

Family Pedagogy

PEDAGOGIKA RODZINY

Kwartalnik

9(1) 2019

ISSN 2543-862X

Rufina Dobrowolska | *The Educational Potential of the Music-aesthetic Space of a Comprehensive School*

Svitlana Hubina | *The Interaction between the School and the Parents in Upbringing of the Adolescent*

Olena Stoliarenko | *The Problem of Teaching Tolerance as a Leading Educational Value and the Basis of Productive Cross-cultural Interaction*

Czesław Gerard Toboła | *Aggressive Behavior of Selected Youth Subcultures*

Inessa Vizniuk | *Hypochondria – Principles and Mechanisms of Behavioral Disorder*

Urszula Kazubowska | *Postparental Love – the Specificity, Symptoms and Significance for the Growth of a Child in the Family*



SPOŁECZNA AKADEMIA NAUK
ŁÓDŹ

Redaktor naczelny:

dr Mariola Świdarska

Sekretarz redakcji:

dr Bożena Zajac

Rada programowa:

Józefa Brągiel, prof. zw. dr hab., Uniwersytet Opolski, Poland
Arthur Ellis, Professor of Education, Seattle Pacific University, USA
Reinhard Golz, Prof., Leibniz Universität Hannover, Germany
Emilia Janigova, Doc. PhDr. Ing., Katolícka univerzita v Ružomberku, Slovakia
Anna Kwak, prof. zw. dr hab., Uniwersytet Warszawski, Poland
Tadeusz Pilch, prof. zw. dr hab., Uniwersytet Warszawski, Poland
Andrzej Radziejewicz-Winnicki, prof. zw. dr hab., Społeczna Akademia Nauk, Poland
Łukasz Sułkowski, prof. zw. dr hab., Społeczna Akademia Nauk, Poland
Andrzej Michał de Tchorzewski, prof. zw. dr hab., Uniwersytet Gdański, Poland
Mikołaj Winiarski, prof. zw. dr hab., Społeczna Akademia Nauk, Poland
Anna Žilova, Prof. PhDr., Katolícka univerzita v Ružomberku, Slovakia
André Boyer, Prof. Emérite, Université de Nice Sophia-Antipolis, France
Cristina Montesi, PhD, Università degli Studi di Perugia, Italy
Abdel Hakim Doukkali, Prof., Université Internationale de Casablanca, Morocco
Maria Uramova, Prof. Ing., PhD., Matej Bel University in Banská Bystrica, Slovakia
Mariola Świdarska, dr, Społeczna Akademia Nauk, Poland (przewodnicząca)

Redaktor naukowy numeru:

Grzegorz Ignatowski

Redakcja „Pedagogiki Rodziny. Family Pedagogy”:

Społeczna Akademia Nauk
ul. Sienkiewicza 9, 90-113 Łódź
42 664 66 21, e-mail: bzajac@san.edu.pl

© Copyright by Społeczna Akademia Nauk

ISSN: 2543-862X

Korekta językowa: Emilia Śliz

Skład i łamanie: Małgorzata Pająk

Projekt okładki: Marcin Szadkowski

Wersja elektroniczna jest wersją pierwotną.

Wszystkie artykuły naukowe w czasopiśmie zostały zrecenzowane zgodnie z wytycznymi Ministerstwa Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego.

