Intersectionality in Gender$^+$ Training

Susanne Baer, Janet Keim, Lucy Nowottnick

Training policy makers and civil servants about gender, gender[+][1] inequalities and diversity has become an important key for establishing, enhancing and improving gender[+] equality policies in the European Union. While there is a huge market for such trainings, one can also examine a lack of quality measures and standards for trainers, commissioners and participants of gender/gender[+]/diversity trainings.

An analysis of contemporary training manuals for gender and diversity trainings within the EU and the UN shows that 'intersectionality' is a concept which is rarely explicitly used in the training field.[2] Neither the term 'intersectionality' nor any other of numerous conceptualisations is used to theorize interlocking types of discrimination. While the field of "diversity trainings" is continuously expanding, the theoretical foundations of these programmes have been described as fragmentary and problematic.[3] Integrating the concept of intersectionality in gender[+] trainings highlights the importance to understand and reflect intersectional inequalities and intersectional discrimination in its complexity. The paper takes its point of departure in the examination of that hypothesis. The challenge of transferring theory to the level of policy making is often acknowledged, however, suggestions to meet this challenge are rare. For the context of gender[+] trainings, we aim to develop recommendations of how intersectionality could be included in order to understand interlocking types of discrimination and in order to provide tools to analyse policies with regard to whether they take intersectional inequalities into account.

First, we will critically discuss different approaches towards intersectionality and their conceptualisations of intersectional inequalities. We will outline important theoretical contributions and present different aspects of its ongoing conceptualisations. Second, we will present the analysis of training manuals by specifically focussing on the lack of intersectional perspectives. Finally, we will discuss how the theoretical, legal and political conceptualisations of intersectionality can be transferred into trainings by discussing which minimum effects the concept should have on methods/material, training conditions and trainer's profiles.

---

1 Gender+ is the term used in QUING to emphasise the intersectionality of gender with other categories. In this article, we set the + in superscript in order to highlight that we define gender as always already interlocked with other categorisations rather than understanding the addition of other categories only as an option.
2   Gabriele Rosenstreich writes in her analysis of diversity trainings: "An explicit conceptualisation of how the multiple elements come together to produce subjects is, however, either lacking entirely or at best ambivalent in programmes." (Rosenstreich 2007: 143)
3   See Rosenstreich 2007: 134.

1. Intersectionality: Theoretical, Political and Legal Concepts[4]

There is not one theory of intersectionality, but different conceptualisations and theoretisations of it, including different terms.5 They can be differentiated with regard to which societal level they analyse, identities, representations or structures, or if they offer a multilevel approach. Another aspect of classification would be the implicit or explicit reference to intersectionality as well as a static or dynamic conceptualisation of intersectionality. They can also be classified along the question of how they understand the 'intersections', i.e. the phenomenon of conflation/overlap or accumulation of different inequalities or forms of discrimination.[6]

1.1 Theoretical Concepts

In the rather unbounded field of feminisms and gender studies, critical race studies, queer studies and disability studies, intersectionality has been addressed and theorized in a variety of disciplinary and interdisciplinary fields for over 20 years. Theoretical discussions have always been connected to political struggles and social or civil rights movements. Here, the recognition of discrimination based on more than one inequality and varying manifestations of experiences of discrimination have been approached not only but most influentially by women of colour in the US American context. This is not to diminish the influence of women of colour in national contexts in Europe[7] who influenced debates therein. However, the international recognition of US American debates was very influential to the European context as well.

Different theoretical approaches try to find answers to questions of how intersections are conceptualised. How can intersectional inequalities be theorised? Is it an "intersection" of inequalities? Or should we look at overlapping sets which produce something new and distinct?[8] Are there diverse "axes of inequalities"?[9] And do they form a complex and multidimensional matrix in which the individual's position has to be contextualised?[10]

Among others, Leslie McCall raises the question of how intersectionality can be studied and offers a classification of methodological approaches.[11] She differentiates between intracategorical, intercategorical and anticategorical approaches. In the anticategorical approach, analytical categories are deconstructed and fixed categories for "simplifying social fictions that produce

---

4   We use the term concepts rather than frames because we are less interested in specific social actors but more in discursive productions.

5   For the conceptualisation of intersectionality in the QUING project, see D13 and D14.

6   While we offer a system of classification that differentiates between different intersectional approaches, there are other classifications, such as Hancock 2007, that distinguishes intersectional approaches from other approaches.

7   See for the context of Germany e.g. Oguntoye et al. 1986, FeMigra 1994, Eggers et al. 2005.

8   See King 1988.

9   Klinger / Knapp 2005.

10 See Hill Collins 1990.

11 See McCall 2005.

inequalities in the process of producing difference"[12] are criticised. In the intercategorical approach, categories are used in order "to document relationships of inequality among social groups and changing configurations of inequality among multiple and conflicting dimensions."[13] The intracategorical approach focuses on particular social groups and analyses the complexity of lived experiences in these groups.[14] Since this article is not a sociological study of intersectional groups or positions, it moves between an anticategorical and an intercategorical approach.

Besides approaches which are explicitly using the term intersectionality, there is a variety of early texts that do not use this term, but nevertheless offer a similar conceptual framework. These texts can be defined as implicit intersectional approaches. For example, Angela Davis[15] and the Combahee River Collective[16] have written about intersectionality from a Black feminist perspective as early as 1981 before the term intersectionality was coined.[17]

Regarding explicit intersectional approaches, Kimberlé Crenshaw's concept of intersectional discrimination (1989) in particular has influenced and stimulated numerous academic and political debates and contributions. Crenshaw's concept of intersectionality is based on the understanding that different lines of identity – in her analysis race and gender – produce multiple forms of discrimination, particularly in legal contexts. Black women can therefore face multiple forms of discrimination: as women, as Black, as women *and* Black, and as Black women. Crenshaw's analysis shows that the "single-axis framework"[18] of US American anti-discrimination law does not provide sufficient protection for women of colour, but rather discriminates against them. The underlying problem is the inequality of standards ("scrutiny") US American courts apply to different aspects of discrimination. Crenshaw uses the metaphor of the crossroad to illustrate intersectionality.[19] This metaphor has been criticized for the inherent static conceptualisation of the relation between categories, and for the implication that the categories exist separated from each other before and after their intersection.[20] However, Crenshaw uses the concept of intersectionality to criticise the challenges of legal decision-making in the face of multiple discrimination.

---

12 Ibid.: 1773.
13 Ibid.
14 Ibid.: 1773-1774.
15 Davis 1981.
16 Combahee River Collective 1981. The Combahee River Collective writes: "The most general statement of our politics at the present time would be that we are actively committed to struggling against racial, sexual, heterosexual, and class oppression and see as our particular task the development of integrated analysis and practice based upon the fact that the major systems of oppression are interlocking." (p. 210)
17 For a more detailed genealogy see McCall 2005: 1772 Fn1.
18 Crenshaw 1989: 139.
19 See Crenshaw 1989.
20 See e.g. Walgenbach 2007: 49. The critique of Crenshaw's static conceptualisation often overlooks that Crenshaw does not limit the metaphor to the description of a crossroad, but talks about the traffic on this crossroad which is a rather dynamic and multidimensional image. See the interview in the journal Perspectives, online available at: http://www.abanet.org/women/perspectives/Spring2004CrenshawPSP.pdf.

