

# New Global Learning



Identity, Culture, Religion, and  
Border Crossings

## Identity, culture, religion, and border crossings

Motion: This House should implement mandatory diversity training in the workplace.

### PART I:

- **Exercise: Group discussion**

The debaters will be divided into small groups of 4 (in case of insufficient number of debaters into groups of two).

Half of each group must come up with as many advantages as possible (without coming up with arguments) and the other half must come up with as many disadvantages as possible.

After 5 minutes, the coach announces that, again as a whole group, they should choose the 1 most important advantage and disadvantage.

Then the coach separately does an analysis with each individual group of their advantages/disadvantages and they look for a reason why they chose that one.

Specifically:

- Why is this advantage/disadvantage more important than others?
- Is it an advantage/disadvantage for only one group (the company as a whole/management/employees)? Or does it affect multiple stakeholders? If so, how?
- Can an advantage also be a disadvantage? (and vice versa)
- Can you think of any other way to achieve this advantage/disadvantage than mandatory diversity training?

- **Exercise: Role play**

The debaters take on the role of a manager and his/her subordinates, where the trainer assigns them successive workplace problems (focusing on cultural and religious differences) and the debaters have to solve them. The trainer assigns some of the model situations to the employees and the manager has to solve them.

After the problem is solved, there is a peer discussion about whether the debaters agree with the solution, what the manager did wrong and what risks the solution brings.

After the discussion, another debater takes the role of the manager, the coach raises another problem and again it is up to the manager to solve it.

Specific situations:

- The collective makes inappropriate jokes about the religion of one of the employees.
- The collective is divided into homogeneous groups by ethnicity. Individuals have difficulty talking to others, they don't know what to talk about.
- Employees complain about one colleague taking leave because of religious holidays, which most of them do not celebrate.

- Some employees bully a new colleague because he does not speak the language as well as others. Some of the team would like to defend the colleague, but they are afraid that they themselves will become victims of bullying.
  
- **Long-term exercise: Reaching out to a company that has already implemented mandatory diversity training**
  - The debaters are divided into several groups (depending on the total number of debaters).
  - Each group will address a specific company that has already implemented diversity training.
  - As part of the collaboration, the debaters would learn the background of the issue, what concrete steps the company has taken and whether it has met expectations, or what problems remain.
  - The debaters would then analyze the situation, look for missteps, good steps, suggest further solutions to persistent problems, and finally evaluate how successful the solution was.
  - Finally, they would present it to the other debaters. All groups would then look for the same parts, compare whether the same results were achieved and if not, why they were not achieved.
  
- PART II: Motions for Further Analysis
  - **THB employees who voluntarily increase their knowledge of diversity should be rewarded above and beyond their salary.**
    - Currently, employees are rewarded with other benefits (pension contributions, multisport cards, my-day off, etc.) in addition to their salary. These benefits are linked to their work performance and the fulfillment of their duties. If this were in place, they would be rewarded with these and other benefits (e.g. priority in training programmes over others) if they showed improvement, or an effort to improve in accepting cultural differences. For example, through voluntary e-learning courses or other training programmes.
    - This solution could bring higher intrinsic motivation to work with diversity and improve oneself.
  
  - **THS implement peer-to-peer programs to improve understanding of diversity in companies.**
    - Peer-to-peer programmes on a variety of bases have shown greater long-term effectiveness than traditional training programmes (especially among young people). By introducing this P2P system in companies, employees would be more motivated to participate in the running of the company, improving internal relations and integrating the team. There could be P2P training among employees. When everyone would be interested in a topic close to them and would educate their colleagues.

Another option is P2P, in which employees who better understand cultural differences would coach those employees who show gaps. They, in turn, would not be afraid to approach them with a problem or ignorance because their colleagues would not be able to punish them (unlike their supervisor).

This system could be a less violent alternative that would be more accepted by employees.

## Motion

This House would introduce compulsory lessons of all religions in school.

## Context

In a context of increasing religious diversity and pluralism, concerns have been raised about the lack of knowledge and understanding of different religious traditions among young people. As a result of globalisation, are countries that have traditionally been religiously homogeneous increasing the penetration of smaller religious movements and beliefs. (e.g. in countries that were almost exclusively Christian is increasing number of Muslims, or various non-Abrahamic religions such as Buddhism or Taoism. Many more people are also converting from mainline churches to smaller and reformist streams.)

