PRINT: ISSN 0972-0073 ONLINE: ISSN 2456-6802
Anthropologist, 20(3): 599-615 (2015)
DOI: 10.31901/24566802.2015/20.03.26

Determination of Tendencies of Secondary School Students to Tolerance and Variables Affecting their Tendencies to Tolerance

Cavus Sahin

Department of Primary Education, Faculty of Education, Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart University, Çanakkale, Turkey
Telephone: +90 505 826 0720; E-mail: csahin25240@yahoo.com

KEYWORDS Acceptance. Empathy. Secondary School Students. Tolerance. Value

ABSTRACT The purpose of this study is to investigate the tolerance tendency levels of secondary school students and determine variables affecting their tolerance tendency levels. Value, acceptance, and empathy levels were considered the sub-dimensions of tolerance. The study adopted a mixed research design. The relational survey model was used at the quantitative stage. A focus group interview was carried out in the quantitative method. In the relational survey model, the population of the study comprised students from secondary schools. Schools' socio-economic backgrounds (SEBG) were chosen as a criterion. Ultimately, 591 students participated in the study. A focus group interview was conducted at each school with low and high SEBGs. The interviews were administered to eight students from each school. A semi-structured interview form was used in the focus group interview and a tendency to tolerance scale was administered as a data collection tool. According to the survey results, the high level of tolerance obtained and its sub-dimensions signify that the present tolerance level is satisfactory. However, considering the concerns resulting from the focus group interviews, it is beneficial to take affecting variables (gender, family's monthly income, grade, SEBG) into account for the sustainability and amelioration of the present conditions of tolerance levels.

INTRODUCTION

Individual and society are two different social terms which contain interactive relationships and with the reflection of these relationships, they gain particular meaning and identity. In a living area embellished with democracy culture, there may be lots of variables that affect and direct the relationship between the individual and society. Among these variables, 'the concept of values' comes into prominence as a most important one. As a part of local, regional, national, international and even universal approaches, the values which not only affect the cultures both also affected by cultures, contain the qualities of being good citizens. It is difficult to describe the 'values' concept and commonly defined as 'guides to action' or 'the moral compasses by which to navigate our interaction with members of society' (Solomons and Fataar 2011). There are lots of values of good citizens, such as tolerance, justice, freedom, equality, diversity, authority, privacy, due process, human participation, truth, patriotism, human rights, rule of law, mutual assistance, personal and civic responsibility, self-restraint and self-respect (Schoeman 2006).

The multicultural life paradigm incorporates different identities and lifestyles along with the risk of probable conflicts in the social structure. Although democratic societies regard themselves as pluralistic societies binding individuals with citizenship ties regardless of their color, belief, language, ethnicity, and cultural identity, knowing how to maintain and sustain social harmony has become a shared concern and focus of academic, political, and social debates at the current time, when lifestyles are increasingly diversified. Answers to such questions focus on "tolerance" to protect and develop freedom zones of individuals in a democratic society (Yazgan 2013).

"Tolerance is hard to describe, perhaps because it is defined somewhat differently from language to language with meaning nuances" (UNESCO 1994). "Each […] encompasses the fundamental essence of tolerance, to respect the rights of others, 'the different', to be who they are" (Aspin 1995; Persell et al. 2001; Rapp and Freitag 2014; Smith 2002; Sniderman et al. 1989; [a]ahin 2011; UNESCO 1994).

For a person or group to be tolerant, three conditions must be met. First, there must be some conduct about which one disapproves, even if only minimally or potentially. Second, although such a person or group has power to act coercively against, or interfere to prevent, that of which they disapprove, they do not. Third, not

interfering coercively must result from more than acquiescence, resignation, indifference or a balance of power. One does not tolerate that which one is not concerned about; nor is it tolerance simply to accept what one cannot, or is not willing to, change (either because one lacks power to effect change or because, for whatever reason, one fears to use one's power) (Bretherton 2004).

Tolerance as an ethical virtue (Fiala 2005) does not require us to accept other people's beliefs or behaviors (Forst 2001), but it does require us to respect every person's human dignity and human rights, including the freedom of conscience (Lickona 2002; Simmons 1965). Tolerance, perceived as an efficient solution to clashes of conflicting opinions and behaviors, is considered to be the primary basis of democratic societies (Kris and Shane 2014). Tolerance is thus valued on both pragmatic and moral grounds (Wainryb et al. 1998). As Stouffer (1955) stated, tolerance is the recognition of the fact that "a free society cannot exist unless one is willing to accept the rights of others to think and behave differently" (Williams, et al. 1976), which signifies a structure in which social freedoms rely on the respect to individuals.

Etymologically, tolerance (Latin originated) is identical to patience (Aubakirova et al. 2014). As Orlenius (2010) expressed, tolerance is based on the kernel of ethical principles—that is, the equal and unique value of all people. Tolerance has historically implies patience and endurance, but today it is inappropriate to use the notion as such, which conflicts with democratic values because it necessitates the evaluation and acceptance of the others by setting differences aside. According to Corneo and Jeanne's (2009) tolerance model, "every individual is equipped with a value system. […] The value system of an individual determines how much esteem he allocates to himself and others." Tolerance requires a process of decision making which roots back to a vigorous value system. This system of values is a conscious constitution in which the choices of the individual himself and other individuals are taken into consideration (Potgieter et al. 2014).

Passivity, ignorance, and indifference in the presence of differences cannot be construed as tolerant approaches because indifference and ignorance mean not caring for others, ceasing relationships with them, and disrespecting the differences (Chong 1994; Sahin 2011). It is crucial in tolerance to respect differences because an individual who accepts differences of any kind deserves being called "tolerant." An individual with different beliefs and practices is welcomed into a tolerant person's world (Gündoðan 2009).

It would be appropriate to put forward symptoms of intolerance and their behavioral indicators to be able to concretize tolerance. The indicators of intolerance include language (denial of a different group or a culture), stereotyping (describing all members of a group as characterized by the same attributes), teasing, prejudice, discrimination, ostracism, harassment, desecration and effacement, bullying, expulsion, exclusion, and segregation (UNESCO 1994). The individual's conflict with "the other" brings about the sense of tolerance. Individuals can amicably settle a conflict with "the other" through tolerance, evaluating their attitudes toward "the other" (Mafora 2013; Yazgan 2013).

According to Kincal (2004), when considered as a democratic value, the co-existence of consensus, democracy, and rationality serves to promote social peace by making wars and fighting unnecessary; freedom by rendering dependence on a higher authority and its enforcements unnecessary; safety and security by preventing fights, conflicts and brute force; justice by preventing social injustice and inequality; and social welfare by hindering resource extravagance and loss. Moreover, Gündogan (2009) pointed out that the acceptance of pluralism and differences and reliance on tolerance can be easily abused. Therefore, a democratic state is not obliged to respect every cultural difference and behavioral form arising from this difference. For instance, racism, sexism, misanthropy, radical, and extremist religious and cultural groupism cannot be tolerated (McClosky and Brill 1983). Briefly, tolerance appeals to a wide range of views, unless they threaten individuals and bring direct damage to them.

Problem Statement

Exposure to social and cultural diversity contributes to an understanding of the importance of protecting civil liberties for the maintenance of a democratic society. Processes such as education, urbanization, geographic mobility, exposure to mass media, and change in occupational structure bring people into contact with values,

beliefs, lifestyles, and the like different from their own. These processes promote tolerance. Changes in the social and demographic diversity would increase the tolerance level of the society (Stouffer 1955; Williams et al. 1976). Education system planners constantly have to deal with external determinants such as changing demographical variables which present them with radical challenges (Maarman et al. 2006). Thus, demographical variables should be taken into account in tolerance studies.

