

UDC: 159.9

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24195/2414-4665-2017-11-3>**Dr. Ercüment Ersanlı,**

associate professor,

Ondokuz Mayıs University, Social Services Department,

Kurupelit Campus 55139, Atakum/Samsun, Turkey,

eersanli@gmail.com

Canan Güven Şahin,

Psychological Consultant,

Çamlıbel Anatolian High School, Kepez/Antalya, Turkey,

pdr_c@hotmail.com

TOLERANCE LEVEL OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

In this research, tolerance level of university students was investigated. The experiment involved 919 students of different faculties. The results of the study have shown that female students had lower tolerance levels than male students. Besides, the respondents studying at the scientific departments had higher tolerance levels as compared to those from language and fine arts departments. Additionally, when fine arts and social departments were compared, it became clear that the students of social departments had higher tolerance level. There was no significant difference between other groups. Some recommendations were suggested for increasing the level of tolerance in students.

Keywords: tolerance, university, student, gender, department.

Introduction

People formed societies by interacting with others to fight against the destructive force of nature. However, as the societies grew, people were disintegrated from it. They were unable to compensate the resulting alienation. When people are in nature it made them happy, which was caused by the idea of freedom and being united. However, they were unable to form such satisfying relationships and perceived the society as another destructive force that limits natural instincts. Therefore, the detachment from nature was connected with the society. Because people were afraid of being alone and believed that they would be sheltered from danger if they were together with other people. In reality, people are better at certain things when they are together. However, they are alone inside, and they need to fight against the world they live in (Gençtan, 1996: 11). The success level in this fight is related to individual tolerance level. In recent years, fast cultural change has brought individualism. Intolerance in attitudes and behaviours towards events can lead to aggression, lack of empathy, and sternness. Tolerance is one of the mandatory qualities of every individual.

Tolerance is often defined as enduring stress, load, pain, pressure without getting harmed. It is the state of enduring and standing against internal stress with the inner power (Ersanlı, 2011). It has been one of the most important discussion subjects and one of the greatest philosophical issues of the human history, especially beginning from the emergence of world religions. Tolerance exists with opposite meanings such as intolerance, discrimination, and fanaticism.

Nowadays one can observe different types of discrimination: ethnical, religious discrimination, and violence against women. Since every individual believed their own culture, ethnical origin, and nation was superior

to others, a discriminative perspective emerged and discriminative policies were observed accordingly. Discrimination was considered as an evaluation problem and ethical issue. This suggested that as ethical perspective and tolerance could be developed, this problem could be solved (Tepe, 2011: 117). In tolerance scale “respecting freedom of others” is considered as an important concept. Independent from the degree of positivity, it is clear that tolerance could completely eliminate the possibility of intolerance. Therefore, there were certain people who found “arrogance” in “tolerance”, thus, believing that “freedom” should be mentioned rather than “tolerance” (Yörükhan, 2007: 326).

Revival of tolerance issue which was a historical problem, is associated with the emergence of universal, heterodox new social and life understanding which is against democracy. We can clearly see that today, “freedom of thinking and stating the ideas” that was won over hundreds of years of struggles is now in danger (Yörükhan, 2007: 61). If values such as trust, peace, justice, fairness, compassion, and responsibility were shaken, disappeared, or lost their importance, children and young people would be unable to develop solid and integrated characters. Individual and social mental health would be under significant threat. Social integration and solidarity would weaken, and people would know weaknesses of one another. Life would be perceived as meaningless and worthless (Hökeli, 2010: 6). Human psychology has always had the desire for domination. Individual or individuals who desired control, would either be inside or outside ethical limits and would try to continue this domination (Tarhan, 2012: 15).

As it would be visible for the historical perspective of tolerance problem, intolerance always mandated certain belief systems to rule the monopolistic social order in

a fanatic way. It is clearly visible that in the past, religious beliefs and especially the large world religions shaped the complete emotion, idea, and action of the life with dogmatic principles where they were immaterially dominant. Similarly, today, the same actions were taken with different ideologies under economic-political world views. Democracy is the social order that enables individuals to live together under different perspectives and living ideas. It softens the tension of conflicts rather than completely eliminating them, it forms a type of “power equivalent” between different perspectives and ideals, and prevents domination of any perspective. On the other hand, aforementioned social ideologies, like large religions of the past, would desire the monopoly of living ideals under certain social order. Therefore, under current conditions, the existence of “monopolistic” regimes is mentioned (Yörükan, 2007: 62). Tolerance represents both enduring and agreement (Botiveau, 1997: 61).