While Crenshaw's concept of intersectionality focuses on the individual level and offers a perspective on intersectional locations, other concepts, like "axes of inequality,"[21] analyse intersecting inequalities on a structural level. This approach emphasises social structures rather than identity categories. Gudrun-Axeli Knapp points out the necessity of analysing the axes of inequality and difference on a macro-level while so far intersectional approaches have focused on intersecting identity categories. She proposes that intersectional theory has to include social theoretical approaches. The concept of 'axes of inequality and difference' focuses on the following questions:

> "How are gender relations and heteronormative sexuality, class relations and configurations of ethnicity and race/ism interwoven in the structural and institutional make-up of a given society and economy, in national as well as transnational contexts? And what happens to these relationalities under conditions of social, political and economic transformation?"[22]

Knapp's proposal of a multi-level approach towards intersectionality has been also addressed and operationalised by other authors, like Nina Degele and Gabriele Winker[23], Nira Yuval-Davis[24] and Myra Marx Ferree[25]. Myra Marx Ferree proposes the concept of interactive intersectionality in which she analyses intersectionality as a multilevel process while focussing on agency. Thereby, she combines a multilevel approach with a dynamic conceptualisation of intersectionality similar to concepts like interdependency and assemblage.

Interdependency can be defined as the mutual construction of categories.[26] Therefore, the concept proposes an interwovenness of inequalities rather than a simple intersection which is limited to one crossing point. Walgenbach et al. offer an integrated interdependency frame in which they conceptualise categories as always already interdependent. Thereby, they defer the interdependencies into the interior of categories since they assume that the separation of categories is only an analytical construction. As analytical perspective, they propose to examine the internal structures of categories.[27] As another alternative, the concept of assemblage, derived from the work of Deleuze and Guattari[28], was introduced by Jasbir Puar into the debate of intersectionality. She writes:

> "As opposed to an intersectional model of identity, which presumes components – race, class, gender, sexuality, nation, age, religion – are separable analytics and can be thus disassembled, an assemblage is more attuned to interwoven forces that merge and dissipate time, space, and body against linearity, coherence, and permanency."[29]

---

21 See Klinger / Knapp 2005.
22 Knapp 2005: 259.
23 Degele/Winker 2006, Degele/Winker 2009.
24 Yuval-Davis 2006. She uses the concept of "intersecting social divisions" (p. 194) and of "different axes of power of different social divisions" (p. 200).
25 Ferree 2009.
26 See Walgenbach et al. 2007, Hornscheidt 2009.
27 See Walgenbach et al. 2007: 63.
28 Deleuze/Guattari 1987.
29 Puar 2005: 127-128.

While Puar emphasizes interwoven forces in her concept of assemblage, the presumption of categories can be productive in gender[+] equality policies. Since the goal of gender[+] trainings is to raise awareness for inequalities, at least for those mentioned in the EU anti-discrimination legislation, referring to categories is necessary. But Puar and others argue, using categories as analytical and political devices must entail a critical reflection of naturalizing tendencies in categorizations.

Not only Puar has pointed to the limits of categories, but other authors have also discussed the possibilities and limits of categories as heuristic devices. Antje Hornscheidt criticises that the concept of categories is taken as unquestioned foundation of most intersectional approaches. She points out that only some aspects reach the status of categories, while other aspects such as citizenship or educational background are neglected and are thereby not included in intersectional approaches. Furthermore, Hornscheidt argues that the assumption of the existence of categories leads to their stabilization and to exclusion of other aspects. She proposes the concept of "categorisation" in order to focus on and reflect upon this process of constructing categories.[30]

The Concept of Intersectionality in This Article

In this article, the term "intersectionality" is relevant with regard to three different aspects. First, the term is used to name the relation between different inequalities, especially in the field of gender[+] equality policies. Second, we refer to the concept as an analytical perspective which could be called an intersectional approach. Third, as mentioned above, "intersectionality" also refers to an ongoing discussion how to conceptualise and analyse overlapping inequalities, multiple discrimination, intersecting categories, or mutually articulating power relations. In our analysis and recommendations, we want to emphasise that it is less important which term is used to implicitly or explicitly name intersectionality, but rather how intersectionality is conceptualised. At this moment, a multilevel dynamic conceptualisation of intersectionality seems most productive to address intersectional inequalities in gender[+] trainings since it focuses on the production and possible change of inequalities on all levels of society.

Additionally, this article also raises questions regarding the uses of theories of intersectionality in relation to attempts to understand, and fight discrimination. We assume that discrimination, in a substantial, asymmetrical sense[31], cannot be understood without an awareness of certain implicit norms which govern societies, thus the inscribed systems or structures, the norms and routines, the normalities and naturalized assumptions of discrimination, inequality and oppression. To address these, we suggest to include a focus on privileges in an intersectional

---

30 See Hornscheidt 2007.
31 MacKinnon 1989: 215-234, Baer 2001.

analysis of inequalities. In doing so, intersectionality may be understood as multiple discrimination, e.g. for legal purposes[32], but also needs to take norms such as hegemonic masculinity or heteronormativity or ableism into account. In that sense, we suggest to understand intersectionality as a general rather than a specific issue, not something to be added eventually, but an analytical perspective to be used in all situations, just like gender in gender mainstreaming.

Since we locate this article between academic discussion and conceptualisation on the one side and the field of transformative gender+ trainings in the context of policy making on the other side, we are aware of the fact that "intersectionality" does not easily travel from the one field into the other. While terms like 'multiple inequalities' or 'multiple discrimination' may be more common in the field of policy making, of law or of trainings, this article can be read as a plea for a transfer of intersectionality theories into antidiscrimination policies, wherever they are pursued. Therefore, we want to contribute to the discussion of how to operationalise intersectionality by focussing on the training field.

