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1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Thomson Reuters Foundation (TRF), with support from the C&A Foundation, implemented a training programme between 2015 and 2018 to increase public understanding of the scale, threats and nature of forced labour and human trafficking and its impact on communities around the world.

With India as a key country in the fight against slavery, the programme’s journalist training element focused on Indian journalists.

This evaluation focuses on TRF’s five-day training and ongoing mentorship of 36 mid-career Indian journalists over three years, to help them develop their expertise in reporting on modern slavery under the framework of a much bigger programme: Fighting Forced Labour and Human Trafficking through Journalism and Media Development.

It assesses the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and impact of the training on its beneficiaries, in line with its goal of developing journalists’ skills in reporting on slavery and human trafficking.

The report finds that the programme achieved its goals. It succeeded in training its target of 36 mid-career journalists. Twelve were trained in each of the sessions held in Mumbai (2016), Chennai (2017), and Delhi (2018). It was highly successful in raising journalists’ awareness of human trafficking and forced labour, strengthening their knowledge and investigative and analytical skills. Journalists rated the course highly, scoring a combined average of 9 out of 10 points. One third of trained journalists (12 people) had published outputs – not a mandatory requirement of the programme – over the three years.

In particular, the programme was highly effective in building journalists’ understanding of the problem, story planning and pitching, ethics, and understanding the expectations of editors.

The hundreds of applications received for the twelve places available each year attest to the demand and popularity of this programme, which is groundbreaking in its capacity to take on the challenge of critical reporting on these issues and, in so doing, contributing to the framing of a public and policy agenda around modern slavery.

The evaluation identified a number of challenges faced by the programme, which did not substantially affect its overall achievements, but are nevertheless worth noting. These focus on first, the transfer of practical field skills and facilitation of real life examples and sources on the topic; and second, the mentorship of journalists which
formed a key component of the original programme.

Challenges in conducting the evaluation were mainly related to gaps in data and a poor response rate from journalists to a survey and requests for published stories for assessment purposes. The evaluation is therefore based on analysis of background documents, pre- and post-training feedback and quizzes, a survey which had a just over 50% response rate, and key informant interviews.

Broadly, the evaluation makes nine recommendations. First, tightening the monitoring and evaluation process by conducting a baseline study of the outputs and frequency of outputs of participants as part of the application process; second, providing guidance for external resource persons and site visits to ensure that such interventions do not end up being viewed as public relations exercises; third, managing expectations of participants on what the course does and does not cover from the outset; forth and fifth, systematically and actively following up with the editors of media houses and journalists that consistently produce articles and sustaining those relationships; sixth and seventh, establishing an incentive scheme to encourage longer term engagement by journalists with the subject – in the form of a fellowship and competitions; eighth, establishing a system for receipt of published stories from participants for the duration of the programme; and finally, curate all published stories into a publication that can both showcase the initiative and plot trends in types of stories – and therefore the nature of modern slavery - published over time.

2. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

An estimated 40.3 million people are modern slaves and, shockingly, more than 10 million of these are children.\(^1\) According to Anti Slavery\(^2\), an organization whose origins stem from the 1849 anti-slavery society, modern day slavery encompasses: forced labour; sexual exploitation; and forced marriage. Women form the largest group affected as they are particularly prone to human trafficking, and its affiliated acts of subjugation such as sexual slavery, forced labour, forced early marriages, debt bondage and other forms of slavery.

---

\(^{1}\) Antislavery, https://www.antislavery.org/slavery-today/modern-slavery/
\(^{2}\) https://www.antislavery.org/about-us/history/
According to Anti Slavery, someone is in slavery if they are:

- Forced to work – through coercion, or mental or physical threat;
- Owned or controlled by an ‘employer’, through mental or physical abuse or the threat of abuse;
- Dehumanised, treated as a commodity or bought and sold as ‘property’;
- physically constrained or have restrictions placed on their freedom of movement

Asia-Pacific is home to the majority of people in modern slavery, with about 30.4 million affected, mostly in bonded labour.

Despite global efforts by human rights groups, the media, and others to shine a spotlight on modern slavery issues, reports indicate that it continues unabated. In its Global Report on Trafficking in Persons 2016, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNDOC)\(^3\) indicates that the number of countries involved in human trafficking has grown significantly from 33 in 2003 to 158 in 2016. This is despite international legal instruments and measures to eliminate all forms of exploitation, especially of women and girls.

**Thomson Reuters Foundation Training Programme**

Thomson Reuters Foundation recognises human trafficking and modern slavery as, “one of the biggest stories of our time... Yet a lot of reporting on trafficking and

Against this background, TRF, with support from the C&A Foundation, implemented a training programme between 2016 and 2018 to increase public understanding of the scale, threats and nature of forced labour and human trafficking and its impact on communities around the world.

With India as a key country in the fight against slavery -- the Global Slavery Index estimates that it has the highest number of people enslaved, at over 18 million according to Global Slavery Index estimates -- the programme’s journalist training element focused on Indian journalists’ training.