Spis treści

Dissertations	5
Rufina Dobrovolska, <i>The Educational Potential of the Music-aesthetic Space of a Comprehensive School</i>	7
Vasyl Haluziak, Iryna Kholkovska, <i>Authority of Educators: Essence, Structure, Forming Stages</i>	17
Svitlana Hubina, <i>The Interaction between the School and the Parents in Upbringing of the Adolescent</i>	33
Volodymyr Shakhov, Vladyslav Shakhov, Natalia Lebedieva, <i>Socio-psychological Mechanisms of the Minimizing Principle of Educational Influence or the Application of Newton's Third Law in Pedagogy</i>	47
Olena Stoliarenko, <i>The Problem of Teaching Tolerance as a Leading Educational Value and the Basis of Productive Cross-cultural Interaction</i>	57
Czesław Gerard Tobała, <i>Aggressive Behavior of Selected Youth Subcultures</i>	67
Inessa Vizniuk, <i>Hypochondria – Principles and Mechanisms of Behavioral Disorder</i>	83
Urszula Kazubowska, <i>Postparental Love – the Specificity, Symptoms and Significance for the Growth of a Child in the Family</i>	93
Research findings	107
Agnieszka Cieślak, Katarzyna Dudek, Aleksandra Zientala, Sławomir Motylewski, Katarzyna Michalak, Elżbieta Poziomska-Piątkowska, <i>The Relationship between Body Posture and Physical Fitness in Children Ages 12–13 attending Primary Schools in Pabianice and Zgierz</i>	109

Olena Stoliarenko¹

Vinnitsia National Technical University

The Problem of Teaching Tolerance as a Leading Educational Value and the Basis of Productive Cross-cultural Interaction

Abstract: The article introduces tolerance training in the classroom as a part of a broader paradigm of teaching culture and intercultural communication skills in the process of foreign language instruction. After a brief discussion on how tolerance is currently understood in Ukraine and in the world, tolerance is presented as, firstly, one of the leading values in modern education and, secondly, as the basis of productive cross-cultural interaction. They conclude with an example of an ESL workshop that embodies the paradigm of culture-based language teaching and targets tolerance as its primary educational goal.

Key words: teaching culture; culture-based approach; cultural and intercultural competence; tolerance training; foreign languages instruction.

The world has changed considerably over the past decades, and the linguistic and cultural abilities are now at the foreground. The reasons why we should consider teaching cultural skills as a part of language teaching are the international role of the English language, which has evolved into a ‘code’ of communication in various spheres, and the globalization process which has opened many new ways for nations to come closer to one another and requires more and more people to move from one cultural environment to another. As a result, people from different cultures “weave their lives into an international fabric that is beginning to fray at the

¹ Olena-best@ukr.net

edges by virtue of miscommunication and propaganda. In order to avoid this cultural and political disintegration, and foster empathy and understanding, teachers should present students with a true picture or representation of another culture and language” [Thanasoulas 2001, p. 18].

The role of cultural learning in the foreign language classroom has been the concern of many teachers and scholars. Recent studies focus on the seamless relationship between target language and target culture teaching. Language is a social institution, both shaping and shaped by the society in which it plays an important role. By teaching a language we are inevitably and implicitly teaching culture [Valdes 1986]. So language is and should be understood as cultural practice. Competence in English has become an important and necessary precondition for better adaptation, self-realization, and effective communication in the modern globalizing world.

Apart from the factual information about a particular society that culture covers, there is also another level of understanding culture as a framework in which people live and communicate with each other. It covers such things as cultural awareness, the qualities to deal successfully with other cultures, and the ability to communicate effectively with people from other cultures. This view calls for adopting an intercultural perspective in language teaching and learning which involves more than developing knowledge of other people and places. It means embracing the fact that communicating across cultures involves accepting both one’s own culturally conditioned nature and that of others and the ways in which these interact in communication. Consequently, this perspective views the teaching of culture as a means of “developing an awareness of, and sensitivity towards, the values and traditions of the people whose language is being studied” [Tucker 1972, p. 26].

Learning to be intercultural involves learning to understand how one’s own culture shapes perceptions of oneself, of the world, and of the relationship with others. That is why, understanding culture as practices with which people engage becomes extremely important. This also means that in the language classroom it is not just a question of learners developing knowledge about another culture but of learners coming to understand themselves in relation to some other culture.