1.2 Political and Legal Concepts

Intersectionality is not only conceptualised in academic theories, but is also an issue in political and legal contexts. Timo Makkonen, a European anti-discrimination legislation scholar, has emphasised the distinction between multiple discrimination, compound discrimination and intersectional discrimination.[33] According to Makkonen, multiple discrimination should describe the phenomenon in which one person is discriminated against on several different grounds at different times. He points to the mathematical connotations the term "multiple" (as well as double, triple etc.) has and argues that it should only be used in connection with situations in which different grounds operate separately. Compound discrimination should be taken to describe a situation in which several grounds of discrimination add to each other at one particular instance: discrimination on the basis of one ground adds to discrimination based on another ground to create an added burden. There can be two or more types of discrimination in play at one given situation. Intersectional discrimination, on the contrary, should be taken to refer to a situation in which several grounds of discrimination interact concurrently and thus form a specific type of discrimination. Since multiple and compound discrimination describe additive forms of discrimination, it is important to differentiate them from intersectional discrimination.[34]

---

32 Shaw 2005.
33 Makkonen 2002: 10-11. See also Fredman 2005. Fredman also uses the terms multiple and intersectional discrimination but without offering a differentiation between those two. In her article, she analyses how the EU directives open up new possibilities in addressing multiple discrimination, but also create several obstacles by their segmentation in different sets of directives.
34 While intersectional approaches focus on the intersections of different categories, additive approaches describe categories as separated entities and are not able to explain their intersections. For example, additive approaches only address gay and disabled people as separated discriminated groups, but are not able to understand the specific

However, multiple, compound and intersectional discrimination are most often used and understood interchangeably.[35] In this article, we use this term as an umbrella term to name all forms of discrimination in which several categories intersect.

Beside the inconsistent use of terminology in the context of equality policies, more importantly, specific measures to tackle intersecting forms of discrimination have not been implemented yet. Nevertheless, awareness for multiple forms of discrimination increases in European Union legislation and policy making ever since the incorporation of Article 13 of the Amsterdam Treaty in 1997.[36] Important steps towards a broad protection against discrimination were the adoption of the Racial Equality Directive (2000/43/EC), the Employment Equality Directive (2000/78/EC) in 2000 and, most recently, the proposal for a comprehensive anti-discrimination directive by the European Commission in July 2008.[37] Legislative measures are supported by action programmes, such as PROGRESS[38], the "European Year of Equal Opportunities for All" in 2007[39], as well as the Communication of the European Commission "Non-Discrimination and Equal Opportunities – A Framework Strategy"[40] and the campaign "For Diversity, Against Discrimination" that the EU has been running since July 2003.[41]

The lack of data on intersectional discrimination is another obstacle that hinders progress from additive understanding of discrimination to an intersectional approach.[42] Different and often hierarchical systems of legislation and other bureaucratic hurdles need also to be taken into account. In most European countries, a broader approach towards discrimination including a multitude of categories can build onto processes of gender mainstreaming which already take place. But as Mieke Verloo points out, it would be problematic to assume a sameness between inequalities that would allow a 'one size fits all' approach. Instead, she emphasizes the differences of various inequality mechanisms and proposes to start by expanding gender mainstreaming as well as to build

---

discrimination of gay people with disabilities.

35 See Makkonen 2002: 9, EC 2007: 17.

36 The Treaty of Amsterdam entered into force on 1 May 1999 and in Art. 13 provides the legislative ground to combat discrimination based on sex, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation.

37 See COM(2008) 426 final.

38 In its decision No 1672/2006/EC the European Parliament and the Council established a "Community Programme for Employment and Social Solidarity — PROGRESS 2007-2013". Further information are available online: http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/spsi/programme_decisions_en.htm

39 http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/eyeq/index.cfm

40 http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52005DC0224:EN:HTML

41 http://www.stop-discrimination.info/

42 Suggestions to the European Commission and Member States are to develop strategies to collect equality data taking into account all protected grounds as well as the adoption of an action plan that spells out the measures that will be taken for the development of an EU and a national knowledge base on multiple discrimination, including monitoring systems. A suggestion to National Equality Bodies is cross-ground referenced data to make the intersection of different grounds visible in the number of lodged complaints and cases handled (See: EC 2007: 55). For further information on why and how to build to a national knowledge base on equality and discrimination on the grounds of racial and ethnic origin, religion and belief, disability, age and sexual orientation see EC 2006.

an intersectional system of equality mainstreaming.[43]

1.3 Analytical Concepts Regarding Training

In an analysis of training manuals, Gabriela Dina Rosenstreich conceptualises intersectionality as the "interrelationships between identities, categories and oppression [...] in Diversity Training programmes".[44] She uses two broad paradigms, which then encompasses five models. The first paradigm she identifies is that of an overriding 'grand model of oppression' which explains oppression as manifested in various forms of systems such as racism, sexism etc. There are two models that built onto this understanding: the *interchangeable model45* which describes all forms of discrimination as essentially the same and the *interlocking model46* in which the forms of discrimination are comprising an all-encompassing system in their very interrelation, hence no form of discrimination can be combated in isolation.[47] The second paradigm is called 'intersectionality' which is focused more on the position of individuals and for which Rosenstreich identifies three models. The model of *intersecting lines or axes* describes the question of which 'car' (as a metaphor for form of oppression) or selection of 'cars' runs you down. This model has to be differentiated from an *intersection of sets*, i.e. overlapping sets which produce something new and distinct. A third model is the *matrix of domination* in which the individual is positioned at the intersections of a complex multi-dimensional matrix with diverse axes corresponding to social categories.

2. Intersectionality in training manuals

A huge and growing market for training activities on gender, diversity, anti-discrimination, equal opportunities and the like is represented by a growing number of manuals for such trainings. Trainings of interest in this article are *gender trainings* (which have a prime focus on sex discrimination) and *gender$^+$ trainings* (as trainings which address sex discrimination intersecting with other categories of discrimination)*, diversity trainings, antidiscrimination, equality* and other trainings. This list highlights the variety of labels, but also the variety of concepts and understandings of addressed issues. This needs to be taken into account in any comparative analysis of gender$^{(+)}$ trainings for policy makers in the European Union, and one needs to address why labels are used and what they signify in a given context. This article attempts to offer possible approaches

---

43 See Verloo 2006.
44 Rosenstreich 2007: 147.
45 "An interchangeable model describes all forms of discrimination as essentially the same, as different manifestations of an underlying type of attitude or behaviour or of an overriding system, just with different points of reference. It is basically an additive model, considering the forms as distinct, but their mechanisms function and impact as fundamentally the same." (Rosenstreich 2007: 147.)
46 "The interlocking model is less frequently articulated. It describes forms of discrimination as comprising an all encompassing system in their very interrelation. The respective systems themselves interlock or require each other to exist." (Rosenstreich 2007: 147.)
47 See ibid.

to such research questions, based on an analysis of manuals for such trainings.

