

ADVANCING GENDER+ TRAINING IN THEORY AND PRACTICE

An international event for practitioners,
experts and commissioners in Gender+ training

Centro de Estudios de Gestión
Complutense University, Madrid, February 3-4, 2011

AVANZANDO EN LA FORMACIÓN DE GÉNERO+ TEORÍA Y PRÁCTICA

Una conferencia internacional para profesionales, expertos/as y
entidades solicitantes de formación de género+

Centro de Estudios de Gestión
Universidad Complutense de Madrid, 3-4 febrero 2011

FINAL PROGRAMME



EU 6th Framework Programme



Summary

Full programme with abstracts	p. 3
Programa en español	p. 17
List of participants	p. 23
Access Maps	p. 29
Annex: Keynote Speech	p. 30
Personal notes	p. 46

Day 1 - Thursday 3rd February

0845-0930 – Registration

Venue: Salón de Actos Reception Area

0930-1045 - **First Plenary Session**

Simultaneous translation available English/Spanish

Venue: Salón de Actos

Welcome

Juan Gómez Castañeda, Director, Centro de Estudios de Gestión, Complutense University

Foreword

Laura Seara, Director, Instituto de la Mujer (Women's Institute), Spain; Cristina Segura Graiño, Director, Gender Unit, Complutense University; Marián López Fernández Cao, Director, Instituto de Investigaciones Feministas, (Feminist Research Institute)

The impact of the new Spanish Law on Scientific Research for Gender Equality and gender+ training

Inés Sánchez de Madariaga, Director of Women and Science, Ministry of Science and Innovation, Spain

Introduction: OPERA and the conference objectives

María Bustelo, Complutense University, Madrid, OPERA Activity Leader and Mieke Verloo, QUING project Scientific Coordinator, Radboud University, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

1045-1145 – **Keynote Speech**

Simultaneous translation available English/Spanish

Venue: Salón de Actos

Introduction

Mieke Verloo

Reflexivity and gender mainstreaming: asking some hard questions

Professor Carol Bacchi, University of Adelaide, Australia

Coffee Break (Aula 2)

1215-1315 - **Second Plenary Session**

Simultaneous translation available English/Spanish

Venue: Salón de Actos

Roundtable:

Gender+ training as a necessary tool in gender mainstreaming strategies in Europe

Barbara Limanowska, Senior Gender Mainstreaming Expert at the European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE); Lut Mergaert, Senior Consultant, Yellow Window, Antwerp, Belgium; Giuseppe Borsalino, Ethics and Gender Unit, DG Research, European Commission; Agnès Hubert, Member of the Bureau of European Policy Advisors, European Commission

Moderator: Mieke Verloo

1430-1615 **Parallel Session A**

Ensuring quality in gender+ training (1): *Developing quality standards*

Simultaneous translation available English/Spanish

Venue: Salón de Actos

Life Long Learning on Gender: a Key Issue for the Quality Gender Equality Policies

Anna Cabó i Cardona, Director of Francesca Bonnemaison Center, Equality and Citizenship Area, Office for the Promotion of Gender Equality, Barcelona Provincial Council

Abstract: Life-long learning is a key issue for professionals and institutions, although few public bodies in Europe outside academia have programs on LLL about gender. The Barcelona Provincial Government has a large program for gender training as a tool for reinforcing gender equality policies and gender mainstreaming. Teaching gender to professionals, policy makers and women active in politics is the goal of the educational program of the Barcelona Provincial Government. In this presentation we will analyse the types of courses, target groups, subjects and results with special emphasis to quality and gender mainstreaming. To ensure the best results we work together with academic intuitions and professors, but also with policy makers. The team of trainers created with gender experts and practitioners made possible a high quality, practice through reflexivity and knowledge of best practices. Throughout the training program we reinforce gender mainstreaming in our organization and also in the cities councils where courses take place. Trainers can come from different departments due to their expertise; this promotes reflexivity about gender issues in the organization. On the other hand "students" come also from different institutions and departments, not only gender or women institutes. Finally we want to analyse results, and evaluation of the program to can design future training plans than make it possible to prepare policy makers and politicians for new challenges.

Building Gender Competences through Qualitative Training

Rachel Andrés, Indera, Gender Equality Consultancy, Barcelona

Abstract: This presentation introduces a proposal we have incorporated into our training practice – the development of 'gender competences'. This proposal arose through a need for dealing with a series of questions which arise in the training context:

- How to develop gender competencies which take into account the diversity of participants - in terms of origins, thoughts, experiences, abilities, training etc. – in a way which goes beyond the exchange of opinions?
- How to challenge knowledge itself in order to generate methodologies and analysis which allow for the construction of knowledge and a critical collective vision, with the possibility of systematizing the reflections and analysis gained in the training process, by connecting participatory methodologies in three areas: domestic, legal and institutional?
- How to raise awareness for action and promote the capacity for indignation about gender inequalities?
- How to generate critical and analytical consciousness which helps to incorporate a gender perspective in all aspects of personal and institutional activity?

From a gender perspective these competences are developed based on empowerment strategies which support a political, technical, methodological, participatory and interpersonal analysis of gender inequalities and a commitment to action. As such, the integral focus of gender competences should take into account how we communicate when we train in gender and how we can construct a coherent discourse that can be translated into a solid theoretical framework.

Building quality standards as part of a process of accreditation of Gender Diversity Experts in Germany

Christian Raschke, Gender Diversity e.V., Müncheberg, Germany

Abstract: My contribution is to present the quality discussion of the Gender Diversity association for gender-competent training and consulting - Gender Diversity e.V., which is a professional association of mainly German gender diversity trainers and consultants (www.gender-diversity.de). As a co-founder of Gender Diversity e.V. and former board member I will show the final results of the quality process over the last five years: the standards for gender trainings and the certification procedure to become recognized as a gender diversity expert. We had to overcome some difficulties developing reliable standards and a procedure to examine them especially in convincing the members of the association.

The active role of institutions in the search for quality in gender training

María José Rosco Galiana, Senior Adviser, Chief of Section, Training and Employment, Instituto de la Mujer, Spain

Abstract: Equality institutions can endorse formative activities in gender equality with the aim of guaranteeing a quality standard. This involves a dual role: direct training and the development of a network of experts in gender and other areas of intervention.

Moderator: María Bustelo, Complutense University, OPERA team, Madrid

Transferring knowledge: theory and methodology (1): Participatory-experiential methodologies

Venue: Aula 4

Some practical (and tricky) aspects of participatory methodologies to be addressed

Nathalie Wuiame, Gender expert and trainer, Engender, Brussels, Belgium

Abstract: Conversations between communities of gender+ trainers and experts have revealed that experiential learning is thought to be particularly helpful for gender+ training. This may involve, for example, working with real cases of participants' daily tasks and/or starting from participants' own definitions of gender equality. This session aims to discuss the potential and limitations of such methodologies through a reflexive sharing of practitioners' experiences. Within this theme, one concern I would like to share is the following:

It is important to give the opportunity to participants to understand the difference between gender and sex. Numbers of exercises proposed are aiming at making aware participants of the difference between biological difference and social, cultural etc. gender constructions. This is an important phase of deconstruction of stereotypes relating to men and women. This type of exercise is always going well. Then participants have to understand how to perform a gender analysis. One step is an analysis of the respective situation of women and men within a given context and for a given target group (of a specific policy on urban planning for example). In that phase, I have seen trainings were participants do come back with sex stereotypes (as you do not necessarily participants that now from a more scientific point of view what are the gender difference, i.e. civil servant) and do perform a very bias analysis. For the purpose of this type of exercise you have to leave them to express the result of their analysis. In the reporting you can then try to inform them about gender differences and other possible dimensions (intersectionality) for the analysis. But you cannot teach them too much either.

I have also experienced people suggesting positive actions completely. I personally find this quite tricky as it is important to have them active and to be able to react to what they present, but at the end of the training, I am not always sure that they have the right reflex + some have difficulties in accepting that in first phase you deconstruct differences between men and women and then you reintroduce them for the analysis (even if the perspective is different, it is not always easy for participants to understand all that in a day).

Psychodrama-methods in Gender Trainings

Michael Gümbel, Gender trainer and consultant, Sujet GbR, Hamburg

Abstract: The psychodrama technique, founded by Jakob Levy Moreno, builds up a wide range of methods that could be used in Gender Trainings and similar events. Psychodrama enables the participants to act out and experience the complexity of gender roles and gender relations in organizations and society. Especially the method of role reversal, but also the possibility to understand and comprehend the multiplicity of own developed and undeveloped roles or the rich aspects of sociometry could bring broad enrichment to gender work in motion.

Using interactivity in gendertraining: the link between method, message and mores

Katlijn Demuyne, Gender expert and trainer, Gender at Work, Brussels, Belgium

Abstract: Using interactive methods in gender+ trainings is undoubtedly one of the most efficient ways in which we can raise awareness on gender issues in the brief timeframe of 1 day training sessions. To succeed interactivity in a gender training, there must be a coherent link between 3 key issues: the method used, the messages that are conveyed and the mores or the rules of engagement in the group. In this presentation I'll briefly explore the linkages as we have constructed them throughout our training experience and make the case that these general rules for good training are particularly relevant in the case of gender+ training. The presentation will teach what it preaches and try to engage participants in the session by illustrating the interactive methodology.

Context, Assumptions, and Bias: How prejudices creep into the 'fair' evaluation of scientific productivity and quality - excerpts from a sensibility training program at RWTH Aachen University

GoBIT Training, RWTH Aachen University, Germany

Abstract: GoBIT is a volunteer group of 6 students, 5 men and 1 woman, working since 2009 to develop a gender+ sensitivity training primarily targeted for a technical university in Germany that has the lowest percent of women professors in the nation. The project is led by Prof. Heather Hofmeister, Sociology/Gender and Life Course Research. One of our "value added" components is that the presentation team is almost entirely composed of young German men, which is very unusual in gender+ training. The training attempts to open minds of especially engineering and natural science professors so that they are more likely to recognize talent in people different from themselves, with a main priority on opening engineering and natural sciences at our university to women. These professors, men and women, are not all convinced that people different from themselves belong in their domain. We will present an interactive, 20-minute excerpt from our one-hour, hands-on training at the part where we expose how context, assumptions, and bias change the ability of people accurately to interpret the actions and talents of another, using principles of intersectionality. We would be grateful for feedback from other trainers and practitioners about how to enhance the intersectionality of our program.

Moderator: Emanuela Lombardo, Complutense University, OPERA team, Madrid

Promoting reflexivity through a Community of Practices (1): Dealing with resistances to gender+ training

Venue: Aula 5

Dealing with Resistances to Gender Training: Experiences at the Austrian Employment Service *Iris Apiano Kugler and Hermine Steinbach Buchinger, Gender trainers, Vienna, Austria*

Abstract: The Austrian Unemployment Services (AMS) is a big organisation of 5.400 employees. Around 60 percent of them are female and 40 % in leading positions. In the Viennese district 70 percent are female and 50 % in leading positions. So there has been a long development that made this possible. Since the year 2003 the organization had to handle the challenge to implement gender mainstreaming. One key measure was and is the training of all employees and the dealing with the resistance against gender mainstreaming because, all of them had to be trained. So since then my colleagues and me, we started to develop a training concept that made two things possible. One: We wanted and had to train more than 15 people at the same time and second: resistance should not stop the learning process. So

after several years today it is possible to offer a concept that makes possible to train 60 people at once and second resistance is definitely not the issue at this day. Meanwhile also other organizations show interest in this concept.

A field of resistance: lessons learned from delivering gender training to defence and security personnel

Kristin Valasek, Gender and Security Sector Reform Project Coordinator, Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces, Geneva, Switzerland

Abstract: Resistance to gender training is experienced in most training settings, however, the field of defence and security is notoriously resistant to gender+. In this presentation, I will give a brief outline of past experiences and practical techniques, including content selection and pedagogy, that have served to prevent, deflect and/or 'out' gender resistance amongst policy-makers and practitioners in the field of security sector reform (SSR) in the EU and West Africa. These experiences and techniques have been gathered through years of designing and delivering ninety minute to three-day gender and SSR training to a wide range of audiences, including government personnel, parliamentarians, security sector personnel, regional and international organisation staff and local civil society organisations. Resistance and challenges that we are often faced with in the security and defence sector take the shape of individual beliefs that gender issues are not important or relevant to security and defence; stereotypes regarding women and men's ability to participate in security provision; beliefs that the integration of gender goes against cultural sensitivity as well as the common challenges of sexist comments, unbalanced participation between men and women and getting off topic. At an institutional level, these forms of resistance are materialised in discriminatory policies and practices and/or non-implementation of national and institutional gender policies. Techniques to address these forms of resistance within gender training include: framing of gender as both a policy imperative and operationally beneficial, participatory knowledge transfer and practical exercises that are relevant to the daily work of trainees.

Men and Gender training: who resists whom?

