

Dr. Tetiana Matuskevych
National Pedagogical Dragomanov University
e-mail: sokmatus@gmail.com



“UNEQUAL EQUALITY” OF GENDER MAINSTREAMING IN EDUCATION: BASIC DIRECTIONS OF CONCEPTUALIZATION AND PRAXEOLOGICAL IMPLEMENTATION

Introduction

The development and formation of social phenomena and structural changes such as the information revolution, humanization, democratization of society, intensification of cross-cultural communication, globalization, etc., have made a colossal impact on the fundamentals of social systems everywhere and given rise to profound changes in the essence of social institutions and practices, which in turn have given rise to profound changes in the everyday life of people, their ideas, values, interpersonal com-

munications, moral norms, life goals and strategies. These developments and changes contribute to the formation of a new infrastructure of social relationships and personal communications, which requires the appropriate methodological support of educational activities to ensure consistency and continuity, namely attention to gender in all components of the educational system: educational institutions, technologies, and philosophy of education.

Gender mainstreaming in education as a catalyst for democratic changes

During the years of Ukraine's independence, the proportion of seats held by women in the national parliament has never reached more than 12% (in the Parliament of 2014 – 11.1%), although they make up 54% of Ukraine's population and the majority of voters. Ukrainian 'leaky pipeline' – the proportion of female Doctors of Sciences is twice as little as the female PhDs: in 2007 – 19.6%, 2008 – 20.5%, 2009 – 21.6%, in 2010 – 22.6%, in 2011 – 23.8%. Nowadays, there are just 4 female academics working at the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine (NASU). There was just one in 1915. So, the amount of female members of NASU has just slightly increased for the last 100 years. At the beginning of 2012, the percentage of women who were members of the Academy

was 2.15%. 22 women (6.2%) were the corresponding members of the NASU at the beginning of 2012¹.

Engaging gender mainstreaming into Ukrainian educational theory and practice is topical nowadays. It should be mentioned that importance of the transformational role of the gender mainstreaming for transitive societies lies in the fact that gender mainstreaming in education is problematic by its nature, as it involves analysis of socio-cultural reality and its subsequent problematization and deconstruction. The distribution of gender relations through all aspects of everyday life allows teachers and students to analyze the “usual” phenomena of disparity and to look for creative ways to deconstruct them. That is to say, in the process of creative transformation of

1. *Жінки і чоловіки в Україні*, “Державна служба статистики України. Статистичний збірник”, Київ 2011: http://www.ukrstat.gov.ua/druk/katalog/poslugi/Ginky_ta_chol_2010.zip

knowledge, the teacher's and the student's personalities are experiencing a kind of "co-evolutionary" development, a prerequisite of which is dialogic educational process and free educational interaction.

Methodological frameworks that enable us to consider gender mainstreaming in education as a factor in building a democratic society are interdisciplinarity, transversality and the rejection of any "centrism", transgression, and transculturality.

Gender theory is characterized by *interdisciplinarity* because it provides a comprehensive understanding of gender relations as a specific socio-cultural reality. The rigid demarcation of the disciplines is a problem of modern education that can be solved by the interdisciplinarity of gender theory, for instead of fragmentation and rigidity, interdisciplinarity represents a holistic, comprehensive approach. Thus, in its approach to the analysis of socio-cultural reality and to the application of diverse experiences and methods used in different sciences, it can provide productive prospects for the study of syncretic interdependencies of any social phenomena.

Another methodological framework of the gender mainstreaming in education is *transversality*, conceptualized in the works of W. Welsch, F. Guattari and J. Deleuze. Transversality not only provides the recognition of plurality and the existence of heterogeneous positions and paradigms, but also it establishes communication and integration among

them. As a methodological framework for gender mainstreaming in education, transversality recognizes the plurality of personal and professional trajectories, and it rejects all «centrism», particularly the androcentrism inherent to the traditional system of education.

A third methodological framework that might be fruitfully used in gender mainstreaming is *transgression*. Transgression not only represents the ability of the individual to go beyond sociocultural stereotypes (including those of gender) but also to detect the gender stereotypes and inequalities that occur in everyday life and to adequately respond to them.

The next methodological vector of gender mainstreaming in education is *transculturality*. The concept of transculturality was suggested by W. Welsch² to characterize the state of the modern world and is aimed at underlining the interdependence and interconnection of typologically similar culture which indicate that different ways of life do not end at national borders. Unclear boundaries between cultures contribute to their constant interaction through dialogues, conflicts, exchange, and communication development. The transcultural aspects of gender mainstreaming in education are manifested in the following universal humanistic values, common to all cultures: freedom, democracy, responsibility, justice, honesty, respect for the personality and human dignity, egalitarianism, gender tolerance.