The subject and scope of tolerance, and therefore intolerance, could vary. However, tolerance and intolerance are connected. In other words, intolerance is a shadow of tolerance or a background that could not exist without the counterpart (Yörükan, 2007: 322). In the world with social, ethnic, political, and religious wars as well as internal wars where although tolerance could be mentioned, it is challenging to apply this concept practically. Terror or violence related events in certain countries would not only hurt people with conscience and compassion, but also form a question regarding when could humanity eliminate such problems. Both in our country and all over the world, “tolerance” is frequently discussed under current conditions. Reviving this subject focused on the hypothesis that uniting people on a common ground that promotes rights and law is a must rather than a need. Accordingly, tolerance is a path for humanity to live in peace and tranquillity (Yiğit, 2010: 11). However, there is no doubt that there is a sense of consubstantiality in terms of “freedom of thought” attitudes. Revival of tolerance problems could only be explained this way (Yörükan, 2007: 64). Ethnic and racist crimes against immigrants or foreign workers have increased in recent years, and in the last decade, tolerance towards these people has decreased significantly (Schafer and Shaw, 2009: 428). If values of democracy were shaken or demolished in a society, individuals would lack healthy development. People who were unconscious about what and why they live for would experience problems such as “uneasiness”, “stress”, “boredom”, “meaninglessness”. In these conditions, “alienation” from oneself and nature, “tarnishing of live”, and “automatization” could be mentioned (Hökelekli, 2010: 6). Generally, values like kindness are considered among urbanity properties and tolerance could be accepted as a similar value (Hersch, 1996: 9). In our country, various issues that disrupt the social order were visible and it is clear that people who were involved in these events had insufficient education regarding these values.

In the light of these social transformations, properties such as citizenship, peace, respect for cultural differences,

democracy, human rights, environmental sensitivity, and autonomy were distinguished and the importance of the role of institutional education towards gaining these values was emphasised. Hence, the reports of internal organisations such as UNESCO started to include such reports (Arıkan, 2011: 1). The reason is values are the principles and standards that guide our behaviours. When socio-cultural environment of an individual was investigated, it became clear that everyone was affected by various emotions and value judgements (Çalışkan, 2005: 1). According to Adler (2000: 20) direction determined by vital objectives not only affects individual characteristics, physical movement, expression styles, and visible general properties but also keeps emotional life under control. It should be noted that individuals often try to justify behaviours and attitudes with emotions.

Under the Turkish context students attending supplementary classes starting from elementary school; participating central examination that measures cognitive abilities for higher education; limited sports, music, and art class hours, and efforts for adding value with activities in certain weeks stated how much cognitive skills and cognitive components of learning were considered inside education system (Arıkan, 2011: 4). However, it is believed that adequate attention for education issues such as tolerance can affect the attitude and behaviour perspective for promoting social well-being. It is determined by maturing of an individual.

In a period where globalisation and localisation are nested, under what scope can tolerance issue be discussed? To what extent has the society (for example the Turkish society) transformed differences to pluralist consciousness and “tolerates” this? To what extent are the rights and ethics required by the minority, considering themselves to be living in other societies, inclined to define within their own minorities? To what extent is the state or public administration responsible for an attitude and activity to broaden the boundaries of tolerance of the society; and at what extent should precautions be taken to raise tolerance consciousness? (Kula, 2011: 36). Under the framework of these questions, our main aim is to assess the tolerance level of university students. To what extent will the student with low tolerance benefit from education? It is undeniable that the healthy continuation of the social order will be possible with high-tolerance individuals, and that the lack of tolerance is a matter of consciousness.

