Dynamics of the communicative tolerance and the attitude of accepting the other person in the social work students

Динамика коммуникативной толерантности и принятия другого при студентов социальной работе

Dinámica de la tolerancia comunicativa y la actitud de aceptar a la otra persona en los estudiantes de trabajo social

Written by:
Anton Stoykov
Associate Professor, PhD
Trakia University
Stara Zagora, Bulgaria
stoykov70@abv.bg
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7347-5408

Abstract

This article is an attempt to analyze the dynamics of development of the communicative tolerance and the acceptance of the other person in the students studying to become Social Workers as part of the traditional higher education, seen as being among the main requirements for performing an effective communication in the social work practice. Presented are results from an experimental study held in 2016-2018 with Social Work students from the Faculty of Medicine at Trakia University, Stara Zagora, Bulgaria. On the basis of these results, proven is the necessity of elaborating scientifically justified models focused on a systematic development of the students' communicative tolerance and their level of accepting the other person, and the inclusion of these models into the higher school training programmes.

Key words: Acceptance of the other person, communicative tolerance, development, dynamics.

Аннотация

Данная статья является попыткой проанализировать динамику развития коммуникативной толерантности и принятия другого человека у студентов-будущих социальных работников, которые рассматриваются как одно из основных требований для эффективного общения в практике социальной работы. Представлены результаты экспериментального исследования, проведенного в 2016-2018 годах со студентами факультета социальной работы медицинского факультета Университета Тракия, Стара Загора, Болгария.

Ключевые слова: Коммуникативной толерантности, принятия другого человека, эффективного общения.

Resumen

Este artículo es un intento de analizar la dinámica del desarrollo de la tolerancia comunicativa y la aceptación de la otra persona en los estudiantes que estudian para convertirse en trabajadores sociales como parte de la educación superior tradicional, visto como uno de los principales requisitos para realizar una comunicación efectiva. en la práctica del trabajo social. Se presentan los resultados de un estudio experimental realizado en 2016-2018 con estudiantes de Trabajo Social de la Facultad de Medicina de la Universidad de Trakia, Stara Zagora, Bulgaria. Sobre la base de estos resultados, se demuestra la necesidad de elaborar modelos científicamente justificados centrados en un desarrollo sistemático de la tolerancia

comunicativa de los estudiantes y su nivel de aceptación de la otra persona, y la inclusión de estos modelos en los programas de formación de la escuela superior.

Palabras clave: Aceptación de la otra persona, tolerancia comunicativa, desarrollo, dinámica.

Introduction

The professional competence of the Social Workers involved in the "person-to-person" system includes not only their special skills and knowledge, value orientation and leading motives for choosing this professional activity but also the level of development of their personal qualities having a direct effect onto their skills for performing an effective communication as this is getting more and more important for ensuring the client's satisfaction. Good communication is at the heart of best practice in social work. Indeed, social work was one of the first professions to recognise the importance of communications skills and how these skills link to effective practice. Communication skills are also essential to the task of assessment and later decision making, not only for social workers but also for other professionals, particularly those working in the field of health and social care. The importance of communication skills can also be seen in government policy, and the emphasis being placed on the role of service users and carers in relation to the new social work degree, and patients (consumers) in relation to health research, policy and practice (Trevithick, Richards, Ruch, Moss, 2004).

A. Leshenko (Leschenko, 1993) points out several groups of skills which the Social Worker should possess. Amongst these, he identifies also the communicative skills in the group of which he identifies: the creation and maintenance of a working atmosphere; overcoming negative feelings which affect people but also the individual himself/herself; identifying and considering as part of the job the differences of personal, social, national, cultural and historical nature; identifying and overcoming aggression and hostility in the relations with people, understanding and interpreting human behavior and relations between people through verbal and non-verbal communication.

The modern concept of social work as a "practice-based profession and an academic discipline that promotes social change and development, social cohesion, and the empowerment and liberation of people" on the basis of which some main principles are formulated, including the principle of respect for diversity, requires from future social workers mastering of skills for tolerant communication.

Tolerance towards diversity and different people is seen by R. Ihara and S. Yamamoto as a key factor in successful communication (Ihara, Yamamoto, 2016).

E. Alekseeva and S. Bratchenko define communicative tolerance as one of the most important qualities of the socionomic specialist, and accept it as a system-forming factor, but also as a transitional state and a sustainable personal position (Alexeeva, Bratchenko, 2003).

