

УДК 130.123

**PROCEDURAL ASPECTS OF THE PHENOMENON “TOLERANCE”****ПРОЦЕССУАЛЬНЫЕ АСПЕКТЫ ФЕНОМЕНА «ТОЛЕРАНТНОСТЬ»**©*Abidova Z.**National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek  
Tashkent, Uzbekistan, aziyoda@gmail.com*©*Абидова З. А.**Национальный Университет Узбекистана им. Мирзо Улугбека  
г. Ташкент, Узбекистан, aziyoda@gmail.com*

*Abstract.* This article is an attempt to systemize procedural aspects of the tolerance phenomenon. The author conducts analytically structured analysis differentiated in causative processes of tolerance and tolerance process substantiated and visually demonstrated in chart procedural aspects of the tolerance.

*Аннотация.* В данной статье сделана попытка систематизации процессуальных аспектов феномена толерантности. Автором проводится аналитико–структурированный анализ процесса проявления толерантности, который наглядно представляется в таблице.

*Keywords:* tolerance, cause, effect, factor, constructive, destructive, inner, outer, object, subject, reaction, relation, action, localization, expression.

*Ключевые слова:* толерантность, внутреннее, внешнее, объект, субъект, реакция, отношение, действие, локализация, проявление.

The tolerance phenomenon studied differently in the scientific literature. Researchers put forward various theories about the tolerance nature and its role and place in society, forms of its expression, its study methods and factors for its formation. The ambiguity of approaches confirms again relevance to study this phenomenon from the scientific point of view.

To study the tolerance phenomenon in depth, uppermost it is necessary to analyze its procedural aspect incurred in causative processes of tolerance formation and behavior.

The causative processes of tolerance divided into causal — due to which tolerance arises, and efficient or resultant, i.e. the derivable effect of tolerance expression.

The factors driving the tolerance formation as a process which is its effective start, conditionally named by us tolerance etiology.

The tolerance etiology lies in “alter” since only “alter” stimulates tolerance formation.

According to L. Yu. Ryumshin the tolerance appears only under unfavorable factors [15]. As per E. Yu. Kleptsova this individual’s character actualizes in a discrepancy of views, opinions, values, beliefs, human behaviors and etc. [11]. Peter Nicholson, the British philosopher, considers that tolerant attitude appears under certain deviation. Summarizing given opinions it may be concluded that the tolerance occurs under unfavorable factors.

In literature, there are also works where authors consider that the tolerance occurs due to interested relation to altering, necessity, favorability of alter. According to R. R. Valitova, the interesting relation to altering, desire to feel deeply its perception of the world, stimulating mind’s work only because this alter is somehow differ from own perception of reality, is required for tolerance occurrence [7]. I. B. Grinshpun defines tolerance as a necessity to interact with alter, its understanding with primordially positive emotional attitude towards altering [8]. N. M. Lebedeva by analyzing ethnic tolerance demonstrates that tolerance associates with the lack of negative

attitude towards other culture, more precisely — with a positive image of other culture by retaining the positive perception of its own. [12]. As set out in given opinions, these authors hypothesize different favorable factors causes tolerance.

Tolerance may also occur under circumstances when current factors are vague. As per A. G. Asmolov there is an ambiguity area in any social–historic life, where individual features of a person are revealed [1]. According to N. L. Okonshnikov opinion, tolerance is the ability to make a decision and think about the problem, even though not all facts and possible consequences are known, ability to stand the strain of crisis and problem situations. The mechanism of tolerance formation and expression, as per V. V. Boyko, associated with the psychology of emotional reflection of individual differences. At fore consciousness or subconsciousness level, each person reacts to that he and partner have differences in varying personality [5].

Thus, all listed factors facilitating tolerance too different, as a phenomenon, society or individual, we symbolically accepted as “alter”. “Alter” can appear under unfavorable, favorable or vague factors. Precisely these factors are the conditions of ambiguity, differences, needs in different, that by nature they are identical in relation to “alter”, i.e. inadequate to expectations not only a person or object but social structures and organizations, ideas, reality and etc. requiring appropriate reaction, attitude, and interaction.

