

UNDERSTANDING

POWER

DYNAMICS

ARTICLES

GLOSSARY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

WITHIN

CHARITABLE

ORGANISATION

GOVERNANCE

France-Belgium Cooperation

Brûlant·e·s & Comme un Lundi

CONTENTS

P.05 **Section 01 | Preface**

P.06 **Section 02 | Articles**

Acknowledgment and participation of minority groups	P.07
Gender issues in charitable organisations	P.10
Precarity	P.13
Transparency in shared governance	P.15
The place of the board of directors in shared governance.....	P.18
Shared governance, an ongoing process.....	P.21

P.24 **Section 03 | Glossary**

Governance.....	P.25
Sexist and sexual violence and harassment	P.32
Discrimination	P.40

P.44 **Section 04 | Bibliography**

01/

Preface

The values of the charitable sector and, more generally, social purpose organisations, such as justice, equality, and solidarity, are easily identifiable. These organisations are not immune to the inequalities that exist in society, though. There are also hierarchical relationships, prejudice, and differences in representation, usually to the detriment of the coherence between the stated principles and actual internal practices.

It is in response to this observation that the Co-lab' project was born; from a desire to better understand the dynamics of discrimination in the non-profit field, it aims to provide concrete tools for reflection and transformation to the organisations involved. The project is structured around three main axes: governance, management, and the reproduction of discriminatory systems and behaviours.

The initiative offered consultation workshops that would bring together professionals from the field to discuss the issues encountered, experiences, and best practices established. The outcomes of these discussions were then presented as a podcast to ensure that this debate was widely spread.

Multiple objectives are pursued: on the one hand, to analyse the problems associated with power management in teams and, on the other, promote networking among organisations that have comparable issues. Additionally, the project aims to increase the organisations' directors, staff, board members, and volunteers' awareness of the vulnerabilities. Moreover, it attempts to guarantee everyone's tangible involvement in decision-making and to increase knowledge of current power relations among all stakeholders.

The Co-lab' project is situated within a comparative and transnational perspective. This initiative, coordinated by Brûlant·e·s in France and Comme un Lundi in Belgium, allows cross-examination of experiences from two contexts, identifying common structural patterns and highlighting divergences specific to each national environment.

Thus, this project makes a significant addition to a still-unformalised reflection on the conditions required in order to create organisations that are consistent with the ideals they defend.

02 /

6 articles exploring power dynamics in charitable organisations

We organised two series of consultation workshops in Vitry-sur-Seine, France, and in Brussels, Belgium, bringing together various charity representatives. The Brûlant·e·s workshops were co-facilitated with the trainer Nora El Massioui. The sessions focused on the role of those directly affected within organisations, and on how organisational structure and decision-making processes can perpetuate racism, classism and sexism.

In Belgium, the workshops centred on the challenges raised by the implementation of shared governance.

These meetings led to the birth of six articles. Each article explores a theme arising from the discussions and shared observations during the workshops, and proposes concrete courses of action to transform our governance practices. Three of the articles were written by Gabrielle Donier (France); the other three were written by Christophe Devue (Belgium). These insights can also be found in episode 0 of our podcast series “Co-Lab”, available on our SoundCloud¹ and YouTube channels².

¹ <https://soundcloud.com/brulant-e-s/sets/co-lab-penser-les-rapports-de>

² <http://youtube.com/watch?v=VdHzfI0Me7Q>

Acknowledgment and participation of minority groups

Brûlant•e•s, by Gabriel•le

The charitable sector usually defines itself through its values of exemplarity and social justice. However, this ethical appearance frequently conceals the perpetuation of the injustices that shape society. Charities and non-profit organisations, far from being sanctuaries of impartiality, contain power dynamics relating to gender, racism, and socioeconomic class. As a result, internal organisation can generate forms of psychological suffering, particularly for those who find themselves at the intersection of several of these oppressions.

«The inequality within these systems stems from horizontal segregation, which keeps decision-making levers in the hands of dominant individuals despite a pretense of variety.»

The inequality within these systems stems from horizontal segregation, which keeps decision-making levers in the hands of dominant individuals despite a pretense of variety. Laura, an employee at an education organisation for young people in the French region of Occitanie, describes a "board of directors led by old white cisgender men who spoke for her every day about her fieldwork," highlighting an ageing male elite's control of speech and strategy, particularly in rural areas. While these governing bodies exercise decision-making authority, people from minority groups are frequently assigned to field or "care" duties.

By confining them to managing social distress and operational roles, these organisations perpetuate a division of labour that effectively excludes discriminated profiles from the true spheres of influence.

Structural injustice is all the more rigid because the transition from the field to decision-making bodies is never truly planned, creating an almost insurmountable glass ceiling. This blockage is confirmed by Laura, who observes that in the non-profit sector, "many women are in coordinator positions, but not in those of leadership," emphasising that while they are the driving force behind actions, they "stagnate very quickly" without career prospects. By boasting about superficial inclusion without offering concrete means for skill development or power sharing, institutions retain the concerned persons' essentially symbolic presence. Due to a lack of acknowledgement of this statutory evolution, field actors remain excluded from strategic orientations, leaving governance in the hands of an elite disconnected from the grassroots.

At the heart of this issue lies the notion of mental and racial burden. For marginalised actors, getting involved in the charitable sector is more than just carrying out professional or activist missions; it is accompanied by persistent emotional and educational overwork. These individuals are burdened with the sole responsibility of the institution's inclusive transformation. This mechanism creates an asymmetry, as the governance (often composed of privileged groups) reaps the symbolic fruits of an "inclusive" image, while it is the marginalised members who provide the constant effort of vigilance, correction, and education among their peers. Those involved are frequently

asked to perform their experiences or identities in order to legitimise the organisation's acts. Their presence then serves as a moral guarantee or a "diversity label" to reassure their funders or the public, whereas their opinions have no real weight in strategic decisions.

By assigning the emotional responsibility for anti-racist pedagogy to the affected individuals, the structure avoids systemic questioning. Rather than examining its own power systems, it uses oppressed people's experiences to provide a free educational resource. From then on, the concept of "taking care" becomes an outward-facing communication slogan, a humanistic showcase that finds no resonance in internal practices.

LEVERS FOR CHANGE

Institutional reflexivity must now be implemented in order to break down power systems and move beyond an illusion of neutrality. As Laura points out, this strategy necessitates a close examination of social profiles and identities within the organisation, despite her acknowledgement that this practice "can make workers vulnerable." For her, it is a critical lever for measuring how inequalities are normalised and so combating "ordinary racism and sexism." Such analysis requires governance acknowledging that its social position affects its perspective of priorities, necessitating a genuine redistribution of representation responsibilities. By changing the material frameworks and speech procedures, the institution may ultimately translate this understanding into concrete accessibility, ensuring that decisions are no longer taken at the expense of the most vulnerable people.

«The sociogram is a strategic tool for highlighting the impact of internal group dynamics and concealed exclusion mechanisms within the ruling circle.»

The sociogram is a strategic tool for highlighting the impact of internal group dynamics and concealed exclusion mechanisms within the ruling circle. Unlike the official organisational chart, this tool maps the reality of human connec-

tions, revealing who holds real power and who ends up isolated. For Laura, the sociogram is an essential measurement tool: she methodically advocates for its use as an "indicator" to compare professional gains based on social profiles, arguing that it helps to "realise the inequalities [in place]" beyond simply collecting testimonies. Although she admits that its introduction is complex because it forces everyone to "become aware of their own privileges," she insists its integration is necessary in order to move from simple observation to proper action. By exposing the closed chains associated with social identities, the sociogram enables the organisation to fix internal imbalances and turn theoretical equality into a reality.

Without a formal framework, the voices of marginalised individuals are collected, but the final ruling remains exclusively within management, who selects what to preserve. To disrupt this mechanism of instrumentalisation, transparency must become a structural lever. Decision-making should run through explicit validation circuits, instead of relying only on the most privileged actors and traditional hierarchy. An isolating environment as such, promotes restricted decision-making circles in which class biases reinforce one another, to the cost of true representativity. This is how transparency can transform an organisation; it shifts its structure from a management mode based on privilege to a system of collective responsibility where every decision can be questioned and contested.

In this context, HR functions must be established as a strategic pillar, going beyond mere awareness in order to ensure real security for its organisation's members. Laura believes that simply "understanding gender inequalities" is insufficient; instead, she emphasises the necessity to "rethink the entire structure of the organisation," from its mission statement to the reception and employer functions. She laments a tendency toward superficial solutions, which workers frequently do not support, although it is "important to name systemic discrimination and identify concrete issues."

«By including the structural dimension of oppressions such

as racism, sexism, and classism into the analysis of psychosocial risks (PSR), HR functions move from reducing individual suffering to meaningful group safeguarding.»

By including the structural dimension of oppressions such as racism, sexism, and classism into the analysis of psychosocial risks (PSR), HR functions move from reducing individual suffering to meaningful group safeguarding. This transformation requires the structure of protected spaces for dialogue and external audits capable of identifying the specific mechanisms of wear and tear affecting marginalised individuals and redefining the stance of all employees.

Gender issues in charitable organisations

Brûlant•e•s, by Gabriel•le

Gender and racial discrimination are present in the relational dynamics of these organisations, even those that claim to be inclusive. This reality, which is frequently reflected through sexist, classist, and racist remarks, is especially prevalent within charitable organisations, since these discriminations are based on relational and professional dynamics. The power structures represent a process of systemic oppression. This is defined as a mode of sustained domination, rooted in an ideology that hierarchises social groups to legitimise subordination. Understanding this system requires integrating the concept of a "continuum." This concept illustrates that violence is created from interdependent links in a chain, rather than separate episodes. These manifestations, whether institutional or ordinary, feed into one another to normalize power dynamics. By making oppression invisible through its repetition in all social spaces, this continuum ensures the reproduction and perpetuation of a system of domination.

