

**Training for nonviolent conflict transformation.
Analysing the relevance and effectiveness
of trainings for peace activists.
An evaluation of the international trainings of KURVE Wustrow –
Centre for Training and Networking in Nonviolent Action.**

A Thesis
Presented to
The Alice Salomon Hochschule
-University of Applied Sciences-
Alice-Salomon-Platz 5
D-12627 Berlin

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts
“Intercultural Conflict Management”

By
Sophia Stappel
and
Laura Weber

April, 2016

The M.A. thesis of Sophia Stappel is approved:

Alissa Brooks

Alfredo Langa Herrera

Alice Salomon Hochschule, Berlin

April, 2016

The M.A. thesis of Laura Weber is approved:

Alfredo Langa Herrera

Alissa Brooks

Alice Salomon Hochschule, Berlin

April, 2016

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|------|
| Table of Contents..... | iv |
| List of Figures..... | viii |
| Acknowledgements..... | ix |
| Instrument for Individual Assessment..... | x |
| List of abbreviations..... | xi |
| Abstract..... | xii |
| 1. Introduction..... | 1 |
| 2. KURVE Wustrow – Centre for Networking and Training in Nonviolent Action..... | 4 |
| 2.1. Fields of Activity and Organisational Structure..... | 5 |
| 2.2. Theoretical and Contextual Framework of KURVE’s activities: Nonviolence and Conflict Transformation..... | 6 |
| 2.3. The Training Unit..... | 7 |
| 2.4. The International Training Work of KURVE Wustrow..... | 8 |
| 2.4.1. Theory of Change..... | 8 |
| 2.4.2. Standards, working principles..... | 8 |
| 2.4.3. Target groups..... | 9 |
| 2.4.4. Selection criteria, process etc..... | 10 |
| 2.4.5. Theoretical and Contextual Framework of KURVE’s training work..... | 10 |
| 2.4.5.1. Learning..... | 10 |
| 2.4.5.2. Adult Education..... | 11 |
| 2.4.5.3. Trainings and trainers..... | 12 |
| 2.4.5.4. Training in Conflict Transformation..... | 12 |
| 3. Profile of the Activity Evaluated: Practitioner Trainings..... | 14 |
| 4. Methodological approach..... | 17 |
| 4.1. Qualitative evaluation research..... | 17 |
| 4.2. Evaluation as a participatory process..... | 18 |
| 4.3. The evaluators..... | 20 |
| 4.4. Triangulation of methods (of data collection) and data..... | 20 |
| 4.4.1. Desk study and analysis of relevant..... | 20 |
| 4.4.2. Participatory observation..... | 21 |
| 4.4.3. Qualitative interviews (structured and semi-structured)..... | 23 |
| 4.4.4. Group interviews..... | 25 |
| 4.4.5. Qualitative questionnaires..... | 26 |
| 4.4.6. Theoretical research..... | 26 |
| 4.5. Sampling of resource persons..... | 27 |
| 4.6. Data analysis..... | 28 |
| 4.7. Limitations..... | 29 |
| 5. Findings on Relevance..... | 30 |

| | | |
|----------|--|----|
| 5.1. | Introduction | 30 |
| 5.2. | Who are “the participants”? | 33 |
| 5.3. | Motivations and Expectations of Participants | 34 |
| 5.3.1. | Activists..... | 36 |
| 5.3.2. | NGOs (staff members) | 37 |
| 5.3.3. | International Peace Workers | 40 |
| 5.3.4. | Trainees..... | 41 |
| 5.4. | Reactions of participants during or after the trainings..... | 41 |
| 5.4.1. | Contents | 41 |
| 5.4.2. | Appropriateness of the over-all setting | 45 |
| 5.5. | Conclusion | 49 |
| 6. | Findings Effectiveness | 50 |
| 6.1. | Introduction | 50 |
| 6.2. | Objectives and Approach | 51 |
| 6.3. | Training Validity..... | 52 |
| 6.3.1. | Trainers and Approach to Facilitation | 52 |
| 6.3.2. | Language..... | 54 |
| 6.3.3. | Group..... | 55 |
| 6.3.4. | Length of Trainings | 57 |
| 6.3.5. | Level and Depth of Trainings | 58 |
| 6.3.6. | Methodology | 58 |
| 6.3.6.1. | Practice-Orientation | 59 |
| 6.3.6.2. | Examples and Contextualisation | 60 |
| 6.3.6.3. | Experience-Orientation | 60 |
| 6.3.6.4. | Group Work and Mutual Learning | 61 |
| 6.3.7. | Exchange..... | 62 |
| 6.3.8. | Networking..... | 62 |
| 6.3.9. | Transition from Training to Work | 63 |
| 6.3.10. | Preparing the Trainings..... | 63 |
| 6.3.11. | Preparation of Transfer during the Training..... | 63 |
| 6.3.12. | Processing and Reflection of Contents..... | 64 |
| 6.3.13. | Reaction to the Trainings | 65 |
| 6.3.14. | Plans for Implementation..... | 65 |
| 6.4. | Transfer Validity | 66 |
| 6.4.1. | Application of Skills | 66 |
| 6.4.2. | Factors Influencing the Application..... | 68 |
| 6.4.3. | Follow-Up..... | 70 |
| 6.4.4. | Networking..... | 70 |
| 7. | Discussion on Relevance | 72 |
| 7.1. | Developing the Training Concept | 72 |

| | | |
|----------|--|-----|
| 7.1.1. | Relevance of trainings as a form of capacity building for peace workers .. | 72 |
| 7.1.2. | Profile of the Trainings | 73 |
| 7.2. | Selection of participants | 77 |
| 7.2.1. | Selection criteria | 77 |
| 7.2.2. | Application procedure – selecting eligible participants – Querying of motivation and expectations and needed skills..... | 78 |
| 7.3. | Conducting the Trainings | 81 |
| 7.3.1. | Ensuring Relevance for Participants..... | 81 |
| 7.3.2. | Creating an atmosphere of well-being | 83 |
| 7.4. | Monitor and Evaluate the Training..... | 85 |
| 8. | Discussion Effectiveness..... | 86 |
| 8.1. | Training Validity..... | 86 |
| 8.1.1. | Trainers..... | 86 |
| 8.1.2. | Language..... | 87 |
| 8.1.3. | Group..... | 87 |
| 8.1.4. | Length of Trainings | 88 |
| 8.1.5. | Level and Depth of Trainings | 89 |
| 8.1.6. | Methodology | 89 |
| 8.1.6.1. | Practice-Orientation | 89 |
| 8.1.6.2. | Examples and Contextualisation | 90 |
| 8.1.6.3. | Experience-Orientation | 90 |
| 8.1.6.4. | Group Work and Mutual Learning | 91 |
| 8.1.6.5. | Exchange..... | 91 |
| 8.1.7. | Networking..... | 92 |
| 8.2. | Transition | 92 |
| 8.2.1. | Preparation of Trainings..... | 92 |
| 8.2.2. | Preparation of Transfer during the Training | 92 |
| 8.2.3. | Processing and Reflection of Contents..... | 93 |
| 8.3. | Reaction to Trainings | 93 |
| 8.4. | Plans for Implementation..... | 93 |
| 8.5. | Transfer Validity | 94 |
| 8.5.1. | Application | 94 |
| 8.5.2. | Factors influencing the Application..... | 94 |
| 8.5.3. | Follow-Up..... | 95 |
| 8.5.4. | Networking..... | 96 |
| 8.5.5. | IPWs | 96 |
| 8.6. | Results Effectiveness..... | 97 |
| 8.7. | Other..... | 99 |
| 8.7.1. | Communication between different stakeholders | 99 |
| 8.7.2. | Power Imbalances and Representations | 100 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 9. Conclusion | 102 |
| 10. References | 106 |
| 11. ANNEX | 109 |
| Annex 1: Email Questionnaires..... | 109 |
| Annex 2: Terms of Reference | 111 |
| Annex 3: List of Best Practices for Facilitators: | 117 |
| Annex 4: Indicators for the Training Objectives Named by KURVE:..... | 118 |
| Annex 5: AGDF/QVB-Standards and the Training Offers by KURVE: | 120 |
| Annex 6: Timeline of the Evaluation..... | 121 |
| Annex 7: List of Resource Persons..... | 122 |
| Annex 8: Application form for Practitioners Training Series – Fall 2015..... | 125 |

List of Figures

Table 1: List of Resource Persons

27

Acknowledgements

We want to thank all participants and trainers of the practitioner trainings in autumn 2015 for welcoming us and for their contribution to the evaluation. We are furthermore thankful to all respondents of questionnaires and interviews for taking the time and providing valuable feedback and input about the international training work of KURVE Wustrow. And we want to express our gratitude to all those who supported us during the evaluation in various ways, among them the staff of KURVE and our supervisors.

Instrument for Individual Assessment

While this thesis was researched and written collaboratively, it is understood that each candidate will be assessed individually. Below is a breakdown of the sections of the thesis with an indication of the primary contributor. The approximate final word count stands as follows:

Stappel 23,000; Weber 22,100 total: 45,100

| SECTION | PRIMARY CONTRIBUTOR |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| I. INTRODUCTION | Weber |
| II. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT | Weber |
| III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY | Stappel |
| IV. FINDINGS | |
| Relevance | Stappel |
| Effectiveness | Weber |
| V. DISCUSSION | |
| Relevance | Stappel |
| Effectiveness | Weber |
| VI. CONCLUSION | Stappel |

List of abbreviations

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| AGDF | Aktionsgemeinschaft Dienste für den Frieden |
| Anti-Bias | Anti-Bias and Social Inclusion - Prejudice Awareness for Peace Work |
| CPS | Civil Peace Service |
| DAC | Development Assistance Committee (of the OECD) |
| DNH | Do No Harm |
| IPW | International Peace Worker |
| IT | International Training |
| LPW | Local Peace Worker |
| PO | Partner Organisation |
| PT | Practitioner Training |
| QVB | Qualifizierungsverbund |
| RIT | Regional International Training |
| CSO | Civil Society Organisation |
| K | KURVE staff |
| NGO | Non-Governmental Organisation |
| O | Organisation |
| Organisational Change | Managing Organisational Change in Non-Governmental Organisations |
| P | Participant |
| PME | Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation/ Project Management for Peace Work |
| Strategizing Change | Strategizing Change for Social Movements |
| Stress and Trauma | Counselling in Stress and Trauma for Peace Work |
| T | Trainers |
| Utilising Media | Utilising the Media for Campaigning and Advocacy |

Abstract

Training for nonviolent conflict transformation.

Analysing the relevance and effectiveness

of trainings for peace activists.

**An evaluation of the international trainings of KURVE Wustrow –
Centre for Training and Networking in Nonviolent Action.**

An Abstract of the thesis by

Sophia Stappel

and

Laura Weber

This master thesis is the result of evaluating the Practitioner Trainings for Civil and Nonviolent Conflict Transformation that are conducted by the German NGO KURVE Wustrow – Centre for Training and Networking in Nonviolent Action. The two criteria Relevance and Effectiveness were at centre of the evaluation and data was collected via qualitative research methods such as participating observation, interviews and questionnaires. The results of the evaluation show that this measure of capacity building for international peace and movement workers is successful and relevant. Anyhow there are various possibilities and needs for change and improvement to increase relevance and effectiveness for the participants of the trainings – among them an unarticulated concept and the lack of follow-up. The results and recommendations that the researchers collected together with their resource persons, should help to improve and adjust future trainings of KURVE Wustrow and ideally other organisations which are training peace practitioners.

1. Introduction

“Training, after all, forms the backbone of one of conflict transformation's primary strategies: capacity building.” (Austin 2011: 219)

While military intervention is usually referred to as the last resort, civil means of dealing with conflicts get much less attention and funding (cf. Müller 2013:11).¹ But while war and armed conflict are most visible to outsiders, they are only the peak of conflicts that have usually started long before. Moreover, the resorted violence has still an enormous impact on respective societies long after fighting has stopped. Actors working for conflict transformation acknowledge that conflicts are not solved when the fighting is put to an end and aim at changing the underlying conditions that led or may lead to violence. According to the Berghof Foundation, conflict transformation is a

“generic, comprehensive term referring to actions and processes which seek to alter the various characteristics and manifestations of conflict by addressing the root causes of a particular conflict over the long term. It aims to transform negative destructive conflict into positive constructive conflict and deals with structural, behavioural and attitudinal aspects of conflict. The term refers to both the process and the completion of the process. As such it incorporates the activities of processes such as Conflict Prevention and Conflict Resolution and goes farther than conflict settlement or conflict management. (Austin et al. 2004:464)

Many Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) are engaged in conflict or post-conflict contexts, trying to transform conflicts. People working on the grassroots level of society are important for that aspiration, which is a long process, tackling many aspects of society. Thus civil conflict transformation is a demanding field and needs competent practitioners. One effort to support them are trainings for capacity building for peace workers. Those trainings are one of the most frequent methods that local and international organisations use as form of peace work (cf. Schweitzer 2009:54). Their aim is to support people who are engaged in conflict transformation by imparting new knowledge, skills and ideas (ibid.).

One of the organisations that offer capacity building trainings for practitioners in conflict transformation is KURVE Wustrow in Germany. It is a small association that was founded in the 1980s in Wendland region in connection to the anti-nuclear movement

¹ The German Ministry of Defence for example has a budget of 34 billion Euros in 2016 while the Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development works with 7.4 billion Euros in the same year, of which the Civil Peace Service programme receives 42 million Euros. (see <http://www.bundeshaushalt-info.de/#/2016/soll/ausgaben/einzelplan.html>)

there. Its aim is to spread nonviolence and since the early days providing trainings is among their most important activities. Today KURVE offers a variety of trainings for international practitioners.

In order to assess the effects of capacity building, evaluation is one of the most used and common means. Evaluations are mainly conducted to account for one's programmes towards donors or to prove the impact, but are also important to monitor the organisations' actions and to improve them (OECD n.d.: 7). The OECD developed several criteria which are useful to consider when evaluating development work (ibid.). As professional peace work is still a rather small sector, the criteria for evaluating development work are likewise used there.

This master thesis evaluates the training work of KURVE, focussing on the criteria relevance and effectiveness. As evaluations cannot – in contrast to scientific research work – be seen as a self-contained result but should be of further use (Stockmann 2002: 11), the immediate goal of this paper is to support KURVE in reflecting and developing their international trainings. Furthermore the evaluation wants to show possible ways for change so that KURVE can improve their training work by making it more relevant and more effective for the applicants and participants who are working in the field of peace work. KURVE initiated the evaluation since the last in-depth evaluation had been conducted back in 1998. Since then the international training work of KURVE has been developed substantially. Apart from the practical use of the evaluation results, the thesis also aims at contributing to the further development of training programmes in civil conflict transformation and embedding them into the academic discussion. Object of the master thesis and the evaluation are the Practitioner Trainings (PT) that are part of the international training work of KURVE and are designed for peace and movement workers from across the world and. The evaluation is an “on-going evaluation”, which means that it observed and assessed the implementation process of the training programme (Stockmann 2002:14). The following research questions lead the evaluation: Are the contents and methods of the trainings relevant for the participants (i.e. activists, NGO staff as well as national and international peace workers)? What are the needs of participants in respect to contents and methodology? What else do the participants need? How can these needs be satisfied? Are peace and movement workers able to build capacities in the trainings? Which factors influence the learning? Are they able to transfer the capacities to their context and work and apply them successfully? How can relevance and effectiveness of the trainings be improved (recommendations)?

In order to answer these questions, the evaluators were present during the autumn cycle of practitioner trainings in 2015, conducting participant observation. Furthermore

they conducted semi-structured interviews during the training period and also with former participants and trainers. In winter 2015 the evaluators sent out qualitative questionnaires to participants that attended KURVE trainings in 2013-2015 as well as to participants' organisations and trainers. These were complemented with a desk study on material provided by KURVE and some other interviews with KURVE staff members and competitors in Germany. The collected data was analysed and complemented by theoretical input in order to answer the research questions and to develop recommendations for KURVE Wustrow.

In the first part KURVE Wustrow and especially the Practitioner Trainings are introduced, and their theoretical and contextual backgrounds are explained. This is followed by a description of the methodology. In a third part the findings of the evaluation are presented, first in reference to relevance, then to effectiveness. In a last step, those findings deriving from resource persons, the evaluator team and theoretical research are discussed to develop recommendations. Based on the results a conclusion will be drawn.

The thesis does not correspond fully to the evaluation report that in its final form will focus on the Terms of Reference whereas the thesis concentrated on the two criteria of relevance and effectiveness. The purpose is not to evaluate each single training and the contents but to visualise an over-all atmospheric picture of the ongoing implementation process of the Practitioners Trainings. Furthermore the thesis aims at identifying aspects and factors that are relevant for all trainings and stakeholders involved.

To render respondents anonymous and for better legibility, only the female form will be used and marked with a * to indicate that all genders are included. For citations that derive from resource persons no quotation marks are used since the researchers adapted the English grammar and spelling as well as deleted detailed information on the working context or the organisation in which the participants is active. –Short citations are set in italic and longer ones also indented. Statements that were made in German were translated by the evaluators. For the sake of rendering all stakeholders anonymous all those changes will not be indicated.

2. KURVE Wustrow – Centre for Networking and Training in Nonviolent Action²

In this chapter the organisation and especially the unit that the evaluation is concerned with will be introduced and the profile of the activity evaluated be sketched. Furthermore KURVE and its work will be put in relation to the context and theoretical discussion.

KURVE Wustrow – Centre for Training and Networking in Nonviolent Action was founded in 1980 and is a non-profit association located in Wendland region in Lower Saxony, Germany. The German word “Kurve” means bend or curve in English. Since its beginnings KURVE has seen itself as part of the social movements in Germany and has been involved in the nonviolent movement against the nuclear waste disposal site in Gorleben which is situated some 20 kilometres from Wustrow (KURVE 2013a: 4f).

KURVE strives for a nonviolent world which is socially and ecologically balanced. Its motto is “spreading nonviolence” and represents the wish of contributing to this vision by helping to build people’s abilities to “translate concern about violent conflict, ecological devastation and social injustice into well-considered nonviolent action” (KURVE website, Mission Statement). It has role models in numerous social movements which fought for change with nonviolent means. The most important values and principles of KURVE are respect for all living creatures and the environment, justice, equality and equity, self-determination, consensus as well as learning and acting on eye-level.

The organisation tries to implement these values when it comes to taking decisions. The aim is to include all persons concerned into decision-making processes. Consensus-orientation and structures of flat hierarchies complement this. Lastly there is the principle of learning and acting on eye-level. For KURVE mutual learning is a step towards a more peaceful and nonviolent society.

Nonviolence for KURVE is based on the positive vision of a more just society. In the social movements against nuclear transports, racist violence and others, experience shows that nonviolence is an effective political tool for social change. KURVE sees nonviolent action as a means for going further than just explaining how dangers like ecological devastation, social injustice and violent conflict come about. It also wants to show possibilities and methods to oppose these dangers. In this understanding, nonviolent action is more than resistance or defence, but opens up a perspective for a more humane society (KURVE 2013a: 2).

² If not indicated otherwise, all information in this chapter is from KURVE's website: www.kurvewustrow.org

2.1. Fields of Activity and Organisational Structure

KURVE is engaged in the field of conflict transformation, having four main fields of activities. Most important for this evaluation is the training unit, which will be presented in more detail in the next chapter. Furthermore, there is the volunteer service unit which sends young people to learn about environmental- and human rights organisations and work with them for a year. In different types of programmes volunteers from Germany can go to India or Macedonia, or help in KURVE's office in Wustrow. Furthermore volunteers from the Global South can spend on year in Germany. KURVE is also a sending organisation for the Civil Peace Service, for which the peacebuilding unit is responsible. The idea of a civil peace service was developed by several organisations from the German peace movement and since 1998 there is a government funded programme, in which professional peace workers are sent to different conflict contexts. The objectives are “[t]o support the initiatives by local partner organisations in crisis regions, seeking to prevent the outbreak of violent conflicts [and t]o contribute towards strengthening peaceful means of conflict resolution and securing a sustainable peace by building peace support structures” (KURVE website: Civil Peace Service). The people who KURVE sends are called International Peace Workers (IPW) and have to be European citizens. They usually work together with a Local Peace Worker (LPW) on a specific project in a partner organisation. The trainings of KURVE are part of their preparation. A fourth, focus of KURVE's work is to support or initiate campaigns and nonviolent actions on different topics, e.g. connected to the Gorleben conflict.

Being an association, KURVE has 92 members who come together annually in a general meeting. Every two years the members elect the board, which works voluntarily and currently consists of four persons who meet bimonthly in the headquarters in Wustrow. In the office, 19 employees are working, two of them in the function of directors. The team is supported by three volunteers from Bhutan, India and Germany who are helping and learning in different working units. Furthermore, 21 peace workers are working for KURVE in its Civil Peace Service projects in Israel, Palestine, Myanmar, Nepal, Bosnia and Hercegovina, Kosovo, Serbia and Macedonia. At the office in Wustrow, there is the management, the administration section with the secretariat, the seminar-house team, two posts for finances, public relations and three units which work on content-matters: the peacebuilding unit that runs the civil peace service projects, the training unit and the volunteer service unit. The association also has several voluntary working groups where members and staff of KURVE are engaged.

2.2. Theoretical and Contextual Framework of KURVE's activities: Nonviolence and Conflict Transformation

Nonviolence means an opposition to physical violence as well as structural and cultural violence. It therefore asks for active engagement against all forms of injustice and inequality, such as racism and other form of dominance. Today a distinction is made between nonviolence and non-violence, so as to include the understanding as active commitment to nonviolent philosophy into the version without the hyphen. The ethical approach to nonviolence is also called "principled nonviolence" and is or was used by people such as Martin Luther King, the Quakers and Mahatma Gandhi. A second line of argumentation uses rather practical reasons for advocating nonviolence. Instead of rejecting nonviolence as morally wrong because it causes brutality and suffering, the pragmatic approach favours nonviolence as a tool that is more effective than violent means (Berghof Foundation 2012: 117f). Nonviolent action describes one of the strategies that are used to achieve peace. Especially if there is a power imbalance in the conflict, nonviolent means seem appropriate to be taken by the less powerful side so they can restructure the relation with the power-holders. Using the strategy of nonviolence means to engage in dialogue with the other side, trying to convince them and at the same time resisting to oppressing structures (Ibid.: 118f.). KURVE Wustrow does promote principled nonviolence and also sees nonviolent action as an appropriate means to reach greater social justice. Therefore they try to support activists in reaching their goals by offering trainings that help them fight for their cause. In this they do not demand from participants of the trainings to live nonviolence as a value, but are trying to promote also the strategic use of nonviolence.

The term Civilian Conflict Management (dt.: Zivile Konfliktbearbeitung) is specific for Germany and has its roots in the political discourse in Germany after the end of the Cold War and the presentation of the „Agenda for Peace“ by the Secretary-General of the United Nations Boutros Boutros-Ghali 1992 (Weller 2007: 9 f.). Scholars from the area of peace and conflict studies raised their voice when international alliances were not able to find alternatives to military reactions in the Second Golf War and the war in former Yugoslavia (ibid.: 11). Civilian Conflict Management was the term that expressed non-military strategies for conflict interventions that aim at preventing violent conflicts, finding solutions for underlying problems and settle erupted conflicts with aiming at future cooperation and reconciliation (Buro 1992: 223). Local civil activists and associations therefore become highly relevant. Empowerment of civil society in using nonviolent means to achieve human and civil rights are the main elements of Civilian Conflict Management (Weller 2007: 13). The aims and tools of Civilian Conflict

Management are diverse and can contain both development and peace work strategies in the contexts of peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding. KURVE Wustrow is mainly engaged in the field of peacebuilding and in activities that aim at political change: peace work in the sense of strengthening civil society in Germany and world-wide. Supporting civil society as a method of civilian conflict management is one of the main fields of activity of international NGOs and state funding. Its main elements are sending volunteers or professionals (development workers or civil peace workers) to conflict regions, offering training, e.g. in nonviolent conflict transformation, managing skills or journalism, and solidarity work. Solidarity work is special in that it includes political work and positioning (Schweitzer 2009: 51ff).

2.3. The Training Unit

KURVE works in the international field of training work and its training unit organises several different basic and practitioner trainings. Two employees with part-time posts and an international volunteer coordinate the trainings that take place at KURVE directly as the seminar wing is located in the same 200-year old house in Wustrow as the organisation's office. It offers simple accommodation for up to 22 persons in dormitory style and has two meeting rooms. There, KURVE conducts seminars and trainings in the field of nonviolence, nonviolent action, civil conflict transformation and similar topics. Its target group are individuals, groups and organisations who want to get to know nonviolent options to act (KURVE 2013a: 2).

KURVE states: "A training is an experimental field to gain experience in nonviolent action and to try out something unusual and new in a safe environment" (KURVE Website: Trainings and Seminars). The motivation to offer these trainings derives from the wish to counteract violence, war, social injustice and ecological devastation. Thus the trainings aim at strengthening the capacities for nonviolent action and also to raise awareness for the possibilities of nonviolent change.

Training has always played an important role in KURVE's work. From the beginning on different kinds of trainings inside of Germany and especially the Wendland region were offered, e.g. for nonviolent action and protests around transports of nuclear waste or for refugees who experienced violence. In 1993, a first training-collective was established at KURVE and in 1995 the first "International Training for Nonviolence in the Context of War and Armed Conflict" (IT) in English took place which is still today conducted once a year.

Besides different formats of action oriented and more academic or personal development focussed trainings in German, since 1995 the organisation runs a number of international trainings each year in English. The latter is subject of this evaluation.

2.4. The International Training Work of KURVE Wustrow

In the following, the international training work of KURVE will be introduced as presented by the organisation itself.

The international training work comprises of an International Training (IT) as a basic course, which lasts 18 days and takes place once a year in KURVE's seminar house in Wustrow. Furthermore there are Regional ITs in different countries, which are not scheduled on a regular basis, a Do No Harm Training of Trainers (DNH ToT) and Practitioner Trainings (PT). The week long PTs are offered on various topics in two cycles each year in spring and in autumn. Since 2015 there is also a 16-month long part-time training qualifying participants as Peace and Movement Workers. In its training report for 2014 KURVE states that with more than 25 years of experience in international training work, KURVE gained extensive competences in passing on methods of conflict transformation and nonviolence. It assembled expertise in conflict sensitive project management, the Do No Harm approach and in security management. Among Civil Peace Workers, activists and staff of NGOs in conflict areas there is increasing interest in the connection of a nonviolent attitude with civil, nonviolent conflict transformation, a specific characteristic of KURVE's trainings that is nearly unique in the training landscape according to the organisation (KURVE 2014a: 14).

2.4.1. Theory of Change

KURVE's theory of change for its international training work starts with the target groups – NGOs and local initiatives – because they are resources for change in society and have access to big parts of the population. KURVE states that strengthening civil society actors will increase the potential for nonviolent change and therefore sustainably contribute to a constructive change of conflicts. These actors can strengthen local capacities for peace by starting well-directed projects at the basis of society. KURVE contributes to this by providing its many years of experience in peace education and offers trainings to contribute to increasing local capacities for peace. Through passing on theory, methods of conflict transformation and approaches of nonviolence and nonviolent action during the trainings, the foundations of peaceful social change are laid (KURVE 2013a: 4).

2.4.2. Standards, working principles

KURVE's trainings are based on the standards of the German Qualifizierungsverbund (QVB), a network of training organisations of the Aktionsgemeinschaft Dienste für den Frieden (AGDF) (KURVE 2015: 5).

Very important for the evaluation are methodological and other principles of KURVE's trainings. KURVE works with adult education didactics as well as the action learning cycle model. To its understanding, trainers and participants are learning from and with each other (KURVE 2016: 2). In the seminar programme it says:

“We work with experienced trainers and with a three-step process of experience – analysis – synthesis. Not the sole academic knowledge transfer is at core but the participatory reflection with practice. We do not only address the mind, but also the heart and hands. We design our trainings participant- and experience-oriented as well as action- and practice-oriented.” (KURVE 2015, 5).

Practice-orientation means that practically trying out the tools and methods is part of the training as often as possible. Participant-orientation includes checking expectations of the participants in the beginning of the training and adapting the training accordingly as far as it is possible. Especially in the (R)IT there is a balance of fixed curriculum and the needs of the participants, while PTs and DNH ToT are more focused on their topics (KURVE 2016: 2). Besides this KURVE also puts emphasis on community living, which means that participants work and live together in the seminar house during the training. This is meant to create a learning environment that supports intense reflection of the learned contents and practical application already during the training (KURVE 2013a: 5). While community living plays a role in all trainings because participants share dorm rooms, it is mostly actively worked with during the IT. For monitoring the training work, KURVE collects participant statistics and reaction sheets after each training as well as trainers' reports. During the trainings there are short daily recapitulations and a thorough evaluation at the end (KURVE 2013a: 12). Furthermore there should be a midterm evaluation in each training (KURVE 2016: 5).

2.4.3. Target groups

KURVE Wustrow's target group for the training work is “people that seek to engage in conflict transformation using nonviolent, civil and creative means” (KURVE 2015: 5), whether on a voluntary basis or professionally, in Germany or other countries (ibid). The trainings are particularly aimed at people working on grassroots level and partly middle level of society. They address women and men alike (KURVE 2013a: 5f). The decision to focus on grassroots and middle-range level of society is based on KURVE's conviction of the importance of local actors. It says that local peace and human rights groups are often active in crisis regions for many years. Thus because of their access and experiences they can give an important contribution to building sustainable structures for peace. They work directly with the affected population and in local projects put measures of civil conflict transformation into practice. As the demand for

professionalization increases, also the requirements for peace and human rights work get higher (KURVE 2013a: 3).