The many faces of gender mainstreaming in education

Given the current process of European integration, it is obvious that reforming the Ukrainian educational system on democratic principles requires attention to gender on all levels of the educational system if a society of equal opportunity is to emerge. So, the question arises: is it possible to use the abstract concept of "gender mainstreaming in education" for developing and implementing national programs and policies of equality?

At least two factors serve as the basis for questions of such kind. First, the conceptualization of gender occurred within a wide range of different theories such as biological determinism, social constructivism, structural functionalism, and the con-

cept of gender plurality. Undoubtedly each of the above mentioned theories or concepts can be criticized for excessive sociologization/ biologization/ diversification of gender. But their indisputable contribution to the overall progress of equality is their consideration of gender as a dynamic, multifaceted, and multidimensional phenomenon. So, of course, the educational implications of a gender approach should reflect the multidimensional nature of the concept. Second, since the early 1970s, gender studies were under the influence of different theories and concepts that sometimes contradict one another: postmodernism, empiricism, psychoanalysis, post structuralism, Marxism, critical theory, critical race

2. Wolfgang Welsch, *Transculturality - the puzzling form of cultures today*, "California Sociologist" 17 & 18 (1994/1995), pp. 19-39.

theory, postcolonial theory, queer studies, LGBT studies, critical study of sexuality, concepts of physicality, and a wide range of feminist theories. The subject area of gender studies has increased significantly, except global, regional and national scientific traditions have appeared. Therefore, the "umbrella" term of gender accommodates a wide range of different theories and concepts that accordingly affects the methodological support of educational activities.

From my point of view, it is productive to conduct analysis of gender theory and practice by the criterion of belonging to a certain concept of gender that was chosen as the main purpose of this article. When studying gender mainstreaming in educational theory or practice, it is necessary to find out what understanding of gender it involves. For, as already mentioned, the concept of gender is controversial and multidimensional because it is represented by a large number of theories. My analysis of the theory and practice of gender mainstreaming in education shows that there are three main directions in which gender mainstreaming is conceptualized: *differential*, *social constructivist*, and *radical pluralistic*. These three main directions complement, contradict, and interact with one another, creating conditions for further development of the educational system and social progress. Let us consider each of them closer.

The *differential* direction of gender mainstreaming is based on the concept of gender proposed by L. Nicholson. Nicholson provides 'the coat-rack view' of gender: "our sexed bodies are like coat racks and "provide the site upon which gender [is] constructed"³. Gender understood as masculinity and

femininity is superimposed upon the 'coat-rack' of sex. Society and/or our cultural community imposes on sexed bodies its normative cultural traditions as well as stereotypes of femininity and masculinity that describe how males and females should act.

Gender mainstreaming in education based on this approach comes from the need to study the biological, psychological, pedagogical features of sexes and their subsequent consideration in the educational process. Theorists of this direction (K. Bradley⁴; A. Caspi⁵; C. P. Karpiak, J. P. Buchanan, M. Hosey & A. Smith⁶; U. Kessels, B. Hannover⁷) consider the study of specific personal development of women and men as the basis of differentiation and individualization of education and training in order to develop egalitarian consciousness.

Researchers emphasize the need to incorporate features of both sexes in the educational process to increase the academic achievement in gender-sensitive areas of expertise. For example, pointing to the marginal position of women and the presence of vertical and horizontal segregation in the scientific and technical specialties, researchers (Bell, O'Halloran, Saw, & Zhao, 2009⁸; Jacobsen Spielman, 2012⁹; Joensen, Nielsen, 2013¹⁰) emphasize the need to find new teaching methods and techniques in order to reduce the gender gap in areas of expertise such as mathematics and science.

This approach is widely used in schools with single-sex education in Europe, the USA, and Australia. Theorists and practitioners of this approach distinguish three major benefits that students receive during their studies in separate classes: increasing of the students' academic achievement level (Carpenter and

3. L. Nicholson, *Interpreting Gender*, Signs, 20, 1994, p. 79–105.

4. See: K. Bradley, *An investigation of single-sex education and its impact on academic achievement, discipline referral frequency, and attendance for first and second grade public school students*, Ph.D. dissertation, Mercer University, United States, Georgia 2009.

5. A. Caspi, *Puberty and the gender organization of schools: How biology and social context shape the adolescent experience*, [in:] L. J. Crockett and A. C. Crouter (eds.), *Pathways through adolescence: Individual development in relation to social contexts*. The Penn State series on child & adolescent development, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., 1995, p. 57–74.

