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Introduction

In 2015, the TC hosted an Expert Group Meeting on Training for Gender Equality that focussed on advancing the field of gender training. One of the group’s recommendations is to visit and review the way gender trainers are trained and professionalised. With this in mind, the TC aims to develop a professional course to certify gender trainers to ensure that trainers deliver high quality gender training in line with feminist principles and pedagogic frameworks.

This report is the first output of a consultancy assignment undertaken by KIT for the TC to conceptualize a professional development programme for gender trainers as part of the wider partnership between the two organizations. It consists of brief literature review outlining current thinking about trainers for gender equality as well as a mapping of initiatives for training and certifying gender trainers.

Background

In order to understand how to approach the professional development of gender trainers, one needs to understand the context in which gender trainers work: they train people on ‘gender’. And in order to understand this activity, gender training, one needs to take into the context in which training takes place: gender mainstreaming.

Gender training has become one of the key tools for promoting gender equality, particularly in the context of gender mainstreaming. Since the Beijing World Conference on Women in 1995, gender training remains a key policy and programme response to address a wide range of perceived needs to make gender mainstreaming happen. While first gaining prominence within international development, gender training has also become popularized within the context of the EU (EIGE 2012). In many respects, it has become a cure-all to address the many challenges gender mainstreaming entails. Seen as a missing element, repeated calls for gender training reflect a ‘more of the same but better’ approach to addressing the limitations of gender mainstreaming (Milward et al., 2015).

As a key response to gender mainstreaming policy and practice, gender training has surprisingly been under studied and researched (Mukhopadhyay and Wong, 2007, Bustelo et al., 2016b). While more informal initiatives have been undertaken, these have tended to focus on the practice of gender training but not necessarily the thinking of the activity from a critical perspective (ibid) let alone within the context of gender mainstreaming.

Similarly, but to a greater extent, there has been very little research on gender trainers. We know very little of who these professionals are. What qualifies them as a gender trainer? What are their academic and professional backgrounds that led them to be gender trainers and allowed them to take on this moniker? What are the differences in understandings of and approaches to gender and development? What are the relationships between gender trainers’ professional qualifications, their understandings and approaches, and gender mainstreaming?

Given the dearth of research of gender trainers, some of these questions can be explored through knowledge and understanding of gender experts and expertise more generally. While not all gender experts are gender trainers, though many likely are (Thompson and Prügl, 2015), there are a number 1 Other activities include conducting a brief needs assessment, developing a concept note and proposing a detailed outline for the programme.
insights that can be drawn from literature on gender experts and expertise, which are discussed in this report.

Gender training is primarily concerned with production of gender knowledge, but what sort of knowledge? The starting point for this review, as directed by the TC, is that gender training is a feminist project and concerns feminist knowledge transfer. Bustelo et al. (2016b) and Prügl (2010) suggest that this entails an understanding that

- gender inequity is structural
- knowledge contributes to social transformation with the aim of “changing the world, fighting against social injustices and redressing unequal power relations” (Bustelo et al., 2016b)
- there is a plurality of feminist knowledges, given that feminist knowledge is situated knowledge and concerns different ways of knowing. Some ways of knowing are privileged over others
- the contexts in which feminist knowledge occurs are inherently political and sites of contestation
- power operates in different ways and is relational, such as between the “object of knowledge” and the way knowledge is generated, both which are “complicit in the production of reality” (Prügl, 2010)
- reflexivity is critical in order to “acknowledge biases and limitations and allow for the recognition of multiple perspectives” (ibid)
- knowledge creation is a collective and inclusive process in order to acknowledge the diversity of knowledges and how these are positioned differently

These all have ramifications not only for the context of gender training, but also for how training is approached, both epistemologically and pedagogically, as well as the role of gender trainers and their professional development, which are explored next. In particular, rather than focus on the practice of gender trainers, this review maps the knowledge context in which gender trainers work. It then outlines current efforts to train and qualify gender trainers.

Gender knowledge and the practice of gender training
This section discusses the embedding of gender knowledge in development, through the deployment of gender expertise, and implications for feminist intentions for gender mainstreaming.

Gender expertise
Gender work, more broadly, is specialist work (Berg, 1994) requiring a range of skills in order to undertake a variety of often conflicting roles (see for example, Byrne et al., 1996; Goetz, 1995; Lazreg, 2002; Prügl and Lustgarten, 2006). It also requires gender knowledge, which is “specialized knowledge” (Berg, 1994: 170) and constitutes “a field of technical expertise” (Macdonald, 1994: 38). Goetz and Sandler (2007: 167) add that “fairly massive expertise” is required and this has often been underestimated.

What exactly is the nature of gender expertise and in what way is it specialized? Thinking about gender expertise can be thought of in three ways: knowledge, experience and skills.

- Gender experts have “authoritative” knowledge that non-experts do not have (Whitbread, 2004), particularly how bureaucracies work (Miller and Razavi, 1998). Beveridge et al. (2000) state gender experts require a “sophisticated understanding of gender relations”. 
- For Standing (2004: 85), “a high degree of sensitivity to the context, and a large and often indefinable dollop of wisdom derived from experience” are also critical.
- Razavi and Miller (1995, Miller and Razavi, 1998) allude that gender expertise concerns possessing analytical skills to “to draw out the WID/gender dimensions...in a sufficiently rigorous manner”. Expertise also entails skills to render facts about women in ways that make sense for development bureaucrats and to mobilize allies and support while, at the same time, maintaining legitimacy and credibility among feminists and women’s organizations outside the organization (Berg, 1994, Macdonald, 1994).

If gender experts are supposed to have specialist knowledge, how is this considered? One understanding is that while gender expertise is specialist knowledge, it is not unique to gender specialists (Ferguson, 2015). For example, Prügl and Lustgarten (2006) note how in the World Bank, managers are assumed to have “a high level of gender expertise (despite) never worked as gender specialists”. For Ferguson (ibid), this establishes an understanding of gender within an institution making it harder, but necessary, to argue against knowledge already produced that is non-feminist or antifeminist.

A second understanding makes a distinction between gender expertise acquired from working in organizations and that developed in academia. For example, Prügl and Lustgarten (2006: 54), writing from “an academic location that puts [them] outside these organizational contexts”, state that they are less interested in definitions, tools or policy analysis, but more in what “gender mainstreaming has to mean” and as “a site around which global gender politics operate”. In making a similar distinction, others privilege gender knowledge derived from “practice” over what is often termed as “academic”.

A third approach is to differentiate between specialist knowledge and “populist knowledge” (Beveridge et al., 2000; Walby, 2005), which is helpful in revealing the assumptions behind “gender expertise”. The result, whether by design or intent, is that gender specialist knowledge has become associated with the exclusive of gender specialists, who are often accused for overly complicating gender knowledge and thus reinforcing its exclusive associations requiring their expertise to decipher. As Pialek (2007: 83) suggests, gender experts become “custodians” of such knowledge where their privileged position is further reinforced with the popular notion that “gender experts” are the key to gender mainstreaming, as “if more gender experts were available the implementation of GAD approaches would increase”.

What these approaches highlight is a distinction of specialist knowledge as the exclusive domain of certain individuals, whether practitioners, development professionals or academics, or more populist notions of knowledge. Intertwined with this distinction is the assumption of a knowledge, one that privileges certain understandings of gender over others. Within the context of “development”, expert knowledge and purveyors of such knowledge, such as trainers, have particular histories and connotations (Verloo and QUING Consortium, 2012) that give rise to the notion of superior and hegemonic forms of knowledge that are often associated with Western, Western-professionalized or Western-trained specialists.