In this connection, a mandatory element is the high level of development of the communicative tolerance as being an important element of the communicative competence, which Spitzberg defines as "the ability to interact well with others" (Spitzberg, 1988). G. Bardier points out four structures which determine tolerance:

1. Individual /most of all age, sex and specifics in the functioning of the neurological processes/;

2. Individuality /temper, character, individual's optional connections with the surrounding reality/;

3. Personality /individual's affective, cognitive and communicative characteristics and personal resources, i.e. skills, level of formation of the self-concept, etc./;

4. Activity subject - the whole repertoire of the individual's activities (Berdier, 2005).

For I. Sternin (2003), the most obvious aspect of tolerance manifestation in the individual's behavior is the communicative aspect. In his opinion, the individual's basic attitude of tolerance is determined by the formation of the "tolerance" concept in the individual's communicative consciousness.

In the scientific literature, attention is drawn to studying various aspects of the development of the communicative and personal characteristics of the Social Work students. However, at this point, there are insufficient studies dealing with the issues related to the purposeful formation of

the communicative tolerance and accepting of the other person as being among the most important and needed professional and personal qualities for them.

The tolerance development of the future social workers in the period of professional training at university is an objectively necessary phenomenon of the contemporary socio-pedagogical reality, of the actual professional practice in the social services. It is important for a modern professional community of the social workers to form the anthropocentrical life position among specialists based on the recognition of the world diversity, variety and heterogeneity of people (Nikitina et al., 2016). The same autors seen professionally-communicative tolerance of social workers as the reflection in everyday behavior of a specialist, his humanistic-oriented position in various types of personal and business communications. This tolerance is connected with professional ethics and moral ideals of a specialist, his personal position in the sphere of professional communications, qualities of his character.

> "Social workers are often at the forefront of societal efforts to relate to diversity and difference. As service providers and street-level bureaucrats, social workers are often in a position of power to provide, withhold, or withdraw services or to support or intervene in challenging situations. They often work with clients from diverse backgrounds who face circumstances that can lead to behaviours, or ways of life, that challenge standards or values that social workers endorse on professional or personal grounds, such as their moral, political, or religious convictions. They are often tasked to act as advocates and supporters of social, cultural, and other forms of diversity and differences – consider, for instance, the complexities of supporting the integration of migrants in often less than fully accommodating social environments of their host societies – while acting, as well, in the capacity to represent institutions that also discipline and enforce laws, public policy,

or social norms. It matters greatly how social workers conceptualise and respond to such mismatches, for the sake of their clients, their own, and the wider community. And yet, toleration is not widely discussed in social work literature" (Thomas, Besch and Jung-Sook Lee, 2017).

Good communication skills are essential to any form of social work practice from therapeutic intervention through to the most mundane bureaucratic activities (Koprowska, 2014).

E. Grebenets (2013) defines communicative tolerance as an integrative personal quality of the individual, including the motivation for a tolerant interaction with the communication partner, the positive emotional and value attitude towards the participants in the communication process, their culture, nationality, religious belief, social belonging, point of view, taste, type of behaviour. In his studies treating the problems related to formation of the communicative tolerance in the future Social Workers, L. Jacevic (2010) defines communicative tolerance as a professionally important quality of the individual, the formation of which determines the integrity of the personal and professional development of the future specialist.

According to V. Grischuk (2005), the analysis of the researchers' different approaches for the formation of communicative tolerance, allows to identify the conflicts between: the existing traditional aspects for students' higher school education and the necessity of organizing of a special systematic activity focused on the development of communicative tolerance; understanding the importance of creating conditions in the higher school allowing formation of communicative tolerance in the future Social Worker and the insufficient level at which their content has been elaborated; the existing contradiction between the efforts of the organizers of the process for formation of communicative tolerance in the students and the necessity of developing optimal models for their interaction.

Considering the specifics of the Social Workers' professional sphere, communicative tolerance seems to be one of the most important requirements needed for their effective professional communication. This is determined by the fact that in their day-to-day work they are supposed to communicate with clients whose

sociocultural, behavioral, etc., characteristics turn out to be unusual for them.

