8. Фромм Э. Бегство от свободы. Минск, 2004. 314 с.
9. Фромм Э. Здоровое общество. *Догмат о Христе*. Москва, 2005. 342 с.
10. Dyczewski L. Spoleczno-kulturowy kontekst religijnosci. *Kosciol w zyciu publicznym*. 2004. S. 103–112.

The article deals with the issues of the re-orientation of values in the postmodern culture. The axiological disorientation of a person due to the challenges of the contemporary postmodern civilization has been revealed and is discussed in the article. The phenomenon of social estrangement as well as the ways of defining the possibilities of its combating is described through the analysis of the mass culture.

Keywords: human being, axiological orientation, globalization, mass culture, postmodernism, consumption society, social estrangement.

Ihor Hoian, Oksana Fedyk

GENDER AS AN AXIOLOGICAL CONSTRUCT

В дослідженні формулюються теоретичні засади парадигми аксіологічного конструювання ґендеру. Доведено, що формування ґендерних відносин має аксіологічний вимір. Для обґрунтування такої думки та для аналізу сутності ґендерних відносин використано метод аксіологічного конструювання ґендеру. Використання такого методу дає підстави стверджувати, що ґендер – це аксіологічний конструкт, який формується на основі системи цінностей, яка створює підґрунтя для розуміння цінності представників тієї чи іншої статі. В контексті аксіологічного конструювання ґендерних ролей їх слід тлумачити як динамічне явище, яке постійно перебуває у процесі формування та створення. Людина схильна наслідувати ґендерні ролі в межах того чи іншого суспільства на основі запропонованих в процесі соціалізації цінностей та моделей пріоритету маскулінності чи фемінності. Ґендерні ролі мотивуються цінностями і світоглядно визначаються процесами, навчання, виховання, самоосвіти. У ракурсі аксіологічного конструювання ґендер являє собою аксіологічну модель поведінки людини у ставленні до представника іншої статі.

Ключові слова: соціальне конструювання ґендеру, аксіологічне конструювання ґендеру, поліфакторне конструювання ґендеру, ґендерні стереотипи, ґендерні відносини.

Formulation of the problem. Despite a number of programs and international strategies, the gender equality issue has not yet been resolved. In our opinion, this is due to the fact that various forms and styles of gender roles have been primordially formed in diverse societies. This fact requires the analysis of the underlying causes on the basis of which different types of gender relations are formed. We assume that the basic foundation for the formation of gender relations in diverse societies is the historically formed axiological network, which at the same time is presented in the structure of mentality, which determines preferences and priorities that have a systemic dimension, that is, they are dependent on a system of axiological factors that, in their turn, are derivatives of the synthesis of diverse social spheres.

Purpose. The study is aiming at substantiating the feasibility of using the paradigm and the method of axiological gender constructing to understand its essence and specifics.

Presenting the main material. Gender and gender relations as an axiological construct. Gender and gender relations are a fundamentally axiological construct that has no analogues in nature, that is, it is created consciously and artificially by a person on his/her own initiative and with his/her understanding of values, human value in particular. In the interpretation of gender and gender relations, we defend the paradigm of *axiological gender constructing*. Values, in our opinion, are the main motives for human activity, which is why they are the basis of constructing stereotypes in gender relations. In this context, we agree with V. Budz's opinion that "values are at the heart of social self-organization. On their basis, all various forms and schemes of social interactions operate" [3, p. 500]. It is difficult to imagine a more substantiated alternative to values as the basis for constructing social relations,

since all other factors of social relations are still accumulated in values. Relationships and differences between sexes cannot be reduced to only one factor, in this case – an axiological one. However, this axiological factor, in our opinion, is systemic, that is it expresses a system of values, which is formed depending on the leading value of a particular public sphere. Therefore, the combination and hierarchy of values in society affects the formation of all types of relations, including gender.