Stefan Beier, Gender trainer, Genderwerk, Berlin, Germany Abstract: Gender trainers, women as well as men, often report resistances of men in trainings or gender mainstreaming processes. This contribution aims to cast a light upon those experiences and invites participants to take a fresh look on their daily gender work. If, for example, a concept like gender mainstreaming, which is downright *designed for all genders*, does not work for one – where is the mistake? Am I, as the gender trainer, part of the solution or part of the problem? Taking reflexivity seriously, this session will dive into our own belief systems as gender experts and question common standards in the training practice. What emerges, if we open-heartedly look at what we call or reduce to "resistance"? The input encourages to change perspectives and will suggest some ways of how to envisage and address masculine participants in their diversity. It will call upon our curiosity and creativity to develop a professional approach to quality-ensuring gender trainings also for men in order to make gender a real issue in their lives. Working mode will be visual-oral input as well as participatory practice and shared wisdom.

From Concept to Action: Strategies to Overcome Gender Resistance

Margarita Jankauskaitė, Center for Equality Advancement, Vilnius, Lithuania

Abstract: This presentation analyses how gender equality meanings are developed and articulated in the linguistic, policy and social-cultural context in Lithuania and contributes to the training methodologies to deal with the resistance against gender equality policies. This presentation relies on the personal experience of gender equality trainer and suggests complex analysis of linguistic, policy and social-cultural contexts in which meanings of gender equality are produced by policy actors. Inquiry into **linguistic context** will show the difficulties in using and understanding of *gender* as theoretical concept in the national languages. Lithuanian experience will highlight the cases of misunderstanding of *gender* concept, absence of the *gender* terms in national language and complicated process of discussion upon the common agreement of the terms and their usage. Analysis of the **policy context** of Eastern Europe will show the development of *dead letters* policy discourse. Conservative political forces (very influential in Lithuania) construct the meaning of gender equality policies as an external intrusion of foreign bodies (Western Europe or Brussels).

This presentation will provide the examples how gender equality discourses have been interpreted as the threat for the traditional and national values and disruption of traditional family. Finally, research into **social-cultural context** shows the opportunities and traps to introduce strategies and visions of gender equality policies in the state. Recent research on value system of population suggests the existing values of survival in Eastern Europe. Economic approach rather than human rights orientations prevail in the policy discourse on gender equality. However, gender equality trainers who adopt only economic arguments might misuse gender equality rhetoric and be trapped in the neoliberal discourse against *de facto* gender equality. Therefore, the trainings on gender equality should provide milieu for theoretical debates and practical involvement into gender equality enterprise where knowledge, competences and attitudes intervolve. The trainer should possess competences to provide complexity of arguments and theoretical approaches on gender equality policies. The trainees should demonstrate their abilities not as passive recipients of knowledge but as active participants in the producing the meanings. The personal trainer's experience shows that systematic and practical work of the trainees in doing gender equality research and formulating strategic goals in their daily occupation makes the most transformative impact on their attitudes. Developed training methodology is based on interplay of theoretical and interactive work and integration of 3R method. The practice of integration of the methodology into the training shows effective results in coping with the resistance of the trainees' and building their understanding of gender equality policies.

Moderator: Katrien Van der Heyden, Gender expert and trainer, Engender, Brussels

Coffee Break (Aula 2)

1645-1830 Parallel Session B

Ensuring quality in gender+ training (2): *Developing innovative training practices in non-European contexts*

Venue: Aula 4

Gender Training in the context of armed conflict and humanitarian disasters: responses and resistances

Ruth Jacobson, researcher and consultant in gender issues, and Jamie Munn, Organizational Development Advisor, Humanitarian Accountability Partnership International

Abstract: As the conference call recognises, gender-focused training now involves a growing variety of actors and fields. One aspect of this expansion includes the training programmes provided for operational personnel engaged in, or about to carry out, humanitarian relief in the context of armed conflict and humanitarian disasters. Participants might include UN 'blue bonnet' forces and other peacekeepers, national police, staff of international and national NGOs, political and civil society organisations from the affected-communities. This presentation will first outline the current context of this particular field of gender training, with special reference to UN Security Council Resolution 1325 ("SCR 1325") passed in 2000 which established a requirement for the integration of a gender perspective across the entire field of security and humanitarian operations. SCR 1325 now forms part of the European Security and Defense Strategy (EDSP). Not surprisingly, however, this requirement raises complex issues both for training practitioners, participants, funders, and most importantly, disaster survivors. These will be covered in the second section of the presentation, drawing on the field experiences of both presenters. The final section will conclude with a review of current training measures humanitarian organisations implementing educational campaigns and prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA) within the humanitarian sector. Even where principles and commitments to these complex issues have been put into practice, there is little information about their efficacy.

Involving Men in Challenging Gender Stereotypes in Zimbabwe

Jonah K. Gokova, PADARE/Men's Forum on Gender, Harare, Zimbabwe

Abstract: I use Gender training as a tool to address existing deficiencies in the lives of organizations, institutions and societies. The existence of patriarchy and the continued marginalization of women in our societies give rise to the increasing popularity of gender training as a method of intervention. My

training target group is men both in the South and the Northern hemisphere. I can share my experience in working in different contexts as well cultural settings. A number of factors have to be considered for a successful training programme. Selection of participants has to be considered very carefully so that the participants' needs are not too far apart. I normally have about 10 to 15 people if the days are three and below. I have 20 to 23 participants if the training is for the duration of one week. If the training is not designed specifically for the group to be trained there is no guarantee that it will work. The participatory approach that I use enable participants to relax and open up. This is particularly important given that the experience of participants themselves is often the most important "material" used in training. Participants should be able to freely share their experiences of patriarchy, male power, domination and the subjugation of women. I will share some of the tools I use to equip men to develop an understanding of patriarchy with the view to challenge and expose harmful ways in which men express their manhood. My presentation will emphasize the need for gender training materials to be informed by and connected to the work of the women's movement.

Moderator: Lucy Ferguson, Complutense University, OPERA team, Madrid

Transferring knowledge: theory and methodology (2): *Communicating feminist and gender studies theory in training*

Venue: Aula 5

Reflections on applied gender-sensitive planning theories in gender training in local and regional planning

Doris Damyanovic and Florian Reinwald, University of Natural Resources and Applied Life Sciences, Institute of Landscape Planning, Vienna; and Heidrun Wankiewicz, planwind.at - consulting engineering studio, Salzburg, Austria

Abstract: The symbolic order in spatial planning concepts and procedures determines the everyday life of women and men and affects them in different ways. It is mostly geared to the image of the hegemonic masculinity (Cornell, Robert 1999). Therefore, a sustainable change towards gender equality in planning must root in the deconstruction and redefinition of the values which produce inequality between men and women according to lifestyle and cultural and ethnic background. Furthermore, common normative certainties in planning processes must be questioned and the symbolic order behind planning processes must be discussed in gender training among researchers, decision-makers and administrative planning authorities. The presentation reflects on the theory of gendered knowledge brokerage processes and the methods applied. This will be outlined using the knowledge sharing concepts which we have been using in our practical and research projects over the past years. The aim is to work out the principles of how to raise awareness for the importance of gender-sensitive planning on local and regional levels. Furthermore, the dynamics of power that allows a change of the symbolic order which benefits gender equality will be evaluated. At the end, it is necessary to summarise the requirements for gender training in planning. There remains a particular need to develop further relevant theories and identify appropriate tools and methods for the sustainable implementation of gender-sensitive planning with which gender-planning knowledge can be shared more effectively and sustainably.

Transformation through learning?

Sandra Smykalla, Gender Studies and Education Studies, Humboldt-University, Berlin, Germany

Abstract: In the presentation the flourishing field of gender consultancy, training and policy advice will be analyzed. The analysis focus on the relation between organizational cultural change and individual learning processes of actors. Using concepts of „transformative learning“ it is shown how the recent practice of implementation of equality policies in the German context could be re-organized in a productive way. The presentation problematizes not only the theory-practice gap but also the missing link of change management (structural level) and individual acting (subject level). Referring to work and research experience both in the new field of gender training and the implementation of the gender mainstreaming strategy by training in public administration, criteria for a differentiated understanding of transformation are revealed.

Experience in communicating gender theory through training in Bulgaria

Tatyana Kmetova and Roza Dimova, Gender trainers for CWSP, Sofia, Bulgaria

Abstract: The presentation will focus on the experience of the Center of Women's Studies and Policies Foundation in Sofia, Bulgaria, on providing training to different target groups of trainees in the country. Training in gender issues in general, including in gender mainstreaming tools and methods, as an activity is developed in Bulgaria recently by NGOs only, and is mainly connected with the pre-accession and accession to the EU period. Trainings are organized either for women (candidates for elections, entrepreneurs, etc.) on different topics, mainly in the scope of projects implemented by NGOs; or for mixed groups of trainees on gender issues in general and on gender mainstreaming tools and methods in particular, commissioned by governmental structures in the scope of their capacity building activities. The presentation will give impression about and will analyze the way and efforts of the experts in the field to communicate gender at these different types of training activities, including challenges in communicating gender theory to different types of auditoria and raising their interest to the discussed gender related topics, and balance between theory and practice during training sessions.

Why don't we use the f-word? Making gender+ and E&D training inclusive

Geraldine Wooley, Scottish Resource Centre for Women in Science, Engineering and Technology, Edinburgh Napier University, UK

Abstract: In male-dominated sectors like the construction industry, the current intake of young male students are the employers and managers of the future. They need to be "on side" if the gender segregation in the labour market is to be effectively addressed and women are to find satisfactory careers in male-dominated sectors. Our E&D project takes an inclusive approach, engaging young male career entrants in the challenges of E&D in the construction industry through a range of participative exercises. Feminist principles may underpin the methods but the word "feminism" is never heard. This paper will examine how and why gender+ training needs to include young men, and consider whether inclusive approaches are in themselves a feminist act.

Moderator: Gitte Beaupin, Gender at Work, Brussels, Belgium

Promoting reflexivity through a Community of Practices (2): Experiences in making gender training more inclusive: towards intersectionality?

Simultaneous translation available English/Spanish

Venue: Salón de Actos

Gender+?=??: Intersectionality and Fluidity – Addressing the Challenges of Complexity in Gender Training

Gabi Rosenstreich, Consultant, researcher and trainer in diversity issues, Berlin, Germany

Abstract: The concept of intersectionality regards individuals as always being members of multiple social groups simultaneously and accordingly as embedded in complex societal and organizational power relations. Thus a person may be a woman, but they are also Black, middle-class, etc. Intersectionality acknowledges various forms of intersecting positions and associated inequalities and discrimination (e.g. sexism, racism, heterosexism, ableism, ageism). When we also consider the fluidity and contextuality of identity, as highlighted by poststructural feminisim, the equation becomes even more complex. For example, the lived experiences of many trans, genderqueer and intersex people would appear to shake the foundations of most gender training approaches even without considering other dimensions such as racialised hierarchies. Thus, there are inherent tensions between category-specific approaches, such as gender training, that take as their starting point one aspect of identity, and the real complexity of identities and social experience. Practitioners' responses to this tension range from assertions of a hierarchy of oppression and/or the necessity of reductionism through to a lack of effectiveness in their training as they are overwhelmed by complexity in combination with practical constraints. If gender training is to be effective in tackling real gender-based discriminations and enhancing gender equality, we need to take real complexity into account by addressing multiplicity, fluidity and contextuality of social positioning. The presentation will critically reflect on some of the ideas found in the practice of gender+training programmes in relation to intersectionality. It will incorporate practical examples

(including interactive elements) and propose a deconstructive approach as potentially fruitful for negotiating the tensions inherent in gender+ training.

Gender Training, intersectionality and diversity management discourses

Maria SanGiuliano, Consultant/Project Manager and Phd candidate at University Ca' Foscari, Venice/CIRDFA (Inter-University Centre on Educational and Training Studies), Italy

Abstract: Since the last 15 years gender training has been gaining increasing attention as a crucial site of dynamic flows between feminist theory and gender studies on one side, and policies implementation/activism on the other. Beginning by drafting the debate on intersectionality and shortly introducing the analytical framework on (gender) training that I'm basing my research on, I briefly try to disclose some questions and issues arising when analyzing gender training processes with an intersectional approach. The background of my analysis is the debate on transformativity of gender equality and mainstreaming policies (Squires, 2007; Verloo, 2007). In the second section I argue that when practicing gender training with an intersectional approach it may be useful to detect if and how HRM strategies and organizational cultures are already shaped by predominant discourses of "diversity management". To what extent discourses on intersectionality differ from diversity ones? Are there any possibilities for intersectionality practices in gender training that start from already present diversity based discourses to transform them preventing to blur gender equality goals or does gender discourses risk to be bent to diversity when meeting diversity rhetorics in organizational contexts via training (Lombardo, Meier & Verloo, 2009)? The paper tries to ground such an assessment on part of the existing literature from feminist organizational studies on diversity and from feminist political studies (intersectionality), and then, in the third paragraph, presents some preliminary traces of empirical evidence found in 2 gender training contexts/projects.

Online Training in Intersectionality: Experiences in Gender+ training at the Spanish Trade Union FOREM

Lucas/Raquel Platero, Phd. Candidate and gender trainer, University Complutense, Spain

Abstract: Trade unions like CCOO have been offering gender training and online gender training in Spain for a number of years. Since 2002 and until 2010, 3,702 students have participated in the "Equal Opportunities Training" offered by FOREM, the training institution at CCOO trade union. These classes are a shared agreement among the trade union and the Complutense University, with students from all over the country. These students have taken 300 hours of classes in 3 years, mostly online and face to face classes. The issue of intersectionality has been introduced for the last four years, in workshops of two weeks. This communication will be presenting my experience of these four years of online gender+ training with 6 workshops, showing some of the challenges and nuances.