On the basis of a theoretical analysis, S. Rusakova (2014) concludes that the authors dealing with the issue treating the essence and formation of communicative tolerance define it as:

- Psychosocial characteristic of the individual with a dominant focus of the mind on the tolerant, non- conflict communication behaviour. /V.M. Grischuk, V.V. Boyko/;
- Sustainable state of the individual determining the individual's particular type of interaction with the other people /O. B. Skryabina/
- The individual's ability to interact with other people /V.V. Boyko, V. M. Grischuk, L. P. Jacevic, E.A. Kalac/
- Ensuring the successful professional activity of the specialists /E. A. Kalac, S. N. Tolstikova, L. P. Jacevic/For V.V. Boyko (1996) communicative tolerance is determined by certain substructures of personality:
- The intellectual substructure: it conveys the paradigm (model, type, style) of the individual's mental activity, i.e. one's own principles of understanding the reality, stereotypes typical for him/her and related with comprehension of issues, ideas, decision-making;
- The value –oriented substructure: it encompasses the individual's leading worldview ideals, his/her close and distant life goals, his/her assessment of each occurring event;
- The ethical substructure – it is an expression of the moral norms adopted by the individual: his/her understanding of what is good and bad, justice and injustice, sense of responsibility, etc.;
- The aesthetical substructure – it is related with the preferences, tastes, feelings and peculiarities of the individual's perception of what is beautiful and ugly, noble and mean, comic and tragic;
- The emotional substructure – it demonstrates the predominant spectrum occupied by the individual: joy or sadness, pessimism or optimism, goodwill or aggression;
- The sensory (sensual) substructure- it encompasses the characteristics of sensory perception of the world at the level of visual, auditory, olfactory, gustatory, tactile and motor sensations;
- The energy-dynamic substructure –it reflects the individual's energy properties, i.e. the quality and strength of one's energy field;
- The algorithmic substructure – it combines a large number of different qualities which are however united by one, i.e. the uniformity of their reproducibility. These include habits, skills and various rituals, including also such related to household, family and religion;
- The characterological substructure – it combines the sustainable, type - forming personality traits which are congenital or acquired as a result of upbringing, examples and imitation;
- The functional substructure – it includes different systems for securing and maintaining the individual's comfort, i.e. most of all the individual's needs and his/her subsequent preferences and desires.

According to V. V. Boyko, the substructures above further determine the different levels of communicative tolerance, i.e.:

- The level of situational communicative tolerance – it is manifested in the individual's attitude towards a particular person in a particular situation;
- The level of typological communicative tolerance – it is manifested in the individual's attitude towards a group or collective personalities, e.g. towards the representatives of a particular nation, social group or profession;
- The level of professional communicative tolerance – it includes the individual's attitude towards collective personalities whom one meets in the process of one's professional communication. In this sense, the extra energy accumulated by emotions is mainly seen in a work environment;
- The level of general communicative tolerance - at this level distinguished are trends in the individual's attitude towards people in general, trends determined by the individual's life experience, trends determined by the individual's expectations, by the individual's character traits, his/her moral principles or mental stability. To a large extent, the general

communicative tolerance is dependent on its other forms, i.e. - the situational, the typological and the professional communicative tolerance.

S. Tolstikova (2002) proposes the following structure of the communicative tolerance as a synthesis of the following substructures:

- The identity substructure /the individual's basic self-concept and his/her basic values in life/;
- The axiological substructure /a combination of the individual's ideas about the meaning of life and his/her motivation and value attitude towards communication as an equal dialogue/;
- The cognitive substructure /reflection of the individual's mental activity, his/her own principles of understanding the reality, the stereotypes typical for him/her and related with the comprehension of issues and ideas/;
- The sensory substructure /the characteristics of sensory perception of the world at a sensational level, i.e. the individual's unique sensory organization and also which of the channels of perception is the leading one for him/her with regard to perceiving the surrounding reality/;
- The emotional substructure /the predominant background mainly occupied by the individual: optimism, pessimism, anxiety/calmness/;
- The characterological substructure /the sustainable traits of the individual, congenital or acquired as a result of upbringing and socialization/;
- The social perception substructure /different variants and levels of the interpersonal and group perception, reflection of reality/;
- The connotative substructure /the specifics of the individual's behavior, habits, work style, rituals, etc./.

Acceptance is one of the leading psychological mechanisms of tolerance. The ability to accept is a basic personality trait within the humanistic psychology. For the mature individual it is normal to accept others as they are, respecting their differences and rights.

The principle of acceptance implies that the social worker must perceive, acknowledge, receive and establish a relationship with the individual client as he actually is, not as we wish him to be or think he should be. It means ~hat no

matter how much the client may have distorted reality,no matter how much our perception of it may differ from his, we must help him .The art of helping, like any other art, depends on accepting material with which we propose to work as it actually exists, with its limitations as well as its potentialities. This principle could be restated by saying that in social work one begins where the client is and at every stage in the helping process relates oneself to the client as he is at each given moment (Kelly, 1955).