1.1. Research Objective

The objective of this research was to identify tolerance levels of university students according to the following parameters:

- ✓ Gender
- ✓ Department
- ✓ Class
- ✓ If the student was born among siblings
- ✓ Income level

1.3. Importance of Research

The world is gradually shrinking under the phenomenon of globalization and experiences great transformation processes. Within this process, interpersonal relationships are increasing and the tendency towards social sciences is accelerating. Under the light of all these orientations, the value of social sciences is increasing and they are becoming the fundamental building blocks of the future of nations. Interaction between societies and people with different cultural structures has increased the importance of studying the issue of tolerance and intolerance.

In today's world, education promotes individuals who are competing for the limited resources, to use their cognitive skills and access these resources. This situation has created a live consequence where individuals without humanitarian values exploited from weaknesses of other people and made the exploited people unhappy. Existence of people in cultural environment is at the same time an education process. In this education process, in addition to learning knowledge regarding life, the characters of individuals are built (Pamuk, 2003: 42). To accept the decisions of others, children should avoid egocentrism and understand the emotions and ideas of other people (Dinç, 2011: 83). Respect towards the ideas of other people are associated with tolerance. Tolerance could be implemented in education system and cultural texture of individuals. This research is important for showing the level of this implementation.

In literature, there are a very few researches on tolerance level of university students, and it is believed that this research will contribute to the literature.

Method

3.1. Research Model

Under the context of this study, tolerance level of university students was investigated with the help of scanning model which is a research approach that describes past or existing events as they are.

3.2. Universe and Sample

The universe of this research was selected among Ondokuz Mayıs University Education Faculty students during 2015-2016 academic year. The sample consisted of randomly selected 919 students of Computer Teaching, Biology Teaching, Science Teaching, Physics Teaching, Mathematics Teaching, Chemistry Teaching, German Teaching, English Teaching, French Teaching, Turkish Teaching, Hearing Impaired Teaching, Psychological Counselling and Guidance, Classroom Teaching, Mental Disabilities Teaching, Music Teaching and Art Teaching departments.

3.3. Data Collection Tools

"Personal Information Form" and "Tolerance Scale" were selected as the data collection tools of the study.

3.3.1. Personal Information Form

It contains questions about demographical properties (gender, department, class, birth order, income) of a respondent. Using this form, the required information was received from students.

3.3.2. Tolerance Scale

Tolerance Scale (TS) was developed by Ersanlı (2011). It has 5-item Likert chart structure with items being measured between 1 and 5. Participants were asked to rate their views as (1) Completely agree, (2) Agree, (3) Uncertain, (4) Disagree, and (5) Completely Disagree. Possible lowest score in the 11-item scale was 11 and possible highest score in the scale was 55. The high total points in the scale showed high tolerance level of the individual.

For the reliability of TS, internal consistency coefficients were calculated. Internal consistency coefficients (Cronbach Alpha) of the 11-item scale was found to be .84. The item-test correlations of the scale varied between .37 and .64.

3.4. Application Stages of Measurement Tool

After the sample was determined in 2015-2016 academic year and necessary permissions were taken, the sample scale was multiplied, given to the participant students, and collected after the students filled in the scale.

3.5. Data Analysis

Before statistical analysis, demographical variables were grouped and the scale (Tolerance Scale) applied to the students was scored. After obtaining this information, statistical analysis was carried out using computer environment.

As this stage, descriptive frequency and percentage distributions of demographical properties of students (gender, department, class, birth order, income) were identified, and sd values for the scale total points were calculated. On the other hand, where the variables did not form adequate distributions for comparative analysis, these variables were associated to form significant groups. In this context:

1. *Independent group t test* to determine whether the "Tolerance Scale" points of the students in the sample group were differentiated for gender,

2. *One-way variance analysis (ANOVA)* to determine whether the "Tolerance Scale" points of the students in the sample group were differentiated according to the department, class, birth order, and income variables,

3. *post-hoc Scheffé and tests*, to determine the differences between groups found as a result of one-way variance analysis (ANOVA) were conducted.

Obtained data were analysed using "SPSS for Windows ver: 20.0", significance minimum $p < .05$ limit was determined, other significance levels were identified, and were presented in Tables in line with the objective of the study.

Findings

As this stage of the research, descriptive frequency and percentage distributions of demographical properties of students (gender, department, class, birth order, income) were identified, and \bar{x} sd values for the scale total points were calculated.