This evaluation focuses on TRF’s five-day training and ongoing mentorship of 36 mid-career Indian journalists over three years to help them develop their expertise in reporting on modern slavery under the framework of a much bigger programme: Fighting Forced Labour and Human Trafficking through Journalism and Media Development.

---

The majority of these journalists had conducted some reporting on issues of modern slavery but lacked information and knowledge on the forms of modern slavery and its pervasiveness within their own communities.

The TRF training sought to advance the understanding and reporting skills of journalists around the topic in the following ways:

- **Understand the problem** – how is slavery defined and how big is it? What laws and conventions exist to tackle it?
- **Access stories** by building links with relevant organizations, communities, and leading experts;
- **Plan a story or investigation on modern day slavery** – including assessing the risk to the journalist as well as any contributors and their families;
- **Take an ethical approach** by working through real-life dilemmas that journalists have faced; and
- **Scrutinize the response** – it’s not just about reporting on the problem, but also questioning what is being done to deal with it.

The structure of training was a mix of theory and practice, which gave participants an opportunity to explore issues of human trafficking and modern slavery in India, learn new skills in identifying and developing story ideas, and to put into practice what they were learning during the course.

During the five-day training, participants interacted with survivors of human trafficking and forced labour through field visits to civil society organisations actively involved in these issues and, through feedback and guidance from their trainers to polish their journalism skills. The journalists applied the skills they acquired by producing stories.

TRF designed the training programme to also cover those aspects of journalism that are lacking amongst journalists in India and other developing countries, in particular ethics in reporting. As such, all training included legal aspects of reporting on human trafficking and modern slavery issues and tools to hone journalists’ interview skills of survivors of these crimes.

### 3. EVALUATION APPROACH

CommsConsult was approached by C&A Foundation to undertake an evaluation of

4 http://www.trust.org/media
development/programmes/?sfid=a15D00000018xNlaiAM&areaOfFocus=Equality%20and%20Tolerance
the training component of the programme and to assess the effectiveness of the training on the programme’s outcomes. The evaluation aimed to answer the following questions:

To what extent was the training provided to journalists:

- **Relevant** in terms of content, delivery and needs of the journalists and objectives of the overall programme. Were the activities and outputs of the training element of the programme consistent with the intended impact?
- **Effective** in terms of providing the journalists with appropriate skills and / or networks to increase the focus on slavery.
- **Efficient** in terms of training methods and best practices.
- To what extent were the **objectives achieved** and what factors influenced the achievement or lack of.
- What was the **overall impact** of training on beneficiaries.

The framework of assessment of the training programme was informed by OECD DAC’s\(^5\) criteria articulated in the DAC principles for the Evaluation of Development Assistance. The Kirkpatrick Model on Evaluating Training Programs\(^6\) was particularly useful in formulating enquiry into: how participants reacted to the training as it relates to:

- **Learning** in terms of new skills acquired, confidence and job motivation;
- **Application of learning** in their own craft as well as broad impact within their own organisation; and value for money.

Assessing impact of training programmes is complex and this is especially so for media training programmes. According to Becker, et al. who evaluated the effects of mid-career training on journalists,\(^7\) “Despite the prominence of these training programs for working journalists, they have received little attention in the literature on journalism education and journalistic work. As a consequence, little is known about their effectiveness.” The challenges of measuring the impact of training are due to the ambiguity of what is being measured and that often, while the results are about the learner’s reaction to training, It is difficult to identify any more concrete outcomes post-training.

\(^5\) OECD DAC Principles for the Evaluation of Development Assistance

\(^6\) https://www.kirkpatrickpartners.com/Our-Philosophy/The-Kirkpatrick-Model

Assessing impact is particularly troublesome, where training is provided to the reporter who is just one part of a chain of command and rarely has the say on the final outcome of his/her output. Further, while it is possible to measure the output of news stories, it is very difficult to measure their effects on news consumers. Pitt and Green-Barber⁸, writing on ‘The case for media impact’, say the media – and especially non-profit media -- has spent the past few years struggling to measure the impact of its work. They note that “…at its core, journalism is intended to have an effect: to inform the public so we can be civically engaged and hold the powerful to account”.

3.1. METHODOLOGY

This evaluation focuses on TRF’s specific objectives for the training as outlined above. The methodology described below sought to assess the impact of training on participants according to the programme rationale, using a combination of evaluation tools, including desk review, key informant interviews, and online surveys. These are described in more detail below.

3.1.1. Desk Review

This involved a comprehensive review of all relevant programme documents supplied by TRF (included in Annex 9.1). Documentation includes:

- Fighting Forced Labour and Human Trafficking Through Journalism and Media Development Contract and Framework
- Course outline/programmes
- Post course evaluations and feedback
- Pre- and post training quizzes;
- Monitoring reports.

