

# **Empirical Research of Students' Tolerance in Extramural and Distance Education**

**Chernyaeva Irina Vasil'evna**

*Lecturer*

*Financial University under the Government of the Russian Federation,*

*Moscow*

**Abstract.** The article substantiates the need for the development of tolerance among students at the university. The content of the key concepts "tolerance", "intolerance", "intercultural dialogue" is revealed on the basis of the theoretical analysis of psychological and pedagogical literature. The article considers the issues of tolerance in cross-cultural communication and summarises advanced experience in the field of fostering ethnic tolerance in students as a preventive measure. The article presents the statistical data of the empirical study on the method of determining the tolerant attitude to representatives of other cultures "Tolerance Index" (G. U. Soldatova, O. A. Krivtsova, etc.). The results revealed the average level of tolerance among the respondents.

**Keywords:** cross-cultural dialogue; tolerance; intolerance; methods of pedagogical research.

## **Introduction**

The relevance of the research topic is determined by the processes of globalization and international integration, which has exacerbated the problems of tolerance in intercultural communication in all spheres of human activity: socio-economic, political, cultural, religious, educational, which negatively affect the stability of the progressive development of the world as a whole.

The need for the formation of ethno-cultural competence and ethnic tolerance among students is caused by the processes of national and cultural self-determination of the peoples of Russia; migration flows to the Russian Federation from the CIS countries, with which local residents have conflicts on the basis of differences between ethnic groups. [7, c. 532-534].

The problems of tolerance are considered with the aim of educating young people in a culture of peace, legal and political culture in the context of multicultural education, which has a significant impact on the cultural self-determination of students. [15, c. 96-110].

**Purpose of the study** – to establish the level of tolerance of students of extramural and distance education as an integral part of the intercultural competence of the individual, which is necessary for professional and interpersonal communication in the intercultural space of the modern

information society. To achieve this goal, the following tasks were solved: 1) identify the content of the key concepts of the research topic: "tolerance", "tolerance", "intercultural dialogue»; 2) to measure the general level of tolerance of students and its aspects (ethnic, social and tolerance as a personality trait); 3) to draw the appropriate conclusions on the basis of the analysis of the conducted questionnaire.

### **Materials and methods**

In the course of the research, methods of analysis and synthesis of scientific and methodological literature on the stated problem, psychological and pedagogical methods (survey, questionnaire), and statistical method were used.

The theoretical basis of the research was made up of works in the field of: 1) cross-cultural and ethnic psychology (G. U. Soldatova [13]); 2) dialogue of cultures (V. V. Safonova [11]); also works devoted to: 3) I-concepts in the theory of personality (k. Rogers [9]); 4) psychological aspects of personal development (G. Allport [1]); 5) concepts of spiritual and moral development and education of the individual (A. Danilyuk, A. Kondakov, V. Tishkov) [4]; and: 6) normative documents (Declaration of the Principles of Tolerance: approved by resolution 5.61 of the UNESCO General Conference of November 16, 1995 [5]).

In pedagogical science, there are methods of pedagogical research, including techniques, procedures, operations, with the help of which processes and phenomena are investigated in order to obtain scientific information. Empirical methods, such as testing, observation, conversation, and questioning, are used to identify judgments, assessments, and attitudes to a particular problem.

The oral survey is usually conducted in the form of a conversation, during which students' communicative competencies are developed. With the development of electronic forms of communication, the method of questioning by e-mail or on the Moodle platform is used in educational activities, with the help of which it is possible to investigate various pedagogical phenomena: motivation for activity, research and creative activity; communication skills; to establish the attitude of students to the acute problems of modern society.

One of such problems is the problem of tolerance, the essence and types of which are widely considered by modern researchers in various humanities. The term "tolerance", which has become an international term, is directly related to the problems of the human world at all levels: family, inter-group, inter-ethnic, inter-confessional, and international relations.

The official document of the UNESCO Declaration of Principles of Tolerance of 1995, in particular Article 4.2., refers to the adoption of urgent measures for education in the spirit of tolerance against violence and exclusion, the creation and implementation of programs in the

education system aimed at the formation of a tolerant culture and promoting legal education, with special attention to proactive measures against racism, xenophobia, discrimination. [5].