The problem is that specialized knowledge is translated as “expert knowledge” where expertise needs to be understood as a form of power (Walby, 2005) and the privileging of a certain knowledge. In the context of gender mainstreaming, Western feminism can unwittingly become hegemonic without “explicit engagement with feminist terms and ideas” (Smyth, 1999: 28). This can be seen, for example, from the often dogmatic, rigid, linear-binary interpretations and applications of gender concepts, or what Standing (2004: 83) calls a “gender and development hegemony”, based
on a “myth of a right and a wrong way to ‘do’ gender in policy contexts” applied through a “policing or even shaming”.

What has now become evident is how complicit gender experts (Prügl, 2010), and the gender knowledge they broker under the auspices of gender mainstreaming, have contributed to the undermining the very aims originally envisioned. As gender experts, including trainers, and gender expertise have become embedded in development, it has “not always [been] in the ways that feminists would have liked” (Mukhopadhyay, 2016). Mukhopadhyay (ibid) explores how “dominant set of practices and technologies of power” in development, through which gender experts and trainers are governed and through which they govern themselves, have “structured and shaped” the process of undermining and framing of feminist practice.

In particular, as Lazreg (2002: 132) states, “the logic of development aid, which generally focuses on the technical rather than the human side of its work, accounts for a greater specialization of gender, and shapes the selection of concepts”. “Expertise” is often elided with technical approaches to gender mainstreaming that is concerned with “how (not whether) to mainstream gender equality” and related focus on ‘tools’ (Walby 2005: 332). An example of this Kabeer’s (1994) critique of the political sub-text of various gender analysis frameworks, which are often at the basis of gender training.

While the role of “experts”, in this case trainers, is to make gender convincing and intelligible to policy makers so that decisions are “based on ‘gendered’ knowledge, rather than on ideology or stereotypes” (Beveridge and Nott 2002: 301), they do so in compromising ways. As Squires (2005) implies, such experts are complicit in the narrowing of gender concerns to fit bureaucratic needs by “reduc(ing) the scope for wider consultation with ‘non-experts’, and so reduc(ing) the likelihood that the policy agenda will reflect the particular experiences and concerns of women that do not resonate with the pre-existing policy framework”.

An example is Campbell and Teghtsoonian’s (2010: 191, cited by Ferguson 2010) analysis of gender experts in Kyrgyzstan. They observe how gender experts change their objectives and expectations over time: “(G)ender advocates can only hope that getting the texts right – aligning the language and inserting appropriate indicators, for example – will have practical benefits for women on the ground”.

As a result, gender experts, including trainers, “draw their authority not from any political position but from their ability to make feminist knowledge fit into programmes of government” (Milward et al., 2015). This has meant “truths’ about women’s position and situation and about gender relations have been generated” (ibid), such as binary notions of gender made commonplace through technologies such as gender training. For Lazreg, (2002), gender training represents as “another link in the chain of the normalization of the development enterprise in the global era through a convergence of academic feminism and organizational interests. If anything, it sheds light on the nature of the relationship between interest, desire and power”.
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Making things more complex, trainers’ livelihoods are embedded within the development industry (Bustelo et al., 2016b). They are dependent financially on the institutions who have hired them for trainings, and this leaves less room for reflection and criticism, limiting a trainer’s autonomy. Fraser argues that the discourse of gender experts is now independent from the feminist movement—feminism and neoliberalism have converged (as cited by Ferguson, 2015). The marketization of gender training “not only tends to shape what gender training looks like; it also makes the tools and methodological approaches developed by trainers a competitive matter, as trainers need to sell their competences on a developing market” (The OPERA Team, 2011).

A point of tension, in this case, exists between being a critical “insider/outsider” feminist and needing to earn a living from the very institutions one wants to criticize” (Ferguson, 2015). This is not to suggest trainers selling out their values wholesale, but the complex positioning of gender work, which has the risk of reinforcing “the embedding of a narrow and problematic vision of gender equality” (Ferguson, 2015: 392).

How gender training as been approached

Gender mainstreaming necessitates that policymakers require a high-level of gender awareness to introduce gender perspectives into all policies (Roggeband and Verloo 2006, cited by Lombardo & Mergaert, 2013; Sharma et al, 2013). Not only is gender mainstreaming a knowledge-intensive process and necessitates learning, Kelly (2015) suggests that it is associated with social learning as a “deliberate attempt to adjust the goals or techniques of social change policies and practices (such as gender mainstreaming) in response to past experience and new information”. She contrasts this with more conventional concepts of learning that are based on assimilating new information, based on past experience, and applying it.

How has gender training generally been understood and practiced?

- **One-off workshop-based event:** gender training is often conceived singular short-term event (Mukhopadhyay, 2014). Often time-bound, there is little room for reflection, which would otherwise allow for participants to “make choices about their gendered behaviors” (Albury and Laplonge, cited by Laplonge, 2015). For Lazreg (2002: 132), the concern with gender training “is the manner in which it has been constructed, manualized and packaged”.

- **Limited scope:** with the time-bound practice of gender training, participants and trainers are constantly given less time to deliver theoretical material and context-sensitive training, rather they are asked to focus on simple checklists or forms that can be ‘easily’ applied by trainees— all of this in short, simple and palatable terms (Mukhopadhyay, 2014). Therefore, gender is presented as a “set of skills, which can be straightforwardly delivered and reproduced” emphasizing “‘knowing that’ rather than ‘knowing how’, and encourage[ing] the parroting of slogans rooted in frameworks disembodied from lived experience” (ibid: 362).

- **Memorization/information transfer:** In the context of training, learning about gender concepts has often relied on memorization of definitions, which only reinforces gender and development as a hegemonic discourse. The emphasis on memorizing pre-defined concepts leaves little room individual interpretations or applications. Even if more enlightened training adopts “participatory” methods, where trainees are encouraged to “apply” gender concepts to their particular contexts, this approach is limited within the confines of the “right” understandings of the gender concepts being discussed (Standing, 2004).
underlying assumption of learning by getting the concept definitionally correct is “hierarchal skills transmission” (Parpart, 1995), which has “limited transformative impact” (Ferree, 2015).

- **Conceptual stripping**: Gender analytical concepts are applied in rigid ways, both in terms of their communication and definition. What were relational concepts are now taught and, therefore, understood as binary opposites that have robbed them of their analytical potential. The process of categorizing something as “either-or” focuses attention, again, on definitions, not the inherent value of understanding something as a particular category in relation to another. This discourages relational, fluid and polymorphic understandings of gender categories and how and why gender concepts can be simultaneously described in more than one way, depending on a particular analytical perspective. Lastly, in perpetuating binary, positivist categories, gender training has perpetuated technocratic notions of development itself where “Development is not theorized, it is a given, a field of knowledge acquisition” where

> The language of development is implicitly assumed to be universal, just like the capacity to speak. Consequently, it does not matter who speaks, whether it is a Latin American, African, Asian or Middle Eastern woman. Interchangeability need only be ‘contextualized’ by the gender expert to be meaningful. (Lazreg, 2002: 134)

- **De-politicization of gender and development theory through the practice of training**

The ways in which ‘feminist knowledge’ has been translated into ‘gender expertise’ and how feminist agendas have been taken up for government purposes have put many feminist in a state of unease (Prügl, 2010). Their concerns lie how gender equality is positioned as a goal for achieving other ends in internationals development (Ferguson, 2015). Moreover, the way gender is translated in policy and practice combined with the interpretation of its meaning is a source of much dissatisfaction for many feminists, as this would not be the first time that feminist concepts are re-appropriated to fit neoliberal understanding of empowerment and the role of women (Cornwall 2007). With this process of appropriation, gender knowledge has been “instrumentalized, rid of political content, adapted and adopted by national and/or global projects not necessarily concerned with equality issues – this goes against the ideal transformational aspect of gender training” (Mukhopadhyay, 2014). As Mukhopadhyay (2014: 360) concludes “The representation of gender as something other than structural inequality has had consequences for how development programmes address inequality”.