4.1. Values for Demographical Structure of Group

Frequency and percentage distribution for the gender variable among the participants was indicated in Table 4.1.1.

Table 4.1.1

Frequency and Percentage Values for Gender

Groups	<i>f</i>	%
Female	573	62.4
Male	346	37.6
Total	919	100.0

As seen from Table 4.1.1, among 919 students in the sample group 573 (62.4%) were female and 346 (37.6%) were male.

Table 4.1.2

Frequency and Percentage Values for Department

Groups	<i>f</i>	%
Science	263	28.6
Language	232	25.2
Social	320	34.8
Fine Arts	104	11.3
Total	919	100.0

As seen from Table 4.1.2, among 919 students in the sample group, 263 (28.6%) studied at the science department, 232 (25.2%) studied at the language department, 320 (34.8%) – social department, and 104 (11.3%) – fine arts department.

Table 4.1.3

Frequency and Percentage Values for Class

Groups	<i>f</i>	%
1 st year	201	21.9
2 nd year	223	24.3
3 rd year	262	28.5
4 th year	233	25.4
Total	919	100.0

As seen from Table 4.1.3, among 919 respondents in the sample group 201 (21.9%) were 1st year students, 223 (24.3%) were 2nd year students, 262 (28.5%) were 3rd year students, and 233 (25.4%) were 4th year students.

Table 4.1.4

Frequency and Percentage Values for Birth Order

Groups	<i>f</i>	%
First born	352	38.3
2nd Child	295	32.1
3rd Child	164	17.8
4th or et. seq.	108	11.8
Total	919	100.0

As seen from Table 4.1.4, among 919 students in the sample group 352 (38.3%) were first born, 295 (32.1%) were 2nd child, 164 (17.8%) were 3rd child, and 108 (11.8%) were 4th or et. seq.

Table 4.1.5

Frequency and Percentage Values for Income

Groups	<i>f</i>	%
0-200 TL	227	24.7
201-400 TL	331	36.0
401 TL and more	361	39.3
Total	919	100.0

As seen from Table 4.1.5, among 919 respondents in the sample group 227 (24.7%) were between 0-200 TL, 331 (36.0%) were between 201-400 TL, and 361 (39.3%) were more than 401 TL in terms of income.

4.2 Tolerance Level of Students

Tolerance levels of students are presented in Table 4.2.1.

Table 4.2.1

Total Points of Student Tolerance Scale and Arithmetic Mean, Standard Deviation Values of All Sub-Dimensions

Size	N	\bar{X}	SD	Item Number
Complete Scale	919	18.74	5.348	11

As seen from Table 4.2.1, tolerance scale total scores of the students in the sample group were ($\bar{X}=18.74$, *sd* = 5348). This level indicated that tolerance levels were below average (Sometimes Agree).

4.3 Evaluating Tolerance Levels of Students for Different Demographical Variables

Analysis of student tolerance levels based on gender, department, class, birth order, and income variables are given below.

4.3.1. Tolerance Level of Students Based on Gender

Tolerance level of students based on gender is presented in Table 4.3.1.1.

Table 4.3.1.1

Student Tolerance Level t Test Results

Point	Gender	N	\bar{x}	ss	Sh \bar{x}	<i>t</i> Test		
						<i>t</i>	<i>Sd</i>	<i>p</i>
Tolerance	Female	573	18.11	4.557	.190	-4.663	917	.000
	Male	346	19.79	6.318	.340			

As seen from Table 4.3.1.1, the results of t test analysis that was made to determine whether tolerance levels of the students in the sample group varied for gender variable, the arithmetic mean of the groups was significant in favour of male. Male students had higher tolerance levels than female students.

4.3.2. Tolerance Level of Students Based on Department

Tolerance levels of students based on department are given in Table 4.3.2.1.