« Despite their discourse of equality and social justice, charitable organisations perpetuate a gendered division of labour in which important positions (political representation, financial ruling, presidency, and management) are dominated by men. »

Despite their discourse of equality and social justice, charitable organisations perpetuate a gendered division of labour in which important positions (political representation, financial

ruling, presidency, and management) are dominated by men. According to a nationwide report published in 2025 and funded by the French trade union HEXOPÉE and the French government's Directorate of Youth, Popular Education, and Associative Life (DJEPVA), the sector is heavily represented by women, accounting for approximately 70% of total employees. This overrepresentation is particularly striking in the fields related to care and reception, under the direct influence of the health and social sector. Based on statistics, women hold 79% of positions in healthcare, 76% in medical-social accommodation, and 94% in home care within the social sector without housing.

We frequently see this same hierarchy: a few men founded and/or command the structure, while women and other gender minorities undertake the majority of the daily tasks. Based on her volunteer work with local organisations in her county, Julie argues that this discrepancy calls into question the viability of "male management" in an egalitarian framework. She advocates for a "shared feminist governance" that, while time-consuming, improves the "quality of action taken on the ground by involving each member in a constant process of questioning." According to her, it is essential to move away from the model where a male minority decides while a feminised base executes, because "sharing management and decisions involves sharing different expertise."

« The areas in which charitable organisations operate, become places in which ordinary and structural sexism are reproduced, with women's

management and mediation abilities being rendered invisible or reduced to supposedly "natural" attributes. »

In this context, the areas in which charitable organisations operate, become places in which ordinary and structural sexism are reproduced, with women's management and mediation abilities being rendered invisible or reduced to supposedly "natural" attributes. Julie, who witnesses similar dynamics in her volunteer work in the local charitable field, describes a "micro-governance dynamic in the decision-making sphere with the same social profiles (older, white cisgender heterosexual men) in an enclosed environment without shared power." This glass ceiling does not just block careers; it perpetuates a culture where financial authority and legitimate speech remain a male privilege. This confiscation of power by a small homogeneous circle is in blatant contradiction with the values of emancipation displayed by the sector, preventing a true recognition of the expertise of those who carry the structure on a daily basis.

This distribution is the product of a social construct that normalizes "care" skills in women, thus removing them from decision-making roles. This division of employment represents a hierarchy in which "care" professions, while necessary, continue to fight for recognition within decision-making organizations.

Thus, the strong female presence, particularly visible in volunteering, masks the fact that the charitable sector is structurally based on a feminised and underpaid workforce. This precarity reflects a system in which these employees face an excessive workload compounded by class, racial and gender inequalities. In addition to their core duties, they frequently ensure emotional crisis management and inclusive education within systems that struggle with self-criticism.

At the heart of this dynamic is the emotional burden, which is a true extension of domestic work into the activist sphere. It is tacitly expected of women to manage tension regulation, wel-

come new members, and maintain social bonds, often to the detriment of their mental health.

LEVERS FOR CHANGE

To break away from these exclusionary tendencies, emerging feminist governance theories suggest replacing traditional hierarchical structures with a co-responsibility model. Julie, relying on her experience in public service and volunteer work at community level, contends that this change begins with a close examination of interactions. "Ideally, we should categorise all the insidious behaviours of the kind: who speaks, who interrupts, who is listened to when decisions are made." This approach replaces the vertical power structure with a horizontal one where each member acts with awareness of their social position. Julie believes it is "important to say that we are working on practices, naming systemic discrimination, and identifying issues" in order to effectively improve the institution. By putting people impacted by gender discrimination at the centre of financial and strategic decisions, this model disrupts the monopoly of dominant profiles in prominent positions.

« In order to put an end to feminised, underpaid labour, charitable organisations must imperatively establish a policy of radical transparency regarding salary grids and bonuses. »

In order to put an end to feminised, underpaid labour, charitable organisations must imperatively establish a policy of radical transparency regarding salary grids and bonuses. It is necessary to move away from individual ruling in order to establish a collective salary grid, ensuring that the value of the work performed is recognised fairly, regardless of the person's social position (for example, a maximum salary that cannot exceed a specific multiple of the minimum wage). This approach also necessitates formalising "care," mediation, and emotional management

skills in classification grids while incorporating technical or financial expertise. Aside from the base income, equity is established by access to social benefits and bonuses; the organisation must ensure that its benefits (health insurance, additional days off, and training) primarily help the most vulnerable employees.

«In order to guarantee that the deconstruction of power relations is no longer dependent on the voluntary educational efforts of those directly affected, the organisation must adopt a mandated continual training requirement.»

In order to guarantee that the deconstruction of power relations is no longer dependent on the voluntary educational efforts of the implicated people, the organisation must adopt a mandated continual training requirement. However, Julie emphasises that "this lever should not be just a mere sprinkling of awareness that members end up challenging. It is essential to reconsider the organization's general structure, from HR functions to the protocol for handling sexual and gender-based violence."

In structures that have yet to incorporate institutional thought on power relations and systemic discrimination, the emergence of a major case of sexual and gender-based violence is frequently a brutal trigger. Since everyday sexism is normalised there, it is only at the time of a crisis that employees and management begin to question structural inequalities. Julie sees the task as overturning this logic: rather than waiting for an incident to act, protocols and training should be implemented as a starting point for a full evaluation. By treating these difficulties as structural problems rather than individual episodes, the organisation transforms violence management into a tool for profound and social change.

Julie illustrates the trivialisation of sexism through an eye-opening experience she had in the field: while she was preparing a women's only, feminist self-defense class, the director of the institution asked her, with an inappropriate insinuation, if the young women would be following the class "naked". This insensitive remark came from a misunderstanding of the importance of single-gender spaces and the security measures put in place to protect them. For Julie, this episode is "indicative of how far sexism and violence are minimised," demonstrating that management can aggressively reject basic protective measures under the pretense of "a joke" or ignorance.

This demonstrates that without a profound reassessment of the frameworks, training remains superficial. By incorporating these resources as actual prevention tools, organisations can ultimately relieve victims of the burden of educating their peers, making it a community responsibility.

Precarity

Brûlant•e•s, by Gabriel•le

The charitable and activist sector frequently positions itself as a space of resistance and an alternative to dominant societal models. Yet, beneath the rhetoric of equality and social justice, organisations struggle to extricate themselves from the oppressive structures they denounce. Understanding these dynamics necessitates examining how the "continuum" of violence and prejudice, as well as job allocation, are articulated with an increasingly fragile strategic autonomy.

«The vulnerability of activist and social groups stems not from incompetent management, but from a structural dependence on public and private resources.»

The vulnerability of activist and social groups stems not from incompetent management, but from a structural dependence on public and private resources. Organisations that rely primarily on grants, public procurement contracts, or more limited calls for proposals find themselves subordinated to accounting programs and the state's fluctuating stances.

The Federation of Solidarity Actors (FAS) conducted a study in 2025 that provides an alarming evaluation of the state of the charitable sector. The figures indicate a brutal reality in which every other charity's financial status has deteriorated, and one in four charities is now at risk of closure. Solidarity workers find themselves caught in a vise between a record rise in poverty and increasingly uncertain funding, forcing them to support more and more people with ever fewer resources. This study identifies fundamental structural issues that limit social action. The financial situation has become extremely dire, with 24% of

organisations having less than two months' worth of disposable cash needed, putting them at risk of payment failure. This instability is worsened by pervasive financing insecurity, with 58% of organisations having no financial visibility beyond one year. This material instability is causing a genuine crisis in social work. The survey highlights that 60% of organisations have observed an increase in staff turnover over the past three years, leading to team exhaustion that undermines the continuity of support. However, these organisations are essential for social cohesion; they are at the heart of implementing social public policies assigned to the state and local governments.

This fragility is worsened by a major change in public intervention, which abandons support for the whole project (grant) in favour of a service order logic. As a trainer for organisations on discrimination issues, Camille observes that this evolution fosters insularity: "The local charity is less demanding in terms of professionalisation and will integrate into local funding and project calls. Since there is less demand for results because it is based on missions, this allows those in dominant positions to occupy higher places and engage in micro-governance."

By prioritising one-off project calls over sustainable funding, the State imposes a framework of permanent competition that weakens the structures. In fact, the public administration delegated its missions to fight against exclusion without incurring real cost, especially in consideration of inflation. Meeting the government's accounting criteria has reduced organisations' resources, reducing them to mere subcontractors of restrictive public initiatives. Camille believes that financial disengagement and project-based management eventually deprive the activist project of its political essence while reinforcing internal hierarchies.

LEVERS FOR CHANGE

To fight the systematic rivalry created by calls for proposals, organisations must break the cycle of isolation by developing shared governance among structures. This lever involves creating strategic alliances, such as employer groups or shared resource hubs, to combine critical support tasks (accounting, human resources, legal expertise, or mediation).

This solidarity between structures would be incomplete unless it was supported by an actual redistribution of decision-making power internally. Camille, a trainer who analyses the internal workings of organisations, considers it is critical to "rethink HR for the transparency of information, the monitoring of career progression according to social backgrounds, and the analysis of wage inequalities." She encourages the need for working circumstances that are actually personalized to everyone's needs, as well as a thorough study of the organization's workers' perspectives. This lever promotes radical transparency in financial and budgetary decisions. According to Camille, sharing information and power guarantees that decisions are no longer determined by a small group, but rather reflect collective responsibility and concrete social equality.

The intersectional approach assures that crisis economies do not systematically undermine "care" functions, mediation, or roles dominated by women and minorities. Camille remarks that the non-profit field suffers from a lack of career progression chances for these profiles: "In the non-profit sector, it is more complicated to advance in skills and build a career; there is a direct link to the glass ceiling. Many women serve as coordinators but do not hold leadership positions. Women stagnate rapidly." To disrupt the cycle of stagnation, she suggests that the organisation's budget must be politicised. This means that each budget line must be reviewed to ensure that financial decisions are consistent with the proclaimed values of social justice. Rather than accepting budget cuts as technical inevitabilities that disproportionately affect the most

vulnerable functions, the organisation employs financial arbitration as a form of resistance. By preserving field posts and raising women and minorities' access to leadership positions, the organisation's financial management becomes an effective lever for structural change.