The progress and monitoring reports were reviewed to assess progress made against planned activities, and to analyse and make explicit how the training interventions and activities contributed to achieving the training objectives.

This evaluation counted the number of publications produced, but did not undertake a content analysis of stories published post training. We were not given access to course materials due to copyright restrictions and so were not able to critique either the quality or utility of what was used for training. This was a significant limitation in

⁸ https://www.cjr.org/tow_center_reports/the-case-for-media-impact.php/
terms of assessment of the comprehensive training agenda.

3.1.2. **Key Actor Interviews**

We conducted interviews with relevant TRF staff and trainers to establish the rationale and approach to training (individuals interviewed included in Annex 9.2). These informed our analysis of the impact of the programme on the Foundation and its trainees.

3.1.3. **Online Survey of Journalists**

An online survey with open-ended and closed questions was designed and distributed through Survey Monkey to the 36 trained journalists (included in Annex 9.3). Fourteen responses were received.

The survey sought to assess the relevance of training as well as its impact on professional and career advancement of journalists. In line with journalists training programme objectives, the survey aimed to establish the extent to which training advanced the following:

- Understanding of the problems of slavery;
- Ability to access stories through facilitation of links with relevant sources;
- Improve story planning, including assessing personal risks as well as any contributors and their families
- Improve and apply capacity to tackle stories through an ethical lens;
- Increase and improve analytical skills in reporting.

The questions were designed to assess if the training provided journalists with space to explore issues of modern slavery using unique approaches and understanding and, if so, how far they have been able to reflect this increased understanding in stories they published. The evaluation questions also examined evidence that the training has provided journalists with new skills, and influenced their journalistic practices (e.g. encouraged them to establish and use new networks and sources). The survey also sought to establish the need for such training programmes; to identify challenges in turning new skills into sustained practices; and to highlight areas that might need attention in future work.

3.1.4. **Survey of Editors**

A short survey was designed to specifically target editors from media organisations whose journalists received training from TRF (sample survey and list of editors targeted included in Annex 9.3). The survey was sent to five editors whose contacts were supplied by TRF and designed to better understand what motivated the
organisations to send their journalists to the training courses offered by TRF, as well as to establish if the training had the anticipated impact. One of reasons cited as an impediment to sustained reporting by a number of journalists was the lack of resources. Through the survey, editors were requested to share their organisational plans to support journalists after training as well as recommendations for future training. None of the editors responded to the survey.

4. EVALUATION FINDINGS

Measuring impact is a long term and imprecise process. Impact is not often immediate and attribution is elusive: it can be difficult to directly connect the observed outcomes of a programme to inputs. With media, sustained pressure as a form of advocacy and awareness raising around a particular issue plays an important role in influencing policy and generating citizen action to demand policy change. The role of skilled and informed journalists, equipped with an understanding of the issues they are reporting and sensitive to the challenges of doing so without doing more harm, is an important part of this ‘causal chain’. The journalism training was a small part of the bigger programme, funded by C&A Foundation, and its achievements should be set in the context of the larger evaluation currently being conducted.

4.1. Overview of Objectives Achieved

The stated intended impact of the training, according to TRF’s proposal submitted to C&A as an element of the overall Fighting Slavery and Human Trafficking Through Journalism and Media Development are:

*To strengthen the quality of local journalism in India, ensuring that slavery and human trafficking are increasingly covered and that these issues are covered accurately (pp13).*

To a great extent, the programme succeeded in meeting the objectives as expressed in the contract and framework.

The training courses met the expressed ambitions of the programme: *‘Raised awareness of human trafficking and forced labour among journalists, strengthened their knowledge, together with their investigative and analytical skills.*

4.1.1. Conclusions drawn from monitoring data

While it is a straightforward process to assess the number of outputs in the form of numbers trained, and numbers and quality of articles produced as a result; it is more difficult to judge either the scale of the audience reached or impact on their attitudes
and behaviours. Attributing longer-term and higher order changes to individual training courses when there are many variables and fluid media contexts, is risky. However, close scrutiny of a programme’s monitoring data tells some of the story. Three annual courses were held in Mumbai, Delhi and Chennai. A total of 36 participants were trained. The evaluation identified 26 stories produced. A closer assessment, however, shows that out of these 26, several of these were from the same journalists and media outlets. In 2016, all seven published stories came from the same journalist working for Hindustan Times. In 2017, nine stories were published by six media outlets, four of these by www.trust.org and written by seven of the 12 Chennai trained journalists. Among the last cohort of journalists trained in 2018, Delhi, five stories, written by four journalists were published. There are likely to be more coming through from the 2018 trainees during the year. There may be other stories that were published but not reported to the TRF.

The proportion of journalists who published stories after receiving training was significant: this despite the fact that producing published articles was not a mandatory requirement, but only a strong expectation of the programme, One third of trained journalists (12 people) had published outputs over the three years. In an industry where a result of 10% is often adequate, this is a good result. It is important here to make the distinction between published and written outputs: the list of stories written by journalists is likely to be longer than the list of stories published. It is likely that some of the graduates of the short courses started to write journalistic pieces but faced challenges such as time pressures after having been out of the office for five days; lack of support from editors etc.