**Feminist implications for Gender Trainers and Practice**

In thinking about gender trainers and the context in which they work, four dimensions arise from the literature: reflexivity, intersectionality, resistance and praxis.

**Reflexivity**

The position of gender trainers is difficult one. One the one hand, their role is to promote change. On the other, they are part of a system upon which their position relies and is embedded in the status quo. In particular, as Mukhopadhyay (2014: 263) writes, the normalization of gender training as a set of skills is contributed to and bolstered by the growth of expertise on gender. Gender training is now a profession...with its own truth
claims, frameworks and tools. In development, ‘doing gender’ has become a set of skills
packaged as a new kind of job with economic interests at stake.

Given that feminist “knowledge transfers in contexts where both gender trainers and experts, as
well as the knowledge transfer itself, is mediated – and paid for – by development donors” (Bustelo
et al., 2016a), is an additional reason why a more critical perspective is required.

Reflexivity is a critical feminist practice that a number of writers promote to confront this paradox.
For example, as Prügl (2010: 15) states “In short, a feminist approach demands situated reflexivity of
the knower, recognizes the relations of power within the research exercise, and proposes an
inclusive collectivity of knowledge creation”. Kelly (2015) notes that although a lack in reflexivity is
prominent among trainers, those who are able to incorporate critical feminist epistemologies into
training, trainers and participants alike learn best through these interactions. Given the
contradictory position of gender trainers, the practice of reflexivity – a process of self-reflection and
decomposition of one’s positionality - allows for the “relationships that are egalitarian, non-
authoritative and intersubjective” (Nencel, 2013). The purpose is to reveal how assumptions,
histories and identities have shaped the process (ibid). For Ferguson (2015 citing Desai 2007),
reflexivity and self-critique can contribute to a ‘regenerative process’ among gender experts and
feminist action, particularly when there is a need to engage specifically with struggles gender
experts face in international institutions.

Yet as trainees are considered targets of gender knowledge sharing (Prügl, 2010) and the emphasis is
on transferring knowledge and skills (Mukopadhyay and Wong, 2007 cited by Prügl, 2010), the
majority of training manuals exclude any exercise based on reflexivity. Moreover, there is a lack of
time and space assigned to assessing both trainees’ and trainer’s positionality (Prügl, 2010).

Intersectionality
Intersectionality, a term coined by Crenshaw (1988), is a concept often used to understand the
multiple forms discrimination an individual may experience - based on race, class, gender, sexual
orientation, nationality, etc. - are interconnected and cannot be separated (Ewig and Ferre, 2012).
Bustelo et al. (2016: 17) provide succinct understanding – “the interactions and mutually constitutive
relationships of gender and other inequalities”. Rather than seeing multiple inequalities as an add-
on, Baer et al. (2010) advocate understanding intersectionality as an “analytical perspective” that
aims to understand “the relation between different inequalities” and requires “an ongoing
discussion how to conceptualize and analyze overlapping inequalities, multiple discrimination,
intersecting categories, or mutually articulating power relations” (ibid: 66).

As a key feminist concept, (Bustelo et al., 2016a) suggest that by definition, gender training, as a
practice of feminist knowledge transfer, pays attention to intersectionality given that a commitment
to feminist politics requires attention to power dynamics at work. Still, intersectionality not only
remains an under-theorized concept in gender training, it is rarely explicitly used in training manuals,
such as those used in the EU and UN, (Baer et al, 2010) and in practice (Bustelo et al., 2016a). The
assumption, such as from diversity training, is that understanding one form of inequality allows an
understanding other forms, as if multiple discrimination is a matter of layered-on inequality (Baer et
al, 2010).

---

2 The exceptions are The Madrid Declaration, developed in the context of the EU initiative, OPERA (Verloo and
QUING Consortium, 2012) and the work of UN TC, both have which have initiated work with intersectionality.
The notion of intersectionality and the need to address it in gender has been taken on. For example, “the Madrid Declaration on Advancing Gender+Training in Theory and Practice” states that “Intersectionality should be integrated into gender+ trainings”. The UNW TC “Compendium of Good Practices in Training for Gender Equality” UN Women Training Centre (2016) also acknowledges the need for addressing multiple intersecting social identities.

As Baer et al (2010: 14) note, however, “The challenge is to operationalize the complexity of intersectionality theory in a way that one can work with and at the same time to avoid a simply additive framework for the understanding of intersectionality”. It must be explicitly addressed theoretically (training content) and practically (methods of training sequences) and included in all aspects of the training.

This is not to say that there have not been attempts to do this. GemTrEx and PROMUNDO gender training are examples. However, the concern is that as a training methodology it is under-theorized (Verloo and QUING Consortium, 2012) and more research needs to be undertaken to understand “How can training processes engage more explicitly with intersectionality?” (UN Women Training Centre, 2016). An example of a lack of theoretical basis is the GemTrEx’s approach to intersectionality that sees it as a tool “that can be used to study structural inequality and cultural differences in a scientific context” and managing diversity as “an organizational and personal learning process relating to differences” (GemTrEx authors team, 2008a). In particular, it is this elision between intersectionality, diversity and organizational development that is of concern. For example, European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE) unproblematically uses these terms interchangeably (EIGE, 2013).

**Resistance**

Dealing with one of the main challenges of gender training – facing resistance – is constitutive of the act (UN Women Training Centre, 2015). However, its existence creates a number of paradoxes. One is that to be successful, gender trainers need to engage with participants and need to be seen as credible. But when participants are predisposed, because of their pre-conceived ideas about gender training, trainers “need to convince their audience of their message before even speaking the first word” (Lombardo and Mergaert, 2013: 303). A second related paradox concerns gender training as performance. Trainers are judged by participants not only for what they are supposed to know but how they share this knowledge in appealing and entertaining ways. Additionally, they are, on the one hand, expected to have expert knowledge, and, on the other, be able to facilitate participants knowledge deepening. They often face the dual criticism of not knowing enough, because of their emphasis on facilitation, or know too much in the way they present knowledge.

Rather than avoiding conflict, feminist knowledge transfer requires an “explicit engagement with the very status of resistances in the process of feminist knowledge transfer” for “resistance and contestation must be present in order for such a scenario to be considered ‘feminist’ and ‘transformative’” (Bustelo et al., 2016a: 170). In the context of gender mainstreaming, resistance is a manifestation to the challenging of “norms, practices and assumptions concerning the relations between women and men that work at the level of individual and institutional actors” (Díaz González 2001 cited by Lombardo & Mergaert, 2013: 300).

While Bustelo et al. (2016a) argue that the risk of de-politicization leads to limiting contestation, one can also argue the opposite, de-politicization results from limiting contestation. Regardless, “when

---

feminist knowledge is de-politicized in order to meet purely strategic needs – be they market driven of geared towards conforming to the broader process of change in which the organization is involved – its transformational potential is lost” (Bustelo et al., 2016a: 170).

