

GENDER-FOCUSED, DIVERSITY-SENSITIVE JOURNALISM: TRAINER'S GUIDE

Nazia Afrin Monami
Trishiya Nastaran

GENDER-FOCUSED, DIVERSITY-SENSITIVE JOURNALISM: TRAINER'S GUIDE

Published by



Supported by



House: 11/1 (2nd Floor), Iqbal Road, Block: A
Mohammadpur, Dhaka-1207
Phone: +88 01819129473
E-Mail: info@sacmid.asia, dd.sacmid@gmail.com
www.sacmid.asia

Coordinated by

Syed Kamrul Hasan
Md. Easin Ahmed
Mahfuja Nasrin

Supervision

Jimi Amir
Mainul Islam Khan

Design & Layout

Shadman Al Arbi

Date : December 2025

PREFACE

Practical Gender and Diversity Sensitive Journalism

In today's interconnected world, journalism carries the responsibility of reflecting societies as they truly are—diverse, dynamic, and evolving. For a country like Bangladesh, where multiple ethnicities, languages, religions, and gender identities coexist, inclusive reporting is not just good practice; it is essential for democratic dialogue. Gender diversity in newsrooms and in news narratives enables more accurate representation of lived realities, particularly those that have historically been marginalized. This preface sets the stage for understanding why gender inclusion matters, how it strengthens trust in media, and what is at stake when it is neglected. Audiences trust media that acknowledge and represent them. When reporting reflects the diversity of a society, people feel seen, respected, and more willing to rely on journalists as credible sources of information.

In Bangladesh, where communities often feel misunderstood or stereotyped in mainstream media, gender-sensitive reporting signals fairness and accuracy. Inclusive storytelling avoids sensationalism, reduces bias, and presents human-centered perspectives. This creates an essential ingredient at a time when misinformation and political polarization erode public trust. Moreover, inclusive media practices strengthen accountability. When diverse voices are part of the newsroom, editorial decisions are less likely to reinforce harmful norms and more likely to uphold ethical standards. As a result, audiences recognize that their realities are portrayed genuinely, not selectively or manipulatively.

To address exactly these needs in a rapidly changing media landscape, DW Akademie launched its project "Journalism of the Future" across Asia in 2024. This project is supported by Germany's Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ). DW Akademie is Deutsche Welle's center for international media development, journalism training and knowledge transfer. Its projects strengthen the human right to freedom of expression and unhindered access to information. DW Akademie empowers people worldwide to make independent decisions based on reliable facts and constructive dialogue. In Bangladesh, DW Akademie is partnering with the South Asia Center for Media in Development (SACMID) to implement this project together.

The project "Journalism of the Future" is an ambitious initiative to empower the next generation of media leaders as 30 fellows from five districts in Bangladesh will be equipped with the skills, critical insights, and ethical grounding they need to navigate today's dynamic media environment. But within the Journalism of the Future program, a series of publications will help all of us explore key issues of the changing media environment too. This module on "Practical Gender and Diversity Sensitive Journalism" is the second in this line of publications. It is a suggested training module with a detailed rundown; interactive training methods and engaging materials that educators can use to help learners explore this important topic. Designed as either a five-day intensive course or a semester-long weekly module, the curriculum blends theory with hands-on practice.

DW Akademie and SACMID extend their sincere thanks to the experts, trainers, and media professionals whose insights and dedication shaped this module. We hope that this module will not become a lasting resource for media education and innovation but also spark broader conversations about the crucial issue itself.

Priya Esselborn

Project Manager, DW Akademie

Syed Kamrul Hasan

Deputy Director, SACMID



AUTHOR BIO



Nazia Afrin Monami

Adjunct Faculty and Media Specialist

Nazia Afrin Monami is a seasoned media and communications professional with extensive experience in journalism, digital content, and audiovisual production. She serves as an adjunct faculty member at ULAB, teaching Mobile Journalism and Aesthetics of Films. Nazia has held leadership roles at Prothom Alo, Somoy TV, and DBC News, overseeing editorial operations and promoting ethical journalism. She also works as a consultant and journalism trainer, including with the Press Institute of Bangladesh and international media projects. Passionate about media development, she bridges academic insight with real-world practice to shape the future of digital storytelling in Bangladesh.

Trishiya Nastaran

CSO, Feminist, Activist

Trishia Nashtaran (she/her) is a feminist activist, foresight strategist, and community organizer from Bangladesh with over 13 years in the gender rights movement. She founded Meye Network, a grassroots feminist platform connecting Bangla-speaking women and marginalized groups. Trishia is also an organizer and editor at the Feminist Alliance of Bangladesh (FAB). A 2014 German Visitors' Program alum, she explored cyber policy and freedom of expression. She holds a Master's in Strategic Foresight and Innovation from OCAD University, where she researched digital feminist futures. Her work centers empathy, design, and storytelling to foster inclusive, decolonized, and just futures.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	01
Workshop Objectives	
Training Approach	
Engagement Techniques for Trainers	
Structure of the Workshop	
Day 1: Understanding Gender and Diversity in Journalism	04
Overview of the Day	
Session Breakdown	
Session Details	
1. Introduction Day 1	
2. Input: The Power of Journalism in Constructing Reality	
3. Discussion: Analyzing Media Framing in Protests/News	
4. Activity 1: Whose Voices Are Missing?	
5. Reflection: Personal Biases and Perspectives in Journalism	
6. Input: Understanding Diversity in Journalism	
7. Discussion: Representation Statistics and Implications	
8. Activity 2: Bias in Headlines	
9. Input: Impact of Bias and Exclusion in Journalism	
10. Discussion: Gender Bias and Erasure of Marginalized Groups	
11. Activity 3: Reflection on Bias in Personal Reporting	
12. Reflection & Conclusion + Personal Action Plan + Headline Bias Battle	
Day 2: Gender, Diversity, and Intersectionality in Journalism	11
Overview of the Day	
Session Breakdown	
Session Details	
1. Introduction to Day 2	
2. Input: Understanding Intersectionality	
3. Discussion: How Journalism Perpetuates or Challenges Intersectional Inequality	
4. Activity: Identity Matrix	
5. Reflection: Intersectionality in Personal Reporting	
6. Input: Applying Intersectionality in Journalism	
7. Discussion: Ethical Considerations & Common Pitfalls	
8. Activity: Intersectional Analysis of a News Story	
9. Input: Impact of Intersectionality on Storytelling	
10. Discussion: Identifying Intersectional Bias in Media (
11. Activity: Reflection on Bias in Headlines	
12. Reflection & Conclusion + Personal Action Points	

Day 3: Reporting on Gender and Diversity: Challenges and Ethics 17

Overview of the Day

Session Breakdown

Session Details

Introduction to Day 3

Ethical Challenges in Reporting on Gender and Diversity

Discussion: Case Studies of Biased and Ethical Reporting

Activity 1: Ethical Decision-Making in Reporting

Input: Balancing Objectivity and Advocacy in Journalism

Discussion: When Does Reporting Become Advocacy?

Activity 2: Sensitivity Reading and Feedback

Input: Cultural Sensitivity in Reporting

Discussion: Ethical Dilemmas in Media Representations

Activity 3: Role-Playing Ethical Dilemmas

Activity 4: Ethical Decision-Making Scenarios

Reflection & Conclusion: Ethical Journalism and Its Role in Social Change

Day 4: Gendered Violence, Media, and Ethical Reporting 25

Overview of the Day

Session Breakdown

Session Details

1. Introduction to Day 4

2. Input: Understanding Gender-Based Violence (GBV)

3. Discussion: The Role of Media in Shaping GBV Narratives

4. Activity: Case Study Analysis of GBV Coverage

5. Input: Ethical Reporting on GBV – Best Practices

6. Discussion: Avoiding Sensationalism, Victim-Blaming, and Stereotyping

7. Activity 2: Rewriting a Problematic News Report on GBV

8. Input: Trauma-Informed Journalism

9. Discussion: Privacy, Consent, and the Power of Language in GBV Reporting

10. Activity 3: Writing Exercise – Crafting a Survivor-Centered News Report

11. Discussion: Ethical Dilemmas and Gray Areas in GBV Reporting

12. Reflection & Conclusion: Final Takeaways and Open Discussion

Day 5: The Future of Gender & Diversity Sensitive Journalism 31

Overview of the Day

Session Breakdown

Session Details

1. Introduction to Day 5

2. Input: Exploring Intersectionality in Future Journalism

3. Input: Diversity in Newsrooms – Investigate & Present

4. Activity 1: Mapping Representation Gaps in Media
5. Input: Solutions Journalism for Gender & Diversity Issues
6. Input: Responsible AI and Technology in Gender-Sensitive Journalism
7. Activity 2: Fact-Checking Gender and Diversity Misinformation
8. Input: Covering Marginalized Voices – Ethical Challenges
9. Activity 3: Writing Exercise – Centering the Marginalized
10. Input: The Future of Gender & Diversity Journalism
11. Reflection & Conclusion: Final Reflections

Works Cited	37
--------------------------	-----------

Bibliography

Glossary	38
-----------------------	-----------

Definitions of Key Terms Related to Gender, Diversity, and Inclusive Journalism



Gender-Focused, Diversity-Sensitive Journalism: Trainer's Guide

Welcome to the *Practical Gender and Diversity Sensitive Journalism* workshop. This five-day training is designed to equip journalists with the knowledge, skills, and ethical frameworks necessary to report on gender and diversity issues responsibly. Journalism shapes public perception and social discourse, and through this training, we aim to enhance how gender and diversity are understood, represented, and integrated into news reporting.