The analysis of psychological and pedagogical works shows a wide range of different descriptions of the essence of tolerance, its structure, functions, types and different approaches to research. S. L. Bratchenko [3] considers tolerance from the point of view of a dialogical approach, K. Rogers [9] uses a humanistic approach, describing the specific features of self-actualization: tension, overcoming obstacles in the struggle, mobility, openness, independence, self-reliance, development in the direction of complexity, self-sufficiency, maturity, competence.

The studied concept of "tolerance", from the point of view of E. S. Sukhykh, tolerance is understood in many ways: as a resistance to uncertainty, stress, conflict situations, behavioral deviations. Its manifestations are observed in various forms and at different levels: from indifference and detachment from society or humility for the sake of peace to openness, curiosity, interest in dissimilarity, approval and respect for the rights of the other. [14, c. 66-77].

According to G. L. Bardier, nonviolent behavior in relation to religious, cultural, moral, political problems of people or social groups is tolerance. In a diverse world, tolerance in situations of dialogue of cultures means strong, sustainable and peaceful coexistence, reaching an agreement by non-violent methods in conditions of different views on the issues discussed, using a rational approach. [2, c. 3].

The concept of "tolerance" is often associated with the American psychologist G. W. Allport, who developed the theory of personality traits and generically characterized a tolerant and non-tolerant personality according to certain parameters.: ability to empathize, security, lack of need for certainty, sense of humor, self-knowledge, self-criticism, responsibility, desire for freedom and democracy. An intolerant person, in his opinion, is characterized by the desire to belong to a national group or organization where he feels safe [1].

The term intolerance is used to describe situations of violence, discrimination, violation of human rights, escalation of social instability, and the desire for strict uniformity. To more clearly explain the understanding of intolerance, A. P. Sadokhin identified the following forms of its manifestation: insults, ridicule, disdainful attitude; negative stereotypes, prejudices, prejudices based on negative traits and qualities; discrimination on various grounds in the form of deprivation of social benefits, restrictions on human rights, artificial isolation in society; racism, nationalism, exploitation, fascism; desecration of religious and cultural monuments; religious persecution; ethnocentrism [10, p.242].

The debatable problem of tolerance in the context of globalization also concerns intercultural communication, which requires the ability to establish a constructive intercultural

dialogue based on digital technologies, including electronic communication; foreign language skills as a means of communication, which is facilitated by the use of the technology of cultural dialogue in the classroom [8, pp.21-24], on the basis of which a cultural picture of the world is formed, which helps to educate young people for tolerance to other cultures [6, 114-120]. Interacting with each other, students gain an understanding of the rich diversity of cultures, the ways and forms of human individuality, the awareness of their abilities and their own destiny.

Zh. M. Utegenov offers an effective program for the education of ethnic tolerance of students, the structure of which includes ideological, emotional and activity components. During extracurricular time, on the basis of universal values (benevolence, peacefulness, empathy, openness) in the form of an intercultural dialogue, students master folk wisdom: proverbs and sayings, the content of which presents the best human qualities, developing young people's aspirations for patriotism, interethnic understanding, peacefulness. [13, c. 6].

To create a tolerant, constructive relationship between the subjects of the educational process of the university, a purposeful system of developing the skills of tolerance, correct behavior in conflict situations, possession of coping strategies for solving both professional and personal and interpersonal problems is necessary, believes O. A. Selivanova. As a preventive measure to correct intolerant and extremist tendencies, the education process focuses on humane values, social responsibility, and active citizenship. In order to avoid negative manifestations in relation to the main cultural and national groups of students in an educational institution, it is recommended to fill national, religious, and cultural phenomena of reality with positive content [12].