Considering these limits, material and symbolic recognition of charitable labor becomes the primary priority. This approach requires setting distance from the "culture of sacrifice," which all too frequently uses militant dedication to justify salary precarity or the omission of technical aspects of jobs. Camille, a trainer, emphasises the insufficient nature of surface-level measures: "You want to understand gender inequalities, you want your employees to be trained, and there you go, you think the work is done. But actually, you need to reconsider the organisation's entire structure, including all employer activities at HR level, the mission statement and even reception."

For her, professionalisation needs careful documentation of the "invisible work" (coordination, psychological support, crisis management) in order to incorporate these components into financing negotiations. Recognising professionals involves determining reasonable supervisory ratios and emphatically rejecting any degradation of services under the pretext of budgetary limitations. By changing the mindset of employees and management, the company avoids perceiving workers' well-being as a variable to be modified, instead making it the foundation of effective social action.

Transparency in shared governance

Comme un Lundi, by Christophe

The vocabulary of shared governance has spread widely across the charitable sector: circles, horizontality and collective decision-making have become the markers that organisations readily display to their teams and funders. Yet behind this adherence in principle, many organisations that claim to practise shared governance continue to operate in an opacity that contradicts its very foundations. Decisions are made in informal spaces, information circulates selectively, and financial resolutions are made by an exclusive few.

« Transparency, however, is not optional when it comes to shared governance: it is foundational. Without it, the redistribution of power remains a statement of intent, and unaddressed grey areas turn into blockages, frustrations and invisible power dynamics. »

Transparency, however, is not optional when it comes to shared governance: it is foundational. Without it, the redistribution of power remains a statement of intent, and unaddressed grey areas turn into blockages, frustrations and invisible power dynamics.

Opacity is, first of all, a mechanism for concentrating informal power. When a single person, or a minority, holds the important information "in their head", they become an indispensable point of reference whom the collective must consult in order to act, even though no formal hierarchy confers that position on them. This

observation, long documented by the analytical tools of self-managed collectives, holds true in shared-governance structures: abolishing hierarchical titles is not enough to make information circulate. At the end of a week of workshops bringing together employees, founders and board members from the Brussels charitable and cooperative sector, the collective conclusion was unequivocal: "from the moment things are made visible, when we can see them, that already settles a great deal. When they are obscure, people start asking themselves questions and things go off in all directions. Whereas sometimes, simply saying things already brings openness." Opacity is therefore not neutral: it feeds speculation, fuels interpersonal tensions and allows an informal power to prosper that is all the harder to challenge because it is written down nowhere.

Transparency also conditions the very possibility of taking part in decisions. You cannot ask the members of a collective to take on responsibilities or get involved in decision-making if they do not have the elements to do so. As emerged from the workshops, transparency "about the decisions that are taken and why they are taken" makes it possible "to clarify certain roles, to explain why decisions are taken, and also to have the information needed to take decisions and take part in this shared governance". Failing that, participation becomes stage-management: collective spaces rubber-stamp orientations already settled elsewhere, and real decision-making migrates into informal conversations between insiders. Being transparent about decision-making processes — who decides, how, at what point, by what criteria and within what limits — is thus the first clarification any structure wishing to share power must make.

Transparency also concerns intentions and expectations, particularly those of people occupying singular positions in the structure. Camille, taken on a year ago as coordinator of an agricultural cooperative moving towards shared governance, voices this requirement from her position as a non-founding worker: she expects first of all "transparency about the intentions — why it was decided to implement shared governance", so as to clarify mutual expectations, and sums up her need as follows: "I need a fairly clear view of who does what, who knows what, and where we are heading together." The vagueness surrounding the place of founders is a particularly fertile source of misunderstanding: many expectations weigh on these people without ever being made explicit, while their past investment — the time and sometimes the money given to build the project — remains invisible to those who arrive along the way. Making these accumulated burdens and frustrations visible, without turning them into "a means of privilege and oppression" but into an element of mutual understanding, is part of the work of transparency.

Finally, transparency concerns the discomforts of everyday life. Charlotte, a workshop participant, reminds us that as soon as a need exists, "it is important to put it into words, because that makes something invisible visible: one, it makes it visible, and two, it makes it possible to organise it and to hand over — to hand over the reins clearly rather than implicitly". In structures where drudgery, overload and limits go unnamed, handovers happen through implicit drift: the thankless tasks always land on the same shoulders, often those of the people least able to refuse. Transparency here is a tool of internal justice as much as of effectiveness. One misreading must nonetheless be avoided: transparency is not an undifferentiated dumping of information.

« Poorly structured radical transparency produces an information overload that drowns out the issues, exhausts teams and can paradoxically recreate opacity — nobody

knows any longer where the relevant information is to be found. »

Poorly structured radical transparency produces an information overload that drowns out the issues, exhausts teams and can paradoxically recreate opacity — nobody knows any longer where the relevant information is to be found. It also runs up against legal limits: the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) protects the personal data of members and service users, and employment law requires the confidentiality of certain information about staff (individual appraisals, medical data, disciplinary procedures). Transparency is therefore a matter of organising information, not of removing all filters.

LEVERS FOR CHANGE

Documentation is the first structural lever of transparency. Documenting the project, its processes, its decisions and their rationale enables current and future members to reappropriate how the collective works without depending on reference individuals. Workshop participants insist on the importance of also documenting failures and moments of blockage, which "shed light on the tools that are not suited to certain situations". But producing documentation is not enough: you also need to "make sure it is properly understood and that there are people to support its implementation". The accessibility of language is central here — logbooks, archived and consultable minutes, welcome guides for newcomers only fulfil their purpose if the vocabulary is shared and if spaces exist for appropriating it collectively.

The second lever consists of making decision-making circuits explicit and opening up the governing bodies. Making the board's minutes public, or even opening its meetings to team members, transforms the relationship between workers and the body that holds legal power: decisions stop appearing as opaque verdicts and become trade-offs that can be discussed. As participants noted, board members "who operate in secret meetings or who direct and impose" are by their very nature incompatible with a shared-governance approach. Clarifying validation circuits

— which decisions fall to which circle, which body, with what right of scrutiny — moves the structure from a legitimacy based on position to a procedural legitimacy that anyone can question.

«As long as pay, bonuses and budget decisions remain opaque, they silently reproduce inequalities, particularly of gender.»

Financial and pay transparency forms a third, particularly sensitive lever. Exchanges between workers during the workshops showed that the question of how pay is distributed — should salaries be on the same scale, how should skills be taken into account — sparks intense discussion as soon as it is raised openly. That is precisely the sign that it should be: as long as pay, bonuses and budget decisions remain opaque, they silently reproduce inequalities, particularly of gender. Establishing a collective pay scale, making the criteria for awarding benefits explicit and putting the budget up for collective discussion turns financial management into a shared political matter rather than a private preserve.

Finally, transparency must be organised if it is to remain sustainable. That means prioritising information rather than accumulating it, defining clear channels and roles for circulating it, and respecting the legal limits of confidentiality. It also means embedding transparency over time: it is not a state achieved once and for all, but a daily practice cultivated in the way meetings are run, needs are voiced and handovers are made clear. A structure that gives itself these concrete means makes transparency what it should be in shared governance: not a shop window, but the very condition for exercising genuinely collective power.

The place of the board of directors in shared governance

Comme un Lundi, by Christophe

Shared-governance initiatives most often emerge from within teams: workers who question verticality, experiment with circles, reorganise how speaking time circulates. But sooner or later, these experiments run up against an unavoidable institutional reality: in Belgium, the Companies and Associations Code (CSA) requires every non-profit organisation (association sans but lucratif, ASBL) to have a board of directors (organe d'administration, OA), which holds the legal power to manage the organisation. Board members, elected by the general assembly, bear responsibility for the management of the organisation and, when there are staff employed, exercise the employer function. Ignoring this body, or hoping to build shared governance against it, amounts to building on sand: without its support, the approach remains legally fragile and politically reversible.

This tension between the legal framework and collective aspirations lies at the heart of the difficulties encountered on the ground. Chris, a worker in a Belgian audiovisual ASBL who co-facilitated the workshops in Brussels, sets out the framework bluntly: "the board of directors is a legal obligation. Board members are elected by the general assembly and bear legal responsibility for what happens in the structure. This legal framework is not always very consistent with what we do in shared governance, but we have to work with it." Distributing decision-making power across circles or roles does not abolish board members' legal responsibility: whatever the internal architecture, it is to the board that funding authorities, banks and courts turn. Any shared-governance approach must therefore hold together two logics — the collective legitimacy built internally and the legal responsibility concentrated on a few people — rather than acting as if the second did not exist.

«Introducing shared governance in a structure without the board's support is really something complicated, if not impossible.»

From this observation flows a conclusion shared by all the workshop participants: "introducing shared governance in a structure without the board's support is really something complicated, if not impossible," Chris sums up. The experience of Céline, an employee of a small ASBL, illustrates the impasse from the other side: she came looking for "leads, tools, ways of thinking about how to bring a little redistribution of power" into her team, only to find that "at board level, there isn't much appetite for moving towards shared governance". The asymmetry is structural: a motivated team can experiment at the margins, in its meetings and its practices, but as long as the body holding legal power does not commit to the process, every advance remains precarious, hanging on the goodwill of people who can take back control at any moment. The question left open at the end of the first day of workshops — "how do you convince a board that isn't particularly keen on this change when the whole team wants to move towards it?" — shows exactly where the knot lies.

The board's support cannot be reduced to agreement in principle: it demands a transformation of its posture and of its relationship with the team. A distant body that "operates in secret meetings or directs and imposes" is by its very nature incompatible with shared governance. Proximity must instead be organised. Camille, coordinator of an agricultural cooperative whose board actively

supports the approach, describes a simple arrangement: "we try to include a board member in every meeting with the collective, precisely so that there is a back-and-forth, so that there is contact", because it is essential "that no distance is allowed to grow between a collective of workers and a board". This constant circulation between the body and the field changes the nature of the link: the board ceases to be a remote instance of control and becomes a partner in the process.