> "From one perspective, acceptance is a relational feeling that stems from our appreciation of our clients' humanity; it is this recognition of our common humanity that sensitizes us to their distress and ultimately brings us to action. Another point of view holds that acceptance generates a kind of attentive restraint as we attempt to follow the client's lead in considering his or her situation and what might improve it. In this sense, acceptance is based on and encompasses an understanding and affirmation of the client's own experiences. By accepting our clients, we also offer them a model for accepting themselves and others—a model for responding with appreciation and care to the full range of their own and others' human qualities. According to this view, acceptance is a form of change. But if we think of acceptance of another or of the self as a pressure-free experience of being (being with or just being), without striving, regretting, or evaluating in any way, we are essentially contrasting acceptance and change" (Berlin, 2005).

Acceptance in social work is also often referred to as "unconditional positive regard", "nonpossessive warmth", or "affirmation". These are not easy attitudes to develop, but they are needed if you're going to be an effective social worker. An attitude of acceptance means that you've learned to respect your clients without judgment, realizing that people come from different backgrounds that may not always resemble or mesh with your own. You realize that each client is an individual with unique

needs, desires and goals. Acceptance means that you don't try to change your clients to suit your own needs. You avoid imposing your own wants or beliefs on them -- even if you dislike or disapprove of their actions or behaviors (Miller, 2018).

In the process of communication between the Client and the Social Worker, and also in the process of the interpersonal relationships between them, the communicative strategy in combination with the communicative tolerance, is a requirement for the realization of a developing interaction and establishing an atmosphere of trust. An important role in this process plays the communication attitude already developed in the Social Worker. For A. Markova (1996), communication attitude is the intellectual predisposition, the mood setting for a particular understanding, attitude towards people, objects and events with whom/which the individual interacts, or as a whole, the general predisposition for communication, or otherwise, an attempt to avoid verbal contacts.

With respect to the social work where the Social Worker is involved in the "person-to-person" system, communication attitude should by all means suggest a psychological readiness for positive reactions in terms of the social object and also the subject of interaction. The Social Worker's high level of professionalism is inconsistent with a negative communication attitude on his/her side towards these categories of people with whom he/she is expected to perform professional interactions and within which those people need a proper attitude to themselves.

With regard to the above statement, it can be asserted that formation of communicative tolerance and accepting the differences in the other people as its mandatory pre-condition are among the main tasks of the professional training of the Social Work students.

Materials and methods

The university training and the regulated practical activity in the various social institutions differing by their functions, have a main influence onto the dynamics of development of the communicative tolerance and the positive attitude for accepting the other person.
In the educational process, formation of communicative tolerance and a positive attitude for accepting the other person takes place mainly through lectures and discussions by the help of which the students overcome their negative

attitude with regard to issues related to accepting the other person's differences; lectures and talks in the course of which the students reach particular conclusions and summaries on their own. A special place is given also to the games. Included in a suitable way into the university education programme (in this particular case in the programme of the Social Work students) with the purpose of formation of personal communication skills needed for the students' future career, the games display their huge potential in several main aspects:

1. Real situations of the professional communication are reproduced in them by the means of game modelling, requiring taking of decisions adequate to each particular situation;

2. Each game made part of the professional preparation reflects the professional duties and the diversity of activities of the Social Worker;

3. The game reveals significant possibilities for diagnostics, correction, formation and development of the professional abilities and qualities of the students, including those needed for realization of the successful professional communication;

4. The same game can be integrated at different levels of the educational process and can be directed towards formation of a complex of personal qualities (Stoikov, 2014).

Apart from these forms, actively integrated are also trainings focused on developing the main components of the communicative tolerance and the positive attitude towards accepting the other person. Placing the trainees in an active position with regard to the other one allows to overcome successfully the traditional mistrust and suspicion towards the different people. The specific features of the training seen in the context of developing tolerance in the Social Work students have a favourable effect on reconsidering and overcoming the limitations, and rediscovering the truth for oneself, for the others and for the world around.

During their institutional and state internship, the students are able to visit social institutions varying in their specifics, where with the help of the Social Workers they actively participate in their work and are able to perform various preset tasks.

Their direct contact with clients with different social status, various social problems, cultural and educational level, undoubtedly has an effect on the dynamics of development of their communicative tolerance and their attitude for accepting the others.

An effect on this dynamics has also the students' participation in the university educational process within which through the different subjects students gain knowledge and skills for a successful communication in their future career. The study was held in 2016-2018. The 2-year dynamics of development of the communicative tolerance and the level of accepting the other person in these students was observed. Two stages of the experimental study were held, i.e. the ascertaining stage during which the levels of development of the participant's communicative tolerance and accepting of the other person were determined, and the control stage which took place after a two-year training period with the purpose to follow the dynamics of their development.