Tolerance plays an important part in the education process, which is defined as the self-realization process of the individual. Tolerance, which is also described as an axiological attitude, relies directly on cultural and social relations and necessitates special social rules (Wainryb et al. 1998). Schools are regarded as media where tolerance is acquired and relevant practices are performed (Avery et al. 1997; Donnelly 2004; Kartal et al. 2007). For Simmons (1965) and Williams et al. (1976), education is among the important elements in the development of tolerance. According to Lenski, higher *tolerance* is linked to younger age and greater education (Dynes 1967). Therefore, tolerance acquisition at an early age is more effective. Secondary school education, which is regarded as a crucial stage of individuals' education and an important period for value acquisition, is a noteworthy process for the exercise and permanent inculcation of tolerances (Wainryb et al. 1998). The effects of social and demographic changes on tolerance can be controlled through education, yet the number of studies revealing the effects of these variables on individuals in the secondary school age range is very limited.

Tolerance involves the willingness to accept any kind of differences of an individual or a community (Bretherton 2004; Ferrar 1976; Greene 2015; Nieto 1994). Such an acceptance entails respect and empathy for understanding the other. Thus, the investigation of individuals' evaluation and acceptance of others and of their empathy levels is necessary for conducting studies on tolerance (Aubakirova et al. 2014; Çaliskan and Saglam 2012).

The school is understood as a practice for the governing of society by making the child its future citizen (Popkewitz 2008). Within this context, the comparison of tolerance levels between the schools which have different social-cultural backgrounds and the students who are taught in these schools, contribute to the international literature studying on challenges of 'tolerance acquisition'. With the universal viewpoint, since the today's students are going to be the citizens of future, the determining of the demographic effects on students tolerance levels, fills an important gap in the literature.

Objectives of the Study

The primary concern of the present study is to investigate the tolerance tendency levels of secondary school students as well as determine variables affecting their tolerance tendency levels. In doing so, value, acceptance, and empathy levels are considered as the sub-dimensions of tolerance.

METHODOLOGY

This section of the research elaborates upon the model, population and sampling, data collection tools, and data analysis.

Research Design

The study was carried out using a mixed research design, in which quantitative and qualitative data collection techniques were combined (Creswell 2003; Hesse-Biber 2010; Tashakkori and Teddlie 2003). A relational survey model was used in the quantitative stage. The survey research aims to determine the characteristics of groups, which offer a flexible and comprehensive research opportunity in relation to the studied content by canvassing the views of volunteer participants about the subject (Babbie 2011). The relational survey research attempts to investigate the relationship among the independent, dependent, and control variables. Differentiations in the dependent variables are explained by independent and control variables. The focus group interview was carried out using the quantitative method. Two separate focus group interviews were conducted for the purpose of this study. Each lasted one to one and half hours and was carried out on different days together with a reporter and a moderator.

The study described students' tolerance levels and determined variables effective in their tolerance level from a quantitative perspective, whereas the qualitative part of the study only aimed to support the description of their tolerance levels and carry out an impact study.

Population and Sampling/Study Group

Because the study used a mixed design, population sampling is defined for the quantitative model and the study group for the qualitative model.

Sampling in the Relational Survey Model

In the relational survey model used for the quantitative research method, the population of the study comprised students from secondary schools in the center of the *Canakkale* province. Strata within the population were identified via stratified sampling, which was chosen due to the heterogeneous structure of the population. While forming the strata, homogeneous groups were clustered using schools' socio-economic backgrounds (SEBG) as a criterion. In this context, the strata are comprised of two secondary schools with a lower SEBG and two secondary schools with a higher SEBG. In stratified sampling, different sampling techniques can be used for sub-sampling. Sub-sampling in each stratum was determined by cluster sampling, with clusters composed of fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth graders. Participants of the sub-sampling were included in the study through random sampling (Onwuegbuzie and Collins 2007).

Table 1 contains descriptive statistics of sample. The sample included 591 students who participated in the study. An examination of the distribution of students by school indicated that 293 students belong to schools with low SEBG and 298 to schools with high SEBG. The sample consisted of 152 (25.7%) fifth graders, 161 (27.2%) sixth graders, 156 (26.4%) seventh graders, and 122 (20.6%) eighth graders. In terms of gender distribution, 287 (48.6%) participants were female and 304 (51.4%) were male students.

Table 1: Descriptive statistical data from sampling of Relational Survey Model

		f (frequency	*% (percent)*
Secondary schools with low socio-economic background (school names abbreviated)	SFC	168	57.3
	TRO	125	42.7
	Total	293	100.0
	ÖMO	157	52.7
Secondary schools with high socio-economic background (school names abbreviated)	CPO	141	47.3
	Total	298	100.0
Grade	5thGrade	152	25.7
	6thGrade	161	27.2
	7thGrade	156	26.4
	8thGrade	122	20.6
	Total	591	100.0
Gender	Female	287	48.6
	Male	304	51.4
	Total	591	100.0

This study investigated students' tendencies for tolerance in terms of specific variables, including number of siblings, parents' educational background, gender, grade, family income, and SEBG. Table 2 contains descriptive analyses of these variables.

Parents' education levels of students at schools with low SEBG are slightly lower than those of the parents of students at schools with high SEBG. Students with two siblings are most common, followed by one and three siblings, respectively.

Settlement properties of the *Çanakkale* province and families' monthly incomes obtained through the students' answers were considered to describe the schools' socio-economic backgrounds. Data on families' monthly incomes are shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Families' monthly income distribution by school

		*1-800 TL**		*801-1500 TL**		*1501-2500 TL**		*2501-4000 TL**		*4001 TL* and over*		*Total*	
		f	*%*	*f*	*%*	*F*	*%*	*f*	*%*	*f*	*%*	*f*	*%*
Secondary schools with low socio-economic background (school names abbreviated)	SFC	49	29.2	61	36.3	43	25.6	14	8.3	1	0.6	168	100.0
	TRO	29	23.2	58	46.4	26	20.8	6	4.8	6	4.8	125	100.0
Secondary schools with high socio-economic background (school names abbreviated)	ÖMO	13	8.3	24	15.3	36	22.9	59	37.6	25	15.9	157	100.0
	CPO	8	5.7	16	11.3	45	31.9	47	33.3	25	17.7	141	100.0

*1TL=0.347 Euro; 1TL=0.469 Dollar (09.2014, exchange rate)

Table 2: Descriptive statistics related to students' socio-economic background

Variables			*Illiterate*		*Primary school graduate*		*Secondary school graduate*		*High school graduate*		*University graduate*		*Post-graduate*	
			f	%	*f*	%	*f*	%	*f*	%	*f*	%	*f*	%
Education Background of Mother	Secondary schools with low socio-economic background	SFC	12	7.1	70	41.7	40	23.8	39	23.2	6	3.6	1	0.6
		TRO	9	7.2	59	47.2	30	24.0	22	17.6	3	2.4	2	1.6
	Secondary schools with high socio-economic background	ÖMO	4	2.5	33	21.0	18	11.5	53	33.8	44	28.0	5	3.2
		CPO	2	1.4	19	13.5	22	15.6	48	34.0	45	31.9	5	3.5
			Illiterate		*Primary school graduate*		*Secondary school graduate*		*High school graduate*		*University graduate*		*Post-graduate*	
Education Background of Father	Secondary schools with low socio-economic background	SFC	12	7.1	48	28.6	42	25.0	45	26.8	21	12.5	0	0.0
		TRO	3	2.4	35	28.0	33	26.4	41	32.8	13	10.4	0	0.0
	Secondary schools with high socio-economic background	ÖMO	3	1.9	23	14.6	16	10.2	36	22.9	70	44.6	9	5.7
		CPO	0	0.0	10	7.1	26	18.4	33	23.4	65	46.1	7	5.0
			1		*2*		*3*		*4*		*5*		*6 and more*	
Number of Siblings	Secondary schools with low socio-economic background	SFC	32	19.0	91	54.2	24	14.3	8	4.8	7	4.2	6	3.6
		TRO	37	29.6	58	46.4	22	17.6	8	6.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Secondary schools with high socio-economic background	ÖMO	28	17.8	90	57.3	28	17.8	3	1.9	5	3.2	3	1.9
		CPO	27	19.1	88	62.4	21	14.9	3	2.1	1	0.7	1	0.7

Examining Table 2 indicate that schools' socio-economic backgrounds are appropriate for the purpose of this study.