How does one address this? Understanding the different ways resistance manifests itself and the reasons for resistance is a first step. “It is therefore important to identify and distinguish different categories of resistance and how they shape/limit the training’s impact, as well as the range of responses that is possible and productive in dealing with resistances” (Verloo and QUING Consortium, 2012: 94). In particular, Lombardo and Mergaet (2016: 58) suggest that “recognizing and typifying resistance can help to more exhaustively diagnose the problem and this design more adequate implementation strategies” for gender mainstreaming.

In creating a typology of resistance, there are different dimensions that can be considered. One is about how resistance is manifested, either as overt and/or covert (Lombardo and Mergaert, 2013).

A second is about the levels of resistance from the individual to institutional (Lombardo and Mergaert, 2013). At the individual level, gender issues are viewed as personal issues and, as a result, gender training is seen as intrusive (Verloo and QUING Consortium, 2012). Gender training challenges people’s identity and personal beliefs and addressing the personal sphere can be interpreted by trainees as an attack and/or an attempt to reduce their freedom (Lombardo and Mergaert, 2013). At an institutional level, resistance manifests itself when gender mainstreaming is not considered as a priority in policy-making. Understanding institutional resistance can clarify why gender mainstreaming is not integrated in a transformative way (Van Eerdewijk 2009 cited by Lombardo and Mergaert, 2013).

A third concerns sources of resistance. Not only from trainees, but resistance can also come from those commissioning training as well as trainers themselves (Lombardo and Mergaert, 2013). Verloo et al. (2012) suggest that trainer resistance occurs at cognitive and emotional levels regarding racism, heteronormativity or xenophobia and when trainers do not question their attitudes, methods and knowledge (Verloo and QUING Consortium, 2012).

Fourth are origins of resistance. Mukhopadhyay provides the most detailed account of what people are resisting (UN Women Training Centre, 2015). She cites differing meanings of gender and gender equality; epistemological differences where thinking of gender requires different ways of knowing that may challenge dominant, pre-existing ways; and opposition to power of global discourses, such as developing country bureaucrats facing donors and international agency conditions and challenges to one’s own conception of gender.

Fifth is how resistance is manifested, other than direct opposition. The UNDP (2001) identifies ten forms of resistance to gender mainstreaming - Denial, Inversion, Dilution, Selection, Subversion, Shelving, Lip service, Compartmentalization, Tokenism, Investigation - all of which can also be observed among training participants.

Dealing resistance requires different strategies (UNDP 2001) and approaches, one of which clearly is not to appease resistant trainees by avoiding different and conflict. As noted previously, identifying resistance and understanding what is concerns are key. Prügl (2016: 39) suggests treating gender training as a form of democratic politics that requires re-channeling identified resistances into a “path for deliberation, turning them into a resource for democratic practice”. Beyond different techniques and approaches detailed elsewhere (see for example UNDP 2001 and UN Women Training Centre, 2015), trainers themselves also need to be able to draw from personal, cumulative experience (Verloo and QUING Consortium, 2012).
Praxis: theory and practice

A common observation found in both the literature and practice on gender training is that “gender” – the concepts, ideas – are too complicated, abstract and theoretical for practitioners to understand and put into “practice”. Trainees often lament that gender training is too theoretical (Ferguson 2015) and need to be more practical with theory often related to being academic. The argument often put forth is that participants are alienated when topics are discussed in complex ways, thus gender concepts are reduced to more simplistic explanations, constructing a ‘right way’ of teaching gender (Ferguson, 2015). Often this implies packaging gender in ways that do not offend participants, which contributes to a sanitizing of what is essentially a political subject.

This binary – between theoretical knowledge and practical knowledge – is a false dichotomy particularly from a feminist context and the notion of praxis: the iterative knowledge development process resulting from the interaction of theory and practice. Theory is developed from practice and subsequently used to further develop theory. In other words, theory and practice are not binary opposites but constitutive of feminist knowledge production.

The role of trainers is to make gender concepts intelligible for participants, in part from relating to practice, without overly simplifying concepts to the point they lose their analytical power. Ideas and concepts need to be presented and understood in ways that development practitioners can use them in order to inform practice.

This requires trainers to possess a level of ‘fluency’ (see Box 1) with gender concepts to such a degree that that have a repertoire of ways and examples to make ideas meaningful and relevant to trainees while maintaining their political and analytical power.

Box 1: Learning a language as a metaphor for gender training

It is helpful to think of learning about gender and development analytical concepts by thinking about the process of learning a new language. As with a new language, we start by memorizing words but this does not make us fluent. To become fluent, we need to understand the meaning behind those words, appreciate the differences in meaning between related words, and learn how to use different words (or in this case gender concepts) together.

When we learn a new language, such as English, we first memorize individual words or phrases, such as “good morning” and we try to use these words appropriately. Training workshops are an effective method for this level of learning: becoming familiar with new terms and their use. The facilitator’s role is to provide conceptual clarity, and therefore you need to be clear yourself and able to communicate clearly.

As we become more confident with our English and learn other phases, such as “How are you?”, we start to use these together with “good morning”, usually in the same order with little change, such as “Good morning, how are you?”. In gender training, we first learn the term “gender”, then we use that term to build other analytical concepts, “gender division of labor”, “gender needs” or “access and control”. Again the workshop context is appropriate. The facilitator needs to be able to explain the meaning of these concepts and how they contribute to our analysis.

---

4 Developed by KIT for Plan International’s gender equality and child rights capacity building programme, Planting Equality: Getting it right for Girls and Boys
As our confidence in English increases, we start to substitute phrases and use English expressions to express ourselves more precisely. We understand the differences in meaning between these phases and when to use one or the other. For example, in a more formal situation we may say “Good morning, how are you?” but with friends we’ll mix things up and say, for example, “morning’, how’s it going?” We are developing “fluency” not only with the words but their meanings, and how we can use them to communicate certain ideas.

Similarly, learning about gender and development concepts is developing a fluency in being to analyze and communicate the social relations of gender. This is not just a matter of memorizing terms – we need to understand why these concepts are important and how to use them. It’s one thing to be able to define “sex” as different from “gender”; it’s another thing to understand why this difference is important, how it relates to other gender analytical concepts such as “gender division of labor”, “gender needs” or “access and control” and why any of this is relevant to women’s rights.

This the level of learning which poses challenges for training. Instead of asking participants to memorize definitions, we are now asking them to analyze social relations of gender as they operate in the real world not just in training workshops. Going back to the English example, we learn the power of a language from practicing in different situations, engaging with others and self-education.

As gender training facilitators, they are required to be fluent ourselves in gender concepts before they start to train others. They need to understand their meanings but know how to use them in different situations, how to communicate their meaning and usage, and how to facilitate learning processes that help others to become fluent.

Importantly, becoming “fluent”, whether in a language or gender analysis, should also be inspiring, build confidence and lead to new insights. The role of facilitator is to create a process that critically challenges, generates interest and motivates learners to seek further knowledge and understanding.
Professionalization of gender trainers: a mapping

This section outlines current initiatives to professionally develop gender trainers. First is an overview of what is known about how gender trainers are qualified which is followed by a review of gender training of trainer programmes and efforts to establish quality standards.

Qualifications

Gender experts should have appropriate “professional” qualifications (Berg, 1994), such as specialized training (Beveridge et al., 2000). Academic qualifications, however, do not ensure that “gender experts” possess the manoeuvring, networking and persuasive skills, referred to previously (Standing, 2004). Bustelo et al. (2016) note the relevance of experts and trainers’ backgrounds and standpoints. So how are trainers qualified?