To determine its level, we have used The Methods for Diagnosing Communication Tolerance by V. V. Boyko (Fetiskin, Kozlov, Manuilov, 2002) and William F. Fey's Acceptance of Others Scale. Dr. William Fay designed his scale in 1955. It consists of 18 questions. According to him, the scores under the Acceptance of Others Scale can be divided into four groups: high acceptance-of-others score, medium with a tendency to high acceptance – of-others score, medium with a tendency to low acceptance-of-others score and low acceptance-of-others score.

The statistical analysis of the data obtained during the experiment was performed by Student's paired-samples t-test and Coen effect interpretation.

The Methods for Diagnosing Communication Tolerance by V. V. Boyko consists of 45 questions and statements, grouped into nine grading scales:

1. Rejecting or not understanding the other person's individuality;

2. Seeing oneself as a standard in the evaluation of other people;

3. Categoricity or conservatism in the evaluation of other people;

4. Inability to hide or suppress unpleasant impressions from the poor communication skills of other people;

5. Tendency to change or re-educate a partner;

6. Tendency to an authoritarian style of communication;

7. Inability to forgive other people's mistakes;

8. Intolerance towards the other person's discomfort (sickness, tiredness, bad mood);

9. Ability to adapt for interaction with the other people.

The respondents were expected to point out to what degree these statements apply to them using 0-3 scoring system. The higher score reveals the respondent's higher level of intolerance towards the surrounding environment and respectively a low level of his/her communicative tolerance. In addition to that, the total score under each grading scale allows drawing of conclusions about the manifestations of communicative tolerance on side of the relevant respondent.

Fifty-three- full-time Social Work students with the Faculty of Medicine at Trakia University, (28 female and 25 male), took part in the experiment. The assessment of their level of communicative tolerance was made on the basis of three of its levels: high, moderate and low. Processing of the results was based on the statement of Nikolay Shevandrin (2001) who points out that finding of low, moderate and high indicators requires:

1. Determining the maximum possible significance of the score estimation. In our case this is 135 points;

2. Determining the moderate possible significance of the score estimate which is 67.5 in our case;

3. Determining the standard deviation (for this purpose the maximum significance of the score estimation is divided into 4), i.e. 33.75 points;

4. Determining the interval endpoints referring to the high, moderate and low score estimations:

– High level of communicative tolerance: within the interval [0 – 33.75] points;
– Moderate level of communicative tolerance: within the interval [33.75-101.25] points;
– Low level of communicative tolerance: within the interval [101.25 – 135] points;

Below are the reference ranges for the high, medium and low levels under the different grading scales used by the applied methodology:

High level: 0-2.25
Medium level: 2.25-12.75
Low level: 12.75-15.00

Results and discussion

The mean score interpretation for each scale for the two stages of the experimental study and the statistical significance of the difference between them, are presented in Table 1:

Table 1. Mean Score Interpretation for each scale for the two stages of the experimental study and the statistical significance between them/ $p < 0.05$

		Mean	Sig. (2-tailed)
Scale 1 Rejecting or not understanding the other person's individuality	Ascertaining stage Control stage	*5.6486* *6.0541*	*.551*
Scale 2 Seeing oneself as a standard in the evaluation of other people	Ascertaining stage Control stage	*4.4324* *5.1892*	*.300*
Scale 3 Categoricity or conservatism in the evaluation of other people	Ascertaining stage Control stage	*7.7027* *5.4054*	*.000*
Scale 4 Inability to hide or suppress unpleasant impressions from the poor communication skills of other people	Ascertaining stage Control stage	*6.3514* *7.2432*	*.203*
Scale 5 Tendency to change or re-educate a partner	Ascertaining stage Control stage	*6.2162* *6.2703*	*.939*
Scale 6 Tendency to an authoritarian style of communication	Ascertaining stage Control stage	*5.2703* *6.0811*	*.213*
Scale 7 Inability to forgive other people's mistakes	Ascertaining stage Control stage	*7.0811* *4.9459*	*.000*
Scale 8 Intolerance towards the other person's discomfort (sickness, tiredness, bad mood	Ascertaining stage Control stage	*4.7838* *5.2162*	*.541*
Scale 9 Ability to adapt for interaction with the other people	Ascertaining stage Control stage	*5.4054* *6.0811*	*.367*

Ref. Scale 1 "*Rejecting or not understanding the other person's individuality*" observed are medium levels of the mean values. Their comparison does not reveal any statistically significant difference (p > 0.05). The size of the effect is insignificant (d < .20). It can be concluded that with regard to accepting the other person's individuality, the students manifest a medium level of tolerance with respect to the personality differences of their interlocutors, their preferences and interests. For the period covering the ascertaining and the control stages of the experiment, no significant difference in their attitude is seen.