There are lessons to be drawn here around the need for consistent follow-on support after each training course, either from the editors or TRF, to maximise the impact made in each journalist.

TRF also needs to follow through on tracking published stories, the best sources being the journalists themselves. Though costly and time consuming, this cost should be factored into the budgeting of the M&E framework.

While the number of journalists trained is small, the impact of the training is high as evidenced by the quantity of stories produced by the participants during the training. TRF indicated that the small numbers were intended to maintain high standards and to ensure that training exposes participants to critical learning and participation, particularly in view of the nuanced reporting of complex issues such as those of human trafficking and modern slavery.
As part of this programme, TRF aimed to provide the best journalists in the group with one-to-one mentoring for a period of six months after training. This was to be provided by the two trainers, to produce quality reporting that could be shared through the Reuters network. This objective was only partially realised due to human resource constraints. One of the trainers was a full-time Reuters correspondent with extreme limitations in terms of balancing their day-to-day work and mentoring. The co-trainer was a consultant whose role could not be extended beyond the training course due to limited budget.

Failure to implement the mentorship element limited the potential outcomes of the programme. Some journalists indicated that they felt the five-day training was insufficient and they would have benefited from long term support through mentorship to really develop their professional skills in this area. However, one of the trainers indicated that there was also limited interest from the journalists, perhaps caused by time pressures.

Similarly, trainers raised engagement with editors as a challenge. This is fairly common in the media sector. One trainer gave the example where Reuters was unable to publish stories from participants because they were not up to Reuters standards. Some investigative pieces require a lot of work, but because of resource constraints, journalists and their editors fail to follow through on all leads required in producing a publishable story.

### 4.2. Review of Activities and Outputs

The activity and goals, as defined in the Performance Indicators/M&E Framework for this element of the overall programme are:

**Goal:** Increased stronger media capacity of journalists to cover slavery in India

**Indicator** - increased journalist knowledge on slavery issues and expert sources

**Activity:** Mentorship and Training – train journalists from India on effective ways to report human trafficking and forced labour and slavery

**Indicators:**

- number of journalists trained
- number of journalists mentored
- number of one-on-one mentorship hours
- number of stories published as a direct result of the mentorship
- number of stories published after training at 6 months/1 year
- number of people reached
- pre- and post-course quality content analysis
- pre- and post course topic knowledge and analysis
- number of stories triggering change on the ground

The training was successful in terms of reaching its overall goal and completing planned activities, although it failed to implement the mentorship element. This may have had implications for outcomes around numbers of stories published, but it is too early to tell.

**Number of journalists trained** – 36 journalists were trained, in line with the planned approach. Three five-day trainings were conducted each in Mumbai (2016), Chennai (2017), and Delhi (2018). It is important to note that the quality of journalists selected for training was also high due to TRFs rigorous selection methods. According to the trainers, the quality of journalists selected was evidenced in their engagement and eagerness to learn new things. A number swiftly put skills they had learned to good use and filed stories to their organisations during training.

- “Already using the methods suggested to pitch better stories. Also using data as an integral part of my reporting”. Mumbai 2017 participant – course feedback report

**Number of journalists mentored** – it is unclear how many journalists were mentored, but they were few, due to the cost and time constraints identified earlier. However, participants formed groups that could be described as a form of communities of practice using social media platforms WhatsApp and Facebook.

**Number of one-on-one mentorship hours** – this was not fully achieved.

**Number of stories published as a direct result of the mentorship** – Seven stories were published, all from the post Chennai training, as a direct result of mentorship

**Number of stories published after training at 6 months/1 year** – at least 26 stories were identified as having been published over the three-year period. Seven from the post-Mumbai (2016) training; 11 from the post Chennai (2017) training; and 5 from the post Delhi (2018) training.

**Number of people reached** – this is not quantifiable based on the data available.

**Pre- and post- course quality content analysis** – this is not quantifiable due to constraints as identified by trainers of the challenges faced in engaging editors to fully support their journalists, the result being that a number of stories were not published because they failed to meet Reuters standards and some were investigative
pieces that couldn't be completed.

**Pre- and post course topic knowledge and analysis** – feedback from journalists trained indicates that the programme was highly successful in increasing their knowledge of the topic and ability to approach their reporting from an analytical and ethical perspective.

**Number of stories triggering change on the ground** – this is not quantifiable based on the data supplied.

### 4.3. Relevance of Training

This section attempts to address the question of whether the training element of the programme’s activities and outputs were consistent with the intended outcome, specifically:

- Content
- Delivery
- Needs of the journalists
- Objectives of the overall programme.

#### 4.3.1. Content

“Unlike other courses that are boring and share mundane information, this course was an eye-opener. Not only did it provide access to information that journalists are completely unaware about, it also helped improve writing skills, listening skills and an overall framework for journalists to handle difficult situations during reporting”.