Within the international development context, there is very little systematic analysis of gender trainers’ backgrounds. One of the few studies is that conducted for EIGE with its 160 self-proclaimed gender trainers (2012) in its database of trainers. The study (EIGE, 2013) concludes that

- Backgrounds of trainers vary to a large degree and come from a wide range of sectors and organizational affiliations
- Most have at least advanced education in a variety of areas related to social sciences with some having a degree in gender studies
- They have followed different professional development paths to become trainers with a number having gained experience from learning-by-doing
- Most trainers indicate expertise in other gender-related areas such as gender analysis, research gender budgeting, project management etc.

The findings of the EIGE study echo that the Graduate Institute in Geneva (Thompson and Prügl, 2015), which undertook a survey of 118 gender experts, 79% of whom work for the UN. In terms of professional backgrounds, the survey found that 92% have graduate degrees, 72% with PhDs mostly in social sciences with very few in gender/women’s studies. 61% of the respondents claimed a feminist heritage whereas 40% did not. A major source of knowledge are employers, who provide both on-the-job and formal training, with on-the-job being the main path to becoming an expert. Unsurprisingly, the approach, understanding and priorities of their organisation had been helpful in learning to integrate a gender perspective, which has implications for how they work. As Mukhopdhyay (2015) writes

gender knowledge and expertise is groomed to fit the purposes of the organisation to which the particular expert belongs, which cannot be good for the gender field as a whole as it lacks the authority of an independent knowledge base from which to hold policies and programmes to account.
Training of trainers programmes

This review undertook a review of training of trainers (TOT) programmes, identified from a quick scan and internet search (see Table 1).

Overall, the programmes show a consistency in how TOT are conducted. They assume training of gender trainers is augmentative. It is a matter of adding ‘gender’ to trainers assumed pre-existing competencies as trainers more generally. The epistemological and pedagogical context and implications are not taken into account. They look suspiciously archetypal (Ahikire, 2007) with the inclusion of standard curriculum and methodologies.

Moreover, their implicit positioning of gender trainers is that of a vessel of knowledge: there is little consideration of how such knowledge is mediated by the very people that are supposed to convey gender training. What is lacking is a consideration of training, both of trainers and trainees, as a political and social process as well as a consideration of the contexts of training both at a discursive level as well as at an organizational level.

Overall observations

• Most of the TOT have a “how to” step-by-step user guide, where each module/session details the objective, the time frame, the material needed, the activities instructions, the content and facilitator/trainer notes.

• The TOT vary in length, ranging from 3-5 days.

• For the most part the methods used to train the trainers within a module or a workshop are diverse. They often employ various methodologies to complement the learning experience; ranging from lecture/presentation, role play, case study methods, simulations, brainstorming, buzz groups, quiz sessions, games, field trips, etc.

• While each module addresses specific topics and or skill, all modules are interrelated and can build on each there. Most TOT curricula state that the modules can be adapted to context and audience.

Curriculum for training of trainers

• The most common themes for modules are; gender concepts/definitions, Gender Relation/Social Construct, Theoretical and historical approach to development, Gender Analysis and Frameworks, Gender Mainstreaming, Training/Presentation Skills.

• Most workshops start off their first module with core gender concepts; Gender vs. Sex, Gender as Relational, Equality vs. Equity, WID vs. GAD, Gender Practical Needs vs. Gender Strategic Needs, empowerment, etc. The point of starting with these core concepts is to clarify misunderstandings as well as make sure everyone uses the terms the same way throughout the workshop.

• The modules then usually address how institutions, structures, systems and processes are responsible for the social construct of gender then often followed with tools for gender analysis by informing participants of the various frameworks followed up with a case study activity.

• Gender mainstreaming is also one of the core modules within most TOT curriculum. Depending on the purpose of the training, either one generic module focuses on the basics (concept, history, project cycle) or the workshop has 2 to 3 modules focused on how to help trainers implement gender mainstreaming into their field.
Training of Trainers

- The TOT are generally targeted to participants whom already have training experience, specifically with a strong gender background.

- The intended audiences of TOT seem to need to be somewhat influential in their respective organizations, to become ‘ambassadors’ in order to cast a wider net when imparting gender knowledge/replicating trainings.

- While most TOT curriculum come with handouts with definitions and activities to better illustrate the purpose of the module, not all have facilitator/trainer notes that go into more depth of the key learning points of each session. This would allow facilitators/trainers to reflect on how and what they are teaching and if they agree with how the concept is being taught.

- Only one TOT curriculum has its participants complete a daily learning and reflection diary. Furthermore the participants are asked to share their learning points and ask if there are any question that may have come up from previous sessions that needs clarification.

- Furthermore, few workshops have a session or activity, at the closing of the module, where participants are asked how they will integrate gender and/or gender mainstreaming into their work (plan of action)

- Rarely is there acknowledgment of the possibility of resistance to gender mainstreaming. Few handouts discuss the issues and the possible counterstrategies; it remains a document to read for trainers but not necessarily address within module sessions.

- Most TOT have a module on Training Skills, which mainly consist of activities that enable trainers to gain confidence and work on their communication skills, different adult learning methodologies, as well as presentation/lecture practice skills.

- Most TOT curriculums have annexes with relevant resources such as activities, further readings and links.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOT name and organization sponsor</th>
<th>Audience (requirements)</th>
<th>Training programme objectives</th>
<th>Overall design – Modules &amp; Topics</th>
<th>Methods used to train trainers</th>
<th>Observations &amp; Facilitator/ Trainer Notes (Issues covered)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A curriculum for Training of Trainers in Gender Mainstreaming</strong></td>
<td>-The training programme targets civil society, governments and intergovernmental representatives involved in gender mainstreaming and/or in communicating this work to wider audiences. -Organized for Anglophone countries of Uganda, Ghana and South Africa. -The curriculum should serve as a guide to gender trainers with extensive experience in gender training. It can also be useful to upcoming trainers.</td>
<td>-This training initiative seeks to re-build a team of gender trainers across the region. -The training provides with information and skills to plan and develop gender responsive programmes and to mainstream gender in their programmes. <strong>Objectives:</strong> -Explain the concepts of gender and development -Explain and differentiate the different frame works of analysis. -Provide information and knowledge on gender and how it impacts on development. -Build and strengthen participant’s skills in gender analysis and mainstreaming. -Build Participants capacity to plan, conduct and evaluate gender training. -Produce plans of action and mechanisms for follow-up in mainstreaming gender in programmes and projects</td>
<td>-This package is designed as Training of Trainers Guide. -Therefore it has regular gender training modules, as reflected in modules 1 to 4, while modules 5 and 6 are designed to offer practical training skills. <strong>Module 1:</strong> Introductions (2hrs) <strong>Module 2:</strong> Gender and Development Concepts (2 ½ hrs) <strong>Module 3:</strong> The Social Construction of Gender (2 hrs) <strong>Module 4:</strong> Gender Analysis Frameworks and Tools (1 ½ day) <strong>Module 5:</strong> Mainstreaming Gender in Programmes and Projects (1 ½ day) <strong>Module 6:</strong> Practical Training Skills (3-4 days) <strong>Module 7:</strong> Plans of Action/Follow-up Activities <strong>Module 8:</strong> Workshop Evaluation</td>
<td>Ice breaker – pairs discussing expectations of TOT -Buzz group -Lecture -hand-outs -debate -group work -audio-video -role play -brainstorming in plenary -case study/analysis -individual reading -training assessment/ critique</td>
<td><strong>Observation:</strong> This TOT has clear instructions as to what a facilitator should do per module, very much ‘step-by-step’ instructions and what materials are needed per activity along with clear session objectives. Within the Annex 1 there is a list of Training methods/activities and it suggest that facilitators do a run through of these activities before delivering a gender training workshop. The TOT has a strong historical background on women &amp; gender in Development – there is a strong focus on concepts/definitions i.e. Gender vs. Sex, WID vs. GAD, mainstreaming vs. integration, etc. An interesting point brought up (signs of some reflection) in the gender analytical framework (handout 4.6) <strong>Facilitators Note:</strong> In this case although the curriculum states that the ‘Trainers notes’ - contains information for the trainer, i.e. key learning points of the session. These are scares and the only one I found states that “facilitator also has the option of showing an appropriate video during this module to illustrate the social construction of gender.” – to me it seems quite superficial. Each module does give instructions on what the facilitator should do and when to wrap up sessions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- The training programme targets civil society, governments and intergovernmental representatives involved in gender mainstreaming and/or in communicating this work to wider audiences.
- The training programme includes seven African countries, in both anglophone and francophone regions. Cameroon, Ghana, Mali, Rwanda, Senegal, South Africa and Uganda.