2.4.4. Selection criteria, process etc.

Being in long-standing cooperation with organisations in South Asia, Palestine and Israel, the Balkans and East Africa, KURVE is linked to practitioners and their fields of work and can therefore assure the relevance of the training topics, it says. Cooperating with CPS partner organisations as well as other partners, it furthermore ensures choosing participants who are eligible and will put the acquired knowledge and skills into practice (KURVE 2013a: 5). KURVE tries to choose participants who are connected to an organisation or initiative. This is based on the assumption that participants are supported by the structure and already have experience from this context, hence when they go back after the training they share their new experiences and act as multipliers. Thus not only the participants but also people around them profit from the training. When assessing the applications, KURVE looks at the motivation, professional experience and/or qualification, and the English proficiency. Furthermore the applicants are asked to describe how they plan to transfer new skills into the working context (KURVE 2013a: 6)..

2.4.5. Theoretical and Contextual Framework of KURVE's training work

In the following section KURVE's training work will be put in relation to relevant theoretical concepts around training work.

2.4.5.1. Learning

Malcolm Knowles stresses the importance to distinguish between the terms education and learning. He describes education as being focused on the person who is passing on knowledge or skills, while learning is centred on the one who is acquiring new skills or insights, the one in whom change is happening. Therefore learning in a very basic definition is "the act by which behavioral change, knowledge, skills, and attitudes are acquired" (Knowles 2005: 10). Important foundations for learning and education concepts were laid by John Dewey (1859-1953), a pragmatic philosopher and progressive education theorist from the United States, who advocated the idea to link philosophy, theory and practical experience (Wadlington 2013: 29). Especially his ideas of experiential learning, the teacher as facilitator and connecting school education to the community (ibid.: 31) are still relevant for adult education and training work today. The progressive education that Dewey advocated for features the encouragement to

express/develop one's individuality and free activity instead of obedience. Furthermore it features learning through experience and for a concrete goal, not in the far future, but making the most of the present time and getting familiar with a changing world (Dewey 1997: 19f). As experiencing is essential for progressive education, it needs to take the external conditions, such as the local community, economic, historical etc., into account, because they are providing a person's experience (Dewey 1997: 40). The person who is in the position to educate others can influence the concrete learning experience by what she* is doing, the way of doing it (e.g. methods, tone of voice), the materials that are used and the learning setting in general. Thus they need to be adapted to the needs and capacities of the learners that are addressed, because not all learning conditions fit all people (Dewey 1997: 45f).

2.4.5.2. Adult Education

Malcolm Knowles states that adults learn best in informal settings that are comfortable, nonthreatening and flexible (Knowles 2005: 61). Referring to Lindeman, Knowles lists some key assumptions about adult learning which are complemented by Chan:

Adults do not want to be passive receivers of information, but want to take their own decisions and actively participate in and steer their learning process (Chan 2010: 27f). As they want to determine themselves what they are doing and when they are doing it, adult education should be a mutual process instead of simply transferring knowledge and expecting learners to adapt to it (Knowles 2005: 40). Adults are also less motivated by external factors than by their own internal motivation to learn. Therefore being seen as equals in the trainings is important to them (Chan 2010: 28). Furthermore their motivation to learn results from certain needs or interests which should be considered in adult education. Adult education should also put life-situations at its centre, as adults want to learn for real life (Knowles 2005: 39f) and are seldom ready to learn for learning sake, but wish to know why they are learning something. Therefore it is crucial to give this information and highlight the relevance for the learners in order to make them engage and participate actively to take as much as possible from a training (Chan 2010: 28). Lastly people are developing more individual features with increasing age and adults have a lot of experience which is a valuable resource. Adult education should use analysis of experiences as the main methodology and needs to provide for different needs in place, time, learning speed etc. as best as possible (Knowles 2005: 40). To use the participants' experiences, beliefs and behaviour as valuable resource for learning, one must allow making the links between new input and already existing experience (Chan 2010: 28).

2.4.5.3. Trainings and trainers

According to Chan, successful trainings lead to change by supplying the participants with new knowledge, skills or the possibility to change their behaviour. They have specific goals or learning objectives of what the participants should/will be able to do after the training. They are focussing on the learners, not on the trainers, which means that the trainers are not experts who “feed” the participants with knowledge, but rather accompany their learning process. Therefore they should also engage the participants in the learning process. The training should entail activities that are interesting and relevant for them and with which they can develop new concepts and skills and connect them to their previous knowledge and experience. This also relates to the “criterion” that trainings should be relevant for the participants’ work and/or context. They should focus on practical information that can be used by the participants immediately rather than theories. Lastly the desired outcomes should be measurable or observable (Chan 2010: 5).

Among the features that characterise good trainers are good communication skills, creativity in finding solutions for upcoming challenges as well as flexibility and the ability to change things quickly according to what is needed in a situation. Energy and enthusiasm help to engage participants while good organisational, resource-management, and time-management skills are needed to frame a training. Furthermore it is very useful for trainers to be patient, as things and processes and learning take time, to have a good sense of humour and to be able to listen, empathise, see things from other peoples’ points of view and respect and appreciate differences (Chan 2010: 13-17).

2.4.5.4. Training in Conflict Transformation

According to Sprenger a lot of capacity building is happening through training within the field of conflict transformation, with an increase in funding, offers and requests. But what does training mean in the context of conflict transformation? As the resources are limited it only makes sense to choose training as method if it has a positive and transforming effect on the conflict in question. As training is not something external to conflict transformation but an intervention in conflict, one must ask about its effectiveness and impact (Sprenger 2005: 2). The reasons why trainings in conflict transformation are offered are to raise awareness for conflict causes and dynamics among participants and to build capacities for dealing with conflict. The trainings aim at supporting actors who strive for social change and engage in constructive conflict transformation. Furthermore networks can be built in the trainings between

practitioners who would otherwise not be connected. Like this empowerment and cooperation are supported (Austin 2011: 209).

Thus “[t]he design, content and methods applied in training processes are an important indicator of what a prospective trainee can expect to learn” (Austin 2011: 212). Concerning methodology one can distinguish between prescriptive methods which are based on the assumption that trainers provide expert knowledge to the participants and elicitive methods deriving from the conviction that trainers and participants have relevant knowledge to contribute to the learning process and are both responsible for the learning process (ibid.:214). Thus this methodology is closer to the learning theories of Dewey. Austin furthermore states that the learning environment must be designed in a way that it provides a safe space to try things out and that the contents need to be adapted to the needs of participants (ibid.:216).

In order to fully use the potential for conflict transformation, a training needs to “offer learning spaces where things can be thought through, where past experiences and interpretations can be reframed, and where one’s own role in conflicts can be critically analysed” (Sprengr 2005, 4f). Sprengr explains that the brain has three parts which are all essential for learning and therefore need to be considered for training work – the cognitive part saves and remembers facts, the procedural area is essential for skills-learning and the emotional area connects experiences and emotions. It is important for understanding conflict, which often has to do with past experience (ibid.).

Furthermore training should be looked at as a process instead of as a one-time event. In his experience often nothing or only very little from a training is put into practice by the participants and only on an individual level. Therefore one needs to develop a perspective that change through training can be reached (only) over time (Sprengr 2005: 3f).

3. Profile of the Activity Evaluated: Practitioner Trainings

KURVE's international training work is based on the idea that peace and social movement workers need basic knowledge plus specific skills according to their field of work. Therefore the basic training IT is complemented by Practitioner Trainings (PT) which are meant for specialisation and further qualification of experts (KURVE 2013a: 3). The PTs are the activity assessed in the evaluation, and have three main goals:

The first and main objective is skill development. The participants should increase their competences in the work field through acquiring skills and knowledge. The second objective is reassurance. Participants should be reassured in their work by getting to know and exchanging with activists and other committed people from other parts of the world. Thirdly there is networking. By meeting face to face with other practitioners, international networks of committed peace and movement workers shall be made possible, encouraged and supported (KURVE 2016: 3).

Offered in their current set-up for the first time in 2007, the PTs today cover a wide range of topics. These are constantly developed further and adapted to the needs of organisations and peace workers to guarantee relevance for practice (KURVE 2013a: 9). There are several trainings on security issues (introduction to security, digital security, security management, counselling in trauma and stress), on nonviolent change (strategizing nonviolent change, campaigning for nonviolent change, living nonviolent change) as well as project management, managing organisational change, facilitation and training skills, anti-bias and prejudice awareness, gender equality, and utilising the media for campaigning and advocacy (KURVE 2015: 12f). Besides, there are two cross cutting issues in KURVE's trainings, the first being gender. The aim is to have increased gender sensitisation in all trainings, and in cooperation with all trainers. A feminist partner organisation is supporting this process, but KURVE admits that increasing the gender sensitivity is a difficult process until now, due to time and logistic reasons. The second cross-cutting issue is the analysis of situations, which is part of the trainings in various forms (KURVE 2016: 6).

Thus the PTs aim at participants with prior knowledge in nonviolent conflict transformation, as is for example offered in the basic training IT. Moreover, the participants do have work experience in peace education, civil conflict transformation, human rights work or similar. The target groups are especially staff of NGOs or activists in initiatives that work for justice, peace and nonviolence, so they can directly use their new skills and knowledge (KURVE 2015: 10). More concretely, the target groups are staff members of NGOs in Germany which are the smallest group of applicants, people from Germany who work abroad e.g. in the Civil Peace Service (CPS), as well as staff members of NGOs in other countries e.g. Local Peace Workers

in partner organisations of CPS projects. Furthermore there are international activists, who are the biggest group of applicants, but also most dependent on scholarships. German activists from social movements have hardly been present until now, but shall be approached more specifically in 2016. Since 2015 there are also the participants of the 16-months part-time training as Peace and Movement Worker, and people who engage in the support of refugees and people affected by war (KURVE 2016: 5).

The trainings are financed via the training fees and funding from Diakonie, Misereor, AGDF, Stiftung Umverteilen and private donations. The funding continues to be fragmented and insecure (KURVE 2010: 22). In order to make participation possible for more people, there are different prices for organisations and individuals, and a reduced fee which can – depending on available funds – be offered to people for whom costs are an obstacle for participation. A five-day PT cost 1.500€ for organisations, 1.000€ for individuals or 750€ reduced price including vegetarian full board and accommodation (KURVE 2015: 10).

There are two cycles of PTs every year, one in spring and one in autumn. Lasting for five days (Monday 12:30 – Friday 13:00), five (until 2015) or six (from 2016 on) PTs are offered in a row. In order to coordinate contents of the different trainings, KURVE is thinking about having a trainers' meeting (KURVE 2016: 8).

Most trainers are external freelancers, who are experts in their training topics (KURVE 2015, 36ff). KURVE chooses trainers who correspond to its profile (KURVE 2016: 5), and mostly knows them well through long-standing cooperation (ibid: 8). For the PTs, mostly trainers living in Germany are contracted in order to keep the travel costs in an adequate frame, and also to consider environmental impact (KURVE 2013a: 11). Concerning gender issues, KURVE tries to have teams of two trainers with different genders (KURVE 2014a: 8).

In each training of KURVE, there should be between 7 and 20 participants, from 2016 on the maximum number is set at 18. KURVE tries to compose the group of participants as diverse as possible concerning countries, projects, age, and gender. Apart from own CPS workers and participants from partner organisations, KURVE tries to invite activists and also offer a time out for people from very stressful contexts. KURVE chooses holders of scholarships with the help of persons who know their contexts well (KURVE 2016: 6f).

In the concept draft it says that at the beginning of the training a training schedule should be set up and learning objectives be formulated. Until now there are no written learning objectives for all PTs (KURVE 2016: 5). Furthermore the curricula for the trainings do not exist in written form (ibid: 8).

In the PTs, various methods are used: they feature interactive methods as well as power point, visualisation, group work, practical exercises, role plays, reflections and theoretical inputs. In this the trainers set own foci according to their different experiences and preferences (KURVE 2014a: 8).

In order to guarantee sustainability, KURVE tries to have two participants from the same organisation in the same training and / or invite staff-members from one organisation in several cycles. Like this, several persons can share skills and include them in the organisation's work. Even if there are not two people from the same organisation in one training, KURVE tries to have several participants from the same country, so that they can support each other and network afterwards. Another measure is to let the participants fill out a personal action plan at the end of the training. This is not yet done in all trainings (KURVE 2016: 8).

In summary what is important about KURVE's profile is that it is a small association affiliated with social movements and committed to nonviolence and nonviolent action. It offers trainings for international practitioners working mostly on grassroots level. Furthermore it tries to adapt its training topics to the needs of practitioners and uses participatory methodology.

In the next chapter the methodology of the evaluation will be explained, before presenting the findings and discussing them.

4. Methodological approach

The following chapter describes which approaches were applied for the research and why they were chosen. Furthermore the researchers' role is explained and reflected. Lastly the methods for data collection and analysis are introduced and limitations mentioned. A final outlook on further research will close this chapter.

4.1. Qualitative evaluation research

As methodological framework for the approach, concept, working steps and data collection methods, the researchers oriented themselves towards evaluation as a form of social research that aims to “[become] a stimulus for change” (von Kardoff 2004:138). The data collection for the evaluation was conducted from October 2015 to February 2016 on the basis of methods common to qualitative evaluation research: participatory observation, face-to-face and Skype interviews, questionnaires sent via email, institutional documents from KURVE and the reading of theory on adult education, training, conflict transformation and nonviolence (c.f. von Kardoff 2004:140). The analysis of the data was conducted in February and March 2016 by using ethnographic coding procedures.

One of the key planning steps undertaken by the evaluation team together with one of the directors of KURVE was to draft the Terms of Reference (ToR) to document processes and agreements in regard to the evaluation. In this document, the frame of the evaluation, certain planning steps, methods to be used, as well as the responsibilities of the evaluators and the main stakeholders (KURVE and trainers) were outlined. It also indicates to whom the thesis and the report will be accessible.

The two evaluators started their research process open-minded to be able to “[o]perate in an impartial and unbiased manner at all stages of the evaluation” (UNEG 2008:5). Since the research had the specific goal to evaluate the international training work of KURVE, certain parameters were set up from the beginning, e.g. the time frame or the possibility for participating observation, as well as the criteria under which the evaluation of the trainings should be conducted: relevance and effectiveness.³ These criteria are interdependent and interlinked. The question about relevance investigates whether the trainings fit the needs of the participants and stakeholders. For assessing the effectiveness, one has to ask if the participants build capacities in respect to the objectives of the trainings.

³ The Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) developed five criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance (2008): relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.

The following guiding questions for each criterion were developed and written down in the *Terms of Reference (ToR)*⁴

- Are the contents and methods of the trainings relevant for the participants (i.e. activists, NGO staff as well as national and international peace workers)?
- What are the needs of participants with respect to contents and methodology? What else or other do the participants need?
- How can these needs be satisfied?
- What have the participants understood and acquired with respect to thinking /feeling /acting at the end of a training (training validity)?
- What have the participants used and implemented with respect to thinking/ feeling /acting after the training in their work and private life (transfer validity)?

Due to the variety of topics it was not possible to have a detailed assessment of the outcomes of each single training in the given time frame. Therefore slightly different research questions were developed concerning effectiveness.

- Are peace and movement workers able to build capacities in the trainings? Which factors influence the learning?
- Are they furthermore able to transfer the capacities to their context and work and apply them successfully?
- How can relevance and effectiveness of the trainings be improved (recommendations)?

To answer these questions, the researchers started a multi-angulated data collection process including participatory action research approaches (Newton 2006:2) and elements of qualitative evaluation research (c.f. von Kardoff 2003). They started the evaluation process by observing and listening to get an understanding of the relevant topics and its concrete interview questions during the five weeks of participating observation.

4.2. Evaluation as a participatory process

The evaluators as well as the contact persons from KURVE agreed that the evaluation should be conducted in an interactive process and provide a space for mutual learning: *“The evaluation will be organized in a way that it creates space for critical reflection and learning for all players involved. For this reason, the review process will be organised as open and process-oriented as possible.” (ToR 2015).* The researches knew that the dialogue and cooperation with stakeholders as well as other persons and institutions

⁴ Terms of Reference are attached in the annex

involved is crucial to not only get an overview of the structures and mechanisms of KURVE's training work but also to include the different perspectives, needs and interests of the people affected by the evaluation and hence to be able to get meaningful and sound results. The essential objective of the evaluation was to guarantee the legitimacy of the investigation process and the results. Designing the evaluation process as participatory as possible ensured ownership by the involved parties, which was important to get their support for the process (c.f. Griñó/Levine n.d.). Furthermore it would make it easier to hand over the responsibilities for implementing recommended changes (cf. Ibid).

The different phases of the evaluation⁵ were hence carried out in (close) cooperation and consultation with the stakeholders of KURVE being responsible for the coordination of the trainings, one of the directors who is responsible for the training unit and the two staff members of the training unit themselves. Also involved were the participants, trainers, and (partner) organisations that are cooperating with KURVE. Especially with the training unit of KURVE, meetings for consultation and exchange were organised during the preparation and the observation phase:

- A coaching of the evaluators on facilitation and training skills before the start of the evaluation, aiming to introduce the training principles that KURVE trainers apply in their trainings to the researchers;
- A briefing of the researchers on the training landscape and the institutionalised Civil Peace Service in Germany which KURVE is part of;
- Weekly meetings during the five weeks of participatory observation in which the evaluators kept the KURVE training unit updated about the research process;
- An in-depth interview of five hours with the director and the training unit with the focus on the training concept of KURVE. The aim was to establish a written document that the researchers could use for the evaluation;
- The training unit and directors were constantly providing institutional documents and other support to the evaluators when needed.

It should be mentioned that the KURVE staff of the training unit and the management, despite their full schedules and half-time jobs, have been helpful by providing documentation material which has facilitated the evaluation process in many ways.

In the last phase of the evaluation process, the evaluators and different stakeholders – the KURVE training unit and trainers – are planning to meet for a final workshop to discuss the results and findings of the evaluation. This will take place after the publishing of this text. Additionally, the researchers will provide all those resource

⁵ For more information about the phases of an evaluation, see: Stockmann 2004: 13f

persons who were involved and expressed their interest in the results with a copy of the evaluation report.

4.3. The evaluators

The evaluation team comprised two students of the Alice Salomon Hochschule of applied science in Berlin who are attending the master's programme in Intercultural Conflict Management. The evaluation was conducted in the context of their master's thesis. Sophia Stappel entered the process with an external and impartial view on the organisation, whereas Laura Weber, a former intern of KURVE Wustrow, brought already some insight into the organisation and was already in friendly contact to important resource persons. She was contributing to the process with a more internal view. In this combination the team consolidated their strengths and mitigate each other's biased positions(c.f. Gohl 2003: 69f.).

The researchers were aware of the chain of interpretations that formed the process of the evaluation: interpretive judgements of the researchers influenced the design of their questions, respondents were interpreting when they responded to these questions, and finally the researchers interpreted those answers again.

4.4. Triangulation of methods (of data collection) and data

"Three fundamental actions underlying the techniques of qualitative research are observing, asking and reading" (Corbetta 2003: 287). That is why different kinds of qualitative methods were used for collecting data and information to ensure a broader reliability of our results. They were combined with theoretical research to be able to discuss the results.

4.4.1. Desk study and analysis of relevant

The researchers analysed several types of documents that were provided by KURVE. They entailed different proposals for or reports on the trainings as well as lists of applicants and participants. Important were also the leaflets and information on the trainings available on KURVE's homepage, especially as KURVE had no "written down" concept of their international training work. The advantage of using institutional documents is that the "information is 'non-reactive', in the sense that it is not subject to possible distortion due to the interaction between the researcher and the subject studied" (Corbetta 2003: 287). Hence those documents were a varied and supportive completion of the interviews, observations and conversations. On the other hand this implied that the researchers could not ask for clarification or more details in case the author was not available (e.g. application forms). Nonetheless, one other advantage for

the researches was that they had access to documents of the past like application lists or proposals. The considered and processed data from the documents were:

- applications of participants to get information about their motivation (why is the training relevant?) and expected learnings (what are the needs?) before they take part in the trainings;
- leaflets as well as information from the homepage of KURVE about the trainings provided information about the Practitioners Trainings which the participants and institutional customers find when they inform themselves about the trainings;
- Proposals for funding of the international training work in which the objectives, target groups and facilitation methods of the trainings are described;
- official training reports (2013 and 2014) that were written for the financial donors of KURVE. They supply an overview of the outcomes of one training year that KURVE conducted.

4.4.2. Participatory observation

DeWalt and DeWalt (2002: 92) state that "the goal for design of research using participant observation as a method is to develop a holistic understanding of the phenomena". This was equally the intention and objective of the researchers. During the autumn training series 2015 that encompassed five trainings on different topics, the researchers collected information and experienced and observed how the trainings are conducted and how participants and trainers interact with each other. The evaluation team used participatory observation, as a "process of learning through exposure to or involvement in the day-to-day (...) activities of participants in the researcher setting" (Schensul et. al. 1999: 91). The researchers sought to understand the concept of the trainings, the daily run, the interaction of trainers and participants, they had to experience the atmosphere and get into direct contact with the beneficiaries of the trainings to get a concrete idea of the actual research subject. These first steps into the research process provided further data that complemented the reading material received from KURVE about the trainings. Moreover, it helped to observe the training validity (observable change in behaviour of participants) that is crucial for assessing the effectiveness of a training.

In each training depending on the needs of trainers and attendants, the evaluators' time and way of being present differed. For all trainers it was important that the researchers' presence would not disturb the training process and/or discomfit participants. Therefore, during the five trainings three different forms of participatory observation were used. In the first training Introduction to Security, the evaluators decided together with the trainers that they would be present in all sessions, but as soon as one or more participants would express their need of more privacy (e.g. talking

about trauma or other delicate personal experiences) they would skip the session and leave the room. They could also discreetly participate in discussions and small group work under the premise that they would not dominate discussions or results and presentations of group work. That format of participatory observation gave the researchers the possibility to build trust with other participants. At the same time the evaluators made the purpose of their presence transparent to other participants by introducing themselves and their approach to the group during the introduction round on the first day of the training and thereby also avoided to fall too deep into the group processes and dynamics or forget about their role as researchers. In the same role, as unobtrusive participants⁶, the evaluators also were present during the last training PME.

During the trainings for Security Management and Managing Organisational Change the researchers took part in several game exercises, but at the rest of time, during inputs of the trainer or discussions and sharing in the plenum they were only observing the training process. The trainers made clear that they would not include or consider our presence during their training, since they had to concentrate on the needs of the participants. In these trainings, the researchers from time to time skipped a session to write down thoughts, ideas and notes while making sure, that always one member of the team was present during the sessions. Additionally, each evening the researchers wrote down their observations from memory and reflected about the balancing of detachment and familiarisation of the setting.

In the third week, together with the facilitators of the training on Anti-Bias, the evaluators decided to take fully part in the training (complete participation, cf. Kawulich 2005), bringing in their own inputs and experience and not taking field notes.⁷ That experience was helpful to fully slip into the role of the participant as well as sensing and experiencing a training. On the other hand the change of roles for each training was a challenge for both the researchers and those participants who were attending several trainings (up to five) and thus experienced the evaluators in different roles. The prolonged and sometimes high engagement into the training setting by the researchers on the one hand was supportive to understand the training situation, to feel, hear and see the participants' needs and ways of interaction as well as to get a holistic image of the idea and concept of the training work of KURVE. It enabled the researchers to "identify with the subjects studied and thereby to see the world through their eyes"

⁶The observer as participant – minimal involvement in the social setting. There is some connection, but the observer is not naturally and normally part of the social setting. c.f.: Gold, R. (1958), "Roles in sociological field observation", *Social Forces* 36: 217-213.

⁷Researcher as complete participant – researcher takes an insider role, is fully part of the setting and often observes covertly. Vgl.: Gold, R. (1958), "Roles in sociological field observation", *Social Forces* 36: 217-213.

(Corbetta 2003: 264). On the other hand the researchers realized from time to time that they were already very close with some of the participants, building up friendships and taking part in external activities. This became very obvious when participants approached the researchers to ask them for help in understanding task and exercises, intending to treat them as equal fellows. In short: the evaluators experienced moments in which their role as researchers and participants blurred. It was difficult to handle for the researchers and some participants got confused by the varying involvement of the team. This juggling act was constantly a topic of discussion between the two evaluators and written down in the research diary.

Out of the participatory observation process the evaluator developed questions for semi-structured interviews to participants and trainers as well as questionnaires.

4.4.3. Qualitative interviews (structured and semi-structured)

During the research process the evaluators conducted 23 interviews with 29 people (20 single and 3 group interviews). The interviews were held in English or German. Most of the interviews with participants took place during the five training weeks in autumn 2015.

During the five training weeks at KURVE Wustrow in fall 2015 the researchers interviewed 19 participants. It was important for the evaluators to get to know the perspectives of the different target groups of the trainings (International Peace Workers, NGO staff, activists, trainees). Those interviews had the objective to grasp the participant's and trainer's' subjective perception of the training(s) (back-up of our observations) and as well as collecting data about effectiveness and relevance of the trainings. The researchers were aware that in their role as interviewers they “[determine] the outcome of the conversation” in the sense that in the “dynamic relationship in which the interview is ‘constructed’ by the interviewer and the respondent together, (...) its outcome will depend largely on the empathetic link that is forged between the two interlocutors” (Corbetta 2003: 279). Being present during the trainings was helpful to build up the needed relationship of trust on a personal level with the interviewed resource persons so that the interviews became “a process of social interaction” (Corbetta 2003: 277). The respondents decided where and when they want to conduct the interview and whether the conversation should be recorded or not.

The interviews were all conducted in a semi-structured way, i.e. the conversation was guided by the researchers with pre-established questions to ensure that all issues relevant for the focusses of the evaluation are mentioned. But, aware of the fact that pre-formulated questions can lead to “serious limitations on the objective of flexibility and adaptability to the specific situation analysed, which is one of the presuppositions

of the qualitative approach” (Corbetta 2003: 269), the researchers reacted to individual needs of the respondents and as much as possible established an atmosphere in which additional (spontaneous) ideas and remarks could be mentioned by both the interviewers and the interviewed person. Thus none of the conducted interviews had exactly the same final structure. The thoroughly prepared outline was important to ensure comparability and completeness of the data that the researchers collected. The process of finding precise and correct formulations as well as a logic order of the questions ensured that the wording expressed the intended meaning. At the end, this process also supported the self-confidence of the interviewers during the conversation. The flexibility towards wording and sequence of the questions was helpful to guarantee that all aspects of the people's answers were understood and everyone could emphasize her* important issues and topics. Moreover it was important that each researcher could establish her own style of conversation and bring in her own personality. As such, a structure was established that ensured both: guidance and space for “unknown and unforeseen elements that belong to the ‘context of discovery’.” (Corbetta 2003: 269).

Thematic priorities of the questions were the methods and contents of the respective training/s that the participant was attending. The primary interest was to find answers to the guiding questions about the relevance and effectiveness of the trainings from as many individuals as possible. The pre-formulated questions were the following:

- Why are you taking part in the training/s?
- In how far were your expectations concerning the training contents and methods met?
- What do you take out of the training?
- Could you get along with the training methods? Were they helpful for your learning process?
- How useful are the tools for you that were offered?
- What could be improved about the trainings?

In case the respondent was working for a partner organisation of KURVE additional questions regarding the relationship and cooperation between that organisation and KURVE and the importance of the trainings for that organisation were asked. As for IPWs in the programme of the German Civil Peace Service the trainings constitute an essential pillar of their preparation time as well as for further training during their employment, extra questions about their personal perspective on the relevance and impact of the trainings for their work abroad were added.

4.4.4. Group interviews

Three group interviews were conducted with different purposes and in various forms: Some of the participants who stayed for more than one week were interviewed as a group. In this way there was room for exchange on the different perceptions of trainings and trainers. It was important for the evaluators to get to know the participants' impressions on staying in Wustrow for several weeks and different trainings. This approach was chosen in order to see participants discussing a special issue and giving them the chance to elaborate their answers to our questions. Besides, "the cost-effectiveness of the group interview should not be underestimated, in that ten people can be interviewed in approximately the same time as it would take to interview one person." (Corbetta 2003: 277). As the questions that the evaluators had prepared did not stimulate the discussion between the participants as they should they were adapted for the next focus group with participants of the educational programme. This group participated for the first time in practitioners' trainings. To get a better idea of their needs and perceptions the research-team arranged a mixture between a workshop and a focus interview with three of the trainees. First, they were asked to collect ideas about what a well conducted training needs and the terms were collected on a flip chart. Then they were asked to share their experience in the training at KURVE. These answers were written down and clustered (best practice – was good – was missing – should be changed – should be left out). As a summary, the trainees were asked whether their expectations towards the training at KURVE had been fulfilled. In a second part of the workshop the respondents were asked to discuss the statement: "KURVE Wustrow with its trainings covers everything that I need as a trainee". At the end the, the evaluators asked them about their recommendations and ideas for KURVE regarding the training concept. This approach was chosen to take advantage of the interaction that actually "produce[d] [a] deeper discussion, thereby aiding the researcher's understanding" (Corbetta 2003: 276) of their standpoints, values and perspectives.

Another focus group interview was conducted with one of the coordinator of the trainings and one of the two directors of KURVE Wustrow. The aim of this interview was to compile the most important contents that constitute the international training concept of KURVE. Such a concept does not (yet) exist in written form but was urgently needed for the evaluation to have comparison criteria. Originally two hours were planned for the interview and collection of conceptual framework, but another session was needed so that the combined interview time was five hours. During that time a first training concept was drafted that helped the researchers to locate the practitioners training in the overall training work of KURVE.