This evolution amounts to a genuine mutation in the role of board members, which participants describe through the image of the dial: "the more autonomous the team becomes and the more they make their own decisions, the more the board has to step back. Where it usually plays a directing role, it should instead take on a role of support and advice, occasionally settling questions the team is unsure about," Chris observes. Sophie, a board member of a cooperative, founded in order to support a farm by exploring other ways of organising, embodies this posture: for her, serving on a board means "watching over the structure and the team behind the structure, whether volunteers or paid workers, making sure things run well and that we achieve the goals of our mission statement". Her cooperative is organised in circles that work around one core circle that "links to the board of directors and vice versa". She admits there are difficulties — "it's exploratory, so there are lots of pitfalls, lots of internal problems" — but stresses that there is "the will to explore and to try". Her testimony reminds us that a board's commitment to shared governance does not amount to stepping down: it is a shift from the power to direct towards a function of vigilance, support and guarantee.

The fact remains that this mandate, generally unpaid, carries a cost that organisations underestimate. Camille poses the question left open at the end of the exchanges: is the board mandate "a burden or a privilege? A burden, it's true, when you see the time it takes, the fact that you're a volunteer, the weight of responsibility when you want to get involved and do things properly. And on the other hand, a privilege, because yes, it is power — there's the legal framework, but not only that. And unfortunately, this power can also be abused."

« Clarifying what each board member is in a position to give, rather than sustaining implicit expectations that produce guilt on one side and disappointment on the other. »

Recognising this dual nature of the mandate means giving oneself the means to think it through: clarifying what each board member is in a position to give, rather than sustaining implicit expectations that produce guilt on one side and disappointment on the other.

LEVERS FOR CHANGE

The first lever consists of explicitly embracing the board's transformation into a body of support, and equipping that posture. It starts with recruiting for qualities too often neglected: when asked about the ideal profile of a board member, participants cite neither accounting nor human resources, but "a great capacity for listening, a certain humility", someone "wise, who can set their ego aside, who can understand human problems and bring solutions", in the words of Catherine and Chris — an observation echoed by the FEBECOOP manual for cooperative board members, which puts relational aptitude before technical expertise and warns against the posture of "I'm right and I'm going to convince you". It continues with self-evaluation: "we tend to evaluate the teams, the coordination, but we should really have proper times of self-evaluation" for the board itself, structured and regular, in a setting safe enough to "speak freely", Camille insists. A body that evaluates itself agrees to subject its own workings to the same demand for reflexivity that it applies to the rest of the structure.

The second lever concerns the composition and renewal of the board. Since the board is elected by the general assembly, its mandate can be redefined by the members: this is a democratic point of leverage that teams often forget. Participants argue for genuine representation of stakeholders on the board and for openness to younger

profiles, "with perhaps fewer skills and less experience to start with, but with new ideas and a different vision from the long-standing members, whose ways of working become almost routine", as Catherine puts it. The pairing arrangement — mentoring a less experienced person "so they gain the confidence and legitimacy to take part in a board of directors" — allows this renewal without loss of institutional memory, and prevents the board from closing in on itself through co-optation.

The third lever consists of clarifying mandates and each person's level of involvement. Rather than implicitly expecting total availability from already busy volunteers, the point is to name the limits: "being clear about what you are prepared to give is already reassuring, and it sets a secure framework for the collective that has to move forward together," Camille testifies. Chris proposes going further by identifying "an active board-member role per mission": distinguishing what falls under legal decisions and approvals from the resources and support board members can bring, mission by mission, according to their skills and availability. This approach turns a monolithic, anxiety-inducing mandate into a modular, legible commitment.

Finally, the link between the team and the board must be institutionalised rather than left to the informal. The rotating presence of a board member at team meetings, transparent minutes, opening board meetings to workers who wish to attend, or pairings of one team member with one board member create a regular back-and-forth that prevents distance — while avoiding communication resting on privileged interpersonal relationships, which can themselves "bring a power dynamic into play, whether intentional or not". Finally, remembering, as the participants do, that the board is made up of people who can be approached directly re-humanises a body too often perceived as an abstraction: shared governance is also played out in the quality of those very relationships.

Shared governance, an ongoing process

Comme un Lundi, by Christophe

Shared governance suffers from a tenacious fantasy: that of the great organisational leap, in which a structure would switch overnight — statutes rewritten, organisational chart abolished — into a finally accomplished horizontal way of working. This fantasy produces two damaging effects. It paralyses the organisations which, measuring the scale of the task, give up before starting; and it condemns to disappointment those which embark on it believing they are applying a turnkey model. For shared governance is neither a state nor a recipe: it is a continuous, living process, built step by step, through trial and error, and it resides as much in the grand architecture of decision-making as in the small things of everyday life — the shape of meetings, the quality of listening, the circulation of speaking time.

This processual character is the most unanimous conclusion to the week of workshops in Brussels. The workshop participants put it like this: "shared governance is not: we get up one day and decide that from 1st January we're switching to shared governance. It really is a process and a will. It's a path that can be quite long, so it really takes tests and adjustments. It isn't built overnight. It's something living, that evolves." Catherine, a workshop participant, continues: "moving towards shared governance is a real laboratory. There's no ready-made solution. It's a process of reflection, of back-and-forth, of significant trial and error." Accepting this experimental dimension means renouncing immediate perfection — and giving yourself the right to fail, to document the failure and to start again differently.

« Shared governance does not apply uniformly to an entire structure, but takes root in cer-

tain places, at certain times, for certain types of decision. »

The process is also situated and partial: shared governance does not apply uniformly to an entire structure, but takes root in certain places, at certain times, for certain types of decision. "There is no single shared governance, no one type of shared governance, and nor is it the case that a structure simply is or is not in shared governance. There are moments, there are places where it happens," concludes the group during their end-of-week debrief. The right question is therefore not "how do we become a shared-governance structure?" but "what do we share, with whom, at what level and with what responsibilities?". Anne-Louise, who launched a radio project on her own before being joined by a second coordinator, insists on this question of timing: knowing "at what point in a project it can be worth moving to shared governance", and refusing to "dilute shared governance into something where everything would be decided collectively by everyone" — it can be built "project by project, event by event, working group by working group", without everything dissolving into an undifferentiated collective.

« Since it is a process, shared governance is lived first of all in modest, almost invisible practices. »

Since it is a process, shared governance is lived first of all in modest, almost invisible practices. The way a meeting opens with a check-in round, speaking time is shared through rounds of the table, facilitation and note-taking rotate, and

a session closes by naming the questions left open: so many gestures that concretely redistribute the power of expression and attention. As Nora, a specialist in power relations and systems of domination quoted in our project's podcast, reminds us, it is precisely "in the small gestures, in the habits" that power dynamics lodge themselves: "Who speaks? Who facilitates? Who takes the notes? Who decides?" The distribution of these roles cannot remain implicit. Vigilance must even be doubled down in periods of overload, for it is when a team is caught up in a sustained pace of work "that we can forget to make sure speaking time is shared fairly in meetings". The struggle against the concentration of power is a daily matter of awareness and attention — not a structural given.

« Rather than transforming everything at once, structures gain from testing formats — on a project, a working group, a type of decision — for a defined period, then documenting what worked and what jammed before widening the scope. »

This path meets very real obstacles: lack of time in already understaffed teams, the slow grind of producing tools and mandates, the limits set by public funding and regulations that give little recognition to this organisational work, differences in skills and appetites within teams. But the participants refuse to turn these into arguments for standing still. "A lot of obstacles and limits get named, but that's not a reason not to do shared governance. It's precisely so we can see what we're heading into. It's useful to have an idea of all these possible obstacles because it points the way," Céline, an employee of a small ASBL, reframes. Obstacles, like tensions, are information: they indicate what needs to be clarified, transformed or better distributed, and they make it possible to move forward "step by step and serenely" rather than hitting a wall.

The experience of Christelle, co-founder of the cooperative Design with Sense, shows what this

process demands — and what it gives back — over time. Launched eight years ago with the intention of "steering the company with the project's workers", the shift to a shared-governance cooperative was built step by step: "We built it together. It takes time, it requires training, because deciding together requires tools that we made our own as we went along. It's [a] long [process], it takes a great deal of patience, and sometimes it generates frustrations and tensions that must be heard and cared for." Far from wearing her down, the journey transformed the meaning of her commitment: "over time, it became a passion, a *raison d'être* and a path I will never leave. Today, it is a political act." Her testimony refutes the idea that the ongoing process is an endless burden: done well, it redistributes the load instead of adding to it. Chloé, a workshop participant, captures this in a phrase that became a touchstone of the exchanges: "putting power back at the centre of the collective does not mean individually carrying the whole collective. It's the opposite."

LEVERS FOR CHANGE

The first lever is phasing: moving forward in time-limited stages, with regular reviews. Rather than transforming everything at once, structures gain from testing formats — on a project, a working group, a type of decision — for a defined period, then documenting what worked and what jammed before widening the scope. Anne-Louise offers a concrete example with her coordination duo: "an evolving roadmap instead of very rigid job descriptions", built "mission by mission", setting out for each mission "who is lead and who is support". This tool embodies the ongoing process: where the job description freezes things, the roadmap is rediscussed at regular intervals and follows the evolution of the project and the people. Phasing also protects against discouragement: each stage completed and reviewed feeds the next.

The second lever consists of institutionalising the place of tensions. Since the process is alive, it inevitably produces friction; the danger is not the tension itself but its repression. Tension meetings, tried out by several participating struc-

tures, provide a framework for "making room for tensions and conflicts", asking whether the tension "endangers the project, the collective", and at what level it sits — structural, interpersonal or individual. Treating tension as information rather than as a sign of failure makes it possible to adjust frameworks to reality instead of letting discomforts settle in implicitly. Documenting failures follows the same logic: it turns missteps into learning that can be passed on.

The third lever is the explicit allocation of time and resources. Shared governance "takes time, and so it's time that must be planned into the organisation of work, into the structure's daily life. It really is a fully-fledged function that has to be taken into account," the workshop organisers insist.

«The reading from Starhawk proposed during the workshops makes the point forcefully: there is "no responsibility without power", and giving people power means making sure they have the capacity to exercise it.»

