

Vasyl Haluziak¹

Department of Pedagogy and Professional Education at Vinnytsia State Pedagogical University named after Mykhailo Kotsiubynskyi Ukraine, Vinnytsia

Iryna Kholkovska²

Department of Pedagogy and Professional Education at Vinnytsia State Pedagogical University named after Mykhailo Kotsiubynskyi Ukraine, Vinnytsia

Tolerance as a Criterion of a Teacher's Personal Maturity

Abstract: Targeted modernization of education on the basis of humanization and democratization significantly change the requirements for the professional position and strategy of a teacher, provide the rejection of the directive role, the adoption of the standards of tolerant interaction with students on the personal level. A high level of personal maturity one of the manifestations of which is tolerance is expected from a modern teacher. Tolerance is defined as a complex personality trait that determines the degree of individual sensitivity to deviation from a standard, tension, instability and contradictions in interpersonal relationships. Tolerance characterizes the general attitude of a teacher to something different in its various expressions. It is the position of recognition of other values, views and customs as their own, regardless of the degree of agreement with them. Tolerance should not be equated with toleration, indifference, indulgence, alienation, positive attitude or friendliness as these phenomena, although related to tolerance, do not reveal its essence by themselves. Tolerance is a manifestation of a conscious, meaningful and responsible choice of an individual of their own position and activity aimed at building partnerships. Focusing on the positive aspects of tolerance, it is not necessary to absolutise it as it has the limits of constructive expression and does not extend to such destructive forms of behavior as aggression, hostility, violence, etc. The genuine tolerance is possible only in the unity and interconnection with other qualities of a mature personality: self-determination, inner freedom, objectivity, critical and dialectical thinking, moderation, sense of proportion, empathy, the presence of an internal position, etc. The psychological content of a teacher's tolerance can not be reduced to a separate quality or characteristic. This is a complex, multidimensional phenomenon that has several basic measurements: cognitive, emotional and behavioral.

Key words: teacher's personal maturity, tolerance, intolerance, structure of pedagogical tolerance, indicators of teacher's tolerance.

¹ E-mail: wgaluz@gmail.com

² E-mail: irholk@gmail.com

Orientation of modern education to the principles of humanization and democratization significantly changes the requirements for the professional position of teachers, involves refusal from the directive role and transition to a dialogic strategy of educational interaction, which is characterized by the tolerant attitude to pupils. The effectiveness of the teacher's activity depends not only on possession of methods, means and techniques of education, but on the establishment of tolerant interaction, planning of professional activities taking into account the principles of tolerance. Understanding, acceptance, positive attitude to people irrespective of their individual characteristics help the teacher to avoid confrontation, to establish constructive relations with the subjects of the pedagogical process.

Humanization of the pedagogical process requires from the teacher not only a thorough methodological preparation but, above all, a high level of personal maturity, with the tolerance as one of its criteria, that is a tolerant attitude to individual differences, dissimilarity, uncertainty (G. Allport, A. Maslow, C. Rogers, D. Leontiev, O. Asmolov and others). Among the features of a mature person, G. Allport [2002] distinguishes tolerant attitude to the differences in values and attitudes, to frustration and individual disadvantages, the tendency to express personal thoughts and feelings taking into account other people. Among five characteristics of a fully functioning individual, C. Rogers [1994] distinguishes "organismic trust", i.e. the trust of a man to himself, the consistency of the I-real and I-ideal. The person who has such coherence is also inclined to accept, respect, appreciate other people, and show tolerant attitude to them. Modern psychologists also consider tolerance to be one of the important indicators of the individual's maturity, which expressed by the ability to regulate contradictory individual meanings (D. Leontiev, O. Asmolov, B. Bratus, etc.).

Tolerance refers to professionally important qualities of the teacher who has to be in contact with different categories of people during the pedagogical process, namely: students, colleagues, parents, school administration, and representatives of educational authorities. Although the participants of the pedagogical process often have different views and value orientations, the teacher must take into account all the positions and consider them in his activities. This is possible only if he has sufficiently formed such personal quality as tolerance. The importance of this parameter of the teacher's personality maturity is determined by the fact that nowadays social differences between students, parents have increased significantly, and the individual and psychological differentiation of schoolchildren have also increased. There are often children of different nationalities in the classes, which was not typical for Ukrainian schools until recently. All this causes high demands to the teacher's personal maturity, which is expressed, in particular, in his tolerance.