- This training initiative seeks to re-build a team of gender trainers across the region.
- This training programme thus focuses on building the skills for gender mainstreaming training to define advocacy agendas in terms of policies and programmes. And, more importantly, to ensure the successful implementation of gender responsive policies and programmes.

Objective:
- Specific By the end of the workshop, participants will be able to:
  - Explain the concept of Gender and Development.
  - Provide information and knowledge on gender and how it impacts on development.
  - Explain and differentiate the various frameworks for gender analysis as means of gender mainstreaming.
  - Plan, conduct and evaluate gender mainstreaming training.
  - Produce plans of action and specify mechanisms for follow up on gender mainstreaming in the irrespective countries.

Annex 1: design of workshop (1 week)
- Broken down per day, listing the time & activity sequence

To develop and establish core teams of gender trainers in Ghana, Uganda and South Africa who will be responsible for building local capacity for gender mainstreaming.

Module 1 – Gender Concepts
Module 2 – The social Construction of Gender
Module 3 – Tools for gender analysis
Module 4 – Gender Mainstreaming
Module 5 – Practical Training Skills
Module 6 – Practice and Facilitation
Final Evaluation

Participatory methodologies
- Brainstorming
- Debates
- Group discussions
- Case study
- Group activity
- Handouts
- Lectures
- Role play
- Observation
- Field work
- Energizers
- Visualization in participatory programmes (VIPP)

Observation:
The format overall isn’t very smooth – a bit too busy. There is a background to the workshop and how it targets as well as a course methodology and outline of the workshop. The TOT has a strong historical background on women & gender in Development – there is a strong focus on concepts/definitions i.e. Gender vs. Sex, WID vs. GAD, mainstreaming vs. integration, etc.

Facilitators Note:
In the session process sections of each module it states what the facilitators are supposed to do – however it is written in the past tense (so it unclear if it summarizes the process that happened for a previous workshop). Their isn’t actually a clear facilitators/trainers note – yet an interesting point is that page 19 has ‘Qualities of a Good Communicator (Trainer)’ in which it list characteristics that are important to have.
Training of Trainers Package

GAW

- The GWA Training of Trainers Package is firstly targeting trainers who are committed to mainstreaming gender in IWRM. Through their skill as trainers, they also become ambassadors for the GWA in developing other people’s skills.

  The criteria of choice for participants attending a TOT workshop includes:
  - Capability to train,
  - Facilitate or run workshops;
  - Interest and commitment to deliver training workshops in the GWA and its partner’s networks;
  - Capability to adapt the training package modules for various audiences in his/her respective country;
  - Is in a position to ensure follow-up training for the longer term

- The general goals of the Training of Trainers Package are: to serve as a basis to enhance the impact of gender mainstreaming in IWRM, to build strategic partnerships for training events and to realize the millennium and GWA goals for a sustainable environment.

  Objective:
  - Enhance the capacity of the GWA members and other partners in gender mainstreaming knowledge and skills.
  - Build a common understanding on gender perspectives in IWRM.
  - Share experience on practical ways of mainstreaming gender within the major phases of the project cycle.
  - Develop strategies to promote gender equality within the staffing, organizational culture and working practices of water sector organizations and departments.
  - Suggest practical tools and methodologies that one can use in engendering projects and organizations.
  - Enhance training skills of participants to facilitate gender-sensitive training courses.
  - Provide a platform for action planning for future capacity building initiatives.

P 15 Design of workshop (1 week)
- Broken down per day, listing the time & activity sequence

Under each one of these topics, the modules address a variety of related issues - All the modules are inter-related and mutually supportive.

Module 1 - Gender and Integrated Water Resources Management
Module 2 - Gender-Sensitive Training Skills
Module 3 - Mainstreaming Gender in the Project Cycle
Module 4 - Gender Mainstreaming Tools
Module 5 - Gender Mainstreaming in Organizations and Policy Process: From Theory to Practice
Module 6 - Planning Trainers-Of-Training Workshops

As the Training of Trainers Package builds on existing tools, methodologies and materials for training and capacity building, it is in itself a flexible tool and adaptation of this package to different local contexts should be explored by trainers using it.

- Introductory Exercise
- Handouts
- Case study
- Brochures
- Workshops
- Transparency
- Group exercise (24 grs day, iceberg of inequality, mapping activities, evaluation modules, analysis tools, etc.)

Facilitators Note:
Per session there are further details to the objectives and step-by-step instructions and what preparations are needed. What is handy is the fact that each sessions has a “trainer’s notes” wordbox which summarizes what the facilitator should make sure the participants should get out of each exercise (to bring home the point across in terms of the objectives).

Observation:
The TOT is very much meant for a selected few (GWA members) to be trained so that they can “impart knowledge and skills learned in the regions and countries in a cascading effect”. The approach to the TOT is problematic, “replicate the training”, as it assumes this notion that those being taught “gender knowledge” are empty vessels that will not resist and smoothly repeat what they have learned. It is mentioned that the trainers have the option to use a specific module for specific audiences within a specific time frame and the need to make clear the links between each module.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training of Trainers Manual on Gender Mainstreaming in Disaster Risk Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNDP</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The participants essentially require some basic training and communication skills. To meet this need, each day basic training and presentation skills sessions are included in between gender sessions as it would be refreshing to participants.

**Objective per session:**
- Participant will understand the concept of Gender (gender-aware, blind, sensitive, equity), difference between Sex and Gender
- Participant will have clarity on Gender Roles & Responsibilities with specific reference to the triple role of Women, Practical Gender Needs (PGN) and Strategic Gender Needs (SGN), Development interventions in relation to gender issues
- Clarify the rational for commitment to gender equality, gender mainstreaming – why its needed and the approach, as well as history and scope of gender

Participants should understand the gender dimension of disasters, the differential disasters of men and women, understand the contribution that both men and women can make to Disaster Risk (DRM)
- Enable participants to identify gender dimensions of disaster through an audio-visual presentation, understand how disasters impact both men and women differently, acknowledge the need for gender mainstreaming in disaster preparedness and response
- Enable participants to distinguish between education, training and learning – describe the four stages in Systematic Approach to Training

- Participants will understand the use of role play, case experiences, use of discussion as a method of training – improve communicate instructions and become a better facilitator and make effective presentations on gender
- Participants will understand gender dimensions in post-conflict scenario, think about gender mainstreaming in post-disaster situations.
- Participants should be able to identify gender issues and concerns in disaster risk management in general & in their field of experience, see the linkages in their work

**TOT manual is in 3 days long.** (p.12-14) the design of workshop is broken down per day, listing the time & activity sequence

- 19 Sessions are designed to build knowledge as well as skills.

