Collaboratively Interpreting Text;

The workshop's impact is reflected in conflict stories

Additional Evaluation Report
DiversityJoy 2008 - 2009

August 2009

MSc. T.J.P. Couzij & MSc. I. Halfman

Contents

Collaboratively Interpreting Text;

The workshop's impact is reflected in conflict stories[1]

Summary:

In this evaluation report, the authors Tijl Couzij and Ivar Halfman present findings they have generated using a narrative analysis method they have developed themselves. Before and after the trainings offered by the Dutch organization DiversityJoy, participants have given detailed descriptions of personally experienced conflicts. Subsequently, Couzij and Halfman have studied, analyzed and interpreted the differences between the versions.

Overall, the analyzed stories reflect positive changes in several socio-psychological areas, such as 'trust' (in self and others), 'respect' (for self and others), and 'responsibility'.

Apart from presenting evaluation results, the authors discuss opportunities and challenges related to this new way of evaluating broad-aim social programs.

Chapter 1: Background and Introduction

Assessing the impact of workshops like those offered by the Dutch organization DiversityJoy and their South-African counterpart Phaphama[2] Initiatives, is challenging. In many instances this is done with so-called customer satisfaction researches mainly using questionnaires. The results of customer satisfaction researches basically tell us whether or not customers enjoyed the training, and what they believe to have learned from participating. An important question however is to what extent customer satisfaction researches produce insight on the qualitative impact of trainings.

This question appears to be even more apt to workshops that focus on broad social developments of individuals and groups of individuals. More often than not, these trainings aim to transform patterns of behavior people are not always aware of. Customer satisfaction researches, and many other traditional forms of evaluation in which questionnaires and interviews are used, seem inadequate in finding and documenting these sorts of changes.

Having in mind these considerations and questions, a search was initiated to find new methods which would be able to capture and qualitatively reflect the impact of workshops offered by DiversityJoy and Phaphama.

Important first steps towards such a new qualitative evaluation method have been made during the research for a masters thesis at the University of Amsterdam in 2008.[3] One of the central recommendations of that research was to focus on the analysis of stories, or, narrative analysis.

Narrative analysis is based on the idea that the way people experience and interpret the world – a person's worldview – is reflected in the stories someone tells. Especially when people talk about things that affect them deep and on a personal level, worldviews heavily impact on how a story is transmitted. That is why the stories used in this report (to reflect

---

[1] We would like to remind our readers that this English text is a translation from the Dutch original: "*In gesprek over betekenis; De impact van workshops weerspiegelt in conflictverhalen.*" (Couzij & Halfman 2009)

[2] Pronunciation: papáma.

[3] Because this research project was initiated in a context of development cooperation, Oxfam has supported financially.

changes initiated by the workshop) are stories of personally experienced conflicts, written by the participants themselves.

In order to see qualitative *change* workshop participants were asked to describe the same personally experienced conflict before and after participation. Together, these two versions of an individual's conflict story make up what we have come to call a 'Twin-Story'. Looking at a Twin-Story the differences between the two versions become apparent. The next step is to discuss the version's differences with a group of instructed stakeholders and inter-subjectively create evaluative meaning. In our experience, it is this meaning that offers new perspectives on the impact of broad-aim social programs. In this report we present this inter subjectively evolved meaning.

This report starts with elaborating the important details of the new evaluation technique. Then the practical execution of this evaluation research is described. Here we also pay attention to the process of method development. Subsequently we present the analyses results followed by a chapter with conclusions and recommendations. The report ends with a discussion on challenges and opportunities which are related to the future use and further development of this narrative evaluation method.

Chapter 2: The New Evaluation Method

2.1. Origin

Telling stories is one of the oldest and therefore perhaps one of the most important forms of inter personal communication. By telling stories we share our sorrow and joy. We build and maintain (and end) our relationships with storytelling. In other words, through stories we express, shape and influence the social world around us.

The significance of stories in human life is evidenced by the multiple contexts in which stories are told, re-told and analyzed on a daily basis. One example is the administration of justice where the interrogation of suspects and witnesses are crucial for determining the punishment. Other examples come from the medical world where doctor – patient conversations during the intake are central to the first diagnose. Even more relevant is narrative therapy where the intake, the treatment and the evaluation of the treatment consist of telling, re-telling and analyzing stories.

An important consideration for the narrative working method in psychotherapy is the basic assumption that patients exhibit their – often problematic – worldviews when telling personal stories. This starts at the intake. The therapist encourages the patient to talk about his/her problem. Both the story's content and the way it is told inform the therapist. For example, someone who is comfortable with people s/he doesn't know will most likely talk differently about them than someone who is not at ease with unknown individuals.[4] The interaction between the therapist and the patient causes slight changes in the patient's stories. These changes in the patient's stories may signal changes in the patient's worldview to the extent that the patient develops new perspectives on the proclaimed problems. To achieve this however it is crucial that the patient retains control over his/her stories. Therefore, the therapist will take the role of 'story facilitator' and encourage the patient to reflect on his/her own stories. It is the patient who decides what is told and how it is told. Slowly, new stories arise reflecting new perspectives on old problems. And these new perspectives enable patients to redesign the social relations they have or they wish to have. It opens up a space for new attitudes and new behavior which reconstruct patients' realities.[5]

Our narrative evaluation method is basically the 'up-side down' version of the reasoning in narrative therapy: when it is possible to change an individual's worldview by letting the narrators analyze, re-tell and change their own stories, than certain changes in an individual's story could reflect changes in his view of the world.

2.2. Conflict stories, Twin-Stories and their analyses

The workshops of DiversityJoy and Phaphama should not be considered therapy, neither should the participants be seen as patients. This means that, contrary to the patients in narrative therapy, workshop participants have healthy[6] worldviews making the search for changes rather difficult. In order to be able to analyze stories in the context of DiversityJoy and Phaphama we need some sort of focus. Because DiversityJoy's and Phaphama's workshops originated from the Alternatives to Violence Project (AVP) which aims at providing alternatives to violent behavior, we have chosen to focus on descriptions of personally experienced conflicts. These stories reflect changing conflict attitudes.

---

[4] Oudenhoven & Hofstra (2001) talk about different styles of attachment that evolve in childhood. To identify these different styles Oudenhoven & Hofstra have developed a scale. For more information we refer to Oudenhoven & Hofstra (ibid.).

[5] Surely, this introduces a circular interaction: a person interprets the social world s/he lives in; with this interpretation decisions are made; through these decisions the social surroundings change, which again will have to be interpreted.

[6] From the tradition of social constructivism the term 'healthy' has meaning for as far this has been defined within the relevant societal context. To some extent we might say that someone can be considered 'healthy' as long as no certified institution or person has claimed otherwise.

Because participants describe real-life personally experienced conflicts, the preferred connection between the conflict story and the world view of the participant is assured. Similar to narrative psychotherapy, it is important that the narrator can identify completely with his or her own story. We want are interested in how participation in a workshop influences an individual's conflict attitude, we are less interested in the story telling capabilities of participants.

Before and after the workshop, participants describe one (and the same) personally experienced conflict. Taken together we refer to the two story versions as the 'Twin-Story' of one participant. Looking at a Twin-Story the differences between the versions become visible. How can these differences be interpreted and analyzed?

Several perspectives can be used for the analysis of conflict stories. The heart of many of these perspectives comes from the idea that conflict stories are theories about responsibility,[7] responsibility for the conflict described. In fact, these perspectives are certain techniques narrators apply (both consciously and unconsciously) to ascribe conflict responsibility. With regard to the content of a story for example, the narrator can choose to leave out aspects of a conflict situation. Doing this, a narrator creates certain images of the different characters[8] in his or her conflict story. Narrators can also employ specific words like 'always', 'never', 'of course', 'normally' or 'surely' to influence their audience.

For the analysis of conflict stories we have supplemented this idea of conflict responsibility with themes that were formulated in collaboration with representatives of DiversityJoy and Phaphama. These themes should be regarded as core values to the program. Most of them are social competences that can contribute to what we have come to call 'Constructive Social Interaction'[9] (CSI). Examples of these competences are 'trust' (in self and others), 'efficacy', 'openness and sensitivity to other ideas', 'openness and willingness to question strongly held personal beliefs', as well as 'taking and giving responsibility'.

There are various ways in which these social competences and the idea of conflict responsibility are expressed. In most instances simply reading the Twin-Story once will be insufficient to notice the important differences. This implies that the analysis of conflict stories benefits from interaction and sharing among multiple analysts who may see different things. From that assumption we have worked towards an analytical, questions-directed dialogue with 2 to 5 instructed individuals (we will return to the details of this process in the next paragraph). For all the stories we have analyzed so far there has been at least interaction between the two of us (the two researchers). Along these lines we have generated the inter subjective evaluative meaning presented in this report.

2.3. Practical execution

Collecting and selecting stories. Collecting conflict stories was the first step in this evaluation process. We have applied three different methods for the collection of pre-intervention conflict stories; there have been class assignments (secondary school), participants have written stories individually at home, and participants have written stories during the workshop in preparation for one of the workshop exercises.[10]

---

[7] See Cobb in Hansen (2003).

[8] While narrating, the narrator – in theory – can do whatever s/he wants. All characters are left to the author's goodwill. As a consequence in most conflict stories the first-person narrator is a powerless victim of a mighty evil doing 'other(s)'. In describing this relation a certain image come into being. An interesting comparison can be made with fairytales which feature a princess, a prince, and a dragon. The princess is beautiful, sweet and powerless. The Prince Charming is handsome and brave. The dragon is the proverbial 'Guinea Pig'.

[9] Our discussion on core values is included in appendix 4.

[10] The exercise referred to is the 'I-message'. More background information can be found in the AVP manual (AVP 2002).

When we applied the first two collection methods, the assignment was done approximately one week prior to the workshop. The instruction for all three assignments was short and resembled the following:

> '*Take 20 to 30 lines to describe a conflict in which you took had an important role. It has to be a conflict you have experienced yourself, or a conflict you are still involved in. What happened? What did you do? What did you feel? What did you want to achieve? Describe the situation as exact as possible in a way you would tell it to someone.*' [11]

Collecting the second versions of the conflict stories – the versions written after workshop participation – has so far been done in two different ways; by an assignment in class (on secondary schools), and by an individual assignment at home. This second assignment was done one week after the workshop. We have chosen for this relatively short time span in order to reduce the possible 'negative' influence of other factors that could interfere with our research results. Again, the assignment is short and resembles the following:

> '*Take 20 to 30 lines to describe the conflict you have described before the workshop again. What happened? What did you do? What did you feel? What did you want to achieve? Describe the situation as exact as possible in a way you would tell it to someone.*' [12]

When a participant has given two detailed descriptions of one and the same personally experienced conflict we say we have a 'Twin-Story'.

We have started to collect Twin-Stories from October 2008. So far our requests to participating school classes have generated the most Twin-Stories.[13] Both before and after the workshop, participating students and teachers (!) have described their personally experienced conflicts. Some have used a computer to type their stories, others have used pen(cil) and paper. This report is based on these stories and is therefore at least applicable to those workshops that were done within a secondary school exchange program in the Netherlands.

Thirty-nine individuals participated in this exchange program. These were students as well as teachers. All of them have written a first conflict story. Twenty-two of these participants have written a second conflict story after participation. Upon examination we have identified nine of these twenty-two Twin-Stories as analyzable with our new method.[14]

Analyzing Twin-Stories. The process of analysis started with three selected Twin-Stories. Using a series of questions[15] we have analyzed these Twin-Stories. After that, three workshop facilitators have analyzed two stories[16] on two different occasions. Every session consisted of two rounds. The first round of analysis was done individually, and a second round was done collaboratively in the group.

The data generated during these two sessions[17] have provided us with information about the impact of the workshop and it has helped us with the further development of the methodology. It has initiated changes in the analysis questions and moved the method towards

---

[11] The forms we used for these assignments are included in appendix 2.

[12] These instructions for the second assignment now also include the remark that participants are not asked do explain how they would have acted differently had they known what they know now, but that we simply ask them to remember the same conflict again (however from a post-workshop perspective) and describe what they remember.

[13] Important explanations for the failure of the other collecting methods include the fact that some requests were rather 'last-minutes', and that there have been unclear instructions.

[14] What went wrong with most other Twin-Stories was that the second versions were about a different conflict, the second versions were descriptions about 'how I would have acted differently', and sometimes the second stories turned out to be summaries of the first versions.

[15] These questions have been developed in a pre-evaluation research done by Couzij and Halfman. See appendix 3.

[16] The Twin-Stories referred to here are the 'I.D.' Story and 'Bullying'. The I.D. story analysis is presented in whole in chapter 3. The story 'Bullying' is included as appendix.

[17] The data we collected were some filled out questionnaires and a tape recording of the group discussion afterwards.

an evaluative dialogue. Next to that we have found interesting leads for new experiments and the further development of the evaluation method. These leads will be discussed in another chapter.

Although the temptation to continue developing our method is great, we lack sufficient means to do so at this moment. Therefore we have decided to start this first evaluation research and write a report on the findings we have collected thus far. This means that the presentation of results in this report is based on a combination of group analyses (with AVP representatives) and individual analyses (done by the two authors Couzij and Halfman).

The way we eventually analyzed Twin-Stories ourselves has been somewhat less structured than the group dialogue we propose in our new evaluation method. This is because during our research we have found the questions-directed dialogue especially helpful for individuals who are involved in story analysis for the first time. The questions help to create specific perspectives with which to look at the stories. Since we have already come to internalize these perspectives we immediately started reading the Twin-Stories, observe important differences between the versions, and carefully discuss these observations with each other. Once we agreed on how to interpret the differences we selected what we believed were the most important differences and wrote paragraphs for each difference explaining our understanding of it. We have attempted to connect these explanations to the theories of conflict responsibility and the core values or social competences.

Chapter 3: Presenting Analyses

3.1. A brief introduction

Our narrative evaluation method is best understood when the analyses results are combined with the original Twin-Stories. On average, this would take at least three pages of text for each Twin-Story. In order to give a good impression of how Twin-Story analysis should be understood we have decided to present three complete Twin-Stories with their analyses. What should be remembered here is that all the original stories have been written in Dutch. Some language/culture related considerations are lost in translation. Therefore it might be rather difficult to understand all the claims we make. Nevertheless we hope this chapter will give a good idea of what our new method is all about.

The original Twin-Story versions with marked text fragments are presented on mirroring pages. On the left page you will find the version written before the workshop, and on the right page you will find the version written after the workshop. For reasons of privacy and readability we have removed names of places and persons where necessary. For practical reasons we have given working titles to each Twin-Story. The titles of the stories presented here are 'Shoehorn', 'I.D.' and 'Gossiping'. Around the Twin-Stories we have presented the related analyses where we argue for the connections between the colored text and two or three themes we regard as central to the story.

In the next chapter we discuss our analyses results in light of all the other Twin-Stories we have studied. First three Twin-Story analyses.

3.2. Analysis Twin-Story 'Shoehorn' (see the box on pages 9 and 10)

Twin-Story '**Shoehorn**' Version 1 (written before workshop participation)

During summer holidays I worked in a shoe shop. It was my first job, so it was great to learn how to work. From day one I learned how to deal with customers. The rules: 1. always welcome the customer; 2. when you see a customer trying on shoes, ask him if it fits. 3. When a customer sits down to try shoes on, always bring a shoehorn. A customer enters the shop. It is a man, he has a rather scary looking head, but ok. I do what I am supposed to do: I get the shoes in his size and I bring a shoehorn. He uses the shoehorn. He puts the shoes on and thinks they look good. He wants to buy the shoes. So I tell him 'I will bring them to the cash desk'. To which he answers 'yes that is fine'. When he arrives at the cash desk – I am in the stockroom at that moment – he asks my colleague 'I take the shoehorn with me, can I oke?!' My colleague answers 'no, we cannot give that away, we sell them!' He answers: 'Never mind, I will ask your colleague since she has helped me.'
I return to the cash desk and now he asks me if he can take home the shoehorn. I am new of course and I do not know what to say. Than I say: "No, sorry, we can not give that away". He gets more and more annoying and says: "what do you mean sorry? I simply take it with me". My colleague gets angry and says: "what do you mean 'I simply take it with me?!' To which the man replies: 'Yes, I just take it with me yes?!' My colleague then replies with: 'why are you acting so silly!?' I: 'yes?!'. Than he says: 'ahahaha I made a joke! I am not taking it with me'. Then I say: 'Okay..., what a strange joke :s'. Me and my colleague look very angry at him and give him the shoes. We were glad he left, the strange scary looking man.