The phenomenon of tolerance has attracted attention of many scholars who have considered its various aspects and characteristics. In particular, philosophical and

socio-cultural aspects of tolerance are clarified in the studies by S. Holenkov, A. Drobnyskiy, V. Zolotukhin, Y. Ishchenko, P. Kozyrev, V. Lektorskiy, A. Mahomedova, M. Orekhova, V. Petrytskiy, L. Skvortsova, B. William, M. Waltzer and others. The psychological analysis of tolerance is presented in the works of O. Asmolov, N. Astashova, V. Boiko, M. Boritko, S. Bratchenko, P. Walitova, B. Wolfov, I. Hrinshpun, O. Kleptsova, O. Kuzybetskiy, L. Mitina, P. Komohorov and others. The problem of tolerance was studied in the context of the individual's psychological stability in stressful situations (L. Abolin, A. Olshannikova, et al.), frustration of tolerance (H. Zarembo), influence of tolerance on the course of conflict (M. Mirimanova).

The concept of tolerance in psychological science has been actively used in recent decades. However, while studying this phenomenon, researchers are still faced with the problem of its definition, determination of structural components, types, borders, etc. Tolerance is considered as the ability to withstand stress loads, as a decrease in the sensitivity to the effects of adverse factors, and as an establishment of the liberal acceptance of patterns of behavior, beliefs, and values of another person. Quite often, tolerance is explicitly or implicitly identified with benevolence, toleration, mercy, empathy, leniency, and other meaningfully similar characteristics. It happens that researchers mean qualitatively different phenomena, when defining tolerance, which are little interconnected. Complexity and multi-aspect nature of the concepts of "tolerance", "pedagogical tolerance" make it difficult to conduct psychological and pedagogical research. There is a need to specify the content of these concepts and methodologically substantiate identification of specific indicators of tolerance in the field of pedagogical interaction.

The most generalized view of the concept of tolerance is presented in the philosophical works of A. Iliin, Y. Ishchenko, V. Tyshkov, V. Zolotukhin and others. In the philosophical encyclopedic dictionary, the following definition of tolerance is proposed, "toleration of another kind of views, tempers, habits. Tolerance is necessary in relation to the peculiarities of different peoples, nations and religions. It is a sign of self-confidence and awareness of the reliability of the individual positions, a sign of an open-minded ideology that is not afraid of comparing with other views and does not avoid spiritual competition, is expressed in the striving for the mutual respect, understanding and reconciliation of heterogeneous interests and positions without pressure, mainly by methods of clarification and persuasion" [Gubsky 2009, p. 457].

The dictionary of philosophical terms emphasizes the difference between tolerance and toleration. "Tolerance is not limited to simple toleration. Toleration emphasizes the way of treating unpleasant or inappropriate objects, namely: their permissive admission or forced patience without the use of violence. Such an external form of behavior often conceals the internal hostility and ignorance of another. Unlike toleration, tolerance implies the right of a person to preserve his autonomy. As a quality of

the personality, tolerance involves disposition for a parity dialogue, perception of the new, “alien”, and it does not exclude the possibility of changing the system of views and ideas of the individual” [Kuznetsov 2009, p. 590].

V. Petrytskyi distinguishes three ways of understanding tolerance:

- subject’s toleration of another subject, despite possible initial negative assessment of tastes, behaviors, style of behavior, lifestyle, and another culture;
- acceptance of the right for existence of other tastes, behaviors, behavior style, ways of thinking that are different from mine, and more widely, another culture;
- internally perceived toleration based on the morally understanding empathy [Petrytskyi 1993].

Having analyzing different approaches to interpretation of the essence of tolerance in the philosophical literature V. Lectorskyi [1997] have distinguished four main ways of understanding this phenomenon:

- “tolerance as indifference” implies the existence of thoughts, the truth of which can never be proved (religious views, specific values of different cultures, special ethnic beliefs, etc.);
- “tolerance as impossibility of mutual understanding” restricts manifestation of toleration by the respect to another, who at the same time cannot be understood and interacted with;
- “tolerance as leniency” is recognition of the privileged position of one's own position, all other views are considered to be weaker, i.e. they can be tolerated, but at the same time they can be neglected;
- “tolerance as an extension of the individual experience and critical dialogue”- each culture, value system and cognitive system not only struggles with another system but anyway it tries to take into account the experience of another system, thereby expanding the horizon of its own experience. In this case, tolerance is understood as respect for another position combined with the aim of the mutual change of views (and in some cases even the change of individual and cultural identity) as a result of a critical dialogue.

The Declaration of Tolerance Principles adopted on November 16, 1995 in Paris defines tolerance as “respect, acceptance and proper understanding of the variable diversity of the world's cultures, our forms of self-expression and ways of manifestation of human individuality” [Declaration 2001, p. 110]. In this definition, attention is focused on the object of manifestation of the tolerant attitude, which is expressed by the diversity both at the level of cultures and at the level of individual identities. Tolerance is a form of attitude towards another, distinct, diverse, which does not coincide with both individual characteristics and usual forms of the culture. O. Asmolov also focuses on this aspect of tolerance, “Tolerance is the norm of the value of differences of another person and support of these differences” [Asmolov 2004, p. 7].

