« Grid to prepare negotiation of incidents in religious diversity - work on concrete cases »

PREPARED BY: Centre Bruxellois d'Action Interculturelle

TAGS (3 categorizations)

Is this activity focusing on one of the 3 steps of the method or tackling a transversal challenge facilitators may face?	Step of the method	YES	Decentering	Discovery of the frames of references of the other	Negotiation	
	Sensitive zone	YES	Religion			

Small Description

Please explain in a short paragraph (using grammatically correct full sentences) what your activity is about, why did you create it?

Here we present the use of a grid we created to complement the grid developed by Margalit Cohen Emerique, by adding more specific questions on the third step of the process (negotiation). We work on concrete situations brought by the participants: shock experiences triggered by demands of a religious nature. We explore the possible answers based on the application of the different criteria (legal, institutional, etc.).

Quick info

TIME FRAME 30-60min	GROUP SIZE 2-10	FACILITIATION LVL Beginner	COMFORT ZONE Safe	MATERIALS Pen and paper or a computer/mobile device.

60-90 min	6-12	advanced	Challenging	Projector / smartboard

Preparations needed

This is an analysis grid we recommend to use for a deeper exploration of the possibility of negotiation of incidents dealing with religious demands.
As such, it is complementary to the method of critical incidents developed by Margalit Cohen Emerique. To use the grid appropriately you should be familiar with the three steps of the method. To help you better understand the grid please read the article "**Religious diversity in training: how to find negotiated solutions based on explicit criteria"**

Instructions Step By Step

Please give step by step instructions of your activity, including debriefing. Be direct, address the reader as a facilitator directly: eg. Ask your participants to stand in a circle…

Step 1.

Describe the request (or, if applicable, the type of behaviour that "raises questions")
- What is the demand?
- Describe the request precisely: what is it about?
- Who is making the request? Is it a request made by several people?

Step 2.

The reasons for making this request
It is just a matter of being able to hear the motivations of the person making the request. It is not a theological discussion about "is this what is prescribed in this or that religion?".
Why is this request important to the person making it?

Step 3
Is the situation problematic in terms of :
Not every request is particularly problematic. However, sometimes you might wonder about the right answer and refuse it too quickly. Here are some questions to ask yourself in order to take stock of the situation and not to answer solely according to your personal subjectivity.

3.1) at the personal level: does this request clash with my values, my beliefs, my norms, my taboos...?

Specify which values/tabs... are affected

3.2) **The legal framework (European Convention on Human Rights, anti-discrimination laws, legal framework of the association (internal rules))?**

3.3) the project of the association (and in particular its pedagogical dimension)**, its missions, its aims?**
Specify in what way.
On the other hand, specify whether the request is fully in line with the association's mission.

3.4) **organization (of activities)?**
What are the organizational challenges? Can organizational changes be made?

3.5) The **work**, professional duties (of the applicant)?
Does the request (behaviour) prevent the professional from carrying out his or her duties, his or her role?
If yes, specify in what way: what functions and role[1]would no longer be performed?

3.6) **"Living together"?**
Does the demand pose a problem in terms of "living together"? Is there a risk, in the responses that are envisaged to be provided (or not provided), of "separating" the public too much? Create tensions between them? Favor one group over another?

Step 4.
Possible solutions
In view of the previous analysis, what solutions could you envisage? Does this solution satisfy the greatest number (Greatest Common Denominator)? Conversely, what is non-negotiable?

Step 5.
Strategies to be put in place
This is about thinking concretely about how you will implement the solution you have found. However, even when your answer is "no" to the request, you need to think about how you will make it explicit and meaningful.

5.1) What is the solution/change about?
Solution found:

---

[1] Sometimes you will need to clarify what the role of the professional is (e.g. what is the role of a youth worker in a community centre?)

Will the solution you find require structural changes in the **legal** framework: should the internal regulations be changed?

- of the **institution** :
  - Clarification or changes in missions
  - Clarification of educational objectives
  - Other

- the **organization** (e.g. changes in the meals offered, installation of a rest room, changes in working hours, other work distribution, etc.)

- of the **profession**: clarification of the role, functions...

- of **living together**: is there any work to be done on prejudices?

5.2) How will I do it?

- **Who** do I need to make these changes **with**? Who are the people involved?

- Where do I start?

5.3) What are the obstacles I might encounter?

5.4) What resources can I mobilize?

Hints for the facilitator

Read the different criteria proposed in the article "**Religious diversity in training: how to find negotiated solutions based on explicit criteria**" and make some research for an accurate "translation" of the criteria to your own context.

Ressources (Who invented this activity or who inspired it)

If you invented it, please write the name of your colleague and institution as you'd like it to be referenced
If you used ideas /activities of others please put full reference as concretely as you can

The grid was developed in collaboration between the CBAI and Dounia Bouzar.