That means budgeting for training, facilitation and documentation as legitimate items of work — not as time stolen from the missions. The reading from Starhawk proposed during the workshops makes the point forcefully: there is "no responsibility without power", and giving people power means making sure they have the capacity to exercise it, where necessary "through opportunities for training, support and the sharing of know-how". Entrusting the facilitation of a crucial meeting to an unprepared person condemns them to fail; training a pool of facilitators makes the process sustainable.

«For a collective does not become fairer because it declares that it shares power; it becomes fairer when it

gives itself, day after day, the concrete means to do so — through transparency, listening, documentation, accountability and the capacity to readjust its frameworks to reality.»

The final lever lies in the care given to the collective's daily life and to the fair distribution of accountabilities. A tiered accountability system — not expecting the same involvement from a volunteer, an intern, a paid worker or a board member — is part of "the care to be brought to a shared-governance system", ensuring that mental load and workload are "distributed according to each person's position and situation". Arrangements for welcoming newcomers, spaces for feedback and recognition, moments when people can name their limits and "turn down the dial" on certain aspects without guilt: all these practices sustain the process over time. For a collective does not become fairer because it declares that it shares power; it becomes fairer when it gives itself, day after day, the concrete means to do so — through transparency, listening, documentation, accountability and the capacity to readjust its frameworks to reality.

03/

GLOSSARY

This guide contains three glossaries. The first covers terms relating to governance in non-profit organisations. The second explores sexism, sexist and sexual violence, and inequalities in the workplace. The third addresses different forms of discrimination. These glossaries are intended as starting points for discussion.

This is how we used them during our workshops: we created a set of cards for each glossary, with a term on one side and its definition on the other. Before turning each card over, participants discussed what the term meant to them, any ambiguities it raised, and the experiences it brought to mind. They then read the definition together and compared it with their own understandings.

These glossaries are not intended to be exhaustive: they have gaps and blind spots. Any group or organisation can adapt them, add new terms and develop its own definitions.

Governance

Brûlant•e•s, by Gabriel•le and Eloïse

01. Governance

There is no commonly agreed definition of governance; it remains a matter of debate. Broadly understood, governance defines how power is distributed, organised and exercised. It is a process of decision-making and of allocating responsibilities. Hoareau and Laville (2008) define charitable governance as "the set of mechanisms that bring an organisation's workings into line with the social project that drives it".

02. Shared governance

Shared governance is a complex concept on which there is no consensus. It generally refers to a management model in which responsibilities and decision-making are distributed among the organisation's members, fostering cooperation and autonomy. However, shared governance does not mean the absence of hierarchy. It is often distinguished from the traditional hierarchy of status (a power dynamic of one person over another) by the establishment of a hierarchy of skills (specialisation) and of common rules. The hierarchy of skills recognises that certain people hold specific expertise in a given field, which confers a natural authority on them within that perimeter. The hierarchy of rules means that everyone, whatever their role, remains subject to the same collectively defined rules and processes. In practice, then, shared governance often comes down to a rigorous architecture in which power is exercised through clear processes.

03. Distributed power

The distribution of decision-making authority among several people or circles, rather than its concentration in the hands of a single leader or a small executive committee.

04. Mandate

A mission entrusted to a person, generally by election or appointment, to represent a group or take on specific responsibilities within an association for a set period. A mandate implies a relationship of trust: the mandated person acts on behalf of the collective and must account for their actions. In the charitable sector, the most common mandates concern positions on the board of directors (chair, treasurer, secretary) or representing the organisation with external partners. A mandate is generally attached to one person for its full duration and confers a status within the structure.

05. **Participative management**

A management approach that seeks to involve an organisation's members in decision-making and strategic reflection, while maintaining a classic hierarchical structure. Participative management rests on consultation, listening and taking teams' views into account before a final decision is taken by those in positions of responsibility. Unlike shared governance, participative management does not structurally redistribute decision-making power: the hierarchy remains in place and keeps the last word. It is more a managerial posture that values collective intelligence and engagement, without fundamentally questioning how power is organised.

06. **Horizontality**

A generic term for a way of organising that reduces or abolishes traditional hierarchical relationships, promoting collective participation in decisions and members' autonomy. Horizontality stands in opposition to the pyramid model in which power flows from the top down. However, horizontality is more an intention or a value than a precise organisational model. It is never absolute: it presupposes a clear, shared organisation of roles and responsibilities, founded on members' skills and cooperation.

07. **Relationship of subordination**

The relationship by which a member of an organisation is placed under the authority of a superior, who holds the power to direct, monitor and evaluate their work. In French employment law, although the Labour Code does not explicitly define the relationship of subordination, case law has characterised it as the employer's exercise of three powers: giving orders and instructions, monitoring their execution, and sanctioning breaches. This case-law definition, established notably by the Court of Cassation ruling of 13th November 1996, distinguishes salaried employment contracts from other forms of professional collaboration. In the charitable sector, volunteers, civic service volunteers and interns are not subject to a relationship of subordination.

08. **Status**

The legal capacity and position a person occupies within an organisation, determining the nature of their relationship with the structure as well as their rights and obligations. Status defines the legal framework governing the person's activity in the organisation.

09. Mission

The purpose or objective assigned to a person, a group or a structure within the organisation, defining what is to be accomplished and to what end. A mission answers the question "why?" rather than "how?". A mission may be assigned: to the organisation as a whole — its *raison d'être*, the social purpose written into its statutes (e.g. "promoting access to culture for all"); to a circle in shared governance — each circle has a specific mission contributing to the overall mission (e.g. "handling the organisation's external communication"); or to a person as part of a role, a mandate or a one-off task (e.g. "organising the annual event").

10. Informal power

The influence a person exercises outside official hierarchical structures, through their reputation, expertise, relationships or capacity to mobilise others. In organisations, it plays an important role in decision-making and team dynamics. In a charity or non-profit organisation, influence refers to the capacity of an individual or group to steer decisions and collective practices without recourse to formal hierarchical authority. It may rest on commitment, expertise, or a legitimacy recognised by members around a shared vision or project.

11. Self- management (Autogestion)

Self-management is a political and social model that aims for total equality between the individuals in a group. On that basis, power belongs indivisibly to the collective and each person carries the same weight. Decisions are generally made by seeking consensus or by democratic vote. Though highly emancipatory, this system often suffers from slowness, since requiring unanimity to move forward can paralyse action or allow charisma-based leaders to emerge. By contrast, shared governance is a pragmatic organisational methodology (inspired by holacracy and sociocracy) that seeks to reconcile autonomy and effectiveness. Rather than giving power to everyone, it distributes it into precise roles. Decision-making here rests on the principle of "consent" rather than consensus. It is therefore not the absence of hierarchy, but a hierarchy of responsibilities in which authority is clear and distributed.

12. Traditional hierarchy

An organisational structure in which power, authority and decision-making are concentrated at different levels, flowing from superior to subordinate. It rests on a relationship of subordination between people, in which each hierarchical level holds a power of direction and sanction over the level below. Traditional hierarchy is founded on a hierarchy of status: power attaches to the position a person occupies (director, head of department, employee). Each post is generally framed by a job description that strictly defines the person's duties, responsibilities and scope of action. Decisions travel up the pyramid, and directives travel down to the lower levels.

13. **Executive committee** (Bureau)

A charity's small governing body, generally elected by the board of directors and traditionally made up of the following officers: chair, treasurer and secretary. In the traditional model, the chair occupies a hierarchically superior position within the committee. However, organisations may opt for collegiate leadership, in which bureau members exercise their responsibilities on an equal footing. The bureau holds decision-making power for day-to-day business and may delegate part of its powers to paid staff. Legally, committee members incur responsibility at several levels and represent the organisation in the event of disputes, litigation or legal proceedings. The executive committee plays a central role in safeguarding the charity's interests – the legal principle whereby leaders may not personally enrich themselves through their office. Committee members are generally volunteers, exercise their mandate unpaid, and hold the employer function when the organisation employs staff.

14. **Board of directors** (conseil d'administration – CA)

The strategic governance body elected by the general assembly. It is not compulsory, except in certain specific cases. Traditionally, the board's missions are to set strategic direction, vote budgets, elect the executive committee and exercise the employer function. Board members are generally volunteers, although paid staff may sit on the board.

15. **Directors** (management)

The person responsible for leading, coordinating and supervising the activities of an organisation, department or project. They take strategic decisions, organise resources and represent the organisation to stakeholders, while ensuring that objectives are met.

16. **Co-founders**

A person who took part in creating an organisation, enterprise or project alongside other founders. They contribute from the outset to defining the organisation's vision, mission and structures, and often play a strategic or decision-making role in its development.

17. **Interns**

A person in education or training, temporarily hosted by an organisation to gain practical experience, develop professional skills and contribute to specific tasks under professional supervision.

18. **Radical transparency**

An organising principle whereby all information relating to the organisation's operations, decisions and finances is accessible to all its members, and sometimes to the public. In practice, this may mean access to the minutes of all meetings, publication of budgets, sharing of internal exchanges, public documentation of decision-making processes, or open organisational data. While it aims to strengthen trust, participation and collective accountability, radical transparency, when poorly structured, can lead to uncoordinated exchanges, difficulty in analysing and prioritising the information shared, and an absence of clear filters. This information overload can affect the effectiveness of the charity's work. Legal limits: radical transparency must respect certain legal obligations that require confidentiality. GDPR (General Data Protection Regulation): the personal data of members, volunteers or service users may not be disclosed without explicit consent (addresses, telephone numbers, health data, etc.). Employment law: certain information about staff must remain confidential (individual appraisals, medical data, disciplinary procedures, items from personal files). Protection of privacy: personal information even where not covered by the GDPR.

19. **Civic service volunteers**

A person, generally aged 16 to 25 (or up to 30 for young people with disabilities), who volunteers under the French civic service scheme for a mission of general interest in fields such as solidarity, education, the environment, culture or health, for a period of 6 to 12 months.