Ref. Scale 2 *"Seeing oneself as a standard in the evaluation of other people"* again the results correspond to the medium level of development. Their comparison does not reveal any statistically significant difference (p > 0.05). Observed is an insignificant size of the effect (d < .20). The more detailed analysis shows a better expressed negative dynamics in the development under this scale. This gives grounds to assume that among the students, there is a tendency to accept themselves as an unequivocal standard with regard to the evaluation of others.

Ref. Scale 3 "*Categoricity or conservatism in the evaluation of other people*" the students involved in the experimental study demonstrate a statistically significant positive dynamics (p < 0.05) and mean results which correspond to a medium level of development. The size of the effect (d= 0.64) is medium. The analysis of this score allows us to conclude that the students increase their tolerance towards the individual manifestations of their partners in the process of communication and do not require from their partners means of communication which they themselves prefer. Categoricity of the evaluation is directly dependent on its objectiveness and suggests confidence in applying it with regard to others. Conservatism in the evaluation of others may be a result of long-lasting stereotypes established already with regard to the individual's value models and hence it may become a reason for its low level of accuracy.

Comparison of the mean values under **Scale 4** *"Inability to hide or suppress unpleasant impressions from the poor communication skills of other people"* obtained during the ascertaining and the control stages of the experiment, shows a negative dynamics in the development and no significant statistical difference (p > 0.05). The size of the effect between the two mean values (d= 0.21) is smaller than the normal. The low degree of developing

this skill as a component of the general communicative tolerance in the Social Worker's career which has a predominant focus on communication would result in serious limitations in the communication process in particular professional situations.

As seen from the Table, the mean values under **Scale 5** "*Tendency to change or re-educate a partner*" received during the ascertaining and the control stages of the experiment, do not demonstrate any significant statistical difference (p > 0.05). The size of the effect which is a sign for the relative importance of the statistically significant results (d < .20) is insignificant.

The results under **Scale 6 "*Tendency to an authoritarian style of communication*"** do not show any significant statistical difference (p > 0.05). The analysis of the mean values demonstrates a negative dynamics of the development. The size of the effect is smaller than the normal (d < .20).

The results under **Scale 7** "*Inability to forgive other people's mistakes*" show a statistically significant positive dynamics (p < 0.05). The size of the effect is medium (d= 0.70). Development of this skill is a mandatory requirement for establishing an atmosphere of trust in the Social Worker's professional communication.

The results from the ascertaining and the control stages of the experiment under **Scale 8** *"Intolerance towards the other person's discomfort (sickness, tiredness, bad mood)"* do not demonstrate any significant statistical difference between the mean values received during the ascertaining and the control stages of the experiment (p > 0.05). The size of the effect between them is insignificant (d < .20). The results under this scale are associated with development of a number of personal qualities related with development of tolerance, empathy and sympathy being among them. This component of tolerance is of significant importance in the Social Worker's professional communication as in his/her professional practice he/she interacts with representatives of various social, professional, ethnical, etc. groups of the society.

Ref. Scale 9 "*Ability to adapt for interaction with the other people*", no statistically significant difference is observed between the mean values received during the ascertaining and the control stages of the experimental study. The size of the effect is insignificant (d < .20). The inability to "adapt" to the partner might pose a serious

hindrance for the proper understanding, and afterwards for the suitably chosen social intervention in an attempt to solve the social problem faced by him/her. Its development suggests manifestation of a high level of empathy.

In conclusion, it should be noted that:

- A statistiucally significant increase is seen under **Scale 3** *"Categoricity or conservatism in the evaluation of other people"* and **Scale 7** "*Inability to forgive other people's mistakes"*
- With regard to the other scales, an increase of the mean values is observed which is a proof for a decrease in the level of the general communicative tolerance of the students (see Table 2) (the higher score level under a particular scale is a sign for a lower level of communicative tolerance with regard this particular aspect of the communication with the partner)

- Relatively high mean group scores for the students participating in the experimental study obtained during the control stage are registered with regard to the following scales:

– Scale 7 "*Inability to forgive other people's mistakes*": mean score 4.94
– Scale 2 "*Seeing oneself as a standard in the evaluation of other people*"- mean score 5.18
– Scale 8 "*Intolerance towards the other person's discomfort (sickness, tiredness, bad mood"*- mean score 5.21

The information about the dynamics of the mean values of the general communicative tolerance, the statistical significance of the difference between them and the size of the effect for the period between the ascertaining and the control stages of the experimental study are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Dynamics of the mean values of the general communicative tolerance, the statistical significance between them and the size of the effect for the ascertaining and the control stages of the experiment

	Mean	Sig. (2-tailed)	Size of effect
Ascertaining stage	53.7838		
Control stage	51.1081	.442	(d < .20)

From the information presented in the Table it can be seen that there is no statistically significant positive dynamics in the level of the general communicative tolerance of the students participating in the experiment for the period between its two stages. The size of the effect between the two mean values is insignificant (d < .20).