All interviews were recorded if the interviewed person had agreed. This was supportive for the evaluators since they could fully concentrate on what the respondents said and maintain a natural atmosphere during the interview. (c.f. Bernard 2011:170)

4.4.5. Qualitative questionnaires

In order to evaluate the relevance and effectiveness of the trainings that KURVE offers, the researchers also had to contact participants of former practitioner trainings, partner organisations and trainers. Other organisations that are members of the Civil Peace Service Consortium and competitors in training offers in Germany were likewise important resources. Since the number of contacts that the evaluation team received from KURVE was very high (attendance lists of 33 trainings, 19 trainers), the most reasonable way to reach out to as many people as possible in a short period of time was via email. Hence, the researchers developed and sent questionnaires with open questions to 216 resource persons. The questions were adapted to each target group (former participants; partner organisations; trainers; German Civil Peace Service organisations; competitors of KURVE)⁸. To make it easier for people to answer, it was also offered to have an interview instead of writing down their responses. For these interviews the researchers used the questionnaire as an outline for semi-structured telephone/Skype or face-to-face interviews. The evaluators received 39 questionnaires back, with some trainers answering the questionnaire together, and some participants sending two questionnaires back, one for themselves and another for their organisation.

4.4.6. Theoretical research

Additionally to all data that was collected with qualitative research methods, the researchers used theory of conflict transformation and adult education and training as basic knowledge to understand the field in which they were conducting their investigations. The theory should also help to develop their own perspective on the training work and their ability to discuss it. For recommendations, they combined the results of the data collection (perspectives of participants and other stakeholders) with this theoretical research. As the evaluators always shape the results of the collected data with their interpretations, it is important to provide the readers and the users of this evaluation with the theoretical background that shaped the evaluators' view on KURVE's training work and concept.

⁸ All questionnaires in the annex

4.5. Sampling of resource persons

The sampling of resource persons was based on the agreements with KURVE made in the ToR. Table 1 gives an overview of all target groups and stakeholders that were involved in the evaluation as resource persons and puts them into categories for a better overview. Several people fit in to more than one category (e.g. a female NGO staff member working in a partner organisation of KURVE attended the Practitioners Training series in autumn 2015).

Table 1: overview of resource persons

| category | Interview | Email Questionnaire |
|--|------------------|----------------------------|
| Participants Practitioner Trainings (PTs) | 25 | 20 |
| Participants PTs 2015 (autumn) | 19 | 5 |
| Civil peace worker (KURVE) | 4 | 4 |
| Civil peace worker (others) | 2 | 3 |
| Activist | 3 | 4 |
| NGO Worker | 15 | 18 |
| (Partner) Organisation | 4 | 2 |
| Trainees Education Programme KURVE | 6 | 2 |
| CPS Organisation | 0 | 3 |
| Competitor | 2 | 0 |
| Trainer | 2 | 7 |
| KURVE Staff (headquarters + KOR) | 4 | 2 |
| Female | 19 | 17 |
| Male | 10 | 17 |
| ALL | 29 | 34 |

The selection of participants during the trainings in fall 2015 for interviews was done by considering all target groups to find out about their different needs and expectations. Therefore, participants working for the Civil Peace Service, participants of the education of KURVE, activists, and NGO staff members working in different positions in their organisations were interviewed. In two cases language became a criteria for not choosing a participant. Furthermore, it was made sure to cover geographically different backgrounds and be aware of a gender balance and the distribution of target groups in the trainings (e.g. more NGO staff than activists, more participants from the Global South than the Global North). Besides paying attention to that distribution, the researchers decided based on their own perception of who could provide the greatest insight regarding the research questions. Such an additional purposive sampling (c.f.

Bernard 2011: 145f.) was needed to approach e.g. participants in management positions or those who attended a KURVE training for a second time.

All trainers that KURVE is contracting were approached with the email questionnaire. Likewise, all former participants (of whom KURVE had an email contact) and who took part in practitioner trainings between 2013 – 2015 were contacted by the researchers. This happened on the one hand to give everyone the chance to express their view on the trainings and on the other hand to handle the usually low rate of responses. The convenient sampling (c.f. Bernard 2011: 161) that resulted out of the answers that the researchers received were used for the data analysis.

Participants were categorised as followed:

- participants in the training series fall 2015
- participants of previous trainings 2013 – spring 2015
- spokespersons of a (partner) organisation that sent several participants to KURVE trainings.

Judgement sampling was again used in the selection of former participants who were believed to be able to answer questions in the name of their organisation that sent already several of their staff members to KURVE trainings.

4.6. Data analysis

All interviews that the evaluators conducted were written down in transcripts capturing the whole conversation in a clear form (without noting each 'uhs' and word repetitions or throat clearings) to "preserves the interviewee's account in its original and complete form" (Corbetta 2003: 280). Since all informants agreed upon being recorded, the evaluators just took notes about the interview (name of the informant, date, setting, interruptions, etc.). Together with all questionnaires as well as the motivations and expected learnings written down by participants on the application form for the trainings, these transcribed interviews were coded one by one by using colours or other markers for important quotes. In a second round of reading, the codes were structured into categories that allowed the researchers to make cross-references between all data. Due to time limitations and the huge amount of data, there were only two rounds of coding conducted.

When analysing the institutional documents of KURVE, the evaluators kept in mind that the "documents often are not objective representations of the institutional reality to which they refer, but instead provide an 'official' representation of it." (Corbetta 2003: 306). This was especially relevant for written proposals that aim at convincing donors to financially support the training work. The institutional documents were analysed likewise in using focused coding as for interviews and questionnaires. Here, the same

categories as for the interviews were used. A quantitative analysis was used “by breaking [the text] down into homogeneous components and relating these to one another.” (Corbetta 2003: 297). The most important methodological principle that the evaluators had in mind was to stay as close as possible to the statements of the resource persons. It was the intention of the researchers to analyse the data in a more descriptive and less interpretative way, hence all voices and written feedbacks were taken into account even if the source of it was one person only. The evaluation team aimed at taking each voice seriously without excluding single voices. A second principle was the consideration that the interaction of stakeholders in different power-constellations and with different interests is a complex net of relations that influences not only the setting but also the interpretation of it. Hence, the evaluators were aware that they were acting in and influencing that fabric when conducting their research (c.f. von Kardoff 2003: 138). The findings were later discussed by using theoretical research as well as ideas of stakeholders with which they came up with during interviews or which they mentioned in the questionnaires they answered.

4.7. Limitations

Reflecting on the research process some limitations have to be mentioned:

An extensive preparation of the evaluation was not possible due to different reasons. For the researchers it has been the first evaluation to be in charge of. Hence, each step of the evaluation process was new. Simultaneously finding their roles as evaluators and reading about the working steps and principles of evaluation while going ahead with the research was challenging. An additional challenging factor was that the training period started before the thesis had been officially approved by the university and both of the researchers were involved in other projects until the end of September. On the one hand this enabled them to dive into the research process without a fixed idea on how the process should look like. The evaluation team was encouraged to follow the needs and indications of participants, trainers and other stakeholders. On the other hand the essential preparation of the evaluation (c.f. OECD 2008) had to be skipped. Additionally the Terms of Reference were only finalised and agreed upon by all parties involved (KURVE, trainers, evaluators) in February.

A slow flow of information and unclear responsibilities provided another challenge. The facilitators were informed about the researchers' presence during their training only two weeks before the first training started and did not receive any clear information on what their own duties and role in the process would be or how they could contact the researchers. Thus, some felt not included into the process and therefore were not sure about the scale of cooperation with the evaluators during the time of participatory

observation. Furthermore, it was difficult in some trainings (especially in the beginning) for the evaluators to enter into the process of participatory observation because it was mainly the researchers' responsibility to introduce themselves and the purpose of their attendance to trainers, participants, and other stakeholders. An active role as gatekeepers by KURVE was missing from time to time.

Although the trainers were very open to the evaluation team, they were very busy during and after the trainings. The evaluators did not receive replies to the first set of questions that they sent to some of the trainers right after the trainings (until December 2015). After a second approach in January several trainers engaged into the process and answered the questionnaire sent to them written or in an interview.

A further hurdle was that the training unit of KURVE does not have a written concept of the practitioner trainings, as described before. Hence, the evaluators had to invest additional time to collect data out of institutional documents and a time intense focus group to compile the needed information. This also influenced the focus of the evaluation, as the objectives were only named and indicators developed in the focus group. After conducting the focus group in November, the researchers wrote a first draft of the concept which they received back in a reviewed version by KURVE at the end of February. Hence some limitations occurred due to slow communication processes with the KURVE training unit. An overload of work, health reasons and holidays in the trainings unit increased this fact.

The results are limited to the data that the evaluators received. Those participants, trainers and other resource persons who were engaged in the process together with the researchers shaped the final results of the evaluation. Nevertheless, there are many other views and perspectives of stakeholders that were not heard due to different reasons (all were informed about the evaluation). This has to be taken into account when reading the results. In addition, the researchers do not claim the results to be neutral. They are aware of their own biases as well as those of their interview partners on the research process.

5. Findings on Relevance

5.1. Introduction

In this chapter all findings regarding the question whether the trainings are relevant to the needs of the target groups will be presented.

Therefore, a brief look will be taken at who “the participants” are, i.e. who was actually attending the trainings in 2015. Then, all data that was collected and about the motivations and expectations with which participants apply for the training will be presented. The statements give insights in how relevant the participants assess the topics of the trainings ,for themselves, why they apply especially at KURVE and what they expect and hope to happen in the trainings. For this part, data derived from applications forms as well as interviews and questionnaires with participants and organisations that send participants to KURVE trainings. In a next step, statements that were made by participants after their attendance regarding the actual relevance of contents and methods (and the overall setting) will be presented. In this part, data from interviews and questionnaires as well as reaction sheets (evaluation sheets handed out by KURVE to participants after each training to assess the training they attended) was used. Object of research were the practitioners series in spring and fall 2015.

Indicators that were used to assess the relevance of the trainings were:

- Participants mention that the training topics are relevant for their work as peace workers before the training starts
- Participants state that they have a need of building new capacities in that specific field of the training/s (before the training)
- Participants mention that the training formats of KURVE – international training group and facilitation style – correspond to their needs (during and after the training)
- Participants assess the over-all setting at KURVE during their stay in Wustrow appropriate
- Participants afterwards say that the training has been effective in terms of an observable change in their behaviour (see next chapter).

The results of the last indicator will be presented in the next chapter. This is where the interconnectedness of relevance and effectiveness can be located.

KURVE states that they are in constant exchange with their partner organisations who give feedback on what kind of qualifications and competences their staff members need and thus help to guarantee the relevance of the training topics. (KURVE 2016). Likewise, participants personal conversations or reaction sheets that they fill out at the end of a training give feedback about what they need or criticize. Those feedbacks are collected and often trainers initiate the development of new trainings for those topics (K4 – interview).Trainings with the following topics were offered by KURVE in the training series of spring and autumn 2015: “Utilising Media for Campaigning and Advocacy” (Utilising Media), “Introduction to Security”, “Digital Security for Peace

Activists” (Digital Security), “Strategising Change for Social Movements” (Strategising Change), “Project Management for Peace Work – Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation” (PME), “Security Management for Peace Work in Conflict Zones” (Security Management), “Anti-Bias and Social Inclusion – Prejudice Awareness for Peace Work” (Anti-Bias), and “Managing Organisational Change in Non-Governmental Organisations” (Organisational Change).

The different trainings aim at supporting peace workers in their diverse working fields, tasks, situations and responsibilities and with all their challenges and opportunities they come along. Therefore, the relevance of the several topics are described by KURVE (2016) as follows: *“Peace work needs proper planning, monitoring and evaluation in order to be able to contribute positively towards conflict transformation”* (PME).

In the Anti-Bias training it is mentioned that peace work *“aims at establishing and nurturing inclusive societies that provide equal access to social, political and economic resources to all”* and hence it is important to understand that the unequal power relations in a society and a region peace workers are active in also influence their work in conflict transformation and reconciliation (T4).

For NGOs and initiatives that often lack visibility in public, the training on Utilising Media offers useful skills and practical support. The trainings on security aim at the diverse threats and dangers peace workers are facing due to their activism and offer various approaches, techniques and skills to protect themselves and others.

The training on Managing Organisational Change addresses especially NGO staff members who are working in conflict zones and *“need to adapt their at times rapidly changing environment”*. Finally, peace and movement workers were explicitly addressed in the training on

Strategising Change, who in their struggle for *“peace, justice or the environment, often find themselves in seemingly hopeless situations”* (KURVE 2015:22). In helping to strategies, actions and campaigns this training seeks to support movements and NGOs in times of chaos and risk. The target groups mentioned by trainers are mostly very inclusive when approaching movement and NGO workers and IPW together. The training Security Management is targeting “management level staff and those who are responsible for security” in an organisation or initiative. Organisational Change – as the name suggests – addresses people working in or with NGOs. The new training on Strategising Change is relevant for “movements, activists, informal groups/initiatives, trade unions, grass roots organizations and advocacy-NGOs” (KURVE 2015:23).

5.2. Who are “the participants”?

The target group of KURVE practitioner trainings are both peace workers in the Global South and North. Among those, the biggest group are people from the Global South working in NGOs – this can be field workers, administrators, managers or board members alike. Many of those participants are working in NGOs which collaborate with KURVE within the Civil Peace Service (CPS). Since KURVE is a German CPS organisation, the second biggest group of participants are German International Peace Workers and attendees of the educational programme. The smallest group of participants are activists from the Global South.

In 2015 KURVE received 245 applications for their trainings. A final total number of 73 participants attended the trainings (42 women and 31 men). The training groups included 36 NGO workers (of whom 18 were working for a partner organisation of KURVE), 15 International Peace Workers (IPW), eight trainees (only fall 2015), and ten activists. Participants attended between one and five trainings. Six participants took part in the whole series, eleven in three or more trainings. Attendees came from Bangladesh (2), Bosnia (3), Columbia (1), Georgia (2), Germany (22), Israel (1), Kenya (3), Kosovo (2), Macedonia (3), Mozambique (1), Myanmar (7), Nepal (13), Palestine (8), and Sudan (5). The countries reflect KURVES regions of action – partner organisations can be found on the Balkan, in Israel/Palestine as well as in South Asia. The high amount of German and female participants is owed to the fact that the practitioners trainings are part of the preparation of IPW who KURVE sends to their partner organisations abroad as well as the newly education in which eight trainees take part – nearly all of them are women.

The trainings with the highest number of participants were Strategising Change and PME and Organisational Change, in which each more than 20 people took part.

Even though more activists do apply for the trainings, due to difficulties in getting visas for this group, they form only a small percentage among the training groups. Most of the participants work in NGOs. This percentage distribution is also reflected in the amount of data that the researchers were able to collect: Most of the data derived from participants who work in NGOs and from International Peace Workers. Since autumn 2015 KURVE offers a one year training to become a consultant for conflict transformation and social movements. Parts of this education programme are five practitioners trainings of which three are obligatory: Anti-Bias, Facilitation and Training skills as well as Project Management. Hence in the autumn training series 2015 it was the first time that trainees attended the practitioners trainings.

5.3. Motivations and Expectations of Participants

The high relevance of the training topics is confirmed by the high amount of applicants and the motivations that are written down in the application forms. In the application form candidates are asked to describe their “motivation for wanting to attend this specific training” and “what [they] expect to learn in this specific training”. There are striking differences in the length and depth of the answers to those questions. Some applicants formulated them in a very general way without referring to specific training. Others expressed very explicitly why they need further training in a special topic. Not all participants answered the questions in the application form about their motivation and expected learning of the trainings they applied for. It remains unclear how the training unit assesses the relevance of the topics for those participants and in how far the brief outline of motivation is influencing the admission.

In general all participants applied because they rate the topics of the trainings as relevant for their (future) work. Participants from the Global South live and work in (post-)conflict regions where they face different societal or political challenges such as tensions in diverse and divided societies, political persecution, state observation, resource conflicts, traumatised societies, etc. Those contexts shape the activities and projects peace workers are engaged in. Thus, a need to build new capacities for peace work or strengthen existing ones are the main motivation for participants to apply for the trainings. Most of them are motivated by certain challenges they face in their work and the urge to face them in a better way.

For me personally, living in such a divided and diverse region might just be the deepest motivation. I have to upgrade myself in this field and to contribute in further development of the society I live in. (P49 – application form)

Some participants knew KURVE as a partner or as a training provider from previous trainings and had good experience with them. That is what motivated them to choose KURVE as the training provider. Hence, KURVE's focus and experience in nonviolence and conflict transformation is a decisive factor for applicants to choose the trainings offered by KURVE. Getting support to address challenges in conflict situations by experienced facilitators in a proficient institution is an objective that most of the participants have. Their personal interest in the contents covered in the training can help them to achieve this objective. All attendees mention that they are motivated and expect to develop (more) skills, knowledge, and experience to perform their peace work in a more professional way. The way in which participants want this to be provided is in form of tools, methods, practice and exchange of experiences with facilitators and other attendees. However, single voices expect (and want) theories included in the training schedule.

[The] training courses are fitting the area of my interests and I am sure I can not only gain but share my own experience too. My motivation is to learn new skills, gain new knowledge and develop network with people who are working in same field as I do. (P53 – application form)

Those who have some pre-knowledge or experience in the topics of the training want to enhance their understanding of situations and contents. Most of the participants seek to establish new networks with other participants from different regions in the world, to exchange experience and learn from each other strategies of their engagement for peace. The international compilation of the training group at KURVE that enables participants to learn about other countries and working contexts is a very important factor that motivates many for an application. Being able to “learn from experiences of other participants” and take part in an “inspiring learning atmosphere” is an unique chance for many participants.

The uniqueness of all these trainings is that they bring diversity along from all over the world. (P39 – interview)

Especially the sharing of different contexts, that is the most beautiful part of this trainings. Participants from different corners of the world... that gives quite an insight. (O8 – interview)

Many applicants want to become change agents in their communities and societies, i.e. to be trained to spread the new knowledge and skills to colleagues or other target groups they are working with. Long-term objectives such as “contribute to more effective strategies for human rights and sustainable peace”, “contribute to conflict transformation”, “raise awareness”, or “empower social movements” are mentionable motivations. Reaching a personal development through an international exposure was explicitly mentioned by two applicants as one objectives.

Scholarships of KURVE are helpful and crucial especially for participants from the Global South because without financial support they could not make the experience of being trained in Germany. Two organisations mentioned that for their staff members the opportunity to be trained abroad is very important for them, since in poor countries opportunities and institutions for further training are weak. The reputation and job opportunities that increase by attending trainings in Germany motivate many peace workers from the Global South to apply at KURVE. The improvement of job opportunities is likewise a motivation of the trainees of KURVE.

A lot of people, (...) want to come here. (...) They want to gain theoretical knowledge in the training. And (...) comparatively we are poor and we are not able to go abroad, that is another reason people want to come to Germany, that is a matter of prestige also, to go to any other countries for trainings or seminars. That is very good, a very big thing for them. (O8 – interview)

Motivations and expected learnings that are valid for the particular target groups are presented in the following part:

5.3.1. Activists

Eight activists stated their motivations and expected learnings in their application. Many of them were formulated very generally especially when they were applying for the whole training series. Thus, the application lists gave little evidence about their motivations and expected learnings regarding specific topics. The few information that could be extracted are the following:

Topics on security (especially digital security), project management, media and campaigning, as well as movement work are the contents that were mentioned as most relevant for activists. Most of them chose KURVE as a training provider because they were recommended by colleagues or friends who told them about the trainings.

The training Strategising Change is designed especially for movement workers who plan activities and are committed to nonviolence. Nevertheless, motivations and expected learnings were formulated by activists more generally than explicitly regarding this training: *I want to know more about how to plan and systemise my movement and my personality as an active human rights defender.* (P46 – questionnaire).

The trainings on security are especially important for those activists who for example participate or organise demonstrations or campaigns or other nonviolent activities. An increase of knowledge and training should decrease the risks as an activist. The main objective of those trainings for activists is “how to protect myself”, as well as protecting members of the social movement and others. For activists, digital security appears to be one of the most relevant topics.

During my long experience in the social movement I found out that the mistakes which causing risks to me as an activist and to my colleagues are because of the lack of knowledge. (P1 – application form)

PME as well as Utilising Media were rated as highly relevant among activists in order work more effectively on projects and increase the impact of campaigns and advocacy work.

We are organising campaigns and demonstrations on peace and human rights issues. We need to have better skills in using media. And we also need to know how to run security plans for our members and other activists (P51 – application form)

No explicit motivations and expected learnings were expressed by activists for the trainings on Anti-Bias and Social Inclusion as well as Organisational Change.

5.3.2. NGOs (staff members)

The majority of organisations that have sent one or more of their staff members to attend a KURVE training rate the relevance of the trainings very high. The topics that are mentioned as relevant for them as an organisation are organizational development, facilitation and training skills, PME, strategizing change, stress and trauma counseling, gender sensitivity, campaigning and advocacy, and Anti-Bias. The relevance is high since the topics address their work either on an administrative/ theoretical or a content level.

In an organisation with more works on software components like lobbying and advocacy and human rights and this kind of things, this kind of trainings are very much relevant and these are the trainings we need, and the organisations which work on conflict transformation, peace building and human rights, counseling trauma and stress, gender equality, social change, campaigning, advocacy, these are essential topics. And also the facilitation and training, because we are providing so many trainings to our stakeholders in community level, so these are skills we need. (O8 – interview)

Staff members of NGOs work in communities, peace building projects, development work and have different positions and responsibilities in their organisations (IT experts, field workers, managers, board members, trainers, etc.). Most of the NGO workers seek personal and professional development and benefits for themselves, their professional career and/or their organisation. Four NGO representatives mentioned the wish to start a cooperation with KURVE or that they already are in the process of implementing it. Several participants said that they were asked and sent by their organisation to get further training and develop capacities for their work.

Participants who work for a partner organisation of KURVE, e.g. as a Local Peace Worker (LPW), were additionally motivated to attend trainings at KURVE by meeting and getting to know KURVE's staff and other partner organisations. Some of them attended trainings together with their international counterpart with whom they are working together in a project. Getting to know approaches of KURVE to certain topics (especially PME and Security Management) that can help and support their cooperation is a motivating factor for their attendance or reason why they were sent. Since the arrival to KURVE implies a long journey for staff members of many of the partner organisations, the peacebuilding unit suggests to them to stay for more trainings than just one so that the trip to Germany becomes more beneficial (K3, K2, P42).

As we entered in new partnership with Kurve and they (...) have their own system in implementation of projects, form and structure, I am highly motivated to be introduced with new or different approaches in project management and improve my existing knowledge and experience in planning, monitoring and evaluation. (P54 – application form)

A few NGO workers expressed their motivation and expectations for the Anti-Bias training. These derive mainly from personal interest because the social environment they are living in is shaped by a highly diverse society and different mechanisms of discrimination which effects their life and work in general. Two mentioned that the field of Anti-Bias and anti-discrimination is the actual content of their projects.

I was interested in Anti-Bias because that is how we are working and we want to see how it is different in other countries. (...) I want to know more about the training and understand how the content is delivered – we have a very different thing in [our country]. (P42 – interview)

My country is very diverse based on ethnic, [social classes] and there is the session on Anti-Bias I was very interested in. (...) I had the expectation to learn skills and tools how to work in diverse communities without affecting anybody. (P30 – interview)

The trainings on security that KURVE offered in 2015 appear highly relevant for NGOs as well. Most of the participants want to learn how to make organisations and their work more secure. They seek knowledge on how to assess the security situation of their organisation and to respond to personal and institutional security affairs (“coping threats”) to work more effectively.

As a program manager of the organisation I am also responsible for security matter of the organisation, staff, volunteers, as well as all the information and documents related to the organisation. We are also running a security related project (...). Since I am also responsible for all the project management and supervision, I am highly motivated to learn knowledge on security. (P43 – application form)

The course about security is very relevant because we work in depression and very violent and insecure work and area. The training will be useful for my organisation [because] we also started a process about digital security and security in general and safe spaces for us and our activities. This made me thought about what kind of steps we need to start to take in our process. (P41 – application form)

Another highly relevant content is provided by the PME training. Many of the participants working in NGOs state that they already have experience in that field but feel the need to be updated with new knowledge and enhance their capacities in project management for peace work.

I want the opportunity to learn the various strategies of other local and international organizations engaged in conflict transformation in order to strengthen my own work and to introduce me to new ways of thinking. I want to gain the tools that are necessary to properly identify and assess local challenges to peace (...) and to subsequently develop projects in order to ameliorate the situation to the best of my ability. (P48 – application form)

Others who do not have much experience seek tools and methods for planning, implementing and evaluating their projects in a structured way and finally to be better equipped for their peace work. This training is especially relevant for partner organisations of KURVE, since they have to get familiar with the approaches that their German partner is using.

Managing Organisational Change seems to be a very relevant topic for many NGO workers especially in management positions since they face different challenges in their organisation concerning internal changes but also reaction to external change. They seek for exchange and support on how to approach those challenges:

Most of the staff is lacking motivation to accomplish our mission and loosing interest in holding their job as a peace worker because of security and communal tension. In terms of those challenges, I think I need specific skills to encourage and inspire staff so they will be able to contribute our mission. (P52 – application form)

My organisation was in crisis for some years but could recover until now. Still, some areas of my organisation have to be improved in terms of team building, ownership, and taking emerging challenges that the programmes bring. We need to first realise [the need for change] and have a team with better understanding on what is going on, that kind of different perception level and of different capacities is a struggle for me. I thought I can learn something from here and then apply some of the tools back in my organisation. (P39 – interview)

I want to listen and learn from other people's experience, how they could have changed successfully and about their failures. And if there are big changes from outside happen to our internal organisation scenario how to respond to it as a leader. (P28 – interview)

Strategising Change is assessed as a relevant topic by those NGO workers who work together with social movements or at least feel related to them. A general interest in the topic is expressed by most of the participants, as they seek for strategies for nonviolent action in general or they want to learn more about how to manage and consciously direct change in societies. Forming coalitions among diverse actors, mobilising the public, developing a common vision and integrate these resources in an effective strategy for change are the main aspects of their interest and motivation in that topic. For some NGOs this topic seems also relevant in the sense of reaching out to social movements and building networks.

For me, it has been the most interesting issue to be trained on. For my organisational perspective and for my task, when the terms suitability and sustainability come, I feel we need to be strategizing the change. Besides, in terms of social movement, I think there are a lot of areas that my organisation can explore. And this training, certainly I believe, can equip me more to contribute to do so because extremism and terrorism has become a challenge for our country and as a change maker, I realize, we have to work for building a society where non-violence will be practised by all. (P50 – application form)

I am fully dedicated to hear about the social movements and peace approaches in different countries and as well very curious to learn new tools from respectful moderators for strategies and nonviolent action. (P47 – application form)

The training on Utilising Media is relevant for most of the participants who work in NGOs. In attending this training they seek for skills to support their organisations in getting “more visible in public”. Some of the participants are not familiar with the use of media and want to explore the possibilities that social media offers for their work.

Media is one of the key instruments as well as major stakeholders of the activities carried out by my organisation. (...) I hope I will enhance my knowledge and skills on building relationship with media, journalistic writing, drafting press releases, conducting press conference through this training and it will also help me to explore the opportunities of social media. (P50 – application form)

5.3.3. International Peace Workers

There are two possible points of time at which IPWs can take part in KURVE trainings: either during their preparation time for the Civil Peace Service (CPS) or they attend a training during their service. In the first case, many do not have a lot of experience in the certain field that the project will be about and/or the region they will work in. The fields differ depending on the organisation they will work for, but all are related to peace work. Most of the participants stated that the German CPS-organisation they are working for chose the trainings for them and that only a limited space for own choices remained. In case the job description is not clarified at the time of the preparation, it is very difficult for the IPW to assess the degree of relevance of the trainings.

I did not choose the trainings. They were on my plan for the preparation. There was one training that I was not interested in. When I asked if I could attend one instead, the answer was 'no'. (...) Regarding my job, there were other topics that would have been interesting and probably more important, but they were offered by other training providers. (P34 – interview)

All of them want to be well prepared for their jobs abroad and hence seek an effective and target-oriented preparation: *My expectations for the whole preparation: Feeling really well-prepared at time of my departure.* (P34 – application form). One IPW expressed that she* wants to “discuss limits of tools in certain regional contexts”. Others just want to get an introduction into a topic as they “don't know much about it”.

I just hope that all the different courses will enable me to make informed decisions in my work life on which tools, methods, ideas may suite the situation best and which I feel confident to apply or not. (P25 – application form)

The peacebuilding unit at KURVE that is responsible for the preparation of IPWs set certain trainings compulsory for that preparation, such as PME, Anti-Bias and Security Management. There are discussions inside the unit about whether this selection of topics is useful for all IPWs or not (K2 – interview).

IPWs who already have been working in their projects for a certain time and come back to Germany for a training, are motivated to gain further education that supports their work in the field or as coordinators and thus choose trainings that are explicitly related to their projects. After being familiar with the region and the context in which they operate they know the challenges and questions that are relevant for them and in which fields they need support and further training. That is why nearly all of them express

very specific expectations for a certain training. The needs depend on the different working contexts and topics they have. In 2015 Managing Organisational Change and Strategising Change were the two trainings that were attended most by these IPWs. Those CPS organisations in Germany who send their IPWs during their preparation to trainings at KURVE list the following topics as most relevant for them: security issues, the Do-no-Harm approach, Anti-Bias, skills for facilitation and training, stress and trauma counselling, campaigning and advocacy and strategised change. For our CPS workers we set up an individual preparation depending on the person and their position in their future work. We together with the IPW often choose trainings from the training programme of KURVE Wustrow as one element of this preparation. (O4 – questionnaire)

5.3.4. Trainees

Due to the mixture of mandatory and self chosen trainings, trainees state that the motivation for their attendance is either duty or interest – depending on the topic. Those who mentioned a specific interest said that this derives from previous experience, current studies or an idea where they want to work in future. Therefore they wanted to deepen and enhance their knowledge and skills. Some saw the trainings as a preparation for their practical unit (three months) or future work and an opportunity for self-reflection especially when they want to work abroad. One trainee explicitly revealed that she* expected to get a lot of theoretical input that she* then can put into practice (P44 – interview).