20. **Collegiate leadership**

A way of running the bureau or board of directors in which members exercise leadership responsibilities collectively and on an equal footing, with no hierarchy between them. Unlike the traditional model in which the chair holds superior authority, collegiate leadership rests on power-sharing between the members of the governing body. Characteristics: collective decision-making — the bureau's or board's decisions are taken together, often by consensus or absence of objection, with no casting vote for the chair; co-chairing or multiple legal representatives — several members may be designated as the organisation's legal representatives; distribution of responsibilities — tasks are allocated according to skills, with no relationship of subordination between bureau or board members; equality of status — all bureau members or directors carry the same weight in decisions.

21. **Power dynamic**

The relationship of influence or domination between two individuals or groups, in which one exercises a degree of direct or indirect control over the other. It can show itself in decisions, access to resources, social recognition, or the constraints imposed.

22. Volunteers

A person who freely gives their time, unpaid, to carry out activities in the service of a charity or the community. Legal framework: although French law does not define a legal status for volunteers, volunteering is distinguished from salaried employment by two fundamental criteria. No remuneration: the volunteer receives no payment in money or in kind, but may be reimbursed for expenses actually incurred (travel, accommodation, materials). No legal relationship of subordination: the volunteer is free to end their involvement at any time, without procedure or compensation. If these two conditions are not met (disguised remuneration or the exercise of a relationship of subordination), the courts may requalify the volunteering as salaried employment, with all the legal and financial consequences this entails for the organisation (back payment of social contributions, compensation, penalties for undeclared work). Volunteer leaders: volunteers who hold leadership positions (bureau or board members) retain their volunteer status while assuming increased legal responsibilities.

23. Paid staff in non-profit organisations

A person linked to the organisation by an employment contract, involving a legal relationship of subordination and remuneration. Non-profit employees carry out their professional activity in the service of the organisation's mission, under the authority of their employers. Specific features of associative employment: in charities, the employers are the members of the executive committee (chair, treasurer, secretary), generally volunteers, who collectively exercise the employer function — recruitment, setting pay, appraisal, disciplinary power and dismissal. This particular configuration generates complexity in the employer/employee power relationship. To clarify these relationships, the bureau may delegate part of its management powers to a salaried director (operational management, team management), while retaining final responsibility for strategic decisions and the employer function.

24. Ethics of care

The recognition and valuing of the work of caring, attending to needs and maintaining relationships in collective and political life — work that has traditionally been rendered invisible and assigned to women. It values solidarity, listening, cooperation and attention to people's needs, rather than the mere application of abstract rules or the pursuit of efficiency. In a voluntary or activist context, an ethics of care means organising projects, decision-making and collective life so as to prevent burnout, reduce violence and foster respectful, inclusive relationships.

25. Members

A natural or legal person who formally joins the organisation, generally after paying a membership fee and accepting the statutes. Members share the organisation's values and take part in its collective life. Link with the governing bodies: general assembly – members take part, vote and exercise their collective power within the organisation's sovereign body. Board of directors – members elect the directors at the general assembly; a member may stand for election as a director, subject to the statutes. Executive committee – no direct link: the committee is elected by the board from among its own members; a member may reach it via the path member, be elected to the board, and then be elected to the committee. Multiple statuses: the same person may be a member, a director, a bureau member, a volunteer, or even an employee.

26. The Labour Code

The body of legal texts governing relations between employers and employees in France (employment contracts, pay, working time, leave, health and safety, contract termination, collective relations). In the voluntary sector: as soon as a charity employs a member of staff, it becomes an employer and must comply with the entire Labour Code and Social Security Code, whatever its size or governance model. Collective agreements: the organisation must apply the collective agreement for its sector of activity where this has been extended by ministerial order. Collective agreements supplement the Labour Code by adapting it to sectoral specificities (community education, sport, culture, health, etc.) and often provide additional benefits. Shared governance and the Labour Code: adopting a shared-governance model never exempts an organisation from applying the Labour Code. The relationship of subordination between employer and employee remains. Shared-governance circles and processes concern the collective organisation of members and leaders, but do not abolish the legal framework of salaried employment. The bureau/board retains its legal responsibilities as an employer.

27. Feminist governance

A governance model that integrates the principles of justice, gender equality and inclusion into an organisation's decision-making and management. It seeks to reduce unjust hierarchies, value everyone's participation, and promote collective, collaborative practices. It aims to dismantle relations of domination, to recognise and value experiential knowledge and invisible labour, and to foster collective, inclusive and equitable decision-making..

Sexist and sexual violence and harassment

Note: This glossary addresses sexist and sexual violence in the workplace using mainly the terms "women" and "men". This choice reflects the current legal framework for combating sexist violence and the available statistical data, which are largely binary.

However, sexist and sexual violence affects people of all gender identities. When we speak of "women" as victims of sexist violence, this includes trans women, who face both sexism and transphobia. Non-binary people can also experience sexist violence linked to gender norms, particularly those socially perceived as women. When we analyse the dynamics of male domination and sexist violence, we are referring to structural phenomena linked to gendered socialisation, male privilege and social perception.

The terms in this glossary cover both interpersonal behaviour and structural barriers to equality in the workplace. These dimensions are interconnected: individual acts of sexism are shaped by broader social structures and contribute to reproducing them.

01. Glass ceiling

The glass ceiling refers to the set of invisible, informal barriers that prevent women and minorities from reaching the most senior leadership or management positions in an organisation, despite their qualifications. The phenomenon does not affect all women in the same way. Women at the intersection of several forms of discrimination (gender, race, class, disability, sexual orientation, migration background, etc.) face multiple, lower ceilings: they encounter obstacles even earlier in their careers and have even more restricted access to positions of power. The figures illustrate this reality: in 2019, women accounted for only 21% of the 264,000 salaried company directors in France, according to INSEE. In local government, only 20% of mayors are women, according to Ministry of the Interior data (2021).

02. Token

The "token woman" is a woman placed in a majority-male group or organisation not for her skills, but for what she represents symbolically. Her presence serves to give an impression of diversity and inclusiveness, and to ward off accusations of discrimination. The term applies to any minoritised person in society (women, people of colour, LGBT+ people, disabled people). The role is essentially symbolic: the woman may be showcased to project a façade of fairness, while her actual responsibilities remain limited. Example: an organisation may recruit a woman not for her expertise or qualifications, but to bolster its inclusive image. Likewise, a Black woman might be recruited by an organisation without the latter questioning its own practices, demands or thinking on racism.

03. Glass escalator

The glass escalator is the phenomenon whereby men enjoy rapid, facilitated advancement in sectors mainly staffed by women. Conversely, women working in male-dominated professions often encounter obstacles and face the glass ceiling. The glass escalator works differently depending on social context. A white man in social work or education will enjoy accelerated progression, while a racialised man may well progress more easily than his female colleagues but will run up against barriers linked to racism. Similarly, a middle-class white woman will have more opportunities for advancement than a woman from a working-class background.

04. Glass cliff

The glass cliff refers to the phenomenon whereby women and minorities reach leadership or senior positions mainly in contexts of crisis or instability, where the risk of failure is high. Whereas the glass ceiling blocks their rise, the glass cliff propels them to the top when the situation is already compromised. If failure follows, responsibility is often laid at their door, which can damage their career and reputation. For example, an organisation's coordinator may be put in charge of a project facing major internal tensions or a loss of funding, while her male counterparts coordinate far more stable projects.

05. Glass walls

Glass walls are the invisible barriers that confine women and minorities to certain undervalued sectors or types of post, creating horizontal segregation. Whereas the glass ceiling prevents people from rising through the hierarchy (a vertical barrier), glass walls prevent them from crossing into other professional fields. In the voluntary sector, for example, women often hold administrative, educational or support roles, while financial management posts remain largely entrusted to men. Racialised women are particularly affected by this phenomenon: the phrase "the colour of skills" describes how they are limited to being recruited into occupations of the domestic sphere – personal care and cleaning – on the basis of presumed aptitudes. Black and Arab women are thus massively confined to jobs as home helps, care assistants or cleaners.

06. Racial burden

The racial burden refers to the exhausting effort that racialised people must make to explain, translate or render comprehensible the violent, discriminatory or racist situations they experience. The burden is all the heavier because they often feel compelled to stay silent or play down what they are going through, for fear of being seen as "exaggerating". They must then adopt coping strategies to avoid conflict or reprisals. It is the necessity for people of colour to adapt constantly in order to be accepted in society – an adaptation that takes a heavy toll on physical and mental health: chronic stress, hypervigilance, early cardiovascular disease. For example, in a job interview, a person may choose to ignore a racist remark so as not to compromise their chances of getting the job. Likewise, within an organisation, a Black person may find themselves having to explain why a remark, joke or behaviour is racist or offensive – suffering a double penalty: first the racism, then the burden of having to explain why it is racist.

07. Colour of skills

The "colour of skills" describes the fact that certain professional qualities or aptitudes are attributed to people on the basis of their origin or appearance rather than their training or experience. For example, workers from certain ethnic groups may be seen as "stronger" or "more authoritative" and steered towards certain jobs, while others are associated with different qualities. The phenomenon shows how racial or ethnic discrimination shapes the recognition of skills and contributes to inequality at work.

08. Maninterrupting

Maninterrupting is when a man systematically interrupts a woman, not letting her finish her idea or her sentence. The behaviour has the effect of minimising women's authority and legitimacy in conversations, debates and so on. The dynamic is not always confined to gender, however: it can also involve any person in a position of power who claims superior legitimacy over another, often someone from a minoritised group or perceived as less entitled to speak. According to a study by Corinne Monnet, in 96% of cases it is men who interrupt women. In the same vein, a 2022 study published in the *American Political Science Review*, covering more than 24,000 US congressional hearings, showed that women parliamentarians were around 10% more likely to be interrupted than their male counterparts. A 2014 study by the linguist Kieran Snyder found that men interrupt twice as often as women in meetings, and are three times more likely to interrupt women than other men.

09. Sexist conduct

Sexist conduct (*agissement sexiste*) is covered by the French Labour Code (article L.1142-2-1) and refers to any behaviour or remark related to a person's sex that violates their dignity or creates an intimidating, humiliating or offensive situation for the victim. Conduct may also be sexual in nature, taking the form of comments, noises, gestures or propositions of a sexual nature. In the workplace, the employer is obliged to prevent and sanction such behaviour. Sanctions are disciplinary: warning, suspension, transfer, or even dismissal. Example: a colleague who regularly makes remarks such as "That's not a woman's job" or "You're too emotional for this role" is engaging in sexist conduct that can lead to disciplinary sanctions by the employer.