This *Trainer's Guide* provides an overview of the workshop's objectives, learning structure, and techniques for engaging participants effectively.

Workshop Objectives

By the end of the five-day training, participants should be able to:

- Understand and apply key concepts related to gender and diversity in journalism.
- Recognize biases, stereotypes, and political challenges in news reporting.
- Develop ethical and inclusive reporting practices, using frameworks and guidelines.
- Utilize emerging technologies, including AI, in diversity-sensitive journalism.
- Produce journalistic content that is gender-aware, inclusive, and socially responsible.

Training Approach

This workshop is structured around **Knowledge, Attitude, and Practice (KAP)** changes. Each session moves beyond the theoretical understanding to actively engage participants in reflection, discussion, and hands-on exercises.

Key Features of the Workshop

- **70% Interactive Learning** – The majority of sessions include group activities, discussions, and hands-on exercises.
- **Real-World Application** – Case studies and practical tasks mirror actual newsroom challenges.
- **Critical Thinking & Reflexivity** – Participants are encouraged to analyze their own biases and assumptions.
- **Ethical Considerations & Press Freedom** – The training recognizes the political realities of journalism, equipping participants to navigate these challenges.
- **Integration of AI & Technology** – Sessions address the role of automation in journalism, its ethical dilemmas, and practical uses.





Engagement Techniques for Trainers

To create real competence development by practical application through individual and group project work trainers should employ the following engagement strategies:

1. Contextualizing for Bangladesh

- Throughout this module, trainers are expected to actively support learning by providing relevant examples from the Bangladeshi media context. Where activities instruct participants to select articles, cases, or scenarios, trainers may either (a) prepare 1–2 illustrative examples in advance to guide discussion, or (b) invite participants to bring their own examples from their professional experience. This flexibility allows trainers to adapt sessions to participants' backgrounds while ensuring discussions remain grounded in local realities.

2. Encouraging Active Participation

- Use open-ended questions to spark discussion rather than lecturing.
- Incorporate small group work to ensure everyone has a voice.
- Invite participants to share personal experiences from their professional work.

3. Balancing Debate and Sensitivity

- Gender and diversity discussions can be contentious. Create a space where participants feel safe to express their views but also be challenged constructively. This principle is operationalized at the start of Day 1 through guided self-reflection and group agreements that establish psychological safety and shared norms for respectful engagement.
- Use case studies to move debates beyond personal opinions and toward journalistic best practices.

4. Using Multi-Modal Learning Tools

- Visuals: Use images, news clips, and infographics to illustrate points.
- Interactive Quizzes: Check comprehension through quick quizzes.
- Role-Playing Exercises: Have participants take on different perspectives in newsroom decision-making scenarios.
- Technology Demonstrations: Show how AI tools analyze bias in news reporting.

5. Addressing Resistance and Misconceptions

- Some participants may resist gender-sensitive journalism, seeing it as advocacy rather than reporting.
- Emphasize that inclusive journalism is about accuracy, fairness, and professional integrity.
- Use data and examples to counter common myths (e.g., that gender-sensitive language is unnecessary).



Structure of the Workshop

Each day of the workshop builds on the previous one, with increasing levels of complexity and engagement:

Day 1: Introduction to Gender and Diversity in Journalism

- Key concepts: Gender, diversity, intersectionality, media's role.
- Historical treatment of gender/diversity in Bangladeshi and global media.

Day 2: Bias, Stereotyping, and Political Challenges

- Identifying biases and stereotypes in news reporting.
- Political and institutional barriers to diversity-sensitive journalism.

Day 3: Ethical Reporting, Guidelines, and Emerging Technologies

- Ethical frameworks for reporting gender and diversity.
- AI's role in journalism and digital backlash against marginalized groups.

Day 4: Practical Tools for Inclusive Journalism

- Inclusive language, visual representation, and storytelling techniques.
- Addressing online harassment and reporting technological abuse.

Day 5: Producing Gender/Diversity-Sensitive Content

- Participants apply workshop principles by producing a complete news piece.
- Peer review, feedback, and reflections on real-world applications.

Final Thoughts for Trainers

This workshop is not just about delivering content—it is about fostering critical awareness and shifting journalistic practices. As a trainer, your role is to guide participants through meaningful discussions, challenge their perspectives, and provide them with practical tools they can apply in their work.

With a balance of theory, practice, and engagement, we aim to create a journalistic culture that values accuracy, fairness, and inclusion.



Day 1: Understanding Gender and Diversity in Journalism

Overview of the Day

Journalism is more than just reporting facts—it shapes narratives, represents voices, and holds power accountable. Mainstream journalism often reinforces inequalities by marginalizing certain perspectives. This session explores the importance of gender and diversity sensitivity in journalism, focusing on how media representation influences public perception and policymaking.

By the end of this session, participants will:

- Understand the role of journalism in shaping social realities.
- Identify gaps in media representation related to gender, sex, sexuality, race, class, caste, ethnicity, disability, religion, etc.
- Learn how exclusion and bias impact storytelling.
- Reflect on their own position and biases as journalists.

Total Duration: 5 hours (including breaks)

Session Breakdown

	Session	Activity + Method	Duration
01	Introduction	Participant Introductions (share name, role, reason for joining, expectation; group question on why journalism needs gender/diversity sensitivity)	20 min
02	Input	The Power of Journalism in Constructing Reality (includes Think–Pair–Share micro-engagement)	10 min
03	Discussion	Analyzing Media Framing in Protests /News (Think–Pair–Share + Small-group discussion)	20 min
04	Activity 1	Whose Voices Are Missing?	25 min
05	Reflection	Personal Biases and Perspectives in Journalism	20 min
	Break	Short tea/coffee break	15 min
06	Input	Understanding Diversity in Journalism (with Bangladeshi examples, Brainwriting micro-engagement)	10 min
07	Discussion	Representation Statistics and Implications	20 min



	Session	Activity + Method	Duration
08	Activity 2	Bias in Headlines	25 min
09	Input	Impact of Bias and Exclusion in Journalism (Small-group Discussion micro-engagement)	10 min
10	Discussion	Gender Bias and Erasure of Marginalized Groups	20 min
11	Activity 3	Reflection on Bias in Personal Reporting	20 min
	Break	Short tea/coffee break	15 min
12	Reflection & Conclusion	Personal Action Plan + Headline Bias Battle (Activity)	30 min
	Break	Mid-day (Lunch Break)	30 min

Session Details

1. Introduction, Safe Learning Space, Self-Reflection, and Group Agreements (20 min)

- Because gender and diversity reporting often involves personal experiences, ethical tensions, and emotionally challenging situations, this training begins by establishing a respectful and safe learning space.
- Participants are invited to engage in a brief self-reflection and group agreement process to ensure that discussions can take place with care, openness, and mutual respect.

Self-Reflection (5 minutes)

Participants silently reflect on the following questions:

- What do I need in order to feel safe and respected in discussions on gender, diversity, and ethics?
- What experiences—professional or personal—might influence how I engage with these topics?

Group Agreements (5 minutes)

The trainer facilitates a collective discussion and records shared agreements, such as:

- Listen without interrupting
- Speak from personal experience
- Respect confidentiality
- Allow space for discomfort and learning
- Avoid personal attacks or dismissive language

The trainer briefly acknowledges that some sessions may evoke strong emotions or recall stressful journalistic experiences, and emphasizes that participants may step out, pause, or seek support if needed.





Brief Diversity Overview (5 min): Trainer introduces basic terminology

- Gender vs. sex, identity, diversity dimensions (race, class, caste, ethnicity, disability, religion, sexuality)
- Sets the foundation for Day 2 intersectionality discussions.

Participant Introductions (5 min): Each participant shares

- Name and role
- Reason for joining the training
- One expectation from the module

2. Input: The Power of Journalism in Constructing Reality (10 min)

Trainer outlines how journalism selects voices, frames events, and constructs social realities.

Use the protest framing example to show contrasting frames:

- Framing as disorder: "Police struggle to contain violent mobs."
- Framing as justice movement: "Citizens demand action against economic injustice."

Micro-engagement (Think–Pair–Share 4 min)

- **Think (1 min):** Participants individually note one recent example (headline or lead) where framing changed the meaning of an event. The trainer may provide a sample Bangladeshi media example to initiate discussion, especially if participants are unfamiliar with the topic or time is limited.
- **Pair (2 min):** Pairs compare notes and choose one example to present.
- **Share (1 min):** 1–2 pairs briefly report back (trainer collects examples on flipchart).

3. Discussion: Analyzing Media Framing in Protests/News (20 min)

- **Method:** Think–Pair–Share + Small-Group Discussion
- **Instructions:**
 - Think (2 min): Participants individually read a short news excerpt. The trainer may provide a sample Bangladeshi media example to initiate discussion, especially if participants are unfamiliar with the topic or time is limited. Then the participants note:
 - Who is centered?
 - Who is missing?
 - What framing techniques are used?
 - Pair (5 min): Pairs compare observations and highlight one framing choice that shifts public perception.



- 
- Share in small groups (10 min): Pairs join another pair (groups of 4) to identify:
 - Dominant Frame(s)
 - Missing Voices
 - Alternative Framings
 - Large-group summary (3 min): Each group shares one finding.