By results, tolerance differentiated to constructive and destructive tolerance.

Constructive tolerance occurs in increasing probability of persistent existence or system development [19], it is positively motivated tolerance driving to positive result [13].

Destructive tolerance occurs in increasing probability of contrary processes (for example, violence tolerance) [19], driving to a negative result, propensity to indifferent attitude to values inspiring beliefs [13].

Thereby, tolerance causative processes divided into causes facilitating tolerance and effects as a result of tolerance. Factors stimulating tolerance may be unfavorable, favorable or vague and tolerance result may be destructive or constructive.

Tolerance as a socio–cultural phenomenon is very diverse. Therefore, it may be classified by various causes. In this work, we distinguish tolerance types versus subject, form, localization and quality.

The tolerance subject may be object or subject, i.e. different natural phenomena. Tolerance may occur towards anatomic, psychophysical characteristics of a subject or subjects.

By form tolerance, as a process, may be conditionally divided into three sub–processes:

1. Response with the more emotional component.
2. Attitude with the more cognitive component.
3. Action with the more behavioral component.

Tolerance, as a response to the more emotional component, progresses against sensitivity reduction to reiterative effects of frustrates or stressors [14], due to enabling patients mechanisms (tenacity, composure, self–control) [11]. Some authors put forward a hypothesis of tolerance formation in increasing the threshold of emotional response to the menacing situation, outwardly — in tenacity, composure, ability to continuously withstand unfavorable impacts without decreasing adaptive resources [15]. Tolerance occurs due to responses [9], lack or slackening of individual reaction to another person unfavorable pressure as a result of desensitization to its impact. [3].

Tolerance as an attitude with more cognitive component progresses as in dialectics of relationships “Self for myself”, “Self for other”, “Other for me” and etc. [4, 7]. It is recognition of the multi–dimensional world and social environment [18], individual moral virtue, characterizing its attitude towards the Other [7].

Tolerance as an action with more behavioral component processes in a dialogue. On psychological level tolerance is considered as aiming for dialogue with other (R. R. Valitova, V. A. Lektorski, G. S. Kozhukhar), ability to listen and respect other’s views (D. Brodskiy), individual behavior characteristic (S. K. Bondyreva) [16], interpersonal dialogue as a unique

method of interaction [6], skill to live with dissimilar, acceptance of alter, conflict solution method, compatibility norm [1], individual feature and ability to non-aggressive behavior based on transparency in relative independence from other person actions, willingness to interact [8]. As per L. M. Drobizheva tolerance directly reflects in social action, since attributively appertain to the system of needs, interests, motivations, aims, goals [9]. As noted by A. G. Asmolov tolerance is active lifestyle [1].

Thus, the tolerance process by form may be a response to the more emotional component; subject attitude towards object/subject with the more cognitive component; and actions with the more behavioral component. All listed forms may have various localization and quality, depending on which there are different types of tolerance.

In literature, there are various approaches in the differentiation of diverse types of tolerance subject to the localization of its direction. Generally, it may be inner or outer relatively to a subject.

The inner tolerance (inner resistance) is characterized by ability to make a decisions and thinking a problem even not all facts and possible consequences are known, it is an ability to keep balance to various unforeseen situations: conflicts, ambiguity, risk, stress, stand the strain of crisis, problem situations (N. L. Okoneshnikova, N. G. Kapustina). Inner tolerance includes psycho-physic and frustrated tolerance: psycho-physic — lack or slackening the reaction to any unfavorable factor as a result of sensitivity reduction; frustrated — ability to withstand various vital difficulties without losing psychological adaptation; at the basis lies ability to sufficiently estimate actual situation and ability to foreseen a solution [10]. According to K. Rogers and J. Budjental, inner tolerance (autotolerance) is a characteristic of an individual who knows and acknowledges own “I”, accepts itself as it is, analyses its words and deeds, draws conclusions from its mistakes (K. Rogers, J. Budjental). Yu. V. Kuznetsova considers tolerance as an ability to take a reflective position relatively its own values and aims [17].