Table 4.3.2.1

ANOVA Test Results of Tolerance Level of Students Based on Department

Section	<i>f</i> , \bar{x} , and <i>ss</i> Values			Variance Resource	ANOVA Results					
	N	\bar{x}	ss		KT	<i>Sd</i>	KO	F	<i>p</i>	
Numerical	263	19.92	5.963	Between groups	822.595	3	274.198	9.863	.000	
Language	232	18.28	5.225							Intragroup
Social	320	18.75	5.040							
Fine Arts	104	16.77	4.080							
Total	919	18.74	5.348							

As seen from Table 4.3.2.1, one-way variance analysis (ANOVA) was applied to determine whether tolerance

levels of the students in different groups varied and the differences between arithmetic means were significant.

To determine which groups caused the differences, Scheffe test was applied. The results are presented in Table 4.3.2.1.1.

Table 4.3.2.1.1

Scheffe Test Results for Scale Points of Student Departments

Point	Group (i)	Group (j)	$\bar{x}_i - \bar{x}_j$	$Sh_{\bar{x}}$	<i>p</i>
Tolerance	Numerical	Language	1.648*	.475	.007
		Social	1.174	.439	.068
		Fine Arts	3.155*	.611	.000
	Language	Science	-1.648*	.475	.007
		Social	-.474	.455	.780
		Fine Arts	1.507	.622	.119
	Social	Science	-1.174	.439	.068
		Language	.474	.455	.780
		Fine Arts	1.981*	.595	.012
	Fine Arts	Science	-3.155*	.611	.000
		Language	-1.507	.622	.119
		Social	-1.981*	.595	.012

As seen from Table 4.3.2.1. students of language and fine arts departments had lower tolerance levels as compared to the students of science departments. Additionally, when fine arts and social departments were compared,

students in social departments had higher tolerance level. There was no significant difference between other groups.

4.3.3. Tolerance Level of Students Based on Classes

Tolerance levels of students based on the year of study are presented in Table 4.3.3.1.

Table 4.3.3.1

ANOVA Test Results of Tolerance Level of Students Based on Classes

Grade	<i>f</i> , \bar{x} , and <i>ss</i> Values			ANOVA Results					
	<i>N</i>	\bar{x}	<i>ss</i>	Variance Resource	<i>KT</i>	<i>Sd</i>	<i>KO</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>
1. Grade	201	18.77	5.921	Between groups	93.680	3	31.227	1.092	.352
2. Grade									
3. Grade	223	18.42	4.958	Intragroup	26166.200	915	28.597	1.092	.352
4. Grade	262	18.55	5.368						
Total	233	19.25	5.160	Total	26259.880	918			
	919	18.74	5.348						

As seen from Table 4.3.3.1, one-way variance analysis (ANOVA) was applied to determine whether tolerance levels of the students between group varied for classes and the differences between arithmetic means were significant.

4.3.4. Tolerance Level of Students Based on Birth Order

Tolerance level of students based on birth order are given in Table 4.3.4.1.

Table 4.3.4.1

ANOVA Test Results of Tolerance Level of Students Based on Birth Order

Birth Order	<i>f</i> , \bar{x} , and <i>ss</i> Values			ANOVA Results					
	<i>N</i>	\bar{x}	<i>ss</i>	Variance Resource	<i>KT</i>	<i>Sd</i>	<i>KO</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>
First born	352	18.82	5.101	Between groups	16.196	3	5.399		
2nd Child									
3rd Child	295	18.55	4.687	Intragroup	26243.684	915	28.682	.188	.904
4th child or et. seq.	164	18.82	6.169						
Total	108	18.90	6.447	Total	26259.880	918			
	919	18.74	5.348						

As seen from Table 4.3.4.1, one-way variance analysis (ANOVA) was applied to determine whether tolerance levels of the students in different groups varied for birth order and the differences between arithmetic means were significant.

4.3.5. Tolerance Level of Students Based on Income

Tolerance levels of students based on their income are given in Table 4.3.5.1.

Table 4.3.5.1

ANOVA Test Results of Tolerance Level of Students Based on Income

<i>f</i> , \bar{x} , and <i>SS</i> Values	ANOVA Results								
	<i>N</i>	\bar{x}	<i>SS</i>	Variance Resource	<i>KT</i>	<i>Sd</i>	<i>KO</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>P</i>
0-200 TL	227	18.47	4.805	Between groups Intragroup Total	56.467	2	28.233	.987	.373
201-400 TL	331	18.60	5.313		26203.414	916	28.606		
401 TL and more	361	19.04	5.693		26259.880	918			
Total	919	18.74	5.348						

As seen from Table 4.3.5.1, one-way variance analysis (ANOVA) was applied to determine whether tolerance levels of the students between group varied for income level and the differences between arithmetic means were significant.

