Tolerance as principle and norm of modern European education system

Volodymyr P. Bekh, Doctor of Philosophy, Prof.[1], Yuliya V. Bekh, Doctor of Philosophy[2]
[1] First Vice-rector, National Pedagogical Dragomanov University, Kiev, Ukraine
[2] Professor of the Department of Methodology Science and International Education, National Pedagogical Dragomanov University, Kiev, Ukraine

Abstract. The article deals with tolerance as phenomenon, need, value, norm and principle of behavior of individual and groups in the development of modern European education. It is proved that tolerance, as the property of individual's consciousness, should be formed at school and therefore it became part of value system in preparing new teachers for the XXI century and was included in the Pedagogical Constitution of Europe as a norm and principle of their behavior in the globalized society of the information age.

Keywords: tolerance, phenomenon, need, value, norm, principle, individual, teacher, pedagogical constitution, Europe, society.

1. Introduction. Modern Europe is rapidly gaining morphological stability and functional properties of the social whole. A special role in the integration processes is played by such social institutions as science, culture, education and law. Its cultural space is spontaneously updated in two ways: the first one is associated with evolutionary rise of the world community from the technocratic to the information age; the second one – with the influx of migrants from around the world attracted by sustainable societies with a strong social security system, such as Sweden, Norway, Netherlands, Denmark, etc.

2. Problem statement. There is a spontaneously formed urgent social need to intellectually comprehend the acquired diversity of social life in Europe, on the one hand, and on the other hand, there is the problem of coexistence of multinational formations in the social whole – the united Europe and reproduction of the whole on the basis of democratic government, implementation of human rights, social justice, environmental and information security.

In this situation, the great hope rests with the European system of education that should prepare and is preparing a new generation of Europeans to live in a new environment, which, on the one hand, provides integration trend, and on the other hand, causes disintegration processes, as all people remember their roots and retain the traditions of their nations not only in everyday life but also in professional activities. At the same time education as a social institution in the twenty-first century, is high on the list of formation of a new society that has even received a specific name – the "knowledge society" as a first step towards the Information Society.

It means that with its appearance comes a new culture, new values, it is not the only popular culture, but a particular "common place" in the diversity of interacting cultures. And the first condition of co-existence of multinational population of the united Europe is tolerant attitude towards other people, as tolerance is a universal sign of communication. So, every inhabitant of the European continent should start learning tolerance at school, as this is a vision problem, the problem of attitude of the individual to another individual and to different culture.

European education must show that the problem of tolerance dates back to ancient times, when people with different religions were forced to live together in large empires such empire of Alexander the Great and Diadochi (successors). In analyzing the heritage of such European educationalists as John Locke, the author of "Letter Concerning Toleration", and Voltaire, who created the "Treatise on Tolerance", we, as other researchers of the tolerance problems (L. Vyshnevska, P. Komohorov, A. Pogodina, M. Khomiakov, V. Shalin, etc.) can emphasize the importance of these European humanists for the development of tolerance.

Later tolerance was associated with believer's freedom of conscience (M. Luther, E. Rotterdamus, T. Moore). They appealed to the Gospel, in which the central place was taken by the sermon of love for neighbor, compassion, forgiveness. These principles were adhered to almost all the leading philosophers of the seventeenth (Spinoza, John Locke, R. Williams) and eighteenth centuries (P. Beyl, F. Voltaire, Diderot and others).

In the nineteenth century the problem of tolerance developed in liberal philosophy. Tolerance was understood as a condition of inner and outer freedom, the possibility of free choice. A variety of perspectives and areas of expertise became a prerequisite of development and progress. The questions of tolerance and non-violent actions were actively studied by the philosophers of modern period (E. Bystrytskyi, R. Valitova, O. Gryva, A. Huseynov, V. Lektorskyi, M. Mchedlov, M.I. Romanenko, D. Sharp, M. Khomiakov, B. Shalin and others).

Today the comprehension of tolerance is getting deeper, for example, by French philosopher Paul Ricoeur. He notes the need not only to guarantee the freedom of the legitimate "different", but to give a weak "different" certain benefits for self-realization.

