in particular, the methodology for determining the total indicator of tolerance- Zinoviev. The questionnaire consists of 30 questions, to which the subject gives either a positive or a negative answer. Processing is carried out in accordance with the key. The total indicator of tolerance and signs on each scale individually determined are respect, kindness, empathy. Instructions to the subjects: "choose the most suitable one from the two answer options and mark it in the answer form."

To study the method of communicative tolerance of V. V. Smartly- In this technique, nine signs of communicative intolerance are distinguished and the sum of points is calculated for each of them. The total score obtained for all 9nine signs is calculated: the more the points, the lower the level of communicative tolerance. The maximum number of points that can be earned, 135, indicates absolute intolerance toward others. Instructions to the subjects: "Judgments are given below, use grades from 0 3 points to express how true they are in relation to you personally: 0 points - not at all right, 1 - true to some extent, 2 - true to a large extent, 3 "True to the highest degree."

Conclusion

In the course of an empirical study, the psychological content of communicative and pedagogical tolerance is clarified. It is empirically proven that tolerance is an important professional quality of a teacher. Cognitive and individual psychological characteristics of communicative and pedagogical tolerance are given. The hypothesis is confirmed that a high level of communicative and pedagogical tolerance is provided by a different combination of individual psychological qualities of the teacher's personality. And the hypothesis is also confirmed that at different stages of professional activity, communicative and pedagogical tolerance has a different structure.

The obtained research materials can be used for the diagnostic procedure for the study of teacher's communicative and pedagogical tolerance, for the development of developmental programs, for lecturing to teachers and psychology teachers as part of continuing education courses, for the preparation of students who are future teachers, psychologists and teachers. Based on the results of the study, methodological recommendations were developed on the development of communicative and pedagogical tolerance. Pedagogical tolerance is of paramount importance in the work of a teacher, and it is here, unfortunately, that a very significant deficit of respect and tolerance is felt. In everyday pedagogical practice, one can often find manifestations of pedagogical intolerance of varying degrees - from indifference to the "own opinion" of the child to his frank and hard devaluation and humiliation of the student himself for "wrong views." The statement of this problem determined the relevance and choice of the topic of scientific research – "The psychological content of pedagogical tolerance as a professionally important quality of a teacher."

As a result of the theoretical and empirical studies, the following conclusions were obtained:

The analysis of psychological, pedagogical, and special literature indicates that the basic theoretical concepts of tolerance are developed in the following scientific areas:

- the concept of tolerance is psycho-physiological and means a weakened response to any adverse factor as a result of a decrease in sensitivity to its effects;
- tolerance is considered as psychological stability in the presence of irritants or stressors, formed as a result of a decrease in sensitivity to their repeated effects;

- the phenomenon of tolerance is considered from three perspectives: in the context of the anthropological problem “I and You”, in the axiological aspect of the problem of values and in praxeology, in particular, the activity of communication.

Bibliographic references

ABULKHANOVA K. A. 1999. The Russian problem of freedom, loneliness, humility *Psychological journal*, vol. 20, n. 5, pp. 5-14.

ABULKHANOVA-SLAVSKAYA K. A. 1960. Activity and personality psychology. In: *Nauka*, 335 p.

ABULKHANOVA-SLAVSKAYA K. A. 1982. Personal mechanisms of regulation of activity. *Problems of personality psychology: Soviet-Finnish symposium* In: *Progress*. pp. 70-72.

ABULKHANOVA-SLAVSKAYA K. A. 1983. On the ways of building personality psychology. *Psychological journal*, vol. 4, n.1, pp. 14-29.

AVALUEV N. B. 2003. Criteria approach to assessing the effectiveness of educational activities of a teacher. *Diss. Cand. ped sciences.* - SPb., 169 p.

ASMOLOV A. G. 1998. Tolerance in the public consciousness of Russia. In: *IARAU*.

ADORNO T. W. – FRENKEL-BRUNSWIK E. – LEVINSON D. J. – SANFORD R. N. 1950. *The Authoritarian Personality*. New York, NY: Harper and Brothers.

AJZEN I. 1991. The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, vol. 50, n. 2, pp. 179–211.

AJZEN I. – FISHBEIN M. 1977. Attitude-behavior relations: A theoretical analysis and review of empirical research. *Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 84, n. 5, pp. 888–918.

BRATCHENKO S. L. 1997. Interpersonal dialogue and its main attributes. *Psychology with a human face: a humanistic perspective in post-Soviet psychology*. Chelyabinsk Oblast: Chelyabinsk State Pedagogical University. pp. 201-222

DASGUPTA P. 1993. *An Inquiry into Well-Being and Destitution*. Oxford: Clarendon.

DUCH R. M. – GIBSON J. L. 1992. Putting up with Fascists in Western Europe: A comparative, cross-level analysis of political tolerance. *The Western Political Quarterly*, vol. 45, n. 1, pp. 237–273.

DUCKITT J. 2005. Personality and prejudice. In J. F. Dovidio, P. Glick & Rudman L. A. (Eds.), *On the Nature of Prejudice: Fifty Years after Allport* Malden, MA: Blackwell. pp. 395–412.

GOLEBIEWSKA E. A. 1999. Gender gap in political tolerance. *Political Behavior*, vol. 21, n. 1, pp. 43–66.

GONZALEZ R. – BROWN R. 2003. Generalization of positive attitude as a function of subgroup and superordinate group identifications in intergroup contact. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, vol. 33, n. 2, pp. 195–214.

KARPOV V. 1999a. Political tolerance in Poland and the United States. *Social Forces*, vol. 77, n. 4, pp. 1525–1549.

MONDAK J. J. – SANDERS M. S. 2005. The complexity of tolerance and intolerance judgments: A response to Gibson. *Political Behavior*, vol. 27, n. 4, pp. 325–337.

ROBINSON J. – WITENBERG R. – SANSON A. 2001. The socialization of tolerance. In M. Augoustinos & K. J. Reynolds (Eds.), *Understanding Prejudice, Racism and Social Conflict* London, Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage. pp. 73–88.

Schuyt K. 1997. Continuïteit en verandering in de idee van tolerantie. In N. WILTERDINK, J. HEILBRON – DE SWAAN A. (Eds.), *Alles verandert. Opstellen voor en over J. Goudsblom*. Amsterdam: Meulenhoff. pp. 167–179.

ZINOVIEV D.V. 2000. Improving the pedagogical skills of the future teacher based on the formation of sociocultural tolerance. Diss. Cand. ped Sciences, Krasnoyarsk.

assoc. prof. dr. Zhanat Bissenbayeva, PhD.

Department of foreign languages

Al Farabi KAZNU

Pr. Al Farabi 71

050000 Almaty

Kazakhstan

zhanat_2006@mail.ru

Zhanzhumenov Rustam

Kyrgyz State university named after I. Arabayev

51, Razzakov Str., Bishkek 720026

Kyrgyzstan

Yergeshev Erzhan

Kyrgyz State university named after I. Arabayev

51, Razzakov Str., Bishkek 720026

Kyrgyzstan

nurzhanzhan88@mail.ru

Nyrkassym Ashimbay, PhD.

Al Farabi KAZNU

Pr. Al Farabi 71

050000 Almaty

Kazakhstan

Abdulina Lyazzat

Kyrgyz State university named after I. Arabayev

51, Razzakov Str.,

Bishkek 720026

Kyrgyzstan