**Workshop Day One**
- Session 1: Introductions to Purpose & Outline (45 minutes)
- Session 2: Ice Breaking (30 minutes)
- Session 3: Gender & Related Concepts (60 minutes)
- Session 4: Gender Roles & Stereotypes (60 minutes)
- Session 5: Gender Analysis & Development (60 minutes)
- Session 6: Gender Analysis (45 minutes)
- Session 7: Gender Quiz (60 minutes)

**Workshop Day Two**
- Session 8: Gender Mainstreaming as an approach and strategy (60 minutes)
- Session 9: Gender dimensions in disaster management (45 minutes)
- Session 10: Gender mainstreaming in disaster risk management (45 minutes)
- Session 11: Introduction to Training Systematic Approach to Training (45 minutes)
- Session 12: Training Methods (45 minutes)
- Session 13: Communication Skills Hands on Session (60 minutes)

**Workshop Day Three**
- Session 14: Presentation Skills (60 minutes)
- Session 15: Presentation Skills (60 minutes)

**Participatory methodologies**
- Icebreaker
- Power-point presentation
- Handouts
- Brainstorming
- Discussion
- Presentation
- Audio-visual
- Group activity/presentation
- Participatory activity
- Interactive session
- Case study/method
- Gender quiz
- Role play
- Training evaluation form

**Facilitator Notes:**
Per session there are further instructions as to what the facilitators should do and how to make sure the participants are getting the take-away messages. Instructions for each activity are very ‘step-by-step’ and it offers extra activities and references.

**Observation:**
There isn’t a clear overall objective stated for the TOT, however there are more detailed and instrumental objectives per session based on the theme and activities being addressed. It seems very mechanical process, each sessions builds on the other – however it seems like there will be a lot of information to take-in in 3 days. While there is a session on understanding activities like role play, case studies and discussion, it doesn’t go into how such activities give both trainers and participants the opportunity to question their positionalities or how these actives are reflective in nature.
and plan how to contribute Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR)

Session 16: Post Disaster Recovery and Rehabilitation Integrating Gender Concerns (45 minutes)
Session 17: Practical tools and guidelines on gender mainstreaming (45 minutes)
Session 18: How do you plan to mainstream gender in DRM future visions (60 minutes)
Session 19: Presentations on gender mainstreaming (60 minutes)

Training of Trainers’ Manual on Gender and Security for the Media and Civil Society

Saferworld

The manual has been designed for the training of trainers (ToT) programme for media and civil society on gender and security in Nepal.

The training team should comprise two trainers and one or two facilitators. There should be one trainer/facilitator for each group of participants. Trainers can also act as facilitators.

The facilitators should have good communication skills, experience of gender and/or security issues and experience in the media or civil society.

Participants’ profile: The participants should be experienced civil society representatives and journalists (particularly print, broadcast and news reporters, editors, feature writers, programme producers and bloggers who focus on relevant topics). The journalists will be a mixture of mid-level experienced reporters and higher-level decision makers.

Civil society representatives chosen to participate will be working on this activity is part of a broader project by the Institute of Human Rights Communication (IHRICON) and Saferworld, with support from the Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs, which strengthens the development and implementation of gender-sensitive policy and programming on security in Nepal.

Objective:

- The aim of the workshop is to strengthen their capacity to advocate for change at policy level rather than providing a basic introduction to the issues.

- The trainers will take it in turns to lead training sessions, depending on their specific skills and experiences. Ideally, one trainer should have experience as a gender trainer and the other should have experience in training on security and SSR. Both trainers should have a background in media and/or civil society.

Overall 3 days

Workshop Day One
Session 1: Introductions and expectations (120 minutes)
Session 2: What do we mean by ‘gender’? (90 minutes)
Session 3: What do we mean by ‘security’, ‘sexual and gender-based violence’, ‘security sector’ and ‘SSR’? (175 minutes)

Workshop Day Two
Session 4: What do we mean by ‘mainstreaming gender’? (30 minutes)
Session 5: Mainstreaming gender into security policy and programming (100 minutes)
Session 6: Dialogue media and civil society – ‘getting to know you’ (90 minutes)
Session 7: Gaps and progress in gender and security in Nepal (125 minutes)
Session 8: Gender and security-related international and national policies (60 minutes)

Workshop Day Three
Media session 9A: Planet Mars (95 minutes)

To reflect a range of different learning styles, the modules in this manual include a balance of doing, analyzing, discussing, thinking, listening and reading. The training package allows scope for participants to contribute and share their knowledge with each other.

- Plenary discussions
- Group work
- Syndicate work
- Pair work
- Information briefing
- Presentation sessions
- Energizers
- Ice-breakers
- Daily learning/reflection diaries

Observation:

This TOT seems very comprehensive, because they provide the manual for the 3 day workshop (including 2 power-points, and a companion workbook which contains tools, handouts and further resources). This TOT requires the participants to even fill out a daily learning diary where they are encouraged to reflect on what they are learning from each session. The methodology has a good balance of practical vs. analytical session.

Facilitator Note:

The TOT values the importance of facilitator and trainer preparation prior to the workshop in order to clarify roles, responsibilities and materials. The TOT acknowledges that men and women have different time-constraints which may affect their attendance, highlighting the importance of consulting with all participants (specifically women, whose access may be restricted depending on socio-cultural context). It is very thorough with direction for facilitators/trainers.
| NORDEFCO Gender Training of the Trainers Course Notice | Objectives:  
- Apply international framework and background of gender perspective in own training activities.  
- Plan education, training and exercises with an integrated gender perspective for the security sector, including pre-deployment, in theatre- and national training.  
- Conduct education, training and exercises with an integrated gender perspective for the security sector, including pre-deployment, in theatre- and national training.  
- Evaluate education, training and exercises with an integrated gender perspective for the security sector, including pre-deployment, in theatre- and national training.  

The course will be interactive and every student is expected to take an active part in all modules and share own experiences of working as a trainer. Course duration is two weeks. | The Gender Training of Trainers course consists of lectures, facilitated discussions, practical exercises, case studies solved in syndicates and individual tasks. | http://www.forsvaramakten.se/en/swedint/courses-at-swedint-and-how-to-apply/gtot/ |
| **TOT Workshop Notice**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Women, Gender &amp; leadership in Higher Education</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Working with a selection of the modules, to train and equip a group of women with the skills required for conducting training programmes both for colleagues in their own university and/or for women in other institutions of higher education nationally or regionally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To promote an understanding of how women professionals learn and develop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To explore the relationship between process and content when planning training programmes for women in leadership and management in higher education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To evaluate and adapt, for the local context, training materials produced by authors from all over the Commonwealth and tested by participants at previous workshops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To provide the theoretical underpinning that will support development programmes, looking in particular at three of the training modules - the Facilitator’s Handbook, Developing Management Skills and the Gender Mainstreaming module.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- To adapt, plan and take back the outline and materials for training programmes to be delivered either in the participants’ own university, or for women in or from neighbouring higher education institutions; and to develop networks to sustain those programmes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 Workshop notices are announcements for training of gender trainers.
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**Conceptualizing Professional Development of Gender Trainers**

*Review and Mapping Paper (May 2016)*
Standards and Certification

There currently lacks a commonly accepted and utilization of a set of gender training standards, although there have been calls for such. This is said to be the reason behind the absence of a certification process for gender trainers (EIGE 2013). Calls for both, standardization and certification, have come from a number of observations about gender training including:

- The rapid expansion of the number of trainers working as gender trainers, particularly in the EU context with the adoption of gender mainstreaming
- The diverse backgrounds and experiences gender trainers possess
- A realization of the plethora of training approaches
- A concern for quality particularly the loss of feminist intent behind gender training and gender mainstreaming
- The potential of conflict of interest between trainers' livelihood interests and the social change agenda of gender training.