Why This Method:

Think–Pair–Share encourages deeper comparative insight, while small-group discussion allows multiple interpretations of framing to emerge and prevents one dominant perspective from steering the analysis.

4. Activity 1: Whose Voices Are Missing? (25 min)

- **Objective:** Recognizing gaps in representation.
- **Instructions:**
 1. Participants select a local Bangladeshi news article (for example, coverage of elections, labor protests, climate disasters, or crime reporting). If needed, the trainer may provide one pre-selected article to illustrate how certain voices—such as women, rural communities, religious minorities, or informal workers—are marginalized or absent.
 2. Identify who is quoted and who is missing.
 3. Rewrite the article by incorporating missing voices.

5. Reflection: Personal Biases and Perspectives in Journalism (20 min)

- Introduce **journaling** as a regular tool for personal reflection.
- Questions for journaling:
 - "Whose perspectives do I tend to include in my reporting?"
 - "What perspectives have I overlooked?"
- Participants journal a few sentences.
- Optional: Pair-share reflections for 5 minutes.
- Trainer briefly notes that reflection can help manage emotional reactions and maintain self-care.

6. Input: Understanding Diversity in Journalism (10 min)

- Trainer gives a concise breakdown: representation, access, stereotypes, dominant narratives. Present the core statistics (briefly) to show scale and patterns of underrepresentation.
- Include examples from Bangladesh (e.g. women in political reporting, rural vs urban coverage, ethnic minority representation).

Micro-engagement (Brainwriting - Quick Plenary — 4 min):

- **Brainwriting (2 min):** Participants silently write one local/Bangladesh-relevant example where a diversity dimension is missing or misrepresented. The trainer may provide a sample Bangladeshi media example to initiate discussion, especially if participants are unfamiliar with the topic or time is limited.
- **Plenary Flash (2 min):** Trainer collects 4–6 written examples (read aloud or posted) and highlights one pattern.

7. Discussion: Representation Statistics and Implications (20 min)

- **Method:** Brainwriting - Small-Group Discussion
- **Instructions:**
 - Brainwriting (5 min, silent): Participants write brief reflections:
 - “What impact does underrepresentation have on public perception and policy?”
 - Include examples from local media contexts.
 - Small-Group Discussion (10 min): Groups of 3–4 share and cluster similar ideas.
 - Plenary share-out (5 min): Each group selects 1–2 key implications to share.

Why This Method:

The topic is conceptual and reflective. Brainwriting prevents dominant voices from taking over and helps structure thoughts before sharing.

8. Activity 2: Bias in Headlines (25 min)

- **Objective:** Recognizing and eliminating bias in journalism
- **Instructions:**
 - Participants receive biased headlines provided by the trainers.
 - In pairs, they rewrite them in a neutral, inclusive way.
- **Example:**
 - Biased: “Female scientist makes history in a male-dominated field.”
 - Neutral: “Scientist breaks new ground in scientific research.”
- Groups share their rewritten headlines and discuss improvements.

9. Input: Impact of Bias and Exclusion in Journalism (10 min)

- Trainer explains gender bias in political reporting and erasure of marginalized voices, with short examples (e.g., women politicians questioned about family/-clothing; LGBTQ+ framed as “controversial”). Emphasize consequences for public perception and policy.



- **Micro-engagement (Small-group Discussion — 4 min):**
 - Form groups of 3 (2 min): Each group names one real consequence of biased coverage (e.g., policy neglect, stigma). In pairs, they rewrite them in a neutral, inclusive way.
 - Share (2 min): Each group offers one concrete newsroom practice that could reduce that consequence (trainer notes practical suggestions).

10. Discussion: Gender Bias and Erasure of Marginalized Groups (20 min)

- **Method:** Fishbowl Discussion (structured participation)
- **Instructions:**
 - Setup: 3 chairs in an inner circle (speakers); remaining participants sit in an outer circle (observers).
 - Round 1 (8 min): Inner circle answers, **“How can journalists avoid reinforcing stereotypes?”** [Trainer explicitly encourages participants to consider their own cultural context when responding.]
 - Rotation (2 min): New volunteers replace any inner-circle seats by tapping in.
 - Round 2 (8 min): Outer circle takes notes on:
 - Recurring patterns
 - Gaps
 - Practical strategies
 - Trainer synthesis (2 min): Summarizes key strategies and links to inclusive journalism principles.

Why This Method:

This is a sensitive topic requiring structured, respectful turn-taking. Fishbowl ensures balanced participation and reduces the risk of a few dominant voices framing the entire conversation.

11. Activity 3: Reflection on Bias in Personal Reporting (30 min)

- **Objective:** Encouraging self-awareness in reporting
- **Participants answer:**
 - "What identities do I hold (gender, class, ethnicity, etc.)?"
 - "How might these identities shape the way I see the world?"
 - "How might my biases affect my journalism?"
- When asking “How do you ensure everyone is engaged?” explicitly encourage reflection on strategies for creating **safe, inclusive participation**.
- Small-group discussions on personal experiences shaping news judgment.





12. Reflection & Conclusion (30 min)

1. Exploring Learning Outcomes

- a. Trainer asks: "What is one major realization from today?"
- b. Participants share key insights in pairs.
- c. Trainer facilitates a roundtable on how these insights will affect their reporting.
- d. Trainer reminds participants that personal action plans can include **self-care** measures for handling emotionally sensitive stories.

2. Reflection Method: Personal Action Plan

- a. Participants write down three changes they will make in their reporting.
- b. Share with a partner for accountability.
- c. Trainer collects responses anonymously for follow-up in later sessions.

Alternative Activity: Headline Bias Battle (20 min)

- **Objective:** Spot biased headlines, correct them, and earn points!
- **Instructions:**
 1. Divide participants into teams (3-5 people per team).
 2. Each team gets a "Bias Battle Sheet" with different bias categories (e.g., gender bias, stereotyping, clickbait, political framing).
 3. The trainer reads out a biased headline (or displays it on a screen).
 4. Teams race to identify the bias and rewrite the headline in an unbiased way.
 5. Teams write their answers on small whiteboards/paper.
 6. First team to raise their board and have a correct answer wins 2 points.
 7. If the first team is wrong, another team can steal for 1 point.
 8. Bonus Round: The trainer throws in a tricky headline, and teams must explain why it's problematic before rewriting it.



Day 2: Gender, Diversity, and Intersectionality in Journalism

Overview of the Day

Building on the concepts of gender and diversity explored in Day 1, Day 2 delves deeper into the framework of intersectionality. It highlights how gender, sex, sexuality, race, class, caste, ethnicity, disability, religion, and other factors intersect to influence media portrayals and treatment. Journalists must consider these intersections to produce more nuanced, inclusive reporting.

By the end of this session, participants will:


- Understand intersectionality and its relevance to journalism.
- Recognize the overlapping forms of discrimination people face.
- Apply intersectional frameworks to journalism.
- Critically assess how the media perpetuates multiple forms of marginalization.

Total Duration: 5 hours (including breaks)

Session Breakdown

	Session	Activity + Method	Duration
01	Introduction to Day 2	(Recap of Day 1; overview of the day; guiding question on overlapping forms of discrimination)	15 min
02	Input	Understanding Intersectionality (includes Gallery Walk micro-engagement)	12 min
03	Discussion	How Journalism Perpetuates or Challenges Intersectional Inequality Think–Pair–Share	20 min
04	Activity	Identity Matrix mapping personal intersecting identities	30 min
05	Reflection	Intersectionality in Personal Reporting (individual reflection)	15 min
	Break	Short tea/coffee break	15 min
06	Input	Applying Intersectionality in Journalism (CardSort micro-engagement)	12 min
07	Discussion	Ethical Considerations & Common Pitfalls Brainwriting + small-group discussion	20 min





	Session	Activity + Method	Duration
08	Activity	Intersectional Analysis of a News Story reframing using intersectional lenses	30 min
	Break	Short tea/coffee break	15 min
09	Input	Impact of Intersectionality on Storytelling	12 min
10	Discussion	Identifying Intersectional Bias in Media small-group case analysis	20 min
11	Activity	Reflection on Bias in Headlines	30 min
12	Reflection & Conclusion	Personal Action Points	30 min
	Break	Mid-Day (Lunch Break)	30 min

Session Details

1. Introduction of Day 2 (15 min)

- Trainer welcomes participants and briefly recaps key learnings from Day 1, especially how journalism shapes narratives and representation.
- Provides an overview of the Day 2 agenda, highlighting the shift from individual identities to the intersections between gender, race, class, caste, ethnicity, disability, religion, and sexuality. This module examines intersectionality within the specific social, cultural, and media context of Bangladesh. Discussions, examples, and activities are grounded in local realities, including gender norms, class hierarchies, religious identities, ethnic minority status, disability, and labor conditions. Trainers are encouraged to draw on Bangladeshi news coverage and participants' professional experiences to contextualize intersectional inequalities in journalism.
- Guiding question to the group: "Where do you see overlapping forms of discrimination in media coverage?"
- Invite 2–3 volunteers to share examples from their professional or national context.
- Trainer connects these reflections to the day's objectives:
 - Understanding intersectionality
 - Recognizing multiple layers of marginalization
 - Applying these insights to journalistic practice



2. Input: Understanding Intersectionality (12 min)

- Trainer introduces intersectionality, defining the concept using Kimberlé Crenshaw's framework.
- Explain how overlapping identities (gender, race, class, sexuality, disability, caste, religion, etc.) shape lived experience and media representation.
- Use the example of how Black women are stereotyped through both racialized and gendered biases to show how single-axis reporting fails.
- In the Bangladeshi context, intersectionality is particularly visible in how gender intersects with class, rural–urban divides, religion, disability, and occupation. For example, media coverage of garment workers' protests often focuses on public disruption while overlooking how women workers' gender, economic precarity, and migration status shape their vulnerability and demands.
- Micro-engagement (Gallery Walk – 3–4 minutes):
 - Trainer places 4–5 identity categories (e.g., gender, race, class, disability, sexuality) written on separate sheets around the room.
 - Participants walk around and put one sticky note under any category with an example of how that identity is misrepresented in the media.
 - Trainer reads 2–3 interesting notes aloud.