The Anti-Bias-Approach - a useful concept for dealing with intersectionality in Gender Trainings

Eva Fleischer, Senior Lecturer, Innsbruck Management Center, Dept. of Social Work, Austria

Abstract: The Anti-Bias-approach is an innovative approach within antidiscriminatory practice in education, which has its roots in the US (Louise Dermain-Sparks, Carol Brunson-Philips) and South Africa. Firstly developed in the field of elementary and primary education, this approach has been adapted for youth and adult education. Anti-Bias is an experience-orientated training focusing not only on (own) discrimination but also on (own) dominance. The aim is to un-learn oppressive and discriminating forms of communication and interaction as well as to analyze the individual, the social and the structural dimensions of power structures. One speciality of Anti-Bias is the focus on many kinds of discrimination based on the theoretical concept of intersectionality. From my point of view the tools and elements developed in the Anti-Bias-Approach can be useful for gender trainings as they give inspiring ideas how to deal with intersectionality in a practical way. In my contribution I want to give a short introduction of the Anti-Bias approach and discuss how the tools and the general attitude of Anti-Bias can be helpful to introduce the theory of intersectionality in gender trainings. To illustrate this thesis I'll talk about one method of Anti-Bias, called „power flower“, which I used within a gender mainstreaming workshop held at a vocational counselling initiative for people with mental disabilities.

Moderator: Lucy Nowottnick, Humboldt University, OPERA team, Berlin

Conference Dinner (upon invitation or reservation)

Day 2 - Friday 4th February

0900-0915 – **Registration**

Complimentary coffee/tea

0915-1100 Parallel Session C

Ensuring quality in gender+ training (3): *Towards a professionalization of gender+ training activities?*

Venue: Aula 4

From political activism to market economy: the uneasy professionalization of gender equality specialists in France

Soline Blanchard, PhD. Candidate, University of Toulouse-le-Mirail, and Gender trainer for Valta Göra, France

Abstract: This paper aims at questioning the French process of professionalization of training and consultancy activities related to equal opportunities in work and employment, focusing on three aspects:

1/ The socio-historical conditions that made its emergence possible from the 1980s onwards. From political activism to a free market economy, three steps of the process will be highlighted: institutionalization, normalization and marketing.

2/ A mapping of the actors. The analysis will point out the variety of public and private actors involved in the field.

3/ The apparent tensions that come with the uncertain professionalization of the field.

The key issue seems to be the lack of legitimacy of the field based on a certain tolerance to inequalities in French society fostered by weak political involvement.

The ongoing professionalization may also be hindered by difficulties in defining and claiming a specific shared expertise as well as in organizational constraints.

There are real issues at stake in this area subject to forthcoming changes, especially from a feminist perspective, which has remained somewhat secondary so far?

Acknowledging gender expertise as an occupation in Romania

Alexandrina Satnoianu, Member of FILIA - Center for Curricular Development and Gender Studies, Romania

Abstract: Having an MA diploma on gender studies, I cannot call myself a gender expert. Even if I could, I would have to use the masculine form of the term, but it's already the second part of the frustration. I started to investigate the process of introducing this occupation into the Romanian Classification of Occupations and also investigating the extent to which this process is already completed in other EU countries and how it was done. In order to be registered as an occupation, one organization (that has a clear image of the description of this specific occupation) should submit to Ministry of Labour:

- a memory,
- list the links between occupation and activities,
- present studies and analysis in which is shown the need for such an occupation
- a full description of the occupation (tasks, responsibilities, working schedule, activities that can be performed by the gender expert, requirements, types of qualifications, salary, promotion system, dynamics, related occupations).

Keeping this occupation out of the Romanian Classification of Occupations is, in my opinion, a form of denial of the relevance of the gender and constitutes a form of institutional resistance.

Moderator: Maxime Forest, Complutense University, OPERA team, Madrid

Transferring knowledge: theory and methodology (3): *New methodological challenges*

Simultaneous translation available English/Spanish

Venue: Salón de Actos

Walking along unknown paths: How practitioners and academics can create a new gender mainstreaming methodology in training

Kristin Ideler, Philipps-Universität Marburg, Germany

Abstract: Since gender mainstreaming became popular in the mid-90s, governments and organizations have dealt with its comprehensive implementation. But did gender training work the way it was designed to? On the one hand, many organizations show great interest in gender equality issues, but on the other hand, gender training activities are often not embedded into sustainable processes of organizational change. Gender trainers have to deal with a lack of interest in gender mainstreaming and have to combine gender-related topics with other themes to make it more interesting for the participants. Meanwhile new training participants often have difficulties transferring their acquired gender competence into their everyday life and work. In this context gender experts have recently noticed the stagnation in gender mainstreaming processes and some even talk about a serious crisis. In this regard knowledge transfer between theory and practice is essential to further advancement. In doing so, organizations and gender experts are walking along unknown paths, as it is often difficult to successfully develop forms of continuous knowledge exchange. My presentation will show how practitioners and academics can create a new gender mainstreaming methodology in training. Using the example of a German trade union, as a best practice for gender mainstreaming in training, I would like to show that the transfer of experiences between scientists and practitioners is an important part of the process and will demonstrate how it could be done sustainably.

Changing Counting House Practices: Challenges in Training for Gender Budgeting

Sheila Quinn, Researcher and Consultant, County Wicklow, Ireland

Abstract: The King was in the Counting House

Counting out his money.

The Queen was in the parlour . . . (Extract from 17th century English Nursery Rhyme)

Based on my experience of having written a number of manuals on gender budgeting and delivered training to a range of target groups, I would like to present on my observations themed around a series of questions:

- What are we doing when we are training on gender budgeting? What is the main focus? Are we teaching about gender issues? Are we training on organisational change? Are we trying to bring a new perspective on economic policy?
- What's our goal, end-point, vision, and expectation? Is the end-point a budget that is procedurally and structurally changed so as to deliver gender equality? Or are we simply availing of the opportunity given to us by raising awareness of gender issues with this new target group?
- To whom is gender budgeting training delivered? Do we have the right target group?
- What are the (false) assumptions about gender budgeting that influence the expectations of trainees?
- Is gender budgeting training best delivered by an economist, a gender-mainstreaming expert, a feminist economist or an organisational change facilitator?
- Can the basic steps of gender budget analysis be presented without the prerequisite of gender 101?
- How can gender budget training be progressed beyond the analysis stage to the budget reformulation stage?
- What are the synergies between gender mainstreaming training and gender budgeting training?
- What are the crucial distinguishing characteristics between gender mainstreaming training and gender budgeting training?

Gender Expertise and Feminist Methodology

Elisabeth Prügl, Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva, Switzerland

Abstract: The proposed presentation probes the way in which gender expertise reflects feminist methodologies by exploring gender training manuals in the security sector. I first define some of the core principles of feminist research methodology and argue their relevance in the practice of training. In a second step I review 12 gender training manuals from the INSTRAW Gender Wiki website and analyze how feminist methodology is visible in the production of the manuals, in the kinds of methodologies employed, and in the kinds of methodologies advocated. I argue that including feminist methodology into gender training requires reflexivity, a focus on participation, and sensitivity to issues of power.

Accompaniment in the Gender Mainstreaming Process

María Isabel Castellvi Carrascal, Chief of Section, Training and Employment, Instituto de la Mujer, Spain

Abstract: Spain's Instituto de la Mujer promotes change in both attitudes and aptitudes through a personal accompaniment system. This is conducted in a personalized manner for professionals from different areas by conducting a gender analysis of their daily work and offering tools and methodologies to support them with the mainstreaming process.

Moderator: Lut Mergaert, Senior Consultant, Yellow Window, OPERA Team

Promoting reflexivity through a Community of Practices (3): Open session on Experience Feedback

Venue: Aula 5

Gender trainings in public administrations at the local and regional level

Brigitte Wotha, Gender Expert, Germany

Abstract: Gender trainings in public administrations have to consider the demands on government employees or civil servants in their special position as agents between legal frameworks, decisions of politics, administrative cultures and administrative procedures as well as the responsiveness to the needs of the citizens. The gender trainings concepts in local authorities have to acknowledge the different experiences and knowledge on gender relations as well as the personal perception of the people working there in their roles as women and men. At the same time gender trainings in public administrations should be combined with the development of enduring instruments which supports the implementation and integrating gender mainstreaming in the everyday routines and the administrative procedures to be successful, effective and widely accepted. The instruments range from supporting groups or advisory boards to checklists or matrices to model projects or self-evaluation procedures. Gender trainings for public administrations aim concurrently at changes in the individual attitudes towards gender equality and equal opportunities, at changes in the organizational structure and corporate culture as well as at the administrative procedures. Therefore, gender trainings have to include awareness rising and individual experiences elements as well as organisational analyses and strategies. In my presentation I would like to evaluate my experiences in gender trainings, discuss my methods especially in mediating knowledge of gender planning and to work on instruments on stabilising the approaches on gender mainstreaming in the respective administrations.

Training of kindergarten-teachers to promote gender equality since early childhood

Maria João Cardona; Teresa Cláudia Tavares; Marta Uva; Isabel Piscalho, Escola Superior de Educação/Instituto Politécnico de Santarém, Portugal

Abstract: We present a synthesis of the action to increase gender awareness and gender-equality that since the nineties we (Escola Superior de Educação/Instituto Politécnico de Santarém teacher's team) develop with future kindergarten teachers during their training and with kindergarten teachers in general or specifically with the teachers already trained, as monitoring and follow-up support. We'll also present and discuss the toolkits and other gender-equality resources to support our action that we develop.

Incorporating Gender in Justice

Viviana Waisman and Paloma Soria, Women's Link Worldwide, Madrid, Spain

Abstract: Women's Link Worldwide is an international organization dedicated to advancing gender justice, through the development and strategic implementation of human rights law worldwide. At Women's Link we acknowledge the successful efforts of our feminist contemporaries and predecessors in achieving recognition for women's rights as enforceable human rights. Although these efforts have led to the inclusion of rights in legislation and policy, gender *injustice* based on judicial prejudice and stereotypes persist and fail to take into account gender+ discrimination. Women's Link uses gender training of the judiciary as one of its overarching strategies towards gender+ equality. Taking an intersectional approach, Women's Link takes the next step; working to ensure that policies which are mainstreamed into policies and legislation are effectively implemented by the judiciary, both in Europe and globally. Women's Link believes in the transformative potential of the courts and has carried out gender trainings on a number of subjects affecting gender equality. We strive to bring to the fore discrimination on multiple grounds in all our gender work as we strategically train judges and attorneys working in the field of gender equality. The presentation would share with the conference participants the reason that we focus on the judiciary to advance gender equality and on how to work strategically with courts, tribunals to advance gender equality in Europe and beyond.

The Uneasiness and Pleasures of Transitions

Gloria Bonder, Director, Center of Gender, Society and Policies, Latin American School of Social Sciences – FLACSO, Buenos Aires, Argentina

Abstract: The aim of the presentation is to share reflections on the intellectual and emotional tensions, disruptions and excitement lived by gender specialists while being involved in the processes of mainstreaming gender in institutional policies, programs and projects. Those reflections came from two interrelated experiences:

*Gender mainstreaming interventions in several Latin American institutions.

*And planning and coordination of on line and blended training programs aimed at building capacities of graduate students to develop such interventions in diverse national and institutional contexts.

It will highlight the challenges posed by those processes in four dimensions: conceptual, political, ethical and subjective. Finally, it will address the notion of transitions, unfolding its different meanings and exploring its possibilities for a better understanding of change in gender relations and a different point of view for the design of educational and technical activities in this domain.