Mumbai 2016 participant – course feedback report

An overall review of the training programme clearly point to a robust training agenda designed both to help reporters to make sense of the complex local and global issues of human trafficking and modern slavery, as well as to help them express themselves more eloquently in their stories. Feedback from participants in their post course surveys and during the evaluation on the programme content was overwhelmingly positive. The course was rated highly, scoring an overall average of nine out of 10 points for trainers’ knowledge and skills, quality of lectures, discussions, exercises, materials, site visits, training facilities and accommodation. Site visits rated more poorly, particularly for the Mumbai training and there were mixed results for Delhi and Chennai.

The participants’ expressed satisfaction that their personal ambitions had been met. These varied from wanting to get a fuller understanding of the issues of human
trafficking and slavery to receiving enough information on multiple subject areas to better improve their reporting at their current jobs and in future (potential jobs). The desire to improve skills in investigating and specialising in human trafficking reporting was shared by many. This is still not covered as a specialised area of training, and it will take time before it becomes established as such, according to one trainer.

Although most of the journalists trained were senior journalists and had previously reported on human trafficking and forced labour, the survey results indicate that before the training they not aware of the full extent of the problem and how it had become normalised in their societies.

According to one of the trainers interviewed, many journalists who attend the course were not able to identify trafficking in their own backyard. For example, some children on the streets are often victims of trafficking. They have been brought from rural areas to ‘work as beggars’. They hand over collections to their handlers. Through training, the journalists began to see stories through a different lens. This is backed by the survey results and post-training feedback from participants, as illustrated below:

“The course provided an opportunity to know more about trafficking and bonded labour, especially in India. The trainers, participants, speakers threw more light on trafficking and modern day slavery happening in India. Even though I was aware of a few, the course gave me an opportunity to know more in detail. The course has educated me to the fact that within India there are more under reported stories on human trafficking and modern day slavery which I can do...”. Chennai 2017 participant – course feedback report
“Information shared during the course opened up a plethora of stories that I was unaware about. The topics are also under-reported and it allows journalists to expand their beat into a national/international framework”. Mumbai 2016 participant – course feedback report

“I associated human trafficking and slavery majorly to sexual exploitation. However, during the session I learnt that there were several elements to the subject. Also, it was interesting to note that one could find elements of human trafficking and modern slavery in other beats. The session on how to access data and go about the story pitch has brought a great change in the way I look at stories and pitch to my editor”. Delhi 2018 participant – course feedback report

4.3.2. Delivery

The post course reviews as well as the evaluation survey highly praised the trainers. Both trainers, Nita Bhalla and Timothy Large, received the highest scores of five across a cross-section of assessment criteria – knowledge of subject, communication skills and lecture quality.

“Listening to and learning from Timothy and Nita, two seasoned journalists, was a great learning experience. Getting to know fellow participants from different parts of India was incredible”. Chennai 2017 participant – course feedback report

The interactive nature of the training proved a high point for most journalists. Participants appreciated the opportunity to learn new reporting techniques and journalistic standards used by Reuters. Engagement with speakers and visits to organisations and survivors gave them new perspectives on issues of human trafficking and slavery. Such first-hand interactions gave participants an appreciation of the sensitivities that are required when interviewing survivors of abuse.

“It was a well framed course with all sort of ingredients in it which made it easy for me to learn and acquire the knowledge and skills. The trainers, practicals, lectures and the discussions made this course interesting. I hope to apply the skills and knowledge in the field as well”. Chennai 2017 participant – course feedback report

Interactions with other experienced reporters was also reported as a highlight of the training. Sharing experiences with other reporters was considered extremely useful as this gave reporters a chance to discuss with their peers, the challenges faced in
reporting and techniques to generate memorable stories.

4.3.3. Meeting the needs of participants

Q12: I feel more confident in writing stories on human trafficking and forced labour

The majority of reporters often struggle to come up with story ideas and pitching these to their editors. Respondents expressed that lessons on how to deal with survivors of human trafficking, different forms of slavery and group discussions improved their journalistic skills and forced them to challenge their own beliefs and stereotypes. After training, they were better able to deal with challenges they faced in identifying stories around them and more enlightened about how an editor’s mind works. Additionally, participants reported that they had acquired better pitching skills and understood how one story could be pitched using different angles.

“I have pitched a few story ideas during the training and now my main aim is to file stories first. I have already convened a meeting of my fellow colleagues of vernacular dailies and students of journalism of Assam University to discuss the things that I learned in the course. I will also share the materials with them so that they can also understand the issue and create more awareness among the people”. Mumbai 2016 participant – course feedback report

Participants found ‘data mining’ aspects of the training extremely useful. Reporting
on issues of human trafficking and slavery requires the understanding and use of data. Getting information and statistics on such issues can be notoriously difficult because sometimes it doesn’t exist and where it does, organisations and governments are sometimes reluctant to share for fear of exposing themselves. Sometimes, trying to get such information may even expose a journalist to danger.