Such calls for standardization are problematic. As the OPERA project found (The OPERA Team 2011), there is such a diversity of trainers and training that a uniform set of standards is unfeasible. Instead, they opt for “minimum” standards. Of more concern is the basis of such standards: what would be the political basis from which such standards can be developed. The use of “standards” implies a universally accepted set of norms concerning gender equality and gender knowledge. The concern here is that rather than take a political stand, the lowest common denominator will be used in an effort to be inclusive.

There have been attempts to introduce standards for gender trainers as well as gender experts more generally, mainly under the auspices of EU funding (see Table 2 for summary). Most focus on skills of training, whether facilitation, communication. While some attention is paid to knowledge of trainers, the nature of such knowledge i.e., gender knowledge is taken as a given, as if there is a gender knowledge that trainers need. There is little indication of an acknowledgement of different gender knowledges, let alone ways of knowing, and how these are politically and relatively situated. Little attention is paid the concerns for reflexivity, praxis and the political nature of gender training and working with resistance. Additionally, there is no consideration for lived experiences gender trainers, except in the limited case of the OPERA proposed minimum criteria gender trainers that alludes to “field competence”.

While nearly all proposed standards are politically anaemic, one possible exception is the “Gender Manifesto: A call for critical reflection on gender oriented capacity building and consultancy”. While not a standard per se, it is an effort to re-situate gender training with its emphasis on regaining concepts and reflexivity.
Table 2 *Summary of Standards for Gender Trainers and Experts*\(^6\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Attitudes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum quality criteria for trainers</td>
<td>General competences: Training and adult pedagogy skills</td>
<td>• Gender+ competence: knowledge of gender+ theory up to date with current</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(The OPERA Team, 2011)</td>
<td>Personal competence: a personal ability to clearly communicate</td>
<td>academic debates, research questions and acquaintance with gender analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>goals and contents of gender+ training while raising interest and</td>
<td>instruments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>questions.</td>
<td>• Method competence: knowledge of methods and competence in their</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Field competence: understanding of the participants’ working field,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>which make the trainers’ competence another highly contextual element</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>of gender+ training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gender Equality Facilitator’s Profile:</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender trainers’ competences</td>
<td>• possesses high interpersonal competence conducive to the participants’</td>
<td>• possesses a higher education as well as competence in workshop design</td>
<td>• possesses personal traits and presents attitudes which encourage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Kwiatowska, 2007)</td>
<td>learning about gender equality</td>
<td>and implementation</td>
<td>learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• possesses high competence in sustaining the process of change</td>
<td>• has comprehensive knowledge of gender issues.</td>
<td>• is highly focused on continuous self-development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>involved in achieving gender equality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• uses non-discriminatory and gender-sensitive language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^6\) Adapted from EIGE 2013.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender trainers’ competences (Fuxjäger, 2007)</th>
<th>Expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Have a know-how of group dynamics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can analyze and reflect on gender issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodological skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can design processes guided by self-discovery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can set up gender-sensitive work in the group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal competences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Have the ability to reflect, promote self reflexivity, and openness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can lead reflection processes in terms of gender roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social competences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Have intercultural skills with an ability to resolve conflicts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can establish connectivity with gender equality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity building</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ability to combine training skills and gender competence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Knowledge, skills and competencies of gender experts | • Academic Skills  
• Planning and problem-solving skills  
• Communication  
• Self-awareness and interpersonal skills  
• Pedagogical Skills  
• Overarching competence: such as consult/negotiate with clients and/or stakeholders in a range of organizational settings in order to:  
  – identify gender related problems and challenges;  
  – agree targets for individual and/or organizational change;  
  – develop and implement strategies to achieve agreed targets;  
  – evaluate the effectiveness of the strategies and their implementation. | • Understand theories of gender and their historical development  
• Understand theoretical approaches to gender-political themes in European societies  
• Understand theoretical approaches to the analysis of the gendered structure of organizations  
• Understand theoretical approaches to gender within interpersonal relationships  
• Understand the relevance and significance of current debates to questions of gender |

| ‘Gender Manifesto: A call for critical reflection on gender oriented capacity building and consultancy’ | The manifesto for quality standards in gender training and consultancy has a dual objective: first, to eliminate gendered norms and preconceptions in gender training and consultancy; and, second, to return to the core and the critical intrinsic meaning of the term ‘gender’ |

Methodologies for reflective gender practice include:  
• systematically applying the three-step process: construction-reconstruction-deconstruction;  
• undoing gender;  
• raising awareness of the ‘paradoxes of gender’;  
• putting gender concepts into the respective context;  
• posing questions on power relations;  
• facilitating participatory training methodologies;  
• developing precisely-tailored concepts instead of offering standard recipes. |

Standards for a reflective gender practice  
1. opposes the reproduction of gender duality and offers instead an analysis of its foundation,  
2. its ways of functioning and its effects, in order to find long term solutions to overcome it;  
3. opposes the trivialization and dramatization of gender. It promotes the specific perception of individual interests and capabilities beyond gender-based preconceptions, without losing sight of the influence of the hierarchical social gender order;  
4. offers gender as an open concept and creates space for ideas for the elimination of previous restrictions on gender identities;  
5. is aware that the origins of gender work are based in the feminist movements and relates to those roots. It respects the work of colleagues in the field and explicitly cites and credits the sources and resources used;  
6. highlights the potential tension in the relationship between efficiency and equality and is committed to gender equality. |
Conclusions

Standing (2004: 85) insightfully asks, are there “better and worse ways of ‘doing’ gender?” . Certainly there are, but this sets up a hierarchy of gender knowledge (Ferguson, 2015), which contradicts the feminist foundations, particularly feminist standards for knowledge production (Prügl, 2010). More critically, it raises a dilemma pointed out by Ferguson (2015: 386),

> How can we make a claim that someone else’s knowledge on gender is wrong — that is, not feminist — and therefore not a true gender approach? Are we saying that only feminists can have gender expertise and knowledge? What, if anything, do we gain for our profession by doing so?

However, notwithstanding Ferguson’s concern, Standing’s question is a provocative one. It implies gender training is normative. This is not surprising, given the social and political context in which it is embedded, gender mainstreaming. It’s also a problematic question. On the one hand, it acknowledges that some practices further the agenda and other do not. On the other, the imposition of particular ways of doing gender contradicts feminist values of plurality and a reluctance to fix meaning.

Perhaps the issue with Standing is the verb — to do. Perhaps the question is more appropriately asked, particularly in the context of gender training, is there a right way and wrong way to think of and approach gender training?

This question allows and calls for an explicit standpoint. In the case of UN TC, this is concerns gender training as feminist project. The training of trainer programs reviewed in this paper do not position themselves in this manner. Some efforts to standardize gender trainers do, although not consistency and nor systematically.

With this in mind, this review argues that an approach to gender training, and therefore gender trainers as the mediators of gender training, needs to take into account key feminist ways of thinking and practice, such as reflexivity, working with resistance and intersectionality and praxis. Even more critical would be to understand how a professional development program for gender trainers can repoliticize feminist knowledge transfer (Bustelo et al. 2016a) and bring an ethical dimension to the work (Prügl 2016).

---

7 “If gender expertise is feminist knowledge, does it live up to the standards feminists have set for knowledge production?” — what power derives from the use of such gender knowledge (Prügl, 2010)
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