The conflict story 'Shoehorn' is about the author's first job and is situated in the shop where the author has only recently started working. When a customer arrives the author simply 'does what she is supposed to do'. All is well until the client claims to take home the shoehorn without paying for it.

To some extend this conflict story illustrates aspects that are typical for other conflict stories as well. For example, apart from the first person narrator and 'the other' (the client), the story features a 'helper', the author's colleague. Also typical is the way in which the description of 'the other' (the client) in the second version differs from the description in the first version. Next to that, this story is filled with reference to conflict responsibility and taking responsibility for own actions. Also, the way in which the author's ideas with regard to

her own responsibility appear to change in this story is deeply connected to expressing personal vulnerability and feelings.

The three intertwined themes we use to discuss this Twin-Story are a '**more neutral description of 'the other'**', '**personal responsibility**', and '**vulnerability**'.

3.2.1. More neutral description of 'the other'

In descriptions of inter-personal conflicts authors always include an 'other', someone who is the counterpart of the first person narrator. Since it is the first person narrator who is telling the story s/he has full control over the characters in the story, including 'the other'. For this reason characters in conflict stories described as 'the other' can be regarded as a 'telling tool' for the author. It is through 'the other' that the first person narrator expresses his or her interpretation of the conflict. As a consequence, the ways in which 'the other' is presented in a conflict story is a direct reflection of the narrator's attitude towards other individuals with whom s/he may be in conflict. In the 'Shoehorn' story, this 'other' is the client.

It is striking how the author describes her client in the first version of the Twin-Story: "A customer enters the shop. It is a man, *he has a rather scary looking head*, but ok." And towards the end of the first version she writes: "We were glad he left, the *strange scary looking man*." In line with these remarks is: "He gets more and more *annoying* (…)".

Obviously, 'the other' is presented here as 'strange' and 'scary' which in the mind of the narrator will help to gain support from her audience. The image of 'the other' anchors the balance between the first person narrator and the client in the advantage of the author. When 'the other' is strange and scary – or so the logic seems to go – the conflict can't be the author's fault. This technique to manipulate (consciously or not) is often applied.

Twin-Story '**Shoehorn**' Version 2 (written after workshop participation)

During the summer holidays, I had my first job as a salesperson in a shoe shop. I found it all quite exciting, because I did not really know what I would be doing, and how to communicate with customers. After a few days of work I believe I got used to the shop-system.

On one day I was in the shop just helping customers fitting shoes and getting the correct sizes. A man approached me to ask whether I had a specific shoe in his size. I said: "one moment sir, I will have a look for you." Fortunately his size was still available. Meanwhile he had sat down on a chair. I gave him the shoes and offered him a shoehorn. He tried the shoes and I asked how they felt and if he liked them. He thought the shoes fit perfectly, so he wanted to buy them. I said: 'that's fine, I will bring them to the cash desk'. He answered: 'that's fine'. I quickly went to the stockroom and then I returned. What do you know? He and my colleague were having an argument. I asked my colleague 'what is going on?' She said: 'Well, this man wants to take home the shoehorn.' Then I said: 'Yes, that is no problem right, but it will cost €2,-' My colleague answered back 'Yes, but he wants to take it with him without paying.' Then I turned to the man and said: 'Sorry sir, but we can't do that, we sell them just like we sell shoes.' Of course the man did not like that and said: 'no worries, it was a joke, never mind'.

My colleague and I said: 'it is alright, so you want to pay for these shoes?' He said: 'yes'.

So eventually this all ended well and fortunately no one was angry.

In the second version of her story, the author does not present the client as a strange and scary man. Apparently, the narrator no longer experiences a need to depict the client as such. Now she simply writes: "A man approached me to ask whether I had a specific shoe in his size." Seen from the perspective described above, this is an enormous change. The client receives more space to develop as a 'normal' or 'neutral' personality, instead of being depicted as some sort of creep. After examining other differences below, we will suggest how this specific change might be related to other changes.

3.2.2. Personal responsibility

In the story's version from before the workshop, the author does not take a lot of personal responsibility. Proof thereof lies in the fact that the story practically begins with a summary of the shop-rules she has to observe:

> "From day one I learned how to deal with customers. *The rules: 1.* always welcome the customer; *2.* when you see a customer trying on shoes, ask him if it fits. *3.* When a customer sits down to try shoes on, always bring a shoehorn."

It appears as if these rules provide external legitimization for the author's actions. It is almost as if she wants to tell her audience that she can not be blamed because she 'lived by the rules'. She refers another time to these rules a bit later in the text: "I do what I am supposed to do (…)." In the second version of the story there are references to the shop-rules. Apparently, the author believes they are no longer needed to explain her behavior. Therefore we might say that the author is self-assured enough to take a bit more responsibility for her own actions. The need for external legitimization is gone.

Another set of lines from the first version that are closely related to taking responsibility is the following:

> "When he arrives at the cash desk – *I am in the stockroom at that moment* – he asks my colleague 'I take the shoehorn with me, can I oke?!' My colleague answers 'no, we cannot give that away, we sell them!' He answers: 'Never mind, I will ask your colleague since she has helped me.'"

This is an interesting part of the story for two reasons. First, it is a part of the text with a description of developments the author has never witnessed. Secondly, this part of the text is completely left out in the version written after workshop participation: "*I quickly went to the stockroom and then I returned.* What do you know? He and my colleague were having an argument."

As with the shop-rules in the first version, this part of the text also legitimizes the author's interpretation of the conflict situation and the individuals involved. Letting her colleague talk, the author reconfirms the strange behavior of her client. As a consequence of letting these lines out in the second version, more personal responsibility has to be taken by the first person narrator. After all, without shop-rules backing up behavior, and without (emphasizing) a 'strange', 'scary' and 'annoying' client, a large portion of conflict responsibility has been relocated and can be found with the first person narrator.

New ideas with regard to responsibility also become clear upon examining the description of the scene at the cash desk in the second version:

> "*I asked my colleague* 'what is going on?' She said: 'Well, this man wants to take home the shoehorn.' *Then I said: 'Yes, that is no problem right, but it will cost €2,-'* My colleague answered back 'Yes, but he wants to take it with him without paying.' *Then I turned to the man* and said: 'Sorry sir, but we can't do that, we sell them just like we sell shoes.'"

Compared to her first version, here the narrator takes initiative. This becomes especially clear when we look at the role of the colleague. In her first version the author describes a situation in which her colleague takes the lead in the argument and the narrator is more of a by stander, nodding agreeable to whatever her colleague does. In her second version however, the author describes a situation in which she takes the lead herself. Her colleague is of no crucial importance anymore. Their roles seem switched. In fact, the sentence uttered by the narrator: "'Yes, that is no problem right, but it will cost €2,-'" can even be interpreted as: "Don't be stupid, you know this is possible right?!" In short, the author has given herself a more active role in comparison to the first version.

3.2.3. Vulnerability

Finally we would like to discuss an observed difference that might shed some light on the other differences discussed above. It is a difference found at the beginning of the Twin-Story. Compare "It was my first job, so *it was great* to learn how to work" from the first version with in the second version:

> "During the summer holidays, I had my first job as a salesperson in a shoe shop. I found it all *quite exciting*, because *I did not really know* what I would be doing, and *how to communicate with customers*."

In these quotes from the second version the author has included the central theme of the conflict which, as we understand it is a relatively low level of self-efficacy. Put differently, the author explains that at the start of this job as a salesperson, she had doubts about her capabilities to deal with customers. What makes this all even more interesting is that sharing her doubts about her own capabilities at the start of the second version is combined with a. a more neutral description of 'the other'; b. the absence of behavior validating 'shop-rules and colleague'; and c. a more assertive and enterprising description of her self.

In her second version the author displays her own vulnerability. She expresses her doubts concerning her capabilities with the reader and also with herself. Taking this vulnerability as a starting point it is no longer necessary to include external legitimization for her behavior in the story which creates space for 'the other' to develop as a normal and rational individual or character. What might even be more important is the fact that the author was able to describe a different, more assertive and enterprising self. To us, what might have been a central change for this person is a growth in self confidence allowing the author all the changes made in her second story version.

3.3. Analysis Twin-Story 'I.D.' (see the box on pages 13 and 14)

Central to the conflict story 'I.D.' is the confrontation between the author and a bouncer of a disco. The situation arises when the bouncer asks the first person narrator to show her ID card while she has forgotten to take it along. After a long tiring week, the author wants to blow of steam in a disco. The bouncer wants to check her ID card to see if she really is 16 years or older.

Because our analysis once started with this Twin-Story, our interpretation of differences between the versions has had plenty of time to sink in and develop further. Along the way we have come across more interesting aspects of the story which also gave rise to new questions. Should we want to speak about 'best practices' or 'research pearls', the 'I.D.' Twin-Story would probably be ours. This is one of the main reasons for us to present the story's analysis in this report.

Similar to what we did with the first analysis, this story will be discussed along the lines of three themes we relate to the version differences. In our opinion these themes connect to the themes discussed in the other analysis without overlapping too much. The themes are: '**openness and susceptibility for different perspectives**', '**trust in other individuals**' and '**self-efficacy or faith in one's own capabilities**'. Again three closely related themes.

3.3.1. Openness and susceptibility for different perspectives

While thinking about – what we have come to call – 'Constructive Social Interaction' a certain healthy form of questioning strongly held personal beliefs has taken an increasingly crucial role. The central idea is that conflicts will be harder to solve when the conflicting parties refuse to give room to one another's perspectives. In our opinion, courage to investigate and review personal beliefs could help to obtain susceptibility for perspectives of

---

Twin-Story '**I.D.**' Version 1 (written before workshop participation)

It is Saturday evening. I have had an tiring week with a lot of concerns and difficulties. Right now, I am in the mood to indulge and party! First we spend some time with the girls at home and then we leave for the local disco.

Once we arrive at the disco, I notice that I have forgotten my ID card. How stupid! This happens tonight, the night I want to blow of steam. But we continue walking in the hope that the bouncer does not need to see my ID. I am 16 years old and I look like 16 years old. However, as it appeared the bouncer had different ideas about this. Or I acted too nervously…

"Yes, show me your ID," is what the unfriendly looking bouncer tells me. "Sorry sir, I find it very annoying, but I have forgotten my ID" is the reply I give in as honest as possible a fashion. I know he probably gets this thousand times a night, but it is true. I have forgotten my ID, but I am 16 so he should let me in. Simple as that. But the bouncer, again, had different ideas. "Yeah sure, I hear this more often," he says, exactly as I had expected. I tell him that I know he hears this more often, but that I tell the truth. "Well," the bouncer says annoyingly, "how old are you then?" Hm… I am 16 years old, but I start doubting whether he will believe me. I decide to reply offended: "Yes, 16 years of course. I come here quite often and I am never asked to show my ID!" Apparently this was not the appropriate strategy. The bouncer starts to get a little irritable and explains in detail how this thing with bringing ID cards works: "It is rather dumb to forget your ID card. We check them a lot and when you are in the disco asked to show your ID to the inspection and you claim to have forgotten it, you will be the first to get a high fine, but the disco will also be fined." Well, what should I say to that. I did not even know about those fines, but I still want to get in badly. Going back home to get my ID is not an option, it will take me half an hour at least. I would be back one hour later, when entrance is only allowed for people over 18. Because I don't know what to say I decide to take my chances with: "I know, but I really am 16 years old and I have really forgotten my ID card."

I guess the bouncer sees that I am serious and that I will continue to repeat this. Or he has had enough of the nagging and wishes to continue his job and check other clients. That seems more plausible because we were standing there for some 10 minutes and the line behind me wasn't getting shorter. Whatever the case, he finally says the magic words: "Ok move on. But don't forget your ID card next time!"

"No sir, I won't!"

---

others. Of course, this is strongly related to self confidence as well. In the 'I.D.' Twin-Story, a small and therefore important difference related to these themes can be discovered.

In the first version of the story the author writes: "I am 16 years old and I look like 16 years old" compared to: "I am 16 years old and *I thought* that *I looked* like 16 years old." in her second version. At first glance this difference may look marginal. Interestingly however, the words changed in the second version are the only words changed in the whole first two paragraphs. This makes it all more interesting and meaningful. Adding 'thought' and 'looked' in her second version, the author courageously opens up for the possibility of other perspectives by adding doubt to her own convictions.[18]

A little further in the text is written: "(…) I am 16 so *he should* let me in." This manner of communication is close to giving orders; a structure with even less space for different ideas. Another fragment is also related:

> "'Well,' the bouncer says annoyingly, 'how old are you then?' Hm… I am 16 years old, but I start doubting whether he will believe me. I decide to reply offended: 'Yes, 16 years of course. I come here quite often and I am never asked to show my ID!'"

All these parts of the story have not been included in the second version reflecting less firmness and anger. This way the author appears to have created more space for 'the other' and for other, deviant ideas.

It seems logical that this increased openness to other ideas is a result from and associated with, **trust in other individuals** and with an increased **self-efficacy**. The 'I.D.' story also reflects these two competences.

---

[18] In theory the author could have celebrated a birthday in the period between writing the first and the second version of her conflict story. We do not think this has been the situation because in both versions the author writes: I *am* 16'.

Twin-Story 'I.D.' Version 2 (written after workshop participation)

It is Saturday evening. I have had an tiring week with a lot of concerns and difficulties. Right now, I am in the mood to indulge and party! First we spend some time with the girls at home and then we leave for the local disco.

Once we arrive at the disco, I notice that I have forgotten my ID card. How stupid! This happens tonight, the night I want to blow of steam. But we continue walking in the hope that the bouncer does not need to see my ID. I am 16 years old and I thought that I looked like 16 years old. However, as it appeared the bouncer had different ideas about this. Or I acted too nervously…

"Yes, show me your ID," is what the unfriendly looking bouncer tells me. "Sorry sir, I find it very annoying but I have forgotten my ID. I can imagine you don't believe me since everyone will say so, but it is true, really" I say. I decided to be honest with the man from the beginning, hoping he will trust me right away. However it doesn't seem to be that easy. The bouncer says: "That might be true, but now I cannot check your age." "Would you believe me if I said I was 21, or doesn't that help much?" I try with a joke. I notice that he does not appreciate my attempt so I continue: "Sir, I know that this makes it very difficult for you to do your job, but I do hope that you trust me when I say that I am 16 years old." At this moment I see the internal dilemma the bouncer is dealing with; whether to let me in or not. I don't think he hears this very often. As a result he finally says: "Well young lady, I believe you. Otherwise I would have sent you back home. You may enter this time, but do not forget you ID card in the future ok."

"I will sew it to my trousers, so I will always have it with me! Thank you so much."

3.3.2. Trust in other individuals

Trust in other individuals is especially expressed towards the end of the 'I.D.' story. It is where the conflict situation is 'resolved'. In the description of this resolution major differences can be observed. The first version states:

> "I guess the bouncer sees that I am serious and that I will continue to repeat this. *Or he has had enough of the nagging* and wishes to continue his job and check other clients. *That seems more plausible* because we were standing there for some 10 minutes and the line behind me wasn't getting shorter. Whatever the case, he finally says the magic words: 'Ok move on. But don't forget your ID card next time!'"

In her second version the author writes:

> "*I don't think he hears this very often. As a result he finally says: 'Well young lady, I believe you.* Otherwise I would have sent you back home. You may enter this time, but do not forget you ID card in the future ok.'"

In the first version the author describes a solution in which the bouncer has had enough of the nagging and therefore decides to let the first person narrator enter the disco. Apparently the author believes that 'the other' acts on 'social pressure' (a growing line of customers) instead of 'good will' or trust in the author. In the second version the author describes a solution where the bouncer acts because he believes the author. The fact that the author describes this completely new situation in the second version of her story reflects an increased trust in other individuals. After all, the author seems to be convinced that the bouncer let her enter the disco because he believed what she said and not because he was getting tired of her nagging. As a result the author presents a more positive image of the bouncer to the reader.