So, Europe already faced the problem of tolerance and solved it positively. It is a phenomenon of the past conflict between European nations in the sphere of religion. The interpretation of tolerance as toleration is traditional, but not complete. John Locke, the philosopher of the seventeenth century came to the following conclusion: perfect tolerance is not only a conscious and devoid of negative connotation recognition of freedom of the "different" to independently handle its civil or private matters in any way, but without controversy with law. It is also the state protection of every citizen's freedom from any of its illegitimate limitations.

In the summer of 1689 the British Parliament adopted the Toleration Act. Pretty soon it became clear that the legitimate coexistence of several churches did not lead to anarchy and loss of control, and made the country stronger. Thus, tolerance showed for the first time in Europe its potential as an effective tool for achieving political reconciliation of various forces with retaining of their legal rights and freedom of being themselves.

Later the concept of tolerance spread not only on the field of interreligious relations, but on most relationships in society arising from the difference between people and communities, diversity of cultures.

3. Main results of the research. Historically, the term "tolerance" comes from the Latin word tolero, which means "to bear", "to withstand", "to endure", wrote V. Malakhov [10]. So it's a character trait, emerging in person's attitude to someone or something, and character is a set of acquired skills, attitudes, principles, basing both on innate characteristics and ideological principles. The word "acquire" involves a process of becoming, therefore, tolerance as well as endurance is not something set and static: it can be always acquired by the person needing it.

What does the word "tolerance" mean? In terms of the Ukrainian language it is terpymist (toleration). Toleration to something peculiar, significantly different – one's opinion, attitude, belief. It's a rather capacious and broad concept. It concerns international relations, dialogue of cultures, interethnic and interdenominational relations, and culture of the world.

Tolerance means respect, perception and comprehension of the rich cultural diversity in the world, forms of self-expression and self-actualization of the human person. Tolerant (from Lat. tolerable) means being tolerant of one's opinions, attitudes, beliefs, etc.; endurance, self-control, absence or weakening of response to any unfavorable factor as a result of reduced sensitivity to its actions.

It should be noted that there were different approaches to developing the problem of tolerance, depending not only on the scope of application, but also time. Now let us proceed to the development of the idea of tolerance in historical perspective. The first to investigate the issues of toleration and tolerance were ancient philosophers. The problem of tolerance was not set publicly at that time, but its motives were observed in the works of such thinkers as Aristotle, Heraclitus, Antiphon, Seneca and others.

One of the difficulties in understanding the term "tolerance" lies in its meaning in different languages. It is ambiguous in different cultures and depends on the historical experience of the people. In English tolerance is the "willingness and ability to voluntarily accept the personality or thing", in French – "respect of one's will, one's way of thinking, behavior, political and religious views".

In Chinese being tolerant means "to allow, permit, and show generosity to others" and in the Arabic language group tolerance is "forgiveness, indulgence, gentleness, forbearance, pity, affection, patience to others".

Most Russian scientists come from the fact that in Russian there are two words with similar meaning – tolerantnist (tolerance) and terpymist (toleration). However, it is recognized that "terpymist" (toleration) in the Russian language has negative connotation – to suffer psychologically. And "tolerantnist" (tolerance) doesn't have the task to suppress those who are tolerant.

In the nineteenth century the word "tolerate" included 26 lexemes and reflected a variety of meanings: to bear, to suffer, to persevere, to take time, to slacken, etc. [5, 267]. When analyzing the polysemy of "toleration", we came to the conclusion that the term has a passive character, whereas tolerance has in our interpretation mainly pragmatic nature.

We would like to point out the difference between "toleration" and "patience". Patience reflects the feeling of guilt or action on the part of those who suffer from something, or someone, for example, pain, unpleasant relationships. "Toleration" means respect or recognition of equality. Thus, "toleration" is interpreted as openness and freedom of thought. For example, "toleration" is specified in the in the Preamble of the UN Charter: "... to practice toleration and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours" [17, 4]. On the basis of this definition we may point out the efficiency, social activity of this term.

On account of all above mentioned meanings we came to the conclusion that in the academic literature tolerance is viewed as respect and recognition of equality, rejection of domination and violence, recognition of the multidimensionality and diversity of human cultures, norms, beliefs and rejection of reducing this diversity to a single view. Thus, tolerance implies the willingness to accept others as they are and interact with them on the basis of consensus. There is risk of reducing tolerance to indifference and conformity, limiting the interests of others and one's own in the name of "consent", but, in our view, tolerance necessarily anticipates reciprocity and active position of all concerned.