There are many effects of teaching culture: humanizing, motivating, linguistic, and pedagogical. And before exploring other cultures, learners must first become familiar with the idea what it means to be a part of their own culture. By discussing the values and customs they unconsciously take part in it, they feel ready to reflect upon the values and traditions of others “with a higher degree of intellectual objectivity” [Straub 1999]. Culture has a humanizing and a motivating effect on the

language learner and the learning process. Students are generally predisposed to negative attitudes towards both the target culture and the language they learn. Culture literacy, therefore, is there to “refine the self so that it can take a more universal and less egoistic form” [Bada 2000, p. 100]. Teaching culture raises understanding and reduces prejudice towards other cultures and people. By emphasizing the cultural content, teachers can help students to accept existing cultural differences among people and defeat stereotypes. By focusing on the characteristics and traits that are important to the members of the target community teachers can make students aware that there are no such things as superior and inferior cultures and that there are differences among people within the target culture, as well. The teachers’ task is to stimulate students’ interest in the target culture, and to help establish the foreign language classroom “not so much as a place where the language is taught, but as one where opportunities for learning of various kinds are provided through the interactions that take place between the participants” [Kramsch 1993, p. 245]. Culture influences language teaching in two ways: linguistic and pedagogical. Linguistically, it affects the semantic, pragmatic, and discourse levels of the language. Pedagogically, it influences the choice of the language materials. Cultural content of the language materials is to be taken into consideration while deciding upon the language class materials.

Teachers need to make culture learning a consistent component of their language classes. The goal is to improve the English-speaking abilities of the students while making them more aware of the importance of intercultural proficiency and stimulating their interest in foreign cultures. Students should view English as not a series of grammar rules to memorize for tests, but also as “a language of world citizenship for learning about our global village” [Cares 2004, p. 32]. The activities in class, therefore, should strengthen intercultural understanding while correcting or confirming notions we may have of other cultures. “Culture should be our message to students and language our medium” [Peck 1998, p. 5].

Among the most efficient means of fostering tolerance in culture-based language teaching and learning we distinguish the cultural competency and tolerance in the English language classroom. Incorporating the culture of the target language in the language teaching programs aims at developing a culturally competent individual. Cultural competency may be defined as “the ability to identify and challenge one’s own cultural assumptions, one’s values and beliefs. It is also about developing empathy and connected knowledge, the ability to see the world through another’s eyes, or at the very least, to recognize that

others may view the world through different cultural lenses” [Fitzgerald 2000, p. 184]. It is also assumed as the ability to work effectively across cultures, understand the dynamics that emerge because of cultural differences and create processes to accommodate people from diverse cultural settings [Betancourt et al. 2003]. Culturally competent individuals demonstrate more open behaviors, greater flexibility and non-judgmental perceptions in professional and social contexts. Though, importantly, cultural competency requires more than practicing tolerance, the notions are interconnected. Developing cultural competency can serve as a mechanism of fostering tolerance in culture-based foreign language teaching and learning. However, tolerance is a complex and controversial concept. A detailed review of the relevant research was provided by C.W. Von Bergen et al. According to their own definition applicable to enhancing diversity training program effectiveness, “authentic tolerance [...] involves showing respect and dignity of others without necessarily agreeing with or accepting their practices or values” [von Bergen et al. 2012, p. 116]. In their interpretation of tolerance they agree with W.J. Bennett [2001] that “properly understood, tolerance means treating people with respect and without malice; it does not require us to dissolve social norms or to weaken our commitment to ancient and honorable beliefs” [Bennett 2001, p. 138]. One of the latest literature reviews on tolerance in Russia was given by L.M. Bezotechestvo. Summing up a variety of opinions of the essence of tolerance, the researcher synthesizes the definition of tolerance based on the investigated characteristics of tolerance as a personal quality of an individual and a value. Tolerance is defined as “an integrative dynamic personal quality of an individual which is based on accepting of the inherent value that every personality possesses and which reveals itself as a moral principle in the interaction of an individual with others [...]” [Bezotechestvo 2015, p. 34]. The above given recent definitions correlate with the fundamental essence of tolerance defined by UNESCO in 1995 as “respect, acceptance, and appreciation of the rich diversity of our world’s cultures, our forms of expression, and ways of being human”. Despite the nuances of meaning, there is enough commonality among the quoted definitions to provide a common base for practice: all of them imply personality development which can be done via education.