D. Leontiev [2009] equitably points to a certain ambiguity of such interpretation of tolerance. First, it remains unclear who can be the subject of a tolerant attitude – individuals or social groups, cultures, subcultures? Should tolerance be considered as a phenomenon of the individual or group mentality? Secondly, the expression “correct understanding” used in the definition requires clarification: what is the essence of such an understanding, what does correct understanding of the diversity mean? In addition, focusing on such features as respect and acceptance raises questions about the limits of tolerance: is it always an absolute benefit? What is more expedient: maximum or optimal tolerance, the excess of which leads to unscrupulous, permissiveness and passivity? In particular, V. Frankl believed that the tolerance, which was misunderstood, could lead so far that the other person may even get the right to be intolerant [Frankl 1982, p. 80]. Misunderstanding of tolerance is conditioned by its absolutisation as a moral ideal, ignoring a bilateral nature of interpersonal relationships and the principle of mutual responsibility, which is considered to be one of the conditions of true tolerance.

Researchers express different views on who can be the subject of tolerance. In theoretical and empirical studies of tolerance, phenomena relating to different levels of reality are considered: public practice, social consciousness, individual consciousness, personal structures, and behavior of individual individuals. One of the most meaningful and multifaceted definitions of tolerance was proposed by G. Soldatova, who considers this phenomenon as “the integral characteristic of the individual, which determines his ability in difficult and crisis situations to actively interact with the external environment in order to restore his nervously-psychic balance, successful adaptation, avoidance confrontation and the development of positive relationships with yourself and the world around you” [Soldatova 2003, p. 84]. In this definition, the phenomenon of tolerance is completely localized in the field of individual psychological features of person. Structural components of tolerance G. Soldatova considers the psychological stability, the system of positive attitudes, a complex of individual qualities, the system of personal and group values [Soldatova 2003, p. 62]. Such interpretation appears to be excessively wide and vague, since it erases the specific features that distinguish tolerance from other substantially similar personality characteristics, for example, sustainability or adaptability.

Tolerance is often mistakenly identified with other meaningfully similar phenomena, for example, toleration. In the scientific literature, the term “tolerance to uncertainty”, “tolerance to pain”, “tolerance to stress”, etc., are used quite often, which characterize endurance, individual's stability to the adverse factors. However, as rightly noted by D. Leontiev and V. Usachova, the concept of “toleration” does not reflect the fullness of the concept of “tolerance”, and may even have the opposite meaning [Leontiev2004]. The verb “endure” has, if not negative, at least an ambivalent emotional color: patience is always passive and only means external restraint of

its intolerable attitude. In contrast, in the Declaration of Principles on Tolerance refers about “active attitude formed on the basis of the recognition of universal rights and basic human freedoms” [Declaration 2001, p. 110]. Tolerant position is characteristic of a mature person who is self-confident and does not see the threat that other people, social groups or cultures adhere to other views and values. Weak, inadequately mature person, this fact frightens, strains, resulting in an intolerant attitude. In contrast to tolerance, toleration only on the external level, in terms of behavior, real interaction manifests itself in a calm attitude to other thoughts and values, but on an emotional level, it is characterized by a distinct discomfort and stress that brings it closer to intolerance.

According to E. Smirnova, “the notion of tolerance in its modern sense provides not a humble and toleration attitude to unpleasant people or actions, but rather commitment and benevolence, respect and recognition of others, recognition of their right to their own lifestyle, their attitude to them as to himself” [Smirnova 2003, p. 1–12]. In such an interpretation, the concept of “tolerance” is not connected with the restraint of their hostility through volitional effort, but rather involves the desire to understand and accumulate experience of interaction with new, unusual objects.

Some scholars, trying to emphasize the difference tolerance of toleration, fall into another outrage, in general pushing the latter out of tolerance. For example, T. Fadicieva notes: “If teacher does not allow himself to express his negative attitude towards a student, that is, he shows toleration, this should not be seen as an expression of tolerance”. Therefore, we believe that toleration should not be part of the structure of the concept of “tolerance of the teacher” [Fadicieva 2011, p. 196]. Obviously, toleration, without being equivalent to tolerance, is an integral part of it. From the point of view of A. Petrytskyi, A. Zymbula, Y. Ishchenko, V. Zolotukhin, S. Golovin, O. Asmolov, G. Soldatova, toleration forms part of the tolerance as a broader concept.

In some cases, tolerance is identified with positive attitude, acceptance, respect and friendliness. However, this analogy is also superficial and follows from the obvious fact that tolerance is usually combined with positive attitude, but intolerance always serves as a source of hatred and enmity. Researchers rightly observe that the main content characteristic of a tolerant relationship is not that it is associated with love, respect and acceptance, but that it excludes hatred and enmity. An emotional background of tolerance may be a completely neutral attitude, which, in turn, should not be equated with indifference. Neutral attitudes can indicate a lack of bias and serve as a perfectly acceptable backdrop for constructive communication and joint activities. Conversely, love and acceptance do not guarantee a tolerant attitude. In family education, cases of despotic, intolerant love, when a father or mother, blinded by their own feelings, often do not see in their child a real personality with their own peculiarities.

