



**GRASE** GENDER AND RACE STEREOTYPES ERADICATION  
IN LABOUR MARKET ACCESS **REC NUMBER 101005792**



FUNDED BY THE EUROPEAN UNION'S  
RIGHTS, EQUALITY AND CITIZENSHIP  
PROGRAMME (2014-2020)

# GRASE

GENDER AND RACE  
STEREOTYPES ERADICATION  
IN LABOR MARKET ACCESS

## EVALUATION REPORT

OF:

TOOLKIT 1: EFFECTIVE STRATEGIES TO FIGHT RACE AND GENDER STEREOTYPES IN CAREER  
COUNSELLING SERVICES

AND

TOOLKIT 2: RAISING AWARENESS AGAINST GENDER AND RACE STEREOTYPES IN RECRUITMENT:  
TRAINING FOR CAREER COUNSELLING PROFESSIONALS



GRASE GENDER AND RACE STEREOTYPES ERADICATION  
IN LABOR MARKET ACCESS REC NUMBER 101005792



FUNDED BY THE EUROPEAN UNION'S  
RIGHTS, EQUALITY AND CITIZENSHIP  
PROGRAMME (2014-2020)

## DISCLAIMER

The content of this Evaluation Report represents the views of the authors only and are their sole responsibility. The European Commission does not accept any responsibility for use that may be made of the information it contains.

The authors shared the Report contents with the Steering Group and the Board of Experts of the Project GRASE that approved it, but they are the only responsible for the final content, expressions and words used.

Report realised within the GRASE Project Funded by the European Union's Rights, Equality and Citizenship Programme (2014-2020)

Fondazione Iniziative e Studi sulla Multietnicità - ISMU  
Via Copernico, 1 – 20125 Milano  
Tel. 02.678779.1  
[www.ismu.org](http://www.ismu.org)

© Copyright Fondazione Ismu, Milano 2021

### Partner

This research was carried out as a part of the GRASE project, coordinated by ISMU Foundation (Italy) in partnership with Fondazione Giacomo Brodolini (Italy), the Adecco Group (Italy), Fundación Adecco (Spain), Asociación AMIGA por los Derechos Humanos de las Mujeres (Spain), APROXIMAR Cooperativa de Solidarieda de Social (Portugal).

### Authors

Alina Grieco and Alberto Vergani



**GRASE** GENDER AND RACE STEREOTYPES ERADICATION  
IN LABOUR MARKET ACCESS **REC NUMBER 101005792**



FUNDED BY THE EUROPEAN UNION'S  
RIGHTS, EQUALITY AND CITIZENSHIP  
PROGRAMME (2014-2020)

## CONTENTS

Introduction.....	4
Toolkit 1: "Effective strategies to fight race and gender stereotypes in career counselling services" .....	6
Toolkit overview .....	6
Toolkit testing phase and assessment.....	7
A glimpse into the collected data .....	8
Toolkit evaluation .....	8
Toolkit 2: "Raising awareness against gender and race stereotypes in recruitment: training for career counselling professionals" .....	12
Toolkit overview .....	12
Toolkit testing phase and assessment.....	12
A glimpse into the collected data .....	13
Toolkit evaluation.....	14
Final recommendations .....	19
Appendix A .....	22
Appendix B.....	26



GRASE GENDER AND RACE STEREOTYPES ERADICATION  
IN LABOUR MARKET ACCESS REC NUMBER 101005792



FUNDED BY THE EUROPEAN UNION'S  
RIGHTS, EQUALITY AND CITIZENSHIP  
PROGRAMME (2014-2020)

## Introduction

GRASE is a 2-year EU-funded project under the EU's Rights, Equality & Citizenship program, focusing on facilitating the access of women with a migratory background to the labour market by reducing the barriers they may find in career counselling services systems.

The project is carried out by a consortium composed of six partners from three European countries: Italy (ISMU, Adecco Formazione, Fondazione Giacomo Brodolini), Spain (Fundación Adecco and Amiga) and Portugal (Aproximar). These organisations have developed significant experience in migrant integration (especially ISMU and Aproximar), gender equality, diversity and inclusion (FGB and Amiga), delivery of fair job market guidance and career counselling services for the general population (Adecco Formazione and Adecco-Spain as subcontractor) and socially disadvantaged groups (Aproximar and Amiga).

The effort pursued till now by the six partners within the framework of the GRASE project has been focused on supporting professionals in recognising and addressing gender and race stereotypes by combining expert knowledge on gender and migration with the practical knowledge of career counselling professionals. To this end, a Community of Practice (COP) has been activated in three countries – Italy, Spain and Portugal – involving professionals who work in private and public career counselling services, as well as professionals who provide support to migrants, women and vulnerable populations, to pinpoint difficulties and areas of intervention.

On the other hand, the partner organisations have analysed gender and race gaps data, collected evidence on diversity management experiences and examined the programming language of job search. In this regard, one of the areas of specific attention has been the unconscious reproduction of stereotypes and implicit bias, which might lead to adopting behaviours or attitudes that can indeed be discriminatory.

These analyses have served as a basis for the drafting of 3 Toolkits: A) Toolkit no. 1, which focused on the intervention strategies which could be implemented in career counselling services in order to reduce gender and race discrimination; B) Toolkit no. 2, defining training modules aimed at career counselling professionals to enhance awareness and adoption of correct behaviours; C) Toolkit no.3, focused on the corrective changes that can be introduced in the AI of job search and skills matching digital platforms (Toolkit no. 3 is not subject of this report).

Toolkit no. 1 was tested by project partners in April-June 2022 by involving 30 professionals working in public and private employment services. During the field test, professionals have been asked to use the Toolkit



**GRASE** GENDER AND RACE STEREOTYPES ERADICATION  
IN LABOUR MARKET ACCESS **REC NUMBER 101005792**



FUNDED BY THE EUROPEAN UNION'S  
RIGHTS, EQUALITY AND CITIZENSHIP  
PROGRAMME (2014-2020)

strategies and suggestions in advising migrant women and to compile two questionnaires (see below) in order to gather evidence to support the assessment of the Toolkit itself.