The sampling size of the number obtained as a result of the calculation carried out with a formula was considered in the relational survey study (Tabachnick and Fidell 2007):

N>50+8m

N: Number of the participants

m: Number of the independent variables

The independent variables considered were gender, schools' socio-economic levels, grades, number of siblings, families' monthly incomes, and parents' educational background. Based on the formula, any sampling size exceeding 50+8.7 = 106 participants was deemed to be adequate enough for the quantitative part of the study. Given that the study covers 591 students, sampling size does not constitute a problem.

Study Group of Focus Group Interview

In the focus group interview conducted in the qualitative part of the study, it does not matter whether the sampling represents the entire population because the research was not concerned with generalizable results. A study group was formed according to the maximum variation sampling using a purposive sampling technique. Maximum variation sampling aims to choose relevant and suitable individuals to maximize the range of perspectives investigated in the study. The attempt to find common points between variations enables the multilateral investigation of the research subject (Onwuegbuzie and Collins 2007). In this context, a focus group interview was conducted at each school with low and high socio-economic backgrounds. The interviews were administered with eight students from each school, including one girl and boy from each class, resulting in 16 students.

Data Collection Tools

A semi-structured interview form used in the focus group interview and the Tendency to Tolerance Scale were used as data collection tools.

Tendency to Tolerance Scale

Çaliskan and Saglam (2012) developed the Tendency to Tolerance Scale to investigate students' tendencies to tolerance and variables affecting their tendencies. The Tendency to Tolerance Scale consists of three sub-dimensions—namely, value, acceptance, and empathy—and 18 items. Internal consistency coefficients for reliability for the original scale and the pilot study conducted by the researcher are highlighted in Table 4.

Table 4: Results of reliability analysis of tendency to tolerance scale

Sub-dimensions	*Original scale*	*Pilot study*
Value	.86	.83
Acceptance	.70	.75
Empathy	.63	.75
Total	.89	.90

According to the data (see Table 4), the Tendency to Tolerance Scale is reliable enough for the sub-dimensions and the entire scale.

Focus Group Interview: Semi-structured Interview Form

The semi-structured interview form was produced for use in the focus group interview. The main questions pertained to tendency to tolerance, and sample cases were created in line with the levels of the students. Question items were revised according to experts' feedback. A piloting of the draft interview form and interview plan was conducted with a group of six students, who evaluated whether items were clear and covered the intended subject or not. The form was revised to obtain the final version.

Data Analysis

Because quantitative and qualitative data collection techniques are used in the study, both data analysis techniques are presented separately.

Analysis of the Quantitative Data

SPSS 21.0 was used to analyze the data. Obtained data were coded, entered into the program, and prepared for analysis using a data-screening technique.

During the coding of the Tendency to Tolerance Scale, items were marked as 1 for "totally disagree," 2 for "disagree," 3 for "no idea," 4 for

"agree," and 5 for "totally agree." For the description of sub-dimensions "value," "acceptance," and "empathy" evaluations were deduced from total scores using the following scale: very low (1), low (2), moderate (3), high (4), and very high (5). A scale of five degrees, ranging from "totally agree" to "totally disagree," was used; this five-degree scaling consisted of four equal intervals. Thus, a 4/5=0.80 coefficient was found and used to determine the actual intervals of the scale points (1–1.79 totally disagree/very low; 1.80–2.59 disagree/low; 2.60–3.39 don't know/moderate; 3.40–4.19 agree/high; 4.20–5.00 totally agree/very high). Arithmetic means of the participants in relation to the items in the Tendency to Tolerance Scale were interpreted by considering these intervals.

The normality of the distribution was tested and histogram analysis as well as skewness and kurtosis values were described so as to determine which test would be appropriate for the analysis of the data obtained by the Tendency to Tolerance Scale. Consequently, it was concluded that the distribution was not normal. The fact that skewness and kurtosis values did not fall outside the -1 to +1 range is the primary cause of the lack of normality. From this viewpoint, descriptive statistical methods (frequency, percentage, arithmetic average, standard deviation) were used in the complimentary analyses, and a Mann Whitney U test was used in the analysis to determine the significance of differences between variables. An ordered logistic regression analysis was conducted for the analysis of variables affecting the tendency to tolerance.

An ordered logistic regression was applied to explain the relationship between variables or to measure the effect(s) of independent variables on dependent variables and in the data sets where dependent variables are ordinal categorical and independent variables are nominal, dichotomous, and continuous. Values of the Wald test are expected to be significant ($p<.05$) in the interpretation of parameters in the results of the applied ordered logistic regression analysis. Values obtained with an estimation value from significant value category and by taking the "e power" of the estimation value are the basis of interpretation.

Analysis of the Qualitative Data

Data recorded on the recorder during the course of the semi-structured interview were transcribed. While producing the transcriptions, participants' comments were carefully transcribed verbatim. After the transcription process, the results were compared with the records. Interview results transformed into transcripts were coded for the purposes of the study. While performing the codings, coding reliability was observed. The coding was carried out by the researcher and an academic expert. Thus, the analyses by different coders were compared.

The reliability formula *Reliability = Number of Agreements / (Total Number of Agreements + Disagreements)* proposed by Miles and Huberman (1994) was used to calculate coding reliability in the content analysis of data collected during the research. The reliability of the codings was calculated to be 86 percent; therefore, codings were accepted as reliable. Any reliability calculation over 70 percent is assumed to be reliable (Miles and Huberman 1994).

The participants' opinions about tolerance are described by inducing generalities from the codings. Descriptions are supported by the explanations provided by the participants. When describing the interviews, the names of the participants were coded to avoid the disclosure of their identities. The coding system is as follows:

H7M: a seventh-grade male student at a secondary school with a high socio-economic background.

L5F: a fifth-grade female student at a secondary school with a low socio-economic background.

FINDINGS

This part of the study presents the quantitative and qualitative statistical analyses carried out in line with the sub-goals.

Findings Pertaining to Quantitative Data

The findings elicited via the Tendency to Tolerance Scale are presented in this part.

Students' Tolerance Levels

Answers given to the items on the scale used to describe students' tolerance levels are separately provided in Appendix 1. The data indicate that students' tolerance levels are generally very high. Table 5 presents the tolerance levels of the students according to the sub-dimensions and the schools' SEBG.