3. Discussion: How Journalism Can Perpetuate or Challenge Intersectional Inequality (20 minutes)

- **Method: Think–Pair–Share**
- How it works (trainer instructions):
 - Think (3 min): Participants individually reflect on the discussion prompt:-
 - “How does mainstream journalism fail to consider intersectionality, and how can it do better?”
 - Participants are encouraged to reflect on Bangladeshi media examples, such as reporting on slum evictions, Rohingya refugees, domestic workers, religious minorities, or transgender communities, and analyze how overlapping identities are either acknowledged or erased in coverage.
 - They note one example from their own context.
 - Pair (7 min): Participants discuss their examples with a partner and identify one way journalism can challenge intersectional inequality.
 - Share (10 min): Each pair shares its key insight with the larger group; the trainer groups similar themes on a board/flipchart.

Why This Method : Intersectionality requires personal reflection before discussion; Think–Pair–Share helps participants process complex examples individually, compare them in pairs, and then surface the most insightful patterns collectively.





4. Activity 1: Identity Matrix (30 minutes)

- **Objective:** Reflect on intersecting identities in personal contexts.
- **Instructions:**
 - Participants create an identity matrix listing their social identities (gender, race, class, ethnicity, religion, etc.).
 - They reflect on how these identities intersect and influence their journalistic approach.
- **Reflection prompt:** “How do your social identities influence the way you report, and how could an intersectional perspective shift that?”

5. Reflection: Intersectionality in Personal Reporting (15 minutes)

- **Objective:** Examine personal biases in reporting.
- Participants reflect on:
 - How their own identities shape story selection
 - Who they interview
 - How stories are framed
- **Reflection prompt:** “What have you learned about your biases today, and how can you apply an intersectional approach in your journalism?”

6. Input: Applying Intersectionality in Journalism (12 minutes)

- Trainer explains how journalists must intentionally apply an intersectional lens—not as an add-on but as a core analytical tool.
- Briefly describe how power structures (patriarchy, capitalism, racism, casteism, ableism, heteronormativity) shape experiences and therefore reporting.
- Emphasize that intersectionality is actionable: it guides story selection, sourcing, framing, and ethics.
- **Micro-engagement (Card Sort – 3–4 minutes):**
 - Trainer distributes small cards listing different story elements (e.g., headline, sourcing, photo choice, quote selection, context).
 - In pairs, participants sort cards into two piles:
 - “Needs intersectional consideration”
 - “Does not need intersectional consideration”
- Trainer quickly debriefs - Most elements require an intersectional lens.

7. Discussion: Ethical Considerations and Common Pitfalls (20 minutes)

- **Method: Brainwriting - Small-Group Discussion**
- How it works (trainer instructions):





- Brainwriting (5 min, silent): Participants silently write down 2–3 ethical concerns related to intersectional reporting (e.g., tokenism, stereotyping, misrepresentation).
- Small-Group Discussion (10 min): Groups of 3–4 compare their lists, cluster similar concerns, and identify one common pitfall and one ethical safeguard.
- Plenary Share (5 min): Each group reports back with one pitfall + one recommended practice.

Why This Method:

Ethical issues can feel sensitive or intimidating to speak about immediately; brainwriting allows participants to express concerns more safely and thoughtfully before moving into small supportive groups for deeper discussion.

8. Activity 2: Intersectional Analysis of a News Story (30 minutes)

- **Objective:** Apply an intersectional analysis to a news story.
- **Instructions:**
 - Participants choose a recent news piece. The trainer may provide a sample Bangladeshi media example to initiate discussion, especially if participants are unfamiliar with the topic or time is limited.
 - Identify race, class, gender, disability, or other axes of oppression in the story.
 - Rewrite or reframe it to add intersectional depth.
- **Example:** Analyze a report on migrant workers by addressing not only economic struggles but also gender and racial dynamics.

9. Input: Impact of Intersectionality on Storytelling (12 min)

- The trainer explains how intersectionality strengthens journalistic storytelling by capturing the complexity of people's lived experiences. Instead of reducing individuals to a single identity—such as only gender, only class, or only race—an intersectional approach highlights how multiple identities shape experiences simultaneously. This leads to richer, more accurate reporting.
- The input emphasizes that incorporating intersectionality allows journalists to move beyond simplified narratives and portray the realities of marginalized groups more holistically. Examples may include stories about migrant domestic workers, disabled women in politics, or transgender communities facing economic injustice—cases where overlapping identities significantly influence experiences and media portrayals.
- The trainer concludes by noting that intersectional storytelling not only improves accuracy but also promotes fairness and inclusion, helping journalism better reflect the diversity of the societies it serves.



10. Discussion: Identifying Intersectional Bias in Media (20 minutes)

- **Method Small-Group Discussion (Case-Based)**
- How it works (trainer instructions):
 - **Group formation:** Participants form groups of 3–4.
 - **Case-based discussion (15 min):** Trainers may use recent Bangladeshi news reports—such as coverage of flood-affected communities, labor migration, or public health crises—to help participants identify how intersectional dimensions (gender, poverty, geography, disability) are frequently flattened or ignored. Each group selects (or is given) a recent media example and analyzes:
 - How intersectional identities were overlooked
 - What biases or erasures occurred
 - How the story could be re-framed to include intersecting identities
 - **Short share-out (5 min):** Groups share one key example or pattern observed

Why This Method:

This discussion requires detailed examination of real news cases, which is best done collaboratively in small groups where participants can pool examples, compare interpretations, and identify recurring patterns of intersectional bias.

11. Activity 3: Reflection on Bias in Headlines (30 minutes)

- **Objective:** Identify and correct biases in headlines. The trainer may provide a sample Bangladeshi media example to initiate discussion, especially if participants are unfamiliar with the topic or time is limited.
- **Instructions:**
 - Participants rewrite biased headlines to incorporate intersectional awareness.
- **Example:** Coverage of an LGBTQ+ activist should reflect their racial identity when relevant, not frame them through a single lens.

12. Reflection & Conclusion (30 minutes)

- **Objective:** Consolidate learning and commitments.
- **Instructions:**
 - **Participants share key takeaways.**
 - **Trainer prompts:**
 - What did you learn about intersectionality today?
 - How will you apply it in your journalistic work? What concrete actions can you take moving forward?



Day 3: Reporting on Gender and Diversity: Challenges and Ethics

Overview of the Day

Reporting on gender, diversity, and social justice issues presents unique challenges for journalists. Ethical considerations, cultural sensitivity, and maintaining objectivity can be difficult when covering marginalized communities or sensitive issues. This session examines the ethics of inclusive reporting, exploring how journalists can navigate the challenges of bias, misinformation, and sensationalism while maintaining respect for diverse voices.

The ethical challenges discussed in this module are examined within the Bangladeshi journalistic landscape, where political pressure, cultural traditions, social conservatism, digital harassment, and structural inequalities shape reporting practices. Participants are encouraged to draw on their own newsroom experiences and national media examples when engaging with ethical dilemmas.

By the end of this session, participants will:

- Understand the ethical challenges in reporting on gender and diversity.
- Learn how to balance objectivity and advocacy in inclusive journalism.
- Recognize the importance of cultural sensitivity in reporting.
- Develop strategies for handling ethical dilemmas related to diversity and representation.

Total Duration: 5 hours (including breaks)

Session Breakdown

	Session	Activity + Method	Duration
01	Introduction to Day 3	(Recap of Day 1 & 2; overview of ethical themes; guiding question and short participant reflections)	15 min
02	Input	Ethical Challenges in Reporting on Gender and Diversity	12 min
03	Discussion	Case Studies of Biased and Ethical Reporting Small-Group Case Analysis	20 min
04	Activity 1	Ethical Decision-Making in Reporting Group analysis of ethical dilemmas	30 min
	Break	Tea/Coffee Break	15 min
05	Input	Balancing Objectivity and Advocacy in Journalism	12 min



	Session Type	Activity + Method	Time Allocation
06	Discussion	When Does Reporting Become Advocacy? Think–Pair–Share	20 min
07	Activity 2	Sensitivity Reading and Feedback Text annotation and revision	30 min
	Break	Tea/Coffee Break	15 min
08	Input	Cultural Sensitivity in Reporting (includes Cultural Lens Swap micro -engagement)	12 min
09	Discussion	Ethical Dilemmas in Media Representations Fishbowl	20 min
10	Activity 3	Role-Playing Ethical Dilemmas Scenario-based negotiation	30 min
11	Activity 4	Ethical Decision-Making Scenarios (Interactive Game)	20 min
12	Reflection & Conclusion	Ethical Journalism and Its Role in Social Change	29 min
	Break	Mid-Day (Lunch Break)	30 min

Session Details

1. Introduction of Day 3

- The trainer welcomes participants and briefly recaps key insights from Day 1 (media representation and bias) and Day 2 (intersectionality and overlapping marginalizations), emphasizing how these foundations lead into today's focus on ethics.
- Overview of the day's agenda, highlighting the complexities of reporting on gender, diversity, and social justice issues—especially the need to balance accuracy, sensitivity, and objectivity when covering marginalized communities.
- The trainer also introduces the idea that 'objectivity' in journalism is not a fixed position but a negotiated practice shaped by whose perspectives and experiences are recognized as legitimate.
- The trainer poses the question:

"What ethical challenges have you encountered—or observed—in reporting on sensitive or marginalized groups?"