Results, Discussion, and Recommendations

In this section, the results of the study are presented, as well as discussion and recommendations are given.

5.1. Results and Discussion

The results of the study could be indicated as follows:

Among 919 students in the sample group 573 (62.4%) were female and 346 (37.6%) were male. Among 919 respondents in the sample group, 263 (28.6%) studied at the science department, 232 (25.2%) – the language department, 320 (34.8%) – the social department, and 104 (11.3%) – the fine arts department; 201 (21.9%) were 1st year students, 223 (24.3%) were 2nd year students, 262 (28.5%) were 3rd year students, and 233 (25.4%) were 4th year students; 352 (38.3%) were first born, 295 (32.1%) were 2nd child, 164 (17.8%) were 3rd child, and 108 (11.8%) were 4th or et. seq. Among the 919 students in the sample group 227 (24.7%) were between 0-200 TL, 331 (36.0%) were between 201-400 TL, and 361 (39.3%) were more than 401 TL in terms of income.

Tolerance scale total scores of the students in the sample group were (\bar{X} =18.74, *sd* = 5348). This level indicated that tolerance levels were below average.

As arithmetic mean of gender based tolerance level of the students in the sample group was considered, there was significant difference for male students. Female students had lower tolerance levels than male students.

There were significant differences between arithmetic mean of department based on tolerance level of the students. Students in language and fine arts departments had lower tolerance levels as compared to students of

science departments. Additionally, when fine arts and social departments were compared, students of social departments had higher tolerance level. There was no significant difference between other groups.

There were no significant differences for tolerance levels between groups in terms of the year of study, birth order, and income level.

5.2. Recommendations

1. Tolerance level of university students was found to be low. This situation could be evaluated as the effect of social system and culture, as well as education system and programs. Although tolerance was evaluated on individual level, this subject should be considered in terms of external variables. In this sense, in order to increase the tolerance level of students, it should be acknowledged that our differences are our uniqueness, our endurance levels that should be increased with certain events, and these data are to be implemented in the education system and program. Thus, the curriculum should be altered.

2. Cultural textures should be developed in line with democratic understanding. This could happen if supported by government policies.

3. Gender had determinative effect on tolerance level. Females tend to be less tolerant. This could be associated with the internality and personal characteristics of females. In order to increase the tolerance level of females, it is necessary to organize activities to affect attitudes and behaviours such as gender-free self-esteem, problem solving, anger management, and endurance and take social steps aimed at making cultural texture and thought changes within the society.

4. Steps should be taken to investigate the relationship between tolerance levels and other emotional states. Tolerance level could be investigated in terms of anxiety, anger, compassion, motivation, and self-esteem.

REFERENCES

1. Adler, Alfred; *YaşamaSanatı* (Çev. KamuranŞipal) İstanbul:Say Yayıncılık, 2000.
2. Arıkan, Arzu; *OkulöncesiDönemdeDeğerlerEğitimi* (Ed. Arıkan, A.) Eskişehir: AnadoluÜniversitesiYayımları No: 2301 AçıköğretimFakültesiYayımları No: 1298, 1-26, 2011.