Moderator: Barbara Helfferich, Independent Consultant

Coffee break

1130-1230 Third Plenary Session

Simultaneous translation available English/Spanish

Venue: Salón de Actos

Roundtable: Networks for supporting quality in gender+ training

Iris van der Tuin, President of the Board, Atgender Association; Ann-Charlotte Callerstig, European Network on Gender Mainstreaming; Gloria Bonder, FLACSO

Moderator: María Bustelo

1230-1315 - Final Closing Session

Simultaneous translation available English/Spanish

Venue: Salón de Actos

Feedback on parallel sessions, conclusions

Final agreement on Mission Statement/Declaration

Mieke Verloo, QUING project Scientific Coordinator, Radboud University, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

OPERA Team:

Universidad Complutense, Madrid: María Bustelo, Emanuela Lombardo, Lucy Ferguson, Maxime Forest

Institut für die Wissenschaften vom Menschen (IWM), Vienna: Mieke Verloo

Yellow Window, Antwerp: Lut Mergaert

Humboldt University, Berlin: Susanne Baer, Lucy Nowottnick

Día 1 – jueves 3 de febrero

0845-0930 – Acreditaciones

Lugar: Hall del Salón de Actos

0930-1045 - **Primera Sesión Plenaria**

Traducción simultánea inglés/español disponible

Lugar: Salón de Actos

Bienvenida

Juan Gómez Castañeda, Director, Centro de Estudios de Gestión, Universidad Complutense

Presentación

Laura Seara, Directora del Instituto de la Mujer (Women's Institute), Cristina Segura Graiño, directora de la Unidad de Género de la UCM, Universidad Complutense y Marian López Fernández Cao, Directora del Instituto de Investigaciones Feministas, Universidad Complutense

El impacto de la nueva legislación española sobre investigación científica para la igualdad de género y formación en género+

Inés Sánchez de Madariaga, Directora de la Unidad de Mujer y Ciencia (UMYC), Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación

Presentación: El proyecto OPERA-QUING y los objetivos de la conferencia

María Bustelo, Universidad Complutense, Madrid, y Mieke Verloo, Coordinadora científica del proyecto QUING, IWM Vienna, Austria y Radboud University, Nijmegen, Holanda

1045-1145 – **Conferencia de apertura**

Traducción simultánea inglés/español disponible

Presentación

Mieke Verloo

Reflexividad y ‘mainstreaming’ de género: preguntándose algunas preguntas difíciles

Profesora Carol Bacchi, Universidad de Adelaida, Australia

Pausa café (Aula 2)

1215-1315 - **Segunda sesión plenaria**

Traducción simultánea inglés/español disponible

Lugar: Salón de Actos

Mesa Redonda: La formación de género+ como una herramienta necesaria en las estrategias de transversalidad de género en Europa

Barbara Limanowska, Experta senior sobre mainstreaming de género en el Instituto Europeo para la Igualdad de Género; Lut Mergaert, Consultora senior, Yellow Window, Antwerp, Bélgica; Giuseppe Borsalino, Unidad de Ética y Género, DG Research (Investigación), Comisión Europea; Agnès Hubert, Miembro de la Oficina de Asesores/as de Política Europea, Comisión Europea)

Moderador/a: Mieke Verloo

1430-1615 **Sesión paralela A**

Asegurando la calidad en la formación de género+ (1): *Desarrollando criterios de calidad.*

Traducción simultánea inglés/español disponible

Lugar: Salón de Actos

Formación continua en materia de género: un asunto central para la calidad de las políticas de igualdad de género

Anna Cabó i Cardona, Directora de Igualdad y Ciudadanía, Oficina para la Promoción de la Igualdad de Género, Diputación de Barcelona

La elaboración de competencias en materia de género a través de formación cualitativa

Rachel Andrés, Indera, Consultoría en materia de igualdad de género, Barcelona

La elaboración de criterios de calidad como parte del proceso de acreditación de los/as expertos/as sobre diversidad de género en Alemania

Christian Raschke, Gender Diversity e.V, Müncheberg Munich, Germany Alemania

El papel activo de las instituciones en la búsqueda de la calidad en la formación de género

María José Rosco Galiana, Técnica Titulada Superior del Servicio de Formación y Empleo, Instituto de la Mujer

Moderador/a: María Bustelo, Universidad Complutense, Equipo OPERA, Madrid

La transferencia de conocimiento: teoría y metodología (1): *metodologías participativas y experimentales*

Lugar: Aula 4

Algunos aspectos prácticos (y espinosos) a discutir en relación a las metodologías participativas

Nathalie Wuiame, Experta en género y formación, Engender, Bruselas, Bélgica

Métodos que utilizan el psicodrama como método en la formación en género

Michael Gümbel, Formador en género y consultor, Sujet GbR, Hamburgo

La interactividad en la formación en género: la relación entre el método, el mensaje y las convenciones

Katlijn Demuyne, Experta en género y formación, Gender at Work, Bruselas, Bélgica

Contexto, asunciones y sesgos: cómo los prejuicios “se cuelan” en la evaluación ‘imparcial’ de la productividad y la calidad científica - extractos de un programa de sensibilización en la Universidad de Aquisgrán, Alemania

GoBIT Training, RWTH Aachen University, Germany

Moderador/a: Emanuela Lombardo, Universidad Complutense, Equipo OPERA, Madrid

La promoción de la reflexividad a través de una Comunidad de Práctica (1): *Afrontando las resistencias relativas a la formación de género +*

Lugar: Aula 5

Enfrentando resistencias a la formación de género: experiencias en el Servicio de Empleo austríaco

Iris Apiano Kugler and Hermine Steinbach Buchinger, Formadoras en género, Viena, Austria

Un campo de resistencia: lecciones aprendidas del desarrollo de la formación de género para personal de defensa y seguridad

Kristin Valasek, Coordinadora del Proyecto Género y Reforma del Sector de la Seguridad, Centro para el Control Democrático de las Fuerzas Armadas, Ginebra, Suiza

Hombres y formación de género: ¿quién se resiste a quién?

Stefan Beier, Gender trainer, Genderwerk, Berlin, Alemania

Del concepto a la acción: estrategias para superar las resistencias de género

Margarita Jankauskaitė, Centro para el Avance de la Igualdad, Vilna, Lituania

Moderador/a: Katrien Van der Heyden, Experta en género y formadora, Engender, Bruselas

Pausa café (Aula 2)

1645-1830 Sesión paralela B

Asegurando la calidad de la formación de género+ (2): *El desarrollo de prácticas formativas innovadoras en contextos no- europeos*

Lugar: Aula 4

Formación de género en el contexto de conflictos armados y desastres humanitarios: respuestas y resistencias

Ruth Jacobson, Investigadora y consultora en asuntos de género y Jamie Munn, Asesor de desarrollo organizacional, Asociación Internacional para la rendición de cuentas en el ámbito humanitario

Involucrando a los hombres en el desafío a los estereotipos de género en Zimbabwe

Jonah K. Gokova, PADARE/ Foro de Hombres sobre género, Harare, Zimbabwe

Moderador/a: Lucy Ferguson, Universidad Complutense, Equipo OPERA, Madrid

La transferencia de conocimiento: teoría y metodología (2): *La teoría feminista y de género en los materiales formativos*

Lugar: Aula 5

Reflexiones sobre las teorías de planificación aplicada con perspectiva de género en la formación de género en la planificación local y regional

Doris Damyanovic and Florian Reinwald, Universidad de recursos naturales y ciencias aplicadas de la vida, Instituto de Planificación Paisajística, Viena; y Heidrun Wankiewicz, planwind.at – estudio sobre consultoría en materia de ingeniería, Salzburgo, Austria

¿Transformación a través del conocimiento?

Sandra Smykalla, Estudios de Género y Estudios sobre Educación, Humboldt-University, Berlin, Alemania

Una experiencia en la comunicación de la teoría de género a través de la formación en Bulgaria
Tatyana Kmetova and Roza Dimova, Formadoras en género para CWSP, Sofía, Bulgaria

¿Por qué no usamos la “palabra F”? Haciendo inclusiva la formación de género+ y en Igualdad y Diversidad

Geraldine Wooley, Centro Escocés de Recursos para Mujeres en Ciencia, Ingeniería y Tecnología. Edimburgo, Reino Unido

Moderador/a: Gitte Beupin, Gender at Work, Brussels, Belgium

La promoción de la reflexividad a través de una Comunidad de Práctica (2): *Experiencias que fomentan una formación de género más inclusiva : ¿hacia la interseccionalidad?*

Traducción simultánea inglés/español disponible

Lugar: Salón de Actos

Género +?=? Interseccionalidad y fluidez. Debatiendo los desafíos de la complejidad en la formación de género

Gabi Rosenstreich, Consultora, investigadora y formadora en asuntos de diversidad, Berlín, Alemania

Formación de género, interseccionalidad y los discursos de gestión de la diversidad

Maria SanGiuliano, Consultora/ gestora de proyecto y candidata a doctora en la Universidad Ca' Foscari, Venecia/ CIRDFa (Centro inter-universitario de estudios en materia de educación y formación), Italia

Formación virtual sobre interseccionalidad: experiencias sobre formación de género+ en el entorno sindical español (FOREM)

Lucas/Raquel Platero, Candidato a doctor y formador en género, Universidad Complutense de Madrid

El enfoque anti-sesgos: un concepto útil para encarar la interseccionalidad en la formación en género

Eva Fleischer, Profesora, Centro de Gestión de Innsbruck, Departamento de Trabajo Social, Austria

Moderador/a: Lucy Nowottnick, Humboldt University, OPERA team, Berlin

Cena de la Conferencia (por invitación o reservación)

Día 2 – viernes 4 de febrero

0900-0915 – Acreditaciones

Café/té disponible en Aula 2

Lugar: Hall del Salón de Actos

0915-1100 Sesión paralela C

Asegurando la calidad en la formación de género + (3): *¿Hacia una profesionalización de las actividades de formación de género +?*

Lugar: Aula 4

Del activismo político a la economía de mercado: la precaria profesionalización de los especialistas en materia de igualdad de género en Francia

Soline Blanchard, Candidata a doctora, Universidad de Toulouse-le-Mirail, y formadora en género para Valta Göra, Francia

El reconocimiento de la experticia de género como una ocupación en Rumanía

Alexandrina Satnoianu, Miembro de FILIA_ Centro para el Desarrollo Curricular y Estudios de Género, Rumania

Moderador/a: Maxime Forest, Universidad Complutense, Equipo OPERA, Madrid

La transferencia de conocimiento: teoría y metodología (3): *Nuevos desafíos metodológicos*

Traducción simultánea inglés/español disponible

Lugar: Salón de Actos

Caminando por senderos desconocidos: cómo profesionales y académicos/as pueden crear una nueva metodología sobre transversalidad de género en formación

Kristin Ideler, Philipps-Universität Marburg, Germany

Modificando las costumbres de la Tesorería: Desafíos en la formación para la presupuestación con perspectiva de género

Sheila Quinn, Investigadora y Consultora, County Wicklow, Ireland

Cualificación de género y metodología feminista

Elisabeth Prügl, Instituto Universitario de Estudios Internacionales y de Desarrollo, Ginebra, Suiza

El acompañamiento del proceso de 'mainstreaming' de género

María Isabel Castellvi Carrascal, Jefa Sección Servicio de Formación y Empleo Instituto de la Mujer

Moderador/a: Lut Mergaert, Senior Consultant, Yellow Window, OPERA Team

La promoción de la reflexividad a través de una Comunidad de Práctica (3): Sesión abierta sobre diferentes experiencias

Lugar: Aula 5

Formaciones de género en la Administración Pública en los niveles local y regional
Brigitte Wotha, Experta en Género, Alemania

Formación de profesoras/es de escuelas infantiles para promover la igualdad de género desde la primera infancia
Maria João Cardona; Teresa Cláudia Tavares; Marta Uva; Isabel Piscalho, Escuela Superior de Educación/ Instituto Politécnico de Santarém, Portugal

La incorporación de la perspectiva de género en la Justicia
Viviana Waisman and Paloma Soria, Women's Link Worldwide, Madrid, Spain

Las incomodidades y los placeres de las transiciones
Gloria Bonder, Directora del Centro de Género, Sociedad, y Políticas Públicas, Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales – FLACSO, Buenos Aires, Argentina

Moderador/a: Barbara Helfferich, Consultora independiente

Pausa café (Aula 2)

1130-1230 Tercera sesión plenaria	Traducción simultánea inglés/español disponible
--	---

Lugar: Salón de Actos

Mesa Redonda: Redes para el apoyo de la calidad en género+ formación
Iris van der Tuin, Presidenta del Consejo de la Asociación Atgender; Ann-Charlotte Callerstig, Red Europea sobre transversalidad de género; Gloria Bonder, FLACSO

Moderador/a: María Bustelo

1230-1315 - Sesión final de clausura	Traducción simultánea inglés/español disponible
---	---

Lugar: Salón de Actos

Conclusiones
Acuerdo final sobre una Declaración conjunta
Mieke Verloo

OPERA Team:

Universidad Complutense, Madrid: María Bustelo, Emanuela Lombardo, Lucy Ferguson, Maxime Forest
Institut für die Wissenschaften vom Menschen (IWM), Viena: Mieke Verloo
Yellow Window, Antwerp: Lut Mergaert
Humboldt University, Berlin: Susanne Baer, Lucy Nowottnick