Axiological construction of gender based on the multiple-factor nature of social factors. The axiological construction of gender appears possible on the basis of the multiple-factor nature of social factors, which in each society have a unique combination and hierarchy (for example, the combination of the values of education, science, law, morals, religion, ideology, philosophy in different societies in this or that society) and, accordingly, those basic or priority values that are constituted within these spheres. The fact is that each of the social spheres (education, science, law, morals, religion, ideology, philosophy) promotes and is based on a separate system of values, which, when combined, create a unique axiological basis in one or another society for interpreting the gender relations and many other types of relationships. It is precisely because of such differences in values in social spheres that gender roles are different in every society. Gender and gender relations, in our opinion, are not *a natural state of things*, but are constructed within a certain worldview, ideology, diverse sub-cultures and cultural traditions, and in general, in the field of knowledge and that of human consciousness. Just as I. Kant speaks of the fact that the subject constructs objects in the process of cognition and puts in them a priori forms [6], it is equally possible to express the assumption that a person constructs all spheres of public life, including gender relations, putting in them their understanding of the value and importance of the person of the opposite sex. That is, this kind of constructing gender relations is axiological, because it is based primarily on values, in particular the value of human being in general and the value of woman in particular.

Axiological representation of gender relationships. In understanding the nature and specifics of constructing gender relations, we use an analogy with the considerations of B. Anderson, who believes that nations and national relations are imaginary, ideological, visual, since they are constructed by man [1]. Similar thoughts on the importance of values, in particular religious ones, in the structuring and construction of communities, are expressed by Harari Y., who believes that all the diversity of living species that existed in nature were surpassed by the "*homo sapiens*" who invented religion that actually united people into the community [8, p. 256–257], and such an association, in turn, contributed to the survival of the human species in nature, because the origin of religion was the consequence of the cognitive revolution of mankind [8, p. 33]. In this aspect, the construction of the diversity of social relations is of interest to L. Zahai, who argues that the gender experience of young people is constructed in the sphere of youth subcultures [5]. However, at the same time, it should be borne in mind that parents are the first to pass on such a gender experience, and therefore the culture or tradition of imitation of gender roles is more influential here. We believe that gender relations are constructed within a set of many other factors that are unique in every society. In this aspect, the gender relations are not predetermined, but are in the process of axiological formation and substantiation. *Gender in its essence is axiologically traditional*, because values are a reflection of the established ways of life of society at the technological and moral levels. Axiological traditions take root in a particular society according to the needs of time and circumstances. But the axiological tradition itself is not a predetermined natural phenomenon. In the understanding of tradition, we agree with the considerations that it is constantly being invented and reformulated in society, because through cultural practices in general, certain institutions are legitimized, certain values are instilled [4], that is, tradition in essence is constructed by a person, although it is relatively stable for a certain time. Similar

considerations concerning the invention and construction of Ukrainian tradition are offered by K. Kyslyuk, who believes that cultural practices are instruments for creating a nation [7].

Value origin of gender stereotypes. In the context of such socio-constructivist methodological approaches, gender relations between men and women, in our opinion, are drawn up differently within the limits of one or another culture at the level of certain gender stereotypes that have an ideological, and in particular, value-based origin. Therefore, the styles of relations between sexes in different cultures are primarily not biological, but psychological, philosophical and axiological. At the same time, it should be kept in mind that genders by nature are also biologically different. The more distinctive are psychological mechanisms of the formation of *femininity* and *masculinity* in one or another culture, although there are no biological differences between men and women who are within different cultures.

If the gender and gender relations were formed only on the basis of the biological nature of a human being, only on the basis of innate anthropological factors and ontological peculiarities of human existence and his/her needs, then in all cultures and civilizations the relations between men and women would have been identical everywhere in all cultures and civilizations. One can agree with the views of V. Budz, who justifies the law of the identity of human nature, according to which the nature of people is one and the same regardless of the time-space and social characteristics. The researcher believes that "the nature of man is one and the same, despite the measurements of space, time, history, culture and the type of civilization. The nature of man (in the measurement of his/her needs) does not change. Only the types of relations among people, norms, rules, ideological principles of social interaction change. Therefore, in any society, *the fundamental principles of any change are not the change in the nature of man* (that is, the change in his/her anthropological factors), but only *a rational change in the type of relations in the semiotic context* (ideological and ideological)" [2, p. 98]. That is why, despite the identity of the biological nature of all people, the types of relations between people, including the gender, are different, since the type of relations is already axiological.

Because of the identity of the nature of all people and the identity of their natural needs, one can speak of a gender as social, and therefore as semantic, valuable, ideological, religious, legal, moral, semiotic proper, hermeneutic construct. This indicates that gender as a social axiological construct has a multiple-factor dimension and depends on a system of axiological factors that synchronously and synergistically combine in society.