Despite the fact that a tolerant attitude can be manifested in a neutral emotional background, it is erroneous to identify tolerance with indifference, disinterest, alienation. V. Lectorskyi, analyzing different views on tolerance (as indifference, as a statement of the impossibility of mutual understanding and as a supportive supremacy), points to their ineffectiveness and suggests a proper interpretation of tolerance as a critical dialogue, which contributes to the expansion of individual experience [Lectorskyi 2006].

From a psychological point of view, tolerance means, on the one hand, the absence of an authoritarian syndrome in an individual (egocentric claims to “the last truth”, simplified, “linear” thinking, “black and white” perception, predisposition to aggressive behavior, etc.), and on the other hand – the presence of a high level of respect and acceptance of oneself in combination with respect and acceptance of others.

Most researchers, refusing to understand tolerance as condescendingly indifferent attitude to another, suggest that it be viewed in the context of such concepts as recognition, acceptance, understanding, critical dialogue, which implies the ability to see in another person the carrier of other values, the logic of thinking, and other forms of behavior, recognition of her right to be different. Tolerance manifests itself in interested attitude toward differences, the ability to see another “from the inside”, the ability to perceive the world simultaneously from two positions: one's and another. It involves the recognition of the equality of another reality – the individual characteristics of people, ideas, values, ways of behavior, which the person does not consider his own, close to himself. In contrast, intolerance is characterized by recognition only of its reality: if other people are different, they have other views, so they do not understand or understand something wrong.

The idea of recognizing the equality of different realities as a content characteristic of the phenomenon of tolerance lies at the heart of the definition proposed by A. Leontiev and D. Leontiev: “Tolerance is the position of recognition of other values, views, customs as equals with the usual” their “values, attitudes and customs, independently from the measure of agreement with them” [Leontiev 2003, p. 81]. S. Bratchenko observed to a similar position: “Tolerance is ... a special kind of activity: the readiness of a person to go beyond the circle of his own” ... towards the “world of worlds” – the equivalent of human worlds ... Tolerance is the ability to distinguish and recognize special limits (moral, legal, psychological) and the ability to constructively act in the “border” situations, to solve contradictions, to coordinate positions, to cooperate” [Bratchenko 2004, p. 173].

It should be emphasized that tolerance does not necessarily imply consent: the attitude of the person to the ideas with which he does not agree, acts as the true criterion of its tolerance. “Tolerance implies ... an understanding of the relativity of many of our beliefs and judgments, the impossibility of such a justification, which would be

indisputable for all”, – notes V. Lektorskyi [2006, p. 22]. Tolerance as the recognition of the equality of different points of view is associated with the responsibility of the individual for his choice and recognition of other rights to his own responsible choice. The same intolerance is typical of those people who are afraid to assume responsibility for their choice, arguing that truth is one, and therefore the choice is the only one possible.

Tolerance is a patient attitude towards other people, respect for another's thought, ability to listen, understand another person. As personal quality, tolerance manifests itself in communicating with self-control, understanding, empathy, respect for people, even if their thoughts and beliefs are different from those commonly accepted. Tolerance is actualized when conflict arises and manifests itself in the ability to avoid or constructively resolve it, without allowing abusive or violent actions.

Discussion is about the structure of tolerance as a personal quality. Most researchers believe that tolerance is a complex psychological education, the synthesis of various parameters and personality characteristics. At the same time, different opinions are expressed regarding the quantity and content of such characteristics. For example, A. Sadokhin distinguishes between cognitive, emotional, behavioral, reflexive and volitional components as tolerance [Sadokhin 2002]. The cognitive component characterizes the possibility of understanding another's “system of constructs” in the content and structure, emotional – manifested in the empathy of other people, behavioral – characterized by actions aimed at establishing contact, avoiding unproductive conflicts or productive their solution, reflexive – the ability to rebuild their own inadequate installation, volitional – the formation of self-regulation tools in frustration situations. S. Bratchenko considers the main dimensions of interpersonal tolerance to be personal, cognitive, emotional, behavioral and verbal, emphasizing the complex interrelationship between them [Bratchenko 2003].

Some researchers suggest to distinguish dispositive tolerance as a position of openness of a personality to other realities and internal personal barriers for intolerant manifestations [Leontiev 2009]. In contrast to tolerance itself, which characterizes the individual tendency to tolerate forms of response, internal personal barriers determine the extent of any level of control over the manifestations of intolerance. To such barriers D. Leontiev relates the general personality characteristics, which are often confused with their own tolerance: the breadth of views, goodwill, morality, education, positive identity. Their presence is negatively correlated with the manifestations of intolerance, but this does not mean they can be equal, and also equal to tolerance itself.