Toolkit no. 2 has been used to organise a training pathway in the three countries involved in the project: 7 editions have been finalised in Spain, 3 in Italy and 2 in Portugal, for a total number of 149 participants and 25 trainers. At the end of the training courses, a questionnaire has been administered both to trainers and trainees (see below) in order to get their feedback on Toolkit implementation and its results.

The present report provides an evaluation of the quality, utility and effectiveness of Toolkit no. 1 and Toolkit no. 2, based on the analysis of data acquired through the administration of the above-mentioned questionnaires. In the following pages, we will start focusing on Toolkit no. 1 then on Toolkit no. 2. For each Toolkit, we will present an overview of its structure and contents; after, a snapshot of the information collected by the professionals involved in the survey will be proposed together with the illustration of the emerging outcomes; finally, we'll propose some suggestions aimed at potentially improving the Toolkits.



GRASE GENDER AND RACE STEREOTYPES ERADICATION  
IN LABOUR MARKET ACCESS REC NUMBER 101005792



FUNDED BY THE EUROPEAN UNION'S  
RIGHTS, EQUALITY AND CITIZENSHIP  
PROGRAMME (2014-2020)

## Toolkit 1: "Effective strategies to fight race and gender stereotypes in career counselling services"

### Toolkit overview

Toolkit no. 1 derives from the reflection conducted within the three Communities of Practice (COPs) activated in the three countries involved in the GRASE project - Italy, Spain and Portugal - with the purpose of discussing how to provide adequate guidance to migrant women. Professionals met and worked over the course of six months (April-September 2021), debating the issues they faced in their respective day-to-day work practice when dealing with the target of migrant women.

Since the aim of GRASE is to fight the implicit reproduction of gender and race stereotypes, or stereotypes concerning migrants, the professionals involved in the COPs reflected on how they may, wittingly or unwittingly, associate migrant women with a series of stereotypes, which, in turn, could prevent professionals from providing effective advice to migrant women, guiding them to low-quality and low-paid jobs, that do not necessarily correspond to the actual skills and potentials of migrant women.

The results of the exchanges within each COP have then been systematised in the Toolkit, which proposes effective strategies to possibly counter the reproduction of race and gender stereotypes in the daily work practice of career counselling professionals.

The Toolkit is structured in 6 thematic areas, which are related to relevant aspects that career counselling professionals need to take into consideration when advising migrant women and identifying their characteristics, strengths and weaknesses<sup>1</sup>:

Area 1 – DIFFICULTIES INHERENT TO THE CONDITION OF BEING A MIGRANT

Area 2 – EDUCATION

Area 3 – PREVIOUS WORK EXPERIENCE

Area 4 – FAMILY

---

<sup>1</sup> Besides the presentation of the topics for each area, the Toolkit provides -in the first part- some "Antidotes to the reproduction of stereotypes" identified by the three COPs – a series of cross-cutting suggestions that represent prerequisites and premises to become inclusive and avoid implicit biases.



GRASE GENDER AND RACE STEREOTYPES ERADICATION  
IN LABOUR MARKET ACCESS REC NUMBER 101005792



Area 5 – DIFFICULTIES RELATED TO LEGISLATION AND BUREAUCRACY

Area 6 – SOCIAL INTEGRATION AND PERSONAL NETWORKS

For each of these areas, the Toolkit identifies:

- the potential "objective" obstacles that migrant women may face in their daily life when integrating into a new receiving society;
- the potential biases and stereotypes that career guidance professionals may have about migrant women;
- possible solutions to avoid reproducing those biases and stereotypes.

As declared in the Toolkit premise, the start assumption refers to the central role that the employment services professionals may play in regards not only to the provision of *advice on jobs and the labour market* but also to the provision of *essential information* that can help migrant women to better integrate into the receiving society at large, and to find a job in line with their skills and aspirations. Delivering clear and objective information with comprehensible and concise language could make a difference in the empowerment and integration path of migrant women.

In particular, they need to be aware of their rights and the institutions where they can report discrimination. Moreover, each professional must be able to identify "real" or "objective" problems in the situation of the migrant woman that he/she is advising and go beyond his/her own stereotypes. If not completely aware of their role and the consequences of stereotyped attitudes, professionals could focus on the presumed "deficiencies" responsible for migrant women's difficult integration in the labour market. It could lead to providing the wrong answer to women's needs and not offering the best support.

Therefore, the GRASE project conceived this Toolkit as an effective tool to help career counselling professionals "overturn their perspective" about their behaviour by identifying concrete suggestions to put inclusive solutions into practice and ultimately support the full integration of migrant women into receiving countries' societies.

### [Toolkit testing phase and assessment](#)

The Toolkit has been tested over one month between April and June 2022, involving – as already indicated – 30 career counselling professionals working for public and private employment services in each country involved in the project (Italy, Spain and Portugal).



**GRASE GENDER AND RACE STEREOTYPES ERADICATION  
IN LABOUR MARKET ACCESS REC NUMBER 101005792**



FUNDED BY THE EUROPEAN UNION'S  
RIGHTS, EQUALITY AND CITIZENSHIP  
PROGRAMME (2014-2020)

During the field test, professionals have been required to use the Toolkit in advising/counselling migrant women accessing employment services.

As anticipated, the Toolkit assessment has been carried out by administering two questionnaires (full versions reported in Appendix A).

The first questionnaire is a case-to-case questionnaire that the professionals involved in the testing phase have compiled for each woman they advised throughout the field test (with a minimum of 10 questionnaires and a maximum of 20 questionnaires from each advisor/counsellor). This questionnaire consists of 6 close-ended questions which explore whether the potential obstacles, the examples of potential biases and stereotypes and the solution proposed in the Toolkit have been useful to profile the advised person and address his/her needs.

The second questionnaire is a comprehensive questionnaire that the professionals have to fill out at the end of the experimental phase in order to give their feedback thinking about the overall experience in using the Toolkit during the field test and their work experience in general (their knowledge of the sector, of the profile of beneficiaries, etc.). In particular, the questionnaire investigates whether the potential obstacles mentioned in the Toolkit are helpful or clear and whether the examples of potential biases and stereotypes and the proposed solution are exhaustive, practicable or influential in their implementation. The final questions point to verifying the usability of the Toolkit and gathering other suitable solutions or other suggestions to improve the Toolkit version.

