

APPROACHES TO UNDERSTANDING THE PHENOMENON OF TOLERANCE IN CROSS-CULTURAL RESEARCHES

Yangiboyeva Dildoraxon Rahmon qizi

II Masters Degree, National University of Uzbekistan named after M. Ulugbek.

Gapparova Mastona Safaraliyevna

II Masters Degree, National University of Uzbekistan named after M. Ulugbek.

Abstract

In different languages, depending on the historical experience of peoples, the general content of the concept of tolerance has different shades of meaning: - in English tolerance is "readiness and ability to accept a person or thing without protest"; - in French - "respect for freedom of the other, his way of thinking, behavior, political and religious views"; - in Chinese tolerance means "to allow, allow, show generosity towards others"; - in Arabic tolerance is "forgiveness, condescension, mildness, indulgence, compassionate tolerance"; - in Persian it means "patience, tolerance, endurance"; - in Arabic it means "forgiveness, indulgence, leniency, forbearance".

Introduction

In different languages, depending on the historical experience of peoples, the general content of the concept of tolerance has different shades of meaning: - in English tolerance is "readiness and ability to accept a person or thing without protest"; - in French - "respect for freedom of the other, his way of thinking, behavior, political and religious views"; - in Chinese tolerance means "to allow, allow, show generosity towards others"; - in Arabic tolerance is "forgiveness, condescension, mildness, indulgence, compassionate tolerance"; - in Persian it means "patience, tolerance, endurance"; - in Arabic it means "forgiveness, indulgence, leniency, forbearance".

From the point of view of social psychology, tolerance (from Latin *tolerantia* - patience) is, first of all, a special attitude coming from a person himself, an attitude (respect, acceptance, understanding-recognition are the three components of an attitude), a need, value, norm, attitude or belief; at the same time, it is a certain moral category formed by society (duty, obligation). The trigger mechanism for the emergence and manifestation of tolerance is the discovery of differences between people, groups, states, cultures and the way they respond to them (war or peace). Psychological qualities that ensure tolerance are all possible forms of expression of people, which allow or limit the parity of the manifestation of social differences (freely done or not). [14.p.49]. The most common in the literature is the consideration of tolerance as a social attitude or social attitude (attitudes). "Tolerance emphasises a way of relating to unpleasant or alien objects - condescendingly tolerating them or forcibly tolerating them without resorting to violence".

Materials and Methods

The human body, thanks to anatomical discoveries and research, has recently been perceived discretely as a collection of organs. Modern medicine makes it possible to transplant organs

from one person to another. Thus artificially sustaining life. In organ transplant surgeries, it is very important to put the body into a state of tolerance. Tolerance is the body's lack of response to the introduced antigens, as a consequence of getting used to these antigens. Tolerance differs from immune deficiency in that the body continues to produce antibodies to other antigens. But since the human body is constantly renewing itself, tolerance needs to be maintained constantly. The body's elimination of tolerance is also done pharmacologically. It is from medicine that the term has seeped into the social-humanitarian sphere.

The loss of the integrity of the social organism was clearly evident at the beginning of the New Age. "Secularization is a global process of pushing religious faith to the periphery of spiritual life, where religious values are increasingly replaced by axiological characteristics of a non-religious nature". [13,p.115]. Secularization has been accompanied by the growth of confessional diversity. Spirituality now consists of separate parts that are alien to each other and itself is a separate system from other systems. This religious tolerance. Faith tolerance has been recognised as one of the first manifestations of tolerance. Until recently, the two terms were reduced to synonyms. Now, however, religious tolerance is only a particular case of tolerance, which claims to be the modern paradigm.