"Whose perspectives tend to be treated as 'neutral' or 'objective' in mainstream reporting—and whose are not?"



- Participants are invited to share 2–3 short reflections.
- The trainer links the shared examples to the day's learning objectives: understanding ethical dilemmas, balancing objectivity and advocacy, practicing cultural sensitivity, and identifying strategies for responsible, inclusive reporting.

2. Input: Ethical Challenges in Reporting on Gender and Diversity (12 min)

The trainer introduces the major ethical challenges journalists face when reporting on gender and diversity, emphasizing the responsibility to avoid stereotypes, obtain informed consent, and prevent harm. The input clarifies how journalistic choices can unintentionally reinforce harmful narratives, particularly in stories involving race, gender, and sexual orientation. It highlights the need for sensitivity when portraying marginalized communities and situates ethical responsibility as a core part of inclusive reporting. The trainer notes that ethical reporting requires recognizing that claims of 'neutrality' often privilege dominant voices, while excluding marginalized perspectives from what is considered objective truth.

In Bangladesh, ethical challenges often arise when reporting on gender-based violence, religious minorities, LGBTQ+ communities, and labor movements, where sensationalism, fear of backlash, and political influence can override principles of dignity, consent, and accuracy.

3. Discussion: Case Studies of Biased and Ethical Reporting (20 min)

- **Method** : Small-Group Discussion (Case-Based Analysis)
- How it works (trainer instructions):Trainer prompts:
 - Group Formation: Participants form small groups of 3–4.
 - Case Review (10 min): Each group receives 1–2 short case studies—one showing biased reporting, one showing ethical reporting. Groups discuss:
 - What makes the first case biased?
 - Which ethical principles appear in the second?
 - What newsroom choices contributed to each outcome?
 - Group Share (10 min): Each group presents one biased technique identified and one ethical practice recommended.

Why This Method : Case analysis requires close reading and collaborative interpretation, which works best in small groups where participants can compare observations and debate differing perspectives before sharing a synthesized conclusion.

4. Activity 1: Ethical Decision-Making in Reporting (30 min)

- **Objective**: Help participants critically evaluate ethical dilemmas in reporting and develop strategies for responsible journalism.
- **Instructions**:
 - Trainers present 3–4 real-life or hypothetical ethical dilemmas journalists face when reporting on gender and diversity,



- Divide participants into small groups and assign one dilemma per group.
- Each group discusses:
 - What are the ethical concerns in this case?
 - How should a responsible journalist handle the situation?
 - What are the possible consequences of different decisions?
- Groups present their solutions to the larger audience, followed by a collective discussion.
- **Example Scenarios:**
 - Reporting on a transgender person's legal battle without exposing them to harm.
 - Covering a gender-based violence case without re-traumatizing the survivor.
 - Reporting on a protest where marginalized communities are misrepresented in mainstream media.

5. Input: Balancing Objectivity and Advocacy in Journalism (12 min)

The trainer expands the discussion of objectivity by explaining that journalism inevitably reflects perspective, and that notions of 'neutrality' have historically been shaped by dominant social groups. In the Bangladeshi context, certain perspectives—such as those of political elites, urban middle classes, or state institutions—are often treated as 'neutral' or 'objective,' while voices from rural communities, women workers, religious minorities, or marginalized genders are framed as subjective or advocacy-driven.

Participants are introduced to multiperspectivity — the practice of intentionally incorporating multiple viewpoints, especially marginalized ones, to produce more accurate and complete reporting. The trainer highlights how journalists can remain factually rigorous while questioning whose voices are treated as standard or authoritative.

Example: climate reporting dominated by Global North experts may appear 'objective,' yet excludes frontline communities whose experiences present a different truth

Reflection Prompt: "When you think of 'objective reporting,' whose viewpoint comes to mind first — and why?"

6. Discussion: When Does Reporting Become Advocacy? (20 min)

- **Method: Think–Pair–Share**
- The trainer encourages participants to examine how certain viewpoints are labeled 'advocacy' while others — often those aligned with powerful groups — are framed as neutral or factual." Participants may reflect on Bangladeshi examples, such as reporting on student movements, garment sector protests, environmental activism, or minority rights, where journalists must navigate pressure to appear neutral while accurately representing structural injustice.



- How it works (trainer instructions):
 - Think (3 min): Participants quietly reflect on the prompt:
 - “At what point does reporting shift into advocacy?”
 - “Is advocacy always a problem—or can it serve public interest?”
 - They write down one example from their own experience or media they follow.
 - Pair (7 min): Participants compare examples with a partner and identify one moment where the line between reporting and advocacy becomes unclear.
 - Share (10 min): Pairs share their insights with the group; the trainer gathers examples along a spectrum (neutral–advocacy journalism).

Why This Method : This topic can be abstract and polarizing; Think–Pair–Share allows personal processing first, then low-pressure paired discussion, before surfacing nuanced collective insights about objectivity, bias, and values.

7. Activity 2: Sensitivity Reading and Feedback (30 min)

- **Objective:** Develop participants' ability to critically assess media content for bias, misrepresentation, and insensitivity.
- **Instructions:**
 - Provide participants with short excerpts from news articles covering gender and diversity issues. Trainers should prioritize excerpts from Bangladeshi news coverage, such as reports on domestic violence cases, hijab bans, madrasa education, or minority communities, to ensure discussions remain grounded in local media practices.
 - Each participant reads and annotates the text, identifying potential issues with bias or insensitivity-
“Identify whether the text implicitly frames one perspective as the ‘objective’ one. Whose perspective is missing?”
 - In pairs, participants discuss and suggest changes to make the article more balanced and inclusive.
 - Groups share their suggestions with the full group, and a discussion follows.
- **Example:**
 - Reviewing an article on domestic violence that blames the victim rather than analyzing systemic issues.
 - Analyzing news framing of hijab bans and religious freedom.





8. Input: Cultural Sensitivity in Reporting (12 min)

- Trainer introduces cultural sensitivity as the practice of respectfully reporting on communities with different cultural, ethnic, racial, or religious backgrounds. Emphasize the need to understand cultural norms and avoid generalizations or exoticizing language.
- Cultural sensitivity in Bangladesh requires awareness of religious practices, gender norms, family honor, and community dynamics. Misrepresentation or insensitive framing can lead to stigma, harassment, or even physical risk for sources and journalists.
- **Examples:**
 - Reporting on Muslim communities
 - Reporting on sexual assault survivors without sensationalism or victim-blaming.

Micro-engagement (Cultural Lens Swap – 3–4 minutes):

- Trainer gives groups of 3 a short scenario (e.g., reporting on a religious festival, interviewing a sexual assault survivor, covering a minority community).
- Each group identifies one culturally insensitive risk in the scenario and one alternative approach that shows respect.
- Trainer takes 2 quick shares.

9. Discussion: Ethical Dilemmas in Media Representations (20 min)

- **Method Fishbowl Discussion**
- **How it works:**
 - Setup:
 - 3 chairs in an inner circle for speakers
 - Other participants seated around them as observers
 - Round 1 (8 min): Inner circle responds to the prompt:
 - “What are the recurring ethical dilemmas journalists face when representing marginalized groups?”
 - “How do journalists navigate situations where objectivity conflicts with minimizing harm or representing marginalized voices accurately?”
 - Observers take notes on patterns, tensions, and disagreements.
 - Rotation (2 min): New volunteers tap in to replace seats in the inner circle.
 - Round 2 (8 min): New speakers elaborate or challenge earlier points, adding examples or proposing solutions.
 - Trainer Synthesis (2 min): Summarizes key dilemmas and introduces ethical frameworks (e.g., minimizing harm, ensuring accuracy, dignity, consent).



Why This Method : Ethical dilemmas can generate emotionally charged opinions; Fishbowl creates a structured, respectful space where multiple voices contribute while preventing any one participant from dominating the conversation.

10. Activity 3: Role-Playing Ethical Dilemmas

- **Objective:** Encourage participants to engage with real-world ethical dilemmas in an interactive and immersive way.
- **Instructions:**
 - Participants are assigned different roles:
 - Journalist covering a marginalized community
 - News editor deciding on a headline
 - Community spokesperson
 - Ethical review board
 - A scenario is presented and each participant argues their position. The group negotiates to find the most ethical reporting approach.
- **Example Scenario:**
 - A journalist wants to publish a story on a refugee child's experience, but the family fears stigma and exploitation. How should the newsroom handle this?

