

України – процес складний і незавершений, тому потребує об'єднання зусиль громадськості.

Література

1. Дядюк М. С. Український жіночий рух у міжвоєнній Галичині: між гендерною ідентичністю та національною заангажованістю : монографія. Львів : Астролябія, 2011. 368 с.
2. Мусіхіна Г. М. Роль жінки у суспільстві. *Publishing House Education and Science s.r.o.* : веб-сайт. 2008. URL: <https://cutt.ly/zffbMeo> (дата звернення: 23.05.2020).
1. Союз Українок. *Бібліотека Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка* : веб-сайт. URL: <https://cutt.ly/ld7hfds> (дата звернення: 21.05.2020).
2. Резолюція 2111 (2016) «Про оцінку впливу засобів покращення представництва жінок в політиці». *Парламентська Асамблея Ради Європи* : веб-сайт. 2016. 21 квіт. 3 с. URL: <https://cutt.ly/lffb7ah> (дата звернення: 24.05.2020).

ISSUES OF GENDER EDUCATION IN THE CONTEXT OF MODERN EDUCATION

Olga KOSOVYCH

**Ternopil Volodymyr Hnatiuk National
Pedagogical University,
kosovych.olga@tnpu.edu.ua**

The concept of “gender” has very firmly entered to the modern scientific and sociocultural space. The category “gender” becomes the basic and marking for entire areas and scientific disciplines, in particular, such as sociology, psychology, anthropology. In addition, pedagogical sciences are gradually involved in gender space. Gender mainstreaming is not accidental but rather caused by general trends characteristic of the modern scientific context. The increased interest in the processes of individualization, in the private life of a person, as well as the development of new personality theories, in particular, the theory of social constructivism, led to a revision of the scientific principles of studying categories such as ethnicity, age and gender, which were previously interpreted as biologically determined. The new approach required the use of new terminology, in particular, the introduction of the category “gender”. The term *gender* is of English origin. The concept of «gender» first appeared in the work of R. Stoler in 1963. Later, the most active distribution and interpretation of «gender» was received in the writings of feminists Eleanor McCobie, Sandra Bam, Nancy Khodorov, Carol Gilligan and others: «Gender is a set of social and cultural norms that are prescribed in society through power and dominance to people depending on their gender» [1; 5].

The number of studies on gender is large, but despite this, there is still no single approach to understanding the content of this concept, both in domestic and foreign science [6].

In domestic science, there is a dual attitude to “understanding of gender”. The first approach, we call it “traditional”, is based on the correlation of categories of sex and gender. Essentially, this is an upgraded sex-role approach. Gender sociocultural differences are due to physiological differences between a man and a woman. The leading position is occupied by the biological determinism of human behaviour patterns, their

main activities, and not cultural. Proponents of this approach are Yu. Aleshina, I. Cohn, V. Kagan, I. Kashirskaya, A. Volovich. In this vein, the problem of gender education is considered in the context of sex education and upbringing, and limited to their boundaries [6].

The second approach is “constructive” is based on an understanding of gender as a social construct, a model of behaviour for men and women, which determines their position in society and its institutions (family, political structure, economy, culture, education and others). Adherents of this approach are A. Kirilina, N. Kletsin, A. Temkina, M. Tomskaya, O. Voronin et al. In the first place, the authors put forward a socio-cultural assessment and interpretation of gender differences, their inclusion in the system of building power relations.

Such an approach allows a broader approach to the analysis of social, economic and cultural phenomena, among which the following can be distinguished: gender asymmetry (the male is considered primary, rational, dominant, and the female secondary, sensual, subordinate); gender norms within the framework of this culture (“real woman”, “real man”). Thus, the issues of gender education and upbringing remain on the sidelines, this feature is noted by many researchers involved in gender issues. So, L. Shtyleva notes that gender approaches in pedagogy are perceived as scientific exotics so far [7].