As [this training] is part of my training as coach for conflict transformation and social movements I see it as very useful to have this training before I start my practical period of the training. (P 32 – application form)

5.4. Reactions of participants during or after the trainings

5.4.1. Contents

NGO workers and activists:

Most of the participants said that the contents of the trainings were (very) good and relevant for their work. Especially the focus on peace work in most of the trainings is very important. Regarding the questions whether their expectations were met content-wise the whole range of possible answers was given. Most of the participants were very satisfied with the training contents and methods. They are aware that in a week

not all expectations of a very diverse group can be met. Hence, the satisfaction with the training depends highly in what one expects:

It depends on your expectations: when we come to a training, we want to see everything whatever we wanted, but we should remember that this is only 4-5 days, so they can actually not get into the inside of every training. They tried their best to make it participatory to some extend it met my expectations, but the "limit is the sky", so you can remain unhappy with some part. (P39 – interview)

Around one third of the participants criticised that they did not know that the trainings were content-wise very broad and introductory. This led to frustration and disappointment for those participants who expected to dive deep into the subject matter or extend already existing knowledge. They would have liked to receive more detailed information about the training contents and level beforehand. This concerns in particular those trainings that are relevant for certain contexts (regional or work related). The training on Security Management for example was especially relevant for peace workers who work in regions where the security situation is unstable and physical threats by the police or other groups are concrete. Likewise, it was relevant for participants who are responsible for security in their organisation (mostly management positions or staff coordinators). Others, who do not fit into those categories, stated that the training was interesting but not relevant for their working and living context.

Trainees:

After attending, most of the trainees revealed that not all their expectations concerning content, level and speed of the training were met, especially because the information they received about the trainings beforehand were not consistent with the content. This applies particularly for the Security Management, Anti-Bias and the Managing Organisational Change trainings. Handling this discrepancy was not easy for them.

It was not helpful to start the (...) training with the expectations I had, because the focus was quite different. I believe that after two days I realised that we will not reach the point I wanted to get due to group dynamics. But I finally learned many other things and that is why the trainings was good. But still, it is difficult to say good-bye to your own expectations. (P32 – interview)

For me it was not really clear if this was supposed to be a basic introduction to a topic or is this supposed to be for practitioners who already have an understanding of certain issues. (P44 – interview)

On the other hand, not all trainees considered it important that all training contents are perfectly relevant for them since additional supervision and several coaching units integrated in the education programme allow them to discuss topics that were missed out in trainings.

Having the chance to follow-up the trainings by intervision and coaching, or with other training providers is great. Like that we can close the gaps that would exist if

we had only practitioners trainings. (P29 – interview)

Since it is the first round of the education programme at KURVE, some trainees observed that their role in the practitioners trainings is not fully defined. One trainee stated that it was important for her* to meet peace workers from other organisations that could be relevant contacts for her* practical training during the education.

IPW in preparation:

Some IPWs felt that they had no choice to decide by themselves which trainings are relevant for them and that they had to attend trainings that were not (yet) important for their future job. This sense is enhanced by the fact that many IPWs in preparation cannot determine what could be relevant for them, since they have not started to work in the project yet. One participant would have preferred to get a more target-oriented coaching by the peacebuilding unit instead of a five-day training that is interesting but not relevant for her* job: *[The training] was interesting but what was really relevant for the job was tackled in a two-hours introduction with the peacebuilding unit – which was not enough time. (P34 – interview)*

The Anti-Bias training was relevant for most of the IPW, since it brings own discrimination tendencies to the surface which is essential when working abroad. Nevertheless, for some participants the focus and the reflection on their own role as a German civil peace servant working abroad were lacking.

IPWs as well as people from partner organisations (e.g. LPW) of KURVE appreciate the opportunity to meet the respective counterpart during the trainings before the IPW starts her* work in their project. For the IPW it is very supportive to get to know the future organisation she* will work for and for the partner organisation it is helpful to meet the “foreigner” who will work with them.

Need for change:

Besides the general feedback, the stakeholders mentioned areas and issues in which they indicate a need for change regarding the relevance of the trainings.

It was difficult for several participants to find out whether a training is relevant for them or not. The course profile in leaflets and on the homepage are not described meaningfully enough for them, i.e. it does not provide the information the applicant require to assess the relevance of the trainings for herself* in advance. It even misled some participants with their expectations. The same holds true for organisations that sent their staff to KURVE and hence have to assess the relevance of the trainings for their employees. They wish to have explicitly more information about target groups and level of the trainings. Furthermore, there were a few participants who were frustrated

because they mentioned their high expectations in the application form but did not receive feedback that those expectations would not be met in the training. Hence, it is requested that more information is provided by KURVE about content and level of the trainings as well as a clear definition of profile and focus of practitioners training: is it the content and capacity building or is it the international leaning experience? Additionally participants would like to have feedback to their applications in case the expected learnings are not coherent with the training contents.

If KURVE says 'our focus is the international training group where people are personally challenged in the informal learning', then it is clear. Then I would not have been frustrated about the content, because I knew that it is also about how I look at people. (P44 – interview)

Concerning the level of the trainings, some participants expressed the wish that topics could have been deeper. They seek to participate in higher level trainings. At the same time there were some participants who rated the level of the trainings as high – concerning language and content.

Regarding the contents of the trainings, several suggestions were made on what changes are necessary or recommendable: One aspect that was mentioned by several participants is their want for more exchange about the background and the countries of the participants as well as their working contexts. Hence, the exchange among participants who are working in similar projects or similar positions in an organisation and the establishment of synergies among them was not enough supported for several participants.

There was no time for “where are you coming from?” and “in what context are you working in?” and “what are the conflicts there?” and “what exactly are you doing with your organisation?”. I felt that there was not enough space for it and that is a pity! Because, there is great potential in the group. (P25 – interview)

With a look at the training methods, participants rated those trainings more relevant in which they were able to connect the examples given in the training to their own contexts. There were some participants especially from non-European countries who felt that the examples in many trainings were difficult to relate to their own working and living situation.

They give examples from totally different contexts [than ours], it is really hard for us to get the points. So this kind of things they have to develop depending on the level of participants and their context. The examples from Africa and Asia are easier for us to understand than the context from Germany, from European countries. (P43 – interview)

Since the day one I was thinking about like they should have some examples from the East also. It might be that we do not have the models or the theory but still, we implement something in the country. It would be good if not only participants but also facilitators try to see where are the participants from, What are the particular

things over there? (...) Because the cultures are so different. It should be discussed here about the differences. If there is one example the facilitator should say 'okay, in Asia it might be different'. (P42 – interview)

There was one person who expressed that she* did not like the training methods since they were very traditional and not up to date, i.e. with the use of media (P26 – interview). Especially those participants who are part of the education programme at KURVE or in the preparation for their Civil Peace Service and either do not have (yet) an own project or organisation on which they can apply tools and methods found it difficult to take part in the several experienced-based learning methods.

5.4.2. Appropriateness of the over-all setting

In this part, the feedback regarding the over-all setting of the trainings is collected. The over-all setting encompasses the training group, the perceived atmosphere during the training, programme apart from training sessions, logistics and organisation, and the venue (accommodation, food, facilities, location).

Concerning the training group, all participants have the need to meet people from different parts of the world and have the possibility to exchange with them about peace work. The heterogeneous and multi-cultural group composition is very important and a valuable experience for most of the participants.

Sometimes formally and also informally I interact with participants from other countries. I get some ideas from them. When we share that is a good idea for peacebuilding. Peace practice is getting new ideas and interventions from others. We can share this type of experience. This is really good. (P33 – interview)

The atmosphere during the trainings was described as pleasant, positive and international. Special thanks is given by many to German participants who additionally support them in orienting in Wustrow, booking train tickets, translating and in general feeling responsible for those who stay in Germany for the first time. Since there are often several participants from the same country, they tend to speak in their own language outside the training. Others tried to switch into English as soon as a person who was not familiar with the specific language entered the room. This behavior was experienced as respectful and helpful.

I know it is not so easy if you have someone you can speak the same language with and then you cannot, because you are trying to consider others. That is why I am thankful for you people that you try to be very considerate when others are around. And for me that is a very good thing, it makes me feel comfortable. You do not have to keep thinking, what they could be saying, if they laugh, you think: they could be laughing at my face. So if a common language is used, it makes you feel comfortable. And for that I am very thankful. (P36 – interview)

A few participants wished that the trainers would have known the group of participants better and prepared themselves on who will take part in the training to be more able to respond to the different needs and to make the trainings as relevant as possible for all participants. In addition, some attendees perceived that the exchange and awareness for the different cultures that everybody brings with herself* – not only during the training sessions but also during common meals and free time – should be much more supported by facilitators and participants:

It is good to have a mixed group of practitioners and trainees but then it should be very well communicated with the trainers. The trainers should know much better about where do people come from and who is in the group. (P44 – interview)

One participant said that in her country they do not talk while eating. I thought this is tough! Maybe it is possible to have a bit more consideration for who has which customs in her* country, and what does she* need to feel comfortable? (P37 – interview)*

Some participants who were the only representatives of their country expressed the wish to have another person from the same country in the training to exchange the societal and political situations. The additional value for the training group in having different views from one country was mentioned as well.

Training coordination – attending several trainings:

Many participants mentioned that attending several trainings in a row was challenging especially if not all of them are relevant for them.

Rather than attending all trainings [of a series] you can have one or two very relevant trainings and go back, apply again and do some follow up trainings. Because I had three trainings last year but I found only one training relevant, useful for me. The others I did not find so relevant for my work. (P43 – interview)

Not only those participants who stayed longer than three weeks but also those facilitators and other attendees who observed them and were in contact with them expressed the need for more support and accompany during the time in Wustrow. Especially for participants who visited Germany for the first time, a programme on week-ends or during the trainings to change the location would be helpful for them.

Here the participants feel depressed, because others come and go and they are left here and they do not go anywhere, just the library, the kitchen, their bedroom. That is very boring. (P27 – interview)

The needs for group dynamics and for working with the group differ between those who stay longer at KURVE and those who stay only for one week. Trainers have to be aware of the weekly changes in the group composition that some participants experience and the different needs that occur due to that situation.

The meals that are offered at the seminar house is rated by all participants “great” or “good”, except of single voices. The strictly vegetarian menu was a challenge for some participants. Others were used to it or expressed some kind of “interesting experience”. Some enjoyed KURVE's idea behind the practice to eat vegetarian food as a form of nonviolence, which for them was real practice – “not easy but good”. Lots of the participants expressed gratitude for the flexibility of KURVE's kitchen staff and their care for making everybody feels comfortable.

The house in which KURVE Wustrow has its offices and seminar rooms is very old. Participants were impressed how well it is managed. Regarding the accommodation, most of the participants had no problem to share a room with others. Some expressed that this is not ideal, but that they managed for the time staying in Wustrow. Two or three persons in one room is found agreeable and convenient- More than four individuals in one room feels uncomfortable for some participants, especially when there is little space to store own belongings. During most of the trainings facilitators and participants are living together in the same house, which was appreciated by participants as an opportunity to talk to trainers and other participants and continue discussions that came up during the sessions. The community living created an atmosphere of familiarity in which participants trusted each other and cared for one another. This experience of sharing food, time and one house with people from different parts of the world is intense, unique and valuable for all participants – especially for those who travelled abroad (to Europe) for the first time.

The fact that we could share facilities with people from different countries and cultures make me realise the other side that I did not know and also the opportunity to travel to Europe is an interesting experience especially for first timers. (P19 – questionnaire)

It was criticised by several participants that the training room at KURVE is not made for large groups. Additionally, the noise from the street was disturbing for some attendees. One participant argued that other training providers receive more performances for the same fee (single room with own bathroom; common restroom, etc.) and for direct payers this prize-performance ratio is not well-balanced. That is why one voice feared that people from the development work sector like at the German organisation GIZ might not feel comfortable at KURVE since they are used higher standards in accommodation and service.

All participants who mentioned the staff members of KURVE said that they enjoyed their support and friendliness (“so friendly”, “kind hearted people”; “humble”; “welcoming”). Participants got the impression that everybody working at KURVE was trying to make them feel comfortable and they appreciated this – especially the support from training coordinators.

And the staff is equally friendly. I do not know most of them by name, but if I meet them on the stairs, they always smile, even if they do not say anything; it makes you feel like you are part of, they know you are here, and they do not have a problem with it. (P36 – interview)

Many participants stated that they were impressed and fascinated by KURVE's and the region's history of nonviolent resistance. For them it was very important to learn about that background of KURVE as the training provider, host, employer or partner. Especially for internal IPWs and partner organisations it is crucial to get to know the headquarters, the people working there and the association's philosophy.

Wustrow was described by several participants as a nice and calm environment without distraction. For them it was a great place for learning and concentrating. Several participants who are working in a stressful environment mentioned that the time in Wustrow, and hence in a remote, quiet place with beautiful landscape, is an enjoyable time-off from work. Nevertheless, for a few participants the remoteness of Wustrow was challenging since there are few possibilities for leisure time in the evenings or at week-ends: *The reason why I am tired and why I am bored is that I am far away from home, it is a very quiet place and I cannot go somewhere to relax. (P27 – interview)*

Concerning logistics, several participants mentioned that the written information about logistics that is sent to the participants before their arrival in Germany is good but very abstract if one does not know the place yet. Hence, they needed further orientation during their stay in Wustrow. The differences in public transport systems compared to the country of origin of some participants were described as confusing. Many participants from abroad explained that they would need more support in reaching and leaving Wustrow:

We are so new and we do not know about all those systems here. I was a bit worried how to go back because I was trying to get the train ticket. I still do not have the train ticket and I was not sure what to do. It is quite difficult for the people who do not have those kind of system. (...) If in the beginning we had an orientation about how to get back and what to do – though it is in the written form they sent – but still if the small things have been told it would have been easy for us. (P42 – interview)

One participant criticised that the way of using health insurance is difficult and that some scholarships do not cover it.

Evaluation of trainings:

Some participants stated that after the training they felt the to give feedback especially to the trainers but also to KURVE. They criticised the way of how the trainings were evaluated at the last day of the training. Often, a time span of five to ten minutes was given for the reaction sheet, which was found to be not enough time to answer the

different questions properly. Additionally it was criticised that some of the trainers did not leave the room during that evaluation which they perceived as unprofessional

I find it very difficult due to time pressure to fill out the reaction sheet. And then not knowing what is the aim of it and the purpose, the motivation to fill it out is quite low. And the question I always had was, is the sheet for KURVE or do the trainers receive them? For whom is it? (P24 – interview)

Follow-up:

The lack of a follow-up programme was stated many times as one of the weaknesses of KURVE trainings. The wish and need for further support after the training is high since there was mentioned an insecurity of applying tools and methods in the own context, particularly when participating alone. Another critique mentioned by a few attendees was that the initiative to stay in contact has to be embraced by participants themselves or the trainers and that the KURVE training unit does not offer to support the group with that issue.

5.5. Conclusion

For all participants, learning new capacities for their peace work is highly relevant. The relevance of the contents on the trainings depend on their working field, their position and the sort of engagement in peace work (NGO work, activism, CPS, education programme).

The needs are vary between international participants and those who are living or working in Germany. Additionally, participants who stay for more than one training and up to five weeks in Wustrow have different needs, especially concerning the over-all setting but also concerning the training methods, than those who attended just one or two trainings. Furthermore, needs differ depending on the position or responsibilities people have in their organisation or initiative.

Taking a look at the indicators mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, the following statements can be concluded: All stakeholders mentioned that the training topics are relevant for peace workers. All participants considered training as a form of capacity building and important and relevant for their further development and work efficiency. Several participants from the Global South argued that the opportunities and funds for further education in their countries, especially for peace workers, are limited. KURVE's offer which provide financial support are therefore very much needed. Not all participants stated that the training formats of KURVE (international training group and facilitation style) corresponded to their needs. There was a majority that was in general satisfied with the training formats, but some participants expected more theory, a higher level, better English skills by several participants and trainers, or a more

homogeneous group composition. Concerning the over-all setting at KURVE, most of the stakeholders found it appropriate for learning and concentration. Nearly all participants noted a need for change regarding the week-end programme and logistical support. Especially for those coming to Wustrow for the first time and staying for several trainings, a more detailed introduction to the location and the house is demanded.

Whether the trainings were perceived to be effective for the participants – which is, besides the relevance, the second important issue for stakeholders – is analysed in the next chapter.

6. Findings Effectiveness

6.1. Introduction

The effectiveness of KURVE's international training work was assessed in two parts. The first is training validity, looking at the degree to which the trainings themselves are successful in building capacities, e.g. transferring knowledge, skills or fostering reflection. The second part is transfer validity which examines in how far the participants are able to transfer the acquired capacities, adapt and use them in their context.

As there was no written down concept for the trainings before the research started and the first draft was created during the research period, the objectives and indicators that KURVE named could not be fully considered in the evaluation. Already before the draft was written several interviews were conducted and questionnaires created. In the data analysis the researchers tried to cover the three objectives named by KURVE – skill development, networking, and reassurance – as much as possible. Anyhow the focus of the evaluation lies on skill development.

The DAC criteria say about effectiveness that it is a “measure of the extent to which an aid activity attains its objectives” (OECD n.d: 13). It is therefore recommended to assess to what extent the objectives of a programme are achieved and which factors were important in influencing this (ibid.)

Corresponding to this definition the research questions concerning effectiveness are the following:

- Are peace and movement workers able to build capacities in the trainings?
- Are they furthermore able to transfer and adapt the capacities to their work context and apply them successfully?

In regard to transfer validity, sustainability was taken into consideration to some degree as well.

In order to answer the research questions, factors that influence the effectiveness of the trainings were collected and taken into consideration. The evaluators furthermore tried to find out which effects the trainings have beyond meeting the predetermined objectives or not. Leaving more space to respondents about what was important to them, questions were included about how participants benefited from the trainings (What did you take out?) and about difficulties they encountered.

There are four parts to this chapter. First the objectives of KURVE as well as factors influencing learning, indicators for achieving the objectives and the pedagogical approach are explained shortly. Then the training validity is assessed, covering the first research question. In the third part the transition between training and going back to one's context and work is examined, covering personal benefits and plans for application of skills. The fourth part looks at transfer validity, addressing application, factors that supported or hindered the implementation of skills and follow-up. These findings will be discussed in the following chapter in order to answer the research questions and develop recommendations for improving the effectiveness of the trainings. Main source for the findings were the participants' responses, complemented by trainers' views as well as assessments of participants' organisations, competitors and KURVE staff working in the Civil Peace Service which are mainly used in the discussion.

While networking is covered as a separate objective, skill development and reassurance are assessed together, because they go hand in hand.

6.2. Objectives and Approach

The objectives of the trainings and the way in which they should be achieved are the basis of the assessment of their effectiveness.

KURVE names three objectives in its concept draft: Skill development, networking and reassurance. To measure their achievement some indicators were developed, which are not yet comprehensive. Because they were not yet available in the beginning of the evaluation time, they were only taken into consideration partly. Anyhow, they can be found in annex 4.

The three objectives are supposed to be reached by and in the Practitioner Trainings of KURVE. As already mentioned in the profile of the activity evaluated, KURVE has certain principles for its training methodology. Apart from participatory, participant- and process-oriented didactics (KURVE 2014, 8), the trainings have an experience-, action- and practice-orientation. Furthermore KURVE uses a three-step of experience, analysis and synthesis as basic methodology of their trainings. This means that

academic knowledge is combined with reflecting practice, addressing mind, heart and hands likewise. This methodology is applied by experienced trainers (KURVE 2015, 5). The participant observation and the trainers' responses in the evaluation showed that while the trainers have certain differences in their methods according to the training topic or personal preferences, all of them use participatory and diverse facilitation methods and work participant-oriented. Some methods that stood out were working on bigger case studies, doing role plays or simulations and working continuously on action plans during the trainings. The action plans aim at taking a first step towards implementation as participants already during the training think about how they want to apply their skills. Furthermore some trainers work with the ADIDS model (Activity-Discussion-Input-Deepening-Synthesis) and the concept of learning zones, which is based on the assumption that people learn best when they step out of their comfort zone but are not yet in the alarm zone.

Apart from the methodology and approach, there are also several other factors which influence the training validity. The findings are sorted around these factors.

6.3. Training Validity

Training validity is to a great extent influenced by the relevance of the contents for the participants and also is connected to the well-being during the training and how adequate the activities are. These factors were covered thoroughly in the previous chapter on the findings on relevance.

Furthermore the trainers play a big role, being the ones who facilitate the training, set the frame and deliver the content with certain methods. Moreover there are factors like the group of participants, the language and the length of trainings that are important.

6.3.1. Trainers and Approach to Facilitation

As the ones who carry out the actual activities of KURVE's training work, trainers – hereafter also referred to as facilitators – play an essential role.

Three participants appreciated to have trainer teams, as the facilitators can complement each other and provide different perspectives. But it was also mentioned that the trainers need to work well as a team. One participant was in favour of more diversity among the trainers in order to have perspectives from other continents as well. If trainers were from different regions, they could also relate the topics to different contexts outside of Europe. While five participants said the trainers working for KURVE are good and qualified facilitators, it was also stated that the quality of KURVE's trainings varies considerably depending on the trainers. More concrete examples were

given by two participants who mentioned positively that the trainers of Introduction to Security are experts in their field. For the PME training three participants appreciated that the trainers managed to provide easy access to complex tools.

The trainers are also important in shaping the atmosphere in a training. Different participants perceived the trainers as committed, friendly and easily approachable. It was valued that they shared a lot of information and took also time for the participants after and before training sessions. One participant said that with their empathy many trainers were good role models and another appreciated it very much how one trainer tried to make the participants feel comfortable in a new environment. One person valued the appreciative communication used by the trainers and that they took participants' needs and situations at home into consideration, e.g. in morning rounds. Furthermore the trainers' high awareness of the energy level and adequate dealing with this was appreciated. Especially for the Anti-Bias training it was mentioned that there was a good, safe atmosphere that enabled participants to work on a sensitive topic like this. But one participant had a different experience and mentioned critically that the trainers should try to be attentive to the atmosphere and satisfaction among participants during the training. Furthermore they should ask participants to tell them if something is not going well and be open for their criticism. Four participants mentioned that all trainers and also KURVE staff should be aware and sensitive about anti-bias issues, even more so as the Anti-Bias training is raising awareness about prejudices and discrimination among participants. One person also stated that with some trainers she* had the impression they were at times acting like they knew everything and the participants needed to learn everything.

The structure and time-management as well as the facilitation style are also important factors connected to the trainers. One respondent liked the clarity of some trainers about what would be covered in the training, having regular breaks and well-prepared resources. Two more participants experienced the trainings as a well-ordered methodological approach and four respondents liked the schedule of the training, describing an adequate balance of seminar time, breaks, time for relaxing and free evenings. One participant though said that she* missed having a clear structure and for the trainers to explain why things are done in a particular way. She* would have liked to get more explanation about the different working steps and stressed that especially for people who are in Germany for the first time there is a lot of uncertainty already, so having more clarity in the training would support them. For the structure she* would have liked to first get a theoretical input and then put the methods into practice, for example being introduced to different methods for analysis and then practicing them on case studies. Another respondent mentioned the structure of the PME training - giving

an input, doing an exercise, concluding the topic and then providing handouts - as best practice and would like to have a similar structure in all trainings.

One participant valued that the trainers had a participatory facilitation style and another was happy that a lot of open space for discussion was provided. Furthermore one participant appreciated that the trainers were clear in their facilitation and did not talk more than necessary for every step. A third though criticised that the trainers do not use the resources enough that participants bring to the trainings. One person said that one trainer was too hectic and rushing at times and another respondent stressed that the trainers need to be flexible and do the trainings slowly because of the different native languages.

About participant-orientation there were some controversies. Two participants appreciated that the trainers took the participants' needs into consideration and were flexible in content and time-frame. Three other participants though said there should not be too much discussion on organisation and methodology, because finding consensus every time takes a lot of time from the training. They stated that the trainers need to find a balance between needs-orientation and transfer of knowledge and also just take some decisions themselves.

Concerning coordination between different trainings, one person said there should be regular meetings of trainers and a common understanding of how they and KURVE want to work. Furthermore there should be much more communication between the facilitators of different trainings, especially concerning group dynamics. As some participants stay for several weeks, the trainers need to know for example where the group stands after the Anti-Bias training.

6.3.2. Language

Language is an aspect of the trainings that was addressed various times. Several participants expressed that English was a challenge for them, and as for most participants English is not the mother tongue, this is a general difficulty. It was also said that the different accents of people create an additional challenge in understanding and following the training. For one person it was particularly difficult to follow if the trainers were talking for a long time, because English as training language needed more concentration and was tiring for her*. It would be helpful if statements and directions were given clearly and slowly. The trainers are responsible for speaking slowly and trying to make the training accessible to everyone. One participant appreciated that this was done while another said the trainers' English was difficult, and a third said it is not the trainers' fault if participants do not know some words. But two participants also

mentioned trainings where they thought the trainers' English proficiency was not high enough and stressed that it is important for trainers to speak English well and fluently. Three persons said that exchange and especially work in small groups created a challenge when participants had great difficulties with the language. One participant said that some content got lost to her* because of language issues. Another participant recommended to look at the speed and complexity of language in the trainers' inputs, but also to make sure that everyone gets a chance to contribute and express oneself even if English is difficult for them. Participants found it helpful to have handouts to catch up on the content after the training sessions and look up some vocabulary, especially when a topic was difficult to follow. As best practice it was mentioned that the trainer in the Security Management training asked the group to give her* a sign if she* is talking too fast. But it was also said that this only works if the participants take the responsibility to tell the trainers, as they otherwise do not know about the difficulty. For PME it was also appreciated that language was addressed in the beginning, explaining that it is not the native language for most people in the room and that everyone should try to help each other and mention difficulties, because it is important for everyone to be on the same level of understanding the contents.

6.3.3. Group

For the training groups there were several aspects that were mentioned. Respondents talked about the composition of the group as well as the group size and atmosphere between participants.

The international training group is nearly unanimously seen as positive and is appreciated by the participants. One participant said what is unique about the KURVE trainings is that they bring together diversity from all over the world irrespective of religion, gender, cast etc, and thereby giving us a very nice and open platform (P39). Respondents liked the opportunity for networking as well as the different perspectives and experiences brought to the trainings. One person said having participants from many countries creates an easy-going nice atmosphere and another valued that there are relatively many participants from the Global South. She* said that this brings different dynamics into the trainings, also providing other perspectives and inputs. The participant thinks this is very good especially for topics like Anti-Bias, as there are differences in experiences of discrimination. But there were also some critical voices. For one participant it is not clear why KURVE says the international composition of the group is important for learning. Another person mentioned that handling different cultural habits can be a challenge and gave the example of a training in which people from one region were talkative and people from another region impatient to listen.

Furthermore it was stated that it is not so nice to have big groups of one nationality who can speak in their own language, especially if others are on their own. Therefore three participants said they would prefer if there were at least two people from each country, as they can help each other in language issues, discuss the situation in their context and no one feels lonely.

The composition of the group was also discussed. Three participants liked meeting other activists and the composition of the group. Another participant said it was a challenge in the training that the group was very diverse in previous knowledge about the topic and therefore also in expectations. It was also said that there are many changes in the group from one week to the other which has an influence on the group process. As some people stay for several weeks and others join for only one, there are different needs concerning group dynamics, group work and contents. The participant said that having a fixed group could be useful, because a common basis of knowledge can be build and used in the next trainings. It was also proposed to try and compose the groups in a way that each participant has at least one exchange partner concerning field of work, position in the organisation, work experience, age or gender.

The atmosphere and behaviour in the group were mentioned positively. One participant said that there was a nice atmosphere in the group. This view was supported by three other respondents who liked the group and were glad about the support among participants, for example when two participants supported another by talking to the trainers about her* difficulties to follow the training. Two respondents valued that the German participants tried to make the internationals feel comfortable, e.g. by speaking in English when others were around. Community living was also brought up as an aspect that affects the group. It was said that sharing rooms and living together in a small space is very special. The positive effects are that participants need to work closely together and thereby learn to take care of each other. In the respondent's opinion it is good for the group to realise that the trainings are not only about taking out content, but also about the learning group and its dynamics. But she* said that on the other hand there is too little privacy. If for example there are four people in one room and some are snoring, one does get little sleep, and it is very difficult to concentrate and be attentive in the trainings. Therefore this setting can also lead to conflicts and the concept should be thought through.

The size of the groups was another important issue, many participants saying the groups are sometimes too big. One person said that KURVE needs to take care not to have too big groups, especially for the limited space in KURVE. Another stated that with big groups the training quality decreases, because one cannot do exercises in the same way. It was said that in bigger groups it is more likely that people stick with those

whom they already know and small groups are also preferable because the exchange is more intense. One respondent proposed a maximum number of 12 participants, another 12 to 15. One participant said that if there is a big group work in small groups is very important and it could also be helpful if the trainers split the group from time to time.

6.3.4. Length of Trainings

The length of trainings was discussed on three different levels: the working hours per day, the time that each training lasts, and the time that participants spend at KURVE, taking part in several PTs.

Concerning the training hours per day, there were different opinions and wishes. One participant said that in her* region people want to take the opportunity of training and sometimes even do night sessions, so here the process was a little slow. Another person stated that working from nine to six or later in the evening is very tiring, especially if participants still have other things on their mind. A third participant would have wished for one afternoon off during the week, to be able to have some space for oneself, look at some contents again, or spend time and exchange with others without a certain topic already set.

Three participants said they would like the trainings to last longer in order to explore the topics more deeply or understand the contents better. One person proposed to have at least ten days per training. But it was also said that one could spend a lot more time, even studies, on each topic, so that a training can never be enough. Therefore in two participants' opinion the PTs function as an introduction and afterwards each person can decide where she* wants to put more emphasis and what she* wants to put into practice.