### [A glimpse into the collected data](#)

Toolkit 1 has so far been tested by 30 operators (12 in Italy, 16 in Spain and 2 in Portugal) who answered the questionnaire concerning a total of 117 migrant women (35 in Italy, 73 in Spain and 9 in Portugal). Therefore, we collected 117 single-case questionnaires and 30 general questionnaires.

### [Toolkit evaluation](#)

#### **SINGLE-CASE QUESTIONNAIRE**

Toolkit 1 single-case questionnaire covered, as already mentioned, 35 women in Italy, 73 in Spain and 9 in Portugal:



- The largest majority of the supported women (107 out of 117) presented at least one of the *characteristics listed in the Toolkit as "potential obstacles" migrant women may face in their daily life when integrating into a new receiving society* (96% in Spain, 80% in Italy, 100% in Portugal)
- Simultaneously, for 38 women (out of 117), other potential obstacles beyond those listed in the Toolkit have emerged during the Toolkit use (with differences among Countries: 40% for Spain, 55% for Portugal, 11% for Italy)
- The examples proposed in the Toolkit are generally considered useful (61 "rather" and 46 "much/very much") *to focus on the potential biases and potential stereotypes one may fall into to the profile of the advised person*
- In 109 cases (beneficiaries), 93% of the treated cases, the operator *put into practice at least one of the solutions proposed by the Toolkit*. The solutions have been judged as much/very much or effective in the 79% of the cases. *Poor effectiveness* concerns 20% of Italian cases, 12% of Spanish cases, and none in Portugal. In line with these figures, for 29 Italian cases (83% of the total), a solution *not included in the Toolkit list* was adopted, but it did *not* work in more than 70% of the situations (the two percentages for Spain are the same, 56%, while no *appropriate* solution has been found in Portugal).

## GENERAL QUESTIONNAIRE

The employment/career counsellors who answered the questionnaire were:

- 30 in total (12 in Italy, 16 in Spain and 2 in Portugal)
- 14 in the position for more than 5 years and 11 since less than 3 years
- 21 working for a private service/agency (but 94% in Spain, 50% in Italy, no one in Portugal) and 7 for a public service
- 21 delivering *universal* services (no target-specific), 12 engaged in services dedicated to migrants and 6 in services for women (more than one answer was possible): migrants-targeted operators are more present in Spain, while in Italy and Portugal, universal operators are the largest majority
- 24 directly working with beneficiaries (and not being managers or in other positions).

As for the answers related to the Toolkit testing:

- the *potential obstacles listed in the Toolkit* are consistently present in the *beneficiaries of the service/agency* the operator belongs to. In fact, considering the "last 6 months", for 21 operators (out of 30), the obstacles are *much/very much* or *rather* present in beneficiaries. But while in Italy '*rather*' is 50% of the answers and *a little* another 50%, in Spain 50% is *rather* and 50% is *much/very much* (a difference largely attributable to the different targeting of the services the respondents work in the two Countries: see above)
- 8 operators (out of 30, but 5 in Italy, only 3 in Spain and no one in Portugal) *have encountered (in the last 6 months of their work) other potential obstacles that migrant women may face*. Here below are the additional obstacles indicated by the respondents grouped by *topics*:
  - o personal/individual conditions: low self-esteem; (involuntary) compliance to stereotypes (regarding themselves as migrant women); the belief to be an object of clear prejudice by the local/native population (linked to the Country-of-origin of the women);
  - o Country-of-arrival related obstacles: low empathy by native/local population (typically, during a conversation); inadequate (Country-of-arrival) language and communication skills (for Spain: for migrants coming from Spanish speaking Countries too)
  - o irregular formal status (with subsequent difficulties in benefitting from rights and supports in general)
  - o health or bad physical conditions (drug addiction, mental illness)
  - o material deprivation (e.i.: no regular place for living or no place at all)
  - o other individual conditions (for instance, the mother alone with children)
- largely positive feedback has been given by the operators on the *stereotypes' examples* being clear (100% of the answers *much/very much* or *rather*) and comprehensive (87% of the answers *much/very much* or *rather*). The same is for the proposed (in the Toolkit) solutions being feasible (93% of positive feedbacks again), effective (77% for *much/very much* or *rather* but around 40% *a little* for Spain) and comprehensive (80% of *much/very much* or *rather* but, again, 33% of unsatisfactory feedbacks from Spanish operators and 100% from Portuguese). In general, it must be underlined that negative judgments are more present in Spanish operators' answers. Only 3 operators *put into practice, in the last 6 months, other solutions beyond the listed ones* in their work

- the largest majority of the operators (28 out of 30) found *the Toolkit useful to support employment services professionals in identifying implicit biases and potential stereotypes* but also for *identifying implicit biases and potential stereotypes* (27 out of 30)
- finally, a huge majority as well of the operators (27 out of 30) affirmed the Toolkit is *easily useable in everyday work as an advisor/career counsellor* while, for the *layout*, a bit less than 50% of the respondents chose *rather* and 23% *a little/not at all*. This means that the operators could appreciate some graphic improvements to the Toolkit (see also the suggestions below).

All the respondents answered the final question concerning "suggestions for improving the Toolkit", but 9 of them indicated "no changes" (or something similar)<sup>2</sup>. As for the proposed modifications:

- 2 are focused on Toolkit contents ("mas ejemplos tipificado menos extensos" and "nombrar mas problemas y mas soluciones")
- 2 suggest the use of "inclusive language"
- 10 (by far the largest majority) relates to the Toolkit format (aspect) and structure.

This last block of suggestions (the most relevant) includes the following (not all of them fully understandable):

- The creation of an app (of the Toolkit, to make its use faster)
- A "more interactive", dynamic and "easily accessible" design/structure (5 comments)
- The use of more infographics (2 comments, one is: "make something visual, practical and short")
- The production of a shorter version of the Toolkit (to be used when the length is not usable)
- The production of a questionnaire, based on the Toolkit, to be directly submitted to migrant women.