On the other hand, the younger generation’s awareness of the imperfection of gender relations existing in society confirms the need to work to promote the ideas of gender equality not only in the education system but also in society as a whole [4]. The educational system traditionally stands out as the second leading institution of socialization: “The development of a student as a person, as a subject of activity is the most important goal and the task of any educational system and can be considered as its system-forming component” [4]. Education set a general vector for the development of personality, including models of gender relations. The main task of the educational system as a social institution is the reproduction of the existing social system, and in this sense, education is quite conservative.

The American school is mainly aimed at the masculine model, which emphasizes such features as independence, aggressiveness, responsibility, competitiveness, and focus on results. In the West, gender education and upbringing begin with kindergarten and school. And this is not accidental, since only education oriented towards gender equality can form an egalitarian consciousness among the younger generation. A significant modernization of the social structure in the 90s, its reorientation to Western models and models, requires a review, including the approach to models of gender behaviour. When society and the family dictate masculine models and the school continues to focus on feminine models according to the Soviet tradition, there is a clear rejection of the school from students, as well as a drop in its authority in the eyes of students.

The gender-role socialization of girls and boys reproduces patriarchal stereotypes of behaviour that reinforce the dominant role of men in the system of public and private relations.

Today, literature is actively developing the idea that an unequivocal emphasis on masculinity or femininity in behaviour models limits the emotional and intellectual development of both men and women [1]. Proponents of the tender approach note that

positive male and female qualities can coexist in the same person. This mixture of qualities forms the so-called androgenic personality, combining a number of positive aspects of both traditionally male and traditionally female behaviour. Moreover, these qualities do not limit the personality in its manifestations. The androgenic type of personality is formed under the influence of special education, thanks to the special position of parents encouraging the child to master patterns of behaviour characteristic of both sexes.

One of the options for the interaction of gender and pedagogy in the education system was proposed by L. Shtyleva. The author introduces the concept of «gender dimension in education». “By the gender dimension in education, we mean assessing the consequences and results of the impact of educational efforts of teachers on the situation and development of boys and girls, their awareness of their identity, the choice of ideals and life goals, the status of children in the school team, a group of peers depending on the biological gender” [7].

L. Shtyleva highlighted several main areas of work with children to expand the opportunities for their socialization, which appear as part of a gender approach in education: 1) the addition of self-fulfilment zones for children (for example, encouraging girls to play sports and boys to self-service); 2) the organization of the experience of equal cooperation of boys and girls in joint activities; 3) the removal of traditional cultural prohibitions on the expression of boys, encouraging them to express feelings; 4) the involvement of both parents (and not just mothers) in raising children [8].

Today, gender education and upbringing present an area of discussion issues awaiting their resolution. The priority ones are the following: 1) a description of the categorical apparatus, 2) clarification and development of a theoretical and methodological base, 3) determination of the main approaches in research work.

References

1. Бем С. Линзы гендера: трансформация взглядов на проблему неравенства полов / пер. с англ. Д. Викторовой. Москва : «Российская политическая энциклопедия» (РОССПЭН), 2004. 336 с.
2. Гендерное образование в средней школе: российский и канадский опыт : учеб.-метод. материалы. Иваново : Ивановский государственный университет, 2002. URL: <https://cutt.ly/2ffngXl> (дата обращения: 15.05.2020).
3. Каширская И. К. Социально-психологический анализ основных источников информации и процесс тендерной социализации. *Вопросы психологии*. 2003. № 6. С. 56–63.
4. Реан А. А., Коломинский Я. Л. Социальная педагогическая психология. Санкт-Петербург : Прайм-Еврознак, 2008. 574 с.
5. Словарь гендерных терминов / под ред. А. А. Денисовой. Москва : Информация XXI век, 2002. 256 с.
6. Батлер Дж. Феминизм под любым другим именем. Интервью с Розой Брайдотти. *Гендерные исследования*. 1999. № 2. С. 53.
7. Штылева Л. В. Педагогика и гендер: развитие гендерных подходов в образовании. *Женщина в российском обществе*. 2000. № 3 (19). С. 61–66.