Outer tolerance expresses relatively others; it is a persuasion that other may have own attitude, ability to see things from different points of view, considering various factors (N. L. Okoneshnikova), relationship among certain individuals, acceptance, respect other person identity without losing own “Self” integrity, individual willingness to conscious actions to achieve humanistic relations among persons, integral feature of professionalism in “individual-individual” activity area [17], defines the relations in society [10].

According to V. A. Tishkov tolerance expresses at two levels: political, as an action or effected norm and psychological expressed in the inner set and individual attitude [18]. Proposed by V. A. Tishkov the first level of tolerance (political) may be attributed to the outer tolerance since it is expressed as an action and the second level (psychological) may be attributed to the inner tolerance since it is expressed as an inner set.

In literature, there are also approaches to actual and virtual tolerance subject to the frequency and quality of contacts.

Actual tolerance occurs under the assumption of tolerance subject interaction with alien to him a phenomenon. This interaction may be direct when tolerance subject contacts alien phenomenon, and indirect, when tolerance subject contacts though other persons (children, parents, friends and etc.), who interacts with the alien phenomenon.

Virtual tolerance occurs provided to lack of contacts. Tolerance subject has a superficial knowledge of the phenomenon, derived from mass media, rumors or other odd information. With virtual tolerance level of the subject’s knowledge of the phenomenon is very low. These varieties may be attributed to the tolerance types subject to the subject implication too direct and indirect.

Thus, against the tolerance location it may be distinguished on inner and outer relatively to the subject; and by subject implication on direct and indirect tolerance.

Analyzing segregated levels of tolerance localization suggested by various researchers, it may be clustered into micro, macro and mega by strata it I expressed in. For example, such types of tolerance as individual tolerance, auto-tolerance (K. Rogers, J. Budjental), personal tolerance (by Otfried Hoffe) are inner tolerance occurring on micro-strata, it may be symbolically called an individual. Interpersonal, social tolerance (by Otfried Hoffe) is outer tolerance occurring on micro-

strata, it may be called interpersonal. Intergroup, Межгрупповая, interethnic tolerance, political tolerance (Otfried Hoffe, V. A. Tishkova) are outer tolerance occurring on mega strata, it may be called intersocial.

Thus by localizing tolerance by strata may discern micro stratum (individual), macro stratum (interpersonal) and mega stratum (intersocial).

Systemizing types of tolerance against its quality it may be also seen the diversity of opinions and approaches to its classification.

According to G. L. Bardier tolerance against occurrence, extent is divided into low, medium and high tolerance types [2]. In our view, medium level in differences levels fraught with high risk of systematic mistakes. Therefore, to minimize possible boundary inaccuracy we suggest two differences extent: low and high.

Colligating suggested tolerance type versions, it may be conditionally marked out two variations demonstrating tolerance quality: it is tolerance occurrence extent which may be low or high; and tolerance occurrence intensity which may be superficial or underlying.

Chart

PROCEDURAL ASPECTS OF “TOLERANCE” PHENOMENON

<i>№</i>	<i>Procedural aspects</i>	<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Types</i>
1	Tolerance causative processes	Tolerance causes, factors	Unfavorable factor
			Favorable factor
			Vague factor
		Tolerance result	Destructive
			Constructive
2	Tolerance process	By tolerance object	Object/objects
			Subject/subjects — Anatomic features — Psycho–physic features — Social features
		By form	Response with more emotional component
			Attitude, with more cognitive component
			Action with more behavioral component
		Localization by effect	Relatively subject — Inner — Outer
			By subject implication — Direct — Indirect
		Localization by strata	Micro stratum (individual)
			Macro stratum (interpersonal)
			Mega stratum (intersocial)
		By quality	Occurrence extent — Low — High
			Occurrence intensity: — Superficial — Underlying