---

<sup>2</sup> Excluding two comments which seem not pertinent with the related question.



GRASE GENDER AND RACE STEREOTYPES ERADICATION  
IN LABOUR MARKET ACCESS REC NUMBER 101005792



FUNDED BY THE EUROPEAN UNION'S  
RIGHTS, EQUALITY AND CITIZENSHIP  
PROGRAMME (2014-2020)

## Toolkit 2: "Raising awareness against gender and race stereotypes in recruitment: training for career counselling professionals"

### Toolkit overview

Toolkit no. 2 sets out a training pathway targeted to employment services professionals to support them in reducing, if not eliminating, gender and race stereotypes in recruitment.

Specifically, the Toolkit is intended to help learning facilitators by providing training sessions on inclusive recruitment for operators in European career counselling services. The final beneficiaries of the training Toolkit are the professionals of public and private career guidance services for general targets and specific vulnerable ones – particularly migrant women.

The proposed training contents are conceived to implement awareness-raising strategies and build on competencies that could contribute to fighting gender and race stereotypes and developing more inclusive recruitment processes, with specific attention to migrant women.

The Toolkit - and, thus, the training course proposed - is articulated into three modules.

The first module - *Raising awareness on unconscious biases, with a special focus on gender and race stereotypes* - aims to raise awareness about the most frequent unconscious biases among career counselling professionals to improve the inclusivity of the pathway and services they offer. The second module - *Inclusive communication* - supports professionals in developing inclusive communication skills. The third and last module - *Inclusive career counselling* - fosters the inclusive aspects of career counselling professionals' services to migrant women for their inclusion into the labour market.

The whole training is intended to enhance awareness of unconscious biases that affect attitudes towards others and decision-making and promote reflection on participants' behaviours. The suggested methodology is interactive and based on experiential learning to favour self-activation and teamwork. The final goal is to support the activation of behavioural changes towards fairer recruitment practices.

### Toolkit testing phase and assessment

As proposed in the Toolkit, the training pathway has been tested in the partner countries between April and June 2022. The partner organisations have completed 12 editions of the training course (7 in Spain, 3 in Italy



GRASE GENDER AND RACE STEREOTYPES ERADICATION  
IN LABOUR MARKET ACCESS REC NUMBER 101005792



FUNDED BY THE EUROPEAN UNION'S  
RIGHTS, EQUALITY AND CITIZENSHIP  
PROGRAMME (2014-2020)

and 2 in Portugal) which involved 149 professionals of career counselling services, public career guidance services personnel working in Public Administrations, and recruiters from other public or private agencies.

The testing phase was aimed not only at training the participants involved but also at improving the collecting their feedback in order to improve the Toolkit itself and to include additional resources originating from the practical experience, thus contributing to the delivery of the final version of the Toolkit.

For this purpose, two questionnaires have been set up, one for trainees and one for trainers (full versions in Appendix B), to collect their opinion and support the evaluation of the quality and effectiveness of the training pathway and the utility of the Toolkit for the implementation of the training modules.

The questionnaire for trainees has been filled out once completed the overall pathway that is the 3 training Modules (the compilation was online on SurveyMonkey platform). In the first part of the questionnaire, some introductory questions have been placed to get information about respondents, their seniority in terms of work experience in the sector and the service they actually work. The second part consists of a set of questions on the training Modules, focusing on the duration, the adequacy of training tools and exercises, and the interest and utility of the training module about participants' roles and work tasks. In the third part, some questions aimed to get feedback on the whole pathway and collect suggestions to improve the Toolkit.

Concerning the questionnaire for trainers, it is oriented to understand whether the Toolkit has revealed to be a valuable support for the implementation of a training course on the topics proposed in relation to the target of participants. Different aspects have been considered: training duration, structure, methodology, contents and exercises. Trainers have also been asked to report on the positive and negative aspects encountered during the training sessions, indicate which factors may have contributed or hindered their implementation, and suggest the changes they would introduce to perfect the Toolkit.

### [A glimpse into the collected data](#)

Overall, 113 trainees and 25 trainers filled out the questionnaires proposed at the end of the training pathways.

In detail, Toolkit 2 has been used in:

- 3 editions of training in Italy for a total of 108 registered participants (94 effective: 56 filled the questionnaire): of the effective, 55 attended more than 75% of training hours, 15 between 50 and 75%, 24 less than 50%

- 7 editions of training in Spain for a total of 116 registered participants (70 effective, of which 44 answered the questionnaire): of the effective, 48 attended more than 75% of total training hours, 8 between 50 and 75%, 14 less than 50%
- 2 editions of training in Portugal for a total of 25 registered participants (23 effective, 13 of which filled the questionnaire): of the effective, 13 attended more than 75% of total training hours, 5 between 50 and 75%, 5 less than 50%.

## Toolkit evaluation

### QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TRAINEES

A total of 113 questionnaires have been filled by training participants: 56 for Italy, 44 for Spain and 13 for Portugal. The respondents' profile is the following:

- Years as employment/career counsellor: 52 respondents more than 5 years, 39 less than 3 years, 22 between 3-5 years
- Employed in: 64% in a private organisation, the rest in public services
- Services delivered to (by the agency/organisations the respondent works for): 38% all the population; 19% dedicated to migrants; 16% women-specific; 26% other categories/targets
- Position/role in the service: 66% direct services to beneficiaries (but 28% indicate "other").

Below are trainees' opinions about some *quality* dimensions of the 3 training Modules: the overall feedback is very positive<sup>3</sup>, with no relevant differences among the Countries.

	Duration <sup>4</sup>	Training tools <sup>5</sup>	Exercises <sup>6</sup>	Interesting topics <sup>7</sup>	Contents utility <sup>8</sup>
M1	++	++	++	++	++

<sup>3</sup> ++ = prevalence of much, very much, rather (or adequate); + = combination of much/very much/rather and not at all/a little; - = prevalence of rather and a little; -- = prevalence of a little/not at all.