The problem is mainly not knowing the differences between the each religions and the resulting fears. This is mainly due to inappropriate teaching that focuses only on the main religious stream(s) or omits teaching religion altogether. All of this is cropland for the populists.

Compulsory religion lessons in schools may help with this, but also it have some risks.

Firstly, replacing the teaching of religion in history or social science classes will allow more time to be devoted to the core content of the curriculum (history, behaviour, sociology, etc.). It will also allow more focus on the quality of teaching of each religion and describe everything more accurately.

Problem could be the quality of teachers and the way how they teach. There will be needed enough amount of professionals in their field of study. Also will be needed to check if the the way of teaching is not one-sided or discrediting a religion.

## What is the problem or decision to be made?

In the debate must be compared the risk of the misrepresentation and misunderstanding of facts that is already happening, with potential risk of inadequate and purposefully discrediting the teaching of religion if lessons would introduced. The benefits of new knowledges from the religion lessons, time for the filling other subjects and quality of tuition should also be aimed, as same as they must determine how much the state/other higher power should intervene to improve their awareness.

## What are the burdons?

Prop:

Addressing the risk of low quality of teachers' knowledge about religion. Also find a way to supervise teachers so that they do not discriminate against certain religions.

Op:

Proving that the quality of teaching (and other control) is difficult to implement, also that there will be a lack of motivation and time to teach students, and may damage their own beliefs.

## What are the competing proposals?

	<b>Compulsory lessons in school (PROP)</b>	<b>Status Quo (OPP)</b>
<b>Who?</b>	Governments in the countries of the functioning democracies, activists supporting inclusion, progressive citizens.	Governments in the countries of the functioning democracies, activists against inclusion, conservatives citizens.
<b>What?</b>	Introducing compulsory lessons of all religions in schools, education of youth and teachers for less stereotyped society. Frequency of lessons depends on grade.	Education based on the voluntariness of individuals, leaving powers only within the limits of individual school curricula.
<b>When?</b>	This policy will be implemented during the upcoming next school year with government oversight in the early years.	
<b>How it would look like in practice?</b>	Quite similar to other school subjects such as PE, history or maths. At least one hour once a week (or equivalent). Depending on type of a school, grade or the fervor of schoolchildren.	Much like the status quo (or nearly so), where the teaching of religion depends on individual governments, schools, teachers and students. All based on voluntariness and willingness to learn.
<b>Exclude extremes</b>	The proposition would not support forced adoption/rejection of religion and would adhere to basic human rights.	Shouldn't support ban on religion in schools (include SQ as e.g. teaching religion in history classes), or teaching just some of the religions by the non-objective way. But the freedom of religion and faith should be maintained.



<b>Examples or analogies</b>	In the Norway is taught the subject „Religion and Ethics“ which should combines the study of religion with the study of philosophy and ethics.	Brainwashing by extremist groups teaching religion (eg in Hungary) where it cause increasing of prejudice and fear of other religions.
------------------------------	--	--

## Possible Arguments

### Proposition:

**Claim: Introducing compulsory lessons of all religions in schools addresses the need for cultural and religious literacy, fostering a more inclusive society.**

Justification: Today, cultural and religious diversity is increasingly common and requires greater education about differences, how to understand them and the context. By making teaching about all religions compulsory, schools can equip pupils with the knowledge and understanding necessary to navigate and appreciate different cultural perspectives. For example, students who receive comprehensive religious education may demonstrate greater cultural sensitivity and a more inclusive worldview.

Evidence: A study “Let There Be Light!” was focusing on the implications of teaching about religion to sixth grade students at a public charter school. One of the judgement was, that the teaching about religions have potential to undermine the important differences and to undertake a more multicultural approach to teaching about religion.

**Claim: Introducing compulsory lessons of all religions in schools respects the right to religious freedom and promotes cultural understanding and tolerance.**

Justification: In a democratic society, individuals have the right to practice their religion freely. By providing compulsory education about all religions, schools uphold this fundamental right while also fostering cultural understanding and tolerance among students. This approach aligns with the principles of inclusivity and respect for diversity.