Thus, the coexistence of communities in the sphere of religion and public life under the principle of tolerance had a positive impact on European social development and therefore gained the role of absolute moral values in collective consciousness. In science and politics there are attempts to track the relationship between social disruptions and appropriate environmental responses to natural bursts of human anger, violence and aggression in the form of various natural disasters, earthquakes, floods, typhoons and so on.

And if liberty, democracy, market are described as panacea for all woes that automatically restores the country, it indicates at least the imperception that it may be the panacea only in case of the appropriate spiritual filling of the person, feeling of absolute values, among which tolerance is rather important. Tolerance, as one of the norms of human behavior, is essential to maintain peace and harmony in a civilized society, socio-economic development of all nations. Indeed, Harri Holkeri, the President of the UN General Assembly, stated on November, 16 2000, that tolerance is the value that brings about peace.

Tolerance includes the profound legal principles. The development and progress of civilization are impossible without toleration, regard of each other's interests, equal rights of peoples and their cultures. Today in Europe tolerance belongs to the fundamental democratic principles related to the concepts of pluralism, social freedom and human rights. The problem of tolerance has become especially important with the development of global integration processes in various fields of economic, cultural, social life and education. Being tolerant means to respect other lifestyles, other feelings, traditions, ideas and beliefs.

Tolerance as one of the norms of human behavior is essential for maintaining peace and harmony in a civilized society, socio-economic development of all nations.

On November 16, 1995 the XXVIII Session of the General Conference of UNESCO Member States unanimously adopted the Declaration of Principles on Tolerance. Since then this date is celebrated as the International Day for Tolerance. "Mutual toleration, tolerance for each other, solidarity, mutual listening and understanding", - proclaims the Declaration, "should become the norm of behavior and actions of all people without exception, groups of people, political parties, public organizations and movements, because tolerance is not only a cherished principle, but also a necessity for peace and for the economic and social advancement of all people."

The concept of tolerance is widely used in various social and political spheres of public life which should be promoted in education by demonstrating the organizational capacity of the principle of tolerance. Depending on the scope of use of the concept its meaning varies depending on the viewpoint and usage coordinates. Thus, tolerance can be interpreted in different contexts.

In terms of religion tolerance is necessary not only for religious people, but also for atheists or non-believers. According to Hegel, religion is the area of human spirit which reaches its depths. Tolerance is justified on the basis of rather different perspectives, the most widely spread of which are: Position of Christian toleration; The separation of church and state; The position of the universality of human rights, constitutional democracy and civil equality of all people in their freedom and dignity; The position of state paternalism.

Tolerance as a type of outlook is now widely cultivated in European education. For example, the famous Russian psychologist the head of the Russian psychological and pedagogical school, active in the direction of forming tolerant people, A.G. Asmolov identifies the following aspects of tolerance: evolutionary biological, political, ethical, psychological and pedagogical [1, 6].

In terms of the evolutionary-biological aspect the development of tolerance conception is based on the idea of "reaction rate", i.e. an accepted range of response options, characteristic of different biological species. Thus, in this case tolerance is viewed as the biological characteristics of the organism, its ability to selectively respond to the stimuli and ignore several of them.

German authors divide the biological tolerance into: physiological – represented in the form of the body properties to withstand the deviations of the environmental in allowable limits and environmental tolerance – toleration of certain types of environmental changes [2, 341]. Besides, they put physiological tolerance above environmental tolerance for its value.

In health care tolerance is understood as body resistance to certain substances, ability to tolerate the toxic doses of drugs, alcohol, and nicotine. It is believed that increasing tolerance is evident when the primary dose of toxic substance doesn't cause euphoria, the desired effect [18, 243].

In ethical terms the concept of tolerance is based on humanistic trends which emphasize the enduring value of different human merits and virtues, including merits that distinguish one person from another. If the diversity of people, cultures and nations is treated as value and dignity of culture, then tolerance, being the norm of civilized compromise between competing cultures and willingness to accept other logics and views acts as condition for preserving diversity, the historic right to difference.

On the political plane tolerance is interpreted as the readiness of authorities to permit dissent in society, to allow the work of opposition under Constitution, the ability to accept defeat with dignity. Thus, the opposite is the manifestation of political violence against any social group, the victims of which are national and social minorities [19].