Understanding tolerance as a setting of a personality G. Bezyuleva and G. Shelamova distinguish two main psychological components in its structure: empathy and communicative tolerance. Empathy is the ability to emotional response, penetration into the experiences of another person. Communicative tolerance is a characteristic of

the attitude of an individual to people, displayed in toleration to unpleasant or unacceptable, in their opinion, mental states, qualities and deeds [Bezyuleva 2003]. Based on understanding, empathy, acceptance, tolerance combines self-sufficiency, benevolence, tact, self-esteem, promotes the knowledge of other views, values, ideals, and customs.

The generalization of the views of scholars on the essence of tolerance as a personal quality gives opportunity to determine its main characteristics:

- tolerance shows itself in the attitude of an individual to different people in his various expressions – this is the position of recognition of other values, views, customs, forms of behavior as equal with own ones, regardless of the degree of agreement with them;
- tolerance is a complex personal characteristic that determines the measure of individual sensitivity to tension, instability and contradictions in interpersonal relationship;
- tolerance as a personal quality should not be equated with toleration, indifference, leniency, alienation or positive attitude or friendliness; though these phenomena are related to tolerance, however, they do not express its sense;
- tolerance should not be absolute – it has boundaries of constructive expression and does not apply to such destructive phenomena as aggression, hostility, violence, etc.; true tolerance is possible only in unity with other qualities of a mature person: moderation, sense of measure, empathy, dialectical thinking, etc.;
- tolerance is a manifestation of conscious, meaningful and responsible choice of the individual of his own position and activity, aimed at building partnership with people who have other views and value orientations;
- the psychological content of tolerance cannot be reduced to a separate property or characteristic; it is a complex, multidimensional and multicomponent phenomenon that has several “basic measurements”.

It should be noted that in scientific research the phenomenon of tolerance is most often considered in the context of interethnic relations, therefore, a considerable number of scientific works is devoted to multinational and interethnic tolerance, the substantiation of their contents and structure. Tolerance is explained less often in the context of interpersonal relationship and specific spheres of professional activity. Recently, a number of studies have appeared which are devoted to tolerance as a professionally important quality of a teacher (G. Bezyuleva, S. Bondyрева, S. Danilova, N. Moreva, M. Perepelitsin, A. Pogodina, A. Shavrin, G. Shelamova and others).

The analysis of psychological and pedagogical literature shows that researchers interpret the essence of a teacher's tolerance in different ways due to the complexity and multidimensionality of this phenomenon: a tolerant attitude to the participants in the educational process (L. Zanina, N. Moreva, etc.); mental resistance (N. Menshi-

kov, Yu. Povarenkov, etc.); the ability to form a dialogical form of interpersonal relations (G. Bezyuleva, B. Chernyavskaya, G. Shelamova, etc.); the aim at the manifestation of tolerant forms of interaction with other people (O. Kleptsova, O. Nurlyhanova, etc.); ability and readiness to cooperate with the participants of the educational process on the basis of understanding, recognition and acceptance of their individual social and psychological features (M. Perepelitsyn, O. Shavrin, etc.); the aim at open and trustful communication with the subjects of the educational process (N. Pavlovskaya, A. Tjutina).

A teacher's tolerance is explained as the key competence of a personality, which is actualized in situations of differences of views, thoughts, evaluations, beliefs, human behavior; it arises on the basis of the functioning of the mechanisms of patience and acceptance, and is closely related to the orientation towards the personal model of interaction, emotional stability, cooperation, and other personal characteristics of a teacher [Stepanova 2012, p. 184]. Researchers consider that the psychological conditions of tolerant attitude to the objects of pedagogical reality are: the increase in the sensitivity to the ideas of tolerance as a humanistic value; person-oriented attitude towards all objects of pedagogical interaction; the usage of mechanisms of patience (endurance, self-control) and acceptance (understanding, empathy, assertiveness).

In our opinion, pedagogical tolerance is a professionally important quality of the personality of a teacher, which manifests itself in unconditionally positive attitude towards the participants of the educational process, having different personal (temperament, character, persuasion, etc.) and social (nationality, religion, social status, etc.) features. The base of a teacher's tolerance is the humanist orientation, the aim at the acceptance of "different" people, the ability to build behavior on the basis of understanding, recognition and acceptance of all participants of the educational process, regardless of their individual characteristics and differences.

Pedagogical tolerance implies a high level of development of moral qualities and is closely related to one of the main components of pedagogical ethics – pedagogical tact, which is shown in respect for human dignity, attitude towards personality as a value, taking into account individual peculiarities of pupils while exercising educational influences.