For the purpose of this article, we analysed several training manuals from the level of EU and UN as well as from the national level.[48] In our search, we did not only collect manuals which explicitly use the term 'intersectionality'. Rather, we also collected manuals which are conceptualised for diversity trainings as well as for gender trainings. There are no manuals explicitly using the term gender[+], however, some manuals work with a broad definition of gender thus can be described as gender[+]. We were looking for manuals, handbooks and compendium for training in the field of gender[+] equality policies. Our main focus was on manuals with a scope of EU countries and that are accessible online or in print version (i.e. no membership in networks is required to use them). For the EU context, we decided to analyse the following manuals: *"Compendium of Theory, Practice and Quality Standards for Gender Workers. A Gender Worker Development Programme"* (GemTrEx), *"Acting Pro(e)quality. Quality Standards for Gender Equality and Diversity Training in the EU"* (Pro(e)quality), *"Training Manual for Diversity Management"* (idm) and *"Civic Education and Learning for Gender Mainstreaming – Examples of good practice in Training: Highlights and Pitfalls"* (GEcel). GemTrEx and Pro(e)quality can be described as gender[+] manuals because they address gender *plus* they take into account other forms of inequalities. The idm manual is allocated in the context of diversity training and GEcel refers to gender training as located within the strategy of gender mainstreaming without any reference to diversity or intersectional dimensions of gender. In addition, we analysed two manuals for gender trainings situated in development contexts. One is from the German gender trainer and author Regina Frey: *"Gender and Gender Mainstreaming in Development Cooperation. Impulses for a gender reflexive and gender-equality oriented work of non governmental organisations"* and the other from the United Nations Development Fund for Women: *"Advancing Gender Equality – Using CEDAW and UN Security Council Resolution 1325: Training Module for Gender Equality Advocates"* (UNIFEM). Both can be described as gender manuals, but while Frey's manual opens up the possibility of understand gender as interdependent with other categories, the UNIFEM manual solely addresses differences among women in some parts of the manual.

With this sample at hand, we examined which understanding of intersectionality is addressed in the manuals. Our aim was to identify 'best practices' in order to develop recommendations that support commissioners and trainers of gender[+] trainings.

On the level of conceptualisation of intersectionality, we analysed whether intersectionality is – implicitly or explicitly – reflected in the manual. Additionally, we examined what is seen as intersecting, be it categories, identities, inequalities etc., and which of these are are named.

---

48   For an overview of analysed manuals see Appendix.

On the level of terminology, we analysed whether the manuals use the term "inequalities" or which other terms they use. How are the terms defined and which theoretical references are made? Do the manuals suggest to deal with inequalities? If so, how? Or do they assume symmetrical differences?

On the level of political context, we examined what the manuals regard as influential contextual factors and why. And especially, how is intersectionality/diversity/etc. linked to discrimination and anti-discrimination politics?

Finally, we analysed on a methodological level how intersectionality is embedded in the training. What status is attributed to intersectionality: Is it treated as an additional point, as a cross-cutting issue, as a crucial perspective, as a political commitment, etc.? In order to identify how the defined content is transferred into the training, we analysed in which sections of the training manual intersectionality is addressed and if there are some parts of the manual only focussing on gender or only on other categories/inequalities/identities while other parts open up for intersections. Recommended methods and material, if available, was also assessed with regard to the application of intersectional considerations.

Additionally, we examined how the manuals discuss the trainer's profile. What competences are named as important and how are they related to the issue of intersectionality and to the field of gender$^+$ equality policies?

In the following, we will present the results of our analysis by focussing on the conceptualisation of inequalities, the status of intersectionality within the manuals, the political-institutional context and more direct conditions of the training as well as the trainer's profile. Based on this analysis, we will provide recommendations about how we think intersectionality can be included with regard to the above mentioned aspects.

2.1 Conceptualisation of Intersectional Inequalities

Based on the theoretical reflection outlined above, our findings are that some manuals remain on a level where gender is seen as the only relevant cause for oppression. Thereby, diversity is understood as plurality[49] or even reduced to gender differences.[50] Rosenstreich's understanding of the "grand model of oppression" is also identifiable in training manuals.[51] An intersectional approach in Rosenstreich's understanding is still an exception, but can be found in the GemTrex

---

49 See idm 2007.
50 See GEcel 2005: 19.
51 This is the case in UNIFEM: although there is no conceptualisation of and no references to "intersectionality" the manual mentions "different forms of discrimination" (p.109) and acknowledges "certain groups of women" (p. 109). The Pro(e)quality manual sees the dimension of diversity as "complementary to the gender approach" (p.8).

manual in which intersectionality is conceptualised as matrix of domination[52].

In their listing of relevant categories, only one manual (GemTrEx) explicitly refers to the Treaty of Amsterdam, but is not consistent in the usage of categories.[53] What is special about this manual is its reflection of the selection and hierarchization of categories:

> "An ongoing discussion about the main emphasis being placed on certain categories leads to listing (and valuing) of categories. What is first? Gender, race and class or the other way around? And how do we get on with the never-ending complexity of human life, with endless categories: class, ethnicity, gender, disability, sexual orientation, religion, etcetera. Last but not least, what does it mean for gender work and gender training and education?"[54]

Other manuals have varying lists of categories without explaining the selection[55] while still others tend to focus on differences among women.[56] As far as gender is defined in the manuals, it is understood as socially constructed. This social construction can be understood as "different sets of societal roles attributed to men and women"[57], "cultural expectations and assumptions about the behaviour, attitudes, personality traits, and physical and intellectual capacities of men and women, based solely on their identity as men or women" or as multidmensional concept with different defining aspects[58].

2.2 Status of Intersectionality

The analysed manuals vary with regard to the status of intersectionality. Three different forms can be distinguished: (1) the absence or unawareness of intersectionality, (2) the location of intersectionality in a short excursus or (3) a multilevel inclusion of intersectionality in the manual.

The UNIFEM manual, the idm manual and the GEcel manual can be described as unaware of the concept of intersectionality. All these manuals do not include intersectionality into any part of the manual.

The Frey manual can be located between absence and short excursus since it does not provide a special chapter focussing on intersectionality but at least names the discussion of intersectionality. Therefore, Frey conceptualises gender as a concept which is open towards other axes of exclusion and differentiation.[59]

The Pro(e)quality manual offers a "short excursus"[60] to diversity in a separate chapter in which quality standards are discussed, but keeps its main focus on gender in the rest of the manual.

---

52 See GemTrex 2008: 12.
53 See GemTrEx 2008: 11 and 55.
54 GemTrEx 2008: 14.
55 Pro(e)quality 2007: 35, 41, 44; UNIFEM 2006: 19, 35.
56 UNIFEM 2006: 18, 106, 109, 110.
57 Pro(e)quality 2007: 43.
58 Frey 2007.
59 Frey 2007: 21.
60 Pro(e)quality 2007: 7.

GemTrex tries to include intersectional perspectives on every level in the training, i.e. theoretical reflection in the introduction, adaptation in different methods and as a cross-cutting perspective throughout the manual. We will pick up this example in our recommendations below.

2.3 Political, Legal and Institutional Context

All of the analysed manuals describe the European legislation as an important foundation for training activities on equality in the EU context and often quote (Article 13 of) the Treaty of Amsterdam.[61] The concept of human rights is another significant point of reference.[62] Gender mainstreaming is referred to as an important instrument for equality policies.[63] Besides the political and institutional context, the manuals also relate the trainings to specific discourses, such as the gender equality of results[64] or anti-discrimination[65].