In speaking of political tolerance, O.G. Asmolov views it from the perspective of power [1, 6]. An interesting position of the individual, his/her political behavior, which shows the relation to the principles and norms of the political system, and is determined by political culture. In general individuals' political culture predetermines the nature of his/her political actions – whether it is a tolerant attitude to the opposition, an adequate expression of disagreement and desire to reach consensus, or the political behavior is manifested in extremism, violence, terrorism.

An interesting fact is that in the field of economics, the concept of tolerance is not defined, since it cannot be in terms of basic principle of market development – competition, rivalry between manufacturers. The possible consideration of tolerance in terms of competition, in the case of identifying it with "pure" competition, which provides equal rights to all producers and eliminates the wicked, "dirty" struggle between competitors [11, 188].

Considering the history of the international documents, which today define human rights, nonviolence and tolerance to others, state the recognition of equality among people and need to support the rights of minorities.

The interest of mankind in tolerance as a way of creating safe society prompted UNESCO to adopt the Declaration of principles on tolerance. It was approved in Paris by Resolution 5.61 of the 28th session of the UNESCO General Conference 5.61. General Conference of UNESCO on November 16, 1995. In the same year the Declaration of principles on tolerance was translated into Russian as "Declaration of principles on toleration". In later versions "toleration" was replaced by "tolerance". This fact reflects the discrepancy in interpreting the term, which existed at the time. The unimpeachable fact was that the Declaration gave the education system priority in tolerance development. Since then the process of theoretical justification of the question and their applications in education practice became more intense.

As is evident from the foregoing, in different periods of European history tolerance covered different social horizons in the life of its population. The most acute disputes consistently occurred in religious, state and political spheres. Today, the wave of tolerance reached the education sphere and covers pedagogical activities.

First the question of pedagogical tolerance was raised by M. Buber. He singled out a number of important qualities of tolerance, showing the relationship of tolerance with the life of people in small groups, and found the traits of tolerant and nontolerant person [3]. Gradually, there appeared the need to create new trend in pedagogics – pedagogy of tolerance.

In Russian science it was first mentioned by the famous Russian educator V.O. Tyshkov [15]. In the second half of the 1990s – in the early 2000s there appeared the research area focused on the pedagogy of tolerance. The researchers studied different sides of tolerance with the purpose of applying the results in the areas of pedagogy and psychology

(Glebov A., Gromova E., Ivanova L., Ilchenko L., Ioffe A., Kozlov V., Lebedeva N., Mubynova Z., Myrotvorska I., Nepochatykh O., Perepelitsyna M., Rozhkov M., Rybak Ye., Sokolova V.).

At the same time the pedagogy of cooperation, tolerance, is based on the concept of the individual as the highest value, as the goal of the whole social process, and not its means. In general, the tolerant personality of student can be educated, formed only by the professionally trained and tolerant teaching staff. Therefore, it is necessary to seek everywhere – in family, classroom, there, where there is exchange of ideas, thoughts, where there is training and communication, tolerance and mutual respect should become the norm of conduct and mutual respect.

There is the need to form in the younger generation the ability to tolerate, to develop competence, which helps to orient in the complicated, diverse and inconsistent world. Psychological and social tasks are transformed into pedagogical task with polysemantic nature – to train tolerant mind. In fact, it is an outlook problem with the signs of globalization in modern conditions of developing socio-economic relations in the country.

On the one hand, tolerance is the psychological characteristics of individuals, the way they perceive and understand the world. However, toleration, as a conventional individual feature, may not show up as long as he comes into interaction with other people, groups, institutes, with everything that is meaningful to him or acquires such significance during interaction.

On the other hand, according to some concepts and theories, the individual possesses psychological intention, opposite to tolerance, – intolerance. Especially productive in this direction is the identity theory, according to which there is always a dichotomy "we" "they" in human life, due to which the person constructs an individual vision of reality, determines the significance and value of the outworld factors. However, this dichotomy produces the intolerance potency in people since the time they begin to perceive the world, structure it in their minds.

Moreover, in the process of self-cognition and development of "ego" people are permanently forced to make choice between tolerance and intolerance, set in their attitude to the world by self-preservation mechanisms [14].

There is tolerance at the psychological and social levels. At the psychological level tolerance is the individual's internal position and attitude to the external stimulus, while at the social level it is action or social norm [16]. In psychology tolerance is regarded as a social system property, which is characterized by the acceptance of another system, its elements and manifestations, without any resistance. There appears constructive tolerance that increases the likelihood of stable functioning and system development.