A question that was brought up by several people was how long participants should stay at KURVE and how many trainings one can take in a row without getting too tired. One participant mentioned the practical aspect of the matter, saying that she* was invited to stay for more than one training, as the travel from another continent is very long for only one week. While one participant said everyone can decide for themselves how many trainings in a row they can participate in, two other participants said that a maximum of three trainings would be good. One of them argued that even though some of the participants come from very far, the learning capacity decreases after some time. Another respondent also mentioned the impact on the learning, saying that when participants stay at KURVE for several weeks their energy level can be quite low.

6.3.5. Level and Depth of Trainings

The level and speed of the trainings were also discussed by participants. One of them criticised that it is not made transparent that the trainings deliver basic skills and that there is no clear profile of the practitioner trainings which leads to frustration. For the participant it is not clear if the focus is more on delivering content or on learning from each other in an international group. Another participant said it would be good to categorise the PT into different levels and offer basic and higher level courses, because it will make the trainings more meaningful compared to what is invested.

Many participants referred to the speed of the trainings, stating for several of them that the pace was quite high or even too high. One participant said that the trainers need to be attentive to how much content can be fit into one training, in order not to go too fast and make sure that people can follow. It was also said that there were great differences in how well people could follow or what they did know before the training, which was also difficult for the trainers. One participant said the trainings should go deeper and another found the pace of one training too slow while a third said that more content should be brought across in the trainings.

Two persons said if the trainings are too packed with content there is a rush, but they need time to practice the tools. Especially being introduced to too many tools and concepts was something that various participants mentioned as a difficulty. One person said that some trainings introduce too many tools “to be able to know any of them afterwards” and that other trainings only present an overview of tools, not really practicing how to use them (P7). Especially about the PME training it was said that so many tools were introduced that it was hard to distinguish between them and get to know them well enough to work with them later. While one person acknowledged that the training provides an overview which enables participants to spend more time on them and master them later on, another two participants said they would have preferred to get to know well-working tools and then practice them more thoroughly. One of them said that she* would feel more confident to use them in her* work if she* had the chance to really master using them in the training. On the other hand this participant appreciated to get introduced to and trying out many tools in the Security Management training in order to get a feeling for them.

6.3.6. Methodology

Many participants liked the facilitation methods, especially the diversity of methods that were used. They appreciated most that the trainings are participatory and very interactive. One participant said the trainings are conducted in a way that they make

learning easy no matter where a participant is from. Another respondent said that interactive methods like role plays and group work helped to transfer the learning into behaviour.

But there was also some controversy concerning the methodology. One participant experienced the trainings as working very much intellectually and would like to have a more holistic methodology, using more diverse methods and in a more lively way. Another person uttered doubts if everyone could follow the training. In her* view the approach of the training was quite European and from her* experiences many organisations do not work as theory-based and structured. Therefore a more practice-oriented approach might be more effective. Another person said though that very 'lively' training methods like using many energizers might not fit all contexts even though they can be eye-openers at times. But the energizers were mostly appreciated. It was also valued that the energizers were related to the topics and did not take much time. In the Introduction to Security training it was appreciated that all energizers were without competition. One participant suggested reflecting again on a general level how learning processes can best be accompanied in diverse groups. She* said that while open learning processes are very good, it might be difficult to handle and process all inputs and possibilities if one is not used to this learning culture.

The different means for visualising and recording contents were appreciated. Four people liked the visualisations during the trainings. Another four participants liked the handouts and said they are helpful to read again about the training content and to catch up on things that were missed during the session. Two people mentioned the videos positively and a third would like to have more use of media in the trainings, stating that the facilitation style is rather traditional.

6.3.6.1. Practice-Orientation

Practice-orientation as a means to connect the training as much as possible to the participants' work reality was also discussed. Six people said they appreciated to work on examples of participants, e.g. when applying tools. One person would also have liked getting the opportunity to apply the DNH approach to her* own context. But it was also said that working on participants' examples can be very problematic especially with participants from partner organisations of KURVE. Talking about problems in the organisation might be an issue for the partners as there is a dependency towards KURVE and they could fear for a worse reputation that influences the cooperation. Therefore case studies from different regions would be more suitable.

Two participants said that the trainers should use more of the resources and expertise of participants in the trainings. One best practice example was given from the

Organisational Change training. The participant appreciated that the trainers opened the floor in an open space session, so that topics that could not be addressed in the training due to time restrictions or diversity did have space anyhow. She* said: “I think the best part was the open space, everybody talked about their own context and we could relate it to our situation, so there were very interactive discussions” (P39).

Concerning practice-orientation there is a special situation for IPWs in their preparation time and participants of the training as Peace and Movement Worker. One participant said that not having a project yet was missing at times. An IPW said that the trainings would have been far more effective if she* had known more about her future project already. Another IPW also said that during the preparation one thinks to know what one needs, but that this must not necessarily prove to be true.

6.3.6.2. Examples and Contextualisation

One issue brought up by participants from all regions was that examples and discussions were sometimes quite focused on Europe. Several participants found it difficult at times to relate to examples that were given to illustrate a method or tool, as they were often not from their context. One participant said that also the discussions were sometimes “very much European” (P39) and felt far away, like this did not relate to or concern her*. Another respondent said it is hard to understand what is essential about tools and methods if most examples are from Germany or Europe. Therefore five participants would wish the trainers to give examples from all continents, because the participants’ contexts are quite different. These differences should be discussed and in one participant’s opinion more diverse examples can also be interesting for those participants who don’t know the context, as they learn about the situation there.

It was also said that Western perspectives were very strong, e.g. working with examples from development work. So apart from a more global contextualisation of examples, four participants would like to have a stronger and clearer focus on peace work in the trainings. One participant also missed the expressed awareness that “today’s tools in development work and conflict transformation might perpetuate colonial mind sets and structures” (P3).

6.3.6.3. Experience-Oriented

Experiential learning was appreciated by several participants. One participant who is in favour of activity-based trainings said the experiential learning was helpful to remember contents. She* said: I really like it, because it is not boring. Using activities and games is very effective, I think” (P27). Two other participants also liked the practical aspects and opportunity to try out tools in the training, one of them saying this should be increased and applied in all trainings. A concrete example was given for Security

Management. One participant said she* is not used to work much with certain matrixes and tools and finds them therefore difficult to understand at times. But practising, applying own experiences to them and group work helped to master them. Another respondent also stressed the need for practising and said when many tools are introduced but there is hardly time to practise, it is difficult to learn and the knowledge stays superficial. Due to the lack of certainty she* would not use several of the tools she* got to know. Furthermore she* proposed to apply a tool in front of the group and then get feedback.

For the application of contents, case studies and role plays were valued by several participants. Three participants liked the role play in the Security Management training as it helped them to directly apply what had been learned and connect the training content to real life. One of them criticised though that it was too short and that there was too much time pressure as it was done at the end of the training. The case studies in the Security Management and especially the PME training were mentioned positively by four participants. Anyhow instead of having only one big example for a topic, one participant would like to get some other examples from different contexts as well in order to have different perspectives and backgrounds.

6.3.6.4. Group Work and Mutual Learning

The work in small groups was appreciated by many participants. It was mentioned that it promoted exchange and gave everyone the chance to interact and speak, especially as in the plenary not everyone gets the chance to talk or does not want to speak in front of everybody. This is particularly true for personal topics, where being in small groups helps to be more open. Furthermore working in small groups helped one participant to take different perspectives. For two participants it was difficult that there was often time pressure for the group work.

Several participants also said they profited from the common learning process and learned from each other. One person said that even though the contexts of participants are very different, they can learn from each other and profit from others' examples for their own work. One person profited especially from being in a training with a participant who is doing similar work. A benefit of the trainings is that participants learn from others how they handled similar problems. It was also said that even if the contents are known already, the inputs from other participants, especially from different countries and backgrounds, can be refreshing and eye-opening. One participant stated that hearing about the situation in other contexts and how people deal with conflicts there helped to put some things into perspective of healthy relativism.

6.3.7. Exchange

The exchange with other practitioners was a very important aspect for many participants, on learning level as well as concerning reassurance and networking. One participant said that “the sharing of different contexts is the most beautiful part of the trainings” (P43). She* said that as people come from different corners of the world, this gives quite an insight and widens the horizon. Furthermore she* can also share experiences from her* work. Another participant even said that talking and exchange can sometimes be more relevant for participants than taking a lot of content out of the training.

While the participants appreciated the opportunity for exchange, one would wish for the trainers to support this by for example bringing people together who do similar work in different countries. Two participants would have liked to have more opportunity for exchange, one in order to profit more from each other’s experiences, the other to get to know each other’s contexts better. Another respondent would also have liked to reflect on different instruments and exchange about the experiences of participants and trainers, which would have been more effective than only presenting the method. One person would wish to have the space to share also about the current political situation in people’s countries or other issues that are not directly linked to the training, e.g. in evening sharing sessions. Another participant also mentioned exchange beyond the training contents. She* said that exchange about traditions and habits could be useful to be considerate and take care of each other, trying to make everyone feel comfortable, for example concerning eating culture.

Participants also appreciated to get to know about KURVE’s background and connection to local activism and nonviolent struggles in Germany. Three participants said that a field trip related to nonviolent movements would have been good and was missing during the trainings.

6.3.8. Networking

Many participants mentioned they appreciated getting to know practitioners from different countries and building networks with them. One person also planned to stay in contact with the trainers when implementing some of the contents and another said that her* organisation is interested in having a cooperation with KURVE.

Five IPW valued to get to know KURVE better during the trainings. As the trainings take place in the building that also hosts KURVE’s office, the IPWs could get better acquainted with their sending organisation. One of them also liked the great consideration that is practiced there, thinking that looking after each other is nice and coherent to KURVE’s philosophy. Another participant said it was interesting to see that

there is a positive atmosphere, much dedication and that KURVE is not luxurious but honest. One of the IPW said this also enriched the cooperation between the PO and KURVE.

Four IPW also appreciated to get to know future colleagues or the partner organisation already during the trainings before the beginning of the project work. One of them said that she* would opt to have the preparation time synchronised as much as possible. She* added that it is very good and not self-evident to have not just an individual preparation for the IPW, but have it linked with staff from the PO.

There were also some wishes and critique towards KURVE. One person said that KURVE could make more of the opportunity to have international groups to build networks between the participants. Another participant also regretted that the initiative for exchanging contact details and networking is not always provided by KURVE or the trainers, but needs to be taken by participants themselves. Others said it would be nice to have some networking or meetings with initiatives from the region or cities as Berlin, e.g. meetings with activists or discussion evenings, maybe also during the weekends.

6.3.9. Transition from Training to Work

During the evaluation period it became clear that the transition between the trainings and the participants' application of what they learned in the trainings in their own contexts is an important stage concerning the effectivity of the trainings. It starts already with the preparation of trainings, is an issue that needs to be addressed in the trainings and covers the time immediately following them.

6.3.10. Preparing the Trainings

Six participants would have liked to have clearer and more detailed information about the different training topics before the start of the training. One person said it would be helpful to know more about the training beforehand than just the title and another stated that participating in the trainings felt like opening a magic box, not knowing what would be inside. The suggestions were to provide the training schedule or the module guidelines to the participants before the training. Another participant said it would also be nice to receive introductory texts before the training.

6.3.11. Preparation of Transfer during the Training

Several participants addressed the transfer of learned skills into the work context as part of the training. One participant pointed at the different ways of saving knowledge. She* gave the example of a small group where she* was the only person who did write

down some results to take with her* and wondered what ways people find to save contents to take them with them.

Some participants would like to have a better transition from training to work-context at the end of the training. For two trainings it was mentioned that the transfer to own projects or work was not possible anymore due to time issues. One participant said this left her* with several questions and she* would wish to have a structured summary in the end of the training, highlighting possible steps and what to pay attention to.

Three participants said that it would be good to create personal action plans, needing maybe an extra day. Therefore it was proposed to either have one more day of training explicitly meant for working on how to transfer the contents to one's work or, if this is not possible, offer the possibility for participants to stay one day longer in order to exchange and reflect on the training together. The respondent suggested that for this reflection questions could be prepared by the trainers, e.g. What do I get out of the training? What do I want to apply when and how? What are my milestones? When do I want to look at the topic again?

It was also said by two participants that the capacity building is not only happening in the training and does not end there. One of them said that the trainings are an introduction that gives an idea about what can be improved. In order to apply the contents, one has to work and read more on the respective topics. The other person said that after the training one needs to gain experience in the organisation.

6.3.12. Processing and Reflection of Contents

A question concerning the amount of trainings that people participate in was to which extent they can digest and reflect on the contents. One participant said it would be better to have a break in between the trainings and not to have too many in a row. Like this the brain has some time to process the contents. Two participants said reflecting and processing the contents is a challenge for participants staying for several weeks. They said some support in this would be nice, because if reflection and sorting is missing, the knowledge might get lost quickly again. Furthermore it was said that especially in between trainings more time for reflecting the contents is needed. Another participant also would prefer to have one or two trainings, then go back and apply the knowledge and maybe do follow-up trainings, instead of having many trainings with different topics at the same time.

6.3.13. Reaction to the Trainings

The participants generally liked the trainings at KURVE, one of them saying she* “really enjoyed coming here” (P27). Four participants mentioned that the contents delivered in the trainings were good and three referred positively to the tools that were provided. Two participants felt like they gathered a lot of information on a rather abstract level and would now need to practice and gain experience. One of them explained that for her* learning is the combination of content knowledge and experience. But the participants did not only mention the contents of the trainings. One person appreciated to learn about international contexts and another valued the opportunity to travel to Europe for the training. It was an inspiring experience that she* tried to make fruitful: “I learn more than just the training contents. I try to understand the culture and system in Germany and learn about different types of skills and interaction” (P33).

Organisations of participants were also asked about the feedback they receive from people who had participated in a KURVE training. Two CPS organisations said that they received very positive feedback on the trainers, pedagogical approach and the international groups. A third said the participants had already known the contents of the trainings. One other organisation stated that two participants liked the trainings, but a third felt a bit out of place. In another organisation there was also very positive feedback about the trainers, the participatory and learner-centred approach and the diversity of the groups.

KURVE staff said that the feedback to the trainings is generally very positive, as participants appreciate the participatory training approach and the exchange with partners of KURVE from other regions. Experienced participants though find fault with the depths of the trainings, saying that they provide important basics but do not go further. Furthermore it was said that there is little space for thorough context related application in the trainings.

6.3.14. Plans for Implementation

Three participants had plans to apply their new skills in their organisations and a fourth wanted to use them in her work with the community. Another participant said that the tools and models introduced during the training were not yet used in her* organisation, but would help to focus the work. Therefore she* was already thinking about where some of them could be used.

Several participants who work as trainers themselves said they profited from the facilitation methods and planned to apply some of them as well. One of them said she* was inspired by the methodology in the trainings and took out many methods and

energizers to use in own trainings. Furthermore she* planned to take more time for the ideas and views of participants and learned how to establish a learning environment. Two of the trainers also planned to pass on their new content-related skills.

Two participants also planned to share their new skills with their teams. One of them is in a management position and decided to have a sharing session after her* return. One participant planned to make a security plan within the next two or three months, to improve digital security among others with better passwords. She* also wants to use incident reporting and advanced security management tools (P43).

KURVE staff also said that participants usually confirm that the trainings were helpful and that they plan to use the skills in their daily work.

6.4. Transfer Validity

6.4.1. Application of Skills

Many alumni gave examples of how they use the skills they learned from the trainings. One participant though said that even though she* found the trainings very interesting and beneficial for herself*, she* was not really able to apply the capacities in her* daily work.

The others answered on several levels. On a general level six participants stated that the tools and methods, which were provided in the trainings were helpful for their work and that they make use of some. One of these alumni said that the trainings made her* and fellow activists work more professionally. Two participants felt they were well equipped with tools and better able to contribute to conflict transformation after the training. One of them said the sharing of experiences by participants from different countries provided lessons learnt that helped to improve the implementation of activities in the field. Another respondent said that taking part in the trainings was an opportunity to build new capacities that improved the work of her* organisation.

On a personal level one participant could apply some strategies on dealing with emotional stress. Another participant also said she* applied methods of the Stress and Trauma training.

One person uses capacities and insights from the Anti-Bias training and initiated processes of prejudice awareness which motivate and equip individuals, groups and institutions to critically confront their discriminatory attitude and actions and thus develop sustainable and empowering structures (P6). One organisation benefits from gender sensitivity, project management and the DNH approach in their work for conflict transformation. The tools from the Organisational Change training were very helpful for them in steering the organisation through challenges and changes during the past few

years. Two participants said they had more skills for strategizing and planning projects after taking part in the trainings. For one of them Strategizing Change was the most beneficial training. Another participant plans to imitate a campaign that other participants had shared about in the training and hopes to find the courage and support for it.

Three participants mentioned that they used skills from the PME training. One of them evaluated a project with the DAC criteria and another mentioned she* had only recently looked again at the materials from the PME training, because she* needed it for work. She* explained that there is no daily need to use these tools, but that they are good to know. An IPW said that she* and the LPW used the PME tools to plan their project soon after the training which was very helpful.

Concerning security, three participants mentioned the trainings as beneficial for their work and well-being. One person said the trainings influenced her* daily life as working and moving is now safer for her. She* profited from the skills on mobile security, as now authorities cannot track her emails or phone calls. Another participant said that she* still remembers many tips from the Security Management training and can use some of them. The training was very helpful for her as it gave clear ideas how to handle certain situations (P7). A third person applied some skills from the digital security training right after going back to work, among them securing documents on the computers and doing back-ups. When a computer crashed some time later, this proved to be very useful.

Alumni also pass on their skills, most of them in trainings, as many participants facilitate trainings themselves. Thus four respondents said they apply skills and pass on knowledge by facilitating trainings. Three of them stated that they took out methods of facilitation that they are now using as well. One of them got the feedback that the participants liked the new methodology and another stated that the participatory methods are very effective. Another participants specifically mentioned the Stress and Trauma training, from which she* could use tools and methods when planning own trainings. They were also useful to her* in working with traumatised people, as she* could for example share tools for dealing with stress. But alumni also pass on their skills in other settings. Five participants said that they share their knowledge with colleagues, other activists or outside of the work context. Of the IPW four people said that they pass on little of their knowledge to others, some of them sharing it in the team.

In one participants' organisation two staff members stopped working for the organisation after they took part in the trainings, so there was not much effect for the organisation (O7). Another organisation though said that there is greater passion and

commitment to peace work due to the trainings and participants are inspired by getting to know how much is going on in other parts of the world (O6).

6.4.2. Factors Influencing the Application

There are many different factors which can support or hinder the application of skills. As an overall factor one participant said it is important to contextualise learning from international trainings. Doing this was helpful for applying the skills.

The quality of the training validity is another crucial factor for the implementation in one's work. One participant said she* tried to apply several PME tools, but was not very successful in it, because the information given in the training is not sufficient to apply them (P7). Another participant said: The trainings that included a specific work plan / strategy for my own work had a better chance to be implemented than those that stayed only theoretical or with case studies from other countries (P3). Furthermore relevance plays a role for the implementation of skills. One IPW said it was helpful to get to know the PME tools before she* had to use them in her* work. Still she* questions whether these methods are useful or effective for peace work. Contents from other trainings she* attended (Security Management, Facilitation) were not really needed in her context and work, therefore she* did not apply much. About Security Management one participant said that it was interesting, but not specific enough about her* context to use it.

In order to apply their skills, participants must also have the mandate to do so in their organisation. Four former participants are working in management positions or even founded their organisation, which makes them key people for applying and transferring skills from the training to their organisation. In two of these participants' organisations the implementation of new knowledge and skills was facilitated because there was interest and efforts for change or even an ongoing process. One respondent was glad about this and said that if one learns something, but does not have the opportunity or space to apply it afterwards, the learning does not mean much. Another participant does not work on management level, but is responsible for the IT in the organisation, which put her* in a very good position to apply the new skills from the Digital Security training. For other participants there was less chance for the application of their skills. One alumnus said that even though the content of the training was relevant for her* work, the working environment was not conducive for application and there was no real opportunity to use her* skills. Therefore she* plans to quit the job soon. Another person also named inner-organisational factors as hindering application of skills. She* said bureaucracy was an obstacle and that it is difficult to get involved in project work if some people are covering posts for a long time already.

Interest in and support for change in an organisation are also big factors among IPWs. In order to implement knowledge there need to be interest and possibilities in one's organisation. One participant said that although many tools from the training were relevant (DNH and conflict analysis) she* could not apply them, because they had either already been implemented in the organisation or there was no interest or opportunity to use them. Furthermore the participants' colleagues often did not know the methods and concepts from the trainings which made it nearly impossible to implement them into their work. She* said that in order to change something on organisational level, a critical number of staff-members need to take part in the same training and the management needs to be on board (buy-in). Another participant was frustrated about the lack of interest in the organisation. She* said that trying to introduce new project management tools did not work as the other staff members would not use them. Another IPW had similar experiences, saying that if only the IPW wants to change something in the partner organisation, one does not get very far. Therefore she* thinks it is good if the LPWs are in the trainings as well, develop their own ideas and support the changes. For one IPW this worked very well. She* said that being in the trainings together with the LPW was very helpful and increased the quality of their work, as they did not need to explain the tools to each other when planning their project.

But there are also factors outside of an organisation that can support or hinder the application of skills. Two alumni named a lack of resources as a difficulty in using their capacities. For one finding funding is difficult and for another facilitating trainings at home increases the risk of her* work. Another challenging factor mentioned was the political situation in one country. Furthermore lack of knowledge about some methods or tools in government-related agencies hindered the application of some tools.

Lack of support can also hinder application of skills. One participant said that some tools from the Stress and Trauma training are difficult to use without supervision. Especially Digital Security was mentioned as a challenging topic. One participant said the Digital Security training was very beneficial, but it also became clear that such a technical and fast developing area needs constant attention (P5). Another respondent said that applying digital security tools and mechanisms requires changing many habits in the use of digital devices and brings about many inconveniences and difficulties, e.g. very different ways of using mobile phones or dealing with computer problems. Even with support by experts it is difficult to apply many of them. Still, an IPW said that for continuing the implementation of digital security issues in the PO it is helpful that KURVE itself is implementing these mechanisms.

6.4.3. Follow-Up

There were many comments on follow-up, generally saying that follow-up is needed and should be provided by KURVE. This was seen as a good support if people have questions or difficulties. One participant stated that the participants are also KURVE's assets in a way and it could do more in regard to follow-up. Two respondents mentioned their own efforts for follow-up. One participant planned to ask the trainers for feedback about her* security plan. Another respondent stated that her* organisation had further in-house training on a relevant topic and that she* also contacted a trainer for advice when the training topic came up in the organisation.

Two people also addressed the sustainability of the trainings. One of them questioned their sustainability, asking to which extent participants only get to know some tools and methods or actually learn to work with them. Another alumnus said KURVE should try to strengthen the commitment to strategies that are developed during the trainings and also to the trainings' sustainability.

The participants gave many ideas on what could be done as follow-up of the trainings. One person said that a buddy system could be a good idea. Participants can choose a buddy or small group, with whom they stay in contact, asking how things are going and reminding each other of what they wanted to implement some months after the training. Another participant had a similar idea in connection to the Anti-Bias training. She* said it would be good to have tandem-partners among the participants who stay in contact for exchange and support.

But it was also said that some follow-up mechanism provided by KURVE, e.g. a needs-assessment for former participants would be helpful. KURVE could ask them which problems occur when applying the skills and knowledge from the training, and see which support they need. Another idea was to set up a website with the different training topics, where participants can share their experiences. In addition trainers could give advice. One participant also had the idea to publish a book with best practices, collecting successful stories from different regions of participants who could apply the knowledge either in their work or by facilitating trainings themselves. One participant said that follow-up trainings in the participants' own regions would be good and also cost less. Another two alumni would like to have exchange programmes or short term placements to increase learning through exchange and hands on experience.

6.4.4. Networking

Sixteen participants said that they were still in contact with other participants, mostly via facebook and other social media. Some were also in contact with trainers and

KURVE. But the participants said that there are differences in the intensity of the contact. Two IPW said to be mostly in contact with colleagues and another is in contact with those working in the same country. One person said she* contacts relevant people if a specific issue comes up that they can help with, but is not in contact with others on a regular basis due to time issues.

One organisation is also in close contact with KURVE due to the joined organisation of a RIT in Kenya. Two participants stated that the KURVE trainings had been recommended to them by former participants and another two told about prior contact to KURVE or plans for cooperation which led to their taking part in the trainings. One person said she* would like to have a branch of KURVE in her* country. One organisation said that the networking might be beneficial in medium and long term. It also said its profile has been raised on inter-organisational level and with the local government, which is helpful for gaining trust and get support for the organisation's work (O6).

As a recommendation, two participants proposed to establish a global network of the KURVE alumni.

7. Discussion on Relevance

For each participant a relevant training looks different. It depends on the region they are coming from, what type of work they do and what position they have, and sometimes also with which (international) partners they work together. Hence, the responses to the questions if the trainings are relevant for the participants is not answered with a simple 'yes' or 'no'. One has to take a closer look at the target groups and actually – in groups with such a high degree of heterogeneity – on each individual participant attending the training. This seems nearly impossible. Nevertheless there are several working steps during the organisation of trainings which can influence the degree of relevance for the respective target group: a) the planning of the trainings, b) the selection of participants, c) conducting the training (creating a learning space and atmosphere of well-being), and d) monitoring and evaluation of the trainings.

In the following chapter the recommendations that were offered by stakeholders and the researchers themselves are located in those working steps to show and discuss how and by whom the response to the needs of participants can be improved. Some of the sources derive from interviews with stakeholders in which they discussed needs for change for KURVE's Practitioners Trainings. Other sources are literature on training for peacebuilding, and the role of civil society in conflict.

7.1. Developing the Training Concept

7.1.1. Relevance of trainings as a form of capacity building for peace workers

Peace work needs many practical and social competences to which many factors belong and broad package of means are needed: It starts with analysis and ends with application – hence, trainings for capacity building are highly relevant for peace workers. (O1)

When discussing the relevance of a project one should first of all ask the question about why 'training'? Generally spoken, all resource persons who were asked the question "How do you rate the importance of capacity building trainings for people engaged in peace work in general?" answered that it is "very important". This grading is based on the assumption "that training can further individual and social/political change which will create more peaceful and less violent societies (in terms of attitudes, behaviour and structures)" (Austin 2012:219). One key element for this premise is that the right people are trained with the right skills. KURVE found peace and movement workers from the grass-root and NGO level (track one and two of Lederach's actor pyramid, cf. Lederach 1998) as the eligible target group for their trainings, as those groups actually apply means of conflict management in their projects. Furthermore, they have access to people who are directly affected by (post-)conflict situations and

hence can contribute to build up lasting and sustainable peace structures (KURVE 2013a). Then, why does a German association has to support those people with trainings? KURVE's first response is:

Due to a differentiation of the working fields and the increasing demand for expertise and professionalism, requirements for peace and Human Rights work are growing. It is necessary that peace services and local NGOs precise their own objectives and test their pedagogical and didactic tools at the new demands on the ground. (ibid.)

Hence, KURVE offers trainings to reflect, analyse and optimise the peace work that each participant is engaged in. This is particularly important for peace initiatives that started informally – which is the case for many movements and NGOs – and whilst growing have to become more structured regarding staff members and working procedures to work more effectively and strategised (cf. Francis 2010:19). The reason for KURVE to offer trainings is that the association itself has many years of experience in nonviolent resistance and conflict transformation and therefore possesses the capacities and resources to transfer their knowledge and skills to support other peace workers – internationally – in extending their local capacities for peace (KURVE 2013a). By offering international trainings KURVE spreads the message that the needed skills can be learned and taught in an intercultural setting regardless the diversity of backgrounds that participants bring with them. This implicit ethical message brings along several challenges and chances for the concept of the trainings which are discussed in the following chapters.

7.1.2. Profile of the Trainings

Peace and movement workers need basic knowledge (on conflict transformation) as well as specific knowledge depending on the type of work. Practitioners trainings offer capacity building in this different kinds of specific knowledge (KURVE 2016) for people that have already basic knowledge in conflict transformation. The objectives are reassurance, networking and skill development which are realised by the community living in the seminar house, the exchange of experience among international peace workers in the training and participant and practice-oriented training methods (ibid). But these objectives are neither written down in a concept, nor do all trainings have a written curriculum. The evaluators therefore tempt to ask if there is a holistic approach in the monitoring and development of the trainings? Are the trainings connected to each other? Do the trainers know what other facilitators do in their trainings? Do the trainers know about the objectives?

One first step for KURVE should be to formulate a concept for the Practitioners Trainings to be able to communicate a clear profile to their target groups. A start has

been made with the drafted document that the evaluators developed after the focus group with the part of training unit (see annex). Format and objectives must be coordinated with trainers and then made transparent to people interested in KURVE trainings. As Austin (2012:216) points out: *“Joint goal formulation early on in a planning process can help to improve the strategic focus and ensure that training measures are context-sensitive.”* As the training unit states, it is planned to formulate two to four learning objectives for each training in the next seminar programme that will be printed in November 2016 (KURVE 2016). Additionally, as the trainings have very diverse objectives and are not relevant for everyone, the evaluators would like to encourage facilitators to define more precisely for whom each training is made for.