Table 5: Students' tolerance levels according to value, acceptance, and empathy

Sub-dimensions of tolerance		*Frequency**	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*x*	*s*
Value	Secondary schools with low socio-economic background	f	2	1	13	120	157	4.4642	.66434
		%	0.7	0.3	4.4	41	53.6		
	Secondary schools with high socio-economic background	f	1	0	8	79	210	4.6678	.56291
		%	0.3	.0	2.7	26.5	70.5		
Acceptance	Secondary schools with low socio-economic background	f	2	7	52	132	100	4.0956	.81787
		%	0.7	2.4	17.7	45.1	34.1		
	Secondary schools with high socio-economic background	f	2	8	51	143	94	4.0705	.80721
		%	0.7	2.7	17.1	48	31.5		
Empathy	Secondary schools with low socio-economic background	f	2	9	47	127	108	4.1263	.83651
		%	0.7	3.1	16	43.3	36.9		
	Secondary schools with high socio-economic background	f	1	4	29	103	161	4.4060	.74732
		%	0.3	1.3	9.7	34.6	54		

Note. 5: very high, 4: high, 3: moderate, 2: low, 1: very low

According to Table 5, scores for value are very high for students at schools with low SEBG ($\bar{X}$=4.46) and high SEBG ($\bar{X}$=4.67); scores for acceptance are high for students at schools with low SEBG (X=4.10) and high SEBG ($\bar{X}$=4.07); and scores for empathy are high for the students at schools with low SEBG ($\bar{X}$=4.12) and very high for students at schools with high SEBG ($\bar{X}$=4.41). These findings indicate high tolerance levels. Table 6 indicates whether value, acceptance, and empathy levels differentiate according to different SEBG.

When he differentiation of students' tolerance levels is considered in terms of socio-economic background of the region of the school, a statistical significance was obtained for the sub-dimensions value (U=36774.5; p<.05) and empathy (U=34956.0; p<.05). It was discovered in relation with the ordinal means that value and empathy levels of the student at schools with a high socio-economic background are lower than those of the students at schools with a low socio-economic background. The analysis yielded

Table 6: Mann-Whitney U Test Results (a) related to variations in students' tolerance levels according to the school's socio-economic background

Sub-dimensions of tolerance	*SEBG*	*n*	*Mean rank*	*Sum of S ranks*	*Mann-WhitneyU*	*Z*	*Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)*
Value	Low	293	272.51	79845.50	36774.500	-3.351	.001*
	High	298	319.10	95090.50			
	Total	591					
Acceptance	Low	293	296.59	86901.00	43484.000	-.084	.933
	High	298	295.42	88035.00			
	Total	591					
Empathy	Low	293	266.31	78027.50	34956.500	-4.272	.000*
	High	298	325.20	96908.50			
	Total	591					

Note. a Grouping Variable: SEBG; *p< .05

a significant difference (U=43484.0; p>.05) pertaining to acceptance with regard to the region's socio-economic background. Students' acceptance levels were similar in both regions.

Factors Affecting Students' Tolerance Levels

By considering the value, acceptance, and empathy sub-dimensions, the study sought to investigate to what extent students' tolerance level is affected by such variables as the region's socio-economic background, gender, grade, sibling number, monthly income of the family, and parents' educational background. Findings and interpretations pertaining to the sub-dimensions of tolerance are presented in this section of the study. To this end, the investigation of goodness-of-fit will first be provided via a test of parallel lines, a goodness-of-fit test, and pseudo values; parameters related with the model are then presented and interpreted.

Parallel Assumption

Assumption of parallelity should be carried out for the ordered logistic regression analysis. Results elicited from the analysis are given in Table 7.

Table 7 suggests that categories of the dependent variable are parallel to each other in each of the three dimensions, and an assumption of parallelity is achieved (p>.05 for each subdimension).

Goodness-of-fit

Results pertaining to the model's goodness-of-fit are summarized in Table 8. According to Table 8, the complementary log-log linked ordered logistic regression model is appropriate for each tolerance sub-dimension (p>.05 for each sub-dimension).

Table 8: Goodness-of-Fit Test for tolerance sub-dimensions (goodness-of-fit)

	Sub-dimensions of tolerance	*Chi-square*	*df*	*Sig.*
Value	Pearson	1641.516	1860	1.000
	Deviance	751.883	1860	1.000
Acceptance	Pearson	1784.314	1860	.894
	Deviance	1098.745	1860	1.000
Empathy	Pearson	1595.831	1860	1.000
	Deviance	1025.505	1860	1.000

Note. Link function: Logit.

The model's goodness-of-fit was investigated using R-square, which indicates what percentage of the dependent variables is explained by independent variables. Because R-square is not a suitable criterion for the analysis of logistic regression analyses, it yields very low results in such analyses, but offers a broader perspective. R-square values are presented in Table 9 as Cox and Snell, Nagelkerke, and McFadden values for each of the three sub-dimensions.

Table 9: Investigation of goodness-of-fit through pseudo values (pseudo r-square)

	Value	*Acceptance*	*Empathy*
Cox and Snell	.125	.067	.129
Nagelkerke	.155	.074	.145
McFadden	.082	.030	.063

Note. Link function: Logit.

Table 7: Assumption-of-Parallelity Test for tolerance sub-dimensions (Test of Parallel Lines (c))

Sub-dimensions of tolerance	*Model*	*-2 Log Likelihood*	*Chi-square*	*df*	*Sig.*
Value	Null Hypothesis	813.745			
	General	748.625(a)	65.121(b)	72	.704
Acceptance	Null Hypothesis	1199.508			
	General	1119.910(a)	79.597(b)	72	.252
Empathy	Null Hypothesis	1111.828			
	General	1016.274(a)	90.555(b)	72	.053

Note: The null hypothesis states that the location parameters (slope coefficients) are the same across response categories.
a The log-likelihood value cannot be further increased after the maximum number of step-halving.
b The Chi-square statistic is computed based on the log-likelihood value of the last iteration of the general model. Validity of the test is uncertain.
c Link function: Logit.

Based on the foregoing findings, the data are deemed to be appropriate for the ordered logistic regression analysis.

As Table 10 indicates, only significant values are interpreted. Estimation values and $e^{â}$ values are considered in the interpretation. It is crucial to determine reference categories to interpret $e^{â}$ value. Table 10 shows that reference categories are the last categories. The variables are interpreted according to odds ratios.

Gender

According to Table 10, the gender variable of tolerance is an important determiner. "Male" was selected as a reference category for the gender variable. According to the data, tolerance levels of the female students are 1.81 times more than those of males in terms of the value sub-dimension, 1.49 times in terms of the acceptance sub-dimension, and 2.07 times in terms of the empathy sub-dimension.

Socio-economic Background of the School (SEBG)

Only in the empathy sub-dimension of tolerance as a statistical difference revealed and, relatedly, it can be suggested that it affects the empathy level. Empathy levels of the students at schools with low socio-economic background are 0.64 times less than those at schools with a high socio-economic background. In the previous analyses (Table 6), it was concluded that value and empathy levels of the students at schools with a high socio-economic background are higher than of those at schools with a low socio-economic background. Accordingly, in consideration of all data obtained, not very significant differences were revealed in the tolerance levels of the students at schools with low and high socio-economic backgrounds.

Grade

Significant differences in terms of grade were found only for the acceptance sub-dimension, which is likely to affect students' acceptance levels. Eighth grade was used as the reference category for this variable in the acceptance sub-dimension. Fifth graders' acceptance levels are 1.69 times higher than those of eighth graders.