Thus, tolerance against occurrence may be divided by subject; occurrence form; extent localization relatively subject and its implication; localization by strata; and by the quality of occurrence extent and intensity. In turn tolerance subject may be object/objects and subject/subjects,

its anatomic, psycho–physic, social features. Tolerance form may be a response to the more emotional component; subject attitude to an object with the more cognitive component; and action with the more behavioral component. Localization by tolerance extent against subject may be inner and outer. While by subject implication tolerance may be direct or indirect. Localization by strata may occur on micro, micro and mega strata, or individual, interpersonal and intersocial. Tolerance quality may be discerned by extent: low and high; or by tolerance occurrence intensity: superficial and underlying.

Summarizing conducted analysis of the procedural aspects of tolerance phenomenon it may be concluded that it is differentiated to:

- tolerance causative processes (by causes and results);
- tolerance occurrence process (by object, form, extent localization, strata, and quality);

This analytically structured approach to a procedural aspect of “tolerance” phenomenon is graphically demonstrated in below chart.

#### *References:*

1. Asmolov A. G. Tolerance: different paradigms of analysis. Tolerance in social awareness in Russia. Moscow, Meaning, 1998. 246 p.
2. Bardier G. L. Social psychology of tolerance. Synopsis of thesis. Dissertation for getting the degree Doctor of psychological sciences. St. Petersburg, 2007, 45 p.
3. Baturina O. S., Kornieko A. F. Reflection of notion tolerance in consciousness of students. Psychology of consciousness: modern state and perspectives. Materials of first Russian conference. Samara, 2007, pp. 354–356.
4. Baxtin M. M. To philosophy of action. Philosophy and sociology and technology: Annual. Moscow, 1986.
5. Boyko V. V., Kovalev A. G., Panferov V. N. Social — psychological climate of collective and personality. Moscow, Idea, 1983. 207 p.
6. Bratchenko S. L. Psychological base of research about tolerance in educational process. Pedagogical development: key components and their information. Krasnoyarsk, 2003, pp. 104–117.
7. Valitova R. R. Tolerance: defect or virtue? Bulletin of Moscow University. Philosophy, 1996, no. 1, pp. 33–37.
8. Grinshpoon I. B. Conception and containing characteristics of tolerance (to the question about tolerance as psychological phenomena) / Tolerance consciousness and formation of tolerance relations (theory and practice): Collection of scientific methods. Voronezh: MODEK, 2002, pp. 31–40.
9. Drobizheva L. M. Sociology of interethnic tolerance / Under the editorship of L. M. Drobizheva Moscow, Institute of Sociology RAN, 2003. 222 p.
10. Kapustina N. G. Psychological features of formation of tolerance in the structure of world–look in the early period of ontogenesis: Monography. Shadrinsk, 2008.
11. Kleptsova E. Yu. Psychology and pedagogics of tolerance: For listeners of system further professional pedagogical knowledge. Moscow, Academy project, 2004. 176 p.
12. Lebedeva N. M. Theoretical–methodical foundations of research of ethnic identification and tolerance in polycultural regions of Russia and CIS. Identity and tolerance / Under the editorship of N. M. Lebedeva. Moscow, Institute of ethnology and anthropology RAN, 2002. 105 p.
13. Petritskiy V. A. Tolerance — universal ethnic principle. Izvestiya, St. Petersburg wood–technical academy. St. Petersburg, 1993.
14. Petrovskiy A. V. Personality in psychology: paradigms of subjectivism. Rostov–on–Don: Pheonix, 1996. 512 p.
15. Ryumshina L. Yu. Library of psychology and pedagogic of tolerance. Questions of psychology, 2002, no. 2, pp. 130–131.
16. Semenova E. M. Psychological meaning of the concept of tolerance. Tolerance in modern society: the experience of scientific researches: a collection of scientific articles / Under the



scientific editorship of M. V. Novikov, N. V. Nizhegorodtseva. Yaroslavl: YaGPU, 2011, pp. 309–311.