Among comments on the use of resource experts, who received mixed reviews and among the lowest, some participants indicated that the government expert provided little useful information. This was further worsened by the fact that the expert insisted that the discussion was off the record. A strategy that TRF might employ, which works successfully elsewhere, is to brief resource experts thoroughly on expectations, ensure that someone with the authority to speak to media is sent, and guidelines provided on how to present information to journalists that is usable and not open to misinterpretation. This can help civil servants overcome their fear of the media, particularly being misquoted. Trust building is essential.

Taking an in-depth focus and approach to the under-reported story of human trafficking and forced labour was new for all journalists. None of the participants had received any training on human trafficking and slavery before attending the TRF training. The few that had an opportunity to cover such issues felt inadequately skilled to competently report on them. In their post course feedback, journalists reported limited knowledge of issues prior to training, but said they went away with a deeper understanding of the issues, how to report them and where to look for information and sources.

4.4. Training Effectiveness

In terms of measuring the effectiveness of the training, the evaluation approaches this from the aspect of transfer of appropriate skills and/or networks to increase focus on slavery and human trafficking as according to the terms of reference.

Feedback forms and the online survey indicate a high level of effectiveness in terms of transfer of skills.
Trainers were highly rated in terms of their knowledge and communication skills. Lectures, discussion, exercises, and training materials were all rated well above average.

Site visits, especially for Chennai and Mumbai (a panel discussion on trafficking held by an NGO) were rated poorly.

“Some of the speakers and visits felt very promotional and not critical”. Delhi 2018 participant – course feedback report

The journalists clearly expected the field visits to facilitate direct contact with sources in the form of affected survivors of slavery and human trafficking. This is not a component of the programme: TRF expects journalists to find their own sources in reporting. In view of the journalists’ expectations, interacting with organizations would have felt to them like covering a public relations exercise. The organizations approached should be well briefed on expectations of journalists in terms of presenting useable (quotable) information, as well as to build their trust that stories will be handled sensitively and reported accurately. Similarly, it should be made clearer to journalists that field visits are not intended to facilitate access to sources but to help them get a clearer perspective on the issues.

Journalists found the course to be a useful networking opportunity, with many reporting having learned much from fellow journalists on the course.
“Meeting journalists who report on human trafficking and slavery and learning from their experiences was an enriching experience”. Chennai 2016 participant – course feedback report

“I learnt a lot from the trainers, and other participants of the course. Each one of them had something new to offer (culturally, professionally) for me to learn from”. Chennai 2016 participant – course feedback report

4.5. Impact of Training on Beneficiaries

There are strong anecdotal examples of both improved awareness and capacity of the journalists trained (to analyse slavery and human trafficking within their own environments); and strengthened skills and practice around story development and successful publication.

Some journalists indicated that the Tamil Nadu government had been forced to act after they wrote stories exposing abuses by textile mill owners.

One journalist reported having been part of a rescue mission, and the training allowed him to have the skills to approach the issue:

“We rescued two girls who were trafficked from West Bengal to Kashmir. It gave me a better understanding of how to approach authorities. Who to and what to explain and to what extent. I also did a story on this in Tehelka later.”

Largely, respondents reported having used the training to approach topics of human trafficking and forced labour with more sensitivity towards the victims, especially by not breeching privacy and revealing identity.

The majority of those who responded to the survey indicated that they are actively sharing their acquired knowledge and skills with others in their journalist networks.
To provide each other with continued support and networking, the participants established groups on WhatsApp and Facebook. These platforms, a type of Community of Practice, have provided journalists with space to actively share their work, share information, ask questions, and to request support on their stories. It is unclear how active the groups are but is something that TRF should continue to support and could be an alternative to individual mentoring.

Impact in terms of increased production of stories on slavery and human trafficking post training could not be established in the absence of a pre-training baseline. As part of the evaluation, journalists were requested to share stories they had produced after the training and practical examples of what they had done to put the lessons from the programme into practice. However, the response rate, particularly practical examples of training application was poor. Generally, TRF encourages participants to share their work after training, and this is done on a voluntary basis.

4.6. Value for Money

Training of any sort is a costly process, particularly where it involves travel and accommodation. Straightforward costs are relatively easy to report, but value for money and especially returns on investment is particularly difficult to assess with confidence and outside of a full evaluation. We take a pragmatic approach in this report, presenting simply the costs of delivering training, and the benefits reported both by its graduates and through the insights of relevant key informants.