Monthly Income

"4001 and more TL" is the reference category of monthly income variable which is the effect of tolerance on the value sub-dimension. Although the value level of students whose families' monthly income accounts for 1–800 TL is 0.19 times lower than that of students with high-income families, it is 0.35 times lower for "801–1500 TL."

Father's Educational Background

University graduates and post-graduates were the reference category for the father's educational background variable, which is the effect of tolerance on the value sub-dimension. The value levels of students whose fathers had graduated from a university or post-graduate program were higher. The ratio difference was very low, eight digits after the "dot". Therefore, it is hard to point to a remarkable difference.

Findings Pertaining to Qualitative Data

This part provides findings from the focus group interviews. To concretize the concepts in the focus group interviews, discussions were based on exemplary cases, and interpretations were carried out accordingly.

The first step of the focus group interview was to test the students' tolerance consciousness, and it was observed that all participants adopted the same approach toward tolerance. The discussion was carried out based on exemplary cases to describe students' tendencies to tolerance. Table 11 contains results of qualitative analysis.

Students from both SEBG levels regard empathy as a fundamental skill indispensable for tolerance. The participants stated that they empathize in various situations. Participant L8M shared such exemplary remarks as "I sometimes put myself in my mom's shoes." L5F stated, "When a friend of mine has a low score on an exam, I put myself in his/her shoes to understand him/her." H6F stated, "If a friend of mine is not well-to-do, I put myself in his/her shoes to understand that he/she is in need." H7M explained, "I got 100 points in the exam, and my friend got 20 points and he/she was crying. I put myself in his/her shoes and felt how sad he/she was."

Table 10: Parameter estimates pertaining to the model

		Value					Acceptance						Empathy					
		Estimate â	*Std. Error*	*Wald*	*e^â*	*df*	*Sig.*	*Estimate â*	*Std. Error*	*Wald*	*e^â*	*df*	*Sig.*	*Estimate â*	*Std. Error*	*Wald*	*e^â*	*df*	*Sig.*
Thres hold	Tolerance=1	-23.480	1.530	235.396		1	.000	-5.153	.994	26.850		1	.000	-6.358	1.125	31.939		1	.000
	Tolerance =2	-23.189	1.503	238.028		1	.000	-3.560	.890	16.017		1	.000	-4.646	.998	21.672		1	.000
	Tolerance =3	-21.293	1.432	221.186		1	.000	-1.460	.864	2.858		1	.091	-2.683	.971	7.636		1	.006
	Tolerance =4	-18.466	1.417	169.897		1	.000	.715	.862	.687		1	.407	-.611	.967	.399		1	.528
Location	Gender=Female	.593	.185	10.316	1.81	1	.001*	.398	.160	6.172	1.49	1	.013*	.727	.166	19.050	2.07	1	.000*
	Gender=Male	0(a)	.	.		0	.	0(a)	.	.		0	.	0(a)	.	.		0	.
	School_socio-economic =Low	-.207	.218	.902		1	.342	.350	.196	3.189		1	.074	-.448	.200	4.994	.64	1	.025*
	School_socio-economic =High	0(a)	.	.		0	.	0(a)	.	.		0	.	0(a)	.	.		0	.
	Grade=5	.017	.266	.004		1	.950	.522	.235	4.947	1.69	1	.026*	-.402	.241	2.785		1	.095
	Grade =6	-.070	.263	.071		1	.790	.220	.232	.899		1	.343	-.354	.239	2.186		1	.139
	Grade =7	.216	.268	.653		1	.419	.323	.231	1.955		1	.162	.179	.242	.548		1	.459
	Grade =8	0(a)	.	.		0	.	0(a)	.	.		0	.	0(a)	.	.		0	.
	Sibling number=1	-.104	.698	.022		1	.881	-.403	.655	.379		1	.538	.328	.651	.254		1	.615
	Sibling number =2	.160	.677	.056		1	.813	-.270	.638	.179		1	.672	.465	.632	.541		1	.462
	Sibling number =3	-.091	.695	.017		1	.896	-.546	.653	.698		1	.403	-.048	.648	.006		1	.941
	Sibling number =4	-.043	.799	.003		1	.957	-.955	.745	1.647		1	.199	-.417	.739	.319		1	.572
	Sibling number =5	.361	.871	.172		1	.679	-.730	.805	.822		1	.365	-.555	.798	.485		1	.486
	Sibling number =6 and more	0(a)	.	.		0	.	0(a)	.	.		0	.	0(a)	.	.		0	.
	Monthly income= 1-800 TL	-1.682	.456	13.621	.19	1	.000*	-.707	.376	3.538		1	.060	-.373	.387	.927		1	.336
	Monthly income = 801-1500 TL	-1.059	.424	6.251	.35	1	.012*	-.663	.340	3.812		1	.051	-.224	.352	.405		1	.525
	Monthly income = 1501-2500 TL	-.690	.406	2.887		1	.089	-.239	.321	.553		1	.457	-.236	.336	.495		1	.482
	Monthly income = 2501-4000	-.183	.414	.195		1	.659	.077	.314	.061		1	.805	-.044	.332	.017		1	.895
	Monthly income = 4001-..TL	0(a)	.	.		0	.	0(a)	.	.		0	.	0(a)	.	.		0	.
	Mother education= illiterate	-1.664	1.306	1.623		1	.203	-.549	.838	.430		1	.512	.027	.925	.001		1	.977
	Mother education= primary school	-.704	1.231	.327		1	.568	.230	.722	.101		1	.750	.646	.824	.615		1	.433
	Mother education= secondary school	-.935	1.234	.574		1	.449	-.112	.730	.023		1	.878	.311	.829	.141		1	.708
	Mother education= high school	-1.114	1.230	.821		1	.365	.015	.708	.000		1	.983	.582	.815	.509		1	.476
	Mother education= university	-.585	1.245	.220		1	.639	-.100	.724	.019		1	.890	.509	.827	.379		1	.538
	Mother education= postgrad	0(a)	.	.		0	.	0(a)	.	.		0	.	0(a)	.	.		0	.
	Father education= illiterate	-16.781	.610	755.553	5.15.10^-8	1	.000*	-.486	.835	.339		1	.560	-1.972	1.010	3.811	.14	1	.051
	Father education= primary school	-16.229	.336	2333.244	8.95. 10^-8	1	.000*	.489	.684	.511		1	.475	-1.301	.891	2.133		1	.144
	Father education= sec ondary school	-16.759	.307	2985.022	5.27. 10^-8	1	.000*	-.133	.667	.040		1	.842	-1.682	.874	3.701		1	.054
	Father education= high school	-16.528	.266	3855.082	6.64. 10^-8	1	.000*	-.154	.654	.056		1	.813	-1.434	.867	2.740		1	.098
	Father education=university	-16.718	.000	.		1	.	.013	.632	.000		1	.983	-1.269	.844	2.263		1	.133
	Father education= postgrad	0(a)	.	.		0	.	0(a)	.	.		0	.	0(a)	.	.		0	.