Tolerance is the recognition of the right of another person to be not similar and differ in social and personal attributes. It implies respectful attitude to a person who has his or her own but not similar to generally accepted views and value orientations. Tolerance is related to rejection of violence and attempts to change what we consider to be wrong in the opinions of other people. According to S. Bondareva's point of view, tolerance is the ability of an individual to accept different from his own thoughts ways of life, characters, behavior, and other peculiarities of people without objections and opposition [Bondareva 2003]. It is easy to notice

that in the pedagogical context such explanation of tolerance conflicts with the professional duties of a teacher: on the one hand, tolerance requires tolerant attitude to those views and actions of pupils which cause rejection, on the other hand, the professional position of the educator requires from him changes in inadequate thoughts and ways of pupils' behavior. In our opinion, the solution to this contradiction can be made by means of distinguishing two aspects of the attitude towards the pupil: global attitude towards him as a person and his attitude towards his particular views and actions. Pedagogical tolerance is based on definitely positive attitude towards a personality of a pupil, the recognition of his right to his own position, but at the same time allows for critical appraisal of his particular beliefs and behaviors if they are contrary to public norms. When a pupil makes an immoral act, the attitude towards him or her should be based on one of the main principles of education: "You are good, but committed a bad deed". If the teacher does not like the particular beliefs and the behavior of the pupil, this cannot be the reason for a negative assessment of him as a personality.

In the context of pedagogical activity, the need for a tolerant attitude is actualized mainly in situations of inconsistency of beliefs and actions of pupils with the expectations and requirements of a teacher. Intolerant attitude of the teacher to pupils most often occurs when the student for some reason does not meet his requirements, begins to annoy, provoke hidden and sometimes even open forms of aggression. If an intolerant teacher does not like some student, is irritated by him, then the teacher internally and sometimes openly does not accept this pupil, ignores or tries to comment on, punish him, etc. However, a tolerant teacher calmly responds to the appearance, quality and behavior of children; is capable of accepting the pupils as they are, with all their disadvantages; understands what he should react at, and what can be ignored; if he decides to change the behavior of the pupil, then he does it gradually, without violence and coercion, without degrading his dignity. Such a teacher states not only the fact of an inappropriate act of the student, but also his motives and factors. If he feels irritated about any pupil, he is able to show patience and endurance, does not blame him, but tries to constructively solve problems by interacting with both the child himself and the people who surround him.

Thus, tolerance does not forbid the teacher to perform educational functions, to correct the beliefs and behavior of pupils if they are contrary to moral norms and rules. Pedagogical tolerance is the recognition of the right of any participant of the educational process to their own opinion, but does not oblige the teacher to accept and approve of this opinion and the corresponding behavior if the teacher does not like them and they contradict generally accepted norms. One can respect a person for having their own opinion but not to accept this idea, to recognize their right to be different but to criticize destructive behavior. In this case, it is important that the differences in thoughts are not transferred to the assessment of personality. The

teacher must accept any subject of educational interaction as a person who has the right to their own position, including a false one. If the pupil demonstrates immoral behavior, the teacher is obliged to apply methods of pedagogical influence aimed at prevention and deceleration of destructive actions. In fact, for this reason there is education and re-education. But this concerns the moral qualities of the pupil and not their social and personality traits. Tolerance requires a respectful attitude to a person as a representative of another nationality, nation or religious denomination. A teenager who is a representative of a certain informal youth subculture with their lifestyle and beliefs also has the right to be different. But if the pupil is being naughty, rude, behaves aggressively, such behavior cannot be the object of a tolerant attitude of the teacher, who is obliged to evaluate it from the standpoint of ethical norms and values. Thus, pedagogical tolerance has certain limits and does not apply to destructive views and actions that violate generally accepted moral standards. However, under all circumstances, it involves a definitely positive attitude towards the pupil as a person and respect for their own dignity.

Analysis of the essence of pedagogical tolerance requires the disclosure of its structure, taking into account the specifics of pedagogical interaction. We agree with researchers who believe that it is impossible to adequately characterize tolerance by treating it as a one-dimensional phenomenon [Bratchenko 2003]. At the same time, the admiration of analytical “manufacturing” contains the danger of “collector” approach reducing the tolerance to bulky lists of “feature lists”. Therefore, it is appropriate to allocate not all, but only the main, most important dimensions of pedagogical tolerance. Traditionally, the triad of components is used for the description of complex personal dispositions: cognitive, emotional and behavioral. In our opinion, this approach allows us to fully comprehend the content of pedagogical tolerance.

The cognitive aspect of tolerance implies that the teacher understands and accepts the complexity, multidimensionality of the life reality and the variability of the ways of its perception, understanding and evaluation by different people, as well as the understanding of the relativity, incompleteness and subjectivity of their own ideas about the world. This aspect of tolerance is manifested in situations of contradictions (with differences of opinion, collision of different views) and allows them to be viewed as a manifestation of pluralism, the richness of individual interpretations. Tolerance implies the ability of the teacher not to transfer the cognitive conflict into an interpersonal one if there is a disagreement with the pupils.