Conference Participants

- András, Rachel** - Indera, Gender Equality Consultancy, Barcelona, Spain, r.andras@indera.es
- ApianoKugler, Iris** - Gender trainer, Vienna, Austria, iris.kugler@blackbox.at
- Bacchi, Carol** - University of Adelaide, Australia.
- Beaupin, Gitte** - Gender at Work, Brussels, Belgium, gitte@genderatwork.be
- Beier, Stefan** - Gender trainer, Genderwerk, Berlin, Germany, stefan.f.beier@web.de
- Blanchard, Soline** - PhD. Candidate, University of Toulouse-le-Mirail and Gender trainer for ValtaGöra, Toulouse, France, soline.blanchard@univ-tlse2.fr
- Bonder, Gloria** - Director, Center of Gender, Society and Policies, Latin American School of Social Sciences – FLACSO, Buenos Aires, Argentina, catunesco1@flacso.org.ar
- Bongartz, Ulrich** - GOBIT Team, RWTH Aachen, Germany, u.bongartz@freenet.de
- Borsalino, Giuseppe** - Ethics and Gender Unit, DG Research, European Commission, Giuseppe.BORSALINO@ec.europa.eu
- Bustelo, María** - OPERA Activity Leader, Complutense University, Madrid, Spain, mbustelo@cps.ucm.es
- Cabó i Cardona, Anna** - Director of Francesca Bonnemaison Center, Equality and Citizenship Area, Office for the Promotion of Gender Equality, Barcelona Provincial Council, Spain, caboca@diba.cat
- Callerstig, Ann-Charlotte** - European Network on Gender Mainstreaming, Sweden, anne-charlott.callerstig@liu.se
- Cardona, Maria João** - Escola Superior de Educação/Instituto Politécnico de Santarém, Portugal, mjoao.cardona@ese.ipsantarem.pt
- CastellviCarrascal, María Isabel** - Chief of Section, Training and Employment, Instituto de la Mujer, Spain, isabel.castellvicarrascal@inmujer.es
- Damyanovic, Doris** - University of Natural Resources and Applied Life Sciences, Institute of Landscape Planning, Vienna, Austria, doris.damyanovic@boku.ac.at
- Demuyneck, Katlijn** - Gender expert and trainer, Gender at Work, Brussels, Belgium, katlijn@genderatwork.be
- Dimova, Roza** - Gender trainer for CWSP, Sofia, Bulgaria, cwsp@cwsp.bg
- Ferguson, Lucy** - Complutense University, OPERA team, Madrid, Spain, lucyferg@pas.ucm.es
- Fleischer, Eva** - Senior Lecturer, Innsbruck Management Center, Department of Social Work, Austria, Eva.Fleischer@mci.edu
- Forest, Maxime** - Complutense University, OPERA team, Madrid, Spain, maxime-forest@hotmail.fr
- Gokova, Jonah K.** - PADARE/Men's Forum on Gender, Harare, Zimbabwe, gokovj@gmail.com
- Gómez Castañeda, Juan** - Director, Centro de Estudios de Gestión, Complutense University, Madrid, Spain, Universityjgomez@cps.ucm.es
- Gümbel, Michael** - Gender trainer and consultant, SujetGbR, Hamburg, Germany, michael.guembel@sujet.org

Helfferrich, Barbara - Independent Consultant, Belgium, helffba@skynet.be

Hofmeister, Heather - GoBIT Training, RWTH Aachen University, Germany
heather.hofmeister@soziologie.rwth-aachen.de

Hubert, Agnès - Member of the Bureau of European Policy Advisors, European Commission
agnes.hubert@ec.europa.eu

Ideler, Kristin - Philipps-Universität, Marburg, Germany, idelerk@staff.uni-marburg.de

Jacobson, Ruth - Researcher and Consultant in gender issues, United Kingdom,
Ruth.Jacobson@bristol.ac.uk

Jankauskaitė, Margarita - Center for Equality Advancement, Vilnius, Lithuania, margarita@gap.lt

Kmetova, Tatyana - Gender trainer for CWSP, Sofia, Bulgaria, cwsp@cwsp.bg

Limanowska, Barbara - Senior Gender Mainstreaming Expert, European Institute for Gender Equality (EIGE), Vilnius, Lithuania, Barbara.Limanowska@eige.europa.eu

Lombardo, Emanuela - Complutense University, OPERA team, Madrid, Spain, elombardo@cps.ucm.es

López Fernández Cao, Marián - Director, Instituto de Investigaciones Feministas (Feminist Research Institute), Madrid, Spain, macao@edu.ucm.es

Matzner, Nils - GoBIT Training, RWTH Aachen University, Germany, nils.matzner@rwth-aachen.de

Mergaert, Lut - Senior Consultant, Yellow Window, Antwerp, Belgium,
lut.Mergaert@yellowwindow.com

Munn, Jamie - Organizational Development Advisor, Humanitarian Accountability Partnership International jmun@hapinternational.org

Nowottnick, Lucy - Humboldt University, OPERA team, Berlin, Germany,
lucy.nowottnick@rewi.hu-berlin.de

Piscalho, Isabel - Escola Superior de Educação/Instituto Politécnico de Santarém, Portugal
isabelpiscalho@gmail.com

Platero, Lucas/Raquel - Phd. Candidate and gender trainer, Complutense University, Madrid, Spain,
platero@cps.ucm.es

Prügl, Elisabeth - Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies, Geneva, Switzerland,
elisabeth.pruegl@graduateinstitute.ch

Quinn, Sheila - Researcher and Consultant, County Wicklow, Ireland, sheilagquinn@gmail.com

Raschke, Christian - Gender Diversity e.V, Müncheberg, Germany, mail@christianraschke.de

Reinwald, Florian - University of Natural Resources and Applied Life Sciences, Institute of Landscape Planning, Vienna, Austria, florian.reinwald@boku.ac.at

RoscoGaliana, María José - Senior Adviser, Chief of Section, Training and Employment, Instituto de la Mujer mariajose.roscoGaliana@inmujer.es

Rosenstreich, Gabi - Consultant, researcher and trainer in diversity issues, Berlin, Germany,
grosenstreich@yahoo.de

Sánchez de Madariaga, Inés - Director of Women and Science, Ministry of Science and Innovation, Spain

San Giuliano, Maria - Consultant/Project Manager and PhD candidate at University Ca' Foscari, Venice/CIRDFA (Inter-University Centre on Educational and Training Studies)
mariasangiuliano@mediaculture.it

Satnoianu, Alexandrina - Member of FILIA - Center for Curricular Development and Gender Studies, Bucarest, Romania, alexandrina.satnoianu@gmail.com

Seara, Laura - Instituto de la Mujer (Women's Institute), Spain, sgprogmuje@inmujer.es

Segura Graiño, Cristina - Director of Gender Unit, Complutense University, Madrid, Spain, almuday@ghis.ucm.es

Smykalla, Sandra - Gender Studies and Education Studies, Humboldt-University, Berlin, Germany, sandra.smykalla@hu-berlin.de

Steinbach Buchinger, Hermine - Gender trainer, Vienna, Austria, office@agentursteinbach.at

Straterhoff, Johannes - RWTH Aachen University, Germany

Tavares, Teresa Cláudia - Escola Superior de Educação/Instituto Politécnico de Santarém, Portugal

Uva, Marta - Escola Superior de Educação/Instituto Politécnico de Santarém, Portugal
marta.uva@ese.ipsantarem.pt

Valasek, Kristin - Gender and Security Sector Reform Project Coordinator, Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces, Geneva, Switzerland, k.valasek@dcaf.ch

Van der Heyden, Katrien - Gender expert and trainer, Engender, Brussels, Belgium, Katrien.Vanderheyden@skynet.be

Van der Tuin, Iris - President of the Board, Atgender Association, The Netherlands, i.vandertuin@uu.nl

Verloo, Mieke - QUING project Scientific Coordinator, Radboud University, Nijmegen, The Netherlands, m.verloo@fm.ru.nl

Waisman, Viviana - Women's Link Worldwide, Madrid, Spain, v.waisman@womenslinkworldwide.org

Wankiewicz, Heidrun - planwind.at, consulting engineering studio, Salzburg, Austria, wankiewicz@planwind.at

Wooley, Geraldine - Scottish Resource Centre for Women in Science, Engineering and Technology, Edinburgh Napier University, the United Kingdom, G.Wooley@napier.ac.uk

Wotha, Brigitte - Gender Expert, Germany, info@wotha.de

Wuiame, Nathalie - Gender expert and trainer, Engender, Brussels, Belgium, Nathalie.wuiame@skynet.be

Conference Attendees

Alonso Cuerva, Isabel – LIKaDI, Madrid, Spain, isabel@likadi.com

Barreiros Ribao, Purificación – Coordinator of Equality Agents, Equal Opportunities Division, Madrid City Council, Spain, barreirosrp@madrid.es

Belan-Menagier, Caroline – MIPADI (Parity and Gender Equality Unit), Ministry of Higher Education and Research, Paris, France

Bernández, Yolanda – GenderTrainer, LIKaDI, Madrid, Spain, yo-landa@cop.es

Blat, Teresa – Instituto de la Mujer, Spain, teresa.blatgimeno@inmujer.es

Blickhäuser, Angelika - Feminism and Gender Democracy, Germany, Blickhaeuser@t-online.de

Caballud Hernando, Belén – Adviser, Ministry of Defence, Spain, belencab@oc.mde.es

Carroll, Vanessa - Status of Women Canada, Ottawa, Canada, Vanessa.Carroll@swc-cfc.gc.ca

Ceci, Amelia – Freelance Trainer, Palma, Italy, Amelia.Ceci@ausl.re.it

Chillida Aparicio, Ana - LIKaDI, Madrid, Spain, ana@likadi.com

Cuadra Moreno, Mauricio - Universidad de Granada, Spain, mcuadramoreno@yahoo.es

De Jesús Checo, Glenys - Women’s Link Worldwide, Madrid, Spain,
g.dejesus@womenslinkworldwide.org

Elizondo, Arantxa- General Secretary of the Basque Institute of Women-Emakunde, Spain,
arantxa.elizondo@ej-gv.es

Ericsson Ryste, Marte - Information Adviser / Project Manager, Gender Balance in Research, Norway
Marte@kilden.forskningsradet.no

Garunja, Evis - Legal Aid Office for Abused Women and Girls, Albania, evigarunja2000@yahoo.com

González González, Ángeles –LIKaDI, Madrid, Spain, geli@likadi.com

Goupil, Sébastien - Status of Women Canada, Ottawa, Canada, Sebastien.Goupil@swc-cfc.gc.ca

Grasa Ferrer, Arantxa – Equality Agent, Equal Opportunities Division, Madrid City Council, Spain,
grasafa@madrid.es

Guerra, Maria José – Coordinator of Equality Projects, Fundación MUJERES, Madrid, Spain,
mariajose.guerra@fundacionmujeres.es

Hankivsky, Olena - Associate Professor, School of Public Policy, Co-Director, Institute for Critical Studies
in Gender and Health, Simon Fraser University Canadian Institutes of Health Research Gender and
Health Chair, Canada, oah@sfu.ca

Hoard, Season - PhD Candidate, Washington State University, United States, seasonsays@gmail.com

Holyoak, Lorne - Status of Women Canada, Ottawa, Canada, Lorne.Holyoak@swc-cfc.gc.ca

Hüffell, Stephanie - GenderWerk, Germany, s.hueffell@t-online.de

Kasrou Contioso, Ismael - Human Resources Department, Ministry of Defence, Madrid, Spain,
ikscnso@oc.mde.es

Loske, Julia - inter:est GmbH, Agency for cultural and educational projects, Berlin, Germany,
julia.loske@googlemail.com

Loudon, Susanne - Public Employment Service Austria, Vienna, Austria, susanne.loudon@ams.at

Mantecon, Christine – Coordinator of the gender equality programme in lifelong learning, Sorbonne
Paris VI University, Paris, France, christine.mantecon@upmc.fr

Martínez Bueno, Helena - PIDUIG, Gender Equality Unit, Cantabria, Spain, martinez_h@gobcantabria.es

Martins Gonzalez, Marina – Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas (CSIC), Madrid, Spain,
Spainmarina.martins@cchs.csic.es

Masegosa, Suliman – Equality Unit, Ministry of Work and Immigration, Madrid, Spain,
suliman.masegosa@mtin.es

Milewski, Françoise – Coordinator of PRESAGE, Programme in Gender studies, Sciences Po, Paris,
France, francoise.milewski@ofce.sciences-po.fr

Morrow, Marina - Associate Professor, Director, Centre for the Study of Gender, Social Inequities and
Mental Health, Simon Fraser University, Canada mmorrow@sfu.ca

Naveira, Ana María – Equality Unit, Economy and Revenue, Spain ana.naveira@meh.es

Netter, Agnès – MIPADI, Ministry of Higher Education and Research, France
agnes.netter@recherche.gouv.fr

Novo, Ainhoa – Political Science, University of the Basque Country ainhoa.novo@ehu.es

Oñate, Araceli - iieddi, Spain aoc@iieddi.com

Palacios Campos, Inés - Instituto de la Mujer, Spain, sgprogmuje@inmujer.es

Palacios, Fernanda – Sociologist, University of Chile, Madrid palaciosfda@gmail.com

Pérvier, Hélène - Coordinator of the PRESAGE Programme, Sciences Po, Paris, France,
helene.pervrier@ofce.sciences-po.fr

Peterson, Elin – PhD Candidate, Complutense University, Madrid, Spain, epeterson@cps.ucm.es

Ramos, Laura - Complutense PhD Student, Madrid, Spain, larcadona@estumail.ucm.es

Rojas Juárez, José Rafael – Adviser, Ministry of the Interior, Madrid, Spain, jrrojas@mir.es

Ruiz Garcia, Sonia – Ministry of Defence, Madrid, Spain, Sonia.Ruiz@minisdef.es

Rustad, Linda M. - Committee for gender balance in research, Norwegian Association of Higher
Education Institutions, Oslo, Norway, linda.rustad@uhr.no

Sacristan Benito, Teresa – Director of Training and Employment, Instituto de la Mujer, Madrid, Spain
teresa.sacristan@migualdad.es

Sánchez de Madariaga, Elena - Universidad Rey Juan Carlos, Madrid, Spain,
elena.sanchezmadariaga@gmail.com

Soleto, Marisa - Director, Fundación MUJERES, Madrid, Spain, direccion@fundacionmujeres.es

Soto Mora, Guadalupe – Adviser, Gender Equality Unit, Ministry of Education, Madrid, Spain
concepcion.palacio@educacion.es

Souvirón, Margarita – Adviser, Ministry of Health, Social Policy and Equality, Madrid, Spain
margarita.souviron@migualdad.es

Stewart-Ebel, Marie-Françoise - Executive Council, Interface3 asbl, Brussels, Belgium, Marie-
Francoise.stewart@interface3.be

Thompson, Hayley Anna - PhD. Candidate, Graduate Institute of International and Development
Studies, Geneva, Switzerland, hayley.thompson@graduateinstitute.ch

Tobías Olarte, Eva – University of La Rioja, Spain, gerencia@estrategiaygenero.com

Velasco Riego, Luisa – Security Division, Salamanca Local Police, Spain, mlvelasco@aytosalamanca.es

Vengale, Laima - Senior Adviser, Office of the Equal Opportunities Ombudsman, Vilnius, Lithuania
lavaic@lrs.lt

Villatoro López, María Teresa – Ministry of the Environment, Rural and Maritime Affairs, Madrid, Spain
mtvillatoro@marm.es

Von Barga, Henning - Feminism and Gender Democracy, Germany, vonBarga@boell.de

Warth, Lisa - Associate Expert on Gender, Development Policies & Cross-Sectoral Coordination Unit,
United Nations Economic Commission for Europe, Lisa.Warth@unece.org

Zahi, Karima – Pro Firmus, Brussels, Belgium, k.zahi@profirmus.eu



Annex: keynote speech

Keynote speech at the *Advancing Gender+ Training in Theory and Practice* Conference
Madrid, February 3rd, 2011.