Tolerance and empathy in the English language classroom play an important role of teaching culture and intercultural communication skills. The analysis of the research data gives evidence to our view of the two main aspects of teaching

tolerance: tolerance as one of the leading values in education and tolerance as the basis of productive cross-cultural interaction. Each subject has the potential of teaching tolerance, nevertheless, a foreign language classroom is one of the most favorable learning environment for education either intolerance or mutual understanding. The process of developing tolerance as a value is promoted through ethics and behaviors of tolerance throughout interactive educational experience in class and out of class activities and virtual communication. It is inspired by healthy learning environment: democratic and cooperative atmosphere in the classroom, unbiased assessment, ethics of teacher-student and peer-to-peer interaction, common values and traditions and belonging to the university community. This way the students develop a tolerant attitude to themselves, empathy and tolerance in relationships with their classmates and educators. The process of developing tolerance as the basis of productive cross-cultural interaction is fostered through infusion of the topics and materials provoking cross-cultural and interpersonal interaction. Thus, students acquire cross-cultural tolerance, adaptability to cultural differences and acknowledgement of the positive aspects of diversity.

The problem of teaching tolerance, pedagogical efforts aiming to develop the students' ability to accept another person, the development of students' empathy and assertiveness have been described by O. Stoliarenko. The use of active forms and methods fosters the formation of tolerant consciousness, tolerant feelings and tolerant behavior of students. The training seminar "The Social Skills Stream of Tolerant Interpersonal Interaction" was regarded as one of the most efficient methods of teaching tolerance [Stoliarenko 2014].

Another means of development a tolerant attitude to others, empathy and tolerance in relationships was introduced by L. Levina [Levina et al. 2016, pp. 277–282]. The teacher developed a detailed lesson plan. The materials can be easily adapted for other needs and educational contexts. A case study method was implied to conduct the workshop. A tolerance training workshop in the classroom was intended to make the abstract notion of being tolerant experienced in a series of two practical exercises. In the course of the workshop students were given an opportunity to see how they might behave and engage in a culture different from their own. The workshop was intended for a monocultural ESL class: it highlighted challenges that monocultural groups rarely encountered in real-life context; this way the workshop enhanced both foreign language and intercultural skills. It could be used on its own or interdisciplinarily, in

relation to topical material studied in disciplines “Culture Studies”, “International Relations”, etc.

So, the example of a workshop will be described in detail. The objective of the lesson implied the elucidation of the concept of tolerance in modern society, fostering intercultural skills through meaningful communication in a foreign language, increasing self-awareness and encourage self-development. The number of participants equals from 30 to 40 high school students or Freshmen/Sophomores; so the educational level can be intermediate and above. Time required is 80 minutes. There are several specific room requirements to be followed – the room should be big enough to allow for movement and quick re-grouping.

The workshop consists of five stages: preliminary questions and discussion; the game with different rules; formulating the principle of tolerance; the Game with different cultures: making conclusions.