The budget for the training component was EUR75 000 out of the total budget of
EUR789 000 for the full three-year duration of the programme: this represents 9.5% and an average budget of EUR25 000 per training activity. This includes visible and quantifiable costs such as hiring trainers, training facilities, travel, accommodation and subsistence, field trips (local travel), costs associated with hiring mentors. There are less visible costs, such as the time-consuming process of reviewing hundreds of applications and the development of training materials. We have not factored these into the review, but because the programme existed prior to the India-specific training, we make the assumption that the work involved in tailoring pre-existing materials was not substantial. A third set of hidden costs lies in the time that journalists spend out of the newsroom in order to attend training. Five days is a not insubstantial commitment, and one which editors are often unwilling to make, resulting in them often sending their most junior reporters for training.

Our reflections on value for money is approached from assessment of the following:

4.6.1. **Response to training**
All the journalists who responded to the evaluation survey said that they acquired new skills during training. But numbers are small, and the response is not independently verifiable.

4.6.2. **Learning retention**
The pre- and post-training quizzes provide evidence for learning retention. The Delhi quizzes, where 10 participants completed the pre-training quiz and 8 completed the post-training quiz, shows a percentage increase in knowledge at nearly 14% from an already good knowledge base of 40% in the pre-test. The percentage increase for Mumbai was nearly 19% to 61.4% and up almost 17% to 62% for Chennai participants. It is unclear whether the quizzes were administered immediately pre- and post training or if there was a gap to measure long-term retention. Further, the tests covered content and not application of knowledge. It would be useful in future if TRF’s pre- and post-training tests were designed to measure both, with the post-training administered in a staggered manner.

4.6.3. **Application/behaviour change**
For the purposes of this evaluation, application is premised on the productivity of trainees – specifically the number of published outputs based on the data that available. At a return rate of 33.3 percent of published outputs, this is significant. It is more difficult to measure the improvement in quality of the outputs with the

---

https://www.business-case-analysis.com/return-on-investment-roi-for-training.html
exception of the stories published by TRF, based on their stringent quality standards.

4.6.4. Cost per successful application

At a calculated average cost of EUR2 083 per participant, including the costs of trainers but excluding hidden costs, the overwhelmingly positive response to training, demonstration of learning, and application of knowledge/skills through published stories, indicates that the TRF training is good value for money. It is difficult to benchmark this figure, as there are few comparative evaluations available in the public domain, and methodologies for reviewing value for money on journalism training specifically, differ quite widely.

5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The interest in, active participation, and outcomes of the training course offered by TRF clearly demonstrate the demand and need for improved awareness and understanding of issues of slavery and human trafficking amongst the journalistic community in India. Further it demonstrates that short, practical interventions can raise the level of knowledge and skills on how to report these issues, and potentially contribute to more informed public and policy discourse on a growing global crisis.

In summary:

- All the journalists surveyed during the evaluation and after the training courses overwhelmingly agreed that the course offered by TRF is one of the best they had been to, and should be continued. Their willingness to advertise and recommend this training to other journalists is testimony of its unique nature and high quality.
- The training offered by TRF is groundbreaking in a broader media landscape where other global and local media actors have failed to take on the challenge of critical reporting on these issues. By doing so systematically, TRF is contributing to the framing of a public and policy agenda around modern slavery.
- The training has played a critical role in raising journalists’ awareness of human trafficking and slavery in their own countries, and helped them to build the necessary skills to report on it in a competent, and nuanced way. The training structure struck a good balance of theory and practice, linking training to real life examples within communities, exposing journalists to experts, allowing them to interact with and learn from fellow journalists covering similar issues.
importantly, it provided journalists an opportunity to put what they had learned into practice.

- TRF expanded trainees’ understanding of ethics in journalism, particularly as it relates to the subject of slavery and human trafficking. This was an eye-opening experience for many journalists.
- Participants gained and appreciated new skills in developing story ideas and perfecting their pitching skills.
- Evidence from feedback and surveys show participants came away from the training courses armed not only with new skills and knowledge, but with renewed interest and commitment to their craft.
- Meeting up with peers from other media organisations fostered new relationships and networks that journalists could tap.
- The failure to fully implement the mentoring component of the programme was a lost opportunity that may have limited the full potential of the investment made in journalists. The poor response to the online survey by journalists could be an indication that journalists have moved to other beats, have changed employer, or that a long time has passed without interaction with TRF and the journalists don’t feel motivated to continue the relationship.
- There is a lack of systematic follow-up of journalists who were trained to establish their progress and to tap on their experiences for design of future programmes.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

The evaluation makes the following recommendations:

6.1 In future training programmes, TRF should invest in baseline studies, especially on the number of stories applicants have published on the topic in a previous set period (six months/one year). This will allow a clearer picture to be painted of any increased frequency of publication, and improvement in quality/reach post training. The same should be done with the identified partner media houses.

6.2 More work needs to be done to brief organizations approached (as knowledge centres and intermediaries with survivors of slavery and human trafficking) on how to interact with media and journalists’ expectations in terms of presentation of material that is usable (quotable) and relevant. This would include providing assurances, that are followed through, that sources and
stories will be handled sensitively and reported accurately.