3. Botiveau, Bernard; Tolerance and Law: From Islamic Culture to Islamist Ideology Ratio Juris. Vol. 10 No. 1 March 1997 (61–74), 1997ç.
4. Çalışkan, Zekeriya, İşTatmini: Malatya'da Sağlık Kuruluşları Üzerine Bir Uygulama, *Doğu Anadolu Bölgesi Araştırmaları*, ss.9-18, 2005.
5. Dinç, Bülent; *Okul öncesi Dönemde Değerler Eğitimi* (Ed. Arıkan, A.) Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayını No: 2301 Açıköğretim Fakültesi Yayını No: 1298, 73-95, 2011.
6. Ersanlı, E. (2011). *Hoşgörü ve Asabiyet Testle Ölçülebilir Erişim* : 10.03.2016, <http://www.haber3.com/hosgoru-ve-asabiyet-testle-olculebilecek-omu-ogretim-uyesi-psikolojik-danisman-yrd-d-689580h.htm#ixzz42Ue19Tjx>.
7. Geçtan, Engin; *İnsan Olmak* (17. Baskı) İstanbul: Remzi, 1996.
8. Hersch, Jeanne; Tolerance: Between Liberty and Truth, Diogenes, No. 176, Vol. 44/4, VVinter 1996.
9. Hökelekli, Hayati, Modern Eğitimde Yeni Bir Paradigma Değerler Eğitimi, *Eğitime Bakış Dergisi*, Eğitim Bir-Sen, Yıl 6 sayı 18 s. 4-10, 2010.
10. Karasar, N. ; *Bilimsel Araştırma Yöntemi*, Ankara: Nobel yayını Dağıtım, 2006.
11. Kula, Onur Bilge; *Anadolu'da Çoğulculuk ve Tolerans*, İstanbul, Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür, 2011.
12. Pamuk, Akif; Karakter Eğitim Programları ve Eleştirisi: İnsan Temelli Evrensel Ahlâk Yasası Mümkün mü? *DEM Dergi*, yıl, 1 sayı 1, 42-47, 2003.
13. Schafer, Chelsea E. ve Shaw Greg M. (2009). The Polls—Trends Tolerance In The United States Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 73, No.2, Summer 2009, pp. 404-431.
14. Tarhan Nevzat; *Psikolojik Taciz*, İstanbul: Timaş Yayınları, 2012.
15. Tepe, Harun; Etik (Ed. Kuçuradi, I. Ve Taşdelen, D.) Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi Yayını No: 2356 Açıköğretim Fakültesi Yayını No: 1353, 86-130, 2011.
16. Yiğit, Yaşar; *Peygamberimiz ve Hoşgörü*, Ankara: DİB.2010.
17. Yörük, Turhan; *Semiyotik, Fanatizm ve Tolerans*, Ankara: Nobel yayını, 2007.

Еркуюменд Ерсанли,
доктор філософії, доцент, факультет соціальних наук,
Самсунський університет 19 травня,
Курупеліт кампус 55139 Атакум, м. Самсун, Туреччина,
Джанан Гювен Шахін,
консультант-психолог,
Лицей Чамлибель Анадоу,
Кепез, м. Анталія, Туреччина

ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ РІВНЯ ТОЛЕРАНТНОСТІ СТУДЕНТІВ

У статті досліджено ступінь толерантності студентів університету у залежності від таких змінних: вік, стать, факультет, рівень прибутку та наявність братів чи сестер. В експерименті взяли участь 919 студентів факультетів педагогіки, інформатики, біології, фізики, математики, хімії, німецької, англійської, французької, турецької мов, психології, соціології, музичного виховання та образотворчого мистецтва. Дослідження проводилося за допомогою Особистісного опитувальника та Шкали толерантності. Встановлено, що рівень толерантності студентів у цілому є низьким, що пов'язано з особливостями соціальної сфери та культури, а також системи освіти. Причому респонденти з факультетів точних наук мали вищу толерантність у порівнянні зі студентами лінгвістичних факультетів та факультету образотворчого мистецтва. Хоча толерантність оцінювалася на індивідуальному рівні, ця тема повинна розглядатися з точки зору зовнішніх змінних. Гендерний аспект має визначальний вплив на рівень толерантності. Жінки виявилися менш толерантними. Для того, щоб підвищити рівень толерантності жінок, необхідно організувати спеціальні тренінгові заходи, спрямовані на підвищення самооцінки, вирішення внутрішньоособистісних проблем, управління гнівом та витривалістю, а також здійснення соціальних заходів, спрямованих на зміну культурних стереотипів та мислення. Необхідно також вжити заходів для вивчення зв'язку між рівнями толерантності та іншими емоційними станами, наприклад, тривожністю, гнівом, співчуттям, мотивацією та самооцінкою.

Ключові слова: толерантність, університет, студент, стать, факультет.

Sumbitted on August, 28, 2017