6. C.P. Karpiak, J.P. Buchanan, M. Hosey & A. Smith, *University students from single-sex and coeducational schools: Differences in majors and attitudes at a Catholic university*, "Psychology of Women Quarterly" 2007, N 31, p. 282–289

7. U. Kessels, B. Hannover, *When being a girl matters less: Accessibility of gender-related self-knowledge in single-sex and coeducational classes and its impact on students' physics-related self-concept of ability*, "British Journal of Educational Psychology" 2008, vol.78, p. 273 – 289.

8. See: S. Bell, K. O'Halloran, J. Saw, & Y. Zhao, *Women in Science in Australia: Maximizing Productivity, Diversity and Innovation*, Federation of Australian Scientific and Technological Studies (FASTS), 2009

9. Jacobsen Spielman L, *Equity in mathematics education: unions and intersections of feminist and social justice literature*, [in:] H. Forgasz & F. Rivera (Eds.), *Towards equity in mathematics education: Gender, culture and diversity*, Springer, Berlin 2012, p. 39–56

10. See: J. Joensen, H. Nielsen., *Math and gender: is math a route to a high-powered career?* [in:] IZA Discussion Paper 2013, N 7164.

Hayden, 1987¹¹; A. Caspi, 1995¹²; Spielhofer, O'Donnell, Benton, Schagen, and Schagen, 2002¹³), choosing gender atypical subjects (Lee and Bryk, 1986¹⁴; Stables, 1990¹⁵; Spielhofer et al., 2002¹⁶), and socio-emotional benefits (Cipriani-Sklar, 1996¹⁷; Cuddy, 2000¹⁸). But due to a large number of studies with mixed results,¹⁹ the issue of single-sex schooling is still controversial.

Despite this fact, experiments involving the separation of students by sex continue to take place in universities in order to create gender-comfortable educational environments. For example, in 2011 at the University of Essex (United States) an experiment on the separation students by sex in certain subjects was carried out. It showed improved academic achievement for 8% of the girls from the gender-homogeneous group. The authors of the experiment, A. Booth and P. Nolen, decided to conduct the study after several studies in schools that have also been productive (Booth & Nolen, 2009a²⁰; Booth & Nolen, 2009b²¹). The researchers emphasize the need to integrate the data of similar studies in the development and implementation of educational policy. In their view, the issue of gender equality should be solved not by quotas and subsidies but by creating a learning environment comfortable for the development of every person regardless of sex.²²

The main shortcomings of this direction should be recognized as follows: 1. Essentialism and attempts to identify an unchanging male/female essence that

necessarily leads to strengthening binarization; 2. Artificial limitation of personal development. It is necessary not only to take into account differences and on these basis to facilitate learning, but also to master other, unusual for certain personality types of activity, decision-making strategies and more. This will be a kind of liberation of the individual, "the practice of freedom".

It should also be noted that despite the shortcomings listed above, this approach has some positive features. After all, it is based on the principle of egalitarianism i.e., gender differentiation aimed at achieving gender equality.

Now let us consider *social constructivist* direction of conceptualization. Social constructivist direction of gender mainstreaming is based on the theory of social construction of gender and focuses on equality, issues of power and dominance, designing and implementing policies of equality.

This approach is well represented in educational programs of Unicef and Usaid. Gender in these programs refers to the social roles of men and women (and boys and girls) as well as the relationships among them in a given society at a specific time and place. Biological differences can create different needs and capacities for women and men, but these differences do not 'naturally' lead to or justify unequal social status or rights²³.