Example: Some countries like Norway have implemented inclusive religious education programs that aim to promote mutual respect and intercultural dialogue. Teaching practices causes that religious education positively influence students respect diversity and enhanced their understanding.

**Claim: The introduction of compulsory religion lessons increases the potential use of other subjects.**

Justification: In subjects that are now more or less concerned with religion (mainly history and social sciences), religion, if sufficiently addressed, occupies a significant part of the lesson allocation. If religion classes were given their own subject that did not interfere with the others, students would not be deprived of material from the original subjects that took a back seat to the teaching of religion in subjects not so closely related to it.

### Opposition:

**Claim: Introducing compulsory lessons of all religions in schools raises concerns about indoctrination, favoritism, and the blurring of the separation between religion and education.**

Justification: Mandating lessons on all religions may inadvertently result in biased or partial teaching, favoring certain faiths over others. This can lead to perceptions of religious indoctrination and compromise the neutrality that schools should maintain in providing education.

Example: This concern can be observed in the controversy surrounding religious education in some regions of the United States or some countries in the European Union, where critics argue that the curriculum heavily favors Christianity, potentially marginalizing students from other religious backgrounds.

**Claim: Mandating lessons on all religions in schools may contradict the principle of the rights of students to follow their own religious or non-religious beliefs.**

Justification: Parents have the right to raise their children in accordance with their own religious beliefs and values, and students have the right to freely exercise their freedom of opinions. Compulsory religious lessons can infringe upon these rights and impose teachings that conflict with the values and beliefs held by families.

Example: In some strict legislative countries might happen legal battles over compulsory religious education.

**Claim: Introducing compulsory lessons of all religions can lead to conflicts in families, and potential marginalization of religious minority groups.**

Justification: The inclusion of religious education that focuses predominantly on the majority religion or inadequately covers minority beliefs may create an environment that exclude and discriminate. This can result in social divisions, tensions, and a sense of marginalization among students from religious minority backgrounds.

Example, in certain regions with a dominant religious majority, students from religious minority backgrounds may face challenges in fully expressing their own beliefs during religion lessons or may feel a lack of representation and understanding.



## Motion

This house believes that EU countries should have a united focus on cultural inclusion of refugees from outside the EU.

## Context

Over the last few years, the EU has faced an increasing influx of migrants from outside the EU every year. Although the EU has been united in accepting refugees, it is not so united in terms of subsequent inclusion and proper integration into society. This means that some countries manage it better than others. This proposal envisages the unification of all integration procedures throughout the EU.

Everything would be unified, from the process of registering new residents in national insurance systems, to a uniform curriculum in language programmes, to the unification of the job search process. Under a unified process, it is expected that integration will be better managed and that there will be no risk of localities with unmanaged integration.

On the other hand, an individual approach by each country may in some ways be more advantageous, as each country can better adapt to specific points. Be it the diversity of newcomers, to differences in education systems, job search or other differences in the system.

## What is the problem or decision to be made?

The key question is whether a unified approach to the entire integration process can raise the level and avoid the risk of unmanaged migration. Or whether it is more sensible to leave all organizational competencies to the individual states, when it must also be taken into account whether there would be any positive change at all.

## What are the burdens?

Prop:

Demonstrate why the current system does not work, the benefits of a changed inclusion process and how it would be more effective than the current system.

Op:

Prove that the process of adapting a unified system would take a long time, was inefficient and did not take into account the individual needs and differences of each country's system.

## What are the competing proposals?

	<b>Legal labour migration (PROP)</b>	<b>Status Quo (OPP)</b>
--	--------------------------------------	-------------------------