Destructive tolerance, on the contrary, under equal conditions reduces the likelihood of stable functioning and system development and prevents it from stable functioning and development.

Therefore, tolerance is not passive, not natural submission to the opinion, views and actions of others; not obedient patience, but the mindset, active outlook position, expressed in psychological readiness for tolerance in the name of mutual understanding, positive interaction with people of different cultural, national, religious, social or outlook environment, people with other attitudes and positions.

Pragmatic aspect of tolerance is expressed in the ability to listen, to be attentive interlocutor who respects other's opinions, who is deliberate and calm in conflict situations, which can properly solved. Tolerant attitude assumes benevolent attitude to other people, diverse and multivariant considerate position.

Having analyzed different approaches to tolerance, we can determine what tolerance was investigated by scientists as: social value, norm of social life, principle of human relations and behavior, personal quality. Besides, it should be noted that there are different types of tolerance. They were most fully analyzed and identified by V.A. Lektorskyi. He described tolerance as:

- indifference to the existence of different views and practices. This type characterizes the situation when different belief systems are accepted, provided they do not conflict with universal standards;

- respect for other people, whom I do not understand with whom I do not interact. This type is singled out in virtue of equality of cultures and absence of privileged system of views and beliefs;

- toleration for weakness of others. This type bears a derogatory context. It is consistent with pluralism and refers to privileges in the systems of beliefs and values;

- enrichment of personal experience and critical dialogue, based on the dialogic nature of mind [9, 46-54].

Based on the classification proposed by V.A. Lektorskyi and on the analysis of works of different authors we can generalize the approaches to tolerance:

- as a passive trait, not directed to actions, which is expressed in the liberal perception of differences, even when they do not seem to be perceived (V.V. Velychko, A.V. Derhay, G.D. Dmyriev, D.V. Karpovych, O.M. Slavchyk);

- as an active position, critically supporting a different given (N.K. Bahareva, N.V Bondarenko, M.S. Myrymanova, G.U. Soldatova, A.A. Pogodina, L.A. Shayherova, O.D. Sharova, N.G. Yurovskykh etc.), which enriches personal experience.

As for the authors' personal position, we support the second approach, as we believe that there is a big difference between passive religious toleration and individual's rational will expression – moderation.

In the process of tolerance formation in young people there are several aspects [13]. We will consider the following criteria as system-forming ones: -tolerance in interpersonal communication; -tolerance in ethnic relations; -tolerance in religious relations.

This is due to the fact that they often become the "stumbling point" in socialization of young people. There are people with very strong will (they are called strong-willed); strong will; moderate will; weak will; invertebrate.

International Commission for UNESCO states that global perspective of education in the twenty-first century is to help people realize their roots and find their place in the world, develop their respect for other cultures [6].

One of the main contradictions in socialization of modern youth is the contradiction between universal human nature of modern education and the national character of individual's life. The observations of modern scholars

(Dzhurynskyi O.N., Yershov V.A. etc.) show that an individual with a big number of national peculiarities, experiences considerable difficulties when adapting in modern multi-ethnic society.

Modern education system is based mainly on the examples of world culture. Its task is to educate the individual at the level of world cultural benefits (to introduce, to teach how to use, etc.). However, the inclusion mechanisms of the individual in social life are mainly connected with the characteristics of a particular social situation: in family, at the local school, village or town, city, among the closest relatives or friends. This situation is related to the mechanisms of social adaptation (disadaptation) of teenagers and young people. Therefore, the task of education is to create the training system that would promote functioning of mechanisms individual's cultural development and character [4].

European teacher training should be universal in this respect. So it makes sense to include into the strategy of tolerant education the requirements to the professional humanist (teacher, psychologist, social worker), which specify what the specialist should know, should be able to and professionally important qualities with account of features of multicultural and multinational environment [8. The specialist should *know*:

– the history and culture of the peoples living in the region, basics of residents' religions; social, national and ethnopegagogics, social and ethnopsychology;

– trends in the development of world community, such as: globalization, urbanization, decentralization, marginalization, etc.;

– social and psychological personality characteristics of the pupil,student, student, client, associated with gender, age, place of residence, nationality, etc.