An important element of the cognitive component of pedagogical tolerance is toleration of situations of uncertainty, which are quite characteristic of pedagogical interaction. Getting into a situation of uncertainty, teachers often lose self-control and the ability to reasonably think, make objective conclusions. The teachers intolerant to uncertainty are inclined to perceive unusual complex situations as more threatening than those that open up new opportunities. They feel better in usual, familiar

circumstances and prefer unambiguous language, clear goals and simple tasks. At the same time, the teachers tolerant to uncertainty feel relatively comfortable even in non-standard and unpredictable situations. They can work productively in an unfamiliar environment and often take on responsibility if there is not enough information, they are able to make decisions without taking long time for reflection or fear of failures. In unusual situations they see opportunities for development and manifestation of their abilities and skills, the disclosure of their potential.

The emotional aspect of the teacher's tolerance is manifested in the ability to empathy, compassion. Establishment of emotional contact between the subjects of communication contributes to the creation of a trusting and safe atmosphere, reduces the tension and the possibility of aggravation of relations, confrontation and rivalry. The emotional component of tolerance is of particular importance due to the fact that it is precisely in this dimension of the communicative situation that the interlocutors have the opportunity to achieve a certain unity, to restore interrelations even with differences in views. The teacher's empathy towards the student is not only one of the forms of expression of respect, but also an indicator of their full personal inclusiveness in communication, a kind of "self-improvement" in the complex process of upbringing. Empathy of full value is invaluable and tolerant in this sense.

A separate component of the emotional component of pedagogical tolerance can be considered a special type of emotional stability – "affective tolerance", the essence of which is the ability to cope with emotional stress, tolerate the complex and unpleasant experiences, anxieties, without suppressing or distorting them. Another aspect of this type of tolerance is related to the tolerant attitude to various (including bright, individual, unusual forms) emotional manifestations of other people. Developed affective tolerance allows the teacher to better understand both their own emotional processes and the experiences of students without being annoyed and without attributing negative meaning to them. Ignoring and suppressing the emotional sphere leads to emotional intolerance of teachers, emotional exhaustion and then to professional deformation.

The behavioral aspect of tolerance is characterized by specific skills, among which one can distinguish the ability to express oneself in a tolerant manner and defend their own position ("I"-statement); the ability to tolerate the statements of others (perception of opinions and evaluations of other people as an expression of their position which has the right to exist regardless of the degree of discrepancy with their own views); the ability to interact constructively with other people (to agree, to coordinate positions, to reach a compromise and consensus); the ability to hold back in tense situations with differences in views, clashes of opinions or evaluations.

The generalization of views on the essence and manifestations of tolerance gives grounds to determine a set of indicators that characterize this criterion of the personal maturity of the teacher:

- openness to new experiences which is sensitivity to reality, the ability to see things and people as they are and not as the individual used to consider them;
- tolerance for uncertainty which is the ability to adequately perceive and constructively act in unpredictable, atypical, unusual situations using them for personal development;
- cognitive complexity which is a personal trait that reflects the person's attitude to ambiguity, differences and contradictions: low cognitive complexity makes the teacher intolerant to ambiguity and differences in the sense of reality; teachers with a high cognitive complexity perceive them calmly and with interest;
- dialectical perception of objects, other people which is the ability to see both their positive and negative characteristics, essential and secondary features in contrast to the dichotomous black and white perception;
- decentralization which is the ability to adopt the other person's point of view; the opposite pole is egocentrism, the tendency to evaluate everything only from one's own position;
- flexibility which is readiness to change one's personal directions, stereotypes if they are no longer consistent with experience as opposed to rigidity which is the tendency to use previously acquired cognitive and behavioral stereotypes, the inability to abandon them or to change them if they no longer respond to reality;
- emotional stability which is the ability to withstand a certain level of emotional stress, tolerate complex and unpleasant experiences without their suppression or distortion, uncontrolled increase of anxiety [Haluziak 2012].

Thus, tolerance is an important trait of personal maturity of a teacher, which manifests itself in an active moral position and psychological readiness for constructive interaction with all subjects of the pedagogical process regardless of their differences. Being a social and psychological category, it manifests itself in the direction of acceptance of another person as an individual, in empathy, understanding, open and trustful communication. Tolerance determines the teacher's ability to form constructive interpersonal relationships with the participants of the pedagogical process on the basis of dialogue, understanding and respect despite the differences in their views, positions and individual characteristics.

Bibliography

- Асмолов А. Толерантность – культура XXI века / А. Асмолов // Век толерантности. – 2004. – № 7. – С. 4– 8.
- Асмолов А. Г. Толерантность от утопии к реальности / А. Г. Асмолов // На пути к толерантному сознанию. – М. : Смысл, 2000. – С. 5-7.