<b>Who?</b>	Leaders of the EU that will delegate orders to the governments of member states.	The governments of the EU countries themselves.
<b>What?</b>	United implementing of policies providing resources, and fostering integration measures to ensure that refugees are included and supported in their new communities.	EU countries should have an independent ways of cultural inclusion of refugees from outside the EU, by the best sources of every single EU country.
<b>When?</b>	This policy should be put in place as soon as possible to make it as effective as possible. January 2024 seems to be a concrete and realistic number.	
<b>How it would look like in practice?</b>	The proposition would lead to united developed comprehensive integration programs for refugees, language courses structures, cultural orientation, and access to education and employment opportunities. Countries should work together on allocating sources, share results and establish supportive networks to ensure a unified and effective approach to the best cultural inclusion.	As a unified process is too inefficient (implementation would be lengthy and expensive), it is better for countries to have their own way of integration. Countries cooperate only on the immigration process. Each country achieves its integration goals independently of the others, according to the needs of each group of new immigrants, which allows to take into account the different functioning of each country's systems (insurance, medical care, employment office).
<b>Exclude extremes</b>	The proposition should not bring unrealistic ideas, such as that without a unified integration process, integration is completely dysfunctional. It should show why unified is better than individual. It must also take into account the fact that it is supposed to be unified across EU countries, but not exactly the same behavior.	The opposition cannot bring unrealistic scenarios, conspiracies and populist claims. It cannot say that the whole integration process should be abolished or that it is unrealistic to introduce it. It has to demonstrate that it is more effective for the government to have its own programme, which is more flexible and adaptive.

<b>Examples or analogies</b>	EU countries are already setting up specialized refugee centers that provide unified education integration programs, help people settle in the region, etc.	As outlined in the proposal. Some countries already have integration processes, but on an individual basis. If they were ineffective, they would call more for unification, but this way they have them set according to their needs and preferences. Thus, they are proving their functionality.
------------------------------	---	---

## Possible Arguments

### Proposition:

**Claim: A united focus on cultural inclusion of refugees promotes social cohesion and reduces the risk of intergroup tensions.**

Justification: By actively fostering cultural inclusion, EU countries can create an environment where refugees feel welcomed and accepted, reducing the potential for social divisions and conflicts.

Example: Inclusive integration policies in Germany resulted in higher social cohesion in german mindset towards refugees.

**Claim: United inclusion processes reduces costs for each countries.**

Justification: Individual countries will not have to come up with their own development of education materials, devising their own projects, complex staff structures and other complexities that are costly to implement. Another benefit is that it would be easier to relocate individual staff between offices within a country or even abroad if necessary. They would not have to learn everything completely from scratch, but they would already have the basic knowledge.

Evidence: Some large organisational structures that need to work as efficiently as possible already operate under unified rules. Within NATO, thanks to unified procedures, it is possible for a Czech group of soldiers to be commanded by a German officer and still be able to work as efficiently as an American unit. And it is because of the unified procedures.

**Claim: Cultural inclusion aligns with the values of human rights and equality.**

Justification: The United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights emphasizes the right to cultural participation and non-discrimination. By prioritizing cultural inclusion, EU countries uphold these fundamental rights and demonstrate a commitment to equality and fairness. Additionally, cultural inclusion fosters empathy and understanding among diverse populations, promoting a more inclusive and harmonious society.

### Opposition:

**Claim: A united focus on cultural inclusion of refugees may divert resources from addressing internal social and economic challenges.**

Justification: Prioritizing cultural inclusion initiatives for refugees from outside the EU may strain already limited resources, hindering efforts to address existing social and economic issues within EU countries. They believe that allocating resources towards internal challenges such as unemployment or poverty would have a more direct and immediate impact on the well-being of citizens.

Example: Lack of financial sources in some countries, which can't focus on refugee crisis (e.g. Romania or Bulgaria).

**Claim: Cultural inclusion of refugees may dilute national identities and cultural values.**

Justification: United cultural integration of refugees can lead to a dilution or erosion of national identities and cultural values in EU countries, as it does not respect the country's original social sensibilities and ties. A focus on uniform acceptance of different cultures can obscure the need to preserve and protect the cultural heritage and traditions of host societies, which do not take uniform practices into account as much as individual countries..

**Claim: A forced cultural assimilation of refugees into European societies may lead to social tensions and conflicts.**

Justification: A united focus on cultural integration of refugees that ignores the differences between countries has the potential to cause social tensions and conflicts between European countries. Allowing for more individualised systemic approaches better takes into account the different needs and capacities of different EU Member States, thereby reducing the risk of social divisions and conflicts.

## Motion

This House believes that the lack of knowledge of culturally and economically different countries is the major cause of human trafficking.

## Context

Human trafficking is a global problem that affects millions of people every year and, according to international organizations, could affect as many as 49 million people (STOP THE TRAFFIK UK.org). Often it is linked to economic and cultural factors which with the lack of knowledge and understanding of differences are major contributing factor to human trafficking. Because people are not aware of these differences, the problems and everything that causes them, they do not have trafficking as a priority. If we agree that this is the main reason, we should start to address this issue and get rid of it.