The first stage suggests preliminary questions and discussions and lasts ten minutes. The facilitator asks two series of introductory questions. The first series of questions concerns tolerance (“What is tolerance? Why is it such a popular word nowadays?”, “What is your personal attitude to it?”); the second series of preliminary questions concerns culture (“Can you name some of the American values? Traditional Ukrainian values?”, “What are values?”, “What is the difference between beliefs and opinions?”). The facilitator draws a preliminary conclusion that different cultures are characterized by different sets of values and beliefs, and misunderstandings between them and their representatives are practically inevitable. During the second stage, called ‘the Game with Different Rules’ and lasting twenty minutes the participants are asked to sit in groups around several tables (preferably 5–7) and play either a card game or a board game with rolling dice and moving pieces. Each table gets a deck of cards (or a board game) and a sheet with rules. The participants are instructed to familiarize themselves with the rules and play a short practice round. Analyzing the sample rules for the card game – table one includes such rules as: trump cards are spades; deal 5 cards to each player; cards are always dealt by someone new at the table; the first to go is the player with the lowest denomination card (6, 7) of hearts; the players take turns clockwise; the winner of the game is the person who still has cards when everyone else is out. Table two, for instance, suggests the following rules: trumps cards are clubs; deal 7 cards to each player; cards are never dealt by someone new at the table; the first to go is the player with the lowest denomination card (6, 7) of any suit; the players take turns counter-clockwise; the winner of the game is the person who gets rid of all his cards first.

The facilitator notes are suggested for the students: the facilitator tells the participants that during the game no one is allowed to speak and all talking must cease until the end of the game; the participants are not told that the rules are different for each of the tables; the rules are completely arbitrary; the only requirement is that they must contradict each other, so that if someone starts playing by different rules it should quickly become obvious.

After the participants have played a practice round and then another round, the facilitator asks one of the people from each of the tables to move one table up and another – to move one table down (i.e.: from Table 3 one person goes to Table 2 and another goes to Table 4). Talking is still prohibited, only gestures and facial expressions are allowed for communication. Once everybody is seated, the facilitator asks the participants to play another round, and within minutes it becomes clear that the people are playing by different rules. At this point, the participants typically try to use language, and the facilitator must reinforce the No Talking rule. After a few minutes, the facilitator asks another two people from each of the tables to move in the same manner and then asks the participants to play another round. By this time, it is very clear to everyone what is going on, and in a minute or two the facilitator stops the game, allows the participants to speak, and asks them to provide feedback and reflection, asking especially to voice their feeling and reactions to the experience. The facilitator helps to deepen the observations and draws attention to several types of reactions, points out that the different reactions demonstrated by the participants during the game potentially may be the first natural reactions they will exhibit when confronted with an unfamiliar culture/context.

The third stage implies formulating the principle of tolerance and lasts 10 minutes. The facilitator asks the participants another question: “Is tolerance a universal principle or there are things which should never be tolerated? Should we be tolerant no matter what?” The facilitator leads the participants to the idea that there are areas where the principle of tolerance should be balanced by basic human rights and moral values (“You shall not kill,” etc.). However, we must remember that even as we refuse to tolerate certain behaviors and values of others, we must never treat them with disrespect and violate their basic human rights. The facilitator invites the group to formulate the principle of tolerance (in smaller groups), helps the group come up with a quality definition, and writes out the final definition suggested by the participants.

During the fourth stage the Game with Different Cultures (25 min) the facilitator asks about specific areas where tolerance is especially important

for effective communication and interpersonal and intercultural understanding. S/he leads the participants to the conclusion that the areas where different people claim to share the same values (e.g. family, charity, etc.) yet drastically differ in the expressions of these values are especially tricky. The facilitator randomly divides the group into four smaller groups, assigning each of them a specific “culture description” printed out on small cards. Each of the groups is asked to proceed to one of the corners of the room and familiarize themselves with their “culture”. The following are the samples of ‘Culture Descriptions’, which can be adapted in terms of language and available materials/props): Culture 1: In this country everyone is loud and noisy. People are accustomed to express their emotions and feelings openly. It is considered polite to ask about and discuss such things as family, health issues, ailments, relatives – in full detail! – and in response to such questions show the same sort of interest towards the person you’re talking to. Their conversations are characterized by a lot of physical touching. The supreme manifestation of hospitality is offering one’s guests candy. The candy is always unwrapped and eaten right away with great gusto; it is a symbol of trust and abundance. Culture 2: The citizens of this country are cordial and friendly. They welcome their guests with a smile but remain closed off. They give their guests all possible attention, but at the same time avoid answering personal questions. Every single step in their lives is regulated by the traditions and rules known only to themselves (“It is the custom”, “It is not the custom”). If you try to talk them into doing something against their traditions, they always respond with “It is not the custom”. They will never touch (and avoid being touched) by a person who doesn’t belong to their clan. Candy is sacred; one would rather die of hunger than eat it. Having much candy means a high position in society. The people of this culture are not accustomed to physical touch. The participants in each group are asked to act out their culture as consistently as possible and, after a short time of practice, cultures begin visiting each other: Culture 1 goes to visit Culture 2 while Culture 3 visits Culture 4, etc. After the visits, the participants are invited to take their seats (preferably in culture groups) and the facilitator asks them to share their reactions to the game and reflect on the experience.