Masculinity and femininity in the context of the axiological construction of gender. In all forms of culture and civilization in the past, present, and as can be assumed – in the future, the gender relations were, are and will be different, since they are based on the system of many factors – religion, economy, politics, ideology, traditions, law, morals, values, preferences. In this context, one can agree with L. Zahrai's view that the process of construing the gender experience of an individual is constantly underway, psychological peculiarities of masculinity and femininity take shape, constructing schemes for interpreting the gender relations and concepts of the gender experience of young people, which are broadcasted in different youth subcultures in particular, takes place [5, p. 2]. At the same time, it should be borne in mind that the biological characteristics of the female and male, that is, the innate sexual characteristics, to some extent, also influence the formation of *masculinity* and *femininity*, but they are not fundamental, since women will be more inclined to institutions of motherhood and childhood, as this is associated with pregnancy and childbirth, which, in their turn, affect the psychological mechanisms of a closer emotional relationship between mother and child than with men.

We consider *axiological* and *synergetic* approaches important methodologically for studying the gender relations, as they include the analysis of gender facts and relationships in the context of the importance of the system of values that spontaneously develops in

accordance with each social sphere available in a particular society (type of economy, politics, morals, law, religion, ideology, geopolitics), which affects the assessment of a representative of another gender in the ethical, aesthetic and legal aspects.

The system of social factors (for example, the hierarchy of the ratio of politics, economy, law, morals among themselves, the degree of corruption and openness of society), which are synergistically combined in a given society, makes the society axiologically unprecedented and unique in its essence, despite some identical features with other societies.

The axiological constructing of gender in premodern and modern societies

In addition, in studying the axiological gender constructing, it is also expedient to use a *multiple-factor* approach to understanding gender and methods of *cultural pluralism* and permanent *culture dynamics*. We believe that gender is formed under the influence of the combination and synergy of various factors and spheres of public life – religion, economics, politics, ideology, traditions, law, morals, science, education, values that tend to be pluralistic and diverse, since they are dynamic as a result of the creativity of man and his/her essence as a rational and intelligent being.

Gender relations and stereotypes, *masculine* and *feminine* traits in a person consist precisely within the cultural and civilizational environment, which is pluralistic depending on specific historical conditions. Therefore, for example, the struggle of women for equal rights with men, the spread of feminism as a worldview, the possibility of same-sex marriages, gender change and the recognition of the rights of sexual minorities as phenomena are possible predominantly and mainly in societies with a liberal-democratic political ideology and a secular outlook. Contrary to these gender tendencies of liberal, democratic and secular societies in societies with a dogmatic worldview, stable patriarchal traditions, with a high level of religiosity, women do not even have the thoughts of fighting for equal rights with men, and non-traditional sexual orientation, same-sex marriages and gender change are condemned by society and public morals, or even can be considered a moral and legal crime. Therefore, the struggle of women for equal rights with men is hard to imagine in traditional patriarchal societies, where the prevalence of men's domination in family and business relationships prevails and masculine personality traits are more valued [9]. In this context, the gender is constructed by means of education, or rather, education and training, in which one or another worldview, values, respect or disrespect for the opposite sex, the priority of *masculinity* or *femininity* is promoted.

Besides, in studying the axiological gender constructing, it is also reasonable to use a multifactor approach to understanding gender and methods of *cultural pluralism* and permanent *culture dynamics*. We believe that gender is formed under the influence of the combination and synergy of various factors and spheres of public life – religion, economics, politics, ideology, traditions, law, morals, science, education, values that tend to be pluralistic and diverse, since they are dynamic as a result of the creativity of man and his/her essence as a rational and intelligent being.