3.3.3. Self-efficacy or faith in one's own capabilities

Keeping in mind the changes discussed above – namely the author's conviction that the bouncer believed her – a simple connection to a stronger faith in one's own capabilities (self-efficacy) is easily made. Apart from the fact the author now thinks that the bouncer believed her, this conviction also reflects the author's confidence in her own capabilities. After all, in her second story the author acts in a way that is convincing for the bouncer. What is

interesting in this Twin-Story above all, is that this change in self-efficacy coincides with differently described behavior. In the second version the first person narrator describes a squeal of events in which she allows herself – compared to the first version – to be more creative and assertive:

> "The bouncer says: 'That might be true, but now I cannot check your age.' '*Would you believe me if I said I was 21*, or doesn't that help much?' I try with a joke. *I notice that he does not appreciate my attempt* so I continue: '*Sir, I know that this makes it very difficult for you to do your job*, but I do hope that you trust me when I say that I am 16 years old.'"

The first person narrator takes initiative by making a joke. This immediately changes the tone of conflict description. On top of that is the fact that this conflict approach apparently leads to a more positive validation of own influence on the conflict situation.

Our main concern is not the question whether this all really happened the way it is described. It is about the author who ascribes a new more assertive role to herself. And this new description leads to a solution in which 'the other' believes the first person narrator. Here it turns out that a more creative and assertive description leads to an increased self-efficacy. Put differently, the first person narrator of the second version is convinced that she has been able to make the bouncer believe her. In her first version she strongly doubts this.

3.4. Analysis Twin-Story 'Gossiping' (see the box on pages 15 and 16)

Central to the Twin-Story 'Gossiping' is a close friendship between a boy and a girl whom – according to the description of the young lady – consider each other as siblings and do not have a love relationship. Their friendship is tested when their rumors have been spread that the two friends do have a love relationship.

The actual conflict between the two friends is about who should be held responsible for – and now pay close attention – telling the guy (who is spreading the rumor) the name of the girl that gave his name to the two friends.

Although the story is about a close friendship, parts of the version-differences involve changing descriptions of 'the other'. Or, in other words, the differences involve the amount of space the author offers to 'the other' to develop as an understandable and human character. The more space given to this development, the less obvious the audience will perceive 'the other' as primarily responsible for the conflict. Logically, this **increase in 'space for the other'** is related to **shifting theories on conflict responsibility**.

Twin-Story '**Gossiping**' Version 1 (written before workshop participation)

A few days ago, I got into an argument with one of my best friends. He and I are very close. I consider him as my brother and he considers me as his little sister. Other people sometimes think we are dating or something. On one day, we found out that a guy we both know is spreading the rumor that the two of have a love relationship. A girl both of us know as well had told this. Her name is ***. So on one day the guy who had spread the rumor shows up on the internet and starts chatting with me through msn. He asked me what was going on because he was being attacked on msn by my best friend (my so-called brother :p). As a response I told him what had happened. Then he said that he had not spread any rumor. He had never said those things to anyone. We continued our conversation. And at one point I mentioned the name ***, and that she had told my best friend that he had started the rumor. The next day my (best) friend came up to me and said: 'why did you give away the name of ***?' I replied 'because I was talking to him about the whole situation.' Then he said 'but I had not given him her name. I had not told him it was ***.' Then I said to him, 'but I did not know that. If you had told me so a little earlier I would not have given away the girls name.' Then we continued our normal way of communication again. But then after the summer holidays he suddenly refused talking to me. Therefore, I did not talk to him as well. And after sometime I heard that he did not want to make up with me and that he could live without me. That was very painful. I also got very angry. At one point we started an argument on a metro station. But the strangest thing was that before the summer he did talk to me and afterwards he didn't. After 3 weeks without communication he approached me. He asked for something and I gave it to him. From then on we picked up our normal way of interaction. Right now it seems as if nothing has ever happened. We have conversations the way we had them before all of this happened. Xx-End-xxx

---

3.4.1. Increase in 'space for the other'

On several moments in her second version, the author presents her best friend as more 'honest' or as a better person than in her first version. In her first version she writes: "(…) because he was being *attacked* on msn by my best friend (my so-called brother :p)." The word 'attacked' does not return in the second version. As it turns out, the author does not have the need to present her best friend as an attacker in her second story.

In her second version of the conflict she lets her friend say something interesting: "Then P replied: 'Yes, but you can figure that I did not give away the girl's name. You know she will get into trouble.'" In our opinion, this is an obvious attempt by the first person narrator to explain the motivation of 'the other'. As a result the character of 'the other' is easier to understand. 'The other' becomes a real human capable of rationality and human emotions.

In addition the first version of the story contains: "And after sometime I heard *that he did not want to make up with me and that he could live without me*." In her second version the author leaves it at: "From others I then heard *what* he thought of me." The 'what he thought of me' from the second version, can be interpreted positively. This is impossible for the text in the first version.

Although both versions contain the same 'best friend', the manner in which he is described in the second version reflects this 'best-friend characteristics' more naturally. In the second version this best friend is represented as someone the author respects, even when she is having an argument with him.

3.4.2. Shifting theories on conflict responsibility

The theory on conflict responsibility shifts between the two stories. In the first version emphasis is put – both explicitly and implicitly – on the responsibility of 'the other'. In the second version the author appears to be more aware of her own influence on the situation. As a result, the balance of responsibility shifts. In the first version she writes:

"The next day my (best) friend came up to me and said: 'why did you give away the name of ***?' I replied 'because I was talking to him about the whole situation.' Then he said 'but I had not given him her name. I had not told him it was ***.' Then I said to him, '*but I did not know that. If you had told me so a little earlier I would not have given away the girls name*.'"

Twin-Story '**Gossiping**' Version 2 (written after workshop participation)

I have had several conflicts, but for the majority these were conflicts between me and a member of my family. For that reason I have decided to write about a conflict between me and a good friend of mine 'P'. It happened before the summer holidays.
P approached me to say that a guy was gossiping about us, that we were having a relationship with each other. When this is not the case. I consider P as a brother and he considers me as a little sister. P had heard about this guy from another girl. On one day this guy came online. Then he asked me what was going on. I have told him (X) everything, including the name of the girl who claimed X was gossiping. Afterwards, P and X have also spoken with one another. The next day P comes to me and starts talking loudly. He said: 'Why did you tell X the name of the girl who told me everything?' I said: 'Oh I am sorry, but you did not tell me I couldn't mention her name to him. How could I have known you had not told the girl's name to X?' Then P replied: 'Yes, but you can figure that I did not give away the girl's name. You know she will get into trouble.' I said: 'Yes, sorry.' After we had this conversation we acted normally towards each other. During the summer holidays P had sent me a text message. It was about the question why I had given away the girl's name to X. At that moment I had not answered P with a text message. I wanted to talk to him in person. During whole the summer holidays I did not speak with P. After the holidays P did not speak to me. I already knew why. He was still angry. I felt hurt because he had accused me of something that was not completely my fault. From others I then heard what he thought of me. And from others he had heard that I have said that I believe it is my fault, but also his, because P never told me I couldn't give away the girl's name. And he heard that I am sorry. After 3 weeks without communication, P suddenly called me. He needed a discount card. During the break I went to him. I gave him my discount card from the shop I work. At that point we had a little conversation. From then on, we behaved like we did before. It seemed as if nothing had ever happened. I felt really happy because we were ok again, because I needed a good friend.

The implicit message here seems to be something like: *you* should have told me earlier… it's your own fault!' In the second version the author writes:

> "The next day P comes to me and starts talking loudly. He said: 'Why did you tell X the name of the girl who told me everything?' *I said: 'Oh I am sorry*, but you did not tell me I couldn't mention her name to him. How could I have known you had not told the girl's name to X?' Then P replied: 'Yes, but you can figure that I did not give away the girl's name. You know she will get into trouble.' *I said: 'Yes, sorry.'*"

What is central to this part of the text is what is marked in grey and the second time 'sorry', replied by the first person narrator. Important to remember is that it is the first person narrator who has written this story. She has decided to include the text marked in grey, thereby presenting 'the other' (as we have mentioned before) as more compassionate and empathetic compared to the first version. The author's 'sorry' following her best friend's remark is an honest one, confirming the value of her best friend's opinion and acknowledging her own responsibility for this quarrel. Especially when we compare this to what is written in the first version, this is a remarkable shift.

A bit further the author expresses her idea about the balance of responsibility even more explicit: "And from others he had heard that I have said *that I believe it is my fault, but also his*, because P never told me I couldn't give away the girl's name."

In close relation to these parts of the text, the author's shifted theory on conflict responsibility is also reflected when she explains 'the other's' behavior, and especially the fact that P was not talking to the author after the summer holidays. In the first version the author does not provide us with an explanation, she was stunned as well: "But then after the summer holidays *he suddenly refused talking to me*" and a little further she repeats: "But *the strangest thing was that before the summer he did talk to me and afterwards he didn't.*"

In her second version, the author seems more aware of her own influence on her best friend's behavior:

> "During the summer holidays P had sent me a text message. It was about the question why I had given away the girl's name to X. *At that moment I had not answered* P with a text message. I wanted to talk to him in person. During whole the summer holidays I did not speak with P. After the holidays P did not speak to me. *I already knew why*. He was still angry."

Because the author presents plausible motives for her friend's behavior – behavior she could not explain in her first version – and because these motives partly reside in the author's own behavior, she starts owning an important part of the conflict. She accepts her responsibility.

Having analyzed this Twin-Story we agree that this workshop participant has become more self-reflective which has enabled her to see and understand her own role in the conflict. In her second story she also takes responsibility for that role. According to us, the shifting theories on conflict responsibility that can be seen in this Twin-Story show a more constructive attitude towards conflicts. In this new attitude, conflicts appear less problematic, easier to manage and easier to deal with emotionally.

All the story analyses presented above are real-life examples to illustrate the method we have applied. We have chosen to present specifically these stories because we believed they give a good idea about the possible results of a Twin-Story analysis. Although the presented stories reflect some of the major findings of all our analyses, our actual conclusions will follow in chapter 4 (Conclusions and Recommendations). There we will proceed with some of the trends we have discovered and discuss overall similarities and differences found in all the analyses we have produced.

Chapter 4. Conclusions and Recommendations

In this fourth chapter we present our conclusions, we discuss some of the bottlenecks, and we suggest some recommendations based on all the previous chapters.

We have reserved the first half of this chapter to draw conclusions (4.1.) and to discuss three themes which are related to those conclusions (4.2.). The second half of this chapter is reserved for our recommendations which in part are based on our narrative analyses (4.3.) and for another part are based on the more intensive experiences we have had during the development and implementation of the evaluation method (4.4). When making these general recommendations we also draw on the experiences we have had as workshop facilitators for DiversityJoy. Let us start with our conclusions.

4.1. Conclusions based on our narrative analyses

The conclusions under this heading refer to the impact of workshops provided by DiversityJoy. These conclusions have emerged after an intensive evaluation research. In this research we have studied and analyzed conflict stories written by workshop participants; hence we have applied a narrative methodology for the analysis of workshop impact.

Our research has started with a request to workshop participants to describe one and the same personally experienced conflict before and after the intervention of the workshop. Together these two versions of the same story of one participant form what we have come to call a 'Twin-Story'. By getting into a group of at least two well-instructed individuals to examine and discuss the version differences, we have collaboratively generated the evaluative meaning included in chapter three. In line with our third chapter, we present our conclusions about the impact of DiversityJoy's workshops.

We wish to remind you immediately that this evaluation research has been the first in its kind when it comes to applying this specific method of analyzing conflict stories. We have not yet had the opportunity to check with 'control groups'. This is one of the reasons we wish to be careful with our conclusions. Nevertheless, we are convinced to have identified a few important dimensions about the workshop's impact. We will present these findings in short statements combined with a brief explanation.

- **Participants enter the workshop on different levels of social development.**
Although all participants of the workshops referred to in this report were in the same age group, they also started out on different levels of social development. Put differently, every individual has different challenges at the beginning of a workshop.

- The **magnitude of the workshop's impact differs** for each participant.
The magnitude of the workshop impact appears larger for some than for others. Nevertheless, some form of workshop influence appears present in all analyzed Twin-Stories.

- The **content of the workshop's impact differs** for each participant.
In some stories, the impact represents shifts in confidence (in self and/or in others), and in others the emphasis appears to be an increased openness to other ideas and opinions.

- **Participation affects multiple areas of social development** in one participant.
Changes are never limited to one social competence.

- **Participation affects the way some participants relate to others**.
In many instances this manifests itself in an *increase of trust in others* and in an *increased openness to other ideas and opinions*.

- **Participation affects the way some participants perceive conflict responsibility**.
In many instances this manifests itself in *recognizing and acknowledging* personal responsibility, and in actually *taking* personal responsibility.

- **Participation affects the way some participants deal with their emotions**.
After the intervention participants appear to be *more conscious of their own feelings* and a portion of them appear to be *better equipped to express those feelings*.

- **Participation affects the way some participants perceive themselves**.
In the stories written after the intervention some participants appear to have displayed *a more creative and assertive self*. Next to that *self confidence and self efficacy have increased*.

4.2. Three short themes-related discussions

We fully back the statements presented above. This does not mean of course that legitimate questions may be raised with regard to the translation from observations (the discovery of differences between the versions of one Twin-Story) to conclusions on workshop impact. Below we discuss three themes we believe deserve some more attention to explain some characteristics we encounter while analyzing conflict stories.

4.2.1. The use of concealing and socially accepted language?

As we have mentioned before, we have always assumed that second versions would deviate in one way or another from the first versions. An important reason for this assumption is the idea that only few are capable of exactly copying a story from their memory. As a result, none of the Twin-Stories have identical twins.

Of all the differences we have observed one has received our special attention. This is the observation that many participants incorporate a specific set of terms and a language we can easily associate with the terms and the language used in the workshop. At first glance this may seem a rather logical change and a trivial, perhaps even superficial difference. However, if we realize that the use of language strongly influences the course of a conflict, we may argue that changes in language may actually be very important. Even if the differences in the use of language can be ascribed fully to socially accepted behavior – after participation the authors have a rather good idea of the individuals reading their second versions – we might conclude they show sensitivity towards people who may have completely different ideas about what would constitute 'good' or 'preferred' conflict behavior. To some of you this may seem a vapid reasoning. Perhaps it is.

Perhaps it is not. Especially when we talk about an intervention's impact, it is clear that the participants have been introduced to new ways of dealing with conflict and to new ways of talking about conflict, and, more importantly, they are imitating these new things. This does not yet proof that this language has fully become their own, but the fact they try to implement it in their own stories does reflect a workshop's impact. Moreover, language is central to transmitting, changing, and expressing worldviews.

Furthermore, the use of new language might very well indicate that the participant has started to internalize a different idea of what constitutes 'socially accepted' conflict behavior. What the author experienced as desired behavior in his first story has become undesired in the second version and might therefore be concealed with new vocabulary.

We have discovered this concealment several times, combined with a 'milder' description of 'the other'. In our opinion this suggests that, during the workshop, the author has reflected on his or her own conflict behavior. Again, from the perspective of workshop impact, initiating a thorough understanding of personal conflict behavior should be considered

an important workshop 'effect'. Therefore we suggest to seriously study conflict stories in which socially desired language has been used with the aim to understand the use of new language within the story's context.

4.2.2. The 'I-message' as skill or as social competence

Although we do not specifically ask for one, many participants implement some sort of 'I-message' in their second conflict story. In some stories the I-message is included in the description of a conversation (as if it was said by one of the story's characters) and in other stories it is included as a direct communication towards the reader.[19]

Because AVP program representatives consider the 'I-message' as an important skill, or competence, [20] provided in the basic workshop we might say it is interesting to see that so many participants have tried to include one in their second story version. The frequency with which 'I-messages' are included in the stories suggest the impact of this part of the workshop and it suggest the faith participants have in applying the skill.

We would still like to make a final and important remark about the included 'I-messages'. We have found that most of the 'I-messages' have both a constructive [21] component as well as an accusing[22] component. According to us this has a lot to do with the extent to which participants are capable of being aware of and getting 'in touch' with their emotions. One recommendation therefore is to spend enough time on recognizing and expressing personal emotions in the workshop if possible. In the second half of this chapter we will discuss this recommendation in more detail.

4.2.3. Social competences for constructive interaction!

Besides concealing descriptions we have also seen many revealing descriptions where the author has chosen to include or exclude elements that enable completely new interpretations of the conflict situation. In these instances we no longer deal with tricks or manipulatively applied skills, but we deal with changed conflict attitudes and social competences participants have internalized in order to have even better constructive social relationships in the future.