Gender mainstreaming and reflexivity: Asking some hard questions*

Carol Bacchi
Professor Emerita in Politics
School of History and Politics
University of Adelaide

I'd like to begin by acknowledging the difficulties and challenges faced in pursuing programs such as QUING and OPERA. I take my hat off to the organisers, especially Mieke Verloo, involved in a change agenda as ambitious as this one.

The title of the paper indicates that my goal today is to ask some hard questions of a key concept associated with those programs – reflexivity. Forecasting my basic proposal, I will be suggesting that *hard questions ought to be welcomed as a part of those programs*, that **hard questions are good things** because they encourage us to pursue novel directions, to move outside of our normal frames of reference.

Background: Australian gender analysis

I'll start with a brief introduction to a large research project in which I was one of the chief investigators, alongside Joan Eveline, who very sadly died in 2009. The project, supported by the Australian Research Council, was called a 'linkage project', meaning that Joan and I, who were academics, worked side-by-side (in 'linkage') with public servants from women's policy departments to test and introduce gender analysis procedures into their respective public sectors. Such procedures generally consist of guidelines for analysing policies to ensure that those policies are gender-inclusive and gender-sensitive. Such guidelines often form part of gender mainstreaming programs.

The Gender Analysis Project took place over 4 years, from 2004 to 2008, and involved the public sectors in two states, Western Australia and South Australia. Distances in Australia are vast. Joan, based in Perth (Western Australia), and I, based in Adelaide (South Australia), were over two and a half thousand kilometres apart, some 3 hours' flying time. This is significant for (at least) two reasons: because it posed challenges for Joan and for me as researchers, shaping our research strategies in particular ways, and because context proved central to our research findings. Indeed, the importance of context stands out as one of the main or primary 'learnings' (things we learnt) associated with the project, something that I know resonates with those of you involved in QUING and OPERA.

Several key 'learnings' emerged from the project. I will refer back to them later in the presentation when the connections become relevant. More detail about the project is available in *Mainstreaming Politics: Gendering Practices and Feminist Theory* (2010), available as a free download from the University of Adelaide Press website.

'Learnings' from the Gender Analysis Project

- We concluded that gender mainstreaming is usefully thought of as a 'field of contestation' where it is impossible to predict 'outcomes' in advance because of the variety of factors involved. The emphasis on context and on contestation highlights this variety.
- One of these factors was a basic disagreement about goals. That is, while there were often expressed commitments to 'gender equality', there were many different versions of what this meant or what it entailed. Therefore engagement and listening were essential. Note: this is not because we (Joan and I and our research teams) were trying to get people to accept a particular version, our version, of gender equality but because it is through the practices of active engagement, discussion and 'deep listening' (discussed later) that we came to understand our differences and how they mattered.
- In terms of how to get gender analysis guidelines to mean something to people, again we found that it was through *engagement* – the actual doing of gender analysis – that people came to see why it was needed. This idea of 'learning by doing' appears to be a central premise in OPERA.
- Reflexivity became increasingly important in our deliberations on ways forward.

A Little Bit of Theory

On contestation as central to politics

Why describe gender mainstreaming as a 'field of contestation'? What is accomplished by this description? There is a very practical objective here and that is to disrupt the impression that, once a 'gender mainstreaming' program is 'on the books', a great victory has been achieved. Without diminishing the acknowledgement due to those who campaign long and hard to institutionalise such programs, describing gender mainstreaming as a 'field of contestation' highlights the *ongoing political deliberations that give those programs meaning and shape*.

This is a somewhat different point from Sarah Ahmed's (2007) reflections on the limitations of 'doing the document'. In fact, our experiences in the Australian Gender Analysis Project highlight that a focus on ongoing political deliberations both in the processes of *producing* the document and in attempts to *implement* it creates a more open-ended understanding of the spaces for change. The general point is to keep to the fore in each and every instance an emphasis on engagement and on politics, understood broadly to encompass the full range of interpersonal and inter/intra-organisational practices (we are not talking about politics here in the traditional institutional sense of the word).

On contested concepts

An accompanying intervention is the language of 'contested concepts'. This idea introduces a rather challenging perspective, stating that concepts have *no fixed meaning*. The mention above about the disagreements over what is entailed by the term 'gender equality' is only one example of what is meant here. The suggestion that concepts have

no fixed meaning is challenging because we are accustomed to using concepts *as if* they do have fixed meanings. Academic writing and policy documents are littered with references to ‘equality’, ‘gender equality’, ‘freedom’, ‘autonomy’, and ‘feminism’, for example, *as if we know exactly what these things are*. Calling these terms ‘contested concepts’ has the same objective as referring to gender mainstreaming as a ‘field of contestation’. It returns the focus to the politics and interaction involved in giving these terms meaning. In fact, you could say that at one level this – giving meaning to concepts – is what politics is all about. Forecasting the argument to follow, we can say that **reflexivity is a contested concept** (Livholts 2008).

If concepts have no fixed meaning, how are we to think of them?

Tanesini (1994: 207) describes concepts as ‘proposals about how we ought to proceed from here’. With this understanding you can see immediately the politics involved in the use of concepts. The suggestion is that we invest a concept with a particular meaning in order to give shape to particular political visions. What follows?

Instead of looking for definitions of key terms such as gender mainstreaming, gender equality and reflexivity, we ought to focus on what kinds of proposals they are – what we are trying to do with them. Deleuze and Guattari (1988: xii) say pointedly that a concept is like a brick: it can be used to build a wall or it can be thrown through a window. So, we will proceed to look at some of the different meanings associated with ‘reflexivity’ with a view to deciphering the agendas associated with those meanings. If (as I assume) the objective is to shatter a few windows, the next step is to decide on ways forward through political judgements about the specific realities those different agendas are likely to create.

The ‘new ontology’ (Hekman 2010: 88-89)

The reference here to ‘creating realities’ may sound strange. This argument is associated with what Susan Hekman calls the ‘new ontology’. Put briefly and over-simply, this development in feminist theory seeks to displace the endless debates over epistemology, debates that get bogged down on the issue of relativism. The new ontology, associated with authors like Donna Haraway (1997), Karen Barad (2003, 2007) and Annemarie Mol (2002), rests on the premise that our interventions shape different worlds. [The new ontology rejects both the fixed ontology of modernity and the linguistic constructionism of some postmodernist writers.]

I find Mol’s (1999) concept of ‘ontological politics’ particularly useful. Mol (1999: 74-75) suggests that reality is multiple but that we generally experience it as singular. Her examples are medical ones. She (2002: 81) refers to ‘the multiplication of a single disease and the coordination of this multitude into a singularity’. For example she talks about ‘different atheroscleroses’ as different *enactments* of atherosclerosis, one performed in the clinic and a second performed in the pathology laboratory. The former builds its understanding on patient symptoms and the latter on blood tests. Says Mol (1999: 77; emphasis added), these two atheroscleroses are ‘*different versions of the object*, versions that the tools help to enact’. Often these enactments cohere but at times they do not. Mol (2002: 95) explains, for example, how a ‘walking therapy’, proven effective at relieving symptoms, was de-privileged in comparison to more invasive therapies in the hospital she studied because there were budget cutbacks to the

physiotherapy department. The task then becomes identifying the specific practices of coordination and interference that shape reality as a particular singular experience (and what those practices suppress in the process) while trying to identify practices that disrupt realities we find oppressive and restrictive.

The 'turn to practice'.

The new ontology builds upon an analytic development described as the 'turn to practice' (Bacchi and Eveline 2010: 292-294). The idea here is that the world we know and the people we become are not fixed or predictable but are the outcome of practices.

Reality, it is argued, does not *precede* the mundane practices in which we 'interact' with 'it', but rather is shaped *within* these practices.

The reality we live with is 'one *performed* [or enacted] in a variety of practices' (Mol 1999: 74; emphasis added).

In this view, people's identities 'do not precede their performances, but are constituted in and through them' (Mol 2002: 38).

A key point is that, through the endless repetition of practices – the process of reiteration (Butler 1995: 135) – room is created for variation: 'the process of reiteration by which subjects are continuously constituted opens a space in which the constituting forces are open to be reworked' (Davies 2006: 428). Judith Butler (1993: 7) talks about gender being 'performed', about 'gendering', in order to capture the focus on movement, on 'doing'.

So, the turn to practice, like the notion of contestation, is a way of thinking that keeps a focus on movement and change rather than on fixity. These ways of thinking create the potential to disrupt realities (note the plural) we wish to alter.

How do these ideas relate to the concept of reflexivity?

Reflexivity: a troublesome term

Summarising the argument so far, I would like us to think about reflexivity as a contested concept. This entails thinking about the various meanings attached to it and the political agendas associated with those meanings. In line with the 'turn to practice' and the new ontology I suggest that we are produced as particular kinds of subjects through the practices in which we engage. Hence, attention needs to be directed to identifying *reflexive practices* that produce us as reflexive subjects. How, I now wish to ask, does this proposal line up (or not) with common understandings of reflexivity?

Like any other concept the term 'reflexivity' has a history and in this case a very long history. It is difficult to think of an important philosopher or anthropologist, including as examples Gouldner, Bourdieu, Habermas, Giddens and Beck, who does not have something to say about 'reflexivity', but they often mean different things by the term. Several disciplines, for example, sociology and science studies in the 1970s and 1980s (Latour and Woolgar 1979, Woolgar 1988) and poststructural organisation studies in the 1990s and 2000s (Chia 1996), have engaged in intensive debate about the concept.

Feminists in these disciplines and elsewhere have contributed to these discussions, as we shall see. Several authors (Denzin and Norman 1997; Marcus 1998; Macbeth 2001) have created typologies of reflexivity to try to sort through the various meanings. Some add the suggestion that perhaps we ought to talk about ‘greater or lesser forms of reflexivity’ (Holland 1999: 472). Needless to say this complex heritage poses problems for a talk such as this one and for programs such as OPERA, which include reflexivity as a key component.

Seigel (2005: 10) notes, helpfully, that there is a basic analytic distinction between ‘reflexivity’ and ‘reflectivity’ (see also Ashmore 1989: 48-49). Reflexivity, as Seigel describes, is linked etymologically to the notion of a ‘reflex’ reaction, an automatic or involuntary action, an uncontrolled response to a stimulus. The most obvious example is the one of the doctor tapping your knee lightly with a hammer to induce the *reflex* reaction of your leg shooting out involuntarily. Needless to say, this idea of a passive, instinctual response is NOT the meaning commonly associated with reflexivity in social theory. When we use the term we certainly do not intend it to mean that we have good reflexes! So, let us leave the etymological debate behind and consider what is implied in the term ‘reflectivity’ [On the etymological issue see Turner 2005: 770 and Naples 2003: 214 fns1 and 3].

Seigel (2005: 10; emphasis added) describes ‘reflectivity’ as one of the key dimensions of selfhood –

the human capacity to make both the world and our own existence objects of our active regard, to turn a kind of mirror [note link to ‘reflections’ as in a mirror] not only on phenomena in the world, including our bodies and our social relations, but on our consciousness too, *putting ourselves at a distance from our own being so as to examine, judge, and sometimes regulate or revise it.*

By contrast with the non-rational, instinctual, passive response associated with a reflex reaction, reflectivity implies a purposive and rational ability to reflect. Importantly for our discussion, reflectivity is held to be an innate human capacity. In fact, as Seigel describes it, it is what marks us as human.

I wish to argue that the term ‘reflectivity’, in that sense of an *innate* human capacity for self-awareness, raises our first ‘Hard Question’: just what kind of ‘self’ can reflect on itself? Is there not a circularity involved in the suggestion that one can ‘stand back’ and analyse ‘oneself’? I will be suggesting that there *is* a circularity here and that we need a different way to think about political subjectivity. Before I turn to this topic I want to indicate how reflexivity (or reflecting on oneself) has become such a pivotal topic in feminist theory.