The received mean group scores referring to the general communicative tolerance are an evidence for a medium level of its development in most of the Social Work students.

For Y. Ladnova (2014), the individual's medium level of development of the communicative tolerance is characterized by the following more important features:

- Humanistic values are manifested only in situations affecting personally the individual;

- Manifestation of respect to the rules for public behavour;
- Not always an objective self-assessment with regard to the individual's own achievements, skills, capabilities and obligations;
- Motives encouraging and regulating the professional activity from the position of the universal values and moral norms of society in the initial stage of their formation;
- The readiness for independent decision-making and realization of these decisions from the position of the universal values and moral norms is manifested in situations of personal interest.

On the basis of these results, it can be concluded that there is a necessity of elaborating scientifically justified models and their inclusion in the training of the Social Work students, these

models focused mainly on increasing the level of the students' communicative tolerance.

In this connection S. Gaponova and N. Kornilova (2016) recommend the inclusion of trainings focused on broadening and clarifying the understanding of the communicative tolerance (development of its cognitive component); developing the qualities of the tolerant personality; development of the emotional perception component (trainings for tolerant perception of the interlocutor); development of the reflexive component of the communicative tolerance (by trainings focused on getting to know one's own personality as a subject of the tolerant communication); development of a tolerant behavior in communication. As a result of these trainings, in the opinion of the same authors, tolerant models for communication, individual styles of tolerant communicative interaction and cooperation are established. These, in our opinion, would help and develop the tolerant interaction between the subjects of the educational process.

V. Grischuk (2005) sees the communicative tolerance as an element of the complex of objectives of the university training process, as a personal quality which can be developed in the process of the student's training, education and self-education.

As we have already stated above, development of the communicative tolerance is in close connection with the development of the attitude for accepting the other person. In order to follow its dynamics, an experimental study was held in combination with the above one over the same period of time. William Fey's Acceptance of Others Scale was used.

The results received from the ascertaining stage of the experiment show that the biggest number of the students participating in the experimental study (17), i.e. 45.9% demonstrated a medium with a tendency to high acceptance. High level of acceptance is demonstrated by 16 of them (43.24%). A medium with a tendency to low acceptance level is demonstrated by 4 students (10.81%).

The results received during the control stage of the experiment do not differ significantly, i.e. 16 students (43.24%) demonstrated a high level of acceptance, 20 (54%) demonstrated a medium with a tendency to high acceptance and 1 demonstrated a medium with a tendency to low acceptance level. As seen from the percentage distribution, the scores do not differ significantly which is proven also by the comparison of the mean group values. In the students demonstrating a high level of acceptance of the other person, the prosocial attitude should prevail, which is a mandatory requirement for their future career.

The analysis of these results gives us grounds to assume that acceptance of the other person has mainly a spontaneous basis, determined in the majority of students by their social status. Hence, in the Social Worker training process, pedagogical conditions should be established for the formation of acceptance of the other person as a sustainable personality which is needed for the successful realization of the future professional activity.

The mean group score values, the statistical significance between them and the size of the effect obtained during the ascertaining and the control stages of the experimental study are presented in the Table below:

Table 3. Mean groups score values, the statistical significance between them, and the size of the effect obtained during the ascertaining and the control stages of the experimental study

	Mean	Sig. (2-tailed)	Size of effect
Ascertaining stage	58.2432		
Control stage	58.7297	.791	(d < .20)

From the information presented in the Table above, it is seen that there is no significant statistical difference between the results obtained during the ascertaining and the control stages of the experimental study ($p > 0.05$). The size of the effect between the two mean values is insignificant ($d < .20$).

These results once again confirm the necessity of including scientifically justifies models in the educational process oriented to development of tolerance as a personal quality, including also the communicative tolerance of the students, associated with their level of accepting the other person. The high level of acceptance is a mandatory pre-condition for the realization of

future successful social interactions, as well as the manifestations of social mobility. In accordance with the received mean values referring to the students participating in the experimental study, it can be asserted that their position with regard to accepting the other person is still inadequately developed. This means that this should be overcome by developing psychological - pedagogical programmes focused on its positive change.