Important shifts seem to have occurred in the openness with which participants include their own share of the conflict in their second description. Here we do not mean 'honesty'[23] about behavior, we mean 'openness' about how the first person narrator may eventually have had some sort of impact on the conflict or, at least, on the (negative) interpretation of the conflict.[24] Doing this, authors take in more responsibility for the situation and increasingly take care of the image they want to portray of 'the others' in the story. By being a bit more critical towards the self, space is created for a more positive view of 'the other'. Space is created also for the author to live within the situation of 'the other'.

Next to changes in context descriptions or in the sequence of events, we have also identified some very small changes that we value as are rather important. This was the case when one or two words had been adapted. In one instance this adaptation represented an increased openness for different ideas and opinions[25] in another instance this represented a

---

[19] See for example the Twin-Story 'Gossiping' in chapter 3.

[20] We wish to make a distinction here between a social skill and a social competence, since we believe that a social skill can be applied manipulative, where we consider a competence as something that has been internalized in an individual's attitude.

[21] What is meant here with the constructive objective is the author's wish to express his/her feelings.

[22] The accusing element is shown in for example: 'I felt abandoned'. Here 'abandoned' can easily be perceived as accusing.

[23] Of course the word 'honesty' remains difficult to use since we will never know what 'really' happened.

[24] See for example Twin-Story 'shoehorn' where the context – described in the first paragraphs – changes significantly.

[25] See the 'I.D.' story, where the word 'thought' is added. (In the Dutch version 'thought' (dacht) replaces 'find' (vind).)

shift from an aggressive attitude towards a milder one.[26] Both shifts appear to be directly related to an increased self-esteem and an increased self-efficacy.

All of the social competences discussed above have been derived from changes we have identified in Twin-Stories. They can rarely all be found in one Twin-Story and it is difficult not to find at least one change. Put differently, in all the Twin-Stories we have analyzed we have seen development in one, and often more, social competences.

4.3. Recommendations based on the narrative analyses

We have divided the recommendations below into two separate paragraphs. At first we will discuss the recommendations based on our narrative analyses and then we will continue with the more general recommendations based on our additional experiences with DiversityJoy. Particularly the second series of recommendations go beyond the data we have gathered in our narrative analyses.

But first we summarize some of the important recommendations we base on our narrative analyses. As you will notice we have combined content-related recommendations with ones that have more to do with the further development of the research methodology.

Recommendation 1. Focus on personal emotions. Like we have mentioned above under 4.1., the application of 'I-messages' in second story versions can be improved. It is the accusation of 'the other' that seems to go wrong. According to us this could change when participants really learn to get in touch with their emotions before they try to implement them in their conflict communications. We think that special attention to this aspect of the 'I-message' is likely to improve the way participants apply the 'I-message' in the future.

Recommendation 2. Train trainers with Twin-Stories. Trainers who have participated in the development of our evaluation methodology have repeatedly commented on the usefulness of the method. Apparently, working with conflict stories enables facilitators to develop an additional perspective to what it is they are trying to achieve in their workshops. Apart from helping individual trainers, implementing Twin-Story analysis in the trainers training, might also help the organization to develop new perspectives on 'effects' and 'impact'.

Recommendation 3. Implement the exercise in the workshop. Implementing the story exercise – perhaps in a different format – into the workshop program would help to increase the amount of analyzable Twin-Stories. Participants are less likely to view the exercise as evaluation research, and more as part of their training. Because participants will be telling and re-telling their own conflict stories they are already involved in an important form of reflection. This way the evaluation method can actually add to the content of the workshop as well.

Recommendation 4. Generate theories on the functioning of the program. We suggest that AVP-representatives generate concept theories that include the AVP-core values[27] and show how the (elements of) the workshop contribute to Constructive Social Interaction (CSI). Our belief is that the impact of workshops will be even better understood both by participants and scholars if these theories convincingly explain how, for example an increase in self-esteem, contributes to CSI. Perhaps even more important is the creation of clarity about what it is AVP-workshops aim for and what the AVP-community would see as Constructive Social Interaction. It would also clarify the specific goals and claims of the trainings.

---

[26] For a change from commanding to requesting language see the appendix for the Twin-Story 'Bullying'.
[27] See appendix with the core value discussion.

Recommendation 5. <u>Invest in the development of the evaluation method.</u> This suggestion is not only directed towards DiversityJoy, it is also meant for other organizations searching for new qualitative methodologies to reflect the impact of broad-aim social programs. Of course DiversityJoy and Phaphama Initiatives have been pioneers and could therefore take the lead in bringing the technique further into the future.

4.4. General recommendations

During the development of our narrative evaluation method[28] we have worked closely with representatives of DiversityJoy and Phaphama Initiatives, both in the Netherlands and in South Africa. In this period where we gathered information about various aspects of AVP and the two organizations, we have noticed and/or repeatedly heard comments with regard to these various program aspects. Below we summarize the most important recommendations we could derive from these comments.

General recommendation 1. <u>Document the 'Critical Moments'[29] of a workshop.</u> The current debriefings at the end of a workshop are perfectly fit to collect more data on workshops. In our opinion a little investment could create a valuable source of information. Facilitators would only need to discuss critical workshop moments and include the identified moments in a small document.[30] This way the facilitator team does not only collect data on how they have experienced the workshop, they will also provide valuable knowledge on group processes during the workshop. On the longer term this may help to better understand group interaction in different settings.

General recommendation 2. <u>Introduce a 'facilitator booklet'.</u> Another important part of the post-workshop debriefings is giving and receiving so-called 'sandwiches'. A 'sandwich' is a specific way of giving and receiving feedback in a non-threatening way. At this moment these 'sandwiches' are exchanged orally, and most of the times it stays at that. Some facilitators write the sandwiches they receive down, other don't. In our experience (as facilitators) we have learned that these comments – even if they are written down – often get lost and are hard to recollect in the next training session.

Some sort of a facilitator booklet, might therefore be helpful. This would be a little notebook that every facilitator will receive for example at his or her first workshop facilitation.[31] Facilitators will bring their booklets every time they are training, and during the facilitator's debriefing they can write down the comments they have received. It would enable facilitators to see their own development, and because facilitators train irregularly, it will be easier for them to recollect the comments received during a previous training.

By formalizing every individual's challenges and lessons in a personalized notebook, the individual development and guidance of beginning facilitators can be approached in a more structured manner. This might be of interest to the organization considering the value of a high quality development of their facilitators. In order to prevent the feeling among facilitators that they are constantly evaluated, it might be important to make these booklets *private* booklets.

General recommendation 3. <u>Create possibilities for post-workshop continuation or contact.</u> Another point of recommendation is to provide some sort of continuation after a workshop is

---

[28] See Halfman & Couzij (2008).
[29] Leary (2004).
[30] In fact, a small document is already being drafted after every workshop
[31] As a result this would create a division among facilitators between those who have, and those who have not yet been 'activated' by their organization.

over. Both participants and facilitators have repeatedly mentioned the need for forms of continuation to prevent the feeling of post-workshop 'emptiness'. The conviction that DiversityJoy provides them with something useful becomes a loose end after a basic training (for participants) after a T4F (training for facilitators) and after a first workshop facilitation (for many facilitators).

Many different forms can be thought of, and some of these have recently been initiated. What tot think of the 'inter-vision day', the HIPP concept, the active self-organizing pool of facilitators, and virtual meeting places for facilitators. These initiatives are good starting points and are worth investing in.

General recommendation 4. <u>Name of DiversityJoy.</u> The name 'DiversityJoy', does not always have positive associations for everyone. Every now and then people claim that the name unleashes images of religious sects.

Whether the name should actually be changed or not is difficult to answer. What is important is to realize that the positive feelings and ideas many of the stakeholders and representatives of DiversityJoy associate with the name are not shared by some others. This could be something to consider during presentations and introductions.

Chapter 5: The development of the evaluation method

The past one and a half year we have tried to develop a full-fletched narrative evaluation method that would be capable of showing the impact that broad aim programs like the ones that DiversityJoy and Phaphama provide, have on their participants.

In the following chapter we want to elaborate on the experiences, observations and challenges that we have met in this developmental process. We also want to make some practical suggestions on how to continue the development of this method, in order to share our experiences with others who will possibly, in the near future, further the progress of this potentially valuable new method.

5.1. Striking observations from the analysis process

Here, we want to mention a few points that became apparent to us during the many story analysis we did in the past few months. We think that these observations are important in order to develop the method further. To give some context to these observations we accompanied them with some ideas that we had on their possible meanings. In the following paragraph we will present seven of these points.

1. Nine of the twenty-two collected stories are meeting the set criteria and are thereby analyzable through the use of the narrative evaluation method.

One reason for this relatively low percentage could be that the text that is showed to the participants, which asks them to, and explains how to, write their story down is not clear enough or does not address them in the write way. This might lead to misunderstandings or even loss of interest.

2. There are almost always differences between the first and the second story.

This observation confirmed one of our initial assumptions; we supposed that when people write conflict stories, with a period in between of approximately a week, they will always write two differing stories. This can mean different things, one is, they can't remember the exact wording, which is probably the case and two, it implies that they no longer completely agree with the exact wording or way they told their first story, which in our eyes is very much the case.

3. In the second story there are often subtle changes in the conflict vocabulary. Words that explicitly express 'feelings' and 'needs' become more commonly used.

A plausible explanation for this is that the participant has picked up the new vocabulary from the workshop. An interesting question is however, what this change in vocabulary means.

A) A possible answer could be that people, after the workshop, think that the newly acquired vocabulary fits there memories and feelings, concerning the conflict, in a better way, and so start using it in their second stories. What could play an important role here is that people (and especially men) often do not like to use words that have strong emotional connotations; they often think this to be 'soft' or 'wimpy'. However, when during the workshop the connotation of these strong emotional words is challenged in a positive way, and their use turns out to be beneficial in the exercises, the appreciation for these words may change and provide the participant with a new way of expressing him/her self.

B) Another possible explanation could be that participants recognize the importance of these words for the facilitators and start using them in order to project a positive image to these facilitators just to act conform the expected social standards.

These two explanations seem both plausible, the question than remains, how to recognize these two ways of using the new vocabulary for what they are. Our own experience is when the analyst looks at the context in which the new vocabulary is used, one can get a good sense of the authors intentions. Meaning, that when the analyst places the found new vocabulary (from the second conflict story) in the context of the complete second story, the analyst can check if the newly used words correspond with the rest of the story, or are at odds with it. From this the analyst can make an educated assessment what the reason might have been and subsequently if this is a positive development or not.

4. All stories seem to have a similar structure. They start with an introduction into the situation, than a description of the conflict at hand, followed by a (mostly) short conclusion.

Conflict stories in general seem to have a similar structure. In the introductory part, the author is often described as a person that happens to be in a situation that escalates into a conflict. He or she rarely is described as being responsible for the escalation. Than the description of the conflict itself starts. Here, 'the other' often does something in a way that forces the author to counter act, or at least legitimized the author's actions. After the introductory part and the conflict description part, mostly a short round up follows, in which the conflict is resolved, left for dead, or forcefully ignored.

In almost al conflict stories we see attempts by the author to arouse empathy from the audience. The author does this by placing the responsibility for the conflict situation with someone else, mostly 'the other' in the conflict. The thing is that power (responsibility) is being traded in for empathy. The less responsibility the author seems to have for the conflict situation the more empathy he or she seems to receive from the audience. This balance between responsibility and empathy sometimes shifts in the second conflict story. The author dears to take on more responsibility for his/her own situation, we say 'dears' because we regard this shift as a result of a change in trust. The author must trust him or herself and the audience to not judge him/her too harshly for their part in the conflict. Or the author must have enough trust in his/herself to be able to cope with this possible judgment (which of course is the opposite of the empathy everyone seems to long for). Only when the author has this trust in him/herself and the audience will he/she be willing to take on more responsibility. This means, as a logical consequence, that 'the other' is released of some of the responsibility or guilt, for the conflict situation, and is allowed to receive more empathy from the audience, by the author.

5. The author describes him or herself in the first stories almost by definition as not guilty or not responsible, and 'the other' as perpetrator or instigator of the escalation of the conflict. In the second stories this sometimes changes in subtle ways.

By pointing at 'the other' as the instigator or responsible person, the author means to gain empathy he/she receives from the audience. This phenomena says something about how the audience or the reader (we) understand and comprehend conflict stories. Audiences seem to choose, unavoidably the side of the innocent, the one that is not responsible for the escalation of the conflict. This underscores the negative connotation that the term conflict often has for people. Apparently conflicts are often seen as situations, which must be avoided or solved. That is probably why the instigator is almost always seen as the 'bad guy' or at least as the one that deserves the least empathy of the conflicting parties; because lets face it, "he/she is the one that started".

What we like to point out here is that most people see themselves as 'good' or at least as being right. People try to sustain this self-image towards themselves and the outside world. To accomplish this, the own actions have (or have to be made) to fit the norms (the rules for

good and bad behavior) of that specific context. This 'making ones own behavior fit the norms' is what happens constantly in conflict stories.

6. 'The other' often gets a lot less attention than the author-personage. In most of the cases there is not much thought on, or attention for the motivation for behavior, or the needs that 'the other' may have. In the second conflict story this attention, or room for 'the other' sometimes increases.

   'The other', as described above, often has a instrumental function in the story of the author. 'The other' is used as a contrast by which the 'good' or the 'right' of the author is becomes clear and present. More often than not this contrasting role seems the main role 'the others' gets within the story dynamics. When the author actually decides to dedicate some attention to 'the other' in his/her story. And decides to clarify some of the behavior of 'the other' by speculating or explaining their behavior, 'the other' becomes more like the author (a full rational and emotional human person) and subsequently looses some of its contrasting value. The black and white of the first story changes into many shades of gray. By doing this, the story often seems to lose some of its sensation and action. In other words, the story is transformed from a flashy Hollywood flick to a more layered and often more complicated cult movie. The story becomes a story about conflicting interest, needs, and emotions of two or more persons instead of the prior 'epic battle between good and evil'. Changes that occur on this level have, in our eyes, a very strong impact on the author's worldview and understanding of conflict situations.

7. The second story is shorter than the first, two thirds of the time. The second story is sometimes almost written like a summary.

   A possible explanation for this is that people get tired of writing the same story twice. They have written this down already, so why do they have to do it again? Which could make the writing seem dull or even irritating. A different explanation is maybe that people think that because its the second time that they write it down, they do not have to go into the details anymore – they have already written these down the first time. A third explanation could well be that because the author already wrote the story down ones, he/she can do it the second time with less words. The author had some practice and now feels it is clearer, so it he/she can do with less words. Because the summarizing and omitting of details in the second story makes the analysis process more difficult, it seems advisable to put some effort into this challenge when collecting new stories.

The points that have been mentioned here are meant to share the most striking observations concerning the analysis method, in order to communicate our experiences during our trials. Also, we think, these points can give a insight on where the method now stands concerning its developmental status. They can give an illustration of challenges ahead and possibilities for further development.

5.2. Further development of the analysis process

When looking at the full picture of the narrative evaluation method, the greatest challenges lay in the analyzing part; what do the differences between the stories tell us? Other parts are also not perfect, but the part that needs most attention in our eyes is the analyses process.

   One of the greatest challenges – and therefore also one of the biggest possibilities – herein lies in finding a well defined perspective through which a Twin-story can be looked at. Here we mean a perspective through which the found differences between the stories can be understood. Now – it turned out during our analysis session with a larger group – it is often found that the ideas of the different analysts about positive change are not always the same.

Often the same terms are used (like *trust*) although the meaning that analysts give to the term may differ. To get to a common meaning – of the found conflict story differences – it is important to find a framework from where 'positive change' can be defined. After this it becomes easier to agree on the meaning of found differences and their respective impact on the idea of 'positive change', or maybe 'negative change'.

As long as this combining framework is not found it will be very difficult to find agreement among different analysts, analyzing Twin-Stories. We have tried to start an internal discussion on core values of the DiversityJoy/Phaphama method, in the hope that this can contribute to finding this shared framework for meaning. This discussion has not really taken of yet, so a continuation and a constructive deepening seems a very good idea.