If I have known that this is an introductory training I would have refused to do it. I would have preferred to choose a training topic I had no clue about. (P44 – interview)

Several participants suggested that the descriptions of the trainings on the homepage of KURVE should include a short overview version (as it is currently the case) and for those who want to read more provide a detailed version to click on with all training objectives (including community living, networking, and reassurance), the level, background of facilitators, methods, accommodation etc. are provided to be read. That is why the evaluator team suggests to categorise the trainings among contents, target groups, and level (basic or advanced), so that the trainings will be more meaningful for those who invest on this (time, money, and energy). Especially the need for higher level trainings was mentioned several times by participants (advanced PME, advanced Counselling Stress and Trauma, etc.). Content-wise there are more technical trainings offered that seek to impart skills and tools or methods to improve the practical work of peace workers, e.g. skills for digital security or tools for analysing the security situation. But, there are also trainings (especially the Anti-Bias training) that focus on building consciousness and awareness (T4, T7 – interviews). Hence, this distinction should be made transparent to avoid misleading expectations. Another distinction can be made in terms of which training aims at which target group? There are some trainings that are more relevant for NGOs (e.g. Managing Organisational Change), others for movement work and activism (e.g. Strategising Change), and others with no specific focus (e.g. Anti-Bias). This distinction could also be made for working positions – management level and field work, board members, or IT experts, etc. Otherwise, if the training group is mixed, or the target group is not the majority in the training, facilitators have to be informed about this situation so that they can adapt the content and methods accordingly. The objectives listed by the training unit (reassurance, networking, and skill development) seem to be relevant for the participants as the findings of the data

analysis reveal. The most relevant objective hereby is skill development which is the main purpose to attend a training for all. The needs for skills and knowledge depend on the work experience and the type of work that participants do. Hence, a clear description of the trainings is very much important to assess the relevance.

Which additional value does the international composition of the group has? In the data we collected and KURVE provided to us, the evaluation team did not find a lot of material that could answer this question. Regarding to skill development regional trainings would make much more sense. But there is another relevant factor that international trainings provide for participants:

In Trainings in which participants from the Global South and North take part, spaces for encounter are created. In case some of them will work together some time or have other international encounters they already have a level and possibility to exchange. (...) Most of the time money is given for practitioners from the Global North to work in the Global South and not for invitations for capacity building – and that is an alternative to say, we can invite people to come here. (T4 – interview)

For KURVE, giving this opportunity to engaged people from the Global South is a form of solidarity. Besides that, the global learning and international exchange is a valuable experience for all participants (from Global South and Global North) and highly relevant in the 21st century in which a globalised world needs more than ever an integral consciousness that humans can only gain by talking to each other and exploring common needs and aims (cf. Rosmann 2015). An international training is an ideal platform for experiencing this kind of encounter and affinity: *I realised it does not matter where you come from, we are all one voice and we can make this world a better place without looking at our physical differences.* (P19 – questionnaire)

The evaluators would encourage KURVE to express this unique feature of the trainings more clearly in the profile of the Practitioners Trainings. It is very important for applicants and participants with high expectations on a content-wise level that the trainings have other objectives, too, and that learning with and from each other, listening to each other is highly relevant for all humans and that an international training setting is a valuable and unique opportunity for all – it is peace building in practice.

On the other hand, by offering international trainings for this kind of target groups, a certain group of peace workers on the ground – who are not working for an organisation or initiative and who do not speak English – cannot take part in the trainings even though they might have qualities and relationships to act as change agents in their working field. As one KURVE staff mentioned:

We have to reflect that we reach only a certain group of NGO workers and activists which are not inevitably those who actually implementing at the basis of society (e.g. social workers) or representing distinct/autonomous movements. Especially in contexts where project focuses are in geographical rural areas or where language

barriers are much bigger. (K5).

For reaching out to them it needs training offers in the local language. The idea of regional practitioners training was mentioned by a few participants and trainers and has already been under discussion in the training unit. This would need a different concept but could also save resources (lower travel costs for participants) (T7). Otherwise participants of KURVE trainings have to be trained and provided with skills to transfer knowledge in form of facilitation to those people. But that would mean to offer more Training of Trainers (Tot) as well as advanced level trainings while focussing on organisations and initiatives who are likewise engaged in training work.

KURVE claims that the topics of Practitioners Trainings are constantly developed and adapted to the needs of organisations and practitioners to guarantee the practice orientation of the education programme. KURVE's long experience in training work as well as their lasting relationships with partner organisations, individual alumni, and the cooperation with the peacebuilding unit at KURVE support this process (KURVE 2013a). This should guarantee that the contents fit to the needs of the target groups. As there was always a need for Project Management, this training is taking place twice a year. Anti-Bias is a training that KURVE wants to offer because they rate it important especially for their IPW and partner organisations. Especially trainers are involved in developing new training concepts since they can assess the needs of the participants best. Trainings that are running well and have a high amount of applicants are continued to be offered. Therefore KURVE uses the reaction sheets and personal feedbacks of participants and trainers.

KURVE has more training topics in their repertoire than are possible to offer in one year. Now, since the education programme has obligatory trainings (Anti-Bias, Facilitation and Training Skills, Project Management), these have to appear once a year in the programme. Furthermore, the packages on Security and Strategising Change have to be put into a logical sequence. A new training topic on "Dialogue" is under discussion. But, more trainings will be difficult to coordinate for the training unit. But as presented in the chapter 6.1., participants have more needs for further capacity building which could be considered – or in case requests are made to have other training providers for recommendation.

Nevertheless, especially among internal IPWs and trainees disappointment was expressed as some trainings were not relevant at all for them. How can this happen? The evaluators fear that exactly the missing curricula and profile of the trainings lead to a lack of knowledge about the training contents among those who are selecting participants.

7.2. Selection of participants

7.2.1. Selection criteria

"[T]rainee selection and preparation needs to be purposeful and address expectations and commitments; it should also be transparent to participants. In terms of effectiveness, it appears that training key people is more promising than indiscriminately training more people". (Austin 2012: 216)

For the trainings theoretical or practical experience in conflict transformation is part of the preconditions to attend. Additionally, the possibility to transfer knowledge into an initiative or organisation should exist. Finally, participants must proof a good English to be able to take fully part in the training. Partner Organisations, CPS coordinators, as well as alumnis from other parts of the world who have direct contact to the target groups support KURVE in selecting the most eligible participants (KURVE 2013a).

The amount of applicants is high which reflects the relevance and the need for capacity building. But, most of the applicants need financial support which can be provided by KURVE for eight participants each year (since 2015). The fact that taking part in a training in Germany is a resource for participants from the Global South and hence can lead to conflicts in organisations about who is going to attend the training has to be taken into account when selecting participants (KURVE 2016). Furthermore, it is important to be cautious that the enthusiasm for training and getting the opportunity to travel to Germany is not exceeding its utility (cf. Francis 2010:17). Participants have the possibility to apply for a whole training series (up to five weeks) which in the eyes of the evaluators can lead to an overtraining of participants. Both, relevance and effectiveness suffer under this practice:

I find that some participants just take the workshop because they are in Germany anyway so some of them lack the management experience and/ or motivation to be completely engaged in what is a demanding course aimed at middle/ senior managers. (...) The practitioner training series of five weeks is practical in terms of visas, flights, etc. but can result in some participants not having the right experience level or motivation for [the training]. (T9)

This issue is also important regarding the relevance of training contents: Therefore evaluators suggest a maximum number of three trainings that can be attended without interruption. Otherwise participants take part in trainings that are not relevant for them. A first step could be to ask participants who apply for 5 trainings to prioritise them according to relevance in case not all of them can be attended. Like that it will be easier to analyse their interests and motives of the application. To find rest and relaxation in Wustrow one does not have to stay for five weeks. As some participants admitted, it can be also very stressful for people when they feel left alone in a foreign environment.

7.2.2. Application procedure – selecting eligible participants – Querying of motivation and expectations and needed skills

Ensuring relevance for participants can also be increased by adding a question on the application form that asks about pre-knowledge in the training topic on a theoretical and a practical level. Get in contact with those participants who do not fill out the whole application form to reassure about motivation and expectations (as well as English skills). Since many participants take some time to fill out the application, it is important that they receive feedback in case their expectations will nor or are not sure to be met in the training:

I think no one looked at my (...) application. And there were three or four people who knew all the methods already, and they were all in the training. So what is the sense of the application if you do not get any feedback? (P44 – interview)

Due to difficulties to get a visa for mostly activists it turned out in the last years, that despite this high amount of applications, peace activists are the smallest group in PTs. In contrast to this, the smallest group of applicants are IPWs from Germany but their acceptance rate is 100% - as well as the new group of trainees of KURVE's education programme. That fact has something to do with the financing of KURVE trainings. IPW and trainees actually finance the scholarships and the trainings themselves. Hence, they need a certain amount of direct payers (this can also be local peace workers of partner organisations that get payed by the CPS) to be able to get the other target groups. Additionally, the problem of getting visa for especially activists is each year a striking issue and the prospects of success on getting a visa became a criteria for selecting applicants (KURVE 2016). In case KURVE wants to get more movement workers and activists into to the trainings it would be helpful to choose more partner CSO that are working as or with movements. When such initiatives are partners of KURVE it might be easier to get visas for them as they have an official partnership with a German CPS organisation. Furthermore, an increased group of international activists, could be a benefit for German movement workers to get into exchange with their international colleagues. Like this a South-North exchange also between activists, not merely NGOs could be supported. Especially trainings that are focussing on activism (Introduction to Security or Strategising Change) would profit of an increased number of activists and movement workers (K2).

At any rate, it is important that KURVE finds a healthy balance between those who finance the trainings and those who need financial support. Simultaneously they have to take into account that for both groups the trainings have to be relevant. There are several trainings that have a special target group (Security Management, Managing

Organisational Change, or Strategising Change) where this should be considered when choosing the participants.

The amount of German participants raised since the training series in autumn 2015, when the first time trainees from the educational programme took part in the Practitioners Trainings. They expressed high expectations for the trainings especially content-wise. Together with the IPW they are a huge group in the trainings – hence, they have to be well prepared and informed about how trainings are conducted and that it is not only about skill development and gain of knowledge. The international training is an excellent opportunity for German peace workers who want to work in the Global South to listen and learn from the experience of peace workers of the Global South – but this has to be communicated beforehand by the supervisors of the trainees as well as the peacebuilding unit (for IPWs).

Partner organisations of KURVE, for example, often spread the information among their staff members and affiliated organisations that the application for new KURVE trainings is running. Then those who are interested send their application forms to KURVE. After checking all applications the training unit of KURVE gets back to the partner organisations and inform them who among their staff has applied for a training and asks them to choose a certain number of participants which they find eligible for the respective trainings. Regarding this procedure, persons who are responsible for the selection process (often management and board of an NGO) expressed the need for more information on the trainings and a categorisation regarding to the target group. For them it would be easier to know whether the training is best for field workers, programme or organisational managers, or board members. That would help them in choosing the relevant trainings.

What I like to request to KURVE is to categorise the trainings: which can be taken by staffs, which can be taken by the board, and which by others? So at least we [who select] understand. Because all the peoples [who apply] do not understand so they all want to come to the training which might not be relevant for them. So if KURVE categorises the trainings that would be easier for everyone. (O8)

If one reason for trainings is, that Local Peace Workers, IPWs and partner organisations get to know KURVE, there is also another way of doing it without sending people to trainings that might not be relevant for them or in which they are not interested? Therefore KURVE needs a good query of motivations and expected learnings that they have to consider when selecting participants. In case there are doubts whether one is eligible or not, the applicant must be contacted and asked about more details. Additionally, the researchers suggest a meeting of trainers, KURVE training unit as well as the peacebuilding unit at KURVE to inform each other about

training contents, objectives and target groups. Like this, the assessment of relevance can be better conducted by those consulting applicants and/or choosing participants. Another idea that came from a participant was to develop a questionnaire on the website of KURVE which helps people who are interested in a certain training to find out whether the training fits their needs and interests or not. The questions should be closed questions asking about the background knowledge and experience of applicants and to inform the individual whether she* is able to gain new knowledge content-wise or not.

I have the idea of a questionnaire on the KURVE homepage for each training where you can find out, if the training is the right one for you. With a few questions that can be answered and if you answer all or most of the questions with a 'yes', then you should not go to the training. (P44 – interview)

This idea certainly can be discussed. Since the facilitation style is very much participant-oriented the contents vary from one training group to the other. If in one training many people do have background knowledge, then the topics might get deeper than in trainings in which the majority is totally new in the field and needs a basic introduction. Anyway, the idea of giving the person a possible way of assessing for herself* before she* applies to the training is fair enough. Therefore the researchers suggest, if implementing such a questionnaire, the users have to be informed that the tool tackles a rough overview and that the actual contents depend on the needs of the participants who are actually taking part. Likewise a note should be added, that there is an additional value to discuss a familiar topic in an international group and that experience and pre-knowledge is also very important to share. A useful side effect of developing such questions for facilitators is, to think about for whom their training/s is not relevant?

If an applicant expresses needs or expectations regarding content or methodology (e.g. learning theory) that the training will not provide, the training unit of KURVE should give them support on where to find what they need. Moreover, the unit should not hesitate to say 'no' to the applicant if that the training will not be relevant for her* – even if she* is a direct payer.

Communication between stakeholders must be nourished and processes must be made transparent. Between KURVE and trainers, partners, and participants, as well as among trainers. In many cases there is a lack of information on what each training is about, what are the contents and the methods used, as well as a common understanding of the theory of change and an overall concept that connects all trainings. The evaluator experienced this during their research process several times: people often felt not enough informed about certain processes or issues.

7.3. Conducting the Trainings

7.3.1. Ensuring Relevance for Participants

The parts of the application form that are important for the preparation of the facilitators have to be sent to them before the trainings starts (motivation and expected learnings of the participants as well as her* background knowledge and experience in the topic) so that they know who will take part in the training and can amend certain methods or contents if needed. For this the facilitators need time and hence money. KURVE should think about how trainers can be paid for making this necessary preparation work (T7, T4 – interview and T2, T3 – questionnaire).

During the training facilitators have many possibilities to deal with the various “personal and societal values (...) that shape [the participants' expectations and interactions (Austin 2012). All trainers working for KURVE are aware of those different expectations and hence ask for them in the first session of their training. However, an additional question could be “how am I used to learn and how this influence my presence during the training?” Such a question would give time and space to exchange and get aware of the different needs concerning methods and facilitation that are in the room. The researchers heard from several participants that there would be differences in the way of thinking and approaching things. That there is the more European way of thinking which is highly analytical and critical. People from the Global South would be much more practical and less theoretical. Therefore, the trainings confronts them with a way of thinking they are not used to but which is familiar to those who e.g. come from Germany (P28, P39, P52 – interviews). If such a perception exists among participants, facilitators have to be conscious about this and try to encourage and support participants in their different learning behaviours, appreciating their experience and knowledge and make those difference - if actually existing – transparent with the participants.

Relevance depends a lot on the type of work people are doing as well as their position in organisations or initiatives and also their country context (e.g. security situations). Guaranteeing relevance for all participants in a highly diverse group is always a challenge for trainers (T7 – interview). Content-wise this might not always be possible. But, the international exposure as well as the experience of the community living and getting to know KURVE as a German activist itself is relevant for also most of the participants – and part of the objectives of KURVE. Hence, if the purpose of the trainings is more than just skill development, then the infrastructure for the other objectives – networking and reassurance – have to be made available. This means e.g. follow-up and networking mechanisms offered by KURVE as an institution (will be discussed in the next chapter), giving space for exchange of experience among

participants also outside the trainings, getting to know the background of KURVE as a nonviolent activist, etc.

The answer, which facilitators gave to the question how they try to ensure relevance for all participants, consistent: with eligible methods. Establish an atmosphere in which participants feel comfortable, encouraged to share own experiences, and do not hesitate to ask questions. It is about mutual learning, methods like small group work, conversations outside the training sessions, asking for feedback from participants are very important – for all trainers.

For trainees of the education programme and IPWs in preparation for their service it is difficult to have experience-based training styles since they do not have (a lot of) experience or even a concrete project in which they can apply the tools and method. The facilitators have to develop a way to integrate this new target group. Making it transparent to the group and encouraging trainees to attend the training to learn from those who have experience – which means a new way of learning, that is not familiar for most of those who went through the German educational system.

For IPWs and trainees who wish to have more time on their own role as a German working abroad the suggestion was made to develop a workshop in critical whiteness in which all together can discuss the issue.

To increase the relevance of the contents of the trainings it is also recommendable, as several participants suggested in interviews and reactions sheets, that facilitators provide more diverse examples so that the participants get to know the different contexts and even more important, feel related to the examples. Another idea to support support this need is to have a mixed trainer team with a trainer from Europe and the other from Asia or Africa, so that participants can more easily relate to other contexts and feel that their needs are seen and considered – at least have the feeling that there is a facilitator who knows their own context. Additionally participants could receive the schedule of the training one to two weeks before the trainings starts. That, so many participants say, would be helpful to prepare and think about possible expectations of the week at KURVE. Another option is to send introduction texts on the topic to the participants. Another recommendation was that trainers should write a short report after the training on the dynamics and issues discussed among participants that they hand over to the next trainer team. In that way trainers can catch the group at its current stage and continue with the group process that was established the week before.

The evaluators collected best practices from all trainings during their participatory observation and compiled some factors for best ensuring relevance and effectiveness for all participants. The list of best practices can be found in the annex.

Methods that make a training effective will be discussed in chapter 8.

7.3.2. Creating an atmosphere of well-being

Trainers as well as the training coordinators of KURVE are responsible for an appropriate atmosphere in which participants feel well (Quelle). The need often expressed by participants to learn more about the country contexts and conflict situations in the countries of the participants could be covered by having

Two or three joint events during the week, that means it is a space for two hours maybe to give space for those who want to talk about the situation in her country and the political issues or any kind of things they want to share with the group what happened now or happened before. (P41 – interview)*

In one of the trainings on an additional evening session was offered on the first day by the facilitators in which participants had the opportunity in small groups or alone to present their current projects. According to feedbacks of participants the given space in this session to get to know each other's life and work was very important for the group. It gave participants an opportunity to find people who are working in a similar field or in a similar position and encouraged participants on the first day of the training to get in personal contact with each other. This could be a supportive method for all trainings to respond to the need of getting to know each other more and to find "buddys" for the training week/s.

The situation of participants who are staying for several trainings in Wustrow was mentioned a lot by attendees. It concerns both the appropriateness of the overall-setting and the relevance of training topics: The first is about the need for accompanied programmes during the stay in Wustrow that helps participants not to feel left alone and bored in a rural area somewhere in Germany especially during the week-ends. There are opportunities to get to know the region, networks of KURVE, other cities in Germany, life in families etc. It is obvious that this kind of programme has to be organised beforehand and needs some (personnel and financial) resources to be realised. But, since it is made possible during the International Trainings in summer, too, where participants stay in Wustrow for three weeks, there are already ideas and contacts available that could be activated for the participants of PTs. Ideas that were mentioned and that the evaluator team collected from their own experience in Wustrow are: visiting Gorleben and other sights of nonviolent resistance in the region; explore the nature, e.g. nearby lakes or wind turbines; visit alternative living projects in the region, establish contacts to families in the region (Wendland, Berlin, Hamburg, etc.) who can shelter participants for one week-end so that participants can experience everyday life in Germany. Since KURVE is an association with more than one hundred

members, there might be some volunteers who would be happy to support KURVE in this matter.

Related to this, is the idea of using a the stay in Germany for advocacy work (K2 – interview). This means to support participants in building networks with initiatives in the region to exchange campaign for their topics. One explicit example would be to organise before or after the Anti-Bias training for those participants who stay a meeting with one of those groups who are engaged in anti-racism work in Wendland (P35 – interview). In case such programmes cannot be realised due to the lack of resources, KURVE should reconsider the habit of inviting participants for more than three weeks. Since nearly all participants expressed a need for change for this situation it seems to be a highly relevant and necessary change.

A first step, and a much less expensive idea, is to compile a folder for participants who stay longer in Wustrow with informations about the region, sport facilities, sight-seeing, contact persons, maps of Berlin or Hamburg, the bus and train schedules, cultural events during their stay, etc. Such a folder has to be actualised for each training series. It could be distributed to each participant or made available in printed form in one of the community rooms at KURVE. This combines the need for support on week-ends with the need for more logistical support. Offering for new arrived participants a tour around Wustrow to know where the supermarket, the bar, the bus station, the post office etc. are would be an additional support. Also the need for more clear instructions regarding office hours of KURVE staff, lunch time and meal preparations was expressed. For the arrival and the departure it was suggested to arrange a car or bus to pick up the participants from the airport or send a person who accompanies those who are in Germany for the first time. All these aspects play a huge role for participants regarding their well-being in Wustrow.

Scholarships are an ambivalent issue. On the one hand, they make it possible for people who cannot afford such a training experience. KURVE seeks to get stipends for engaged people as a manifestation of solidarity between North and South (KURVE 2013 – BfdW). As the findings showed, this possibility is appreciated and needed for peace workers in the Global South. On the other hand this can have a negative effect concerning the feeling of equality on the side of the beneficiaries. Feeling more as an actor who is depending on the finances and somehow the benevolence of another actor, makes people hesitating to express important critique and in the worst case fostering the labels of the rich and noble Global North and the poor and depending Global South. Hence, the question arises, on how much Anti-Bias is needed to be brought into the trainings in form of encouraging all participants to feel equal and

expressing all needs and constructive feedback that KURVE as a training provider is actually depending on. To reach an approach that strengthens the contact on an eye-level as well as a mutual learning between all participants and facilitators, the evaluators suggest elaborating on the PT's profile regarding the Anti-Bias approach. It is important to reflect and face the problematic of Global North-South hierarchies and power structures KURVE is embedded in and to try to break through them actively by searching together for common alternatives. The trainings can be one area of practice. Again, this would need a meeting of all stakeholders that are involved. Finally, such an approach has to be communicated with IPWs, trainees and participants from the Global South.

7.4. Monitor and Evaluate the Training

I find it very difficult due to time pressure to fill out the reaction sheet. And then not knowing what is the aim of it and the purpose, the motivation to fill it out is quite low. And the question I always had was, is the sheet for KURVE or do the trainers receive them? For whom is it? (P24 - interview)

Handing out reaction sheets at the end of the training is an important part for evaluating the trainings (cf. Kirkpatrick). KURVE uses such sheets in all of the trainings. However how they are used can influence the outcome as well as how they are designed. As the participants says in the statement above – and was observed by the evaluators in most of the trainings during participatory observation – is, that there is not enough time planned in the schedule for filling out these reaction sheets. In some cases, participants got five minutes to fill out a questionnaire with more than 15 questions (some of them ask for written answers). This is not enough time – especially not for those who do not read and write English easily. These reaction sheets should help KURVE to assess the quality of the training and how participants rate their own learning success as well as the methods and contents (KURVE 2013a). If KURVE wants to have meaningful results by this, they have to introduce the reaction sheets to participants, explain the purpose and the treatment (who is reading it, why is it anonymous, why is it important for KURVE) of the sheets. As Kirkpatrick (2007:126) argues: “By asking trainees to complete a reaction sheet, you are telling them that their input is important.” Some participants suggested that the reaction sheets should be handed out at the evening before the last day starts so that participants have more time to think about what they have to say and take the time they need for writing it down. Another 10 to 15 minutes should be provided at the last day. Furthermore, KURVE needs to check the formulation of the questions in the reaction sheets. As the evaluators read through the answers of participants they realised that some answers did not fit to the question that was asked. They got the impression that not all questions

are easily to understand for participants. More interactive evaluation methods could motivate participants to reflect about the trainings more intense and hence produce more meaningful results in the reaction sheets.

Regularly repeated analysis and strategy-building exercises should involve trainees, trainers, organisers and funders, and should focus on goal formulation and process planning. Still too seldom, though, do organisations or trainers in international contexts afford the “luxury” of thorough preparatory and follow-up work. In part, this shortcoming can be blamed on a lack of resources to invest in such staff-intensive programme activities. In part, though, needs assessment and strategy formulation are also willingly sidestepped in favour of ready-made training modules and programmes, which are assumed to work in any context. (Austin 2012: 216)

Another suggestion by trainers was to exchange contents, methods an experience of the trainings on a common platform (online) to be better informed about what other facilitators do in their trainings (T7 - interview). This form of monitoring can increase the coordination of contents and thus sharpen the profile of each training. The role of trainers in the preparation, monitoring and follow-up process is crucial for keeping the quality, relevance and effectiveness of the trainings. Until now, they get paid for the conduction of the trainings only which is why a thorough preparation and follow-up by trainers are the weaknesses of the trainings. KURVE should increase payment of facilitators for compulsory preparation and follow up so that trainers can prepare for the diverse group's needs and accompany after the trainings the processes.

8. Discussion Effectiveness

8.1. Training Validity

8.1.1. Trainers

The answers of respondents as well as the information available on the trainers (KURVE 2015: 36-39) showed that they are all experts in their fields. In summary also their way of interacting with the group as well as caring for the atmosphere and learning environment is greatly appreciated, one of the factors that foster learning for adults as explained in chapter 2. Thus the trainers contribute to the training validity. Some issues were brought up though that could be worked on. Participants mentioned there needs to be a balance between needs-orientation and transfer of knowledge. One participants' organisation got the feedback that trainers did not at all times deal adequately with non-constructive dynamics in very diverse groups, e.g. when some participants were very dominant or there were very different interests and expectations

in the group (O4). Participants said all trainers should be aware of topics like Anti-Bias. While many participants liked the structure of the trainings, it was also said that the trainers should explain better why things are done in a certain way and make the different working steps transparent. This wish corresponds to the principle of adult education that adults want to know why they are doing things. The structure of the PME training (input, exercise, conclusion, handout) was mentioned as a best practice example for structure. Another issue was that trainers should include the perspectives and expertise of the participants more. There is also the wish for more diversity among the trainers in order to include perspectives from different regions of the world and more communication between the trainers would be beneficial.

8.1.2. Language

English as a training language is challenging on different levels. Some participants said it was difficult and tiring to follow the training at times and different accents created an additional challenge. Small group work was sometimes affected by language difficulties and also the trainers' English proficiency was experienced as not high enough in two cases. One participant even said that she* missed some contents due to language difficulties. As a trainer's responsibility it was seen to speak slowly and use simple language. Furthermore they should make sure that everyone gets the chance to contribute even if English is difficult for them. One respondent mentioned that language proficiency is also a power issue (T4), thus it needs to be considered who gets how much room and chance to contribute and who is listened to. Handouts were seen as helpful to catch up. Furthermore it was appreciated if trainers encourage participants to remind them of speaking slowly and addressing language as a challenge in the beginning of the training. A best practice example was given from the PME training where the trainers explicitly mentioned that participants should ask for help and mention difficulties as it is important for everyone to be on the same level of understanding the contents. One trainer also mentioned that she* encourages people from the same country to help and translate for each other when necessary.

8.1.3. Group

Concerning the groups the international and diverse composition as well as the atmosphere and support among participants are greatly appreciated. An issue is the group size which was brought up by trainers and participants alike, saying that there are sometimes too many participants. Some respondents proposed a maximum of 12 or 15 participants. Sprenger also stresses that it is not useful to have a big group of people and relying on sheer number of people trained. If the group is too big to be able to work properly and if many of the participants are not change agents, then there

might be no impact of the training at all. Furthermore especially working on emotional issues of conflict, as attitudes, world views etc. takes more time and intensive work, so that smaller groups are far more suitable (Sprenger 2005, 7).

Furthermore participants would like to have at least two participants from each country and no big groups of one nationality. Having two participants from the same organisation or region is something KURVE tries to cater for already, as described in chapter three.

It was also mentioned that there are challenges as the group composition changes each week and participants who stay for longer have different needs than others. Therefore KURVE should think about how group processes and dynamics can be supported and well accompanied. Also the limited space and privacy due to dormitories is an issue that needs to be addressed. Especially for participants who stay for several weeks it is the question how exhausting and tiring this setting is. One trainer also said that particularly personal topics need more possibilities to retreat, as they affect people in a different way than topics which needs a lot of cognitive concentration (T4). While community living is an important aspect of the ITs, it is hardly addressed in the PTs. But if shared bedrooms etc. are more than a necessity due to lack of space, this needs to be a topic in the trainings and be made transparent to participants.

The diversity of participants is an issue that is greatly appreciated on the one hand but brings challenges on the other hand. Two trainers said the groups should not be too diverse in the participants' backgrounds (T2, T3). If there are many different backgrounds in one training, it becomes more difficult to work needs-oriented but also to include the participants' experiences and expertise. If the trainers try to cater for the different needs, the training schedule might be impossible to follow and if the needs are taken less into consideration, the training might not be effective for the participants. In any case having an international and diverse group also means that it is not possible to consider the specifics of the different contexts and the knowledge stays quite general. One respondent said that the trainings do not tackle the specific realities of participants enough (K1). Therefore a question that KURVE should think about is how the trainings can be designed in a way that everyone can learn well and profits from the trainings.

8.1.4. Length of Trainings

Participants had different wishes for the training hours during the week, so it will be difficult to find a perfect solution for this. Some participants would like to have more time for the trainings, but nobody said the current time of five days was far too short. Some respondents also see the trainings as an introduction which they can build up on. An issue that should be considered though is how many trainings participants should take in a row. The trainers shared the view of most participants that while there is a

point for staying longer from a practical perspective, too many trainings in a row are very tiring and cannot be processed anymore. The trainers also said that the practice of taking rather more than only really relevant trainings also has influence on the motivation of participants. Both participants and trainers suggested that three trainings should be a maximum.

8.1.5. Level and Depth of Trainings

The level and depth of the trainings are two issues that should KURVE should look at. Participants mentioned a lack of transparency as to the level of the trainings and would wish for PTs on basic and higher level, as advanced level courses are missing. Many participants said the pace of the trainings was quite high and also said the trainers need to take care that participants can follow. This also is connected to the amount of content that can be covered in one week. Many participants said that in some trainings too many tools are introduced and they would prefer having fewer and to practice them more thoroughly. Especially the PME training was mentioned in this regard by participants and also KURVE staff who said it should be considered to concentrate on only two or three approaches. Thus the depth of practicing tools is a factor that highly influences the training validity and could be improved. Participants would like to go deeper and master the tools instead of getting an overview over many.