Russian universities conduct social and educational work aimed at participating in cross-cultural communication and interaction based on a dialogue of cultures to prepare students for life in a multicultural society. Cross-cultural communication, in the understanding of V. V. Safonova, is a communicative interaction between people belonging to various geopolitical, continental, regional, religious, national, ethnic communities, social subcultures, differing in value orientations, lifestyle, models of speech and non-speech behavior. The key term in cross-cultural communication is "cultural dialogue". The basic principle of intercultural dialogue is mutual understanding and respect, an open exchange of views. [11, c. 123-138].

### **Results and discussion**

As a result of studying the sources on the problem of tolerance of university students, it was revealed that teachers use modern pedagogical technologies, active methods of teaching and upbringing (conversations and discussions, interviews, game methods, discussions, trainings, various test methods).

Our study was conducted at the Financial University during the 2019-2020 academic year with the aim to forming tolerance as a personality quality, along with openness, curiosity, rejection of prejudices, which is part of the structure of students' intercultural competence, which is an important component of foreign-language professional communicative competence.

In our research was used widely known in higher education institutions questionnaire "Tolerance Index", created on the basis of domestic and foreign experience in the field of psychology (G. U. Soldatova, O. A. Kravtsova, O. E. Khukhlaeva, L. A. Shaigerova.). The questionnaire includes statements that reveal a tolerant or intolerant attitude of a person to the surrounding world and people, as well as social attitudes that manifest themselves in the process of interaction in various fields of activity.

Students of 1-2 courses of extramural and distance learning in the number of 55 respondents aged 18 to 46 years from various ethnic groups: Russians (41 people); Armenians – 4 people); Koreans (3 people); Ukrainians (3 people); Kyrgyz (1 person); Georgians (1 person), Kabardin (1 person); Dagestani (1 person).took part in filling out the questionnaires.

Table 1. Distribution of respondents by training profile and gender, as a percentage of the total number of respondents

№	Direction of training	Gender. number		Total, %
		Female	Male.	
1.	Distance learning groups ("Economics", "Management", "Financial Management")	11	3	25,45%
2.	Extramural learning group(direction "Economics" of accelerated program)	5	4	16,36%
3.	Extramural learning group 1 (direction "Management" )	17	-	30,909%
4.	Extramural learning group 2 (direction "Management" )	10	5	27,27%
	Total: 55 respondents	43	12	100.0%

Students were offered a list of 22 direct and reverse statements. For direct statements, the points were distributed from 1 to 6 ("absolutely disagree" – 1 point, "completely agree" - 6 points). To reverse statements-reverse points ("absolutely disagree" - 6 points, "completely agree" - 1 point).

According to the received data of the questionnaire, a quantitative and qualitative analysis was carried out. Table 2 shows the overall results of the quantitative analysis without dividing the identified tolerance level into subscales of the groups that took part in the survey. The overall assessment of the level of tolerance was determined by three stages: low level of tolerance - from 22 to 60 points; average level – 61-99; high level – 100 to 132.

**Table 2. Group assessment of the identified level of tolerance without division into subscales**

Groups Tolerance Levels	Low level of tolerance (22-60)		Average level of tolerance (61-99)		High level of tolerance (100-132)	
	Number of participants	Percentage %	Number of participants	Percentage %	Number of participants	Percentage %
Distance learning groups	-	-	11	20%	3	5,45%
Accelerated Learning Group	-	-	7	12.72%	2	3,63%
Extramural Learning Group Management (1)	-	-	12	21,81%	5	5,45%
Extramural Learning Group Management (2)	-	-	10	18.18%	5	5.45%
Total: 55 (100%)	0	0	40	72,72%	15	19,98%

According to the creators of the questionnaire, a high level of tolerance (more than 115 points) can indicate a psychological infantilism of an individual, indifference or a desire to be friendly in social contacts. Among the respondents who scored more than 115 points – two people, which was 3.63% of the total number of participants in the survey. The results of the group assessment of the level of tolerance showed the average level of the majority of respondents-72.72%.

Then we conducted a diagnosis of the level of tolerance of students in three aspects: 1) ethnic tolerance – attitude to people of their own ethnic group, other race and ethnic group; 2) social tolerance-attitude to poor, mentally ill people and minorities; 3) tolerance as a personality trait – respect for a different point of view, readiness for constructive conflict resolution and fruitful cooperation.