Feminist theory and reflexivity

Two developments in feminist theory led to engagement with the concept of reflexivity:

- First, recognition that researchers bring perspectives and biases to the research they perform led to the conclusion that there needs to be *reflection* on the relationship between the researcher and the researched. Much feminist research starts from the suggestion that it is necessary to see the researcher as ‘located’ within her research. The work of Stanley and Wise (1983, 1993), Harding (1987, 2008) and Dorothy Smith (1987) deserves mention here.

- Second, the encounter between white, mainstream feminist theory and ‘women of colour’ feminists reinforced a concern with *one’s positioning* as a factor in one’s analysis. As a simple and often-repeated example, ‘women of colour’ pointed out that identifying the family as an oppressor of women, a common argument in mainstream white feminist theory in the 1970s and 1980s (Barrett and McIntosh 1982), sits uneasily with many Black women who often turn to their families as supports in a racist society (hooks 1987: 37).

Together these two impulses have produced numerous attempts to acknowledge the complexities of women’s lives and the relevance of ‘position’ (or ‘positioning’) to ‘truth’. We can see the term ‘intersectionality’ and the innovative concept of ‘equality+’ in QUING and OPERA as some of these attempts. The term ‘reflexivity’ is another.

That hard question we just asked – what kind of self can ‘reflect’ on itself? –, however, continues to haunt feminist theory, as well as much other social theory. Put in other words the question reads: how can a ‘positioned’ subject stand back from itself to become ‘aware’ of its positioning?

The ‘turn to practice’ offers a novel perspective on this question. It suggests that **we become who we are through our practices**. So, it is misleading to talk about reflexivity (or reflectivity) as some kind of innate human capacity. Rather than a fixed, unchanging human essence, subjects are **beings in process** (Davies et al. 2004: 368). While this might sound arcane and abstract, the point is simply to draw attention to how all of us have changed over time and the factors that contribute to that change. The suggestion is that **we change through practices, through what we do**. With this new perspective, attention shifts to our practices, to what we *do*.

This argument produces reflexivity as a different kind of proposal. Instead of calling for ‘self-reflection’, assuming that this is some sort of innate capacity, the suggestion is to examine our practices and to see what kinds of subjects those practices produce. Campbell (2004: 163) calls this position ‘constitutive reflexivity’. Such a position acknowledges the ‘impossibility of a thoroughly and nameable knowledge of oneself’ (Davies 2006: 436), while still giving us a target for analysis – our practices.

With this analytic perspective (‘constitutive reflexivity’) we get a new question – how do we go about identifying reflexive practices? This also, of course, is a Hard Question. Remember that hard questions are good things, questions we should invite and encourage because they impel us to think outside dominant frames of reference. So, let’s see where this question takes us.

Chela Sandoval (2000) has contributed significantly to this project with her articulation of a ‘methodology of the oppressed’. I offer the ‘what’s the problem represented to be?’ (WPR) approach as a technology or resource to add to Sandoval’s list of ‘skills’. I am recommending the application of the questions in a WPR approach to our own proposals for change *as a reflexive practice*, as elaborated below.

Practising reflexivity: the WPR approach

Some of you will be familiar with this approach to policy analysis, introduced in *Women, Policy and Politics* (Bacchi 1999) and more recently developed in *Analysing Policy* (Bacchi 2009). The approach consists of a series of questions that provide a way of interrogating the deep-seated assumptions and presuppositions (the conceptual logics, discourses or assumed ‘knowledges’) in policy proposals. The approach builds on Foucault’s (1984) interest in the concept of problematisation as a fertile entry-point for thinking about thinking.

Put simply, what we propose to do about something reveals what we think ought to change and hence what we assume or represent the ‘problem’ to be. I take this commonsense insight and apply it to public policies. One starts with the policy proposal and works backwards to see what the ‘problem’ is assumed to be. For example, if one proposes training programs for women as a way to increase their representation in positions of influence, the assumption is that women are underrepresented *because* they lack training (this is how the ‘problem’ of women’s under-representation is understood in this proposal). A WPR analysis proceeds to uncover the presuppositions that accompany this representation of the ‘problem’, identifies possible limitations in this way of thinking about the ‘problem’, and encourages consideration of other possible representations of the ‘problem’ (‘problem representations’). The goal of the analysis is to reveal the complex relations of power through which we are governed.

The ‘what’s the problem represented to be?’ (WPR) approach includes the following six questions and concluding directive:

- What’s the ‘problem’ represented to be in a specific policy?
- What presuppositions or assumptions underlie this representation of the ‘problem’?
- How has this representation of the ‘problem’ come about?
- Can the ‘problem’ be thought about differently?
- What effects are produced by this representation of the ‘problem’? Consider discursive effects, subjectification effects and lived effects.
- How/where has this representation of the ‘problem’ been produced and defended? How/where has it been contested?
- **Apply this list of questions to your own proposals for change, focusing on how these proposals represent the ‘problem’.**

(adapted from Bacchi 2009: xii)

Note the directive at the end of the six questions to apply the questions to *one’s own* proposals and the problem representations they contain.

I wish to highlight the usefulness of this directive as a *reflexive practice*. Put simply, applying these six questions to our own policy proposals allows us to consider the extent to which we may inadvertently be complicit in oppressive modes of governing.

Questions 1 and 2 call upon practitioners and researchers to examine our own policy proposals and the presuppositions and knowledges upon which they depend. This is not a simple task. In *Women, Policy and Politics* I apply the approach to a range of policy interventions that are frequently endorsed by feminists and show how specific proposals produce the ‘problem’ as a particular sort of problem. As one example (Bacchi 1999: Chapter 9) I discuss how the proposal that domestic violence be categorised as a form of ‘assault’ tends to produce the ‘problem’ as a ‘law and order’ problem. With this starting point it becomes possible to consider the up-sides and down-sides of this form of intervention, considering, for example, how it can lead to stigmatisation of the men of some ‘races’ and classes.

Question 3 encourages an examination of the genealogy of particular policy ‘problems’ so that we can gain a sense of the forces at play in shaping certain problem representations.

Question 4 encourages a rethinking of the ‘problem’. That is, it encourages analysts to consider problem representations associated with proposals put forward by others. You can see here an in-built reflexive impulse [we’ll return to this difficult task of *listening* to the problematisations of others in a moment].

Question 5 confronts researchers and practitioners to think through the ‘effects’ of their proposals. I identify three kinds of interconnected ‘effects’: discursive effects, subjectification effects and lived effects. ‘Discursive effects’ calls upon us to think through the ways in which particular knowledges, for example, psychology, social work and medicine, frame an issue in particular ways, and how we may have unthinkingly accepted these knowledges as forms of ‘truth’. ‘Subjectification effects’ directs attention to how various ‘actors’ are positioned within particular understandings of the ‘problem’. Because the researcher or practitioner is one of these actors, there is an opportunity here to perform a ‘double movement’ – studying oneself through one’s proposals and what they assume, examining the constitutive forces that have produced us. Lived effects are the material effects of specific problematisations. We are not dealing here with linguistic determinism. In tune with the new ontology, we are dealing with the worlds created by forms of problematisation.

Question 6 re-emphasises this position by directing attention to overt and analysable forms of contestation over the representation of the issue. Again we are alerted to the need to consider alternative representations of a ‘problem’.

Together these questions produce a form of what Shore and Wright (1999: 572) call ‘political reflexivity’. As they describe, political reflexivity ‘is about understanding critically the way individuals, as social persons, are positioned within systems of governance and how concepts, categories, boundaries, hierarchies and processes of subjectification are experienced and culturally reproduced’.ⁱ

Returning to our theme for today, the greatest challenge faced when discussing reflexivity is **what to do about it, how to proceed**. My argument is that it is not enough to say simply that we need to *be* reflexive, assuming that it is an innate human capacity. Rather, given the perspective developed in the ‘turn to practice’ – that we are shaped through practices – I argue that, in order to *become* reflexive, we need to engage in

reflexive practices. Today I am putting forward the WPR approach as a set of guidelines to practise reflexivity.

Now I am well aware that some authors feel that any attempt to determine a methodology for reflexivity in advance is ‘self-defeating’ because it ignores the need to preserve fluidity (Stronach et al. 2007: 193). However, I am unhappy with leaving the issue of *what to do* in limbo. It seems to me that the WPR approach preserves an open-ended, experiential mode of interacting. It does this by producing **guidelines that are questions**. Since questions – and by now you can tell that I am very fond of questions – invoke ‘reflection’ and avoid closure, I see questioning as a useful reflexive practice. We now have something to do, to practice, which in the process of being executed produces us as new kinds of ‘reflexive’ subject.

So I hope I am providing a very practical intervention. I suggest that, in exchanges and interactions, each person involved in gender analysis examines their proposals for change through the six questions in the WPR approach. My recent book, *Analysing Policy: What’s the problem represented to be?* (Pearson Education 2009) provides more detailed guidance on how to apply the questions.

Listening to other problematisations

I identified Question 4 as the question most clearly associated with reflexivity, because it calls upon researchers and practitioners to explore the problematisations offered by others and hence to confront potential limitations in their own problematisations.

Question 4 asks: ‘Can the “problem” be thought about differently?’

By this stage in a WPR analysis we have performed our deconstruction of assumed knowledges (Questions 1, 2 and 3). Hence we are moving to the **more positive, reconstructive stage**. But how can we access novel perspectives? How can we recover other ways of understanding a ‘problem’?

Here it is possible to talk about the need for a **kind of training** which Arendt (1982: 43 in Barr and Griffiths 2004: 91-92) describes as ‘training the imagination to go travelling’. In explaining how I envisage such training, I will draw links with the opening comments about the ‘learnings’ that were generated by the Gender Analysis Project in Western and South Australia.

I mentioned at the outset that, as GAP developed over four years, Joan Eveline and I paid more and more attention to the issue of reflexivity. This was because of certain things that happened and things we had learned in the process of conducting the project. We tell these stories in *Mainstreaming Politics*.

One ‘learning’ was the realisation that we (Joan and I) had unthinkingly placed a priority on the concept ‘gender’ and that this priority created dilemmas for the Aboriginal women associated with the project.

Chapter 10 in *Mainstreaming Politics* relates how in Western Australia the Aboriginal women involved in the project expressed forthrightly their disinclination to associate

themselves with a white, feminist concept (i.e. 'gender') that, in their view, undermined the status of their men. The Chapter also shows how they successfully reframed an Indigenous electoral strategy that increased the participation of Aboriginal women *without mentioning gender*.

Through this experience Joan and I came to understand that there are many ways to 'do' gender and that they do not necessarily involve articulation of the concept 'gender'.

Similarly in South Australia the starting assumption that the 'problem' to be addressed by gender analysis was *gender bias* came into question. The Aboriginal women associated with the project insisted that 'cultural analysis' had to become a part of the framework. Again we white, academic researchers came to understand the need for this reframing through active engagement with and listening to these Aboriginal women. In other words, new ways of representing the 'problem' came from on-the-ground engagement and listening. The message here is in tune with the broader finding of the GAP project that those who *actually performed* gender analysis were the ones most likely to recognise its usefulness. That is, change – a slow, ongoing and always unfinished process – requires practice and engagement.

In Chapter 13 of *Mainstreaming Politics* Joan and I attempt to theorise this learning. Our goal was to identify the *practices* that allowed us to rethink the place of 'gender' in the project. One such practice was 'deep listening'.

I have used the term 'listening' several times in the talk today. Indeed, the heading for our current topic is '*listening* to other problematisations'.

My goal here is to suggest the usefulness of replacing the more common metaphor of sight in discussions of reflexivity with the metaphor of listening.

Metaphors are more than literary devices. They shape interactions in many ways (see Lakoff and Johnson 1990; Grimshaw 2000). Maxine Greene (Greene and Griffiths 2002: 85) notes that a 'metaphor is what it does'. Because of the way it 'brings together things that are unlike', it 're-orient[s] consciousness, which customarily connects things that are alike'.

As mentioned, when talking about reflexivity, we most commonly use *visual* metaphors. We 'see' reflections in a mirror. We turn the 'gaze' on ourselves. In this way visual metaphors are intrinsic to that hard question I raised at the outset – what kind of self can reflect on itself? The metaphor of sight, I'd suggest, implies a privileged 'I/eye' (or self) that can provide 'insights' and 'overviews'.

Donna Haraway (1997: 16, 34) and Karen Barad (2007: 87-89) make a similar point when they suggest replacing the metaphor 'reflexivity' with the metaphor 'diffraction'. Both authors are dissatisfied with the suggestion that one can make a significant contribution to feminist political practice simply by 'reflecting' on oneself. In Barad's view, reflexivity, which incorporates the idea of reflections in a mirror, involves a reproduction of the same. Her suggestion, with Haraway, is that we need a more active metaphor, that of diffraction, a physical process by which light rays produce different patterns. According to Haraway (1997: 88) diffraction offers a way of understanding the

world from within and as part of it, instead of suggesting that it is possible to reflect on the world from outside.

While I can see the usefulness of diffraction as metaphor, it seems to me that it is a difficult concept for those of us who are not scientists. Hence I suggest that we explore the metaphor of 'listening'.

By contrast to 'sight', *listening* by its nature involves *more than one* person. It is an embodied, *inter-subjective* activity. Hence, as with diffraction, it makes the 'I' (or self) *part of the interaction* instead of implying an ability to distance oneself to enable an 'overview'.