Link function: Logit.

a This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

Table 11: Analyses of the results obtained from focus group interviews

Schools with low SEBG		*Questions*	*Schools with high SEBG*	
Participants	*Codes*		*Participants*	*Codes*
All participants	No	Can tolerance exist without empathy?	All participants	No
L8M	Sometimes I do	Do you respect people around you?	H5M and H8F	Yes
All participants except L8M	Yes		All participants except H5M and H8F	I respect people who are trustworthy, close, and known to me, but not the ones who mistreat my acqauaintances
L7F, L8M, L5F,	Yes	Do you accept somebody as he/she is?	H7F	Sometimes
The others	Sometimes		The others	Yes
L8F, L5F	Tolerate	How do you react to someone younger than you who suppresses you by giving orders?	H8F, H5F	Tolerate
The others	Do not tolerate		The others	Do not tolerate
L7F, L6F, L6M, L8M	Tolerate	A friend of yours unwillingly causes an unpleasant situation for you. Do you tolerate it?	H7F	Do not tolerate
The others	Do not tolerate		The others	Tolerate
All participants	Do not tolerate	In relation with the foregoing item, you learn that your friend did it on purpose. Do you tolerate it?	All participants	Do not tolerate

Participants H5M and H8F expressed that people deserve respect for humane reasons, and this process is mutual: If they respect others, others will respect them in return. The majority of the students at schools with a high SEBG also attached importance to trust and intimacy in terms of respecting others. Remarkably, this result was not observed in students at schools with a low SEBG.

Participant H8F stated that she does not accept every person as he/she is and that efforts should be made to change some negative aspects into positive ones. For example, she explained that her friends are disrespectful and abusive from time to time, making them unwelcomed. Similarly, H5M said that it is important to accept individual differences, but this could be problematic in practice; he explained that his friends mock him because of his skin color. H7F explained that she does not accept people as they are and cannot stand their irritating behaviors, which frustrate her. Generally, the students showed tolerance to individual differences and behaviors, although some students indicated limits to their tolerance threshold.

L8F and L5F stated that they can tolerate the negative manners of younger individuals and help them by simply warning them in an appropriate manner. However, students at the other school with a low SEBG expressed that they cannot tolerate such behaviors, but instead react to them. Similarly, students at both schools with a high SEBG stated that they can tolerate such behaviors whereas the others indicated that they cannot. According to H6F, if someone does not respect her, she will break his/her heart even if he/she is younger. H5M stated that he would act the same and gave the following example: "While I was playing football, a younger student was talking as if he was giving an order and saying that he was the captain. I did not take kindly to this behavior." It can be inferred from the fore-

going that the participants have some tolerance problems.

Half of the students at schools with low SEBG can tolerate any unintentional behavior with a negative result whereas the other half stated that they cannot. When their tolerance levels were investigated by making changes in the exemplary cases and intentional misbehaviors are included, all the participants expressed their intolerance. When the students at schools with a high SEBG were examined, it was determined that only one student could not put up with an unintentional behavior; all the other could. Contrarily, all stated that they would be intolerant to intentionally malicious behavior. Only H5F expressed that she would talk to the doer of such an act, distance herself from the doer, and forgive him/her when he/she realizes and accepts his/her mistake. The fact that such a tolerant behavior is only adopted by one student highlights the lack of tolerance of the rest. Tolerance levels of the students could vary depending on the results of the negative behaviors. Those at schools with either SEBG who expressed that they would not be tolerant of an unintentional behavior would forgive the wrongdoer if he/she faced the same outcome, which is considered a negative finding for students' tolerance levels. Some of the students could accept the negative behavior if the wrongdoer suffers the same consequences. Such tendencies might result in undesirable behaviors, like revenge and hatred.

DISCUSSION

Information age and the global changes in it lessen the distances between the societies and forced the different cultures being together. Since today's world needs close relationships between the different cultures of societies, it is necessary for individuals to be gained tolerance in order to construct healthy social structures and keep having so. Most of all, the younger the students the more permanent tolerance they have. Being as a universal term 'tolerance', investigation of students' levels of tolerance is an important issue. Determining the challenges in students' tolerance acquisition is a significant opportunity to increase students' tolerance levels and to maintain the existing tolerance levels of students. In this study, the variables that affect tolerance are addressed.

When secondary school students' tolerance tendencies are investigated, tolerance levels of students at schools with high SEBGs are shown to be quantitatively higher than those of students at schools with low SEBG; however, both have qualitatively high tolerance tendency levels. Keskin et al. (2012) found a high level of tolerance in secondary school students. Çaliskan and Saglam (2012) obtained similar results. When tolerance levels are considered according to value, acceptance, and empathy sub-dimensions, it can be seen that students have a very high tendency for tolerance in terms of value dimension in schools with either SEBG, while it is high in only the acceptance sub-dimension. Although it is very high in the empathy sub-dimension at the high SEBG school, it is only high in schools with a low SEBG. When these results are examined, it is revealed that secondary school students respect other individuals and accept them irrespective of their differences. However, value levels are slightly higher than acceptance levels. Whereas value is associated with an attitude, acceptance is related with behavior. Thus, it can be perceived that it is normal for secondary school students to display such a difference because the likelihood of translation of behavioral tendencies toward others into relationships is quite higher than into attitudes, which explains the obtained results. In addition, the fact that tendencies are similar in both groups despite differences in socio-economic backgrounds suggests that economic parameters are not effective in value and acceptance sub-dimensions. On the other hand, empathy levels are not similar in both groups as observed in the other two sub-dimensions. Students at schools with a high SEBG scored lower than those at schools with a low SEBG (empathy levels of both groups are high; the aforementioned difference is quantitative), which might result from such factors as education, environment, and lifestyle differences of students with a high SEBG. Secondary school students possess a certain tolerance competence. The stability of these views regardless of different environments, time, and cases is surely open to discussion. Focus group interviews conducted to this end offer solutions to this problem. The analyses yielded that students' tolerance levels are high, but in some cases they are unwilling to be tolerant. It can be seen that intentional and unintentional behaviors violating individual rights and conflicting with their inter-

ests are not tolerated. Moreover, behaviors intended to hurt one's pride and ego are likely to lessen the occurrences of tolerance. In reaction, not only intolerance but also behavioral and affective reactions might emerge.

The most effective variable observed in tolerance tendencies is gender, and female students scored higher than males in terms of value, acceptance, and empathy. According to Golebiowska (1999), gender is a significant determiner for tolerance, and men are more tolerant than women (Williams et al. 1976). Çaliskan and Saglam (2012) revealed in their study that girls are more tolerant. Keskin et al. (2012) conducted a study with secondary school students and found no significant difference between girls and boys, proving that gender cannot be overlooked in the acquisition of tolerance. Although female students' tolerance levels are higher, those of male students are often higher or the same in other studies. Tolerance is shaped by culture. Therefore, understanding and roles of gender in culture are effective. In addition to gender, family's monthly income (value level of those with 0–1500 TL (approximately 550 Euro or 700 Dollar) income is lower) and father's education level (university graduates and post-graduates have a higher value level) are effective for determining the value sub-dimension, while the grade variable (fifth graders have a higher level of acceptance) has an effect on acceptance and high SEBG (empathy levels of students at school with a high SEBG are higher) on empathy. The limited effect of socio-economic level variable is significant. Tippett and Wolke (2014) state that socioeconomic level has a very limited effect on intolerance for other students. Contrary to this study, Borinskaya et al. (2014) emphasizes the socioeconomic level on the degree of tolerance. Tolerance creates a less stressful environment so, individuals tend to be happy. In order to get this outcome, the level of tolerance is expected to be high and hence they take socio-economic level as an indicator.

According to Çaliskan and Saglam's (2012) findings, the higher the grade is, the lower the tolerance levels are; in addition, the higher mothers' education levels are, the higher students' tolerance levels became. Fathers' educational background created no variation in tolerance. In the research carried out by Keskin et al. (2012), tolerance levels of secondary school students did not vary according to SEBG variable. Thus, gender, socio-economic structure, grades, and parents' education levels have varying levels of effects on tolerance of secondary school students.