11. Activity 4: Ethical Decision-Making Scenarios (Interactive Game)

- **Objective:** Make ethical decision-making fun and engaging through a gamified approach.
- **Instructions:**
 - Each participant receives a card with a brief ethical dilemma.
 - They must respond within 30 seconds and justify their decision.
 - Others can challenge the decision, leading to a rapid debate.
 - The best-argued ethical responses are voted on by the group.

12. Reflection & Conclusion: Ethical Journalism and Its Role in Social Change

- **Objective:** Wrap up the session with reflections on the role of journalists in shaping ethical narratives around gender and diversity.
- **Instructions:**
 - **Group Reflection:** Each participant shares one key takeaway from the session.
 - **Ethical Journalism Pledge:** As a symbolic closure, participants write a short ethical commitment for their future reporting.
 - **Open Discussion:** Facilitator encourages open-ended thoughts on how journalists can be agents of social change without compromising ethics.





- **Final Key Takeaways:**

- Ethical journalism must navigate complex challenges in reporting on gender, diversity, and marginalized communities (Gans, 2004).
- Objectivity and advocacy are not mutually exclusive but must be carefully balanced to ensure fair and accurate representation (Kovach & Rosenstiel, 2007).
- Objectivity is strengthened — not weakened — by including multiple perspectives and interrogating whose voices historically dominate the journalistic narrative.
- Cultural sensitivity is essential for accurate and respectful reporting on diverse communities.
- Journalists must confront ethical dilemmas with a commitment to dignity, privacy, and accuracy.



Day 4: Gendered Violence, Media, and Ethical Reporting

Overview of the Day

Inclusive storytelling is essential for journalists who aim to represent diverse voices and perspectives accurately. This session focuses on techniques for inclusive reporting and storytelling, emphasizing the importance of using language that is respectful and empowering while avoiding harmful stereotypes and tropes.

By the end of this session, participants will:

- Learn best practices for inclusive and ethical storytelling.
- Understand how to use language to empower marginalized communities.
- Develop skills for recognizing and avoiding harmful stereotypes in reporting.
- Create inclusive news stories that reflect diverse perspectives.

Total Duration: 5 hours (including breaks)

Session Breakdown

	Session	Activity + Method	Duration
01	Introduction to Day 4	(Recap of Day 3; overview of agenda; opening question; participant reflections; connection to learning objectives on inclusive storytelling and survivor-centered reporting)	15 min
02	Input	Understanding Gender-Based Violence (GBV) – Definitions, Myths, and Realities (includes micro-engagement: identifying GBV myths participants have encountered)	12 min
03	Discussion	The Role of Media in Shaping GBV Narratives — Think–Pair–Share - Small-Group Discussion	25 min
04	Activity	Case Study Analysis – Media Coverage of a High-Profile GBV Case Small-Group Analysis	30 min
	Break	Tea/Coffee Break	15 min
05	Input	Ethical Reporting on GBV Best Practices	12 min

	Session	Activity + Method	Duration
06	Discussion	Avoiding Sensationalism, Victim-Blaming, and Stereotyping — Brainwriting - Small-Group Discussion	25 min
07	Activity 2	Rewriting a Problematic News Report on GBV Pair Work	30 min
	Break	Tea/Coffee Break	15 min
08	Input	Trauma-Informed Journalism – Interviewing Survivors with Sensitivity	12 min
09	Discussion	Privacy, Consent, and the Power of Language in GBV Reporting Scenario -Based Small-Group Discussion	25 min
10	Activity 3	Writing Exercise – Crafting a Survivor-Centered News Report - Individual + Group Feedback	30 min
13	Discussion	Ethical Dilemmas and Gray Areas in GBV Reporting Fishbowl Discussion	30 min
14	Reflection & Conclusion	Final Takeaways and Open Discussion	14 min
	Break	Mid-day (Lunch Break)	30 min

Session Details

1. Introduction of Day 4 (15 min)

- The trainer welcomes participants and briefly recaps key takeaways from Day 3 on ethics, cultural sensitivity, and responsible reporting practices.
- Overview of the day's agenda, emphasizing the importance of inclusive storytelling when covering gendered violence and sensitive issues—particularly the use of respectful, empowering language and the avoidance of harmful tropes.
- The trainer poses the question:

“What challenges do journalists face when reporting on gender-based or sensitive forms of violence?”
- Participants are invited to share 2–3 short reflections
- The trainer links these insights to the Day 4 learning objectives:
 - i. mastering ethical storytelling techniques
 - ii. recognizing harmful stereotypes
 - iii. producing inclusive narratives that center survivor dignity and diverse perspectives.



2. Input: Understanding Gender-Based Violence (GBV) – Definitions, Myths, and Realities (12 min)


- Gender-based violence (GBV) refers to harmful acts directed at individuals because of their gender, including physical, sexual, psychological, and economic abuse. Women, girls, and gender-diverse individuals are disproportionately affected.
- **Key Points:**
 - GBV stems from power imbalances and societal norms.
 - Common forms: domestic violence, sexualized violence, femicides, online harassment, economic abuse.
 - Myths often blame survivors or downplay harm.
 - Global and Bangladesh-specific statistics highlight prevalence.
 - Example: The myth that domestic violence is a “private matter” often prevents survivors from getting legal or social support.
- **Micro-engagement:** Ask participants:
“Can you think of a myth about GBV you’ve encountered in your community or in media reporting?”

2. Discussion: The Role of Media in Shaping GBV Narratives (25 min)

- **Method Think–Pair–Share – Small-Group Discussion**
- How it works (trainer instructions):
 - **Think (3 min):** Participants individually reflect on the discussion prompts:
 - How does news framing shape perceptions of GBV?
 - How are survivors and perpetrators portrayed?
 - What stereotypes are reinforced?
 - **Pair (7 min):** In pairs, participants compare examples they have witnessed in local or international media, identifying a framing technique that subtly shifts responsibility or blame.
 - **Small-Group Discussion (12 min):** Pairs join another pair (groups of 4) to analyze how these patterns shape public attitudes toward GBV. Groups propose one alternative framing that avoids victim-blaming.
 - **Share-Out (3 min):** Each group presents 1 harmful framing pattern + 1 ethical alternative

Why This Method:

GBV framing is sensitive and requires personal reflection before open conversation; Think–Pair–Share allows participants to process their reactions individually before analyzing patterns collectively, resulting in deeper, less judgmental discussion.



4. Activity 1: Case Study Analysis – Media Coverage of a High-Profile GBV Case (30 min)

- **Objective:** Examine real-world examples of GBV reporting and identify ethical concerns.
- **Instructions:**
 - Participants analyze a published news article on a GBV case. The trainer may provide a sample Bangladeshi media example to initiate discussion, especially if participants are unfamiliar with the topic or time is limited.
 - They identify elements of victim-blaming, sensationalism, or bias.
 - Small group discussions on alternative ways to frame the story ethically.

5. Input: Ethical Reporting on GBV – Best Practices (12 min)

- **Key Points:**
 - Center the survivor’s perspective without sensationalizing.
 - Avoid explicit or triggering details of violence.
 - Use survivor-preferred language; avoid stigmatizing terms.
 - Ensure safety and privacy in reporting.
- **Example:** Instead of “rape victim,” use “survivor of sexualized violence” to respect dignity.

6. Discussion: Avoiding Sensationalism, Victim-Blaming, and Stereotyping (25 min)

- **Method: Brainwriting - Small-Group Discussion**
- How it works (trainer instructions):
 - **Brainwriting** (5 min, silent): Participants write down examples of sensational or victim-blaming coverage and list words/phrases that create harmful implications. The trainer may provide a sample Bangladeshi media example to initiate discussion, especially if participants are unfamiliar with the topic or time is limited.
 - **Small-Group Discussion (15 min):**
 - Groups of 3–4 compare their notes
 - Cluster common patterns (e.g., sensational details, stereotypical language)
 - Identify safer alternatives.
 - **Plenary Share (5 min):** Each group shares one example of harmful wording and one improved version.

Why This Method : Because GBV reporting can evoke strong emotions or discomfort, brainwriting provides a safer, more reflective way for participants to express concerns and examples before moving into small-group discussion.



7. Activity 2: Rewriting a Problematic News Report on GBV (30 min)

- **Objective:** Learn how to reframe a report to align with ethical guidelines.
- **Instructions:**
 - Participants receive a problematic news report from the trainers with victim-blaming or sensationalized language.
 - They work in pairs to rewrite it using ethical reporting principles.
 - Discussion on changes made and why.

8. Input: Trauma-Informed Journalism – Interviewing Survivors with Sensitivity (12 mins)

- **Key Considerations:**
 - **Consent:** Explain interview purpose and allow withdrawal at any time.
 - **Emotional Well-being:** Avoid intrusive questions that may retraumatize.
 - **Power Dynamics:** Recognize the journalist's role in shaping narratives.
- **Example:** Instead of "Why didn't you report this earlier?" ask, "What barriers did you face in seeking justice?"

9. Discussion: Privacy, Consent, and the Power of Language in GBV Reporting (25 min)


- **Method : Small-Group Discussion (Scenario-Based)**
- How it works (trainer instructions):
 - Form groups of 3–4 participants.
 - **Scenario-based discussion (18 min):** Each group works through questions such as:
 - When is it ethical to name a survivor?
 - How can journalists ensure anonymity and consent?
 - Which words reinforce power structures or stigma?
 - Groups assess hypothetical news excerpts and propose safer alternatives.
- **Share-Out (7 min):** Each group shares one strong principle for protecting survivor privacy and dignity.