On the other hand, the cause can also be seen in purely selfish economic interests of groups. The second view works with the principle that people are aware of these differences, but put their private (mainly economic) interests above the value of human life. One could say that because there is demand, there is also supply. The solution, therefore, may not be to raise awareness of difference, but to try to focus on fighting the market in people. Specifically on the desire and opportunity to buy someone (for whatever purpose - often slave or other inappropriate work)..

## What is the problem or decision to be made?

The most important thing is to identify the root cause of trafficking. Specifically, whether the root cause is a lack of knowledge or a human desire to buy a person. This involves understanding the underlying dynamics and root causes of trafficking in order to inform effective strategies and interventions to combat it.

## What are the burdens?

Prop:

Establish the link between lack of knowledge and human trafficking. To show that lack of awareness trivializes the whole problem and therefore that only when people understand the links will they tend to fight it.

Op:

Prove that awareness is sufficient but not the root cause of trafficking. The fundamental problem is that people are not sufficiently aware that even today someone wants to buy a human being. So we have to fight the demand, then the supply will disappear on its own.

## What are the competing proposals?

	<b>Helping on changes in public (PROP)</b>	<b>Alternative ways of helping (OPP)</b>
--	--	--

<b>Who?</b>	Activist organisations, schools and governments of countries where human rights are respected.	Activist organisations, schools and governments of countries where human rights are respected.
<b>What?</b>	To bring about changes in public perception, to strengthen interest in trafficking itself and to awaken the public's desire and willingness to address it.	To show society that the demand exists so that they take it as a serious threat. And consequently, to force society to put more pressure on governments, multinational organisations and international communities to ensure that countries suffering from trafficking do not allow the conditions for it.
<b>When?</b>	This could happen at any time and should continue until the problem is sufficiently resolved.	
<b>How it would look like in practice?</b>	Prioritizing efforts in understanding of culturally and economically different countries. (includes implementing educational programs, awareness campaigns, and cross-border collaboration initiatives to address the knowledge gap)	Emphasising the importance of addressing factors such as the political capacity to intervene against trafficking in some countries (due to weak legal systems or corruption) and prioritising measures that directly target service providers to traffickers. The method is similar, namely through lectures, educational programs and awareness campaigns.
<b>Exclude extremes</b>	Avoid the attitude that the sole and exclusive cause of human trafficking is ignorance of culturally and economically different countries. You may admit that it is not the only one, but it is the most important one.	Avoid completely dismissing the role of knowledge and understanding, for example, by claiming that there is no need to improve. You should acknowledge that the economic situation may be the reason, but insist on your demand and supply reason.

<b>Examples or analogies</b>	<p>A scenario in which a person walks through the darkness at night. His ignorance of the dangers of unfamiliar terrain puts him at a higher risk of harm, so he may struggle. If he knew what dangers might arise, he would prepare for them and actively fight them. Similarly, his lack of knowledge about cultural and economic differences does not compel him to do anything about it. If he knew more, he would have more reason to do something about it.</p>	<p>Classical valid economic theory of supply and demand. When demand for something rises, it causes supply to rise. When demand completely disappears, supply disappears. When demand is not allowed to arise, the market does not arise.</p>
------------------------------	---	---

## Possible Arguments

### Proposition:

#### **Claim: Lack of cultural and economic knowledge leads to recruitment channels**

Justification: Insufficient understanding of culturally and economically different countries creates recruitment channels for traffickers. Traffickers exploit the vulnerabilities arising from the lack of knowledge to deceive and manipulate potential victims. For example, they may falsely promise job opportunities or marriage prospects in countries with different cultural norms, taking advantage of victims' limited understanding to trap them in exploitative situations.

Example: Traffickers often target individuals from economically disadvantaged backgrounds or regions with limited access to education and information. For example, child trafficking is a serious problem in some African countries that suffer from a lack of education and poverty in general. Whether it is the sale of children to paramilitary organisations or sex slaves.

#### **Claim: Duty to promote cultural understanding and respect**

Justification: It is our moral duty to foster cultural understanding and respect for the values and rights of individuals from different countries. Lack of knowledge about culturally and economically different countries hinders our ability to recognize and respect their rights, leading to potential exploitation. By prioritizing knowledge, we can uphold the values of human rights, diversity, and equality.