2.4 Trainer's Profile

The trainer's profile is discussed in detail in Frey and in Pro(e)quality. Frey conceptualises the trainer's competence as gender competence, field competence and gender sensitive didactics. Gender competence in Frey's understanding means knowledge of different gender theories, intercultural competence, the competence to make the own position transparent as partial and relative and to use networks for quality assessment, -reflection and -enhancement. Field competence is expressed in the ability to apply theoretical knowledge to the field and to have sufficient background knowledge about the specificities of the field. Gender sensitive didactics mean reflection of gender with regard to content, methodology, trainers team, participants and contextual factors.[66]

Pro(e)quality states that while gender and diversity trainers differ from each other regarding the knowledge of particular theories, effects and possibilities, other competencies are similar in the training field. These competencies encompass competence regarding the methods, personal competence, social competence and competence in action.[67] Nevertheless, they only discuss the gender equality facilitators profile in detail by differentiating between knowledge and experience, abilities and skills, and attitudes and values.[68]

GemTrEx offers a special publication in which quality standards of trainings are discussed.

---

61 See GemTrEx 2008: 14, GEcel 2005: 8, Pro(e)quality 2007: 15-16.
62 GemTrEx 2008: 34, Pro(e)quality 2007: 16, UNIFEM 2006.
63 GemTrEx 2008: 6, Pro(e)quality 2007: 9, GEcel 2005: 18, UNIFEM 2006, Frey 2007.
64 See UNIFEM 2006: 21.
65 GemTrEx 2008: 14, 34.
66 See Frey 2007.
67 See Pro(e)quality 2007: 10-11.
68 See ibid.: 31-36.

The authors base their considerations on the "European Qualifications Framework for Lifelong Learning (EQF)"[69] and use the distinction between knowledge, skills and competences.[70] A similar distinction offers the GEcel manual which differentiates between knowledge, attitudes and capability.[71] It also proposes the duo principle, i.e. that the two trainers should have supplementary competencies while they do not need to be male and female.[72]

3. Transferring Intersectionality onto the Training Field

As our analysis of training manuals shows, there is a need to transfer intersectional theory onto the training field. The challenge is to operationalise 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.

With the emphasis on contextuality and complexity, it is difficult to develop a general approach which can work for all European contexts and situations. Today, dialogues of how to put intersectionality theories into training practices are still needed. Such dialogues ask for the involvement of different social actors, such as gender/diversity trainers, intersectionality researchers, anti-discrimination experts, policy makers etc. Intersectionality has to be taken into account in all aspects of gender[+] trainings.

The following aspects should provide exemplified recommendations of how to approach intersectionality in training activities. The recommendations are developed by inserting the presented theoretical, political and legal conceptualisations of intersectionality into the examined gaps in training manuals. These recommendations need to be read as a proposal of how intersectionality could be included in gender[+] trainings that needs further improvement through experiences in the training field and through discussions by various actors in the training fields.

3.1 Conceptualisation of Intersectional Inequalities

The theoretical questions about what is to be understood as intersecting continues on the level of training practice. Whereas many gender trainings seem to tackle gender as a separated category without acknowledging any intersectionality, trainings labelled 'diversity' focus on several aspects of identity that are considered important. In the analysed diversity trainings, there is only an additive understanding of inequalities. This implies that all inequalities are basically the same; if you have understood gender inequality, you can transfer your knowledge onto any other inequality. As has been shown above, there are still many unanswered questions concerning structure, impact and relations of and between inequalities. Hence, a training approach that pretends to have simple

---

69 European Commission 2008.
70 GemTrEx 2008a: 8-13.
71 Gecel 2005: 36.
72 Gecel 2005: 37, 44.

and all encompassing answers must rather be perceived as lacking of profundity and risking to provide fundamental misconceptions of any inequality context. Rosenstreich proposes an interlocking approach by saying that diversity trainings need "to develop a fluid, flexible, multidimensional model of multiple identity that specifically addresses the contextuality, variance and process inherent in the categories structuring difference."[73]

Gender[+] trainings should work with a variety of concepts, such as identity categories and inequalities. Thereby, different levels of discrimination can be addressed and their interrelation with each other can be stressed out. The trainers should pay attention so that different levels are not mixed up, but analytically differentiated.

On the level of identity categories, the question of which of these categories should be emphasized in a training cannot be answered generally, but heavily depends on the specific context in which the training takes place[74] as well as the competences of the trainer, the agreements made in the contract etc. A gender[+] training in the European context should at least address the categories mentioned in the European Union Treaty of Amsterdam (Art. 13): sex, racial or ethnic origin, religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation, and thereby locate intersectionality within an anti-discrimination framework. But the training should also be open for other important (contextual) aspects, e.g. citizenship or marital status, and categories, e.g. class.[75]

In general, gender[+] trainings should take on an anti-essentialist approach which means that categories are understood as socially constructed in opposition to biologically essential. All the analysed manuals have included such a definition of gender which can be transferred to other categories. Therefore, the trainings have to deal with the dilemma of simultaneously taking social categories seriously and showing their social constructedness. In critical gender trainings, this challenge is translated into: acknowledging differences while deconstructing them.[76]

The following set of questions provides a framework for self-analysis and self-evaluation by the trainer(s) before, during and after the training in order to raise awareness for the conceptualisation of intersecting inequalities:

–   Does the gender[+] training address intersectionality in a multilevel perspective and differentiate between identity categories and inequalities?

–   Does the training include at least the categories mentioned in the Amsterdam Treaty? Does it stay open for other contextually relevant categories or aspects?

–   Does the training take on an anti-essentialist approach by defining the categories as socially

---

73 Rosenstreich 2007: 151.
74 By talking about ethnicity, for example, Slovakian policy papers mostly address Roma communities, while in Germany, the debate centres around Turkish and Arab communities. Taking the context into account does not only mean that one has to know which social groups are focussed on, but also have to shift the discussions to new areas.
75 See Fredman 2005 who argues for a non-exhaustive list in anti-discrimination law.
76 See Frey et al 2006.

constructed?

3.2 Status of Intersectionality

For a successful inclusion of intersectionality into the training, the concept must be considered as explicit content of the training (theoretical), with regard to the methods of training sequences as well as the material that is used to support these methods (practical). Last but not least, intersectionality should be included as a cross-cutting perspective in all parts of the training and enable the participants to gender[+] competence.