<sup>4</sup> In relation to contents: M1 "adequate" for 95 respondents (2 "too short" and 16 "too long"), M2 for 102 (2 "too short" and 9 "too long") and M3 for 94 (10 "too short" and 9 "too long").

<sup>5</sup> For M1 8 "a little"; for M2 5 "a little"; for M3, 8 "a little" and 1 "not at all".

<sup>6</sup> For M1, 6 "a little"; for M2, 6 "a little"; for M3, 9 "a little".

<sup>7</sup> For M1 7 "a little" and 1 "not at all"; for M2, 6 "a little" and 1 "not at all"; for M3 8 "a little" and 1 "not at all".

<sup>8</sup> For M1, 12 "a little" and 2 "not at all"; for M2, 7 "a little" and one "not at all"; for M3, 10 "a little" and one "not at all".

M2	++	++	++	++	++
M3	++	++	++	++	++

Focusing on the 3 training modules altogether (that is on the *whole* training pathway):

- 93% of the respondents "gained awareness of implicit biases and potential stereotypes one can fall into about the employment services' beneficiaries" (55 participants indicated "rather" and 50 "much/very much")
- 90% "enhanced the capacity to identify the profile and specific needs of the employment services' beneficiaries" (63 "rather" and 39 "much/very much")
- 87% "learnt new methods and techniques to overcome implicit biases and potential stereotypes" (51 "rather" and 47 "much/very/much")
- 85% "contributed to improving the quality of the career counselling support offered to the employment services' beneficiaries" (56 "rather" and 40 "much/very much").

To sum up:

- Overall satisfaction for the training is significantly high: 52 trainees (out of 113) are *much/very much satisfied* and 55 *rather* (3 and 4 scores cover 95% of answers)
- The same is for "recommending the training to colleagues" (55 would recommend the training *much/very much* and 51 *rather*).

Of all the respondents, 83 made suggestions aimed at the prospective improving the training or positively commenting on the training; the others posed "no suggests"<sup>9</sup>. Positive comments are quite frequent (mostly focused on the whole *structure* of training), while improvement indications may be divided into the following thematic *blocks*<sup>10</sup>:

- Suggestions related to the *temporal placement* of the training: very few suggestions regard this point (one "to avoid afternoon for training" and the second "to choose training time able to conciliate work and training attendance")

<sup>9</sup> One suggests to include in the questionnaire the option "Third-sector organization" in Q2 answers.

<sup>10</sup> One suggestion is unclear in its meaning and another one is not pertinent.

- Suggestions related to training methods. Suggestions on this point are the most indicated and include quite different issues: one is the request for more moments/*spaces* for interactions among participants (raised in several questionnaires) but also for more stimulations, feedback and contents from trainers (but "respecting the closing time"); another one – quite mentioned - is the suggestion of more practical activities focused on interviews with target-populations and "techniques for helping people in overcoming prejudice"; another – much stressed - is the quest for the "sharing of instruments to use in everyday work" and practical cases/examples; another is the request for "a final moment of synthesis" of all the training contents
- Suggestions related to training contents. This kind of suggestion too is frequently mentioned in the answers (although, quite frequently, the indications are very generic): they often refer to "delve in more detail some operational instruments [for dealing with migrant women]"; "better and more usable contents"; "dedicate more time to the presentation of new techniques"; "a better focus on operational contents and migrants"; "give more attention to cultural differences and the consequent stereotypes and coping styles"; "more and comprehensive contents"; "to explore in more detail the relationship with employers to cope with gender and race stereotypes")
- Suggestions related to training general architecture and duration. Comments on this area mainly cover training duration ("less hour", "too long" and "too long the first part, general and preliminary"<sup>11</sup> prevail but also indications for "more training time" are mentioned) with one suggestion to "distinguish modules [delivery] for target-population."<sup>12</sup>
- Suggestions related to trainers: very few comments are for trainers, one emphasising their "misalignment on the training topics"; another one, very negative, suggesting "to choose more qualified trainers, deeply competent in gender differences, able to develop all the programmed contents as well as to manage far from stereotypes *in-group activities*"; another one asking for more "dynamic" trainers and "more than one trainer" for making online training more attractive and interesting.
- Suggestions related to online training delivery are focused on the "possibility of downloading the recorded lessons" and on how to gain the most from the combination of synchronous and asynchronous contents. However, comments mostly concern the quality of the digital connections

---

<sup>11</sup> The reference is to Module 1.

<sup>12</sup> But it not clear if the target-population is migrants or training participants.



(and its influence on training fluidity) and the "too much wasted time" in online training. Another suggestion is to make the switch-on of the computer screen compulsory "for at least 75% of the training time."

- Suggestions related to providing participants with training materials, synthesis and bibliographical indications.
- Suggestions related to other (minority) issues: one suggestion is on the development of a network among participants (a network lasting beyond training conclusion), one concerns the proposal of offering further training aimed to explore in more depth the proposed topics, and the last one focuses on giving the possibility to attend "separately each Module, in different periods of the year".

To sum up, suggestions concerning training methods and contents appear to be the most numerous and relevant.

### QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TRAINERS

A total of 25 single-module questionnaires (corresponding to 25 trainers) have been filled: 6 for Italy, 12 for Portugal and 7 for Spain. In detail, 11 trainers answered for M1 (Raising awareness of unconscious biases, with a particular focus on gender and race stereotypes), 7 for M2 (Inclusive communication) and 7 as well for M3 (Inclusive career counselling).

The here below table summarises trainers' answers on different dimensions of each module:

- by column, modules' duration is the most critical issue;
- by row, M3 emerges as the one more critical (although not in a very severe way).

	Contents clearness	Contents comprehen.	Duration	Method.	Synch- asynch balance	Exercises	Overall structure	Effective support
M1	+ <sup>13</sup>	+	+	++	+	++	++	++
M2	++	+	-	++	+	++	++	++
M3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+

<sup>13</sup> ++ = prevalence of much, very much, rather; + = combination of much/very much/rather and not at all/a little; - = prevalence of rather and a little; -- = prevalence of a little/not at all.