Example: The Universal Declaration of Human Rights emphasizes the importance of cultural rights and the need for mutual understanding and respect among nations. By promoting knowledge and understanding of different cultures, we can contribute to the fulfillment of these rights and ensure that individuals are protected from exploitation and trafficking.

It is our moral duty to foster cultural understanding and respect for the values and rights of individuals from different countries. Lack of knowledge about culturally and economically different countries hinders our ability to recognize and respect their rights, leading to



potential exploitation. By prioritizing knowledge, we can uphold the values of human rights, diversity, and equality.

### **Opposition:**

**Claim: Human trafficking is influenced by multiple factors beyond the lack of knowledge about culturally and economically different countries.**

Justification: Human trafficking is a complex phenomenon that is influenced by a number of socio-economic, political and individual vulnerabilities. It is important to recognise that factors such as poverty, gender inequality, armed conflict and weak governance also contribute significantly to the prevalence of trafficking. Focusing only on knowledge gaps misses these root causes and limits our understanding of the broader dynamics. If the problems of living standards were addressed, then there would be no reason to even create trafficking as a tool to improve the economic situation.

Evidence: International organizations (e.g. the UN) highlights the role of extreme poverty and lack of job opportunities as key drivers of labor trafficking.

**Claim: Lack of demand constraints in countries where trading occurs.**

Justification: Because there are insufficient legal measures in countries that suffer from trafficking (and there is a lack of sanctions) it allows the market environment for trafficking to persist and expand. Lack of awareness of the existence of demand and arable land for it means that demand is kept high. If people knew that this was a real problem, they could more effectively apply pressure to curb demand.

## Motion

This House should implement mandatory diversity training in the workplace..

## Context

Nowadays, it is common for employees from different backgrounds to work together in the workplace. It is important that employees have an understanding of the specific needs of others to reduce the risk of shock and exclusion from the team (which could lead to a breach of the law).

Diversity training raises awareness of the differences of individuals through lectures, instructional videos, tests (anonymous), or other (Attend a Minority Culture Day). Training raises awareness of different cultures, religions, etc. Most of the time the training is conducted by a member of the HR department or a specialized outsider to reduce the risk of violating employment regulations.

An alternative to this can be voluntary training only, or to leave the raising to the collective itself, where it is assumed that the classical communication about the life of the co-workers will increase the education. It works with the principle that when something is mandatory people have a resistance to it, when something is done voluntarily the chances of achieving a result are higher.

## What is the problem or decision to be made?

For companies working with people from different backgrounds (which is more and more these days), the need for acceptance of other cultures is important. The question is whether diversity training can increase acceptance of other cultures and their needs or, on the contrary, increase the risk of discrimination and exclusion. Or whether being left on the collective without training is an appropriate alternative.

## What are the burdens?

Prop:

Demonstrate that mandatory training will not be resisted because people do not like to do something because it is mandatory; that there will be no discrimination because of differences (which they would not have known about before/because without the differences they would not have had to take the training).

Op:

Prove that mandatory training is met with resistance because people don't like to do something because it is mandatory; that there is no discrimination because of differences (that they wouldn't have known about before/because without the differences they wouldn't have had to take the training).

## What are the competing proposals?

	<b>Mandatory trainings (PROP)</b>	<b>Voluntary trainings - SQ (OPP)</b>
--	-----------------------------------	---------------------------------------

<b>Who?</b>	Management of companies and governments in the countries of the European Union and the United States.	Employees and unions of companies in the countries of the European Union and the United States.
<b>What?</b>	Introducing mandatory diversity training programs to increase awareness of cultural diversity and provide employees with the necessary tools to work effectively in a multicultural workplace.	Diversity training programs only on voluntary basis of companies, their management or employees unions.
<b>When?</b>	This policy will be implemented in the near future, after appropriate planning and preparation.	
<b>How it would look like in practice?</b>	Mandatory training would happen at the time of employment and every year thereafter. Similar to the current training on workplace safety and fire regulations. Failure to attend (and subsequent failure to train) would be taken as a gross breach of work discipline, which could lead to dismissal.	Employees could receive voluntary training at any time during their employment, even several times a year (depending on company policy). Training would be during working hours. The normal conversation (not just about differences) would be through chit-chat during breaks, as it already is.
<b>Exclude extremes</b>	Stakeholders (minorities, followers of different religions, victims of bullying) would not be specifically named or highlighted during the training. The aim is to prevent them from being targeted by negative interest from co-workers that could lead to exclusion from the collective.	Avoid the strategy of claiming that the Proposition only offers training but nothing more, whereas the Opposition offers much more. It is not a fair approach to debate. Moreover, the proposition could respond by offering not only training but other follow-up programmes. It would be a vicious circle. Argumentation must only be within the bounds of debate and not go to extremes.