Gender[+] trainings should contain an introduction into intersectionality theory and offer space to practice intersectionality as an analytical tool for different policy fields. Methods and practices can contain aspects that raise participants' awareness for and intersectional understanding of discrimination and inequalities and exemplify how the participants are located in intersectional positions. One good example of how intersectionality can be included in theoretical, practical and cross-cutting ways is the *Compendium of Theory, Practice and Quality Standards for Gender Workers: A Gender Worker Development Programme* by GemTrEx (Gender Trainers and Experts). While the importance of an intersectional approach is stressed out in the introduction of the manual, the topic is picked up in a specific module, namely Module 3: "On power relations in gender and diversity discourses", in which the concepts of intersectionality and diversity are explained through theoretical inputs and practices, such as "Sociometry on group diversity" and "Bingo". For Bingo, every participant has a sheet of paper with a Bingo table in which every field contains a question. The participants' goal is to get five answers in a row or a column answered by other participants while they decide by themselves which questions they want to ask. The questions address the personal backgrounds of the other participants by ranging from individual characteristics to structural inequalities.[77] After this introductory module, intersectionality is also employed as an analytical perspective in modules more focused on policy making, e.g. intersectional fields within the supply field of water services management, intersectional fields in sustainable regional development, intersectional fields and relations in mobility infrastructural planning.

Beside the methodical planning, one also needs to pay attention to the material used in the training. In order to make intersectionality visible, the material used should be inclusive and show a variety of intersectional identities and make visible a broad range of inequalities. By giving examples, the trainers need to reflect implicit norms and offer a variety of situations and contexts. The same recommendations apply for terminology and language used in the training.

The following set of questions provides a framework for self-analysis and self-evaluation by

---

77 See GemTrEx 2008: 77-79.

the trainer(s) before, during and after the training in order to raise awareness for the transfer of intersectionality onto all levels of the training:

– Is intersectionality in its complexity introduced to participants? How is it explained and transferred onto the specific policy fields?

– Is intersectionality applied as an analytical perspective which allows the participant to recognize intersectional discriminations?

– Which methods are chosen to demonstrate intersectional positions as well as interlocking systems of inequalities?

– Does the material make intersectionality visible?

3.3 Political, Legal and Institutional Context

Different studies about the quality of gender trainings have shown that the context in which the training is embedded and hence the conditions of the training have an immense impact on its quality and its transformative impact.[78] Hence, one needs to reflect what role intersectionality plays and can play in regard to the conditions of gender[+] trainings. The level of awareness of intersectionality in the specific policy field, in surrounding legal regulations, in institutional designs and in governance structures as well as in general politics is therefore crucial. Do laws, policy papers, governmental publications recognize intersectional discriminations, inequalities and/or identities? Is there already an awareness of this issue in the specific policy field in which the trainings take place? It is helpful for the training, if these questions have been researched and can be pointed out in the gender[+] training. These factors have an enormous impact on the context of the training, but can hardly be changed by the trainers.

Most often, the **commissioners** are situated within the field described above. Their interest in addressing intersectional discrimination does also shape the conditions of gender[+] trainings. Therefore, it is helpful if commissioners are aware of the legal and political situation of inequalities, and it is even better if they have an interest in improving gender[+] equality policies and anti-discrimination. If they are not aware of the situation or if they have limited knowledge, the trainers should be able to argue why gender[+] trainings are necessary by informing about inequalities in general and in the specific policy field.

There are more direct conditions which can sometimes be modified or be brought in a balanced relation to each other. For example, the **time** frame of the training and its **goals** should be in such a balanced relation. The goals regarding a four hour training are very different from those regarding a training over several days and with different modules. In gender[+] trainings, the trainer

---

78 See e.g. Kaschuba 2004, Frey 2007.

should always address gender inequalities in their multidimensionality, but only explain them in theoretical and empirical depth if there is enough time. Practising an intersectional perspective onto different policy fields is on the one hand almost indispensable for gender[+] trainings, on the other hand almost impossible without informing the participants about intersectionality theories and research.

The **participants** of the gender[+] training are the anchor point of the training. The trainer needs to be informed about the participants' knowledge of intersectional inequalities and gender[+] and needs to design the training on this basis. Therefore, it is helpful if each module has a basic and an advanced version, as e.g. the manual *United Nations Development Fund for Women: Advancing Gender Equality – Using CEDAW and UN Security Council Resolution 1325. Training Module for Gender Equality Advocates* does.[79] The intersectional positions of the participants also need to be taken into account. The training should both relate to their intersectional backgrounds and give information in regard to the policy field. It is also crucial how interested the participants are in striving against intersectional discriminations and in reflecting their own privileges, implicit norms and power relations.

To create sustainable visibility of intersectionality in gender[+] trainings, the **evaluation** is an important tool to do so. Therefore, it is necessary that there is room for intersectionality within the evaluation (system). That does not only mean that there need to be questions concerning the received knowledge of intersectionality and the acquired intersectional perspective. But it also asks for an open questionnaire which leaves space for other insights than the planned ones. A truly intersectional training requires a certain flexibility and spontaneity in 'going with the flow' and an ability to address inequalities that come up in relation to the topic of the training.

The following set of questions provides a framework for a self-analysis before the training in order to raise awareness for intersectionality advocating conditions:

– Context: Is the context (policy field, law and governance) in which the training takes place open for change regarding all forms of discrimination and their intersections?

– Commissioners: Are the commissioners interested in addressing intersectional inequalities? How can their interests be combined with the necessity of including intersectionality into gender[+] trainings?

– Goals: Does the time frame of the training allow to explore intersectionality in depths and to adopt it to the fields? Which goals can be defined in a balanced relation to the available time frame?

– Participants: Do the participants have knowledge about intersectional inequalities? How are the participants situated in intersectional locations? What are their interests, and are they interested

---

79 See UNIFEM 2006.

in striving against intersectional discriminations?

– Evaluation: Are the gained knowledge about intersectionality and the acquired intersectional perspective evaluated? Is the evaluation open for "other" insights and criticism?

3.4 Trainer's Profile

Since the goal of a gender[+] training is transformation of gender[+] equality policies it is important for the trainer not only to impart knowledge about intersectional theories and research, but also to show how to put them into practice. Therefore, the trainer needs to know how to apply an intersectional perspective onto a policy field. That means that a specific field competence is needed as well as gender[+]/ intersectionality competence as it is stressed time and again for the context of gender trainings.[80]

Competence in general can be described in relation to four aspects: willingness, knowledge, skills and power (WKSP). Willingness means motivation to work towards the goal of transformative equality policies. Knowledge means that the trainer needs to be familiar with a broad spectrum of gender and intersectionality theories and needs to be able to distinguish between different conceptualisations, as described above. Skills refer to a broad range of soft skills, such as awareness of the intersectional composition of the participating group and the ability to appropriately address this composition, as well as mediating skills and conflict management skills. Power means for the trainer "being allowed to" and depends on the contract, political context, "standing" of trainers etc. As has been discussed elsewhere, gender[+] training in order to have truly transformative potential needs WKSP+ competence of the trainer.[81] The additional competence here is called "transformative courage" and emphasises the importance of resistances for the learning impact of the training. According to this, trainers need to encourage resistances and need to be able to deal with them in order to make them fruitful for the learning of participants.