Why This Method : Ethical decisions about privacy and consent require back-and-forth debate and collaborative reasoning, which small groups enable without the pressure of speaking in a large room.

10. Activity 3: Writing Exercise – Crafting a Survivor-Centered News Report (30 min)

- **Objective:** Apply ethical reporting principles to a real-world writing task.





- **Instructions:**

- Participants select a GBV case (fictional or real, with sensitive handling). The trainer may provide a sample Bangladeshi media example to initiate discussion, especially if participants are unfamiliar with the topic or time is limited.
- They write a short news report prioritizing survivor dignity and ethical framing.
- Group sharing and constructive feedback.

11. Discussion: Ethical Dilemmas and Gray Areas in GBV Reporting (30 min)

- **Method: Fishbowl Discussion**

- How it works (trainer instructions):
 - **Setup:** 3 chairs in the inner circle (discussion), the rest in an outer circle (observers).
 - **Round 1 (10 min):** Inner circle discusses real dilemmas:
 - Survivor wants to speak publicly but family objects
 - Police release graphic details—publish or not?
 - Public figure accused of GBV—how should the media proceed?
 - **Rotation (2 min):** Observers tap in to replace anyone in the inner circle.
 - **Round 2 (10 min):** New speakers add examples or challenge earlier points.
 - **Trainer Synthesis (8 min):** Trainer summarizes ethical tensions and introduces practical criteria (e.g., consent, harm reduction, public interest, minimizing sensational detail).

Why This Method: Ethical dilemmas are complex and morally charged; Fishbowl creates a structured respectful environment where multiple viewpoints can emerge without the conversation becoming chaotic or dominated by a few individuals.

12. Reflection & Conclusion: Final Takeaways and Open Discussion (15 min)

- Participants share key insights and discuss how they will apply these lessons in their reporting.
- **Reflection Prompt:**
 - What was the most challenging aspect of today's session?
 - How can journalists advocate for better GBV reporting standards in their newsrooms?



Day 5: The Future of Gender & Diversity Sensitive Journalism

Overview of the Day

The final day synthesizes insights gained throughout the workshop and examines the structural, ethical, and technological challenges of gender and diversity-sensitive journalism. The focus is on newsroom power structures, intersectionality, solutions journalism, AI's influence, and fact-checking misinformation. Participants will reflect on their role in shaping inclusive narratives and develop practical commitments to integrating gender-sensitive approaches into their reporting.

Learning Outcomes

By the end of this session, participants will:

- Understand intersectionality in newsroom structures and journalism practices
- Analyze newsroom power imbalances and barriers to diverse representation
- Learn how solutions journalism can improve reporting on gender and diversity
- Evaluate AI and algorithmic biases in news production
- Develop fact-checking techniques for misinformation about marginalized groups
- Apply ethical storytelling techniques to cover underrepresented voices

Total Duration: 5 hours (including breaks)

Session Breakdown

	Session	Activity + Method	Duration
01	Introduction to Day 5	(Recap of Days 1–4; overview of Day 5; opening prompt; 2–3 volunteers share; trainer links responses to learning outcomes)	15 min
02	Input	Exploring Intersectionality in Future Journalism — Experience - Reflection - Input	15 min
03	Input	Diversity in Newsrooms – Investigate & Present — Input - Activity - Discussion	15 min
04	Activity 1	Mapping Representation Gaps in Media — Small-Group Analysis	30 min
	Break	Short Tea/Coffee Break	15 min



	Session Type	Activity + Method	Time Allocation
05	Input	Solutions Journalism for Gender & Diversity Issues — Input - Reflection - Discussion	15 min
06	Input	Responsible AI and Technology in Gender-Sensitive Journalism — Input - Group Brainstorm	15 min
07	Activity 2	Fact-Checking Gender and Diversity Misinformation — Group Work	30 min
08	Input	Covering Marginalized Voices – Ethical Challenges — Experience - Input - Reflection	15 min
09	Activity 3	Writing Exercise – Centering the Marginalized — Individual + Pair/Group Work	30 min
	Break	Short Tea/Coffee Break	15 min
10	Input	The Future of Gender & Diversity Journalism — Input - Activity - Discussion	15 min
11	Reflection & Conclusion	Final Reflections — Group Sharing + Trainer Synthesis	30 min
	Break	Mid-Day (Lunch Break)	30 min

Session Details

1. Introduction of Day 5 (15 min)

- Trainer welcomes participants and recaps Days 1–4, highlighting the journey from representation and bias to ethical reporting and survivor-centered approaches.
- Overview of Day 5 as a forward-looking module exploring newsroom structures, solutions journalism, AI and algorithmic bias, and misinformation.
- Prompt: **“What structural or technological challenges will most shape the future of inclusive journalism?”**
- 2–3 volunteers share.
- Trainer links responses to the day’s learning outcomes.



2. Input: Exploring Intersectionality in Future Journalism (15 min)

- **Method Experience - Reflection - Input**
- **Experience (3 min):** Participants recall a recent news story and note whose voices were included or missing. The trainer may provide a sample Bangladeshi media example to initiate discussion, especially if participants are unfamiliar with the topic or time is limited.
- **Reflection (3 min):** Discuss how intersecting identities shape who is heard in stories.
- **Input (9 min):**
 - Intersectionality helps uncover gaps in future journalism, especially in fast-paced, digital-first reporting.
 - Challenges: siloed reporting, superficial identity-based framing, narrow data sets.
 - Case example: Reporting on violence against women often misses how class, disability, sexuality, or ethnicity alter risk and access to justice.

3. Input: Diversity in Newsrooms – Investigate & Present (15 min)

- **Approach: Input - Activity - Discussion**
- **Mini Input (5 min):**
 - Diverse teams strengthen coverage accuracy.
 - Barriers: hiring bias, editorial gatekeeping, unequal career progression.
 - Example: Global underrepresentation (e.g., women = 24% of news subjects).
 - Added Reviewer Suggestion: Mention the **BBC 50:50** Project as a practical model for improving representation.
- **Activity (5 min):**
 - Participants assess diversity in their newsroom (or a familiar local outlet). The trainer may provide a sample Bangladeshi media example to initiate discussion, especially if participants are unfamiliar with the topic or time is limited.
 - If not employed in a specific newsroom, they can analyze any Bangladeshi media house.
- **Discussion (5 min):**
 - Groups share 1–2 findings.
 - Trainer facilitates: How does diversity impact accuracy, framing, and trust?



4. Activity 1: Mapping Representation Gaps in Media (30 min)

- Participants analyze real news stories to identify whose voices are included/-excluded. The trainer may provide a sample Bangladeshi media example to initiate discussion, especially if participants are unfamiliar with the topic or time is limited.
- They propose **future-focused strategies**—how to make similar coverage more inclusive using lessons from earlier days.

5. Input: Solutions Journalism for Gender & Diversity Issues (15 min)

- **Approach: Input - Reflection - Discussion**
- **Input (10 min):**
 - Solutions journalism highlights responses and systemic change rather than only problems.
 - Key principles: rigor, evidence, avoiding “hero narratives,” showing limits.
 - Example: Instead of “Girls are dropping out of school,” spotlight programs that reduce dropout rates.
- **Reflection & Discussion (5 min):**
 - “How can solution-focused stories avoid oversimplifying structural inequality?”
 - Participants share ideas from their Bangladeshi context.

6. Input: Responsible AI and Technology in Gender-Sensitive Journalism (15 min)

- **Approach: Input - Group Brainstorm**
- **Input (10 min):**
 - AI influences news selection, writing, moderation, and verification.
 - Risks: misgendering, racial bias in facial recognition, algorithmic invisibility of marginalized groups.
 - Kept the original examples; framed AI as a future challenge, addressing reviewer feedback.
- **Brainstorm (5 min):**
 - Pairs identify an AI tool used in media and consider how it may introduce bias.
 - Share strategies for responsible use.

7. Activity 2: Fact-Checking Gender and Diversity Misinformation (30 min)

- Participants evaluate real or hypothetical examples of misinformation. The trainer may provide a sample Bangladeshi media example to initiate discussion, especially if participants are unfamiliar with the topic or time is limited.
- Using fact-checking methods, they debunk false claims about marginalized groups and propose clearer, responsible narratives.



8. Input: Covering Marginalized Voices – Ethical Challenges (15 min)

- **Approach: Experience - Input - Reflection**
- **Experience (3 min):** Recall a story where representation felt exploitative or incomplete.
- **Input (7 min):** Ethical pitfalls: sensationalism, tokenism, erasing agency, lack of consent.
 - Promote practices such as co-creating context with communities.
- **Reflection (5 min):**
 - Pairs discuss: “How would you approach this story differently?”