17. Stepanov P. Tolerant man: How must we bring up him? National education, 2001, no. 6.

18. Tishkov V. A. Tolerance and agreement in transformational society Theory and politics of ethnics in Russia. Moscow, Russian world, 1997, pp. 256–274.

19. Sheburakov I. B. Formation of state clerk's tolerance to the negative psychological interaction of professional environment: Synopsis to the thesis for getting the degree of the candidate of psychological sciences. Moscow, 2002, 184 p.

#### Список литературы:

1. Асмолов А. Г. Толерантность: различные парадигмы анализа // Толерантность в общественном сознании России. М.: Смысл, 1998. 246 с.

2. Бардиер Г. Л. Социальная психология толерантности: автореф. дис. ... д-ра. психол. наук. Санкт-Петербург, 2007. 45 с.

3. Батурина О. С., Корниенко А. Ф. Отражение понятия «толерантность» в сознании студенческой молодежи // I Всероссийская конференция «Психология сознания: современное состояние и перспективы» (29 июня — 1 июля 2007 г.): материалы Самара, 2007. С. 354–356.

4. Бахтин М. М. К философии поступка // Философия и социология науки и техники: ежегодник. М., 1986.

5. Бойко В. В., Ковалев А. Г., Панферов В. Н. Социально-психологический климат коллектива и личность. М.: Мысль. 1983. 207 с.

6. Братченко С. Л. Психологические основания исследования толерантности в образовании // Педагогика развития: ключевые компетентности и их становление. Красноярск, 2003. С. 104–117.

7. Валитова Р. Р. Толерантность: порок или добродетель? // Вестн. Моск. Университета. Сер. Философия. 1996. №1. С. 33–37.

8. Гриншпун И. Б. Понятие и содержательные характеристики толерантности (к вопросу о толерантности как психическом явлении) // Толерантное сознание и формирование толерантных отношений (теория и практика): сб. науч.-метод. ст. М.: Изд. МПСИ; Воронеж: МОДЭК, 2002. С. 31–40.

9. Дробижева Л. М. Социология межэтнической толерантности / отв. ред. Л. М. Дробижева. М.: Изд-во Ин-та социологии РАН, 2003. 222 с.

10. Капустина Н. Г. Психологические особенности формирования толерантности в структуре мировоззрения на ранних этапах онтогенеза. Шадринск, 2008.

11. Клепцова Е. Ю. Психология и педагогика толерантности. М.: Академ. проект, 2004. 176 с.

12. Лебедева Н. М. Теоретико-методологические основы исследования этнической идентификации и толерантности в поликультурных регионах России и СНГ // Идентичность и толерантность / под ред. Н. М. Лебедевой. М.: Изд-во Ин-та этнологии и антропологии РАН, 2002. 105 с.

13. Петрицкий В. А. Толерантность — универсальный этический принцип // Известия СП лесотехнической академии. СПб., 1993.

14. Петровский А. В. Личность в психологии: парадигма субъективности. Ростов-на-Дону: Феникс, 1996. 512 с.

15. Рюмина Л. Ю. Библиотека психологии и педагогики толерантности // Вопросы психологии. 2002. №2. С. 130–131.

16. Семенова Е. М. Психологическое содержание понятия толерантность // Толерантность в современном обществе: опыт междисциплинарных исследований: сборник научных статей / под научн. ред. М. В. Новикова, Н. В. Нижегородцевой. Ярославль: Изд-во ЯГПУ, 2011. 357 с.

17. Степанов П. Толерантный человек: Как его воспитать? // Народное образование. 2001. №6.

18. Тишков В. А. Толерантность и согласие в трансформирующихся обществах. Очерки теории и политики этничности в России. М.: Русский мир, 1997. С. 256–274.

19. Шебураков И. Б. Формирование толерантности государственного служащего к негативным психологическим воздействиям профессиональной. М., 2002. 184 с.

*Работа поступила  
в редакцию 18.09.2016 г.*

*Принята к публикации  
22.09.2016 г.*