After strengthening the shared framework of understanding 'positive change' the next step is finding an answer to the question: How does this 'positive change' express itself in the conflict stories. Although we have been trying to answer this question, we have not found a conclusive answer yet. After one has established what 'positive change' is one has to be able to recognize it in the texts. And with this, we do not simply mean recognizing differences between the stories – this has already been done successfully – but really recognizing the meaningful differences and making this meaning explicit. This than has to be done in a way that the different analysts can come to a shared understanding of these meanings. How to exactly shape this process is not clear for us at this time, and should therefore be a point of research for further work on this method. We, however, do have a number of clues that can point us in the direction of possible shapes of the above-mentioned process.

As a first step – in the direction of a possible solution – it would help to come up with a <u>list of signal words</u>. With this list the analysts can look at the stories in a directed way, instead of just looking for differences at random. One of the most promising findings on this topic was the role of pronouns. Pronouns, and especially personal pronouns and possessive pronouns, seem to play a very important role in conflict stories.

Personal pronouns can be very helpful in the analysis process to get information about demarcations (*in-group, out-group)*: Where does the author see him/herself as part of a group (this is often shown through the use of including personal pronouns like; 'we' and 'us') and where the author sees him/herself outside of the group (this is often shown through the use of excluding personal pronouns like; 'them', 'they', 'you').

Possessive pronouns are often strong indicators for the experience of 'responsibility' by the author. How does the author see his/her own role in relation to 'the others' in the conflict story? Possessive pronouns like, 'mine', 'ours', 'theirs', 'his', and 'yours' refer to ownership and are clearly, in this way, connected to responsibility. With ownership we do not mean directly the ownership of property, but more an *ownership of what you say/do*; the process of taking ownership for a situation, own actions, decisions, words, and sometimes even for ones own feelings.

It has become clear to us that pronouns can – and maybe even should – be used as indictors for certain parts of the author's worldview. They can in this way contribute to an attribution of shared meanings to the differences between conflict stories.

Another point that seems a key issue to us in attributing meaning to differences between conflict stories can be the effect that certain story elements have on the image the author draws of himself and 'the other'. When we look at conflict stories as theories of conflict-responsibility, the constant connection between certain story elements and the image of the author and 'the other' can be seen as a very valuable source of information. In this light a passage where the author claims to have asked 'the other' if he is ok, can tell us something about the author's capacity to empathize or about the author trying to look compassionate. This of course, has great implication when talking about the social worldview of a person. Often when one looks at the context – the whole story – the meaning of such passages can be

filtered out, but sometimes it's less clear. Therefore it is important that attention is paid to the relations between the context of the whole story and certain specific elements, and if these are compatible or mutually excluding.

Long story short, what the analysis method needs is a <u>clear set of understandable and effective questions that can guide the annalist in the process</u>, in order to get in a relative short time, to reasonably shared conclusions about the found differences between the Twin-Stories. After which the annalists can come to a conclusion about the development the participant, has gone through in the time between the writing of the first and the second conflict story.

5.3. Increasing the amount of analyzable Twin-Stories

Although we see the current return of nine usable Twins-Stories from 39 participants as a glass that is quarter full (instead of quarter empty, which is a Dutch saying), we acknowledge that a higher return rate is desirable. When we for the sake of argument assume that the Twin-Stories mainly stay the same – one conflict story before and one written after participation to a workshop – a few challenges arise.

A first challenge is the vocal or written way of instructing the conflict-story-authors. Here a lot of improvement might be possible especially when sometimes Twin-Stories become unusable because the first and the second conflict stories are written about a different experienced conflict. These are clearly matters of instructions that fail to be clear enough. The solution to this can probably be found in <u>fine-tuning the instructions to a point that everybody can and does understand them</u>.

A different hurdle that has to be taken is the, what we have started to call 'second story tiredness' The instruction, to write down the personal conflict for the second time seems to be boring or even irritating to some. This, as been mentioned before, can also explain the fact that second stories are often shorter and sometimes are more like summaries that a new version of the same conflict story. When this 'second story tiredness' occurs it seems to influence the way people describe their story. Moreover, when the instructions for the second story are given directly after the workshop 'second story tiredness' may be even stronger, because people want to socialize outside the workshop setting or are tired and want to go home.

One of the great challenges concerning the increase in written-conflict-story return is making the task of writing the stories more interesting and exiting. This could be done in many ways. It is maybe an idea <u>to give the process of writing/rethinking the conflict stories a more important part within the actual workshops</u>. Which would make the whole thing part of the workshop in the eyes of the participants and would this way become more meaningful to them.

Next to this other ways of trying to increase the return can be thought. Fore instance one can change the way the stories are collected by making the participants tell the stories while they are recorded on tape or video. Changing these things has also implication for the way the material can be analyzed. With sound and video images one can think of a broad spectrum of interpretations through voice intonations and body language. These could help in the analyzing process by providing more angles to extract meaning from the stories. On the other hand adding new material in these ways can also severely slow the process down and create so much information that it would only complicate the analyzing process, instead of helping it.

5.4. What do we know about what we do not know

When we zoom out to the look at bigger picture of the evaluation method as a whole, we can see that some of the elements of the method seem to be on odds with some of the methods goals. On the one hand we want to develop a method that is easy to implement (in order to

make it usable for the organizations we develop it for) and shows fast results. On the other hand we want the evaluation method to be able to pick up on very broad-social-psychological changes in participants. Is it even possible to do this sort of evaluation in a fast and easy way without blinding ourselves to broad-social-psychological processes that we are looking for? Maybe we have to comprehend these two sides as a pair of scales; when one side goes up the other goes down. When one focuses more closely on one element in the story a faster and more accurate interpretation can be made, but the chances grow exponentially that one misses other, maybe just as or even more important processes. This all sounds plausible but maybe this image of a pair of scale is misleading and obstructs our way of thinking in our search for the write evaluation method in which no concessions have to be made.

However, the current method – the analyses of conflict stories – seems to be capable of delivering a way of getting insights into the social understandings of participants, in other words; into their worldview. No other practical evaluation method (working and structured) that we know of has generated similar understanding of subtle changes in peoples' worldviews. This originates partly in the fact that we have tried to find a way of looking beyond the self-observations of people. To add a deeper perspective on what people learn from social skills programs. This is also why we have started to believe strongly in the value of narrative analysis of conflict stories. And because it concentrates on very broad social understandings of people, it seems important to keep the method as open-minded and flexible, in order to try to keep broadest possible spectrum of social-psychological changes, into our scope.

5.5. Experiments and suggestions for additional research

Here we want to give some practical ideas concerning possible additional research. A few of these ideas go past the use of Twin-Stories as we have used them in our evaluation attempts. We also want to stress that the ideas that written down below, will most likely imply new challenges and hurdles.

Control groups. Up till now we have not used a control group. We think though that this can be a valuable addition to the existing data. An important argument is the possible influence that writing a conflict story might have on the perception of that conflict. After all, writing a personally experienced conflict story down is immediately a moment of reflection on ones own version of the story. It is plausible that this works as a form of self-reflection and in itself creates changes in the perception. Moreover, data from control groups could give a meaningful understanding that could be used to develop the analysis and interpretation conflict stories.

Closely related to the use of control groups is the idea, not to let all the participants of one workshop write both before and after the workshop, but only half before and the other half after. This way it would be possible to look at impact of the workshops more on a group level instead of on an individual level as we have done up till now. On top of this it could prove to be helpful in increasing the amount of usable conflict stories that can be collected. It is, however, very important that first a very structured way has to be decided upon, because this it will prove impossible to compare different stories of different participants with one another.

Next to writing conflict stories it could be beneficial to record oral versions of conflict stories. It is a fact that some people can talk much easier than write, for these people writing a conflict story can result in a story that does not have as many valuable pieces of information as would be possible. Meaning that we might well miss out on valuable insights.

Another interesting option for additional research would be to give participants back their first conflict story, which they wrote before participating, and let them reflect on their

own story. Questions like; 'does anything strike you in particular about your own story?' and 'when you were allowed to change something, what would you change?' and 'can you tell what the reason is that you want to change your first story?' Or 'write down you thoughts and feelings about your own story'. In this way the differences between the two measuring moments are very clear, and on top of this the participant has already provided some of the meaning. This could give an important contribution to the interpretation process.

Yet, another possibility would be to use two standardized conflict stories on which the participants have to comment before and after their participation in the workshop. The idea behind this is that the worldview of a person can not only be observed through his/her own conflict stories, but also in his/her interpretation of other conflict stories. This is one of the ideas that came forward after a long session with a few annalists that could not agree on the order in which the two versions of the conflict story were written. From this experience it became clear that the assumptions of an annalist strongly influences the meaning they attribute to the differences he/she finds. This is the earlier mentioned problem of multiple interpretations of differences.

To be able to measure anything like 'negative impact' it seems interesting to experiment with the most significant technique.[32] Trying to come, with a group of facilitators, to a shared understanding of the Twin-Stories that best reflect 'positive change' and Twin-stories that reflect the least change or even 'negative change'.

To get to a deeper understanding of conflict stories and their reflecting characteristics, it might be a good idea to include some professional psychologists, sociologists, and experienced people from the field of psycho-analysis in the analysis process and see if together with them more standardized methods can be applied or developed.

Further more, a study has been conducted by Oudenhoven, J.P. van & Hofstra, J,. This study is about _Hechtingsstijlen_[33] which means as much as 'attachment styles'. This study looks at the way people see themselves in relation to others in terms of trust. These 'attachment styles' are developed mainly during the first years of childhood in the social interaction with the parents. Many of then things that AVP is concerned with in their workshop are being addressed in this theory about _Hechtingsstijlen_. This is why this study might give additional information of human social behavior or might even give rise to new way of trying to evaluate the changes in the understanding of the social world of the participants.

As a last remark we would like to present three 'out of the box' ideas. For the AVP-organizations it could be valuable to 1. Include in their education program, for their facilitators, the reading and analyzing of conflict stories. 2. To let participants in small groups play one of the versions of a Twin-Story and record this on video, and than compare this to a video recording of an other group playing the other version of the same Twin-Story. 3. To let a workshop group make drawings inspired by one Twin-Story version and compare these drawings to ones that are made inspired by the other version of the same Twin-Story.

5.6. Does this evaluation method have a future?

The future of this method seems promising in our opinion. It depends, however, on a few important issues, which have been mentioned in the past chapter. A few big steps are needed to make this method reach its potential. For us this report is a conclusion to an important research in which we have looked for an alternative way of evaluating broad-aim programs. Whether we will continue this development of the method is not clear at this moment.

---

[32] Dart & Davies (2003).

[33] Oudenhoven, J. P. van, & Hofstra, J. (2001). _De Hechtingsstijllijst (HSL); Handleiding,_ Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.

With this, the further development and future of the method lies not exclusively in our hands. It now lies in the hands of colleague-researchers, students, and organizations with an interest in developing an evaluation method based on narrative analysis. We think that this method can be used in many fields, much uncovered ground can be explored and above all, this method seems to carry the promise of changing the way we perceive social qualitative evaluation research.

To conclude we would like to express our hope that others (maybe together with us) will take up the challenge and continue on the path that we have entered. We would like to invite everyone who works in the field of evaluation of personal and social development to give it a try; it will be worth the effort. Lots of success and we hope to hear from you soon.

Bibliography

AVP (2002). *Alternatives to Violence Project; Manual basic course*, revised 2002 by the education committee Alternatives to Violence Project / USA.

Blaak, G., Couzij, T., Deelen-Meeng, L. van, Halfman, I., Schram, T., Vroegop, I. (2009). *SAN Samenwerking Amsterdam Nijverdal; een burgerschapsproject over noaberschap / neighbourship*, Amsterdam/Nijverdal: SG Reigersbos, CSG Reggesteyn, Stichting DiversityJoy. http://www.diversityjoy.nl/downloads/files/SAN-boekje%20juni%202009.pdf

Couzij, T. & Halfman, I. (2009). *In gesprek over betekenis; De impact van workshops weerspiegelt in conflictverhalen,* Amsterdam: Stichting DiversityJoy.

Dart, J. & Davies, R. (2003). *A dialogical, Story-Based Evaluation Tool; The most significant change technique*, In: American Journal of Evaluation, Vol. 24, No. 2, 2003, p. 137-155.

Halfman, I. & Couzij, T. (2008). *Narrative Conflict & Evaluation*, Amsterdam: ISHSS, Conflict Resolution and Governance, University of Amsterdam. http://74.125.77.132/search?q=cache:SXXRuoEk_lcJ:www.diversityjoy.nl/downloads/files/Narritive%2520Conflict%2520%26%2520Evaluation.pdf+conflict,+evaluation+narrative+tijl+couzij&cd=3&hl=nl&ct=clnk&gl=nl&client=firefo

Hansen, T. (2003). *The Narrative Approach to Mediation*, http://www.mediate.com/articles/hansenT.cfm, accessed on 07/03, 2008.

Leary, K. (2004). *Critical Moments as Relational Moments; The centre for humanitarian dialogue and the conflict in Aceh, Indonesia,* In: Negotiation Journal, Vol.20, nr.2, pp. 311-338.

Oudenhoven, J.P. van & Hofstra, J. (2001). *De Hechtingsstijllijst (HSL); Handleiding,* Groningen: Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.

Appendices

In these appendices the following items are included:

1. Original conflict stories.
2. The instructions used to obtain the conflict stories.
3. The questions that were used up till now to guide the analysis process.
4. Discussion on core values.

1. Original conflict stories

Included are the original Dutch Twin-Stories and a translation of the Twin-Story 'Pesten' ('Bullying') because we have referred to this story in the main text.

'Briefje van 50' verhaalversie 1
In de zomervakantie werkte ik een schoenenwinkel [***]. Op een dag kwam er een Afrikaanse vrouw binnen. Ze wou een schoen en vroeg haar maat. Ik pakte de schoen en liet haar passen. Toen ze het gepast had, besloot ze het te nemen. De schoen kostte €30 en ze betaalde met een vaste €50. Ik keek of hij echt was. Ze werd boos dat ik dat deed, maar die €50 was nep. Ik riep mijn baas erbij om het nog eens te bekijken. Hij zei dat het nep was. De vrouw begon te stotteren en te zeggen dat ze het net gepind had. Toen we zeiden dat we de politie erbij moesten roepen, begon ze te schreeuwen. We probeerden rustig te praten. Het was ook nog eens moeilijk om te communiceren, want de vrouw schreeuwde en sprak in het engels. Even later kwam haar vriend die begon ook te schreeuwen. We zeiden dat we het konden oplossen, maar ze wouden niet luisteren en liepen heel snel de winkel uit (zowat rennen). Wij belden de politie en hebben de band laten zien. De rest hebben we aan de politie overgelaten.

'Briefje van 50' verhaalversie 2
Deze zomer werkte ik in een schoenenwinkel; [***]. Op een dag kwam er een vrouw binnen. Ze koos een schoen uit en vroeg haar maat. Ik zocht haar goeie maat en liet het haar passen. Ze vond het mooi en wou hem. De schoen kost €30. Ze betaalde met een briefje van €50. Ik keek of het briefje echt was. De vrouw werd boos dat ik haar niet geloofde, maar het briefje bleek nep te zijn. Ik riep mijn baas om dubbel te checken. Hij zag ook dat het nep was. Die vrouw begon te stotteren en zei dat ze het net gepind had. We zeiden dat we de politie erbij moesten halen. Toen kwam ook haar vriend naar binnen en ze begonnen te schreeuwen. Wij spraken rustig. Uiteindelijk zijn ze heel snel weggelopen (weggerend). De politie heeft de band bekeken en de rest hebben we aan de politie overgelaten.

'I.D.' verhaalversie 1
Het is zaterdagavond. Ik heb een vermoeiende week gehad met genoeg aan mijn hoofd en ik heb nu zin om even helemaal los te gaan! Eerst zitten we gezellig met de vriendinnen bij iemand thuis om vervolgens uit te gaan naar een discotheek in de buurt.