Gender relations and stereotypes, *masculine* and *feminine* traits in a person consist precisely within the cultural and civilizational environment, which is pluralistic depending on specific historical conditions. Therefore, for example, the struggle of women for equal rights with men, the spread of feminism as a worldview, the possibility of same-sex marriages, gender change and the recognition of the rights of sexual minorities as phenomena are possible predominantly and mainly in societies with a liberal-democratic political ideology and a secular outlook. Contrary to the gender tendencies of liberal, democratic and secular societies in societies with a dogmatic worldview, stable patriarchal traditions, with a high level of religiosity, women do not even have the thoughts of fighting for equal rights with men, and non-traditional sexual orientation, same-sex marriages and gender change are condemned by society and public morals, or even can be considered a moral and legal crime. Therefore, the

struggle of women for equal rights with men is hard to imagine in traditional patriarchal societies, where the prevalence of men's domination in family and business relationships prevails and masculine personality traits are more valued [9]. In this context, the gender is constructed by means of education, or rather, education and training, in which one or another worldview, values, respect or disrespect for the opposite sex, the priority of *masculinity* or *femininity* is promoted.

Axiological dynamics of gender. It is due to such multiple-factor and cultural diversity, that gender relations, gender stereotypes, gender bias and culture of gender relationships are constructed. This indicates, on the one hand, the positive dynamics of gender relations, which may be more progressive and humane in the future, aimed at recognition of gender equality. But on the other hand, this kind of constant cultural and axiological dynamics also indicates that the outcome of the future interaction of sexes may be rather variable, and therefore should not only be based on progressive positions regarding the successful future of gender relations, as cultural codes and stereotypes may change towards growth of patriarchy or even matriarchate, if you imagine the extinction of civilization as a result of man-made or space catastrophes. That is, in these or those futurological future projects gender roles will also be constructed in the axiological aspect.

Conclusions. It is due to such multiple-factor and cultural diversity, that gender relations, gender stereotypes, gender bias and the culture of gender relationships are constructed. This indicates, on the one hand, the positive dynamics of gender relations, which may be more progressive and humane in the future, aimed at recognition of gender equality. But on the other hand, this kind of constant cultural and axiological dynamics also indicates that the outcome of the future interaction of sexes may be rather variable, and therefore should not only be based on progressive positions regarding the successful future of gender relations, as cultural codes and stereotypes may change towards growth of patriarchy or even matriarchate, if you imagine the extinction of civilization as a result of man-made or space catastrophes. That is, in these or those futurological future projects gender roles will also be constructed in the axiological aspect.

1. Anderson B. Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism / transl. from Eng. by V. Morozova. Ed. 2nd, corrected. Kyiv : Krytyka, 2001. 271 p.
2. Budz V. P. Self-Organisation of Public Reality in the Context of its Antropological Principles and Axilogical Factors: in 5 vol. Vol. 2: Self-Organisation of a Man and of Intersubjective Communications as Synergical Autopoiesis of Human Antropology: Monograph. Ivano-Frankivsk : Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, 2017. 459 p.
3. Budz V. P. Self-Organisation of Public Reality in the Context of its Antropological Principles and Axilogical Factors: in 5 vol. Vol. 3: Phenomenological and Axilogical Factors of Self-Organisation of Social Being in the Context of Human Antropology : Monograph. Ivano-Frankivsk : Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, 2017. 501 p.
4. Invention of Tradition / Transl. from Eng. by Mykola Klymchuk ; Ed. By Eric Gobsbaum and Terence Ranger. Kyiv : Nica-Centre, 2005. Issue 8. 448 p. (Series "Changing Paradigms").
5. Zahrai L. D. Youth Subculture: Gender Experience : Monograph. Ivano-Frankivsk : Nova Zorya, 2012. 376 p.
6. Kant I. Critique of Pure Reason / Transl. from Germ. And notes by I. Burkovskyi. Kyiv : Universe, 2000. 504 p.
7. Kyslyuk K. V. "The Invention of Tradition": Ukrainian version. *Cultural Ukraine*. 2016. Issue 52. P. 164–171.
8. Harari Y. N. Sapiens. A Brief History of Humankind / Transl. from Eng. by Lyubov Summ. – Moscow : Sindbad, 2016. 520 p.
9. Storozhuk S. V., Goyan I. M. Greek "Φyziz" as the basis of gender stereotypes. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*. 2016. Vol. 10. P. 78–89.