-
11. P. Carpenter and M. Hayden, *Girls' academic achievements: Single-sex versus coeducational schools in Australia*, "Sociology of Education" 1987, N 60, p. 156–167.
 12. A. Caspi, *Puberty and the gender organization of schools: How biology and social context shape the adolescent experience*, [in:] L. J. Crockett and A. C. Crouter (eds.), *Pathways through adolescence: Individual development in relation to social contexts*. The Penn State series on child & adolescent development, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., 1995, p. 57–74.
 13. See: T. Spielhofer, L. O'Donnell, T. Benton, S. Schagenand, I. Schagen, *The impact of school size and single-sex education on performance* (Local Government Association Report 33), Berkshire, U.K.: National Foundation for Educational Research, 2002.
 14. V. E. Lee and A. S. Bryk, *Effects of single-sex secondary schools on student achievement and attitude*, "Journal of Educational Psychology" 1986, N 78, p. 381–395.
 15. A. Stables, *Differences between pupils from mixed and single-sex schools in their enjoyment of school subjects and attitudes to science and to school*, "Educational Review" 1990, N 42, p. 221–230.
 16. See: T. Spielhofer, L. O'Donnell, T. Benton, S. Schagenand, I. Schagen, *The impact of school size and single-sex education on performance* (Local Government Association Report 33), Berkshire, U.K.: National Foundation for Educational Research, 2002.
 17. See: R. Cipriani-Sklar, *A quantitative and qualitative examination of the influence of the normative and perceived school environments of a co-educational public school vs. a single-sex Catholic school on ninth-grade girls' science self-concept and anxiety in the area of science education*, *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 57(10), 1996, 4312A (UMI No. 9706808).
 18. A. R. Cuddy, *The development of self-concept in adolescent girls attending single-sex and coeducational schools: Exploring the influence of cognitive and social factors*, "Dissertation Abstracts International" 2000, 63(10), 4941B, (UMI No. 3067808).
 19. See: U.S. Department of Education, *Single-sex versus coeducational schooling: A systematic review*, Department of Education, Washington 2005.
 20. See: A. Booth, & P. Nolen, *Gender differences in risk behavior: does nature matter?* [in:] IZA Discussion Paper 2009, N 4026.
 21. See: A. Booth, & P. Nolen, *Choosing to compete: how different are girls and boys?* [in:] IZA Discussion Paper 2009, N 4027.
 22. See: R. Garner, *Girls 'do better' at university when classes are single sex*, "The Independent" Tuesday 27, December 2011.
 23. See: Sen, Gita, Asha George and Pirooska Ostlin, *Engendering Health Equity: A review of research and policy*, "Harvard Center for Population and Development Studies Working Paper Series" February 2002, vol. 12, N. 2.

Gender equality in this direction means that males and females have equal opportunities to realize their full human rights and contribute to and benefit from economic, social, cultural, and political development. Parity and equity are the building blocks of equality in education²⁴. There are four main dimensions of gender equality outlined in the framework²⁵:

- Equality of access, which means that girls and boys are offered equitable opportunities to gain admission to formal, non-formal, or alternative approaches to basic education. Actual attendance, rather than enrollment, is a better indicator of whether access has been achieved.

- Equality in the learning process, which means that girls and boys receive equitable treatment and attention and have equal opportunities to learn. This means that girls and boys are exposed to the same curricula, although the coursework may be taught differently to accommodate the different learning styles of girls and boys. Equality in the learning process also means that all learners should be exposed to teaching methods and materials that are free of stereotypes and gender bias. In addition, it means that boys and girls should have the freedom to learn, explore, and develop skills in all academic and extra-curricular offerings.

- Equality of educational outcomes, which means that girls and boys enjoy equal opportunities to achieve and that outcomes are based on their individual talents and efforts.

- Equality of external results, which occurs when the status of men and women, their access to goods and resources, and their ability to contribute to, participate in, and benefit from economic, social, cultural, and political activities are equal. This implies that career opportunities, the time needed to secure employment after leaving full-time education, and the earnings of men and women with similar qualifications and experience are equal²⁶.

Educational programs in higher educational institutions grounded on the social constructivist di-

rection usually pay great attention to the problems of interaction of gender and global development, gender and politics, gender and multiculturalism. For example, the UCL Institute of Education (IOE), judged to be the world's leading centre for education and related areas of social science, has proposed an MA program entitled "Education, Gender and International Development". Core topics of this MA program include the following: "Gender, education and development" and "Education and international development: concepts, theories and issues" while related topics include "Development education in the era of globalization", "Education, conflict and fragility", "Gender: theory and practice in education", "Introduction to social research", "Justice: Contemporary social issues and perspectives", "Learners, learning and teaching in the context of Education for All".

I consider that figurative model of the "unequal equality" created by the famous Ukrainian philosopher G. Skovoroda serves as a philosophical background for and/or conceptual basis of the differential and social constructivist direction of gender mainstreaming in education conceptualization. He wrote: "God is like a plentiful fountain, filling all kinds of crockery according to their volume. There is an inscription above the fountain: "Unequal equality for all". Different currents are pouring out of all kinds of pipes flowing down into all kinds of crockery, located around the fountain. Smaller dishes hold less water, but still they are equal to the bigger ones and all of them are brimful". This idea is based on two main principles: accordance with nature (everyone has to follow his/her nature) and ethical pluralism (every person chooses his/her own way)²⁷.