Eenmaal bij de discotheek aangekomen merk ik dat ik mijn ID ben vergeten. Wat stom! Dat gebeurt nu net vanavond, terwijl ik lekker stoom af wou blazen. Maar we lopen gewoon door, hopelijk vraagt de uitsmijter gewoon niet naar mijn ID. Ik ben 16 en ik vind dat ik toch ook wel uitzie als 16. Maar blijkbaar dacht de uitsmijter daar anders over. Of ik keek te zenuwachtig…

"Ja, laat je ID maar is even zien", zegt de niet al te vriendelijk uitziende uitsmijter tegen mij. "Sorry meneer, ik vind het heel vervelend maar ik ben hem vergeten." probeer ik zo eerlijk mogelijk te zeggen. Ik weet zelf ook dat hij dat elke avond waarschijnlijk wel duizend keer om zijn oren krijgt, maar het is echt waar. Ik ben mijn ID vergeten, maar ik ben 16 dus ik vind dat hij me gewoon binnen moet laten. Maar ook hier dacht de uitsmijter anders over. "Ja ja, dat hoor ik vaker," zegt hij zoals ik precies had verwacht. Ik vertel hem dat ik weet dat hij dat vaker hoort, maar dat ik toch echt de waarheid spreek. "Nou," zegt de uitsmijter erg chagrijnig, "hoe oud ben je dan?". Tja, ik ben 16, maar ik begin te twijfelen of hij mij zal geloven. Ik besluit heel verontwaardigd te zeggen: "Ja 16 natuurlijk. Ik kom hier veel vaker en dan word er nooit naar mijn ID gevraagd!" Dat was waarschijnlijk niet de goede aanpak. De uitsmijter begint wat geprikkelder te worden en legt mij vervolgens haarfijn uit hoe het zit met ID kaarten meenemen: "Wat is dat nou voor stom iets om je ID te vergeten. Wij controleren heel vaak op

ID kaarten en als er dan straks in de zaal aan je wordt gevraagd door een inspectie hoe oud je bent en er blijkt dan dat je geen ID kaart bij je hebt krijg jij ten eerste een hoge boete, maar de discotheek ook nog eens." En ja, wat moet ik daar nou op zeggen. Van die boetes wist ik niet eens, maar ik wil toch nog wel heel graag naar binnen. Terug naar huis om mijn legitimatie op te halen is ook geen optie, want ik moet een half uur fietsen. Dan ben ik een uur verder voor ik weer terug ben en dan worden er alleen nog mensen van 18+ toegelaten. Omdat ik niks weet te zeggen besluit ik het maar te doen met: "Ik weet het, maar ik ben echt 16 en ik ben echt mijn ID vergeten."

Volgens mij ziet de uitsmijter dat ik het meen en dat ik dat zal blijven herhalen. Of hij is gewoon het gezeur zat en wil weer doorgaan met andere mensen controleren. Dat denk ik eigenlijk eerder, want we stonden al wel zo'n 10 minuten met elkar te praten en de rij voor de discotheek werd er niet korter op. In ieder geval zegt hij – eindelijk maar toch- de magische woorden "Vooruit, loop maar door. Maar de volgende keer niet je ID vergeten!"

"Nee meneer, zal ik niet doen!"

'I.D.' verhaalversie 2

Het is zaterdagavond. Ik heb een vermoeiende week gehad met genoeg aan mijn hoofd en ik heb nu zin om even helemaal los te gaan! Eerst zitten we gezellig met de vriendinnen bij iemand thuis om vervolgens uit te gaan naar een discotheek in de buurt.

Eenmaal bij de discotheek aangekomen merk ik dat ik mijn ID ben vergeten. Wat stom! Dat gebeurt nu net vanavond, terwijl ik lekker stoom af wou blazen. Maar we lopen gewoon door, hopelijk vraagt de uitsmijter gewoon niet naar mijn ID. Ik ben 16 en ik dacht dat ik er ook wel uitzag als 16. Maar blijkbaar dacht de uitsmijter daar anders over. Of ik keek te zenuwachtig…

"Ja, laat je ID maar is even zien", zegt de niet al te vriendelijk uitziende uitsmijter tegen mij. "Sorry meneer, ik vind het heel vervelend maar ik ben hem vergeten. Ik kan me voorstellen dat u dat niet gelooft omdat iedereen dat zegt, maar het is echt waar." zeg ik. Ik denk ik ga gelijk eerlijk doen tegen de man, dan vertrouwt hij me hopelijk wat sneller. Maar zo makkelijk gaat het nou ook weer niet. De uitsmijter zegt: "Dat kan wel zijn meisje, maar ik kan nu niet controleren of jij wel 16 bent." "Gelooft u het wel als ik zeg dat ik 21 ben, of helpt dat niet echt?" probeer ik nog grappig te zeggen. Ik zie echter dat hij het niet zo grappig vind dus zeg ik vervolgens: "Meneer, ik weet dat het voor u heel erg vervelend is om uw werk nou goed te doen, maar ik hoop wel dat u mij vertrouwt als ik tegen u zeg dat ik 16 ben." Ik zie op dit moment de uitsmijter twijfelen wat hij nu met me moet. Ik denk niet dat hij dit heel vaak te horen krijgt. Uiteindelijk zegt hij dan ook: "Nou dame, ik geloof je maar anders had ik je zo weer terug laten fietsen naar huis. Loop deze keer maar door, maar vergeet je ID de volgende keer niet weer hè."

"Ik zal hem in mijn broek naaien, dan heb ik hem altijd bij me in het vervolg! Heel erg bedankt."

'Ik ben geen lamp' verhaalversie 1

Nou dit conflict heeft kort geleden plaats gevonden ik herinner me het conflict prima.

Op een zaterdagochtend sta ik vroeg op en bereid me voor om te gaan werken. Eenmaal aangekomen kom ik erachter dat ik pas in de avond moet werken. Ik baal er natuurlijk van maar ik accepteer het en kom later die avond terug.

De week daarop sta ik weer vroeg op om te gaan werken en is er weer sprake van een misverstand. Ik word natuurlijk ontzettend boos omdat ik afspraken die avond heb. Ik stond op het punt te ontploffen maar hield me in. Tot dat ik een uur later gebeld wordt of ik om tien uur wil beginnen. Ik kan het nu echt niet meer voor me houden e reageer "Luister dan! Ik ben niet van plan elke ochtend vroeg op te staan om naar huis gestuurd te worden en vervolgens op gebeld te worden om eerder te komen werken! Wat denken jullie wel niet dat ik ben!! Ik ben geen f*cking lamp die je aanzet wanneer je die nodig hebt." Vervolgen hang ik op en vertel aan mijn moeder wat er gebeurd is en die zegt dat ik toch maar moet gaan en dat zulke dingen nou eenmaal gebeuren. Ik ga om tien uur werken en licht mijn collega's in over het probleem en vervolgens mijn afdelingshoofd. Zij kijkt er is misgegaan en sindsdien is het niet meer fout gegaan en werk ik nog steeds.

'Ik ben geen lamp' verhaalversie 2

Op een zaterdagochtend stond ik op en maakte me klaar om te gaan werken. Eenmaal aangekomen ontdekte ik dat ik pas in de avond moest werken. Ik baalde ontzettend maar ik keerde terug naar huis. Later die dag ben ik toen gaan werken.

De week daarop ging ik weer naar het werk en wat bleek dat ik pas in de middag moest. Dit vond ik heel

vervelend omdat ik in de middag afspraken had. Ik vroeg aan de leiding van die dag hoe dit nou komt en zei antwoordde, " het is waarschijnlijk een communicatie fout maar ik heb je middag wel nodig". Dus ik ging naar huis. Later die ochtend belde ze me op en vroeg, " [***] zou je misschien iets eerder kunnen beginnen want ik heb een ziekmelding". Waarop ik antwoordde, "Ik voel me een beetje in de maling genomen als ik telkens voor niks kom en jij me naar huis stuurt. Ik heb behoefte aan duidelijkheid en ik ga me niet telkens aanpassen aan jullie fouten."
"Ja, maar zo[u] je toch willen komen", antwoordde zei. "Ja ik zal kijken of ik het red en dan kom ik", zei ik.
Op het werk vertelde ik een aantal collega's over het incident en ze gaven mij het advies de leiding moest aanspreken. Zo gezegd zo gedaan enzo is het probleem opgelost.

'Ommen' verhaalversie 1

In de zomer ben ik met vriendinnen op vakantie gegaan. We logeerden in een stacaravan in Ommen. Het begon allemaal leuk, we deden gezellige dingen en we hebben erg gek gedaan.
Na een paar dagen begon het al, er kwam een soort van spanning in de groep. Een van de meisjes vond dat we ons als 'aso's' gedroegen. Natuurlijk vond de groep het niet zo leuk, dat iemand dit over haar eigen vriendinnen kon zeggen. Het begon steeds slechter te lopen, iedereen irriteerde zich aan het 'heilige boontjes' gedrag van haar.
Er zijn natuurlijk meer dingen gebeurd, een van die dingen was het volgende:Een van de dingen die je kan verwachten als je met zes vriendinnen op vakantie gaat is het praten over jongens, natuurlijk is hier niks verkeerds aan. Alleen door een van de meisjes werd dit als seksistisch gezien. Toen wij dezelfde avond een feestje organiseerde en het vriendje van het meisje ook kwam, zegt ze (waar al haar vriendinnen dus bij zitten) tegen hem 'sorry hoor, maar ik kan er ook niks aan doen dat ze zo hoerig doen en dat ze zo lomp zijn.' Als toppunt zegt haar vriendje dan ook nog: 'tja, dat had ik zo al kunnen zien.' Natuurlijk is dit niet leuk als er zoiets over je gezegd wordt. Maar om geen onnodige ruzie te schoppen hebben we er niks van gezegd.
Later die week betrapte we haar erop, dat ze bij de buurvrouw van ons zat, over ons te roddelen. Die avond aan het eten zegt ze dat de buurvrouw last van ons had en dat zij ook last van ons had, omdat wij niet normaal konden doen en dat we over haar roddelde. Toen wij zeiden dat we gehoord hadden wat ze tegen de buurvrouw en haar vriendje had gezegd en we zeiden dat we dit niet zo leuk vonden begon ze te huilen en zei dat we dat gewoon hadden verzonnen. (Toen wij 's avonds onze excuses aan de buurvrouw wilden geven, zei zij letterlijk, "waarom, ik heb niks geen last gehad').
Wij hadden hier natuurlijk genoeg van. Die avond kwam ze zelf met de mededeling dat ze naar huis ging. We gaven haar de sleutel van de caravan, want wij gingen zelf naar een volleybal toernooi op de camping. Tussen de wedstrijden door gingen wij nog snel even kijken of ze niet toevallig onze sleutel had, en ja hoor, ze had de sleutel in haar jaszak, van plan om die mee naar huis te nemen. Bij de caravan kwamen we er achter dat ze alle ramen en deuren dicht had gedaan, zodat wij 's avonds niet meer in de caravan konden komen, bij onze spullen en natuurlijk het bed waar wij die avond nog in moesten slapen. Dit was bij ons echt de druppel.
Ik heb na de vakantie nog een kwartier met haar gepraat over wat er nu gebeurt was, natuurlijk lag de hele schuld bij ons en zij had niks gedaan. Ik heb toen besloten dat ik met haar geen vriendschap meer wil, ze heeft kansen genoeg gehad om het bij te leggen.

'Ommen' verhaalversie 2

In de zomer ben ik met vriendinnen naar Ommen op vakantie geweest. We logeerden in een stacaravan in Ommen. Het begon allemaal leuk, we deden gezellige dingen en we hebben erg gek gedaan.
Na een paar dagen kwamen er wat meningsverschillen: Wij waren asociaal aan het doen volgens een meisje. Zelf hadden we dat helemaal niet zo door en vroegen haar wat we dan precies fout deden. Ze zij dat we te veel over jongens praatte en dat onze humor lomp was. Natuurlijk vonden wij het niet leuk dat ze dat over ons zei, want wees nou eerlijk, dat zijn de dingen die op een vriendinnen vakantie gebeuren.
Er zijn natuurlijk meer dingen gebeurd, een van die dingen was het volgende: We vierden 's avonds een feestje, gewoon omdat we er zin aan hadden. Het vriendje van het meisje dat ook zei dat wij asociaal waren kwam ook. We waren zelf een beetje banaal aan het praten en we waren natuurlijk een beetje gek aan het doen. Ze zei toen tegen haar vriendje: "Ik zei toch, ze zijn een beetje seksistisch en 'hoerig'." waarop haar vriendje antwoordde: "Tja, dat had ik zo al wel kunnen zien." We voelden ons een beetje belazerd, maar we dachten bij ons zelf, laten er niks van zeggen, straks komt er nog een ruzie dan zijn we er helemaal klaar mee.
Er zijn nog meer dingen gebeurt, die dingen heb ik allemaal beschreven in mijn vorige conflict verhaal. Toen hadden we de ruzie nog niet opgelost, maar nu wel, dat gebeurde als volgt:
We zagen haar op school en vroegen of ze even met ons wilde praten. We hebben ons uitgelegd hoe we ons voelden toen zei zo achteloos die dingen over ons zei. Ze zei dat ze ons wel begreep, maar dat wij wel moesten snappen hoe zij zich gevoeld heeft tijdens onze vakantie. We zeiden dat we haar begrepen. We hebben sorry tegen elkaar gezegd.

Toch zijn we nog niet de vrienden die we waren van voor de tijd. Zelf denk ik ook niet dat het nog weer helemaal zoals voorheen zal gaan. Daarvoor is er te veel gebeurd en zijn we allemaal te verschillend.

'Pesten' verhaalversie 1

Ik ben niet een persoon die vaak ruzie heeft of vaak ruzie maakt, maar als je me eenmaal boos krijgt ben ik dan ook echt boos. Zo had ik laatst een conflict met een collega van mij. Hij was ongeveer in de zelfde periode als ik begonnen dus voelde ik een soort band met hem. Maar hij ging toch iets te ver. Het is zo'n jongen die best chill is wanneer je alleen met hem bent, maar zodra er andere mensen bij zijn hij anders gedraagd. Hij wil altijd macho zijn tegenover andere mensen, waarmee ik normaal geen probleem tegen heb maar als hij mij erbij betrekt of omlaag haalt moet hij oppassen. Anyway, een keer ging hij toch iets te ver, hij bleef me pesten. Het begon met expres 'gay' tegen me te gaan doen zoals zeggen van 'Hey ***, schattebout, gisteravond was lekker he'! Dat vond ik al irritant en dus zei ik hem te stoppen. Toen hield hij zich wel stil. De volgende werkdag begon hij weer met 'Hee ***, ouwe homo, alles goed'? Toen gaf ik toe aan mijn instinct en gaf hem een vuist recht op zijn kaak. Hij gooide ook een rechtse maar werd gestopt door een andere collega. Later had ik mezelf weer in de hand en vroeg hem of hij oke was. Verder hebben wij het uitgepraat en een paar weken later was hij ontslagen, omdat hij pennen meenam naar huis. Dat was dus mijn conflict.

'Pesten' verhaalversie 2

Nou ik ben geen gewelddadig persoon en maak ook bijna nooit ruzie, maar laatst had ik een conflict met een collega op werk. Het is zo'n jongen die aandacht tekort komt. Als je alleen met hem bent is hij best rustig en gedraagt hij zich normaal, maar gelijk zodra er andere mensen bij komen of zijn gaat hij zich kinderachtig gedragen en brengt hij personen naar beneden of iets dergelijks. Bij mij doet hij dat dus ook. Bij mij gedraagt hij zich als een homo om ermee te suggereren dat ik homo ben of iets dergelijks. Dat vond ik niet fijn dus heb ik hem enkele keren gevraagd te stoppen. Dat deed hij dan ook, maar ging hij de volgende werkdag weer verder. Daar werd ik nogal moe van en voelde de woede opborrelen. Op gegeven moment kon ik mezelf niet meer onder controle houden en gaf ik hem een stoot in het gezicht, het was nogal onverwachts dus deed hij een paar passen achteruit. Toen was hij van plan mij terug te slaan maar hij werd tegengehouden door een andere collega. Verder hebben we het nog uitgepraat en dat was mijn conflict.

English translation
'Bullying' story version 1

I am not a person who quarrels a lot, but once you have made me angry, I am really angry. So, the other day I had a conflict with a colleague of mine. He had started in the same period as I had and due to that I felt some sort a connection with him. But he went a little too far. It's one of those guys who is rather 'chill' when you're alone with him, but as soon as other people are involved he behaves differently. He always wants to be 'macho' to other people, and normally I don't have any problems with that, but as soon as he involves me or when he brings me down he should watch out. Anyway, at one point he went a little too far, he kept on bullying me. It all started by purposely acting 'gay' to me like saying 'Hey ***, sweetheart, yesterday was really good aye!' I found this already annoying, so I told him to quit. Then he kept quiet. The next day however, he started again with: 'Hey ***, old faggot, all is well?' Then I gave in to my instinct and gave him a blow to the jaw. He threw a right one as well but he was stopped by another colleague. A little later I had regained control over myself and asked him if he was alright. Moreover, we have settled things during a little talk and a few weeks later he was fired for taking pencils. So, that was my conflict.