Table 3 shows that the majority of students have a high (50.9%) and average (45.44%) level of tolerance towards representatives of other ethnic groups and positive attitudes in the field of intercultural communication. Two students have a low level (3.63%), which means that this category of respondents should be involved in interactive discussions on the development of empathy and tolerance, in university events dedicated to the issues of ethnographic literacy,

harmonization of interethnic relations, and be motivated to get acquainted and study the cultures and traditions of other peoples, including those living in Russia.

**Table 3. Tolerance indicators for the Ethnic tolerance subscale»**

The aspect of tolerance Groups	the Ethnic tolerance			Average mean
	Low Level – до 19 баллов	Average Level – 20-31 балл	High Level – 32 и более баллов	
Distance learning groups	Not fixed	9 (16,36%)	5 (9,09%)	31
Accelerated Learning Group	Not fixed	2 (3,63%)	7 (12,72%)	32,44
Extramural Learning Group (1)	Not fixed	10 (18,18%)	7 (12,72%)	30,23
Extramural Learning Group (2)	2 (3,63%)	4 (7,27%)	9 (16,36%)	26,66
njnal: 55 чел. (100%)	2 (3,63%)	25 (45,44%)	28 (50,9%)	120,33

Table 4 shows the results of the analysis of social tolerance, which allowed us to identify the average level (81.81%) of tolerant manifestations of students to various social groups (minorities, criminals, mentally ill people), as well as the attitudes of the individual in relation to certain social processes. The high level (14.54%) was shown by five and a half times less students than the average, and the intolerant manifestations were recorded in 3.63% of respondents.

**Table 4. Tolerance indicators for the "Social tolerance" subscale»**

The aspect of tolerance Groups	Social tolerance			Average mean
	Low Level – до 22 баллов	Average Level – 23-36 баллов	High Level – 37 и более баллов	
Distance learning groups	Not fixed	12 (21,81%)	1 (1,81%)	32,14
Accelerated Learning Group	Not fixed	8 (14,54%)	2 (3,63%)	32
Extramural Learning Group (1)	Not fixed	13 (23,63%)	4 (7,27%)	31,52
Extramural Learning Group (2)	2 (3,63%)	12 (21,81%)	1 (1,81%)	26,33
Total: 55 resp-s. (100%)	2 (3,63%)	45 (81,81%)	8 (14,54%)	121,99

Table 5 shows the results of the diagnosis of tolerance as a personality trait: high indicators – in 29 respondents (52.72%), average – in 26 (47.27%). The low level was not

recorded. The diagnosed personality traits largely determine a person's attitude to the world around him, his attitudes and beliefs.

**Table 5. Tolerance indicators for the subscale " Tolerance as a personality trait»**

The aspect of tolerance Groups	Tolerance as a personality trait				
	Low Level – до 19 баллов	Average Level – 20-31 балл	High Level – 32 и более баллов	Number of resp-s	Average mean
Distance learning groups	Not fixed	9 (16,36%)	5 (9,09%)	14	32,71
Accelerated Learning Group	Not fixed	4 (7,27%)	5 (9,09%)	9	31,44
Extramural Learning Group (1)	Not fixed	6 (10,9%)	11 (20%)	17	32,76
Extramural Learning Group (2)	Not fixed	7 (12,72%)	8 (14,54%)	15	28,6
Total: 55 resp-s. (100%)	0	26 (47,27%)	29 (52,72%)	55	125,31

### Conclusion

Based on the results of the study, the following conclusions were made: 1) according to the quantitative analysis of the overall result without dividing by scales, respondents in all groups showed an average level of tolerance (72.72%), which means the manifestation of both tolerant and intolerant traits in various social situations; intolerant manifestations were recorded on two scales ("Social tolerance" (3.6%) and " Ethnic tolerance "(3.6%)) in two respondents from Extramural Learning Group (2); this is explained by the fact that in all groups, except for this one, preliminary conversations were held on the topics of culture and intercultural communication, and the content of interethnic tolerance was discussed; it is likely that the existing experience of interaction with other cultures in interpersonal and professional communication among the respondents of distance education and their older age than the students of extramural education affected the results of the survey;