Below there is a list of the Toolkit aspects that worked best in its implementation:

- for M1: its interactive structure, the clear definition of the module's objectives, key concepts and contents in general and the module's link with everyday work;
- for M2: the "examples of practices" and the proposed "exercises";
- for M3: the "proposed cases and activities" (but the module's contents and structure have been considered an essential guide and needed further development).

To better understand the contents of the table above, it is helpful to mention the factors that – according to trainers – "**mostly contributed** to the Toolkit implementation ":

- in general, trainees' profiles (18 citations) and trainers' profiles (12 citations) have been indicated as the prevalent factors (with *Toolkit quality* receiving only 5 citations)
- but while for Italian trainers, *Toolkit quality* is the most voted option, no Spanish trainer and one Portuguese indicated this option (their answers focused on all the other options).

Nevertheless, *Toolkit quality* received only 4 mentions as the factor contributing "**to the critical issues** encountered in the implementation of the Toolkit" (one from Italian and Spanish, 2 from Portuguese), with "other factors" weighting for the 50% of answers (16 of 33 mentions). An idea of these "other factors" may be elicited from the trainers' indications of the **Toolkit aspects that worked worst in its implementation**. These aspects for each module are the following:

- **M1**: the need to adapt the Toolkit exercises to participants' profiles and/or to the circumstances of module implementation<sup>14</sup>; M1 contents needed more time to be adequately developed
- **M2**: the online delivery of the module may be particularly complicated if participants do not know the topic or are *passive* (an adaptation of the Toolkit-based activities has been necessary, also taking into account participants' different profiles and time availability)
- **M3**: module's development in the Toolkit is considered an essential *basis* ("a guide", "a starting point" if not "insufficient") on the topic. The management of the Teams platform and the combination of

---

<sup>14</sup> But this is indicated as "normal" by one trainer.

sync/async hours (challenging to cope with for participants at work) are also mentioned as critical aspects of the Toolkit.

Suggestions by the trainers for improving the Toolkit are the following (distinct by module):

- **M1** (9 suggestions): eliminate Exercise 2 (Revealing Unconscious ...: too risky to use at the beginning of a training path) and the IAT Test (not consistent with Toolkit and poorly translated in Italian). In addition, more "space" should be given – in module instructions – to participants' contributions and inputs; more activities and multi-media content are also indicated as well as a better definition of contents
- **M2** (6 suggestions): the main suggestion is the opportunity to introduce exercises to be done in plenary together with the trainer and individual/small-group exercises to be later shared with the whole class; mentions are also for multi-media content and, in general, for "more complete" contents
- **M3** (5 suggestions): more exercise and more contents (and hours) are the most evident suggestions (with, for example, content concerning relations with employers). Another indication concerns the sync/async balance to ease "professionals' participation" while another is for "more flexibility in contents and hours" at the trainer's discretion.

## Final recommendations

In general, the evidence emerging from the use-assessment of the two Toolkits are very positive. This is true for Toolkit 1 – considering both single-case and general operators' perspective – and for Toolkit 2 – by the perspective of both trainers and trainees.

Within this favourable framework, some possible areas of reflections and/or adjustment of the Toolkits may be indicated here to stimulate the project's experts' contribution.

Starting from **Toolkit 1**, no relevant areas of improvement emerge from **single-case questionnaires'** answers. The only exception is, maybe, the *poor* effectiveness of the *solutions proposed by the Toolkit* in the 20% of Italian cases, together with the consequent individuation of solutions *not included in the Toolkit list*, which did *not* work in more than 70% of the situations.

Moving to the **general questionnaire**, Spanish situation seems to deserve some attention on Toolkit proposed solutions, in particular for solutions *effectiveness* (judged as *little* by the 40% of respondents) and

*comprehensiveness* (which had 33% of unsatisfactory feedbacks from Spanish operators). In general, considering the solutions proposed in the Toolkit, *less-positive* feedbacks are more present in Spanish operators' answers. An area of improvement emerging from the general questionnaire is related to the Toolkit graphic and *interaction* format. On this point, operators suggested the "creation of an app" (of the Toolkit, to make its use more flexible); a "more interactive" dynamic and "easily accessible" design/structure; the use of more infographics; the delivery of a shorter version of the Toolkit; the production of a questionnaire, based on the Toolkit, to be directly submitted to migrant women.

As for **Toolkit 2**, the overall feedback from training participants was very positive (as shown in the here below table).

	Duration <sup>15</sup>	Training tools	Exercises	Interesting topics	Contents' utility
M1	++	++	++	++	++
M2	++	++	++	++	++
M3	++	++	++	++	++

**Trainees'** indications on improvement concentrate on two dimensions which appear more critical:

- Toolkit contribution in trainees' learning "new methods and techniques to overcome implicit biases and potential stereotypes."
- Toolkit contribution in improving "the quality of the career counselling support offered to the employment services' beneficiaries" (probably because, as mentioned in the questionnaires, the "quality of career counselling" is influenced by many factors external to the training and out of operators' control).

Focusing on trainees' suggestions, the most mentioned cover three areas:

- training methods. They include different issues: more moments/*spaces* for interactions among participants and for more stimulations, feedbacks and contents from trainers; more practical activities focused on interviews with target populations and "techniques for helping people in overcoming

<sup>15</sup> In relation to contents: M1 "adequate" for 95 respondents (2 "too short" and 16 "too long"), M2 for 102 (2 "too short" and 9 "too long") and M3 for 94 (10 "too short" and 9 "too long").

prejudice"; the "sharing of instruments to use in everyday work" and practical cases/examples; "a final moment of synthesis" of all the training contents

- training contents. These suggestions may be synthesised in the request for "more practical contents" but quite often this instance is very generically expressed in the questionnaires ("some operational instruments [for dealing with migrant women]"; "better and more usable contents"; "more time to the presentation of new techniques"; "a better focus on operational contents and migrants"; "more attention to cultural differences and the consequent stereotypes and coping styles"; "more and comprehensive contents").
- training general architecture and duration. Comments on this area mostly cover training duration ("less hour", "too long" and "too long the first part, general and preliminary") with one suggestion to "distinguish modules [delivery] for target-population"<sup>16</sup>.