9. Input: Writing Exercise – Centering the Marginalized (30 min)

- Participants rewrite a problematic news piece provided by the trainers using principles from:
 - Intersectional analysis
 - Ethical reporting
 - Solutions journalism
 - Diversity-sensitive framing

10. Input: The Future of Gender & Diversity Journalism (15 min)

- **Approach: Input - Activity - Discussion**
- **Input (10 min):** The trainer introduces key emerging trends shaping the future of gender- and diversity-sensitive journalism. In addition to current developments, the session incorporates a systemic, power-critical lens that examines how global inequalities and colonial knowledge structures influence media production.
 - Emerging trends include:
 - **Feminist and anti-racist independent media**, which challenge dominant narratives and foreground marginalized voices.
 - **Decolonial journalism**, which critiques traditional Global North–centric media frameworks and emphasizes:
 - Power imbalances between the Global North and Global South,
 - The legacy of colonial knowledge systems,
 - The importance of centering local epistemologies, histories, and storytelling methods,
 - Resisting extractive reporting practices.
 - **AI-supported fact-checking and verification**, which help counter misinformation but require awareness of algorithmic bias, particularly against communities that have historically been underrepresented in datasets.



- 
- **Community-centered journalism**, which positions affected communities as experts and collaborators, shifting power away from top-down reporting structures.

The trainer emphasizes that the future of inclusive journalism lies in challenging inherited hierarchies, producing narratives that reflect diverse worldviews, and rethinking who gets to speak, who gets represented, and whose knowledge is valued.

- **Activity (5 min):** Small groups identify one area in their own reporting practice that may still rely on Global North frameworks (e.g., terminology, sources, assumptions, angles) and propose a decolonial alternative.
- **Discussion (5 min):** Groups share commitments; trainer synthesizes “How can we integrate feminist, community-centered, and decolonial approaches into our everyday newsroom decisions?”

11. Reflection & Conclusion: Final Reflections (30 min)

- Participants share their most meaningful takeaways and outline realistic next steps for applying gender-sensitive and diversity-aware approaches in their reporting.
- The trainer closes the module with final reflections and gratitude.

WORKS CITED

1. Ahmed, S. (2016). *Living a Feminist Life*. Duke University Press.
2. Bromley, M. (2014). *The Media and the Public: "Them" and "Us"*. Palgrave Macmillan.
3. Buchwald, E., Fletcher, P., & Roth, M. (1993). *Transforming a Rape Culture*. Milkweed Editions.
4. Eide, E. (2006). "Language and Power: The Construction of Meaning in Journalistic Practice." *International Communication Gazette*, 68(3), 235-255.
5. Gans, H. J. (2004). *Deciding What's News: A Study of CBS Evening News, NBC Nightly News, Newsweek, and Time*. Northwestern University Press.
6. Jost, J. T., Banaji, M. R., & Nosek, B. A. (2009). "A Decade of System Justification Theory: Accumulated Evidence of Conscious and Unconscious Biases in Favor of Status Quo." *Political Psychology*, 41-58.
7. Kovach, B., & Rosenstiel, T. (2007). *The Elements of Journalism: What Newspeople Should Know and the Public Should Expect*. Crown Publishing Group.
8. Tuchman, G. (1978). *Making News: A Study in the Construction of Reality*. Free Press.
9. Zetter, R. (2007). "More than Just Refugees: Humanitarian Agencies and the Politics of Refugee Protection." *International Journal of Refugee Law*, 19(3), 276-296.

GLOSSARY

This glossary provides definitions of key terms related to **gender, diversity, and inclusive journalism**. It serves as a reference for participants to ensure clarity and consistency in understanding the concepts discussed in the workshop.

A **Ableism** – Discrimination or prejudice against individuals with disabilities, often manifesting in social attitudes, inaccessible infrastructure, or exclusion from media representation.

Affirmative Action – Policies designed to address historical and systemic discrimination by actively promoting inclusion in workplaces, education, and media.

Allyship – The practice of supporting marginalized communities through active advocacy and solidarity while recognizing one's own privilege.

B **Bias** – A prejudice or preference that influences one's judgment, often unconsciously. In journalism, bias can affect the framing of news stories, selection of sources, and choice of language.

Byline – The section of a news article that attributes the journalist's name, signifying authorship and responsibility for the content.

C **Cisgender (Cis)** – A term for individuals whose gender identity aligns with the sex they were assigned at birth.

Colonial Gaze – A perspective shaped by colonial ideologies that exoticizes, stereotypes, or distorts representations of formerly colonized people and cultures.

Colorism – Prejudice or discrimination based on skin tone, often favoring lighter skin within racial or ethnic communities.

Constructed Reality – The idea that media narratives shape public perception rather than merely reflecting objective reality.

Cultural Appropriation – The adoption of elements of a marginalized culture by members of a dominant culture, often without understanding or respect.



D Deadnaming – The practice of using a transgender person's former name instead of their chosen name, often considered disrespectful and harmful.

Disability Justice – A movement advocating for the full inclusion and rights of disabled people, emphasizing intersectionality.

Diversity – The presence of multiple identities, perspectives, and experiences within a group, society, or media representation.

Double Burden – The phenomenon where marginalized individuals face multiple layers of discrimination (e.g., women of color facing both sexism and racism).

E Embedded Journalism – The practice of journalists being closely attached to military or state institutions, often leading to compromised neutrality.

Equity vs. Equality –

- **Equality** means treating everyone the same.
- **Equity** recognizes systemic disadvantages and seeks to provide fair opportunities by addressing barriers.

F Framing – The way information is presented in media to shape public perception. Framing can reinforce stereotypes or challenge dominant narratives.

Feminization of Poverty – The trend where women, especially single mothers and older women, are disproportionately affected by poverty due to systemic inequalities.

Fourth Estate – The press and media as a societal watchdog that holds power accountable.

G Gender Identity – A person's internal sense of their own gender, which may or may not align with their assigned sex at birth.

Gender Pay Gap – The difference in earnings between men and women, often influenced by discrimination, occupational segregation, and societal norms.

Glass Ceiling – An invisible barrier preventing marginalized individuals (especially women and minorities) from advancing in their careers.

Global South – A term referring to regions historically affected by colonialism and economic underdevelopment, often including parts of Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

H Hegemony – The dominance of one social group over others, often maintained through ideology, media narratives, and cultural institutions.

Heteronormativity – The assumption that heterosexuality is the default or normal sexual orientation, often leading to the marginalization of LGBTQ+ identities.

Human Rights Journalism – Reporting that centers human dignity, justice, and equality rather than just state or corporate perspectives.





- I** **Implicit Bias** – Unconscious attitudes that influence how people perceive and interact with others, often leading to discriminatory behavior in journalism and storytelling.
- Inclusivity** – The practice of ensuring representation and participation of all groups, particularly those historically excluded.
- Intersectionality** – A framework that recognizes how different forms of oppression (race, gender, class, disability, etc.) intersect and create unique experiences of marginalization.
- J** **Journalistic Objectivity** – The ideal that journalism should be neutral and fact-based, though it is often challenged by structural biases and power dynamics.
- Just Transition** – A principle advocating for an equitable shift from an extractive economy (fossil fuels, capitalism) to a sustainable, inclusive economy.
- L** **LGBTQIA+** – An acronym for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer (or Questioning), Intersex, Asexual, and other diverse sexual and gender identities.
- Language Politics** – The ways language reinforces power structures, such as gendered language or colonial linguistic dominance.
- Lived Experience** – The firsthand experience of individuals affected by social issues, often undervalued in traditional journalism.
- M** **Mansplaining** – When a man explains something to a woman in a condescending or overconfident manner, often assuming she lacks knowledge.
- Marginalization** – The exclusion or devaluation of certain groups from mainstream society, politics, or media.
- Media Ethics** – The principles guiding fair, accurate, and responsible journalism, including issues of bias, representation, and harm reduction.
- N** **Narrative Control** – The power to shape dominant social and political stories, often held by privileged groups or corporate media owners.
- Neocolonialism** – The continuation of colonial power dynamics through economic, cultural, and political means rather than direct occupation.
- Newsworthiness** – The criteria determining what stories receive media coverage, often reinforcing dominant perspectives and excluding marginalized voices.
- O** **Oppression** – Systemic discrimination that disadvantages certain groups while privileging others.
- Outing** – The act of revealing someone's LGBTQ+ identity without their consent, which can be harmful and dangerous.
- P** **Patriarchy** – A social system in which men hold primary power, influencing politics, economy, and culture.
- Privilege** – Unearned advantages granted to certain groups based on race, gender, class, ability, etc.





Public Interest Journalism – Journalism that prioritizes serving society by exposing injustice and amplifying underrepresented voices.

Q Queer Erasure – The exclusion or invisibilization of LGBTQ+ people in media and public discourse.

Quota System – A policy that mandates a certain level of representation for marginalized groups in workplaces or politics to address systemic barriers.

R Representation Matters – The idea that diverse and authentic representation in media shapes public perception and self-identity.

Reproductive Rights – The rights of individuals to make decisions about their reproductive health, including access to contraception and abortion.

S Sexual Harassment in Media Workplaces – A systemic issue where women and LGBTQ+ journalists face gender-based violence, discrimination, or unsafe working conditions.

Silencing – The act of ignoring, dismissing, or preventing marginalized voices from being heard in journalism or public discourse.

Structural Violence – Systematic ways in which social structures harm individuals by preventing them from meeting their basic needs.

T Tokenism – The superficial inclusion of marginalized individuals in media or workplaces to appear diverse without meaningful representation or power.

Transphobia – Discrimination or prejudice against transgender individuals.

W Whitewashing – The practice of minimizing or erasing non-white identities in media portrayals, often replacing them with white actors or narratives.

Whose Story Is Being Told? – A fundamental question in journalism that challenges the dominant narratives and ensures a diversity of perspectives