- Безюлева Г.В., Шеламова Г.М. Толерантность: взгляд, поиск, решение. – М.: Вербум-М, 2003. – 168 с.
- Бондырева С.К. Толерантность (введение в проблему) / С.К. Бондырева, Д.В. Колесов. – Воронеж: НПО «МОДЭК», 2003. – 240 с.
- Братченко С.И. Образование: ненасиление, толерантность и гуманитарная экспертиза // Межкультурный диалог: исследования и практика / Под ред. Г.У. Солдатовой, Т.Ю. Прокофьевой, Т.А. Лютой. – М.: Центр СМИ МГУ им. М.В. Ломоносова, 2004. – С. 172-182.
- Братченко С.А. Психологические основания исследования толерантности в образовании / С.А. Братченко // Педагогика развития: ключевые компетентности и их становление. – Красноярск, 2003. – С. 104-117.
- Галузяк В. М. Показники міжособистісної толерантності вчителя / В. М. Галузяк // Формування професійної культури майбутніх педагогів в умовах модернізації освіти: матеріали Всеукраїнської науково-практичної конференції, 5-6 грудня 2012 року. – Харків: ФОП Шейніна О.В., 2012. – С. 91 – 92.
- Галузяк В. М. Толерантність у структурі особистісної зрілості педагога / В. М. Галузяк // Наукові записки Вінницького державного педагогічного університету імені М.Коцюбинського. Серія: «Педагогіка і психологія». Випуск 38. – Вінниця, 2012. – С. 69-76.
- Галузяк В. М. Толерантність як критерій особистісної зрілості вчителя / В. М. Галузяк // Наукові записки кафедри педагогіки. Випуск XXXI. – Харків: Харківський національний університет імені В.Н. Каразіна, 2013. – С. 59-65.
- Губський Е.Ф. и др. Философский энциклопедический словарь / Ред.-сост. Е.Ф. Губский и др. – М.: ИНФРА-М, 2009. – 569 с.
- Декларация принципов толерантности // Век толерантности: Научно-публицистический вестник. – 2001. – №1-2. – С. 131-137.
- Кузнецов В. Г. Словарь философских терминов / под. ред. В.Г. Кузнецова. – М.: ИНФРА-М, 2009. – 731 с.
- Лекторский, В.А. О толерантности, плюрализме и критицизме / В.А. Лекторский // Вопросы философии. -1997.-№ 11.-С. 46-54.
- Лекторский В.А. Эпистемология классическая и неклассическая. 2-е изд. / В.А.Лекторский. – М.: Эдиториал УРСС, 2006. – 255 с.
- Леонтьев А.А., Леонтьев Д.А. Словарь терминов // Психолингвистическая экспертиза ксенофобии в средствах массовой информации. – М.: Смысл, 2003. – С. 80-81.
- Леонтьев Д.А. К операционализации понятия «толерантность» / Д.А. Леонтьев // Вопросы психологии. – 2009. – № 5. – С. 3-16.

Леонтьев Д.А., Усачева В.В. Психологическое содержание понятий толерантности и ксенофобии // Скрытое эмоциональное содержание текстов СМИ и методы его объективной диагностики / Под ред. А.А. Леонтьева, Д.А. Леонтьева. – М.: Смысл, 2004. – С. 19-28.

Олпорт Г. Становление личности / Г. Олпорт. – М.: Смысл, 2002. – 462 с.

Петрицкий В.А. Толерантность – универсальный этический принцип // Известия СП лесотехнической академии. – СПб., 1993. – С. 139-151.

Ребер А. Большой толковый психологический словарь / А. Ребер. – М.: Вече, АСТ, 2000. – 559 с.

Роджерс К. Взгляд на психотерапию. Становление человека : Пер.с англ. / Карл Р. Роджерс . – Москва : Прогресс-Универс, 1994 . – 478 с.

Садохин А.П. Толерантное сознание: сущность и особенности // Толерантное сознание и формирование толерантных отношений. – М.: Издательство Московского психолого-социального института; Воронеж: Издательство НПО «МОДЭК», 2002 – С. 20 – 31.

Смирнова Е.О. Межличностные отношения как сфера зарождения и проявления толерантности // Возрастные особенности формирования толерантности. Труды по социологии образования. Т. VIII. Вып. XIV / Под ред. В.С. Собкина. – М.: Центр социологии образования РАО, 2003. – С. 11-13.

Солдатова Г. Практическая психология толерантности, или как сделать так, чтобы зазвучали лучшие струны человеческой души? / Г. Солдатова // Век толерантности: Научно-публицистический вестник. – 2003. – № 6. – С. 60-78.

Степанова И.А., Донгаузер Е.В. Толерантность как профессиональное свойство личности педагога // Вестник Волжского университета им. В.Н. Татищева. – 2012. – № 3. – С. 175-185.

Фадеева Т.Ю. Формирование толерантности у будущих педагогов-психологов в образовательном процессе вуза / Т.Ю.Фадеева // Вектор науки Тольяттинского государственного университета. Серия: Педагогика, психология. – 2011. – №2. – С. 194-197.

Frankl V. Der Wille zum Sinn. 2 Aufl. – Bern: Hans Huber, 1982.