<b>Examples or analogies</b>	<p>This is similar to occupational health and safety training. Overall, hands-on training is the best way to get better at it. Outside specialist firms with behavioural experts may be interested in this to provide training to a higher standard.</p>	<p>The concept of self-directed learning could be taken over, where individuals take responsibility for their own growth and understanding of cultural diversity through personal experiences and interactions.</p>
------------------------------	--	---

## Possible Arguments

### Proposition:

**Claim: Mandatory diversity training programs are necessary to address cultural differences and promote inclusivity in the workplace.**

Justification: Cultural differences can lead to misunderstandings, conflicts, and decreased productivity in a multicultural workplace. Mandatory diversity training programs provide employees with the necessary knowledge and skills to navigate these differences effectively, fostering a more inclusive and harmonious work environment, which leads to higher effectivity.

Evidence: A study by Kalev, Dobbin, and Kelly (2006) examined the impact of diversity training on workplace attitudes and behaviors. The researchers were been focusing how much mandatory diversity training programs led to a significant reduction in biases and increased understanding of different cultural perspectives among employees.

**Claim: Implementing mandatory diversity training programs aligns with the values of equality, fairness, and respect for individuals' rights in the workplace.**

Justification: Companies have a duty to ensure a respectful and inclusive work environment where all employees have equal opportunities to thrive. By implementing mandatory diversity training programs, they are demonstrating their willingness to make this a reality. Because people's mindsets are usually not as open to voluntary activities and can lead to lower levels of fulfillment of this in the workplace, as a bullying or other form of discrimination.

Example: In the USA is a state agency EEOC (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission) which supervisors the equal opportunities in the workplaces. During the debate could be used opinions of their investigative reports or knowledges. (e.g: <https://www.eeoc.gov/newsroom/eeoc-launches-diversity-equity-inclusion-dei-workshop-series>).

**Claim: Mandatory training helps more because of higher participation.**

Justification: The problem with voluntary training programs is lower participation than mandatory programs because some employees see them as wasted time that takes away from real work. Mandatory training ensures that all employees are engaged in the material being discussed and as actively as possible. This increased participation improves understanding of differences and will lead to a higher level of cooperation in the organization.

## **Opposition:**

### **Claim: Mandatory diversity training programs may be ineffective in addressing cultural differences and promoting inclusivity in the workplace.**

Justification: The effectiveness of mandatory diversity training programs may be flawed, because their might brought mixed results. Diversity training can point out the problematic questions in the workplace, which will give them higher value than it should have and other will focus on them. The effects of it could lead to discrimination (of cultural or religious minorities), or even to overstepping the law.

Example: The effect of noticing something negative only when it is pointed out comes from childhood. Until a negative is pointed out by a stranger, people usually ignore it. But then they focus on it, creating more pressure (and therefore more bullying).

### **Claim: Mandatory diversity training can interfere with individuals' personal beliefs.**

Justification: While promoting inclusivity is important, mandatory diversity training programs can be seen as coercive and restrict the rights of individuals to hold different views or beliefs. It is dangerous not to cross the line between diversity training and discrimination. It may be better to respect the autonomy of individuals and allow open dialogue without mandating mandatory training programmes.

### **Claim: Implementing mandatory training programs can lead to unintended consequences.**

Justification: Psychology suggests that people generally have a strong psychological reactance to being told what to do, even though they are generating resistance against it. When something is mandatory it infringes upon the sense of autonomy and freedom of choice and people have higher tend to sabotage it result. Better way is to implement voluntary trainings, against which employees will not have so strong resistance. Furthermore it may increase the will to educate more about differences, because employees may take it when they want and take it as a rest activity.