'Bullying' story version 2

Well, I am not a violent person and I am not often involved in arguments, but the other day I had a conflict with a colleague at work. It's one of those guys who suffer a shortage of attention. When you're alone with him he is quit calm and he behaves normal. But as soon as other people get involved he starts acting childish and he brings people down or something like that. With me he does the same. With me he acts as if he is gay to suggest that I am gay or something like that. I did not like that so I asked him several times to quit. And he did, but the next day at work he continued. It tired me and I felt the anger rise. At one point I could no longer control myself and I hit him in the face. It was quite unexpected so he did a few steps backwards. Then he wanted to hit me in return but he was stopped by another colleague. Moreover, we have settled things during a little talk and that was my conflict.

'[*R*] en [*T*]' verhaalversie 1

Ongeveer een jaartje geleden zat ik nog op basketbal. Ik zat in een team waar ik me goed thuis voelde. Maar, zoals meestal bij teams, was er een "buitenbeentje". Hij kon niet goed meekomen met de rest, was altijd stil en was snel geïrriteerd (wat dit met het verhaal te maken heeft, volgt later).
Op een normale dinsdagavond hadden we training. Deze liep goed voor mij en de rest van het team, op twee na. Het buitenbeentje genaamd [*R*] en m'n vriend [*T*].

Er waren spanningen ontstaan, met als gevolg een kleine ruzie met woorden tussen de twee. Deze is goed opgelost door de trainer, en de training verliep verder goed, maar zwaar.

De training was afgelopen, en we gingen met het hele team naar de kleedkamer. Van de 9 man uit het team, douchten er altijd maar een stuk of 4 in de kleedkamers. Waaronder ik, een vriend, [*T*] en [*R*]. [*T*] begon heel vervelend te doen tegen [*R*]. M'n andere vriend en ik probeerden [*T*] te sussen, want [*T*] was boos omdat [*R*] hem tijdens de training zou moeten hebben geslagen. Toen begon [*T*] te schreeuwen tegen [*R*]: "[*R*], ga gewoon zitten met je dikke reet, zodat je dikke lichaam kan uitrusten van een zware training voor dikerds". [*R*] pikte dit niet en stormde op [*T*] af, en gaf hem een schop tegen zijn hoofd. [*T*] knalde met zijn hoofd tegen de muur en bleef even versuft op het bankje zitten. Dat was m'n teken om in te grijpen.

Ik rende naar [*T*] om te kijken of alles goed was. Het ging wel weer want hij begon te schreeuwen tegen [*R*]. Ik liep op [*R*] af om hem te bedaren. Hij begon ook tegen mij te schreeuwen omdat ik een vriend van [*T*] ben. Ik zei dat ik er niets mee te maken wilde hebben, maar dat ik wel wilde dat [*R*] even rustig zou doen. Hij haalde naar mij uit, maar ik kon gelukkig net op tijd bukken. Ik greep [*R*] vast, en zei in z'n oor: "rustig, ik ben hier niet om jou ook nog een pak slaag te geven ... even rustig!" Gelukkig werd [*R*] weer een beetje rustig, en ik m'n vriend nam het van me over.

Hierdoor kreeg ik de tijd naar de trainer te lopen en het verhaal uit te leggen. Hij kwam de kleedkamer binnen, en kreeg de rest onder controle.

Gelukkig is alles goed afgelopen, en heeft niemand blijvende schade van dit "avontuurtje" opgelopen!

*'[*R*] en [*T*]' verhaalversie 2*

Zoals mijn vorige verhaal te lezen is, zat ik ongeveer een jaar geleden op basketbal. Het team beviel me goed. Maar 1 jongen, [*R*], lag het team niet zo ... Hij was eigenlijk te hoog ingedeeld. Hij vond ons, de rest van het team, ook niet echt aardig, en was daardoor vaak stil en snel geïrriteerd.

Het is dinsdagavond. Dit is onze trainingsavond. De training ging zoals velen: gewoon goed en soepel. Toch kregen [*R*] en, een vriend van mij [*T*], een meningsverschil die niet zo erg had hoeven zijn. De trainer kwam tussenbeide, maar je merkte dat er toch een sfeer hing die vijandig was.

De training was afgelopen, en iedereen ging de kleedkamer in. Toen de niet-douchers naar huis waren gegaan, bleven ik, [*T*], [*R*] en nog een kameraad over om te gaan douchen. Hier ging het mis.

[*T*] werd boos op [*R*] om dat [*R*] [*T*] zou moeten hebben geslagen tijdens de training. M'n andere kameraad, die tevens de broer van [*T*] is, probeerde [*T*] te sussen; zonder succes.

[*T*] werd nu helemaal boos omdat [*R*] ontkende dat hij hem geschopt zou hebben. [*T*] zei: "Waarom ga je niet gewoon zitten met je dikke reet, want dan kan je dikke lichaam eventjes uitrusten van de zware training voor dikkerds". Het zal misschien niet gek overkomen als ik vertel dat [*R*] dit niet pikte. [*R*] riep zoiets als: "Nu ben je ECHT te ver gegaan!!". [*R*] rende op [*T*] af en schopte tegen [*T*]'s hoofd. [*T*] knalde keihard met z'n hoofd tegen de muur en het leek eventjes alsof ie ging flauwvallen. Gelukkig ging het goed. Vanaf dit moment wist ik dat ik iets moest doen.

Ik ging direct naar [*T*] om te kijken of het goed met hem ging. Dit werd bevestigd toen [*T*] weer begon te schreeuwen tegen [*R*]. Ik probeerde hem een beetje te sussen, maar m'n andere kameraad nam het over. Ik ging naar [*R*] toe om hem een beetje te sussen. Dit had eerst averechts effect want [*R*] begon tegen mij te schreeuwen. Hij dacht blijkbaar dat ik hem kwaad wilde doen omdat ik een vriend van [*T*] ben. Ik gebruikte gelukkig de goede woorden: "[*R*], rustig ... ik wil er niets mee te maken hebben, maar toch kun je beter rustig doen, want anders draait het nog op iets veel ergers uit." [*R*] snapte me, en begon rustig te worden. [*T*] was ook weer rustig ... maar had nog wel hoofdpijn. Ik fluisterde [*R*] in z'n oren dat hij maar beter even naar [*T*] kon gaan om het uit te praten. Dit deed [*R*] en [*T*] heeft hem vergeven. De trainer is verder niet meer nodig geweest.

(dit is de verandering van wat ik heb geleerd. Een kleine aanpassing, maar die wel belangrijk kan zijn ...)

'Roddelen' verhaalversie 1 ('Gossiping')

Een paar dagen terug kreeg ik ruzie met één van me beste vrienden. Hij en ik zijn heel goed bevriend. Ik beschouw hem als een broer en hij mij als een zusje. Alhoewel bepaalde mensen soms denken dat we met elkaar hebben ofzo. Op een dag kwam wij erachter dat een jongen die we allebei kennen een roddel heeft verspreid dat wij met elkaar hebben. Dit had een meisje verteld die ook wij allebei kennen. Ze heet ***. Dus op een dag komt die jongen op msn tegen me praten die de roddel had verspreid. Hij vroeg aan mij van wat er precies is gebeurd want hij werd op msn aangevallen door me beste vriend (mijn zogenaamde broer :p). Dus ik vertelde hem alles van wat er precies is gebeurd. Toen zei hij mij dat hij die rodel helemaal niet heeft verspreid. Hij heeft dat nog nooit gezegd aan iemand. Zo gingen we door praten. En ik noemde de naam van ***, dat zij mijn beste vriend had gezegd dat jij die roddel had verspreid. Volgende dag kwam mijn (beste) vriend naar me toe en zei "waarom

heb je het doorverteld dat *** dat zei." Ik zei "omdat ik erover ging praten met die jongen." Toen zei hij "maar ik had hem geen naam gezegd. Ik had niet gezegd dat het *** is." Toen zei ik hem, "maar dat wist ik niet. Als je me dat eerder had gezegd had ik dat niet doorgezegd." Toen gingen wij gewoon weer normaal tegen elkaar praten. Maar opeens na de zomervakantie sprak hij niet meer tot me. Dus ik ging ook niet naar hem toe om te praten. En ik hoorde achteraf dat hij het niet goed wou maken en dat hij wel zonder mij kan leven. Dat vond ik echt hard aankomen. Ik was ook heel erg boos geworden. Een keer op de metero station gingen we bekvechten. Het raarste vond ik dat hij voor de vakantie nog wel met mij ging praten na de vakantie opeens niet meer, maar ja. Na 3 weken niet praten kwam hij zelf naar mij toe. Hij vroeg om iets en ik gaf hem dat. Zo gingen we weer met elkaar praten. Het lijkt nu alsof er nog nooit wat is gebeurd. We praten nu weer goed als vroeger. Xx-Einde-xxx

'Roddelen' verhaalversie 2 ('Gossiping')
Ik heb meerdere conflicten gehad, maar die zijn voor een groot aantal conflicten tussen mij en iemand van mijn familie. Daarom heb ik een conflict gekozen tussen mij een goede vriend P. De gebeurtenis vond plaats voor de zomervakantie.
P kwam naar mij toe om te zeggen dat een jongen over ons roddelt, dat wij met elkaar hebben. Terwijl dat helemaal niet zo is. Ik beschouw P als een broer en hij mij als een zusje. P had het gehoord van een meisje dat een jongen over mij en hem roddelt. Op een dag kwam die jongen online op msn. Toen vroeg hij mij wat er precies aan de hand was. Ik heb hem (X) dus alles verteld en ook bij verteld welk meisje het was, die zei dat X roddelt.
Achter af hebben P en X elkaar ook gesproken. De volgende dag komt P naar mij toe en begint heel hard te praten. Hij zei: 'Waarom heb je X verteld welk meisje mij alles heeft verteld.' Ik zei: 'Ow sorry, maar je hebt mij ook niet gezegd dat ik het niet mocht doorvertellen. Hoe moet ik nou weten dat je X niet hebt verteld welk meisje het is.' Toen zei P: 'Ja, maar je moet toch wel na gaan dat het kan dat ik het niet hebt verteld welk meisje het is. Ze gaat toch dan in problemen komen.' Ik: 'Ja sorry.' Na deze gesprek gingen we weer normaal tegen elkaar praten. In de zomervakantie had P mij een bericht gestuurd. Het ging weer over waarom ik dat meisje had verraden. Ik had hem toen geen bericht teruggestuurd. Ik wou hem gewoon alles weer persoonlijk uitleggen. Hele zomervakantie had ik P niet gesproken. Na de zomervakantie sprak hij niet met mij. Ik wist al waarom hij niet tot me sprak. Hij was nog boos. Ik voelde me gekwetst omdat hij mij had beschuldigd om iets, wat eigenlijk niet helemaal mijn fout was. Ik hoorde toen via anderen wat hij nog over mij dacht. En via anderen heeft hij ook gehoord dat ik heb gezegd dat ik wel vind het mijn schuld is maar ook die van hem, want P heeft mij niet gezegd dat ik het niet door mocht vertellen. En dat het me spijt. Na 3 weken niet gesproken te hebben had P mij opeens gebeld. Hij had een kortingspasje nodig. Ik ben dus in de pauze naar hem toe gegaan. Ik heb hem toen mijn kortingspasje gegeven van de filiaal waar ik werk. Zo hadden wij een klein gesprekje. Nadat gingen we weer als vroeger tegen elkaar praten. Het leek alsof er niks was gebeurd. Ik voelde me echt blij omdat het weer goed was tussen ons, want ik had behoefte aan een goede vriend.

'Schoenlepel' verhaalversie 1 ('Shoehorn')
Ik werkte in de zomervakantie bij een schoenenzaak. Het was mijn eerste baantje, dus vond het best leuk om te leren werken. Ik leerde daar al vanaf dag één hoe je met klanten om moest gaan. De regels: 1 Begroet altijd de klant; 2 wanneer je iet dat de klant aan het passen is, vraag of de schoen goed zit. 3. Als de klant begint te zitten om te passen neem altijd een schoenlepel mee. Er komt dan een klant binnen. Een man, hij heeft best een eng koppie, maargoed. Ik doe wat er gevraagd wordt, haal de schoenen in zijn maat en neem een schoenlepel mee. Hij maakt gebruik van de schoenlepel. Hij past de schoenen en vindt dat ze goed staan. Hij wilt ze kopen. Dus zeg ik tegen hem 'Ik zet de schoenen alvast bij de kassa'. Waarop hij antwoordt 'Ja, is goed hoor'. Als hij eenmaal bij de kassa is, ik ben op dat moment in de magazijn, vraagt hij aan mijn collega 'Ik neem de schoenlepel mee, mag dat, okè?!' Mijn collega zegt 'Nee, dat geven wij niet zomaar weg, wij verkopen ze!' Hij antwoordt dan: 'Laat maar, ik vraag je andere collega wel, zij heeft mij ten slotte geholpen'.
Ik kom weer terug bij de kassa en hij vraagt nu aan mij of hij de schoenlepel mag meenemen. Ik werk er natuurlijk pas en weet eigenlijk niet wat ik moet zeggen. Dan zeg ik: "Nee, sorry dat kunnen wij niet zomaar meegeven': Hij wordt steeds irritanter en zegt "Wat sorry? Ik neem het gewoon mee". Mijn collega wordt boos en zegt "Hoezo je neemt het mee?!" Waarop de man antwoordt "Ja, ik neem het gewoon mee ja!?". Mijn collega zegt dan: "Waarom doe je zo lullig!?". Ik: "Ja?!". Dan zegt hij: 'Ahahaha grapje! hoor ik neem het niet mee'". Ik zeg dan: "Okeey…. wat een raar grapje :s". Ik en mijn collega kijken heel boos naar hem en overhandigen de tas met zijn schoenen erin. We waren blij dat hij weg ging, rare, enge man.

'Schoenlepel' verhaalversie 2 ('Shoehorn')

In de zomervakantie had ik mijn eerste baantje als verkoopmedewerker bij een schoenenzaak. Ik vond het best spannend allemaal, want ik wist niet echt wat ik precies moest doen en hoe ik met klanten moest communiceren. Na een paar dagen gewerkt te hebben, was ik wel gewend aan de –winkel– systeem.

Op een dag stond ik gewoon in de winkel om klanten te helpen met schoenen passen en de juiste maat. Er kwam een man naar me toe om te vragen of ik een bepaalde schoen in zijn maat had. Ik zei: "momentje, meneer ik zal voor u kijken.' Gelukkig was zijn maat er nog wel. Hij zat inmiddels op een stoel. Ik bracht hem de schoenen en bood hem een schoenlepel aan. Hij paste de schoenen en ik vroeg hoe het zat en of hij het mooi vond staan. Hij vond die schoenen perfect zitten en dus wilde hij ze kopen. Ik zei: 'goed, dan breng ik ze alvast naar de kassa'. Waarop hij antwoordde 'is goed hoor'. Ik ging eventjes naar de magazijn en toen kwam ik weer terug… wat bleek… dat hij en mijn collega wat discussie hadden. Ik vroeg aan mijn collega 'wat is er aan de hand?' Zij zei: 'Nou, die meneer wil die schoenlepel meenemen'. Ik zei toen 'Ja, dat kan toch, maar dat kost dan wel €2,-' Mijn collega antwoordde terug 'Ja, maar hij wilt het meenemen zonder te betalen'. Ik zei toen tegen de man 'Sorry meneer, maar dat kunnen wij niet doen, wij verkopen dat net als wij schoenen verkopen'. De man vond het natuurlijk niet leuk en zei 'Nee, hoor grapje, laat maar zitten'.

Mijn collega en ik zeiden 'Het is al goed hoor,' dus u wilt deze schoenen afrekenen?' Hij zei 'ja'.

Dus uiteindelijk kwam er toch een goed einde en niemand was gelukkig boos.