2) the analysis of scientific and pedagogical literature on the topic of the study allowed to learn various points of view, approaches of researchers to the content of the key concepts of "tolerance", "intolerance", as well as the interdisciplinary status of the problem of tolerance were identified. The debatable problem of tolerance in the context of globalization in the context of intercultural communication requires a more detailed consideration on the basis of intercultural dialogue by electronic means of communication using digital technologies;

3) as a result of the analysis of the questionnaire and best practices in the education of tolerance at the university, it is possible to develop methodological and didactic materials that



contribute to the development of a tolerant culture of students, which will expand the capabilities of the English teacher in the formation of intercultural competence of students on the basis of digital technologies.

### References

1. Allport G. Tolerantnaya lichnost ' [Tolerant personality]. 2011. No. 2 (6). pp. 155-159.
2. Bardier G. L. Social psychology of tolerance. Autoreferat diss. Ph. D. in Psychology. 2007. Saint-Petersburg. 45 p.
3. Bratchenko S. L. Interpersonal dialogue and its main attributes // Psychology with a human face: a humanistic perspective in post-Soviet psychology / ed. D. A. Lent'yev, V. G. Shchur. M.: Smysl, 1997. pp. 201-222.
4. Danilyuk A., Kondakov A., Tishkov V. The concept of spiritual and moral development and education of the individual citizen of Russia. Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 2010. 25 p.
5. Declaration of the principles of Tolerance [Electronic resource]: Approved by resolution 5.61 of the UNESCO General Conference of November 16, 1995. URL : <https://06spb.edusite.ru/p94aa1.html>. [Electronic resource: URL: [https://www.un.org/ru/documents/decl\\_conv/declarations/toleranc.shtml](https://www.un.org/ru/documents/decl_conv/declarations/toleranc.shtml)
6. Karmova M. R., Maksimova O. I. Dialog kultyry [Dialog Culture: from Conflict to Mutual Understanding: materials of the Second International Scientific and Practical Conference (Moscow, April 21-25, 2020)], edited by L. G. Vikulova, Moscow: Languages of the Peoples of the World, 2020, pp. 114-120.
7. Leontiev M. G. Multicultural education and the formation of ethno-cultural competence of university students // Bulletin of the Moscow State University of Civil Engineering. 2011. No. 6. C. 532-534.
8. Mashanova S. M., Kylyshpaeva M. Kh., Kylyshpaeva S. Kh. Development of students ' tolerance by means of the English language in higher education institutions. Questions of theory and practice. 2019. Vol. 4.Issue. 2. pp. 21-24.
9. Rogers K. R. View on psychotherapy. The formation of man / trans. from the English by M. M. Isenina; general ed. and preface by E. I. Isenina. M.: Progress; Univers, 1994. 480 p.
10. Sadokhin A. P. Cross-cultural communication. Moscow: Alfa-M; INFRA-M, 2004. 310 p.

11. Safonova V. V. Co-study of languages and cultures in the mirror of world trends in the development of modern language education // *Language and culture*. 2014. No. 1 (25). pp. 123-141.
12. Selivanova O. A. Main directions of prevention of intolerance and extremism in the environment of a modern regional university // *Education and Science*. 2012. No. 3. pp. 74-79. 24.
13. Soldatova G. U. Tolerance: psychological stability and moral imperative // *Practicum on psychodiagnostics and research of tolerance* / ed. by G. U. Soldatova, L. A. Shaigerova. Moscow: Lomonosov Moscow State University, 2003. pp. 4-13.
14. Sukhykh E. S. Tolerance: psychological content and personal factors. *Community. Management*. 2005. No. 4. pp. 66-77.
15. Sysoyev P. V. Linguistic multicultural education in the XXI century // *Language and culture*. 2009. No. 2 (6). pp. 96-110.
16. Utegenov Zh. M. Education of ethnic tolerance of students in extracurricular time (based on the material of the Republic of Kazakhstan): autoref. diss. ... k. p. n. M., 2011. 22 p.