The rapid interest in the problem of tolerance has led to many discussions and disagreements. Political, religious, pedagogical, ethnic, psychological and philosophical aspects of this problem cause a rapid metamorphosis of the concept of tolerance - from volitional non-response to a social irritant to conscious acceptance of the "alien" and enrichment of the "own" at the expense of diversity and multiculturalism. Tolerance is an early rejection of the "alien" in absorption. The relationship of tolerance does not allow for a process of assimilation; it is a position that is alienated in advance, built on respect, patience and distancing of the 'alien' from the 'own'. "An 'alien' perceived as tolerant can never become 'one's own' as he or she is respected as an 'alien' and assumed equal rights as an 'outsider'. In this context, the notion of 'alien' may include: another person, another way of life, another idea, religion, ideology, another worldview that is sacred in nature and possesses a 'foreignness'. Not "naturally alien", but "artificially alien" forms necessity of tolerant attitude. For the "naturally alien" calls for development and assimilation rather than tolerance and acceptance.

A transplanted heart does not become "our own". The "own" is not enriched by the emergence of the "foreign" and does not develop. And while the 'own' is busy repressing in itself the reaction against the 'alien', it loses its identity and ceases to be itself. For example, a South African does not demand tolerance for himself, but when a South African emigrates to a new land, he loses his culture, he ceases to be what he was and becomes "black" i.e. alien in relation to "white". The need for tolerance appears as a consequence of the loss of identity. When a woman ceased to be a woman and became the female sex as opposed to the male sex, she started to demand tolerance towards her own sex, but not towards herself. And when there is no "her own", the "alien" loses its "alienity".

Discussion of the Research

The problem of tolerance is exhausted when boundaries and distinctions are erased. "According to the results of the survey, the majority (73.7%) assumes that a different faith has no influence on the attitude to another person. One should not see any negative moments in this mass

indifference of believers and non-believers to issues of faith in interpersonal relations. On the contrary, it seems to be evidence of the absence of obstacles to normal personal relations, regardless of worldview differences. [3, p.38-39]. What, then, does the author quoted above mean by "normal personal relations"? Is it a reduction to the norm, to the average or the suppression of one's immunity to the other as an antibody? In faith lurks the intimate, individual - one must not meddle and must not be discarded. Without a worldview and a world view, there is no identity, so we cannot speak of interpersonal relations in this context.

The problem is that the modern tolerant person endows the other (for the purposes of this article, "other" and "stranger" are identical) with the right to be different. This process is conscious and has rational grounds. On the level of ontology, the "alien" is no longer a "stranger", he is granted such a right. Now the "alien" is not being, but is a "stranger" to "one's own". 'The 'other' is necessary in order to become one's own. The cognition or debunking of the Other, attempts to penetrate its essence, to include it in oneself, only destroy the Other that must remain a mystery. Today reflexion is a reflection of the Other outside out of its own opacity.

The struggle for equality leads to the neutralization of differences, without which opposites lose their meaning and essence". [2, p.27]. "The cultural other perishes by being trapped inside the universality, when it is induced to give up its irreplaceability and uniqueness... by subsidizing, preserving, integrating, taming the Other in cultural reservations, it is put on a leash" [2, p.28]. The purpose of tolerance is to free a person from the shackles of stereotypes, prejudice, religious pressure. But, in fact, the compulsory requirement to comply with the tolerant attitude enslaves the individual in this obligation. A tolerant person does not hear a diversity of sounds and voices, but a noise to which he learns not to respond. Every sound is culturally loaded. A multitude of sounds merge into noise. Yet one would hardly agree that noise is an example of multiculturalism.

Firstly, because there is a blending of voices rather than consonance; and secondly, the person hearing noise learns not to react to it or perceive it. "Collectively organised sound space tried to banish silence as a condition and mechanism of individuality formation. Silence on the value side was secondary to social noise, it was rather a break, a pause between lines of noise. Moreover, silence is dangerous: it is uncertainty, it is a possibility of the other, of the ultimate alien. Accordingly, silence is dangerous, too, for it can hide the possibility of one's own position or opposition. [1].

The concept of noise embraces the main spheres of society and goes hand in hand with tolerance. Noise implies the blurring of differences; the destruction of individual elements as individual constituents; insensitivity on the part of others. Noise removes the 'us versus them' opposition without suggesting ways of resolving it. Prominent examples of "noise" are: religious noise (uncoordinated sound of multiple religious' concepts), political noise (haphazard coexistence of political programs), ethnic noise (loss of people's identity in the process of globalization), etc. The alternative to noise is polyphony. Polyphony refers to the coexistence of the many while preserving the singularity.