8.1.6. Methodology

The diversity of methods as well as the interactive and participatory approach of the trainings are a strength that is greatly appreciated by the participants. They also contribute to the wish of adults to actively engage in and steer their learning process. Visualisation and the energizers were mentioned positively several times. But there were also some controversies showing the different needs and wishes of participants. While one participant would have liked to have a more holistic methodology and worked less intellectually, another said that the very lively methodology might not fit all contexts. In the following sections more specific aspects of the methodology will be discussed.

8.1.6.1. Practice-Oriented

Generally participants appreciated the connection to their work by working on participants' examples during the training. Anyhow it was mentioned that especially for partner organisations opening up about weaknesses and difficulties might be an issue concerning the dependency on KURVE as a donor and their cooperation. It was also said that the trainers should use the expertise of participants more. One best practice example in this regard was given from the Managing Organisational Change training,

where there was one afternoon of open space in which participants shared their expertise. One difficulty that came up for participants of the training as Peace and Movement Worker and IPWs was the lack of own projects or lack of knowledge about the future projects which renders working on own examples difficult. Especially because practice-orientation is one of the principles of KURVE's training work and many trainers work with the assumption that participants have relevant experiences from organisations or initiatives to work with, this is a great disadvantage for IPWs and the trainees which affects the training validity. Therefore it should be assessed how practice-orientation can be provided in a meaningful way for all participants.

8.1.6.2. Examples and Contextualisation

A general criticism that was brought up by participants from all regions was a certain Eurocentrism of the trainings. Several participants said they found it hard at times to relate to examples because they were often taken from the German or European context. It became clear that in order for examples to be effective, the participants need to be able to relate to them. As the participants' contexts are quite diverse, there should also be examples that cover different realities. For this perspectives and examples from all regions should be brought into the trainings. As Sprenger states the examples and case studies the trainers use to illustrate their content need to "speak" to the participants, they need to connect culturally and regionally. Furthermore the methods and tools used in the training need to be applicable within the context of the participants, only if they are able to transfer them to their own context will the training be useful for them (Sprenger 2005, 10f).

Furthermore participants wish for a clearer focus on peace work, e.g. in the examples that are used. A third issue was the question in how far there might be a general danger of continuing colonial structures and mind sets in international peace work.

8.1.6.3. Experience-Oriented

The participants found it helpful to try out and practice contents and tools they got to know in the training. Bigger case studies and role plays from the Security Management and the PME trainings were mentioned as particularly helpful. But participants also criticised that there was not enough time to really practice the tools, which would in some cases hinder their application, because the participants did not feel confident enough. It was also proposed to use tools in front of the group and get feedback in order to deepen the learning. As practicing the tools is a step from theoretical knowledge to the practical use and mastering of skills, it is a very important factor of training validity. Thus KURVE should consider putting more emphasis on practicing tools and methods in the trainings, an issue that was already discussed concerning the

level and depth of training. Still this should not result in strict transferring of knowledge from “experts” to “learners”. Sprenger stresses that he prefers “facilitating processes and opening spaces for learning rather than teaching best practice” (Sprenger 2005, 11). This requires that the trainer is not responsible for results but for facilitating the process in a way that the participants can develop their own solutions. It is not about the participants learning detailed step-by-step instruction, but developing an understanding the logic of the whole issue at stake and being able to deal with it in their own way. Like this the participants also have responsibility for their learning and should have an active and participative role in the training. Already taking active responsibility for the learning during the training helps later on to actively implement and transfer the new skills, knowledge etc. (ibid).

8.1.6.4. Group Work and Mutual Learning

Doing work in small groups and learning from each other was a part of the trainings that participants appreciated a lot. Working in small groups provides space for everyone to contribute and is also safer than the big round. Furthermore not only getting input and perspectives from the trainings but also hear about others’ experiences helped the participants in their learning. One example for this was two participants from different contexts who are doing similar work and could profit from this a lot.

8.1.6.5. Exchange

Apart from the mutual learning that exchange enables, it also fosters reassurance and provides a basis for networking. Participants valued the exchange very much and stressed its importance. Several respondents would have wished for more exchange, as well on training topics and relevant experiences as in order to get to know each other’s contexts and share about the current political situations there. Furthermore it was said that exchange about traditions and habits could be good in order to understand each other better and for everyone to feel comfortable during the trainings. Furthermore, two trainers said that the regional work of KURVE and the Gorleben context could be more brought up and introduced to the participants.

While exchange is the most important factor for reassurance, there is little done actively by KURVE to foster it, except for interactive and participative methods in the trainings. Therefore KURVE focus more on how to increase and support exchange on different levels. Some ideas concerning the follow-up of trainings could also increase reassurance of participants.

8.1.7. Networking

The possibility to meet practitioners from different regions and build networks with them was unanimously appreciated. IPWs also valued the opportunity to get to know KURVE and future colleagues during the training time and said the synchronisation of the preparation should be practised as much as possible. Still participants said that KURVE could provide some support for the networking and also offer to get to know initiatives in the region or nearby cities. Considering that networking is one of the main objectives of KURVE, it should put more effort into this and think about ways to foster the contact between participants and also other groups. As there are many trainers among the participants, they might be specific group for whom some form of networking and exchange could be provided. Another group with specific needs and interests are activists.

8.2. Transition

8.2.1. Preparation of Trainings

Plans for implementation of the training contents are part of the application that participants send to KURVE. But the answers given are often vague, which might also be because of the little information that is available on the trainings. Several participants criticised the lack of information that is available on the trainings. Thus is worth considering if the transition from working context to the trainings can be supported, e.g. by providing more information of what to expect. Maybe also the questions in the application form could be specified, because if participants know where they want to apply their new skills, they may also have a more purposeful motivation for the training. In this regard training seen as a process can already start before the actual training.

8.2.2. Preparation of Transfer during the Training

Something that does not happen in all trainings is a specific support of transferring the knowledge and skills from the training to the work context of the participants. Therefore KURVE and the trainers should think about how the step from training to practice can be supported already in the training.

The questions of saving contents and the transition from training to work context were discussed by several participants. They regretted that there was often no time anymore to think about the transfer to practice at the end of the training and make concrete plans for implementation. The proposition was to have a structured summary and highlight possible steps for application as well as what needs to be considered. This

could also include possibilities for deepening the contents. The action plans that were worked on in a few trainings could be a best practice taken over for all trainings. Respondents also proposed that participants could stay for one more night to work on their plans for implementation together. Concerning content-saving the Security Management training could be taken as an example. The participants are asked to write a lot of their answers down, so that they can take at least partially completed materials with them.

Another issue is that due to the international setting of the trainings, the contents cannot be contextualised very much. Therefore it is an important question how participants can transfer the knowledge or skills from a general training to their specific context and how this can be supported.

8.2.3. Processing and Reflection of Contents

An important factor for the sustainability of the trainings and the step from knowledge to learning is in how far they have the possibility to reflect and process the information. A KURVE staff member said for example that the preparation schedules of IPWs are too full, so that there is hardly any room for reflecting the trainings and inputs. She* said some time should be planned as well for reading and reflection (K1). Also participants said that time for reflection and processing is crucial and a challenge for those staying for several weeks. Here KURVE could try to think about possibilities to support the participants.

8.3. Reaction to Trainings

The reactions of participants to the trainings are generally very positive, not only referring to the contents, but also the overall setting and the international group. This was also “bestätigen” by the organisations of participants and KURVE staff. This implies that they are also motivated to use some of their skills and stay in contact with others.

8.4. Plans for Implementation

Participants gave various examples of how they plan to use the skills from the trainings, which indicates that they benefitted from the trainings and are motivated to transfer their knowledge.

8.5. Transfer Validity

8.5.1. Application

Many alumni said that they could use their skills from the trainings for their work. Some described a more general benefit and others gave very detailed examples of how they implemented skills. A prominent group were trainers who often said they could use facilitation methods and contents in their trainings.

On a negative side one participant said she* could not use many of her* skills and one organisation said that two staff members left the organisation after the trainings, so that it did not benefit much from their new skills.

While this sounds like a positive result that participants make use of their skills, we do not have a full picture. It is likely that participants who like the trainings and could successfully apply their skills would rather answer the questionnaire than those for whom the trainings had little meaning. In order to find out more about the transfer validity, alumni were also asked about factors that supported or hindered the application of skills.

8.5.2. Factors influencing the Application

There were several main factors influencing the application of skills. In connection to training validity, insufficient depth and lack of contextualisation were hindering factors and application plans a supporting factor. The mandate and position in the organisation was another major factor, for some participants – direct staff members as well as IPWs - supporting and for others hindering the application. Sprenger also states that if in hierarchical organisations or structures certain leaders do not want any change it is a challenge for training participants to bring them about anyway. Therefore these “invisible” participants need to be considered and involved in some way in the training process, either by informing them or involving them in questions of transfer and implementation. By involving key persons one can provide important support to the application of training contents (Sprenger 2005, 7). For IPWs it was generally helpful if the LPW was also in the training. As some participants mentioned there was lack of interest and support from the organisation, it makes sense to find out what role the organisations play concerning the training and how the application of skills can be supported. Does KURVE have possibilities to foster the “buy-in” of management-level staff and other key actors?

Furthermore funding and the political situation as well as need for support, especially for complex issues like digital security, were mentioned as factors that hindered application.

8.5.3. Follow-Up

As Austin states “[o]ngoing support (access to a network, coaching or supervision, ongoing contact with the trainer team) and follow-up opportunities are crucial factors for successful training programmes” (Austin 2011:221). Follow-up was also mentioned by many different stakeholders as one aspect of the KURVE’s trainings that needs to be improved. Additionally respondents had many propositions how this could be done.

As one trainer stressed, participants need time to process the information they receive in the trainings, to adapt skills to their context, reflect and then do further steps (T7). This corresponds to Sprenger’s argumentation that training should be seen as a process and not a one-time event (Sprenger 2005). In this follow-up is an essential measure of support and to make trainings more sustainable. From two different contexts it was reported that participants are enthusiastic about and have a high motivation for change right after the trainings. But this decreases in the daily work routine and tends to get lost. It was argued that if contents are not repeated or applied in everyday work, one quickly falls back on known and proven skills. One cannot assume that participants will for sure apply new skills after a one-time training and therefore support or coaching is needed (K1, K5).

There are two aspects to follow-up. The first is to provide support in putting skills into practice and the second is further offers to develop the skills or knowledge about one topic further. Concerning the former, for now the trainers mostly provide the minutes of the training and give their email addresses to participants, offering to contact them if questions come up. But several trainers would like to provide some support after the training and proposed to have maybe two more days paid for follow-up. This was also addressed from KURVE staff who said that support for the application of skills would be good, especially concerning challenges that come up (K1).

Apart from providing professional support by the trainers, there were some ideas that would only need some support for establishing them. One of them is to set up tandems or small groups among the participants who stay in contact and support each other. This could take shape as sharing action plans and after some time ask what has been put to practice etc. Especially for trainings like Anti-Bias which foster a lot of reflection, having regular exchange on contents was seen as helpful from participants and trainers alike.

One organisation also said that KURVE should establish some mechanisms in order to be in touch with the impact of the trainings. It proposed to provide updates via email and set up a library to show the work that alumni are doing worldwide (O6). Further ideas were to set up a website where alumni can share their experiences around different topics, or publishing best practice stories of alumni.

The second aspect of follow-up is about developing the skills around one topic further, e.g. in advanced level courses. It was said that offers to intensify certain topics are missing (K5). One trainer suggested establishing regional forums, alumni meetings and/ or regional PTs (T7), an idea that was also brought up by participants. The idea of having more regional trainings was also uttered by a staff-member of KURVE. This is also linked to the question of who is reached by and able to take part in the trainings. Offering advanced level courses would also contribute to the sustainability of the trainings, as participants could improve and develop their work on certain topics further..

8.5.4. Networking

Concerning networking, most participants said to be still in contact with other alumni. There were also some examples of participants to whom the KURVE trainings had been recommended by alumni and interest in cooperation from the organisations' side. Still, there is not much information about the quality of the networks and contacts. We do not know in how far the connections between participants are beneficial for their work or reassure them.

The idea to have an alumni platform on the website was also mentioned from trainers as well as from participants.

8.5.5. IPWs

For IPWs it was mentioned that their preparation schedules are very full and miss the time to process and reflect on contents. Furthermore they often do not know very well yet what their project is going to be when they take part in the trainings. This decreases the possibilities to work on own examples in a meaningful way and also to know what skills they actually need for their work. One participant mentioned the examples of another organisation that sends their staff into families for a while to get to know the local context better and wondered if it would make sense to think in this direction as well, stressing the introduction to the context and language skills of IPW in their preparation (P4). Splitting the preparation time into two parts could also be a measure to make the trainings more effective for the IPW. After some basic introduction, the IPW could go to the country, to get to know the context and the organisation, maybe taking a language course or even start the project work. Then they could take some more trainings in Germany, having a better knowledge of what is needed for their project.

The possibility to get to know KURVE as sending organisation during the trainings is appreciated a lot by the IPWs. They also value to be in trainings together with future colleagues from the partner organisation, as this provides a platform to get to know

each other before the work starts and also creates a common ground of knowledge. This supports implementation of skills, as there are two people already who have the same knowledge. Furthermore it is also a question of ownership that not only the person from the outside brings in impulses for change. A third aspect of common preparation is the question of North-South hierarchies. Instead of only training the IPW, local staff members do profit from training, therefore empowering and building local capacities and not only internationals who leave again after a few years. One IPW said that as IPWs are often limited due to language proficiency, LPWs do more of the field work and therefore should have equal access to training and capacity building (P4).

8.6. Results Effectiveness

The evaluation of the effectiveness of the Practitioner Trainings of KURVE Wustrow reveals that capacity building is happening in the trainings and that there are participants who apply and profit from their skills in their work context. This derives from the reactions to the trainings and the various examples given by respondents as to what the use from the trainings. No quantitative facts can be given as to what percentage of participants uses the capacities from the trainings to which degree. But it was possible to look at factors that influence the training and transfer validity and develop recommendations based on the feedback of participants.

The following results indicate that the participants are able to build capacities in the trainings:

- The trainers are experts in their field.
- There is a good learning environment and atmosphere.
- There were several good examples for dealing adequately with English as a training language that is a foreign language to most.
- The international setting provides a good possibility for learning and exchange which is appreciated a lot by participants.
- Practice-orientation is helpful for the training validity and valued by the participants.
- Experiential learning is increasing the training validity.
- Work in small groups is increasing the training validity.
- The possibility for exchange is used extensively and gladly by participants.
- Participants appreciate the possibility for networking.
- Especially for IPWs the possibility to get to know KURVE and future colleagues from the PO is very valuable.
- Action plans help to transfer knowledge into the work context.

Recommendations to improve the training validity:

- Ensure that there is awareness for and adequate dealing with issues like power imbalances, anti-bias etc. among all trainers.
- Ensure clarity in the structure of the trainings and about reasons for activities.
- Increase the diversity among trainers concerning their regional background.
- Keep language issues in mind, as English proficiency is also an aspect of power relations, influencing who has how much room to contribute.
- Take care about the maximum number of participants. The proposition of participants and trainers was 12-15.
- Try to accompany group processes in some way, especially as the group changes every week, but some participants stay for several trainings.
- Provide more transparency about the level of the trainings. Also consider offering PTs on basic and advanced level.
- Consider blind spots and sensitive issues in the trainings: Working with examples from participants has to be handled sensitively as there are certain power imbalances and dependencies between KURVE and some participants' organisations. For POs working on their examples and opening up about difficulties might be an issue concerning the cooperation and dependency on KURVE as donor.
- Increase the use and consideration of the participants' expertise in the trainings.
- Think about how to ensure that everyone can learn well in the diverse groups. Not all participants (mostly IPW and trainees) for example have an organisation that they can work on, which decreases the effectiveness of practice-orientation.
- Make sure that there is an adequate balance of examples from all regions when illustrating methods and tools, so that all participants are able to relate to them.
- Consider increasing the time for and intensity of practicing tools and methods.
- Consider expanding the exchange by introducing participants to local initiatives and the Gorleben context.
- Think about ways to support and foster exchange among the participants.
- Support the networking among participants more, e.g. initiate the exchange of contact details.

The following results indicate that participants transfer and use the capacities:

- There are generally very positive reactions to the trainings.
- Participants give many examples of plans for application of skills from the trainings.
- Participants give many examples of how they used their skills and profited from them in their work.
- Quite some participants are in relevant positions in their organisations to implement new skills.

- Many participants are trainers and use and pass on their knowledge and skills.
- Many alumni are in contact with other participants.

Recommendations concerning transition between training and work context and transfer validity:

- More information on the trainings should be available to participants and applicants before the training.
- The transition from training to work context should be supported more, e.g. using action plans in all trainings and working on them throughout the week.
- At the end of the training there should be a session on the transition from training to work context.
- Think about how participants can be supported in contextualising the skills.
- Reflection and processing of information and knowledge needs time and should be considered for the overall training concept
- Follow-up needs to be provided: support for application of skills as well as follow-up trainings to deepen specific skills.
- Consider the roles of the participants' organisations for the application of skills and think if KURVE can try to support some buy-in of the management.
- It is not clear how sustainable the trainings are. This should be looked at and increased.

8.7. Other

During the research also several cross-cutting topics came up that are important for the training work of KURVE.

8.7.1. Communication between different stakeholders

One of them is the communication between different stakeholders. There were many issues that are connected to lack of communication or information between the stakeholders. Especially about the training contents more communication is needed. Several participants wished for more and clearer information about the training contents before the training. In order to provide for this, the training unit needs to have sufficient knowledge about what will happen in the trainings, what the objectives are, who the target group is etc. The trainers furthermore should know who is generally chosen as participant. Connected to this is also the peacebuilding unit. When it sends IPWs to the trainings, the staff should know what will happen in the trainings and which contents and level of training, in order to make sure the trainings fit the IPWs needs. It was also not clear in how far the non-content related factors of the trainings are

“present” to the IPWs and other participants, so maybe their importance can be stressed in order to clarify expectations and objectives. In general the profile of the training work could be sharpened, stressing for example exchange and mutual learning etc. One participant also said it is not clear for her* why KURVE says international groups are important for the learning. This indicates that there is a lack of information and transparency for participants and other stakeholders. In order to provide better and more detailed information on the trainings to participants beforehand, writing a full concept for the practitioner trainings, including theory of change, approach, objectives (overall & for each training) etc. should be helpful.

For the sake of quality and coherence of the trainings, communication and exchange between the trainers should take place. Most trainers said that they are not or not much in contact with other trainers, but thought that an exchange meeting would be very beneficial. One trainer also proposed to share the training minutes in order to know better what the other trainings are about and exchange. Additionally some hand-over between the different training weeks would also be helpful. The trainers should exchange to share knowledge, skills and lessons learned. It would be useful to find a common understanding of how to balance participant-orientation (concerning content and well-being) with prepared contents; of how to facilitate transition (e.g. with action plans), and the role of community living.

But there were also communication issues towards the outside. One organisation said that they had not always received timely answers when sending requests about individual coaching and said that they will not ask any more if this continues, even though they value the work of KURVE highly. Two competitors also mentioned difficulties in communicating with KURVE often having to wait for answers.

8.7.2. Power Imbalances and Representations

On a wider and long-term perspective we recommend to KURVE to reflect their training work (and also other fields of activity) concerning power structures and representations. Several times issues around representation and power imbalances were brought up in the evaluation and as KURVE is committed to nonviolence and works with an understanding of violence that acknowledges structural and cultural violence, this corresponds to KURVE’s very principles.

Being embedded in transnational structures in which donors usually are situated in the Global North and the organisations at the “receiving end” in the Global South, there are many pitfalls of reproducing neo-colonial hierarchies. Therefore it is essential to reflect these issues and to identify blind spots. What power relations and asymmetries are there between KURVE and participants and their organisations? What does this mean for the trainings? Who is facilitating the trainings and therefore also seen as expert?

As the trainings provide a precious opportunity for practitioners from the Global South and North to meet and exchange, it is essential to look at how much this is used and who is listening to whom. Is the opportunity listen to and learn from perspectives from the South used by participants and KURVE?

Then there is the issue of who is actually taking part in the trainings. The requirement of good English proficiency means that only well-educated people and therefore elites are able to participate. Therefore one can think about possibilities to make the trainings accessible to more or different people.

Gender is another aspect related to power and representation. While KURVE tries to have a balance of female and male participants and mixed trainer teams, gender sensitivity and the question of representation goes a lot further than having equal numbers (Coalition of Women for Peace 2014:7).

9. Conclusion

Conducting international trainings for peace and movement workers is a complex task that needs careful preparation and professional implementation in order to provide relevant and effective seminars for the participants. This evaluation assessed the relevance and effectiveness of the international Practitioner Trainings offered by KURVE Wustrow. The evaluation team used the means of desk study, participant observation, questionnaires and interviews to answer the following research questions:

- Are the contents and methods of the trainings relevant for the participants (i.e. activists, NGO staff as well as national and international peace workers)?
- What are the needs of participants in respect to contents and methodology?
- What else do the participants need? How can these needs be satisfied?
- Are peace and movement workers able to build capacities in the trainings?
- Which factors influence the learning?
- Are they able to transfer the capacities to their context and apply them successfully?
- How can relevance and effectiveness of the trainings be improved (recommendations)?

The training work of KURVE Wustrow is valued by and gets a lot of positive feedback from stakeholders involved, as this research found out. Concerning relevance it became clear that for all participants, building new capacities for their peace work is highly relevant. Since opportunities for further education are still rare, especially in the Global South, KURVE's training offers are very much needed as they are tailor-made for peace and movements workers engaged in peacebuilding and nonviolent change of societies. The relevance of the training contents depends on the working field, the position and the type of peace work (NGO work, activism, CPS, education) in which participants are engaged. Training an international group for all coordinators, facilitators and participants means that different learning styles and educational backgrounds, language difficulties, as well as diverse needs and expectations concerning the training and the over-all setting have to be handled carefully. But this is not the only factor that makes the group heterogeneous. Participants additionally work in different conflict settings, areas and positions which results in an additional challenge especially for facilitators to ensure relevance and effectiveness for all participants. And as most of the trainers stated, this is not always possible. Hence, in order to be able to organise and conduct trainings that are international and cutting across positions, it needs a stable infrastructure so as to meet the requirements.

For the criterion of effectiveness the question if participants can build capacities in the practitioner trainings cannot be answered by a simple yes or no, because there is no

full picture for all participants. But looking at the different influencing factors and the received feedback of participants it became clear that some capacity building is happening in the trainings. The first of KURVE's objectives, skill development, is supported by the quality of content due to expert trainers, a good learning setting, the use of active and participatory training methods, practice-orientation and the possibility of mutual learning.

The other two objectives were not focus of the evaluation, therefore there is only little knowledge on effectiveness concerning them. From what was found out, networking happens between participants and in some cases also between organisations. It is fostered by the fact that participants are meeting and spending the training together, but is not further actively pursued by KURVE. The same is true for the third objective of reassurance: In the training participants get to know other engaged peace and movement workers and exchange.

Concerning transfer validity of skill development the research has the result that there are alumni who do apply skills from the trainings in their work. Still, it is not possible to say what percentage of participants and to what extent they use the skills. Another big question is that of sustainability. Alumni are usually still in contact with other participants, and there are also some contacts between organisations and KURVE, but the quality of this contact is not known. Difficulties in the application derived from lack of interest or support in the organisation, external factors like the political situation, need for support or not knowing the tools well enough after the training.

The evaluation brought about many possibilities and suggestions for improving the effectiveness of the Practitioner Trainings. Limiting the group size and providing more information on the trainings and their level as well as having advanced level courses were some of them. Furthermore there is the wish to intensify the practicing of tools and methods and to spend time on the transition from training to work context. The most prominent need for change is the lack of follow-up action though. Many stakeholders said that follow-up programmes need to be provided as supporting the application of skills as well as in providing offers to deepen skills about a certain topic.

On a general level, the communication between different stakeholders should be increased and improved in order to have well-working cooperation and sufficient knowledge to make well-informed decisions.

Issues that were mentioned critically several times and connected to different situations and topics were power relations and representation. Participants asked for more diversity among trainers concerning their regional backgrounds. Furthermore they missed an adequate balance of examples from all regions of the world. The question was mentioned who is learning from whom concerning the interaction between trainers

and participants as well as the exchange between participants from the Global South and Global North. Language proficiency was addressed as an aspect of power that influences in how far participants contribute to and are included into the training process. In addition, there is the general question in how far international conflict transformation activities in their current form perpetuate colonial mind sets and reproduce structures. Interestingly gender inequalities were only mentioned once, although gender is one of the cross-cutting issues of KURVE's trainings. Therefore the evaluators recommend to KURVE to assess their training work (and international work in general) in relation to power asymmetries between different regions of the world and how solidarity on eye-level can be brought about as much as possible.

The recommendations of the evaluators and ideas to improve the trainings brought up by the respondents will be presented at a meeting of the evaluators team together with stakeholders after the publishing of this thesis. As von Kardoff (2004: 139f) puts it, those results "cooperate openly in the resolution of conflicts of interest and prospects of action, in negotiating goals and forms of implementation". It is the wish and the intention of the evaluators that this evaluation will be a "stimulus for change" in the training work of KURVE. All stakeholders should use it as a reflexive tool that can support a consensus-oriented process of finding common measures for the implementation of change (von Kardoff 2004: 140).

To gain greater insight into the relevance and effectiveness of training as a tool of capacity building interventions and peace work in general, further research would have to be applied: The outcome of the trainings could be assessed more specifically on the level of the participants' organisations. There could also be more research on each specific training in order to gain insights on specific strengths, best practices and need for change. Furthermore, the impact of the trainings on the actual (post-) conflict situation in the home countries of participants could be looked at, acknowledging that impact is difficult to assess and to investigate. To find out about the correlation between (international) training work and changes in society many actor levels, interactions, and circumstances have to be traced back and considered. A closer look on the most significant change that empowered successful peace activists would be one starting point. In the field of civilian conflict transformation, only a few cases could approve the performance of such activities until now since the question of impact on conflict is a new research field (Schweitzer 2009).

Another interesting question would be to look at this training work critically considering possible neo-colonial patterns and ask why trainings often are organised by Western European providers and with which implicit ethical messages they go about their work. Further research could investigate what factors distinguish training for development

work from trainings for peace work and also if expectations of participants are shaped by their form of education and culture.

10. References

- Atashi**, Elham (2009): Challenges for conflict transformation from the streets. In: Dayton, Bruce W. / Kriesberg, Louis (eds.) (2009): Conflict Transformation and Peacebuilding. Moving from violence to sustainable peace. London and New York: Routledge. pp.: 45-60.
- Austin**, Alex/ Fischer, Martina/ Ropers, Norbert (eds.) (2004): Transforming Ethnopolitical Conflict. The Berghof Handbook. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.
- Austin**, Beatrix (2011): Training for Conflict Transformation – an overview of approaches: In: Austin, Beatrix/Fischer, M/ Giessmann H.J (eds.) (2011): Advancing Conflict Transformation. The Berghof Handbook II. Opladen/Framington Hills: Barbara Budrich Publishers. pp: 207-236.
- Berghof** Foundation (Ed.) (2012): Berghof glossary on conflict transformation. 20 notions for theory and practice. Berlin: Berghof Foundation.
- Bernard**, H.R. (2011): Research Methods in Anthropology: Qualitative and quantitative methods. 5th edition. Plymouth: AltaMira Press.
- Chan**, Janis Fisher (2010): Training fundamentals. San Francisco, CA: Pfeiffer.
- Coalition** of Women for Peace (2014): Gender Sensitivity and Feminist Methodologies. Information Kit for Activists Groups And Civil Society Organisations. Available online at <https://de.scribd.com/doc/243072424/Feminist-methodologies-CWP-2014>, checked on 4/10/2016.
- Corbetta**, Piergiorgio (2003): Social Research. Theory, Methods and Techniques. London (et al.): Sage Publications Ltd.
- DeWalt**, Billie R. / DeWalt, Kathleen M. (2002): Participant observation: a guide for fieldworkers. Walnut Creek [u.a.]: Alta Mira Press.
- Dewey**, John (1997, ©1938): Experience and education. 1st Touchstone ed. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Francis**, Diana (2010): From Pacification to Peacebuilding. A Call to Global Transformation. London: Pluto Press.
- Gohl**, Eberhard (2003): Checking and learning – Impact monitoring and evaluation – a practical guide. Access on: <http://www.venro.org/fileadmin/Publikationen/Einzelveroeffentlichungen/Evaluation_und_Wirkungsbeobachtung/Checking%20and%20learning.PDF>. Last visit: 01.04.2016
- Griñó**, Laia / Levine, Carlisle (no date): Local Ownership in Evaluation: Moving from Participant Inclusion to Ownership in Evaluation Decision Making. Access on: <<https://www.interaction.org/sites/default/files/Local%20Ownership%20in%20Evaluation%20-%20FINAL.pdf>>. Last visit: 15.03.2016.

Heinemann-Grüder, Andreas/ Bauer, Isabella (2013): Was will zivile Konfliktbearbeitung? In: Heinemann-Grüder, Andreas/ Bauer, Isabella (eds.) (2013): Zivile Konfliktbearbeitung. Vom Anspruch zur Wirklichkeit. Opladen (et al.): Verlag Barbara Budrich. pp. 17-21.

Kawulich, Barbara B. (2005): Participant Observation as a Data Collection Method [81 paragraphs]. Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung / Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 6(2), Art. 43. Available at: <<http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/466/996>>. Last visit: 6.2.2016.

Kirkpatrick, Donald L./ Kirkpatrick, James D. (2007): The Four Levels. A Practical Guide for Effective Evaluation of training Programmes. San Francisco: Baret-Koehler Publishers.