Finally, considering **trainers'** questionnaires, the here below table evidence - by column - that modules' duration is the most critical issue while - by row - that Module 3 design, contents and structure need some reflections.

Not surprisingly, suggestions mainly cover Module 3 and focus on "more exercises" together with "more contents" (and more hours) are the most mentioned. Another indication for M3 concerns the sync/async balance in order to ease "professionals' participation" while another one is for "more flexibility in contents and hours".

	Contents clearness	Contents comprehen.	Duration	Method.	Synch-async balance	Exercises	Overall structure	Effective support
M1	+ <sup>17</sup>	+	+	++	+	++	++	++
M2	++	+	-	++	+	++	++	++
M3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+

<sup>16</sup> But it not clear if the target-population is migrants or training participants.

<sup>17</sup> ++ = prevalence of much, very much, rather; + = combination of much/very much/rather and not at all/a little; - = prevalence of rather and a little; -- = prevalence of a little/not at all.



## Appendix A

### TOOLKIT 1 CASE-BY-CASE QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is realised in order to collect the feedback of the employment services' professionals involved in the field test of Toolkit n. 1 in the framework of the GRASE project. During the field test (April 2022) professionals are required to use the Toolkit in advising/counselling migrant women who access employment services. Professionals are also required to complete this short questionnaire for each migrant woman they will advise over the duration of the field test (at least 10 questionnaires up to a maximum of 20 from each professional).

Your contribution is fundamental to test the quality, utility and effectiveness of the Toolkit in order to release it as an output of the GRASE project.

**Thanks for your cooperation!**

#### Questions on the implementation of the Toolkit with regard to each advised person

1. Has the advised person any of the characteristics listed in the Toolkit as "potential obstacles" migrant women may face in their daily life when integrating into a new receiving society? Please, consider the "potential obstacles" listed in each area of the Toolkit.	① No, he/she has not any of those characteristics ② Yes, he/she has at least one of those characteristics
2. Did you find other potential obstacles beyond those listed in the Toolkit?	① Yes, I do      ② No, I don't
3. Were the reported examples useful to focus the potential biases and potential stereotypes one may fall into in relation to the profile of the advised person?	① not at all ② a little ③ rather ④ much or very much
4. Did you put into practice at least one of the solutions proposed?	① Yes, I did      ② No, I don't
5. If yes, was it/were they effective?	① not at all ② a little ③ rather ④ much or very much
6. If not, did you put into practice a different solution which is not included in the Toolkit list?	① Yes, and it worked well ② Yes, ma it did not work ③ No, I could not find an appropriate solution



## TOOLKIT 1

### GENERAL QUESTIONNAIRE

As an employment service's professional, you have been involved in the field test of the GRASE project. In order to complete the field test, we kindly ask you to fill out this questionnaire (just once) – it is anonymous. Please, answer the questions below thinking about your overall experience in using the Toolkit over the last month.

Your contribution is fundamental to help us understand and improve the quality, utility and effectiveness of the Toolkit in order to release it as an output of the GRASE project.

**Thanks for your cooperation!**

**First part: starter questions**

1. How long have you been working by an employment and career counselling service? Please, consider both your present employment and all your previous employment contracts within this sector.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>① less than 3 years</li> <li>② 3-5 years</li> <li>③ more than 5 years</li> </ul>
2. You actually work for:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>① a public service</li> <li>② a private service/agency</li> </ul>
3. It delivers services for:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>① the general population</li> <li>② specifically, migrant persons</li> <li>③ specifically, women</li> <li>④ specifically, other categories or target</li> </ul>
4. Your role within the service is:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>① a management role</li> <li>② advisor or career counsellor</li> <li>③ other</li> </ul>

**Second part: questions on the implementation of the overall Toolkit.**

5. According to your work experience over the last 6 months, do you think that the "potential obstacles" listed in the Toolkit are mainly consistent with the beneficiaries' profiles of the service/agency you work for?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>① not at all</li> <li>② a little</li> <li>③ rather</li> <li>④ much or very much</li> </ul>
---	---

6. In your experience, have you encountered other potential obstacles which migrant women may face, beyond the listed ones? Please, think about your work experience over the last 6 months.	① Yes, I have    ② No, I haven't
7. If yes, which ones?	
8. Are the examples of implicit biases and potential stereotypes reported in the Toolkit clear?	① not at all ② a little ③ rather ④ much or very much
9. Are the examples of implicit biases and potential stereotypes reported in the Toolkit exhaustive?	① not at all ② a little ③ rather ④ much or very much
10. Are the solutions proposed in the Toolkit practicable?	① not at all ② a little ③ rather ④ much or very much
11. Are the solutions proposed in the Toolkit effective?	① not at all ② a little ③ rather ④ much or very much
12. Are the solutions proposed in the Toolkit exhaustive?	① not at all ② a little ③ rather ④ much or very much
13. Have you ever put into practice other solutions beyond the listed ones, in your work experience? Please, think about your work experience over the	① Yes    ② No
14. If yes, which ones?	
15. On the whole, do you find the Toolkit useful to support employment services' professionals in identifying implicit biases and potential stereotypes?	① not at all ② a little ③ rather ④ much or very much
16. On the whole, do you find the Toolkit useful to support employment services professionals in overcoming the implicit biases and potential stereotypes?	① not at all ② a little ③ rather ④ much or very much





17. Is the Toolkit easily useable in your everyday work as an advisor/career counsellor?	① not at all ② a little ③ rather ④ much or very much
18. Is the layout of the Toolkit <i>user-friendly</i> ?	① not at all ② a little ③ rather ④ much or very much
19. What would you change in order to improve the Toolkit? Maximum 3 suggestions.	



## Appendix B

### TOOLKIT 2 QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TRAINEES

Dear trainees,

the training course for employment services' professionals you attended was realised in the framework of the GRASE project.

We kindly ask you to fill out this questionnaire and give us your feedback about the training modules.

The questionnaire is anonymous. Your answers would help us understand whether the training pathway was satisfying or not and eventually improve it for future editions.