10. Sexual harassment

Sexual harassment is the repeated imposition on a person of remarks or behaviour with a sexual or sexist connotation that violate their dignity or create an intimidating, hostile or offensive situation. It can also be constituted by serious pressure (even without repetition) exerted with the aim of obtaining sexual favours. According to a report on the state of sexism in France (HCE, 2025), 10% of women have experienced unwanted embraces or kisses from a colleague or a man they did not know. In French criminal law, sexual harassment is an offence punishable by 2 to 3 years' imprisonment and a fine of €30,000 to €45,000. Victims may press charges against the perpetrator within 6 years.

11. Sexist insults

A sexist insult is a remark that insults a person on the grounds of their gender with the aim of humiliating and demeaning them. In the workplace (Labour Code), the employer must sanction such behaviour through disciplinary measures: warning, suspension, transfer, or even dismissal. Example: a colleague who calls a woman a "slut" or hurls gender-based insults is committing a sexist insult. In French criminal law, a public sexist insult is punishable by a fine of up to €1,500 (€3,000 for reoffending). A non-public sexist insult carries a fixed fine of €38. Victims may press charges within 3 months in the case of a public insult.

12. Rape

Rape is legally defined as an act of sexual penetration (vaginal, anal or oral) committed with violence, coercion, threat or surprise, without the person's consent. Penetration may be by a sexual organ, a finger or any object. In the workplace (Labour Code), the employer must sanction such behaviour with immediate dismissal for gross misconduct. The employer also has an absolute duty of protection towards the victim and must take all necessary measures to guarantee their safety. In French criminal law, rape is a crime punishable by 15 to 20 years' imprisonment depending on aggravating circumstances (abuse of authority, vulnerability of the victim, violence causing mutilation or permanent disability, etc.). Victims may press charges within 20 years of the events (30 years if they were a minor at the time).

13. Everyday sexism

Everyday sexism often shows itself in trivialised discriminatory remarks or behaviour that may go unnoticed but concretely affect women's careers and the recognition of their skills. Examples include comments on appearance or dress, or phrases such as "You work/lead like a man", associating effectiveness and competence with men. It is normalised ("it's just a joke", "you're too sensitive"), which makes victims doubt the legitimacy of what they feel. Each act taken in isolation seems "not that serious", whereas it is their repetition that causes harm. Women at the intersection of other forms of discrimination experience amplified everyday sexism: racist, LGBTQphobic and other stereotypes combine with and compound sexist violence.

14. Femicide

Femicide is the murder of a woman because she is a woman. Very often, femicide is committed by a partner or ex-partner (35% of women murdered worldwide are killed by their partner). 131 women were killed in 2025. The term highlights the systemic, gendered dimension of these murders. "Transfemicide" refers to the murder of a trans person because she is a trans woman. Like cis women, trans women experience misogynist violence, but it is compounded by transphobia: misgendering, accusations of not being a "real woman", dehumanisation. These crimes are often marked by spectacular violence, committed in public space, and by a lack of institutional recognition: victims misgendered, inadequate prosecution, invisibilisation. It is a femicide motivated both by misogyny and by the refusal to recognise trans women as women.

15. Sexual assault

Sexual assault is an act of a sexual nature committed with violence, coercion, threat or surprise, without the person's consent. It covers any act of a sexual nature imposed on another person, excluding rape (which is a specific category of sexual assault involving penetration). In the workplace (Labour Code), the employer must sanction such behaviour with disciplinary measures up to dismissal for gross misconduct. The employer also has a duty of protection towards the victim. In French criminal law, sexual assault is an offence punishable by 5 to 10 years' imprisonment and a fine of €75,000 to €150,000 depending on aggravating circumstances (abuse of authority, vulnerability of the victim, etc.). Victims may press charges within 6 years of the events (20 years if they were a minor at the time). With aggravating circumstances, penalties can reach 7 years' imprisonment and a €100,000 fine. Aggravating circumstances include, for example, an assault committed by an ascendant or by a person in authority over the victim (employer, teacher).

16. Mansplaining

Mansplaining is when a man explains to a woman something she already knows or in which she is a specialist. The behaviour rests on the often unconscious presumption that he knows more than she does simply because she is a woman. For example, a recently arrived volunteer may explain to an organisation's coordinator how to set up a project, when she has already run dozens. According to the HCE's report on the state of sexism (2025), the phenomenon bothers 64% of the population. In the same way, whitesplaining is when a white person explains to a racialised person their own lived experience or field of expertise. For example, a white person may explain to a racialised migrant colleague the procedures for regularising her status, when she has been dealing with them for years, or play down her accounts of discrimination by asserting: "That's not racism." Most often unintentional, these behaviours rest on deeply rooted stereotypes of which people are unaware. Nonetheless, they invalidate the lived experience of the people concerned by presuming to know their reality better, thereby reinforcing structural relations of domination.

17. The Matilda effect

The Matilda effect refers to the tendency to minimise or ignore women's contributions in scientific and intellectual fields, to the benefit of their male colleagues. For example, a researcher may see her work attributed to a man in a scientific publication or presentation, depriving her of the recognition she deserves. History offers many examples: Mileva Marić collaborated on Albert Einstein's research, but her role was erased in favour of her husband's. Chien-Shiung Wu (a Chinese-American physicist) designed and carried out the experiment that proved parity violation; two of her male colleagues received the 1957 Nobel Prize in Physics for the discovery, but she did not. Origin: the concept was first theorised in the 1960s as the "Matthew effect", to describe the unequal way recognition and renown are distributed in research. In the 1980s, Margaret Rossiter took up the idea to show that the phenomenon is amplified for women scientists. She named it the "Matilda effect" in homage to Matilda Joselyn Gage, a feminist activist.

18. The gendered division of labour

The gendered division of labour is a socially constructed allocation of tasks according to the gender assigned to people, based on what society deems "natural" for each gender. For example, women carry out support, reception, listening and emotional-support tasks, while men are assigned executive and decision-making roles. This division is compounded by a racist dimension: within feminised tasks themselves, racialised women are given the least valued and most arduous activities (front-desk work, fieldwork, repetitive administrative tasks rather than project coordination). The problem is not the division itself, but the hierarchy that values work culturally associated with men and devalues that associated with "women".

19. Child penalty

The "child penalty" refers to the impact of a child's arrival on a career, particularly women's. The concept highlights the fact that motherhood often entails a loss of income and professional advantages for mothers. Five years after a child arrives, women lose on average one third of their income — and even more for women in precarious situations (40% of their income). Others move to part-time work, which also means a loss of income. For example, a woman planning maternity leave may be offered less strategic projects and a lower salary on her return, on the assumption that she will now be absent more often because she has a child.

20. **Horizontal segregation**

Horizontal segregation refers to the unequal distribution of women and men across sectors and occupations. The phenomenon appears as early as education: men predominate in scientific and technical fields, while women are concentrated in the humanities, social sciences and caring professions. This distribution stems from gender stereotypes that associate relational and maternal qualities with women, and rational, technical skills with men. For example, the jobs of cleaner, teacher and care assistant alone account for nearly a fifth of women in salaried employment. The voluntary sector follows the same logic: men mostly chair sports, angling or rights-advocacy charities, while women more often lead humanitarian, social or health organisations.

21. **Pay inequality**

Pay inequality refers to the gaps in remuneration between different categories of people — here, women and men. Women earn 14.2% less than men for equal work, and 22% less across all jobs combined (Observatoire des Inégalités figures). These gaps are explained in part by the fact that women more often hold precarious and part-time jobs. In the least valued sectors with the most precarious working conditions, racialised and migrant women are over-represented and face multiple discrimination. A US study by the Institute for Women's Policy Research shows that Black women earn 38% less than white men and 21% less than white women (in the United States). Transposed, these figures would mean Black women should have stopped working from June onwards.

22. **Invisible labour**

Invisible labour refers to all socially useful activities that receive little or no recognition, because they are often unpaid or undervalued. This work, mostly done by women, includes domestic work, volunteering, caring for children or the elderly, listening work, and informal activities not covered by contracts. Care work is part of this invisible labour. Historically and socially, it has been assigned to women and perceived as a "naturally" feminine skill. In France, for example, around 90% of care workers and 91% of nursing assistants are women (Oxfam). This reality intersects with other inequalities: racialised women are often over-represented in precarious care jobs that remain poorly valued.

Discrimination

01. Sexism

Sexism refers to a particular, often demeaning way of behaving towards others on the grounds of their sex. It is founded on an instituted hierarchical relationship between the two sexes, from which flows a difference in value, status and dignity. Sexism thus takes many forms, rooted in the collective unconscious, characterised in particular by jokes, inappropriate remarks or demeaning language towards one of the two sexes in a largely trivialised setting. This violence can also take a physical form (blows, rape, murder). Whatever its form, sexism aims at and has the effect of despising, devaluing, humiliating and discriminating against its victims – girls and women first and foremost.

02. LGBTphobia

Anti-LGBT behaviours, or LGBTphobia, are hostile attitudes towards people on account of their sexual orientation or gender identity. Such expressions of anti-LGBT+ hatred are not limited to homophobic behaviour: more broadly, they cover acts of hatred and discrimination against lesbian, gay, bi and trans people. What French law says: discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity is an offence punishable by up to 3 years' imprisonment and a €45,000 fine for a natural person. Where a public official refuses on these grounds to provide a service or goods in a place open to the public, or denies access to it, the penalties rise to 5 years' imprisonment and a €75,000 fine. 20% of LGBT+ people surveyed report having been subjected to insults or verbal threats; 68% of LGBT+ people who have experienced intimidation, threats or hurtful or derogatory comments linked to their sexual orientation and/or gender identity first experienced them at school.