Conclusion

1. For the successful realization of their future career, the Social Work students are supposed to possess not only the required level of professional knowledge and skills, but also a whole array of personal qualities and characteristics. Among them, as very important, the level of development of their communicative tolerance stands out since its high level of development allows a better efficiency of the process of interpersonal communication between them and their future clients.

2. On the basis of the results obtained from the experimental study, it can be asserted that the standard training system at university is unable to adequately speed up the process of developing the communicative tolerance in the Social Work students, regardless of the academic forms made part of it and intended to develop this personal quality.

3. The levels of accepting the other person preserve their mean values almost unchanged throughout the university training process. However, seeking of positive dynamics in their development can make it possible to integrate in this process new and active training forms intended especially to support it.

4. To speed up the dynamics of development of the communicative tolerance in the Social Work students as part of the university training, more active forms of training should be included with a direct focus on its development, and combined in a scientifically justified methodological system. Our belief is that the potential of the game-based forms of communication can also be used more actively for this purpose. These can be integrated into all forms and stages of the training process.

References

Alexeeva E.V., Bratchenko S.L. (2003). Psychological basis of the teacher's tolerance. Saint-Petersburg, SPbAPPO Publ.

Berdier G. L. (2005). Social psychology of tolerance. Saint-Petersburg.

Berlin S. (2005). The Value of Acceptance in Social Work Direct Practice: A Historical and Contemporary View. In Social Service Review, 79(3), p. 482-510.

Boiko V.V. (1996). Energy of emotions in the communication: first-person and third-person perspective. Moscow, Filin Publ.

Fetiskin N., Kozlov V., Manuilov G. (2002). Social-psychological diagnostics of the development of personality in small groups. Moscow, Institute of Psychotherapy Publ.

Gaponova S., Kornilova N. (2016). Dynamics of the communicative tolerance in students future state and municipal workers. In Organizational physchology and labor physchology, 1(1).

Grebenets S. (2013). Formation of communicative tolerance in senior students in extracurricular activities. Dissertation, Moscow.

Grishuk V.M. (2005). Formation of communicative tolerance in humanitarian students in higher education institutions. Kirov.

Ihara R., Yamamoto S. (2016). Role of tolerance in communication with diverse people. The Annals of Regional Science, 56(1).

Jacevic P. (2010). Formation of communicative tolerance in future social workers. Dissertation.

Kelly R.M. (1955). Acceptance in the Casework Relationship. Master's Theses. Paper 1070. Available at: http://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/1070.

Koprowska J. (2014). Communication and Interpersonal Skills in Social Work, 4th edition.

Ladnova Y. (2014). Criteria of the formation of communicative tolerance in students. In Yaroslav Pedagogical Journal, 1(2).

Leschenko A.I. (1993). Organization and management of social work in Russia. Moscow, MSCU.

Markova K. (1996). Psychology of professionalism. Nauka, Moscow.

Miller. (2018). Why Acceptance Is Important as a Social Worker. Work - Chron.com. Available at: http://work.chron.com/acceptance-important-social-worker-11329.html. Accessed 30 October.

Nikitina N., Grebennikova V., Podzorova M., Nikishina I., Galkina T., Tolstikova S. (2016). About Tolerance Development in Future Social Workers at University as a Professionally

Important Quality. In Indian Journal of Science and Technology, 9(29), p.2-3.

Rusakova S. (2014). Formation of communicative tolerance in students at school. In Journal of Hunmanitarian, social-economic and public sciences, 1.

Shevandrin N.I. (2001). Psychodiagnostics: correction and development of personality. Vlados Publ, Moscow.

Spitzberg B.H. (1988). Communication competence: measures of perceived effectiveness. In C.H. Tardy (ed.): A handbook for the study of human communication, Norwood: Ablex.

Sternin I.A. (2003). Tolerance and communication. In Philisophical and Libguoculturological problems of the tolerance, Ekaterinburg.

Stoikov A. (2014). Education by means of games. In Social activities. ISBN 978-954-338-075-6.

Thomas M., Besch, Jung-Sook Lee. (2017). On toleration in social work. In European Journal of Social Work. DOI: 10.1080/13691457.2017.1286460, p.2.

Tolstikova S.N. (2002). The development of communicative tolerance in future social teachers in the system of communication. Dissertation, Kaluga.

Trevithick P., Richards S., Ruch G., Moss B. (2004). Teaching and learning communication skills in social work education. University of Bristol, University of Reading, University of Southampton, Staffordshire University.