**Thanks for your cooperation!**

#### **First part: starter questions**

<p>1. How long have you been working by an employment and career counselling service? Please, consider both your present employment and all your previous employment contracts within this sector.</p>	<p>① less than 3 years ② 3-5 years ③ more than 5 years</p>
<p>2. You actually work for:</p>	<p>① a public service ② a private service/agency</p>
<p>3. The service/agency delivers services for: [More than one answer can apply]</p>	<p>① the general population ② specifically, migrant persons ③ specifically, women ④ specifically, other categories or target</p>
<p>4. Your role within the service is:</p>	<p>① a management role ② advisor or career counsellor ③ other</p>

#### **Second part: questions regarding each training Module**

<p>5. Was the duration of Module 1 adequate in relation to the contents presented? Please, think about both meetings.</p>	<p>① Yes, it was adequate ② No, it was too short ③ No, it was too long</p>
---	--

6. Were the training tools (slides, audio/video tools, etc.) used in Module 1 adequate to facilitate the understanding of key contents?	① not at all ② a little ③ rather ④ much or very much
7. Were the exercises proposed in Module 1 adequate to facilitate the understanding of key contents?	① not at all ② a little ③ rather ④ much or very much
8. Are Module 1 topics of interest to you in relation to your job?	① not at all ② a little ③ rather ④ much or very much
9. Are Module 1 topics useful for you in relation to your job?	① not at all ② a little ③ rather ④ much or very much

Questions 5-9 are repeated for Module 2 and Module 3.

**Third part: questions regarding the whole training pathway**

On the whole, at the end of the training pathway you have:	Not at all	A little	Rather	Much or very much
10. gained awareness of implicit biases and potential stereotypes one can fall into with regard to the employment services' beneficiaries?	①	②	③	④
11. enhanced the capacity to identify the profile and specific needs of the employment services' beneficiaries?	①	②	③	④
12. learnt new methods and techniques to overcome implicit biases and potential stereotypes?	①	②	③	④
13. contributed to improve the quality of the career counselling support offered to the employment services' beneficiaries?	①	②	③	④



**GRASE** GENDER AND RACE STEREOTYPES ERADICATION  
IN LABOUR MARKET ACCESS **REC NUMBER 101005792**



FUNDED BY THE EUROPEAN UNION'S  
RIGHTS, EQUALITY AND CITIZENSHIP  
PROGRAMME (2014-2020)

14. On the whole, are you satisfied with the training pathway?	① Not at all    ② A little    ③ Rather    ④ Much or very much
15. Would you recommend the training pathway to your colleagues?	① Not at all    ② A little    ③ Rather    ④ Much or very much

16. Have you any suggestions in order to improve the training pathway? Maximum 3 suggestions.



## TOOLKIT 2

### QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TRAINERS

Dear trainers,

The training course for employment services' professionals you have been involved into was realised in the framework of the GRASE project.

We kindly ask you to fill out this questionnaire and give us your feedback about the training Module you have been assigned. Please, fill out one questionnaire for each module you have taught (whatever the number of editions it has been replicated).

The questionnaire is anonymous. Your answers would help us understand whether the training modules were satisfying or not and eventually improve them for future editions.

**Thanks for your cooperation!**

#### **First part: starter question**

1. Which module did you teach?	① Module 1 - Raising awareness on unconscious biases, with a special focus on gender and race stereotypes ② Module 2 - Inclusive communication ③ Module 3 - Inclusive career counselling
--------------------------------	--

#### **Second part: questions regarding each training Module**

2. Did you find the Toolkit contents clear?	① not at all ② a little ③ rather ④ much or very much
3. Did you find the Toolkit contents exhaustive in relation to the topic of the module you have been assigned (and in relation to the contents of the other Modules of the training pathway)?	① not at all ② a little ③ rather ④ much or very much
4. Was the duration of the module adequate, in relation to the contents you had to present?	① Yes, it was adequate ② No, it was too short ③ No, it was too long
5. Were the methodologies suggested in the Toolkit useful to implement a training module on the topic you have been assigned?	① not at all ② a little ③ rather ④ much or very much

6. Was the module well-balanced between synchronous and asynchronous parts?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>① not at all</li> <li>② a little</li> <li>③ rather</li> <li>④ much or very much</li> </ul>
7. Were the exercises suggested in the Toolkit effective for promoting the comprehension of the key contents?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>① not at all</li> <li>② a little</li> <li>③ rather</li> <li>④ much or very much</li> </ul>
8. On the whole, was the Toolkit overall structure (contents, duration, methodologies, etc.) effective in developing skills and competences in relation to the target participants?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>① not at all</li> <li>② a little</li> <li>③ rather</li> <li>④ much or very much</li> </ul>
9. On the whole, did the Toolkit provide you with a valuable support for implementing a training module on the topic you have been assigned?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>① not at all</li> <li>② a little</li> <li>③ rather</li> <li>④ much or very much</li> </ul>

<p>10. On the whole, which aspects of the Toolkit worked best for the purpose of its implementation? Maximum 3 examples</p>
<p>11. Which factors mostly contributed to the implementation of the Toolkit? Maximum 2 option</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>① quality of the Toolkit</li> <li>② location</li> <li>③ trainees' profile</li> <li>④ trainer's profile</li> <li>⑤ other factors</li> </ul>
<p>12. On the whole, which aspects of the Toolkit worked the least for the purpose of its implementation? Maximum 3 examples</p>
<p>13. Which factors mostly contributed to the critical issues encountered in the implementation of the Toolkit? Maximum 2 options</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>① quality of the Toolkit</li> <li>② location</li> <li>③ trainees' profile</li> </ul>



**GRASE** GENDER AND RACE STEREOTYPES ERADICATION  
IN LABOUR MARKET ACCESS **REC NUMBER 101005792**



FUNDED BY THE EUROPEAN UNION'S  
RIGHTS, EQUALITY AND CITIZENSHIP  
PROGRAMME (2014-2020)

- ④ trainer's profile
- ⑤ other factors

**14. What would you change in order to improve the Toolkit? Max 1 answer**