How a trainer's competence can be measured is a highly debated question in training evaluation and research. Nevertheless, we want to give some ideas of how trainers can be evaluated or evaluate themselves:

– Does the trainer have knowledge about intersectionality theories and research?

– Does the trainer know how to adopt an intersectional perspective onto different fields?

– Does the trainer have an awareness about the intersectional composition of the group of participants? Does she or he know how to appropriately address this composition?

---

80 See http://www.genderkompetenz.info/eng/gendercompetence/
81 Chebout / Baer forthcoming.

4. Conclusion

In this article, we have examined different conceptualisations of intersectionality by outlining theoretical genealogies as well as political and legal adaptations. Training policy makers on equality issues can be seen as a route to transfer theory into practice. This article has tried to answer questions of how intersectionality is applied and embedded in gender[+] training activities by analysing existing training manuals that explicitly aim to contribute to equality policy making. This analysis has shown that although there is an awareness for a complexity of inequalities, both theoretical foundations as well as practical implementations most often lack intersectional perspectives. In this article, we have addressed the gap between conceptualisation and operationalisation and offered suggestions of how to face the challenges of transfer. Thereby, we developed recommendations of how intersectionality can be included in training activities. Nevertheless, we are far from stating that this transfer is an easy task but acknowledge that challenges regarding intersectionality in training activities are complex and diverse. It is important to be aware that there can not be one universal recipe or an overall training model which is usable for every individual context. Rather, one needs to remember that each training is always embedded in a broader context of equality policies that has to be reflected. By providing the trainers and commissioners with a set of questions for self-reflection, we aim to contribute to the improvement of a very diverse market of trainings. This improvement can not be gained by quick answers to the questions posed, but has to be slowly built by continuing questions regarding intersectionality.

Appendix: Manuals

GemTrEx (Gender Trainers and Experts) (2008): *Compendium of Theory, Practice and Quality Standards for Gender Workers. A Gender Worker Development Programme*
This manual is based on a needs analysis in Austria, Germany, Slovenia, Spain, United Kingdom. The aim of the manual is to develop „criteria for the training of gender trainers and gender experts in Europe as well as testing related train-the-trainers course modules" (p. 6).

Pro(e)quality (EQUAL Transnational Cooperation) (2007): *Acting Pro(e)quality. Quality Standards for Gender Equality and Diversity Training in the EU*
This manual is targeted at gender issues training facilitators and experts, contractors, policy and decision makers on the national and European level with the aim to "contribute to systemic and structural change towards gender equality in the labour market" (p. 5).

International Society for Diversity Management (2007): *Training Manual for Diversity Management*
This manual has been prepared for the European Commission in the framework of the "Anti-Discrimination and Diversity Training VT 2006/009" project. It was set up and funded by the European Commission. The training manual provides concepts and practical tools which can help companies to try out or deepen their understanding about diversity management.

Gecel (2005): *Civic Education and Learning for Gender Mainstreaming – Examples of good practice in Training: Highlights and Pitfalls*
The production of this handbook involved partners from Denmark (Danish Research Centre at Roskilde University), Estonia (Women's Training Centre), Greece (Research Centre for Gender Equality), Iceland (City of Reykjavik) and Germany (Research Institute for Labour, Education and Participation, Strategie 21 e.V. and the Federal Agency for Civic Education). The aim of the manual is to contribute to the education of decision makers and of administrative personal in understanding and working with gender mainstreaming.

Regina Frey (2007): *Gender und Gender Mainstreaming in der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit: Impulse für eine genderreflektierte und an Geschlechtergerechtigkeit orientierte Arbeit von Nichtregierungsorganisationen* **(Gender and Gender Mainstreaming in Development Cooperation. Impulses for a gender reflexive and gender-equality oriented work of non governmental organisations)**
This manual has been developed in the context of a train the trainer semiar within a project of WIDE network in Austria. It aims to provide a theoretical reflection and substantiation of exercises used in gender training in the context of developmental cooperation.

United Nations Development Fund for Women (2006): *Advancing Gender Equality – Using CEDAW and UN Security Council Resolution 1325: Training Module for Gender Equality Advocates*
This manual has been developed in the context of the UNIFEM Regional Project "Women for Conflict Prevention and Peace-Building in the Southern Caucasus". The focus is on women's participation and gender justice in the context of post-conflict and peace. The aim of the manual is "to build the capacity and awareness of gender equality advocates in government and civil society in the Southern Caucasus to advocate for and to support the implementation of CEDAW and UNSC resolution 1325" (p. 3). The training is targeted at civil society and decision makers.

Bibliography

Baer, Susanne (2001): Hierarchie, Demokratie und Differenz. Perpektiven für eine Rechtsordnung der Bürgerinnen und Bürger. In: Brandner, Stefanie et al. (Ed.): Geschlechterdifferenz und Macht. Reflexion gesellschaftlicher Prozesse. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, pp. 141-159.

Chebout, Lucy; Baer, Susanne (forthcoming): Towards an intersectional methodology in gender+ trainings. What exactly is gender+ competence? (Working title)

Combahee River Collective (1981): A Black Feminist Statement. In: Moraga, Cherrie; Anzaldúa, Gloria (Ed.): This Bridge Called My Back. Writings by Radical Women of Color. New York: Persephone Press, pp. 210–218.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé Williams (1989): Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics. In: James, Joy; Sharpley-Whiting, T. Denean (Ed.): The Black Feminist Reader. Malden: Wiley Blackwell, pp. 208-238.

Degele, Nina; Winker, Gabriele (2006): Intersektionalität als Mehrebenenanalyse. Online available at: http://www.tu-harburg.de/agentec/winker/pdf/Intersektionalitaet_Mehrebenen.pdf.

Degele, Nina; Winker, Gabriele (2009): Intersektionalität. Zur Analyse sozialer Ungeichheit. Bielefeld: transcript.

Deleuze, Gilles; Guattari, Félix (2004): A Thousand Plateaus. London/New York: Continuum.

Eggers, Maureen Maisha et al. (Hg.) (2005): Mythen, Masken und Subjekte. Kritische Weißseinsforschung in Deutschland. Münster: Unrast.

European Commission (2006): European Handbook on Equality Data. Online available at: http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/publications/2007/ke7606381_en.pdf

European Commission: Community Programme for Employment and Social Solidarity — PROGRESS 2007-2013, decision No 1672/2006/EC.

European Commission: Proposal for a Council Directive on implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of religion or belief, disability, age or sexual orientation (presented by the Commission), COM(2008) 426 final.

European Commission. (2007): Tackling Multiple Discrimination: Practices, Policies and Laws [Electronic Version]. Online available at: http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/fundamental_rights/pdf/pubst/stud/multdis_en.pdf.

European Commission (2008): The European Qualifications Framework for Lifelong Learning (EQF). Online available at: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/publ/pdf/eqf/broch_en.pdf.