The obtained high level of tolerance and its sub-dimensions (value, acceptance, and empathy) signify that the present tolerance level is satisfactory. According to Mokeyeva et al. (2015), the rejection of some qualities such as violence and vicious are gains of students of educational systems which maintain tolerance as value.

However, considering the concerns resulting from the focus group interviews, it is beneficial to take affecting variables into account for the sustainability and amelioration of the present conditions of tolerance levels.

CONCLUSION

The results of the study revealed a high level of tolerance for secondary school students. There is no significant difference when tolerance levels are discussed both for low and high socio-economic background. Tolerance level of students from different socio-economic background is only effective on the dimensions of value and empathy. However, this difference is limited. Because, in general, students have higher levels of tolerance in value, empathy, and acceptance which are considered as sub-dimensions of tolerance.

As for factors which affect tolerance levels; gender, socio-economic status, class, parents' level of education are effective in various ways on the tolerance level of secondary school students. The result that, high levels of tolerance might be vulnerable in an uncontrolled educational environment should not be ignored.

RECOMMENDATIONS

When education is defined as preparing the individual for a vigorous and qualified society, high tolerance level of secondary school students is significant. For the sustainability of this level, it is suggested that, with respect to educational policies, functional mechanisms should be improved. Besides, it is important to support students by considering some factors such as, gender, socio-economic status, class, and parents' level of education. From another point of view, it is suggested that, educational environments should be organized by including value, empa-

thy, and acceptance which are considered as sub dimensions of tolerance.

FOR FUTURE STUDIES

This paper studies tolerance in secondary schools within the framework of defined independent variables. In this respect, the investigation of tolerance both prior to and after secondary school would help us to have a wider understanding for the development of tolerance. Besides, in the light of various theoretical bases, the concept of tolerance could be investigated with reference to different paradigms. Additionally, investigation of functional outcomes of high level of tolerance would provide feedback for the educational system.

LIMITATIONS OF STUDY

The current study has a mixed methodology design and interpreted the findings with reference to both positivistic and interpretive paradigms. The validity of the findings is interpreted with the framework of these paradigms.

Value and empathy were taken into consideration as sub dimensions of tolerance and level of tolerance were interpreted with regard to these three sub component.

Çanakkale, the province where the study was carried out is of high level social status. The results should be interpreted within this framework.

REFERENCES

Aspin DN 1995. The conception of democracy: A philosophy for democratic education. In: JD Chapman, ID Froumin, DN Aspin (Eds.): *Creating and Managing the Democratic School.* London: Falmer, pp. 30-59.

Aubakirova SS, Ismagambetova ZN, Karabayeva AG, Akhmetova GG 2014. Tolerance in contemporary Kazakshtan socio-cultural space. *European Journal of Science and Teology,* 10(6): 89-98.

Avery PG, Sullivan JL, Wood SL 1997. Teaching for tolerance of diverse beliefs. *Theory into Practice*, 36(1): 32–38.

Babbie E 2011. *The Basics of Social Research.* 5th Edition. USA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Borinskaya S, Inglehart R, Harro J, Cotter A, Ponarin E, Welzel C 2014. Genetic factors, cultural predispositions, happiness and gender equality. *Journal of Research in Gender Studies*, 2014(1): 32-100.

Bretherton L 2004. Tolerance, education and hospitality: A theological proposal. *Studies in Christian Ethics,* 17(1): 80-103.

Chong D 1994. Tolerance and social adjustment to new norms and practices. *Political Behavior,* 16(1): 21–53.

Corneo G, Jeanne O 2009. A theory of tolerance. *Journal of Public Economics,* 93: 691–702.

Creswell JW 2003. *Research Design, Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches.* 2nd Edition. USA: Sage Publication.

Çaliskan H, Saglam HI 2012. A study on the development of the tendency to tolerance scale and an analysis of the tendencies of primary school students to tolerance through certain variables. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice,* 12(2): 1431–1446.

Donnelly C 2004. Constructing the ethos of tolerance and respect in an integrated school: The role of teachers. *British Educational Research Journal,* 30(2): 263–278.

Dynes W 1967. Education and tolerance: An analysis of intervening factors. *Social Forces,* 46(1): 22–34.

Ferrar JW 1976. The dimensions of tolerance. *The Pacific Sociological Review*, 19(1): 63–81.

Fiala A 2005. *Tolerance and the Ethical Life*. USA: Continuum Press.

Forst R 2001. Tolerance as a virtue of justice. *Philosophical Explorations: An International Journal for the Philosophy of Mind and Action,* 4(3): 193–206.

Golebiowska EA 1999. Gender gap in political tolerance. *Political Behavior,* 21(1): 43–66.

Greene, JP 2015. Learning from live theater: Students realize gains knowledge, tolerance and more. *Education Next,* 15(1): 54-71.

Gündoðan AO 2009. Demokrasi ve Kabul Görme Sorunu. *I. International European Union, Democracy, Citizenship and Citizenship Education Symposium, Symposium Proceedings,* Usak University, AB Egitim, Arastirma ve Uygulama Merkezi, Usak, 28-30 May 2009, pp.74-76.

Hesse-Biber SN 2010. *Mixed Method Research: Merging Theory with Practice.* USA: The Guilford Press.

Kartal O, Saygili S, Gökçen E, Özdemir S, Ates R, Attila S, Kincal R 2007. The tolerance level of high school students. In: A Ross (Ed.): *Citizenship Education in Society.* London: CiCe, pp. 723–736.

Keskin Y, Öksüz Y, Gelen Y, Yilmaz HB 2012. Comparing the acquisition levels of some universal values in the 5th grade students (The Case of Samsun). *Ondokuz Mayis Üniversitesi Egitim Fakültesi Dergisi,* 31(2): 351–374.

Kincal RY 2004. *Vatandaslik Bilgisi.* Ankara: Mikro Basim –Yayim –Dagitim.

Kris D, Shane PS 2014. Pluralistic conditioning: Social tolerance and effective democracy. *Democratization*, 21(1): 1-28.

Lickona T 2002. Making Sense of Tolerance and Diversity. The Fourth and Fifth Rs, 8(2). From <www.cortland.edu/character>

Maarman R, Steyn E, Wolhuter C 2006. Optimal demographic information for policy development in the South African education system. *South African Journal of Education,* 26(2): 295–304.

Mafora P 2013. (In)tolerance of diversity and school governance: Perceptions and experiences of parents in Soweto secondary schools. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences,* 4(4): 101–109.

McClosky H, Brill A 1983. *Dimensions of Tolerance: What Americans Believe About Civil Liberties*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Miles MB, Huberman AM1994. *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*. 2nd Edition. USA: Sage Publications.

Mokeyeva EV, Zakirova VG, Masalimova AR 2015. Tolerant pedagogic space as a condition of non-violence position education among elementary school pupils. *Review of European Studies*, 7(4): 216-220.

Nieto S 1994. Affirmation, solidarity and critique: Moving beyond tolerance in multicultural education. *Multicultural Education*, (4): 7: 18.

Onwuegbuzie AJ, Collins KMT 2007. A typology of mixed methods sampling designs in social science research. *The Qualitative Report*, 12(2): 281–316.

Orlenius K 2010. Tolerance of intolerance: Values and virtues at stake in education. *Journal of Moral Education*, 37(4): 467–484.

Persell CH, Green A, Gurevich L 2001. Civil society, economic distress, and social tolerance. *Sociological Forum*, 16(2): 203–230.

Popkewitz T 2008. Education sciences, schooling, and abjection: Recognizing difference and the making of inequality? *South African Journal of Education*, 28: 301-319.