Kirylo, James D. (Ed.) (2013): A critical pedagogy of resistance. 34 pedagogues we need to know (97).

Knowles, Malcolm S.; Holton, Elwood F.; Swanson, Richard A. (2005): The adult learner. The definitive classic in adult education and human resource development. 6th ed. Amsterdam, Boston: Elsevier.

KURVE Website. Available online at www.kurviewustrow.org.

KURVE Wustrow (2010): Jahresbericht 2010 (Annual Report). Available online at http://www.kurviewustrow.org/?page_id=1933, checked on 3/28/2016.

KURVE Wustrow (2013a): Antrag an Brot für die Welt.

KURVE Wustrow (2014a): Sachbericht 2014.

KURVE Wustrow (2015): Seminarprogramm Seminar Programme 2016/17. Available online at http://www.kurviewustrow.org/cms/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/KURVEWustrow_Seminarprogr2016-17_web.pdf, checked on 3/28/2016.

KURVE Wustrow (2016): Konzeptentwurf / Concept draft. (not published / internal).

Lederach, John Paul (1997): Building Peace. Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies. Washington/ USA: United States Institute of Peace. pp: 37-61.

Müller, Bernhard (2013): Vorwort. In: Zivile Konfliktbearbeitung. Vom Anspruch zur Wirklichkeit. Opladen (u.a.): Verlag Barbara Budrich. pp. 9-13.

Newton, John (2006): Action Research. In: Jupp, Victor (2006): The Sage Dictionary of Social Research Methods. London et al.: SAGE Publications. pp. 2-3.

OECD DAC Network on Development Evaluation (n.d.): Evaluating Development Co-Operation. Summary of Key Norms and Standards. 2nd ed.

Rosmann, Nadja (2015): Bewusstsein auf Entdeckungsreise. Der Wandel westlichen Denkens im globalen Dialog. In: evolve – Magazin für Bewusstsein und Kultur, 08/2015. pp. 41-44.

- Schensul**, Stephen L.; Schensul, Jean J. & LeCompte, Margaret D. (1999): Essential ethnographic methods: observations, interviews, and questionnaires (Book 2 in Ethnographer's Toolkit). Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Schütz**, Alfred (1962): Collected Papers. Volume I: Studies in Social Theory. The Hague: Nijhoff.
- Schweitzer**, Christine (2009): Erfolgreich gewaltfrei. Professionelle Praxis in ziviler Friedensförderung. Stuttgart: Institut für Auslandsbeziehungen.
- Sprenger**, Dirk (2005): The Training Process: Achieving social impact by training individuals? How to make sure that training for conflict transformation has an impact on conflict transformation (Berghof Handbook). Available online at www.berghof-handbook.net, checked on 3/25/2016.
- Stockmann**, Reinhard (2002): Qualitätsmanagement und Evaluation – konkurrierende oder sich ergänzende Konzepte? CEVAL, Arbeitspapier 3 (2002), Saarbrücken: Centrum für Evaluation.
- Stockmann**, Reinhard (2004): Was ist eine gute Evaluation. CEVAL, Arbeitspapier 9 (2004), Saarbrücken: Centrum für Evaluation.
- UNEG** (United Nations Evaluation Group) (2008): UNEG Ethical Guidelines for Evaluation. Access on <<http://www.unevaluation.org/document/detail/102>>. Last visit: 02.03.2016.
- von Kardoff**, Ernst (2004): Qualitative Evaluation Research. In: Flick, Uwe / von Kardorff, Ernst / Steinke, Ines (ed.) (2004): A Companion to Qualitative Research. London (et. al.): SAGE Publications. p. 137 – 142.
- Wadlington**, Elizabeth (2013): John Dewey: Pragmatist, Philosopher, and Advocate of Progressive Education. In James D. Kirylo (Ed.): A critical pedagogy of resistance. 34 pedagogues we need to know (97), pp. 29–32.
- Weller**, Christoph (Ed.) (2007): Zivile Konfliktbearbeitung. Aktuelle Forschungsergebnisse. Duisburg: Institut für Entwicklung und Frieden, Universität Duisburg-Essen (INEF Report 85/2007).

11. ANNEX

Annex 1: Email Questionnaires

Questions to former participants:

- In which KURVE-Training(s) did you take part and when?
- What was your motivation to choose this/these particular training(s)?
- What made you choose KURVE Wustrow as the training provider?
- Are you still in contact with other participants, trainers, or KURVE?
- What did you take out of the training(s) and how have you benefited (e.g. methods, tools, personal eye-openers, etc.)? Has it/have they changed your life in any way?
- Could you apply any of the new tools, strategies etc. from the training(s) in your own context? If yes, which and in how far were they helpful?
- What factors supported or hindered you in applying the insights, tools, etc. in your context?
- Do you pass your knowledge on to other people?
- Apart from the training content, what was important for you about your stay at KURVE Wustrow?
- Out of your experience, what would you say are strengths of the KURVE trainings?
- Out of your experience, what would you say are weaknesses of the KURVE trainings and where do you see need for change?
- If you look at your situation as a peace worker now, what capacities do you still want to develop and how would you like to build them?
- Generally, how do you rate the importance of capacity building trainings for your work as a peace worker?

Questions to CPS-Organisations

- How do you rate the relevance of trainings for capacity building in the field of conflict transformation in general?
- In how far do you cooperate with KURVE?
- In how far do you cooperate with other training providers (national/international)? How do What are the reasons for that cooperation?
- Which of the training topics that are offered by KURVE do you find relevant for your organisation? (you can find them listed here: http://www.kurviewustrow.org/cms/?page_id=2046&lang=en + International Training)
- What kind of feedback do you get about the KURVE-trainings from you staff-members or civil peace workers who took part in them?
- All in all, what would you say are strengths of the KURVE trainings?
- All in all, what would you say are weaknesses of the KURVE trainings and where do you see need for change?

Questions to trainers

- What are the objectives of your training (short-term and long-term)?
- Which target group is your training meant for? (And who is taking part?)
- What teaching methods and pedagogical approach do you apply during your training?
- How do you deal with the various needs of the participants (previous knowledge, expectations, stress, experience, ...) during the training?
- How do you try to guarantee that the training is relevant for everyone in such

- diverse groups?
- Do you do any follow-up and if yes, what kind of?
 - What does the cooperation between you and KURVE look like (processes, communication, difficulties, strengths)?
 - Are you also in contact with other KURVE trainers about the trainings?
 - How coherent and useful is the overall training concept of KURVE in your opinion (e.g. 5 weeks of practitioner trainings in autumn and spring; IT; combination of topics; composition of the groups; etc.)?
 - Where do you see the need for change regarding KURVE's training work (e.g. contents; communication with trainers and/or participants; accommodation; etc.)?
 - Do you have any other recommendations, questions, or remarks?

Questions to competitors

- How do you rate the relevance of trainings for capacity building in the field of conflict transformation in general?
- Out of experience, which training topics are relevant for (international) peace workers?
- Where can you identify lacks/gaps in the (international) training landscape?
- To what extent do you cooperate with other training providers (national and international)? What are reasons for this cooperation?
- What monitoring mechanisms do you have for your training work to guarantee quality and relevance as best as possible?
- How well do you know the training work of KURVE Wustrow in Germany?
- Do you cooperate with KURVE Wustrow?
 - If yes, in how far?
 - If no, what are the reasons?
- Which features of KURVE's training work do you appreciate? Where do you see weaknesses?

Questions to partner organisations

- What kind of feedback do you get about the KURVE-trainings from staff-members or activists who took part in them?
- Which of the training topics that are offered by KURVE do you find relevant for your organisation? (you can find them listed here: http://www.kurviewustrow.org/cms/?page_id=2046&lang=en + International Training)
- Do you see any further need for capacity building within your organisation or working context? If yes, which and how could these capacities best be achieved?
- Can you identify any changes in your organisation that you would relate to participation in KURVE-trainings (by single or different staff members)? If yes, what are they?
- To what extent are these changes supportive for your work?
- What other training providers does your organisation make use of for capacity building? What do you like or criticise about them?
- If your organisation offers trainings itself: is there an exchange about training approaches, topics etc. with KURVE?
- All in all, what would you say are strengths of the KURVE trainings?
- All in all, what would you say are weaknesses of the KURVE trainings and where do you see need for change?

Annex 2: Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference

between

Sophia Stappel, Scheffelstr. 11, 10367 Berlin

and

Laura Weber, Schwedenstr. 18, 13357 Berlin

as evaluators

and

KURVE Wustrow, Centre for Training and Networking in Nonviolent Action,

Kirchstr. 14, D-29462 Wustrow

Represented by Jochen Neumann (Director)

as contracting body

for

Evaluation of the International Training Work of KURVE Wustrow

1. Background information

KURVE Wustrow – Centre for Training and Networking in Nonviolent Action was founded in 1980 with the aim of turning concerns about violent conflict, environmental degradation and social justice into conscious nonviolent action.

The history of KURVE Wustrow is closely connected with the nonviolent resistance against the temporary storage facility for nuclear waste in Gorleben. The founding aimed at the empowerment of the movement with nonviolent action through training work. KURVE Wustrow remains committed to this objective and dedicates itself to work towards an increasing capacity for peace in the region, Germany, Europe and the world.

The training unit of KURVE Wustrow offers trainings in nonviolent conflict transformation. These trainings are tailored for people that seek to engage in conflict transformation using nonviolent, civil and creative means. This can be applied in

everyday situations, in voluntary engagement, in political actions or at work – in Germany or in conflict and crisis areas worldwide.

KURVE Wustrow works with experienced trainers and with a three-step process of experience – analysis -synthesis. Not the sole academic knowledge transfer is at the core but the participatory reflection with practice. Not only the mind is addressed, but also the heart and hands. The trainings are designed as participant- and experience-oriented as well as action- and practice-oriented.

The trainings are based on the standards of a network of training organisations within the Aktionsgemeinschaft Dienst für den Frieden (AGDF).

The international training work is monitored and evaluated on a regular basis. Written feedback forms are filled in by participants at the end of each training. The findings are shared with the trainers and the responsible director of KURVE Wustrow and joint conclusions for future trainings are drawn. However, the trainings have grown in number and contents. More participants are attending and more combinations of trainings have been conceptualised and advertised for. The management and the training unit have launched an evaluation process in order to gain insights how to further develop the international training work of KURVE Wustrow.

2. Purpose and objective for the evaluation

Main purpose of the evaluation is to provide a learning space for KURVE Wustrow (training unit and management) as well as the trainers.

It is needed because

- Since the last in-depth evaluation in 1998 the international training work of KURVE Wustrow has been developed significantly and the environment has changed substantially
- Especially the training needs with regard to the Civil Peace Service Programme of KURVE Wustrow as well as in general has changed
- The people involved in the trainings like participants, trainers, KURVE staff as well as supporters and donors deserve a profound assessment of the strength and weaknesses of KURVE's international training work.

It is meant to provide

- an independent assessment of the relevance and effectiveness of the trainings and the underlying training concept
- helpful information and recommendations for the steering and management of the future activities of the training unit of KURVE Wustrow on operational and strategic level
- support in enhancing PM&E practice, especially the monitoring system and the follow-up of trainings.

3. Areas to be covered by the review and assessment questions:

The main purpose of the evaluation is to provide a learning space for the training unit and management of KURVE Wustrow.

The evaluation is based on the DAC-criteria and focusses mainly on

- a. Relevance
 - Is the contents relevant for our participants (i.e. activists, NGO staff as well as national and international peace workers)?
 - What are the needs of participants with respect to contents and methodology?
 - What else or other do our participants need?
 - How can these needs be satisfied?

- b. Effectiveness
 - What have the participants understood and acquired with respect to Thinking / Feeling / Acting at the end of a training (training validity)?
 - What have the participants used and implemented with respect to Thinking Feeling / Acting after the training in their work and private life (transfer validity)?

- c. Recommendations for the operational, conceptional and strategic development of the international training work of KURVE Wustrow

4. Intended Use(s) and User(s)

This evaluation is meant primarily as a learning tool for KURVE Wustrow and the trainers. Its use will be predominantly of internal importance for KURVE Wustrow.

However, the evaluation of KURVE Wustrow's international training work is intended to present its results in a fashion valuable in both format and style to be used for interested outsiders also. The management and training unit of KURVE Wustrow will consider in which way to include selected relevant stakeholders in the process (and design of) the evaluation.

- The evaluation will be written as Master Thesis of the two evaluators in the Master in Intercultural Conflict Management at the Alice Salomon University in Berlin
- Additionally an evaluation report with recommendations will be written for internal use of KURVE Wustrow and will be shared with relevant stakeholders joining the internal learning space (e.g. trainers and members)

The confidentiality of all data will be respected.

5. Methods to be applied for the evaluation

It is the essential aim of this evaluation to increase the capacities of KURVE Wustrow and the trainers to understand the strengths and weaknesses of the training concept and to further develop ideas for the next planning phases.

The evaluation will be organised in a way that it creates space for critical reflection and learning for all players involved. For this reason, the review process will be organised as open and process-oriented as possible. This implies participatory action research

approaches and systemic methods. The qualitative data collection will be combined with theoretical research.

Evaluation Design

- Desk-Study of relevant data collected on international training work (e.g. participant lists, evaluation questionnaires at the end of the training and some months after the training, training reports, concept notes and proposals)
- Participant Observation (e.g. at the international training in June/July 2015 in Wustrow, at selected practitioner trainings in October/November 2015 in Wustrow)
- Focus-Group Discussions (e.g. with trainers and participants of the practitioner trainings)
- Semi-Structured Interviews (e.g. with trainers, participants (activists, NGO staff, national and international peace workers)
- Feedback from Organisations which use training services more (like PBI, Bread for the World, WFD, AGEH) or less frequently (like GIZ, forumZFD)
- Feedback from Competitors (e.g. Akademie für Konfliktransformation, Responding to Conflict, Steps for Peace)
- Theoretical Research (e.g. on adult education, evaluation, nonviolent action, training work, conflict transformation)

6. Roles and responsibilities

- KURVE Wustrow
 - As the contracting body covers all expenses of the evaluation team for travel and accommodation in Wustrow
 - Drafts and finalises ToR
 - Provides all relevant materials and information (including interviews) regarding the international training work to the evaluation team
 - Establishes contacts to trainings teams
 - Is available for exchange meetings on a regular basis with evaluation team about the evaluation process on progress and upcoming questions
- Trainers
 - Are available as contact persons for evaluation team
 - Support participant observation of evaluation team, allow insights and share their perspective with the evaluation team in the process of the evaluation
- The evaluation team
 - Arranges travel to Wustrow independently
 - Shares the overall responsibility regarding the evaluation process including methodology development, data collection, data analysis, development of recommendations and reporting.
 - Together draws out the expectations of the relevant stakeholders, selects stakeholders to be interviewed, briefs & debriefs the KURVE team, shares recommendations, writes and finalizes the report and presents it to KURVE Wustrow
 - Exchanges on a regular basis with KURVE Wustrow about the evaluation process on progress and upcoming questions
 - Writes report according to reporting requirements below

- Facilitate initial kick-start workshop and final feedback workshop

The final report will be approved by KURVE Wustrow in consent with the trainers, while independence of contractor and findings are guaranteed.

7. Reporting requirements

The following is required of the reporting:

- Executive Summary
- Evaluation Report
- Recommendations
- Annex (e.g. list of interviews)

A complete report will be written in English and submitted to KURVE Wustrow after the 31st May 2016. A first presentation of the evaluation's findings and recommendations will take place in Wustrow with the directors and the training unit.

A presentation and discussion of the final draft report will be held for KURVE Wustrow in a joint meeting (AG Bildungsarbeit) in April/May 2016.

8. Time schedule

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| June-September 2015 | |
| 02.06.2015 | Agreement on cooperation (evaluation as master thesis) |
| 03.-04.06.2015 | Coaching on facilitation and training |
| | Preparation of evaluation and master thesis proposal |
| September 2015 | |
| 25.09.2015 | Finalisation of proposal for master thesis |
| October 2015 | |
| 05.-09.10.2015 | Practitioner Training: Introduction to Security |
| 06.10.2015 | Official start of the master thesis |
| 12.-16.10.2015 | Practitioner Training: Security Management |
| 19.-23.10.2015 | Practitioner Training: Anti-Bias |
| 26.-30.10.2015 | Practitioner Training: Organisational Change |
| November 2015 | |
| 02.-06.11.2015 | Practitioner Training: PM&E |
| | Monthly meeting to discuss current state of the evaluation |
| December 2015 | |
| | Monthly meeting to discuss current state of the evaluation |
| January 2016 | |
| | Monthly meeting to discuss current state of the evaluation |
| February 2016 | |
| | Presentation of first draft of the evaluation to KURVE + feedback |
| March 2016 | |
| | Finalisation of the master thesis |
| April / May 2016 | |
| | Presentation of final draft evaluation report at a joint meeting with KURVE Wustrow (AG Bildungsarbeit) |

| | |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| End of May 2016 | |
| | Finalisation of evaluation report |

8. Signatures

Place, date Sophia Stappel (Evaluator)

Place, date Laura Weber (Evaluator)

Place, date Jochen Neumann (Director KURVE Wustrow)

Annex 3: List of Best Practices for Facilitators:

List of best practices for facilitators to increase relevance and effectiveness for participants in an international training:

- thorough preparation of the training: what are the motivations, expected learnings and background knowledge that participants formulated in the application form?
- asking for expectations before the training starts
- clarify which expectations can be fulfilled and which not
- introduce participants to the international training and learning setting:
 - rules for communicating in English (if you need translation from one of your country colleagues, if we spoke too fast or you didn't understand something do not hesitate to tell us with in giving us sign. It is important that we are all on the same level of understanding the contents → Buddy system
 - sometimes the groups needs longer processes
 - different learning styles
 - different ways of expressing ones needs and wishes
- ask for feedback from participants after each day (each session)
- use the method of open spaces to give a chance for sharing expertise and encourage discussions and exchange among participants on methods /tools/ best practices/ etc.
- The relevance and effectiveness of tools should be analysed by discussing their pros and cons in plenum after testing it. This reflections need some time that has to be planned and taken (~ 30min per day)
- facilitators should give constructive feedback to individual or group work to reassure them and give helpful hints
- summary and repetition of the most important lessons learned of the last day in the morning of the new day
- give enough time for action plans and ideally consult participants to make feasible plans for themselves. For this it could be helpful that trainers stayed until the evening of the last day or until Saturday to make a sound ending possible
- give enough time for participants to fill out the reaction sheets at the end of the training

Annex 4: Indicators for the Training Objectives Named by KURVE:

Capacity Building Indicators:

Training Validity:

- The participant is present throughout the training.
- The participant uses the presented tools during and after the training.
- The participant is able to transfer the tools to her* own context and adapt them. She* recognises weaknesses of the tools, is able to adapt them and use them creatively. (To ensure this, tools need to be evaluated together with the training group and trainers).
- The participant works on own examples from her* working context during the training (practice-orientation).

Transfer Validity:

- The manuals are read by the participant and used as support and FAQ in her* own context (these manuals are still worked on and not yet in use).
- The participant gets a higher position within her* organisation. (Concerning Do No Harm it needs to be considered that capacity building can also lead to participants leaving their NGO, because they might be able to find a better job with new qualifications.
- The participant founds an own NGO (and ascribes this step to taking part in the training).

Networking (for mutual support) Indicators:

Training Validity:

- Participants exchange their contact details.

Transfer Validity:

- After the training participants are in contact via email or social media.
- Participants recommend the trainings to others or applicants mention that the training was recommended to them by former participants.
- Participants meet again after the training (e.g. in an alumni-meeting of RIT).
- Participants set up a blog to stay in contact and exchange about contents (thematisch).
- Participants support each other in their campaigns via social media.
- Organisations of participants are interested in cooperating with KURVE.
- Cooperation is set up between participants' organisations and KURVE.
- Participants or their organisations cooperate with other donor organisations in Germany.

Reassurance Indicators:

Training Validity:

- Participants are active peace workers who use the opportunity for exchange about their experiences with committed peace workers from different parts of the world. They mention this exchange positively.

- The participants are supported to work on their own examples and use the opportunity. Other participants and trainers show appreciation about the work of those who provide examples.
- There is constructive feedback and exchange; this should be established by trainers.
- Participants state that the new skills and competencies are relevant for them, find them helpful for their work and make plans for implementation.

Transfer Validity:

- Participants found an own NGO and mention that the training influenced their decision.

Annex 5: AGDF/QVB-Standards and the Training Offers by KURVE:

| Standards AGDF | Grundkurs (14 Tage) * | | Aufbaukurs | | Info-Spezialisierung*** |
|-----------------|--|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| Was zählt dazu? | | | - FFK-Ausbildung ** - Training of Trainers (toT) * | | |
| KURVE-Trainings | Kreativ im Konflikt (Friedenskreis Halle, KURVE) | IT Basiskurs (seit 1994) (18 Tage) Regional IT (2x in Nepal; Kenia 2016 in Planung) | Nonviolent Conflict Transformation ToT (2004-2007, Durchgang) (53 Tage) Ausbildung zur BeraterIn für gewaltfreie Konflikttransformation und soziale Bewegungen (ab 2015) | DNH ToT (seit 2013) (10 Tage) DNH Modulkurs (ausgesetzt) | Fachseminare (seit 2007) (5 Tage) |

*Standards sehr detailliert festgelegt

** Standards detailliert festgelegt

*** Standards rudimentär festgelegt

Annex 6: Timeline of the Evaluation

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| June-September 2015 | |
| 02.06. | Agreeing on the cooperation (evaluation as master thesis) |
| 03.-04.06. | Coaching on facilitation and training |
| 14.06. | Visiting IT for Midterm-Evaluation |
| | Preparation of evaluation and master thesis proposal |
| September 2015 | |
| 25.09.2015 | Proposal for master thesis |
| October 2015 | |
| 05.-09.10. | Practitioner Training: Introduction to Security |
| 06.10. | Official start of the master thesis |
| 12.-16.10. | Practitioner Training: Security Management |
| 13.10. | Meeting with director (JN) to clarify Terms of Reference |
| 19.-23.10. | Practitioner Training: Anti-Bias |
| 26.-30.10. | Practitioner Training: Organisational Change |
| November 2015 | |
| 02.-06.11. | Practitioner Training: PM&E |
| 16.11. | Meeting to discuss current state of the evaluation (with training unit and JN): preliminary findings, what did we do until now, what are the next steps |
| 25.11. | Meeting with the supervisors |
| December 2015 | |
| ~24.12.-03.01. | Christmas Break |
| January 2016 | |
| 21.-26.01. | Questionnaires to Alumni (2013-2015), Organisations, Trainers and Competitors sent out by email |
| February 2016 | |
| | Analysis of Data and Writing |
| March 2016 | |
| | Finalising the thesis |
| April | |
| 15.04. | Handing in of the thesis |
| May/June 2016 | |
| | Presenting results to KURVE (e.g. in a workshop) |

Annex 7: List of Resource Persons

| | | |
|------------|--------------|---------------|
| K1 | KURVE staff | Questionnaire |
| K2 | KURVE staff | Interview |
| K3 | KURVE staff | Interview |
| K4 | KURVE staff | Interview |
| K5 | KURVE staff | Questionnaire |
| T1 | Trainer | Questionnaire |
| T2 | Trainer | Questionnaire |
| T3 | Trainer | Questionnaire |
| T4 | Trainer | Interview |
| T5 | Trainer | Questionnaire |
| T6 | Trainer | Questionnaire |
| T7 | Trainer | Interview |
| T8 | Trainer | Questionnaire |
| T9 | Trainer | Questionnaire |
| O1 | Organisation | Interview |
| O2 | Organisation | Questionnaire |
| O3 | Organisation | Questionnaire |
| O4 | Organisation | Questionnaire |
| O5 | Organisation | Interview |
| O6 | Organisation | Questionnaire |
| O7 | Organisation | Questionnaire |
| O8 | Organisation | Interview |
| P1 | Participant | Questionnaire |
| P2 | Participant | Questionnaire |
| P3 | Participant | Questionnaire |
| P4 | Participant | Interview |
| P5 | Participant | Questionnaire |
| P6 | Participant | Questionnaire |
| P7 | Participant | Questionnaire |
| P8 | Participant | Questionnaire |
| P9 | Participant | Questionnaire |
| P10 | Participant | Questionnaire |
| P11 | Participant | Questionnaire |
| P12 | Participant | Questionnaire |
| P13 | Participant | Questionnaire |
| P14 | Participant | Questionnaire |
| P15 | Participant | Questionnaire |

| | | |
|------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| P16 | Participant | Questionnaire |
| P17 | Participant | Questionnaire |
| P18 | Participant | Questionnaire |
| P19 | Participant | Questionnaire |
| P20 | Participant | Questionnaire |
| P21 | Participant | Questionnaire |
| P22 | Participant | Questionnaire |
| P23 | Participant | Interview |
| P24 | Participant | Interview |
| P25 | Participant | Interview |
| P26 | Participant | Interview |
| P27 | Participant | Questionnaire + Interview |
| P28 | Participant | Interview |
| P29 | Participant | Interview |
| P30 | Participant | Interview |
| P31 | Participant | Questionnaire |
| P32 | Participant | Questionnaire + Interview |
| P33 | Participant | Interview |
| P34 | Participant | Interview |
| P35 | Participant | Interview |
| P36 | Participant | Interview |
| P37 | Participant | Questionnaire + Interview |
| P38 | Participant | Interview |
| P39 | Participant | Interview |
| P40 | Participant | Interview |
| P41 | Participant | Interview |
| P42 | Participant | Interview |
| P43 | Participant | Interview |
| P44 | Participant | Interview |
| P45 | Participant | Questionnaire |
| P46 | Participant | Application form |
| P47 | Participant | Application form |
| P48 | Participant | Application form |
| P49 | Participant | Application form |
| P50 | Participant | Application form |
| P51 | Participant | Application form |
| P52 | Participant | Application form |
| P53 | Participant | Application form |

| | | |
|------------|-------------|------------------|
| P54 | Participant | Application form |
|------------|-------------|------------------|

Annex 8: Application form for Practitioners Training Series – Fall 2015

APPLICATION FORM



PRACTITIONER TRAININGS

Please read carefully and fill out this form completely!
Your application will not be considered if any detail is missing!
Please send the form by Email until 5th July 2015 (for people in need of visa)
and until 6th September 2015 (for those without visa requirement)

I would like to participate in the following training(s):

Introduction to Security: 05.–09.10.2015
Security Management: 12.–16.10.2015
Anti-Bias and Social Inclusion: 19.–23.10.2015
Managing Organisational Change: 26.–30.10.2015
Project Management: 02.–06.11.2015

Personal information (according to your passport)

Surname(s)/Family name(s)

First name(s)/given Name(s)

Country of residence

Telephone

Fax



eMail

Date of birth

Place of birth

Gender

Education

Profession

Nationality

Passport No.

Passport: Date of issue

Passport: Place of issue

Passport: Date of expiry

Further information:

Experience in international context (stays abroad/ purpose of travel/ contact with intern. organisations)

Organisational background (Name of the organisation you are working with)

I have applied for a training at KURVE Wustrow before yes no

How many times
(approximately)

I have participated in a training of KURVE Wustrow yes no

Name and date/year of training you have participated in

Have you been in Europe before? yes no

Where?

How often?

Have you applied for a visa for Germany before? yes no

Has your visa worked out? yes no

If your visa application was rejected, has the embassy explained why? Please give the reason, so that we can try to help you with a more successful visa application

English language level
(level of proficiency)

Essay Questions

(You may use an extra page and answer separately for each training you apply for)

1. Please describe the organisation/initiative you are working for, and the specific work that you are doing within this organisation/initiative. (maximum 3-5 sentences)

2. Please explain your motivation for wanting to attend this specific training. (maximum 3-5 sentences)

3. Please explain what you expect to learn in this specific training. (maximum 3-5 sentences)

4. Please describe what your relevant experiences are, and how you could contribute to the learning in the training. (maximum 3-5 sentences)

5. Please relate how you intend to apply what you will have learned at this training to your work and life. (maximum 3-5 sentences)

Participation Fee (Please tick the boxes which are applicable)

I will be able to cover the full participation fee for organisations (2500,- Euro).

I will be able to cover the full participation fee for single persons (2000,- Euro).

I will be able to cover the reduced participation fee for single persons (1250,- Euro)

I hereby apply for a scholarship for the participation fee

Request for Financial Assistance (can only exceptionally be provided)

Please be aware that we can provide only limited financial assistance, which depends on funds from donors.

I need a subsidy for my travel expenses (note: the maximum amount is 700,- Euro)

I can cover my travel expenses up to an amount of _____ Euro

Please explain briefly but clearly why you need financial assistance by KURVE Wustrow.

References

| | Reference 1 | Reference 2 |
|----------|-------------|-------------|
| Name | | |
| Function | | |
| Address | | |

| | | |
|-----------|--|--|
| Telephone | | |
| Fax | | |
| eMail | | |

Special Needs / Important information:

Consent:

I will participate throughout the whole training.

I am aware that the training is held in English. My ability to speak and understand English is sufficient to follow the training and to participate actively.

SEND

PRINT

Please send this form via Email to training@kurviewustrow.org or volunteer02@kurviewustrow.org
or Fax to +495843987111

Certificate of Authenticity

I, Sophia Katharina Stappel, herewith certify that the above presented thesis is true and right to the best of my knowledge. I further certify that I have researched and written this thesis without any outside help. Should I have had assistance this is pointed out at the appropriate place within this thesis.


(Sophia Stappel)

Berlin, 14.04.2016

Certificate of Authenticity

I, Laura Weber, herewith certify that the above presented thesis is true and right to the best of my knowledge. I further certify that I have researched and written this thesis without any outside help. Should I have had assistance this is pointed out at the appropriate place within this thesis.


(Laura Weber)

Berlin, 14.04.2016