FeMigra (1994): Wir, die Seiltänzerinnen. In: Eichhorn, Cornelia; Grimm, Sabine (Ed.): Gender

Killer. Berlin: ID-Verlag, pp. 49-63.

Ferree, Myra Marx (2009): Inequality, intersectionality and the politics of discourse. Framing feminist alliances. Not pubilshed yet, copy by editors.

Fredman, Sandra (2005): Double Trouble. Multiple Discrimination and EU Law. In: European Anti-Discrimination Law Review, No. 2, pp. 13-18.

Frey, Regina (2007): Gender und Gender Mainstreaming in der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit: Impulse für eine genderreflektierte und an Geschlechtergerechtigkeit orientierte Arbeit von Nichtregierungsorganisationen, Magdeburg: docupoint Verlag.

Frey, Regina et al. (2006): Gender Manifesto. A call for critical reflection on Gender-oriented capacity building and consultancy. Online available at: http://www.gender.de/mainstreaming/GenderManifesto_engl.pdf

GEcel – Civic Education and Learning for Gender Mainstreaming (2005): Examples of Good Practice in Training – Highlights and Pitfalls. Online available at: http://www.bpb.de/files/59VYH8.pdf

GemTrEx (2008): Compendium of Theory, Practice and Quality Standards for Gender Worker: A Gender Worker Development Programme. Online available at: http://www.GemTrEx.eu/compendium/GemTrEx_Compendium.pdf.

GemTrEx (2008a): Standards and Training for Gender Workers in Europe. Quality criteria and further education for gender work. Online available at: http://grunyi.net/gemtrex/joomla/images/brochure/brochure_gemtrex_english.pdf.

Hancock, Ange-Marie (2007): When Multiplication Doesn't Equal Quick Addition. Examing Intersectionality as a Research Paradigm. In: Perspectives on Politics, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 63-79.

Hill Collins, Patricia (1990): Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment. Boston: Unwin Hyman.

Hornscheidt, Antje (2007): Sprachliche Kategorisierung als Grundlage und Problem des Redens über Interdependenzen. Aspekte sprachlicher Normalisierung und Privilegierung. In: Walgenbach, Katharina; Dietze, Gabriele; Hornscheidt, Antje; Palm, Kerstin: Gender als interdependente Kategorie. Neue Perspektiven auf Intersektionalität, Diversität und Heterogenität. Opladen: Verlag Barbara Budrich, pp. 65-105.

Hornscheidt, Antje (2009): Intersectional challenges to gender studies – gender studies as a challenge to intersectionality. In: Åsberg, Cecilia; Gustavsson, Malena et al. (Ed.): Festskrift till Nina Lykke (working title), forthcoming.

International Society for Diversity Management – idm (2007): Training Manual for Diversity Management. Online available at http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=1474&langId=en.

Kaschuba, Gerrit (2004): Von der Wundertüte zum kontrollierten Einsatz? Anregungen zur prozessorientierten Entwicklung von Qualitätskriterien für Gender Trainings. In: Netzwerk Gender Training (Ed.): Geschlechterverhältnisse bewegen: Erfahrungen mit Gender Training. Königstein/Taunus: Ulrike Helmer Verlag, pp. 117-135.

King, Deborah K. (1995): Multiple Jeopardy, Multiple Consciousness: The Context of a Black Feminist Ideology. In: Guy-Sheftall, Beverly (Ed.): Words of Fire: An Anthology of African-American Feminist Thought. New York: The New Press, pp. 294-317.

Klinger, Cornelia; Knapp Gudrun A. (2005): Achsen der Ungleichheit – Achsen der Differenz. Verhältnisbestimmungen von Klasse, Geschlecht, »Rasse« / Ethnizität. In: Transit - Europäische Revue, Institut für die Wissenschaften vom Menschen, No. 29. Online available at: http://www.iwm.at/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=232&Itemid=230.

Knapp, Gudrun A. (2005): Race, Class, Gender. Reclaiming Baggage in Fast Travelling Theories. In: European Journal of Women's Studies, Vol. 12 (3), pp. 249–265.

Lutz, Helma/Norbert Wenning (2001): Differenzen über Differenz – Einführung in die Debatten. In: Lutz, Helma/Norbert Wenning (Ed.): Unterschiedlich verschieden. Differenz in der Erziehungswissenschaft. Opladen, pp. 11-24.

MacKinnon, Catherine (1989): Sex Equality. On Difference and Dominance. In: MacKinnon, Catherine: Toward a Feminist Theory of the State. Cambridge/London: Harvard University Press.

Makkonen, Timo (2002): Multiple, compound and intersectional discrimination: Bringing the experiences of the most marginalised to the fore. Online available at http://www.abo.fi/instut/imr/norfa/timo.pdf

Oguntoye, Katharina et al. (Ed.) (1986): Farbe bekennen: Afrodeutsche Frauen auf den Spuren ihrer Geschichte. Berlin: Orlanda Frauenverlag.

Pro(e)quality (2007): Acting Pro(e)quality: Quality Standards for Gender Equality and Diversity Training in the EU. Online available at: http://www.berlin-divercity.de/diwiki/images/2/2a/Brochure_wg4.pdf.

Puar, Jasbir (2005): Queer Times, Queer Assemblages. In: Social Text, Vol. 23, Nos. 3-4, pp. 121-138.

Rosenstreich, Gabriele (2007): The Mathematics of Diversity Training. Multiplying Identities, Adding Categories and Intersecting Discrimination. In: Broden, Anne/Mecheril, Paul (Ed.): Re-Präsentationen. Dynamiken der Migrationsgesellschaft. IDA-NRW: Düsseldorf, pp. 131-159.

Shaw, Jo (2005): Mainstreaming Equality and Diversity in the European Union. In: Current Legal Problems, Vol. 58: 255–312.

United Nations Development Fund for Women (2006): Advancing Gender Equality – Using CEDAW and UN Security Council Resolution 1325: Training Module for Gender Equality Advocates. Online available at: http://www.unifem.org/attachments/products/AdvancingGenderEqualityManual_eng.pdf.

Verloo, Mieke (2006): Multiple inequalities, intersectionality and the European Union. In: European Journal of Gender Studies, Vol. 13 (3), pp.211-229.

Walby, Sylvia (2007): Report (Theory) on Intersectionality. QUING Deliverable No. 13.

Walby, Sylvia (2007): Research guidelines for the analysis of intersectionality elements in LARG and WHY. QUING Deliverable No. 14.

Walgenbach, Katharina; Dietze, Gabriele; Hornscheidt, Antje; Palm, Kerstin (2007): Gender als interdependente Kategorie. Neue Perspektiven auf Intersektionalität, Diversität und Heterogenität. Opladen: Verlag Barbara Budrich.

Yuval-Davis, Nira (2006): Intersectionality and Feminist Politics. In: European Journal of Women's Studies, Vol. 13 (3), pp.193-209.