Understanding the equality (not equity, uniformity) of boys and girls serves as an axiological basis of gender mainstreaming in education. Biologically, psychologically, pedagogically NOT EQUAL girls and boys have EQUAL educational rights: to fully develop their academic and creative potential, to gain a high level of competence in all academic

24. *Education from a gender equality perspective*, Report for USAID's Office of Women in Development by the EQUATE: Achieving Equality in Education, 2008, p.14.

25. See: R. Subrahmanian, *Gender equality in education: Definitions and measurements*, Background paper for UNESCO GMR 2003-043.

26. *Education from a gender equality perspective*, Report for USAID's Office of Women in Development by the EQUATE: Achieving Equality in Education, 2008, p.14.

27. Dmytro Chyzhevskiy, *Introduction to the Life and Thought of H.S. Skovoroda*, [in:] Hryhoriy Savych Skovoroda: Anthology of Critical Articles, edited by Richard H. Marshall, Jr., and Thomas E. Bird. Edmonton: Canadian Institute of Ukrainian Studies Press, 1994, p. 1-60.

subjects regardless of their gender typicality (or untypicality), and to be trained in gender-comfortable environment free from the pressure of stereotypes and prejudices.

The third direction of the gender mainstreaming conceptualization is *radically pluralistic*. The theoretical basis of this direction is the concept of gender plurality, which destroys the traditional dichotomy (masculinity /femininity) and considers gender as a continuum. The idea of gender plurality arose as a result of gender theory development in the 1980s and '90s. The ideas of post-structuralism and post-modernism (nomadology, deconstruction, M. Foucault's theory of sexuality) served as the philosophical basis of this theory. Nomadology (G. Deleuze, F. Guattari) provides an understanding of necessary inclusion the principles of connection and heterogeneity; the principle of multiplicity; the principle of a signifying rupture; the principle of diversity and pluralism into the educational possess. The most distinguished examples of the use of deconstruction for the destruction of the traditional dichotomy (masculine/feminine) are J. Butler's concept of performativity and R. Braidotti's nomadic theory.

Representatives of this direction of gender mainstreaming in education pay considerable attention to the analysis of the role of sexuality in the educational process. Recent studies (Gowran, 2004²⁸; Epstein et al, 2003²⁹; Lynch and Lodge, 2002³⁰) show that sexuality is increasingly recognized as a gender-related

Conclusion

Summarizing everything above mentioned I can conclude that analyzes of the theory and practice of contemporary gender mainstreaming in education showed the ambiguity of interpretations of the gender mainstreaming in education and its basic concepts. It makes impossible to use the abstract concept of "gender mainstreaming in education" for the development of national policies, implementation

issue in teacher identity. Yet, there are high levels of regulation of sexuality in schools, both for pupils and teachers, with heterosexuality being assumed. This leaves LGBT teachers at risk, particularly where proscriptive belief systems support narrow interpretations of gender identity³¹.

The praxeological dimension of this direction is represented by academic disciplines that consider the interaction of sexuality, gender and sex, and focus attention on the multiplicity of these categories. For example, the University of Pennsylvania (USA) offers a "Gender, Sexuality and Women's Studies Program" which is an interdisciplinary program that provides opportunities to explore the role of gender in human affairs, emphasizes on the study of feminist theory, gender studies, multiple sexual orientation, and includes courses on the study of gender and sexuality and gender and health. Since 1982 the LGBT-center and the QUEER-students Alliance have been functioning at the university, and "color" journals and newspapers have been published.

The obvious drawbacks are the excessive ideologization of sexuality and sexual practices as well as the hyperbolization of their role in the development of personality and in human life. These drawbacks cause one to associate one's personal/professional defeats and victories with one's sexual identity and its perception by society, a situation that unacceptably reduces the living world of the individual.

strategies and praxeological implementation. This ambiguity, on the one hand, complicates the search for methodological approaches, and, on the other hand, offers alternative possibilities for adaptation of the national gender policy in education according to the requests, needs and expectations of the particular society.

28. Sandra Gowran, *See no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil: The experiences of lesbian and gay teachers in Irish schools*, [in:] Jim Deegan, Dympna Devine and Anne Lodge (eds) *Primary Voices: Equality, Diversity and Childhood in Irish Primary Schools*, IPA, Dublin 2004, p. 37–55.

29. See: Debbie Epstein, Sarah O'Flynn and David Telford, *Silenced Sexualities in Schools and Universities*, UK, Trentham 2003.

30. See: Kathleen Lynch and Anne Lodge, *Equality and Power in Education*, Routledge, London 2002.

31. *Gender and education (and employment). Gendered imperatives and their implications for women and men lessons from research for policy makers*, An independent report submitted to the European Commission by the NESSE networks of experts, 2009, 111 p.