At the fifth stage the conclusions of the workshop are made. It lasts not more than 10 minutes. The facilitator may encourage the participants to think of practical application of these principles with examples or relevant personal experience.

Since challenges of diversity have become relatively acute in recent years, an increasing amount of attention in foreign languages teaching has been given to acquisition of intercultural skills and cross-cultural communication. A university foreign language classroom nowadays tends to become an educational environment where learning a foreign language through culture offers specific ways of dealing with challenges of diversity. Developing tolerance as one of adaptogenic character qualities occurs through everyday interactive teaching practices promoting tolerant behaviors, empathy and cooperation in the atmosphere of trust and respect.

Bibliography

- Bada E. (2000), *Culture in ELT*, “Cukurova University Journal of Social Sciences”, pp. 100–110.
- Bennett W.J. (2001), *The broken hearth*, Doubleday, New York.
- Betancourt J.R., Green A.R., Carrillo J.E. and Ila O.A. (2003), *Defining cultural competence: a practical framework for addressing racial/ethnic disparities in health and health care*, “Public Health Reports”, 118, pp. 293–302.
- Bezotechstvo L.M. (2015), *Formation of tolerance in students – future teachers: vocational training in the university educational process*, Ph.D thesis, Krasnoyarsk: FSBEI HPE “KSPU named after VP. Astafiev”.
- Cares K. (2004), *Becoming a global teacher: Ten steps to an international classroom. The Language Teacher*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Fitzgerald M.H. (2000), *Establishing cultural competency for mental health professionals* [in:] V. Skultans, J. Cox (eds.), *Anthropological approaches to psychological medicine: Crossing Bridges*, pp. 184–201.
- Kramsch C. (1993), *Context and culture in language teaching*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Levina L., Lukmanova O., Romanovskaya L., Shutova T. (2016), *Teaching Tolerance in the English Language Classroom*, “Procedia. Social and Behavioral Sciences”, Vol. 236, CMSC, Moscow, pp. 277–282.
- Peck D. (1998), *Teaching culture: beyond language*, New Haven Teachers Institute, Yale.
- Stoliarenko O. and Stoliarenko O. (2014), *Teaching the culture of tolerant attitude to students*, Nilan-LTD, Vinnytsia.
- Straub H. (1999), *Designing a cross-cultural course*, “English Forum”, 32(3).
- Thanasoulas D. (2001), *The importance of teaching culture in the foreign language classroom*, Radical Pedagogy, ICAAP.

- Tucker G.R., Lambert W.E. (1972), *Sociocultural aspects of foreign-language study* [in:] J.W. Dodge (ed.), *Northeast Conference Reports. Montpellier*, The Capital City Press, Vermont.
- Valdes J.M. (ed.) (1986), *Culture bound: bridging the cultural gap in language teaching*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Von Bergen C.W., von Bergen B.A., Stubblefield C., Bandow D. (2012), *Authentic tolerance: between forbearance and acceptance*, "Journal of Cultural Diversity", 19(4), pp. 111–117.