The concept of polyvocalism is close to the nature of the human organism (polyvocal organs provide vital functions), and can also be traced in the social organism (four main spheres,

institutions support the society), but somehow so far from modernity, which prolongs its stay in the paradigm of tolerance with the help of artificial preparations.

"Tolerance is a certain quality of interaction between the subject and the object of tolerance, characterized by the willingness of the subject to accept the socio-cultural differences of the object, which include external signs, statements, features of behavior, etc." (M. S. Matskovsky) [3, p. 143].

"Tolerance is considered as a social attitude and the aspect of the three components of its structure (behavioural, emotional, cognitive)" (N. V. Nedorezova) [4, p.5].

"Tolerance characterizes the relationship of an individual, group, society to each other and can manifest itself in humility or acceptance" (O.Yu. Kharlamova) [12, p 9]. M. Walzer also understands tolerance as a certain attitude or mindset [11]. A. V. Pertsev considers the cognitive and conative side of tolerance.

According to his definition, tolerance is a transitional state from the conflict resulting in violence to mutual understanding and cooperation [6, p. 53].

G.U.Soldatova suggests distinguishing four main perspectives of tolerance: as psychological stability, as a system of positive attitudes, as a set of individual qualities, as a system of personal and group values [9, p. 4]. Another option of penetrating into the essence of the concept of tolerance is the consideration of this phenomenon as "tolerant consciousness" [10].

There is also an independent approach that interprets tolerance as sustainability. For example, in the English-Russian Dictionary of Psychology the psychological meaning of tolerance is expressed as follows: acquired resilience; resistance to uncertainty; ethnic resilience; the limit of human resilience (endurance); resistance to stress; resistance to conflict; resistance to behavioral deviations [5, p. 5].

Many authors use the category "their own-other" to define tolerance, denoting, on the one hand, the fact of existence of differences between people (social groups), on the other hand, the fact of existence of self-identification processes. Tolerance is supposed to allow a person to accept the "other" (different, different, different) without losing his or her own identity. In the paradigm of 'our own-others' "tolerance is not passive acceptance, but an active search for contact with the obscure, incomprehensible, alien; a desire to understand this obscure. Passive acceptance of the alien is an element of conformity, i.e. a process of potential loss of individuality" [5, p.32].

The prevailing majority of authors, while pointing out the difficulties of the semantic translation of the term, nevertheless widely use the category of "tolerance", correlating tolerance with tolerance of dissent and non-tolerance of action.

E.Yu.Kleptsova in her PhD thesis in educational psychology makes an attempt to distinguish between the concepts of "tolerance" and "capability". In particular, she writes: "We define tolerance as a property of personality which expresses the attitude of a person to the world in general, to things, objects, other people, their views, himself, and which is actualized in situations of disagreement of opinions, values, opinions, behavior of people, etc. and which manifests itself in heightened sensitivity to the object. Under tolerance we understand a property of a personality, actualizing in situations of disagreement of views, opinions, estimations, beliefs, behavior of people, etc. and manifesting itself in reduction of sensitivity to the object" [2, p.7-8].

The author believes that tolerance and tolerance have different functions and are provided by different leading mechanisms. According to the author, the leading mechanism of tolerance is patience (composure, self-control), which makes it possible to lower the threshold of sensitivity to adverse factors. Acceptance as another mechanism of tolerance recedes into the background and in some cases may not be actualised at all. The leading mechanism of tolerance, on the contrary, is acceptance of something as a given (understanding, empathy, assertiveness), and patience, while retreating into the background, does not lose its potential and is actively used by the individual.

Of course, Kleptsova's point of view may seem debatable. But at a time when the scientific elaboration of the term "tolerance" is still very weak and the everyday use of the term is very intense, this concept of the author seems quite coherent, justified and worthy of attention. T.P. Skripkina poses and tries to solve the problem of correlation between the concepts of "trust" and "tolerance".