The specialist should *be able to*:

– communicate and interact with people – children, youth, clients – representatives of different cultural groups with account of their age, gender and other peculiarities;

– provide assistance in the adaptation of the individual and group, if they represent other cultures;

– carry out rehabilitation on recovery of lost social relations in the multicultural environment;

– help the individual or group integrate in culture.

The specialist should *be:*

– emphatic, tolerant, reflexive, socially flexible, i.e., able to respond quickly to social changes. Therefore training of specialists (philosophers, teachers, psychologists) in addition to traditional objectives should include the following components: knowledge of geopolitical and ethno-cultural peculiarities of the region, familiarity with the cultures of the peoples living in the region, special socio-philosophical and socio-pedagogical training. The mentioned trends influence the nature and characteristics of education and training in the multicultural society and in some way contribute to the preparation of professionals working with young people in the multicultural environment. Special vocational training should be imposed on student's philosophical and historical-cultural understanding.

In this case it concerns the world outlook as a system of student's knowledge, beliefs and relations. It is based on the knowledge of history, culture, religion, ethnopedagogics and ethnopsychology of the peoples living in the region, as well as belief in the need to maintain peace and stability in the region, country and world in general. Respect for the individuals, readiness to defend their rights and interests, regardless of their cultural, national or religious affiliation. Besides, the development of multicultural way of thinking can be called as a special component of student's way of thinking. In view of this it is necessary to make provisions of the following issues:

- formation of ideas of cultural, national, religious diversity of the world and the need to accept this diversity for granted;

- recognition of the right of all nations and cultures for their identity;

- acquirement of specific conceptual framework that will help describe themselves and others in cultural diversity. In the context of multicultural way of there are specific types of mental activities, such as interpretation, identification, reflection, design, modeling [7, 27].

Considerable efforts are needed to educate a tolerant person. And on both sides. In our opinion, tolerance of every teacher begins with professionalism, pedagogical excellence and specific academic freedom. The methodology and lesson structure are not as important as impact on student's professional personal achievements as the outcome of the educational process.

Tolerance in the relationship "teacher – student" is an extremely challenging problem. And yet it can be solved. The two parties should show common sense, willpower, fairness, developed sense of responsibility particularly of older for younger ones. If not, conflicts, failures, misunderstandings are inevitable.

Why is there any antagonism and even aggression to each other? The answer is pretty simple: usually it is because of discourtesy, lack of proper expertise in cultural and educational plane.

Meeting other people, traditions, customs and cultures, we may not always imagine how to behave, because don't know what we deal with. It's both at the interpersonal and interstate levels. Lack of experience, culture of communication, and ignorance of intercultural and human differences give rise to intolerance. The only way to counter this is to raise cultural and education levels.

The pedagogy of cooperation and tolerance is based on the concept of individual as the highest value, as the goal of all social processes, not as their means. In general, the tolerant personality of student can be educated, formed only by the professionally trained and tolerant teaching staff. Therefore, it is necessary to seek everywhere – in family, classroom, there, where there is exchange of ideas, thoughts, where there is training and communication, tolerance and mutual respect should become the norm of conduct and mutual respect.

There are also discussions concerning the degree of tolerance – to what extent and in what situations tolerance may be present. Complete (radical) tolerance is problematic, as it requires tolerance even from radicals, potentially threatening the rights of some citizens and the stability of social system.

Effective tolerance should necessarily be absolute, and effectively perform its functions – to be coercion, to be intolerant to intolerance. Karl Popper defined it as "the paradox of tolerance": "unlimited tolerance must lead to intolerance". In this regard, the dispute concerns the limits of tolerance – the way society and its social institutions can find reasonable means of self-preservation, which to some extent substitutes the principle of tolerance [12].

American researcher Ronald Inglehart refers tolerance directly to the welfare level, economic progress and type of culture. In his opinion, it depends on whether society is closer to "traditional" or to "secular-rational" culture. Societies with culture of the first type are characterized by "survival values", contempt for ethnic equality, gender equality, low level of interpersonal trust, intolerance for dissenters; communities with culture of the second type are characterized by "self-expression values" [8], [20].