1. Андерсон Б. Уявлені спільноти. Міркування щодо походження й поширення націоналізму / перекл. з англ. В. Морозова. Вид. 2-ге, перероб. Київ : Критика, 2001. 271 с.
2. Будз В. П. Самоорганізація суспільної дійсності в контексті її антропологічних засад та аксіологічних чинників: у 5 т. Т. 2 : Самоорганізація людини та інтерсуб'єктивних комунікацій як синергійний автопоезис людської антропології : монографія = Self-Organisation of Public Reality in the Context of its Antropological Principles and Axilogical Factors: in 5 vol. Vol. 2 : Self-Organisationof a Man and of Inter-subjective Communications as Synergical Autopoiesis of Human Antropology : Monograph. Івано-Франківськ : Прикарпат. нац. ун-т ім. В. Стефаника, 2017. 459 с.
3. Будз В. П. Самоорганізація суспільної дійсності в контексті її антропологічних засад та аксіологічних чинників: у 5 т. Т. 3 : Феноменологічні та аксіологічні чинники самоорганізації суспільного буття в контексті людської антропології : монографія = Self-Organisation of Public Reality in the Context of its Antropological Principles and Axilogical Factors: in 5 vol. Vol. 3 : Phenomenological and Axilogical Factors of Self-Organisation of Social Being in the Context of Human Antropology : Monograph. Івано-Франківськ : Прикарпат. нац. ун-т ім. В. Стефаника, 2017. 501 с.
4. Винайдення традиції / пер. з англ. Миколи Климчука ; за ред. Ерика Гобсбаума та Теренса Рейнджера. Київ : Ніка-Центр, 2005. Вип. 8. 448 с. (Серія "Зміна парадигм").
5. Заграй Л. Д. Молодіжна субкультура: ґендерний досвід : монографія. Івано-Франківськ : Нова зоря, 2012. 376 с.
6. Кант І. Критика чистого розуму / пер. з нім. та прим. І. Бурковського. Київ : Юніверс, 2000. 504 с.
7. Кислюк К. В. "Винайдення традиції": українська версія. *Культурна Україна*. 2016. Вип. 52. С. 164–171.
8. Харари Ю. Н. Sapiens. Краткая история человечества / пер. с англ. Любови Сумм. Москва : Синдбад, 2016. 520 с.
9. Storozhuk S. V., Goyan I. M. Greek "Фyziz" as the basis of gender stereotypes. *Anthropological Measurements of Philosophical Research*. 2016. Vol. 10. P. 78–89.

In the study we formulate the theoretical foundations of the paradigm of axiological gender constructing. It has been proved that the formation of gender relations has an axiological dimension. To substantiate such an opinion and analyze the essence of gender relations, the method of axiological gender constructing has been applied. Using this method gives reason to assert that gender is an axiological construct, formed on the basis of value system, which creates the basis for understanding the value of representatives of one sex or the other. In the context of the axiological construction of gender roles, they should be interpreted as a dynamic phenomenon that is constantly in the process of formation and creation. A person tends to emulate gender roles within a particular society on the basis of the values and models of the masculinity or femininity priority offered in the process of socialization. Gender roles are motivated by values and ideologically determined by the processes of learning, education and self-education. From the perspective of axiological construction, gender is an axiological model of human behavior in relation to a representative of another gender.

Materials and methods. The object of research is the processes of the gender relations deployment. The **subject** of the study is the axiological mechanisms for constructing gender relations.

The research is based on the works of B. Anderson, V. Budz, E. Hobsbaum, L. Zahrai, I. Kant, K. Kyslyuk, S. Storozhuk, T. Ranger, Y. Harari. The study uses methods of axiological gender construction, cultural pluralism, permanent culture dynamics, as well as axiological, synergistic and multifactorial approaches that seek to study the fundamentals of the paradigm of axiological gender constructing.

Results and their interpretation. We propose to interpret gender as an axiological construct, as a philosophical interpretation that defines the parameters of relations between the sexes that are inherited within a particular culture or subculture that can develop and be dynamic. Gender relations are formed as an imitation of a certain axiological tradition, but do not function as a natural objective fact that is independent of the will of a person. Gender roles depend on the conscious will of a person, on the structure of his/her consciousness, beliefs, world outlook and his/her values, which a person confesses or imitates in the process of socialization.

These or other gender roles are usually legalized and recognized at the level of moral and legal norms, but in general at the level of substantiation of the value of man in general and the values of women's qualities in particular.

Keywords: social construction of the gender (what distinguishes it from the axiological one?); axiological gender constructing; multiple-factor construction of the gender; gender stereotypes; gender relationships.