According to her definition, trust is a complex bipolar phenomenon associated with the simultaneous existence of trust in oneself and in that part of the world with which the subject intends to interact. The boundaries of trust are defined by some measure, some "quantitative" measure of trust. If we are talking about interaction with another person, trust can be interpreted as an internal state of readiness of interacting subjects not only to "penetrate" into the value and semantic sphere of each other, to be ready not only to accept it, treat it as a value, but also to share it in terms of value, correlate it with their own values. The author further suggests that in terms of functional analysis, tolerance acts as a mechanism of trust formation. Moreover, tolerance can exist in the form of advanced trust. In this sense, trust is a necessary condition for tolerance. But, on the other hand, tolerance is a step, a stage on the way to mutual trust as a source of social and psychological well-being of society, the author concludes [8, p. 47-55]. Discussing the issue of the boundaries of tolerance, T.P. Skripkina proposes, at the theoretical level, to distinguish at least five tolerant personal positions, differing in the degree of tolerance allowed: - Tolerance as an internal attitude, as acceptance and tolerance to the other, alien; - Tolerance as a cultural norm (in other words - tolerance of external expression); - Tolerance as impartiality, as indifference to the other; - Tolerance to the one who causes us harm; - Tolerance in relation to the one who causes harm not us, but to someone else, but we do not care about it.

Conclusion

Tolerance, or acceptance, is the desire and ability to establish and maintain common ground with people who differ in some respect from the prevailing type or who do not adhere to commonly held opinions. In fact, any belief - religious, political or cultural - can lead to intolerance if there remains no doubt about the infallibility of the ideas one believes in and the falsity of the views one disputes.

Literature

1. Г. Л. Бардиер. Социальная психология толерантности. СПб., 2005.
2. Клепцова Е. Ю. Психологические условия формирования терпимого отношения педагогов к детям.

3. Мацковский М. С. Толерантность как объект социологического исследования // Межкультурный диалог: исследования и практика / Под ред. Г. У. Солдатовой, Т.Ю.Прокофьевой, Т. Л. Лютой. М.: Центр СМИ МГУ им. М.В.Ломоносова, 2004.
4. Недорезова Н. В. Толерантность в межличностном общении старшеклассников.
5. О смыслах понятия «толерантность» // Век толерантности. 2001. №1.
6. Перцев А. В. Ментальная толерантность // Вестн. Урал, межрегион, ин-та обществ, наук. 2002. №1.
7. Почебут Л. Г. Организационно-методические основы функционирования центра толерантности. СПб., 2004.
8. Скрипкина Т.П. Доверие и толерантность: существуют ли границы? // 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.
9. Солдатова Г. У. Толерантность: психологическая устойчивость и нравственный императив // Практикум по психодиагностике и исследованию толерантности / Под ред. Г. У. Солдатовой, Л. А. Шайгеровой. М.: МГУ им. М.В.Ломоносова, 2003.
10. Толерантное сознание и формирование толерантных отношений (теория и практика): Сб. науч.-метод, ст. М.: Изд-во Мог.ков. психол.-социал. ин-та; Воронеж: Изд-во НПО «МОДЭК», 2002.
11. Уолцер М. О терпимости. М., 2000.
1. 12.Харламова О. Ю. Воспитание у студентов вузов профессиональной толерантности в ходе обучения иностранному языку.
12. С.Е.Вершинин Принцип шума, или проблема звуковой толерантности // Дискурс-Пи. Выпуск 3: Дискурс толерантности в глобальном мире/ Под ред. О.Ф.Русакова. Екатеринбург: Изд-во УрГУ, 2003. – С. 18.
13. В.С. Мартыянов Метаязык политической науки в контексте глобализации // Дискурс-Пи. Выпуск 3: Дискурс толерантности в глобальном мире/ Под ред. О.Ф.Русакова. Екатеринбург: Изд-во УрГУ, 2003.