We would like to emphasize that the division of people into tolerant and intolerant should be conditional. We can rather speak of a certain individual's orientation – tolerant or intolerant, because everyone in his or her life commits both tolerant and intolerant actions. This fact is mentioned by many researchers of tolerance problems (Soldatova G.U., Shayherova L.A., Sharova O.D etc.). In this regard, we turn to the criteria of tolerance in order to more clearly define the tasks of development of a tolerant person. The question of tolerance criteria was often described by various authors (Asmolov A.G., Hlebkin V.V., Komohorov P.F., Pogodina A.A., Sobkin V.S., Soldatova G.U., Shalin V.V. etc.).

4. Conclusion. Thus, analyzing tolerance in terms of social attitudes, knowledge, quality traits and instrumental skills, it can be concluded that tolerance criteria are such integrative personality characteristics as: a) toleration, b) empathy, c) communicativeness, d) emotional stability, e) social activity, f) adequate level of culture and education, g) sufficient level of critical thinking.

These criteria can be used in the system of tolerance formation in young people for setting goals, designing educational process, diagnostics of individuals and groups, assessing the results of the educational process in the territory of modern Europe.

In view of the above said it can be concluded that tolerance as a phenomenon, need, value, norm and principle of behavior in the development of European education is an essential element, because tolerance, as the property of individual's consciousness, should be formed at school. It is necessary for people throughout their lives and in every sphere of their life activities. Therefore, it can be listed in European values, norms of teachers' professional activities and principles of their behavior in a globalized society in the information age.

References
[1] Asmolov A.G. *Tolerance: from Utopia to Reality*. // On the Way to Tolerance. – M.: Smysl, 2000. – P. 5-7.
[2] *Biology. Reference Book for Pupils and Students*. / Edited by Z. Bremm, I. Maine. Translated from German. – M.: Drofa. 1999. – 400 p.
[3] Buber M. *Me and You*. Translated from German. - M.: Vysshaya shkola, 1993. – 175 p.
[4] Hryva O.A. *Youth Tolerance in Multicultural Environment*: Monograph. – K.: Dragomanov NPU Publishing House, 2007. – 275 p.
[5] Dal V. *Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language*. – M.: 1998. – P. 267.
[6] *Report to UNESCO of the International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first*. – Internet – http://copyright. iile.ru/news_oon
[7] Yershov B. A. *Formation of multicultural way of thinking – condition for preserving the unity of multinational state* // Proceedings of the Russian Academy of Pedagogical and Social Sciences. – M., 2002. – P. 22-29.
[8] Inglehart R. *Culture and democracy* // Culture matters. How values shape human progress / Edited by L. Harrison and S. Huntington. – M. 2002. – P. 106–128.
[9] LektorskyiV.A. *On Tolerance, Pluralism and Criticism* // Problems of Philosophy. – 1997. – № 11. – P. 46-54.
[10] Malakhov V.A. *Communication Ethics: Textbook*. – K.: Lybid, 2006. – 400 p . – P. 329.
[11] *Fundamentals of Economic Theory*. Textbook. Vol.1. – Ed. by. Yu.V.Nikolenko and others. – K.: Lybid, 1998. – 272 p.
[12] Popper K. *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. – K., 1994.
[13] *Problems of Tolerance in the Teenage Culture*. Ed. by V.S. Sobkin. – M.: Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation, 2003. – 280 p.
[14] Romanchuk O. M. *Tolerant and Identity-Semantic Determinants of Professional Training of Social Workers* // Research studies on social and political psychology: Proceedings of the Institute of social and political psychology of the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of Ukraine – K.: IStaPP APN Ukraine, 2008. – Issue № 20 (23). – P. 159-170.
[15] Tishkov V.A. *On Tolerance*. (Report at the general meeting of the Academy of Pedagogical and Social Sciences). – Reprint, s.a.e.l. – 12 p.
[16] *Tolerance as a Basis for Social Safety* / Ed. by N. P. Medvedev. – Stavropol: Servisshkola, 2002. – 280 p.
[17] *UN Charter*. – M., 1985. – 19 p.
[18] Shalin V.V. *Tolerance: (Cultural Norm and Political Necessity)* / Shalin V.V. – Rostov-na-Donu: Sov. Kuban, 2000. – 255 p.
[19] Shilbord N.I., Petrukhin A.S., Krivosheev V.F. *Politics and Law*. Textbook. – M.: Drofa, 1995. – 416 p.
[20] *Inglehart R. Inglehart-Welzel Cultural Map of the World*.