Potgieter FJ, Walt JL, Wolhuter CC 2014. Towards understanding (religious) (in)tolerance in education. *HTS Teologiese Studies/Theological Studies*, 70(3): 1-8.

Rapp C, Freitag M 2014. Teaching tolerance? Associational diversity and tolerance formation. *Political Studies*, 1-21.

Schoeman S 2006. A blueprint for democratic citizenship education in South African public schools: African teachers' perceptions of good citizenship. *South African Journal of Education*, 26(1): 129–142.

Simmons JL 1965. Tolerance of divergent attitudes. *Social Forces*, 43(3): 347–352.

SmithT 2002. Tolerance and forgiveness: Virtues or vices? *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 14(1): 31–41.

Sniderman PM, Tetlock PE, Glaser JM, Green DP, Hout M 1989. Principled tolerance and the American mass public. *British Journal of Political Science*, 19(1): 25–45.

Solomons I, Fataar A 2011. A conceptual exploration of values education in the context of schooling in South Africa. *South African Journal of Education*, 31: 224-232.

Stouffer SA 1955. *Communism, Conformity and Civil Liberties*. New York: Doubleday.

Sahin Ç 2011. Perceptions on prospective teachers about tolerance education. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 6(1): 77–86.

Tabachnick BG, Fidell LS 2007. *Using Multivariate Statistics*. 5th Edition. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Tashakkori A, Teddlie C 2003. *Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioral Research*. USA: Sage Publication.

Tippett N, Wolke D 2014. Socio-economic status and bullying: A meta-analysis. *American Journal of Public Health*, 104(6): 48-59.

UNESCO 1994. *Tolerance: The Threshold of Peace: A Teaching/Learning Guide for Education for Peace, Human Rights and Democracy*.

Wainryb C, Shaw LA, Maianu C 1998. Tolerance and intolerance: Children's and adolescents' judgments of dissenting beliefs, speech, persons, and conduct. *Child Development*, 69(6): 1541–1555.

Williams JA Jr, Nunn CZ, St Peter L 1976. Origins of Tolerance: Findings From a Replication of Stouffer's Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties. Sociology Department, Faculty Publications (Paper 123). From <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/sociologyfacpub/123> (Retrieved on 7 March 2015).

Yazgan AD 2013. *The Relationship Between Media Literacy Levels of Pre-service Teachers and Their Democratic Values Concerning Active Citizenship*. Doctoral Dissertation. Institute of Educational Science. Çanakkale: Çanakkale Onsekiz Mart Universtiy.

APPENDIX

Appendix 1: Determination of tolerance tendencies of students

School with low SEBG									*School with high SEBG*							
s	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*Frequency*		*	*Frequency*		*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	s
4.6177	0.71478	3	3	13	65	209	f	1. I do understand people's having different t houghts and mindsets.	f	3	0	12	45	238	4.7282	0.63294
		1	1	4.4	22.2	71.3	%		%	1	.0	4	15.1	79.9		
4.5734	0.80169	6	2	16	63	206	f	2. It is normal that people are different.	f	2	2	3	35	256	4.8154	0.54076
		2	0.7	5.5	21.5	70.3	%		%	0.7	0.7	1	11.7	85.9		
4.5973	0.74594	2	5	19	57	210	f	3. It is important that tolerance spread across people.	f	2	2	8	45	241	4.7483	0.60337
		0.7	1.7	6.5	19.5	71.7	%		%	0.7	0.7	2.7	15.1	80.9		
4.3208	0.96487	9	5	35	78	166	f	4. I accept people as they are.	f	2	2	25	75	194	4.5336	0.73435
		3.1	1.7	11.9	26.6	56.7	%		%	0.7	0.7	8.4	25.2	65.1		
4.3242	0.91449	6	7	33	87	160	f	5. Other people's thoughts can be right. too.	f	5	3	20	70	200	4.5336	0.80437
		2	2.4	11.3	29.7	54.6	%		%	1.7	1	6.7	23.5	67.1		
4.3891	0.88295	6	5	28	84	170	f	6. I do tolerate different views.	f	3	2	23	57	213	4.594	0.74732
		2	1.7	9.6	28.7	58	%		%	1	0.7	7.7	19.1	71.5		
4.3447	0.95835	8	4	41	66	174	f	7. I love people.	f	4	1	26	66	201	4.5403	0.77854
		2.7	1.4	14	22.5	59.4	%		%	1.3	0.3	8.7	22.1	67.4		
4.413	0.94548	7	7	32	59	188	f	8. Reconciling people cross with each other makes me happy.	f	10	6	23	66	193	4.4295	0.96229
		2.4	2.4	10.9	20.1	64.2	%		%	3.4	2	7.7	22.1	64.8		
4.4164	0.90509	5	5	39	58	186	f	9. I am a beloved person.	f	3	3	36	69	187	4.4564	0.82047
		1.7	1.7	13.3	19.8	63.5	%		%	1	1	12.1	23.2	62.8		
3.587	1.20079	22	24	92	70	85	f	10. I hate nobody.	f	32	32	95	76	63	3.3557	1.23132
		7.5	8.2	31.4	23.9	29	%		%	10.7	10.7	31.9	25.5	21.1		
4.1468	0.98044	6	9	59	81	138	f	11. I understand others' mistakes.	f	7	6	51	75	159	4.2517	0.9677
		2	3.1	20.1	27.6	47.1	%		%	2.3	2	17.1	25.2	53.4		
4.2116	0.99464	8	8	48	79	150	f	12. I am a forgiving person.	f	7	6	45	78	162	4.2819	0.95403
		2.7	2.7	16.4	27	51.2	%		%	2.3	2	15.1	26.2	54.4		
4.0751	1.1443	12	18	55	59	149	f	13. I am not an aggressive person.	f	14	13	47	66	158	4.1443	1.12635
		4.1	6.1	18.8	20.1	50.9	%		%	4.7	4.4	15.8	22.1	53		
4.2014	1.01886	10	6	50	76	151	f	14. I refrain from seeing people as my enemies.	f	9	7	49	79	154	4.2148	1.00211
		3.4	2	17.1	25.9	51.5	%		%	3	2.3	16.4	26.5	51.7		
4.0068	1.13775	16	11	59	76	131	f	15. I can put myself in others' shoes.	f	17	7	36	73	165	4.2148	1.11352
		5.5	3.8	20.1	25.9	44.7	%		%	5.7	2.3	12.1	24.5	55.4		
4.099	1.0405	8	15	52	83	135	f	16. I can understand what people feel.	f	4	6	39	92	157	4.3154	0.87299
		2.7	5.1	17.7	28.3	46.1	%		%	1.3	2	13.1	30.9	52.7		
4.4505	.85715	6	1	32	70	184	f	17. I want my friend to be sincere.	f	2	1	15	34	246	4.7483	0.62529
		2	0.3	10.9	23.9	62.8	%		%	0.7	0.3	5	11.4	82.6		
4.3242	.99002	10	6	33	74	170	f	18. I am sincere to my friends.	f	4	2	20	59	213	4.594	0.76071
		3.4	2	11.3	25.3	58	%		%	1.3	0.7	6.7	19.8	71.5		
4.28	0.70	2	2	23	151	115	f	Total Scores for Tolerance	f	1	0	18	133	146	4.42	0.64
		.7	.7	7.8	51.5	39.2	%		%	.4	.0	6.0	44.6	49.0		

*5: Totally agree. 4: Agree. 3: No idea. 2: Disagree. 1: Totally disagree