03. Transphobia

A feeling or expression of rejection, contempt or hatred towards people or behaviours associated with trans identities. Any person, cis or trans, who expresses — occasionally or otherwise — a gender perceived as non-conforming may be the target of transphobic and/or homophobic behaviour. It takes the form of social stigmatisation of trans people or those perceived as such, and of discrimination (at work, in public space, in the family, among friends, in the neighbourhood, in healthcare, etc.), negative prejudice, verbal aggression (insults, threats, mockery), physical aggression (blows, injuries, rape, etc.) or psychological violence.

04. Racism

Racism is a doctrine founded on the belief that a hierarchy exists between human groups, according to nationality, a supposed race, skin colour, descent, or national or ethnic origin. By extension: an attitude of systematic hostility towards a category of people defined by their origin. In France, the Pleven Act of 1st July 1972 legally defines racism as "incitement to discrimination, hatred or violence against a person or group of persons on account of their origin or their membership, or non-membership, of a specific ethnic group, nation, race or religion". The Pleven Act, which brought French legislation into line with the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, is the first major anti-racism law and the cornerstone of non-discrimination law. Racism appears in four guises: it shows itself in attitudes (remarks, insults, threats, etc.) founded on opinions and beliefs, articulated with stereotypes and prejudice; it is found in behaviours expressed through social practices ranging from avoidance to persecution, in organised forms or otherwise; it also exists in ways of operating that institutionalise exclusion, segregation and discrimination (state persecution, apartheid, etc.); finally, it appears in ideological, theoretical or even doctrinal discourses, made up of narratives designed to justify the domination of some human groups by others, often invoking science to that end.

05. Antisemitism

Antisemitism covers all forms of discrimination, prejudice, stereotyping and hostility towards Jewish people (or people perceived as such). It may also target Jewish people's property, community or religious institutions. It is a form of racism that targets Jewish people because of their identity, whether real or supposed. In France, according to the report of the National Consultative Commission on Human Rights (CNCDH), antisemitic acts — and racist acts in general — have risen worryingly since the end of 2023. The report draws in particular on Ministry of the Interior data recording an "exponential rise in antisemitic acts" in 2023 — a level unmatched since records began in 1992.

06. Islamophobia

Islamophobia is a racism that targets people perceived as Muslim (whether they are or not), often on the basis of their physical appearance, name or geographical origin. The racism affecting Muslim people results from the construction, in the collective imagination, of a homogenised social group that conflates religion, ethnic or national origin, and cultural or even physical traits. Since establishing an International Day to Combat Islamophobia, the United Nations has regarded it "as a form of racism in which Islamic religion, tradition and culture are seen as a 'threat' to Western values". The Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, for its part, adopted a resolution in October 2022 calling for Islamophobia to be recognised as a form of racism. In France, Islamophobia is not explicitly enshrined in criminal law, but Islamophobic acts can be punished as discrimination and incitement to hatred on grounds of race or religion. Islamophobia has its roots mainly in the history of European colonisation, which relied on theories of the supposed inequality and hierarchy of "races". Despite the end of the colonial and slave systems, racist representations and mechanisms inherited from colonialism and slavery persist in today's societies.

07. Xenophobia

Though in common use, the term "xenophobia" carries a degree of terminological blur, all the more so as the notion of the "foreigner" is gradually becoming decoupled from that of nationality: a French citizen can be perceived as foreign. Xenophobia cannot be entirely conflated with racism, since its mainspring lies more in a recoil from difference — with regard to certain national cultural traits — than in a will to essentialise and rank origins and cultures. The suffix "phobia" refers to reactions that emphasise the need for protection against immigration, "invasion" and foreign influences. Drawing on slogans such as "France for the French!" or "Foreigners out!", xenophobia reveals a defensive, exclusionary attitude towards whatever is suspected of corrupting the country's identity, essence and traditions. One thinks of the student and professional corporations mobilised in the 1930s to impose quotas in their fields. Indeed, xenophobia has long been associated above all with material, economic concerns (competition from immigrant workers). Hostility may target only certain specific traits of a minority, judged too different. Xenophobia thus expresses a form of cultural insecurity, linked to the feeling that the traditional order — often a fantasised one — and national values are under threat.

08. Fatphobia

Fatphobia refers to all the phenomena of social marginalisation affecting people perceived as fat. It shows itself explicitly, through insults and remarks, but also through a set of discriminations that form a system: difficulties accessing employment, medical care, or suitable infrastructure (seats that are too narrow on public transport, for example). It is also expressed in attributing the deaths of fat people to their weight alone, when other comorbidity factors may be involved.

09. **Classism**

Classism refers to all forms of discrimination based on membership of a social class. Such discrimination can operate through various markers: clothing, leisure activities, education (qualifications, languages spoken, general culture, etc.), networks, place of residence, ease of access to various services (justice, healthcare, etc.). Classism can combine with other forms of discrimination such as sexism or racism.

10. **Ableism**

Also called "capacitism", ableism refers to systemic discrimination that makes non-disabled people the social norm, justifying the inferiorisation and marginalisation of disabled people. Ableism manifests itself in a set of structural discriminations — difficulty accessing housing or public buildings, obstructed movement in public space, unsuitable facilities, etc. — as well as in insulting remarks or comments.

04

Bibliography

- Bazin, C., Bonneau, P., Duros, M., Fauritte, G., Lin, C., Mabazan, D., & Malet, J.** (2025). *La France associative en mouvement* (23e éd.). Recherches & Solidarités.
- Cottin-Marx, S., Hély, M., Jeannot, G., & Simonet, M.** (2017). La recomposition des relations entre l'État et les associations : Désengagements et réengagements. *Gouvernement et action publique*, 6(4), 11-25.
<https://doi.org/10.3917/gap.174.0011>
- Crettol, M.** (2024). *Who cares ? Analyse du travail du care dans le milieu associatif, de la théorie à la pratique* [Mémoire de stage de master, Université de Genève]. Archive ouverte UNIGE.
<https://archive-ouverte.unige.ch/>
- D'Ussel, B.** (2024). *Gouvernance démocratique : piège ou nécessité pour une organisation militante ?* [Mémoire de master, Aix-Marseille Université].
- Febecoop.** (s. d.). *Manuel pour les administrateur·rices de coopératives*.
<https://wallonie-bruxelles.febecoop.be/publications/manuel-pour-les-administrateurs-de-cooperatives/>
- Fédération des acteurs de la solidarité.** (2025). *Enquête : Associations de solidarité en voie de disparition*.
<https://www.federationsolidarite.org/innover-soutenir/observatoires/enquete-associations-de-solidarite-en-voie-de-disparition/>
- Flahault, É., Dussuet, A., & Loiseau, D.** (2014). *Emploi associatif, féminisme et genre*. *Travail, genre et sociétés*, 31(1), 101-121.
<https://doi.org/10.3917/tgs.031.0101>
- Freeman, J.** (1972). *La tyrannie de l'absence de structure* (Collectif Indice, trad.). Indice. (Œuvre originale – texte prononcé en conférence – publiée en 1970)
- Guérin, I., Hillenkamp, I., & Verschuur, C.** (2019). *L'économie solidaire sous le prisme du genre : une analyse critique et possibiliste*. *Revue Française de Socio-Économie*, 22(1), 107-124.
<https://doi.org/10.3917/rfse.022.0107>
- Loi du 23 mars 2019 introduisant le Code des sociétés et des associations et portant des dispositions diverses. (2019).
Moniteur belge, 4 avril 2019.
- Merckelbach, S.** (2020). *Un petit livre rouge sur la source : Un regard inspirant et libérateur sur le management et la vie grâce aux « principes source »* (postface de P. J. Koenig). Éditions Aquilae.
- Starhawk.** (2021). *Comment s'organiser ? Manuel pour l'action collective* (G. Chognard, trad. ; préface d'I. Frémeaux & J. Jordan). Cambourakis. (Œuvre originale publiée en 2011 sous le titre *The Empowerment Manual*)
- Vachée, C., Dansac, C., Gontier, P., Bordes, V., & Ruel, S.** (2014). *Vers des pratiques inclusives en matière de gouvernance des associations : Rapport de recherche de la phase 2 du projet GARP* (Gouvernance des Associations et Rapports de Pouvoir). LRPMip /IUT de Figeac / Université de Toulouse.

Authors

BRÛLANT-E-S

Brûlant-e-s is a French charity that provides workshops, training, and instructional materials to a wide range of audiences with the goal of promoting gender equality, raising awareness of discrimination, and preventing sexist and sexual violence at the local, national, and European levels.

To address these issues, the organisation uses participative and creative approaches, including non-formal teaching and artistic mediation. Through various formats, such as film-debates, radio workshops, creative writing, and fanzines, the organisation creates spaces for expression around feminist issues. Brûlant-e-s aims to reach diverse audiences, including secondary school and university students, local program beneficiaries, the elderly in nursing homes, prison inmates, and the general public at open events. The organisation also trains social and equality workers, municipal employees, educators, feminist activists, and other working professionals.

Website : www.brulant-e-s.com / Instagram : [brulant.e.s](https://www.instagram.com/brulant.e.s)



COMME UN LUNDI

Comme un Lundi is a Belgian charity that provides interactive audiovisual workshops on a variety of topics for young people and adults. Its approach aims to create meeting spaces for exchanges between peers and with field practitioners, in order to develop critical thinking and enrich collective reflection.

Radio is now the organisation's primary tool, while they also use video and photography according to the needs of the participants. Based on its sound creations, Comme un Lundi develops instructional tools that can be used as training material.

The organisation's activities fit into three axes: radio creation, which includes training and workshops on topics such as sexual and mental health, and stereotypes; facilitator training, which provides training and audiovisual production methods; and shared governance, which is based on participation and collective decision-making.

Comme un Lundi works with a wide range of audiences, including youth, aspiring entrepreneurs, social workers, communities, and persons involved in shared governance initiatives.

Website : www.commeunlundi.be / Instagram : [commeunlundiasbl](https://www.instagram.com/commeunlundiasbl)



Funding Bodies & Partners

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.



Co-funded by
the European Union

Licence

© 2026 by Brûlant•e•s and Comme un Lundi

This book is made available under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution – ShareAlike 4.0 International licence (CC BY-SA 4.0).

View the licence : <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>