Several authors (Bickford 1996; Calder 2009) point out that listening is commonly devalued as a democratic practice. We talk for example about the right to free speech but too little is said about the right to be heard. However, one possible limitation in turning to 'listening' as a new metaphor for reflexivity is that it may appear to be just as passive as 'looking in a mirror'. For this reason Joan and I (2010; Chapter 13) suggest exploring the Aboriginal concept of 'deep listening' or *Dadirre* (Gabb and McDermott 2007: 5). This concept, developed among transcultural mental health practitioners, emphasises that listening is both an inter-subjective and an inter-*active* practice. *Dadirri* refers to listening with both 'heart and ears', challenging a purely cognitive activity. And, pointedly, it insists that it is not enough just to listen, that deep listening entails 'an obligation to contemplate in real time everything that you hear – to self-reflect as you listen, and then, tellingly, to *act* on what you've registered' (Gabb and McDermott 2007: 5; emphasis in original). This insistence on responsive action echoes Barad's (2007) and Haraway's (1997) use of the diffraction metaphor to insist that our reflections make a difference.

A hard question remains: what kinds of engagement can lead to deep listening and responsive actions/practices?

Most of the writing on this topic, including *Mainstreaming Politics*, emphasises on-the-ground, *face-to-face* interactions.

Cynthia Cockburn's (1998) path-breaking work on how women on opposing sides in nationalist struggles work to recognise and deal with their contrasting politics is exemplary. Cockburn worked alongside women in Bosnia, Belfast and Israel-Palestine, exploring how these women engaged in what she called 'rooting' and 'shifting': 'each woman stayed "rooted" in her own position, while "shifting" towards other women in the dialogue by recognising their specific positionings, and her own unfinished knowledge about them' (Barr and Griffiths 2004: 8). In Cockburn's work it is clear that *living alongside 'other' women*, if only for a short period, encouraged these 'rooting' and 'shifting' practices.

Referring back to the 'learnings' from GAP Joan and I note that on-the-ground application of gender analysis procedures was most likely to spark recognition of the usefulness of those procedures. 'Learning by doing' in *face-to-face* interactions appears to be necessary for significant change to occur.

However, I think we all recognise that new perspectives on issues can emerge from other than face-to-face encounters. In producing *Women, Policy and Politics* (Bacchi 1999) the *writings* of women of colour (e.g. Crenshaw 1988; Iyer 1993; Ng 1993) proved to be critical in allowing me to identify alternative problematisations, problematisations that caused me to rethink my own proposals.

In the current technological age it is necessary to broaden the range of potentially transformative experiences beyond the print media. Barr and Griffiths (2004: 20) usefully talk about the ‘web of relations’ associated with the new technologies, a mix of ‘cyber links, of face-to-face conferences and seminars, and through traditionally printed books and desk-top published material’. Online training, therefore, can usefully be located as part of this ‘web of relations’, especially in the emphasis placed in OPERA on the sharing of experiences in online interactions.

I am suggesting then that ‘listening’ as a metaphor puts the emphasis on the listener (who is *practising* listening) rather than on the varied sources for alternative views. It highlights active engagement, becoming a part of the interaction, rather than ‘distancing’ as essential to reflexivity.

Moving towards some conclusions

Questions of terminology

I have pointed out that the term ‘reflexivity’ has a long and complex heritage and that it is associated, etymologically, with a kind of knee-jerk reflex reaction that is the opposite of what is intended when the term is used in feminist and social theory. Should we then drop the term ‘reflexivity’ and start referring to ‘reflectivity’, as Nancy Naples suggests (2003: 214 fn 1). I don’t think so. In fact I think that ‘reflectivity’ has just as many unfortunate associations as ‘reflexivity’, particularly the idea that self-awareness is simply an innate human characteristic. The issue then is **not the word we use but the proposals that accompany it.**

So let us keep the term ‘reflexivity’ but ensure that it is supported and elaborated by identifying *reflexive practices*, the ‘doings’ that create the openings for making a difference. I have offered the WPR approach as a reflexive practice and am suggesting that it offers a way to give substance to the oft-repeated but vague suggestions about the need for reflexivity. It calls upon all researchers and practitioners to examine their own proposals for change, to consider how those proposals represent the ‘problem’ under scrutiny, to identify the unquestioned presuppositions that underpin that thinking and to listen to alternative problematisations.

I’d like to end by addressing two concerns often raised about reflexivity.

I call the first concern, that of ‘infinite regress’. This is the suggestion that the intensive questioning associated with reflexive practices can deflect attention away from really ‘useful’ political activities – actually doing something. This is the common critique that reflexivity is nothing more than narcissistic navel-gazing (Pillow 2003: 176) and that it induces a kind of paralysis (Davies et al. 2004: 374) – we are so concerned to ensure that we are not imposing our assumptions and views on others that we become afraid to do anything.

A related concern is the impracticality of reflexivity in a world of evidence-based policy (Bacchi 2009: xvi) – how can you claim *authority* for your position while problematising it? Clearly this is a *Very Hard Question*.

On this point recall that the WPR approach aims to reveal the complex relations of power through which we are governed. Hence, it puts in question not only the authority of practitioners and researchers but also the authority of dominant frameworks like ‘evidence-based policy’. In this way it exposes practices that install oppressive realities while creating a ‘hearing aid’ to listen to alternative problematisations. It is, I believe, a practical and empowering intervention.

Today I’ve suggested that hard questions are something to invite, not something to avoid – that they can be seen as prompts for reflexive engagement. They signal a different way of thinking – a way of thinking that **does not look for simple answers** but that celebrates questioning. On that note, I wish you ‘happy questioning’.

* I would like to thank Jennifer Bonham, Anne Wilson and Malin Rönnblom for helpful comments on this paper. Thanks to Anne also for some research assistance and to Benito Cao for assistance with translating some concepts.

ⁱ I would like to thank Malin Rönnblom for drawing this reference to my attention.

References

- Ahmed, S. 2007. ‘“You end up doing the document rather than doing the doing”: Diversity, race equality and the politics of documentation’, *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30(4): 590-609.
- Arendt, H. 1982. *Lectures on Kant’s Political Philosophy*, edited by R. Breiner. Chicago: University of Chicago Books.
- Ashmore, M. 1989. *The Reflexive Thesis: Wrioting Sociology of Scientific Knowledge*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bacchi, C. 1999. *Women, Policy and Politics: the construction of policy problems*. London: Sage.
- Bacchi, C. 2009. *Analysing Policy: What’s the problem represented to be?* Frenchs Forest: Pearson Education.
- Bacchi, C. and Eveline, J. 2010. *Mainstreaming Politics: Gendering Practices and Feminist Theory*. Adelaide: University of Adelaide Press.
- Barad, K. 2003. ‘Posthumanist Performativity: Toward an Understanding of How Matter Comes to Matter’, *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 28(3): 801-831.
- Barad, K. 2007. *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Durham & London: Duke University Press.
- Barr, J. and Griffiths, M. 2004. ‘Training the imagination to go visiting’, in J. Nixon and M. Walker (eds) *Reclaiming Universities from a Runaway World*. Maidenhead, London: Maidenhead SRHE and Open University Press. pp. 85-99.

-
- Barrett, M. and McIntosh, M. 1982. *The Anti-social Family*. London: Verso.
- Bickford, S. 1996. *The Dissonance of Democracy: Listening, Conflict, and Citizenship*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Butler, J. 1993. *Bodies that matter: on the discursive limits of 'sex'*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J. 1995 'For a careful reading' in S. Benhabib, J. Butler, D. Cornell and N. Fraser (eds) *Feminist contentions. A philosophical exchange*. New York: Routledge. pp. 127-143.
- Calder, G. 2009. 'Listening, Democracy and the Environment', *In-Spire Journal of Law, Politics and Societies* 4(2): 26-41.
- Campbell, K. 2004. 'The Promise of Feminist Reflexivities: Developing Donna Haraway's Project for Feminist Science Studies', *Hypatia* 19(1): 162-182.
- Chia, R. 1996. 'The problem of reflexivity in organisational research', *Organization* 3(1): 31-59.
- Cockburn, C. 1998. *The Space Between Us: Negotiating gender and national identities in conflict*. London and New York: Zed Books.
- Crenshaw, K. 1988. 'Race, Reform, and Retrenchment: Transformation and Legitimation in Antidiscrimination Law', *Harvard Law Review* 101(7): 1331-87.
- Davies, B. 2006. 'Subjectification: the relevance of Butler's analysis for education', *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 27(4): 425-438.
- Davies, B., Browne, J., Gannon, S., Honan, E., Laws, C., Mueller-Rockstroh, B., and Bendix Petersen, E. 2004. 'The Ambivalent Practices of Reflexivity', *Qualitative Inquiry* 10(3): 360-389.
- Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. 1988. *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. London: Athlone Press.
- Denzin, N. and Norman, K. 1997. *Interpretive ethnography: Ethnographic practices for the 21st century*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Foucault, M. 1984. 'Polemics, Politics and Problematizations', based on an interview conducted by P. Rabinow, Trans. L. Davis, in *Essential Works of Foucault, Vol. 1: Ethics*. New Press: New York. www.foucault.info/foucault/interview.html, accessed 9 August 2008.
- Gabb, D. and McDermott, D. 2007. 'What do Indigenous experiences and perspectives mean for transcultural mental health? Towards a new model of transcultural teaching for health professionals'. Conference paper, *Psychology & Indigenous Australians: Teaching practice & theory*, Adelaide, South Australia.
- Greene, M. and Griffiths, M. 2002. 'Feminism, philosophy and education: Imagining public spaces', in N. Blake, P. Smeyers, R. Smith and P. Standish (eds) *Blackwell Guide to the Philosophy of Education*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Grimshaw, J. 2000. 'Philosophy and the Feminist Imagination', in S. Ahmed, J. Kilby, C. Lary, M McNeil and B. Skeggs (eds) *Transformations: Thinking Through Feminism*. London and New York: Routledge.

-
- Haraway, D. 1997. *Modest_Witness@Second_Millennium*. New York: Routledge.
- Harding, S. (ed.) 1987. *Feminism and Methodology: Social Science Issues*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Harding, S. 2008. *Sciences from below: Feminism, postcolonialism and modernities*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Hekman, S. 2010. *The Material of Knowledge: Feminist Disclosures*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.
- Holland, R. 1999. 'Reflexivity', *Human Relations* 52(4): 463-484.
- hooks, b. 1987. *Feminist Theory: from Margin to Center*. 3rd edition. Boston: South End Press.
- Iyer, N. 1993. 'Categorical Denials: Equality Rights and the Shaping of Social Identity', *Queen's Law Journal* 19: 179-207.
- Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. 1990. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Latour, B. and Woolgar, S. 1979. *Laboratory Life: the social construction of scientific facts*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Livholts, M. 2008. 'Relocating Dislocation in Writing?', paper presented at Women's Worlds Conference, Madrid, 3-9 July.
- Macbeth, D. 2001. 'On "reflexivity" in qualitative research: Two readings and a third', *Qualitative Inquiry* 7(1): 35-68.
- Marcus, G. 1998. 'What comes (just) after "post"? The case of ethnography' in N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (eds) *The landscape of qualitative research: Theories and issues*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage. pp. 383-406.
- Mol, A. 1999. 'Ontological politics: A word and some questions', in J. Law and J. Hassard (eds) *Actor Network Theory and After. Sociological Review Monograph*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 74-89.
- Mol, A. 2002. *The Body Multiple: Ontology in Medical Practice*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Naples, N. 2003. *Feminism and Method: Ethnography, Discourse Analysis and Activist Research*. New York: Routledge.
- Ng, R. 1993. ' "A Woman out of Control": Deconstructing Sexism and Racism in the University', *Canadian Journal of Education* 18(3): 188-97.
- Pillow, W. 2003. 'Confession, catharsis, or cure? Rethinking the uses of reflexivity as methodological power in qualitative research', *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education* 16(2): 175-196.
- Sandoval, C. 2000. *Methodology of the Oppressed*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Seigel, J. E. 2005. *The idea of the self: Thought and experience in Western Europe since the seventeenth century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shore, C. and Wright, S. 1999. 'Audit Culture and Anthropology: Neo-Liberalism in British Higher Education', *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 5(4): 557-575.

Smith, D. 1987. *The Everyday World as Problematic: A Feminist Sociology*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Stanley, L. and Wise, S. 1983. *Breaking Out: Feminist Consciousness and Feminist Research*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Stanley, L. and Wise, S. 1993. *Breaking Out Again: Feminist Ontology and Epistemology*. London: Routledge.

Stronach, I., Garratt, D., Pierce, C. and Piper, H. 2007. 'Reflexivity, the Picturing of Selves, the Forging of Method', *Qualitative Inquiry* 13(2): 179-203.

Tanesini, A. 1994. 'Whose Language?', in K. Lennon and M. Whitford (eds) *Knowing the Difference: Feminist Perspectives in Epistemology*. New York: Routledge.

Turner, B. S. 2005. 'Review article: The self, religion, and the sociological tradition', *The Sociological Review* 53(4): 769-774.

Woolgar, S. (ed.) 1988. *Knowledge and reflexivity: New frontiers in the sociology of knowledge*. London: Sage.