'TV kijken' verhaalversie 1

Een jaar geleden had ik ruzie met mijn broer. Ik zat TV te kijken en hij wilde gamen maar kon het spel niet vinden. Ik was de laatste die gespeeld had en hij vond dus dat ik het voor hem moest zoeken. Ik had het in de kast gelegd en zei dat ook tegen hem. Hij kon het nog steeds niet vinden. Ik zei dat het toch niet uitmaakte omdat ik TV zat te kijken, dus hij kon sowieso niet gaan gamen. Toen deed hij de TV uit en zei dat ik dat spel moest gaan zoeken. Toen weigerde ik en deed de TV weer aan.
Toen deed hij het opnieuw uit en ik werd boos, zei dat ik niet wist waar zijn spel was en liep naar boven. Hij vond zijn spel later toch nog, maar we hebben elkaar een paar dagen niet meer gesproken.

'TV kijken' verhaalversie 2

Een keer zat ik TV te kijken en mijn broer was zijn spel kwijt. Hij vroeg aan mij waar het lag want ik was de laatste die ermee had gespeeld. Ik zei dat het in de kast lag. Hij zocht maar kon het nog steeds niet vinden. Toen zei ik tegen hem dat het niet uit maakte omdat hij nu toch niet kon spelen, want ik keek TV. Toen deed hij de TV uit en zei dat ik het moest gaan zoeken. Ik weigerde en deed de TV weer aan. Toen deed hij het weer uit en werd ik boos. Ik zei dat ik niet wist waar zijn spel was en liep naar boven. Later vond hij het spel toch nog maar we hebben elkaar een paar dagen niet gesproken.

---

2. The instructions used to obtain the conflict stories

Form T1, meant for individual participants:

Dear Sir or Madam,

Soon you will participate in a workshop offered by Phaphama Initiatives. To prepare for the workshop we invite you to write a brief personal story. Our request serves two purposes. First it is a way of collecting information about the changes the workshop propels. Secondly, this exercise hopefully stimulates you to think about personally experienced conflict situations, which primes you in a way for the workshop. This exercise can help you quickly join the workshop process. Unless you choose to share your story, it will not be part of the workshop.

Now we ask you to write a personally experienced 'conflict'. With 'conflict' we refer to a simple difference of opinion, a disagreement, a labor dispute, and even a situation in which physical violence occurs. For example you can write about a conflict with a colleague, a conflict at home with a partner or family member. A 'conflict' does not always have to involve physical violence. We are interested in 'conflicts' in the broadest sense of the word. It is up to you to choose a situation you see as 'conflict'. It is however important that you write about a conflict that you personally experienced and in which you play (or have played) a central role.

Exercise:
Describe a conflict that you personally experienced and in which you play (or have played) a central part. Try to describe the situation as specific as possible. What happened? What did you do? What were your thoughts? What did you feel? What did you want to achieve? Describe the situation as if you would tell it to someone. Your story need not be longer than 20 or 30 lines.

At the beginning of the workshop you can submit a copy of your story to one of the workshop facilitators. Please write your name above your story. And as a reminder, unless you choose to do so, your story will not be shared in the workshop.

Support for memorizing a suitable story of conflict:
From our experience we know that it may be difficult to remember a suitable conflict situation. Perhaps the support below is helpful.

When was the last time you were angry or sad. What was the origin of those feelings? Is this a situation you can use for this exercise?

Confidentiality:
Your story may become part of an impact research of Phaphama Initiatives. If so, your story will be read and analyzed. In any case, the researchers will not know the author's identity. When parts of your story are included in an evaluation report, all names and references to the author are omitted.

Good luck with this exercise. We are looking forward to meeting you during the workshop. Should you have any questions regarding this exercise or the workshop, feel free to contact us.

Kind regards, Phaphama Initiatives.

Collin
Judy
Jabu

Form T1 with additional questions:

Name:
Date:
Place:

We would like to ask you to do the following exercise:
Describe a conflict that you personally experienced and in which you play (or have played) a central part. Try to describe the situation as specific as possible in the way you understand it now. Think about: what happened? What did you do? What were your thoughts and feelings? Describe the situation as if you would tell it to someone. Your story need not be longer than 20 or 30 lines.

Thank you for taking the effort of writing your story down. To understand your story even better we would like you to answer the following questions: please continue on the next page.

1.What according to you is the cause of the conflict?

2. What is your opinion on 'the other' in your conflict story?

3. If you would encounter a similar conflict situation would you act the same way you did here? Please explain and use examples from your story.

Form T1 with additional questions:

Name:
Date:
Place:

We would like to ask you to do the following exercise:
Describe a conflict that you personally experienced and in which you play (or have played) a central part. Try to describe the situation as specific as possible in the way you understand it now. Think about: what happened? What did you do? What were your thoughts and feelings? Describe the situation as if you would tell it to someone. Your story need not be longer than 20 or 30 lines.

Thank you for taking the effort of writing your story down. To understand your story even better we would like you to answer the following questions: please continue on the next page.

1. What according to you is the cause of the conflict?

2. What is your opinion on 'the other' in your conflict story?

3. If you would encounter a similar conflict situation would you act the same way you did here? Please explain and use examples from your story.

Form T2, meant for individual participants:

Dear participant,

You have recently taken part in a Phaphama workshop. We hope this has been a positive experience. We also hope that this experience continues to live on because it could support a sustained personal development. This development is important both for you as a person as for Phaphama Initiatives as a learning organization. It will help Phaphama to better understand the impact of the workshops and so enables opportunities to learn and make improvements in the workshop.

Telling and re-telling, stories of conflict, is one way to engage in personal and social development. The fact that conflict stories touch upon crucial aspects of these developments indicates that they can also provide valuable insights into these changes. For the reasons mentioned above we want to ask you – as a final exercise of the workshop – to write a second version of the conflict you have described at the beginning of the workshop.

It is important to understand that <u>this is not a test</u>. It is not about "how you would have acted if you had known what you know now", it is about re-describing the conflict you have described beforehand <u>as you remember it NOW</u>.

Exercise:
Describe the conflict, difference of opinion, or quarrel you have described before taking part in the workshop. Try to remember the situation and re-describe it as specific as possible. Describe the situation as if you would tell the story to someone else. What happened? What did you do? What were your thoughts? What did you feel? What did you wish to achieve? Your story need not be longer than 20 or 30 lines.

When you are done writing, we would like to ask you to either send the story by e-mail to ...*(address)*... or by regular mail to ...*(address)*...

The research in which the stories are read keeps the highest standards of confidentiality. Your story will be dealt with respectfully. When elements of your story appear to be helpful in Phaphama's evaluation reports, these elements are inserted without disclosing the author's identity and any possible references to the author are omitted or changed.

Again, we wish you the best of luck with this exercise and we look forward to your story. If you have remaining questions, please feel free to contact us.

With the kindest of regards,

Phaphama Initiatives.

Judy
Jabu
Collin

Form T2 with additional questions:

Name:
Date:
Place:

Everything we experience influences our ideas about our selves, about others and about our relations with others. The impact of these influences may vary and we may not always be aware of the impact. Your participation in the workshop of DiversityJoy can be seen as such an influential experience. We are trying to establish a new perspective on the various ways in which workshop participation affects people's ideas about social interaction. Conflict stories reflect these ideas.

As you will probably remember, you have already described a personally experienced conflict. We would now like to ask you to write a new story about this same conflict. You may wonder about the usefulness of re-describing the same conflict. This may seem strange at first glace but writing a new story on the same conflict, actually involves reconstructing the conflict in a new way. In this process of reconstruction, the story changes in subtle ways that might not even occur to you. These small changes are exactly the things that interest us because they represent the impact of workshop participation.

Re-describe the story about the earlier conflict in a way that you understand it now. Try to be as specific as. Think about: what happened? What did you do? What were your thoughts and feelings? Describe the situation as if you would tell it to someone. Your story need not be longer than 20 or 30 lines.

Thank you for taking the effort of writing your story down. To understand your story even better we would like you to answer the following questions: please continue on the next page.

---

1. What according to you is the cause of the conflict?

2. What is your opinion on 'the other' in your conflict story?

3. If you would encounter a similar conflict situation would you act the same way you did here? Please explain and use examples from your story.

3. The questions that were used up till now to guide the analysis process

---

Individual Analysis Questions 'Twin Story'

Title Story: ....

Version (encircle):   ■   of   ★

Name analyst: ....

Date: ....

This Individual part of the story analysis is, so to say, a preparatory part. It is meant as a catalyst for your analytical skills, as a memory aid, and a source of reverence for the last part of the evaluation. In this part of the analysis we try to prompt you to critical reading and rereading of the text. Answer the questions below, as you understand them. And by the way, it is allowed to enjoy the analysis process; enjoyment is not by definition unscientific. A tip before you start: write clearly so you can read your own thoughts back in the later part of this evaluation. And finally we wish you lots of success and joy.

Concepts explained:
In the analysis questions below we use a few terms, which may need some explanation. With 'the author' we mean the one who has written the conflict story, not the one who is now writing/reading (you). With 'the other' we mean the character that is described (by 'the author') as the 'opponent', the 'opposing' party, or just simply 'the other' within the conflict story.

Responsibility:

1.Does the author take responsibility for his/her part in the conflict? If so, where do you read this in the text, use quotations and line numbers.

Agency:

2.Are there any indications in the text that the author is aware of his own influence on the conflict situation? If so, where do you read this in the text, use quotations and line numbers.

Reflection, empathy, respect:

3.Does the author try to explain the needs, feelings, and actions of the characters, including those of the author him/herself? If so, where do you read this in the text, use quotations and line numbers.

Trust, respect, reflection:

4.Does the author describe the conflict problems as inherent or external to the characters in the story? If so, where do you read this in the text, use quotations and line numbers.

Trust, respect, reflection:

5.How does the author present him/herself and the other? Where do you read this in the text, use quotations and line numbers.

Self:

Other:

Reflection, empathy, respect:

6.Does the author describe feelings, needs, and thoughts? If so, where do you read this in the text, use quotations and line numbers.

Individual Analysis Questions 'Twin-story': The Differences

Important differences:

Choose the, according to you, most important (3 to 5) differences (these can also be story aspects that have not been mentioned yet). Where do you see these differences, use quotations and line numbers. And why did you choose these differences?

1.

2.

3.

Individual Analysis Questions 'Twin Story'

Title Story: ....

Version (encircle):   ■   of   ★

Name analyst: ....

Date: ....

This Individual part of the story analysis is, so to say, a preparatory part. It is meant as a catalyst for your analytical skills, as a memory aid, and a source of reverence for the last part of the evaluation. In this part of the analysis we try to prompt you to critical reading and rereading of the text. Answer the questions below, as you understand them. And by the way, it is allowed to enjoy the analysis process; enjoyment is not by definition unscientific. A tip before you start: write clearly so you can read your own thoughts back in the later part of this evaluation. And finally we wish you lots of success and joy.

Concepts explained:
In the analysis questions below we use a few terms, which may need some explanation. With 'the author' we mean the one who has written the conflict story, not the one who is now writing/reading (you). With 'the other' we mean the character that is described (by 'the author') as the 'opponent', the 'opposing' party, or just simply 'the other' within the conflict story.

Agency:

1.Are there any indications in the text that the author is aware of his **own influence** on the conflict situation? If so, where do you read this in the text, use quotations and line numbers.

Responsibility:

2.Does the author **take responsibility** for his/her part in the conflict, i.e. in the cause management and resolution of the conflict? If so, where do you read this in the text, use quotations and line numbers.

Reflection, empathy, respect:

3.A) Does the author **describe feelings, needs, and thoughts**? If so, where do you read this in the text, use quotations and line numbers.

3.B) Does the author try to give **reasons/explanations for feelings, thoughts, and actions**? If so, where do you read this in the text, use quotations and line numbers.

Trust, respect, reflection:

4.Does the author see the problems as part of the characters' **identities** or as part of their **behavior**, i.e. as bad persons or as persons behaving in a bad way? If so, where do you read this in the text, use quotations and line numbers.

Behavior:

Identity:

Trust, respect, reflection, relational:

5.How does the author **describe him/herself, the others, and their relations**? Where do you read this in the text, use quotations and line numbers.
Self:

Other:

Relations:

4. Discussion on core values

In this initial discussion, we (the researchers) have asked some of the most experienced facilitators of both DiversityJoy and Phaphama to take part and write down what they think are the core values of the AVP program. We have started ourselves with three core values of that we think are important. The others have started from these three. The mentioned core values in the list below are connected to themes from the workshop.

With this discussion we tried to make a start with building a framework that can make the theory behind the program more explicit. Although the program is both rationally and emotionally very well developed there is no real theory written down anywhere. This makes it difficult for an evaluation to make claims about impact if one doesn't know exactly what the goals for instance are (except for very broad goals like helping people). That is why it seemed good to start this discussion within the organizations. Also we hoped that people within the organizations can get a better view of their own basic values, which can than tell a lot about what for instance 'positive change' could mean or what it is exactly that others within the organization see as core values.

Tijl Couzy and Ivar Halfman
1. Trust/Confidence in oneself, and others
(expect the best, communication, cooperation, community, thinking before acting, etc)
2. Responsibility for own actions (feelings and needs) and for relations with others
(cooperation, community, thinking before acting, etc)
3. Respect for self and for others
(equality, looking for a non-violent solution, cooperation, community, thinking before acting, etc)

Judy and Jabu
4. Seeing good in all (including self!) - which would find expression in the "Affirmation" pillar that we use, and which would form a basis for trusting and respecting self and other.
5. "Recognizing our interconnectedness"

Tom
6. Non-judgmental and non-accusing in our communication, as counterpart to taking responsibility for own feelings
and needs.
7. "Openness" to other perspectives
8. Sensitivity (to other people's perspectives and needs)
9. Compassion
10. Trust / safety

Mirjana
11. Self relativisation, self reflectiveness.
12. Seeing alternatives
13. Care for yourself and the other.
14. Willingness to examine own assumptions

This is what came out of our first inquisitive round on 'core values'. What we want with these core values is to assemble a framework. A grouping of social values that function as a catalyst to Constructive Social Interaction. In other words, values, which the AVP community believes, contribute to an increase in Constructive Social Interaction.

What is Constructive Social Interaction?
It is a concept that we came up with to solidify a goal for AVP, and to give this goal a name. 'Constructive Social Interaction' is a concept that has no hard-edged borders, however it has clear qualities and objectives. This form of social interaction focuses on win-win situations, finding non-violent solutions, and aiming for the connection of people, instead of their separation. It tries to supply both individuals and groups with a way of expressing and contributing to their communities and societies. It creates a discourse through which people can feel respected, valued, and affirmed for who they are, Constructive Social Interaction is about making individuals and communities interested in- instead of afraid of 'others'. Words like community, group, nationality, and ethnicity shift from words that are mainly used for exclusion to words that are used for inclusion.

'Constructive' refers to building relationships in which both the interests of 'the other' and of 'the self' are equally represented and weighted. Relationships that enable people to learn from and enjoy interaction with others. Constructive Social Interaction strives for social relations of trust, responsibility, respect and openness.

In our attempts, to assemble the list of mentioned AVP core values to a sensible whole, we came to the following short list of core values and their respective places in a possible framework.

Possible start of a theoretical framework
The two main principles of, the AVP way of thinking, seem to be: '**Seeing good in all**', '**Inter connectedness**'. These two principles are believed to be implicitly present in every human being.

From this it becomes clear that to better cope – in a constructive way – with an increasingly modernizing world (a world that is rapidly becoming more interdependent and divers; religiously, ethnicity wise, culturally, and socio-economically) one needs to start to be aware of these to basic human principles.

The most effective way of making people aware of these principles is believed to be, letting them experience them first hand.

The experience of these two principles is – within the AVP program – achieved by the use of workshops in which these two principles are made explicit through exercises. These exercises make the participants engage in personal interaction with each other. These interactions are guided through the use of different basic psychological themes. Now, these psychological guiding themes seem to be the following ones:

Trust (in self and others)
    Confidence
    Safety
Responsibility (for own actions)
    Reflection
    Control
Respect (for self and others)
    Non-judgmental
    Openness
    Sensitivity
Creativity (finding alternative solutions)

This is as far as the discussion and our thoughts about it have taken us thus far. This makes clear that the discussion is not finished and may well, never be finished while it seems to be an on going process and is likely to change through time.

An interesting drawing that came up during our framing and reframing of these core concepts is the one below. It made sense to us, thinking about these concepts in this way. And it can maybe clarify the different positions the different concepts have, in relation to each other.

Photo of a sketch: Imagined AVP Structure; Psychological expressions & Believed roots