6.3 TRF should make it clear to successful training participants from the outset, what the course is and what it is not: this would mitigate the negative effects of unmet expectations, e.g. from some participants who also expected to get training in journalistic writing or the field visits to provide access to survivors. Participants should be notified of other training opportunities that are available through TRF, which they can pursue on their own.

6.4 At different points of the programme cycle, TRF should follow-up with the editors of media houses and journalists who were trained, to identify gaps in training and support, and to identify stories that were filed but not published. Without such post training follow-up, either from the editors or TRF, enthusiasm generated during training dampens quickly. Lessons from these interactions would help to shape ongoing programmes of capacity strengthening beyond simply journalistic training, and could thereby have more impact.

6.5 While the evaluation findings reveal the impacts of the training on the individual journalist, the impact on editors and media houses is not so clear. It would be useful if the editors could be approached to find out why they selected particular journalists for the course and what they hoped would be the value added to the media house.

6.6 TRF should develop a repository of published stories, and require as a mandatory condition of the training that all journalists send their published stories to the Foundation. That way, TRF will develop a comprehensive picture of stories that have been published, including insights on quality, breadth of topics covered, gaps in coverage etc. This information should be used to inform and improve on TRF training courses. The C&A Foundation can also use this database as an information tool for its partners to use in their advocacy activities as well as in resource mobilisation.

6.7 TRF should consider establishing a Fellowship Scheme for journalists who have demonstrated good flair during training. Giving them some form of funding in the form of a fellowship to produce stories will not only motivate the journalists (sometimes journalists don’t follow through because their organisations lack resources to support their work). The funding should be administered through the organisations to foster ownership and commitment at an institutional level.

6.8 The idea of a competition should be pursued. TRF is already thinking of doing something along these lines. This will be a great incentive for journalists to
produce stories consistently and to raise the bar on quality. Winners could form a pool of Resource Persons, who are invited to speak on future courses being delivered in India and elsewhere. Journalists are motivated by their peers.

6.9 The best stories each year can be collated into a publication to both raise visibility of the outputs of the scheme, and the issues covered on all aspects of tackling modern slavery. This would also form part of the marketing materials to attract high caliber journalists on future training courses.
7. APPENDICES

7.1 Background documents used as source materials

- Fighting Forced Labour and Human Trafficking Through Journalism and Media Development Contract and Framework
- Monitoring Report 16 March 2016 – 15 September 2017
- Monitoring Report 16 September 2017 – 15 March 2018
- TRF Candidate Selection Criteria
- Chennai Course Programme
- Chennai 2017 Post-course Feedback Report
- Chennai Quiz results
- Chennai Feb 2017 List of participants
- Delhi Slavery Course Programme
- Delhi 2018 Post-course Feedback Report
- Delhi Pre and Post Course Quiz
- Mumbai Outline Agenda
- Mumbai participants
- Mumbai 2016 Course Feedback Report
- Mumbai 2016 Quiz results
- Mentoring and stories

7.2 Key Informants interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tendik Tynystanov</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:tendik.tynystanov@thomsonreuters.com">tendik.tynystanov@thomsonreuters.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolas Bellet</td>
<td>Director, Journalism and Media Programme</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nicolas.bellet@thomsonreuters.com">nicolas.bellet@thomsonreuters.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belinda Goldsmith</td>
<td>Editor in Chief</td>
<td><a href="mailto:belinda.goldsmith@thomsonreuters.com">belinda.goldsmith@thomsonreuters.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nita Bhalla</td>
<td>Trainer/East Africa Correspondent</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Nita.bhalla@thomsonreuters.com">Nita.bhalla@thomsonreuters.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellen B Beccera</td>
<td>Project Coordinator</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bellen.beccera@thomsonreuters.com">bellen.beccera@thomsonreuters.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interview Script for TRF staff

1. Please could explain your role in the programme and a little about your background?

2. Could give us some background to TRF media development activities and how this training component fits into the organisation’s broad initiative?

3. What were the specific objectives of the training component of this programme?

4. What was your specific role in putting together the training?

5. How would you describe the pedagogical approach of this training? Is this approach something you have applied before, is it unique to TRF?

6. What were the expected learning outcomes?
   - Were you successful in achieving these?
   - Are there areas for improvement?
   - What factors contributed to success or the lack of it?

7. How was the training designed?
   - What were the modules?
   - What were the practical elements of the training?
   - What subject matter do you cover?

8. You mentioned in your project document that, “training is most effective when engaging editors who are responsible for training and when training is followed by mentoring of the trainees right from the writing stage”. How did these lessons influence the design of your programme, with what impact?

9. What, in your mind, are the successes of this training?

10. Specifically, what were the key lessons from training workshops and mentorship?

11. What were some of the challenges?

12. How did you determine the best candidates for the training, once the basic eligibility criteria had been met?

13. What has the demand of eligible candidates been?

14. This training was aimed at career journalists, can you explain why selection was pegged at this level?
   - What were you hoping to achieve by having more experienced journalists trained?
   - Has it been successful?

15. Estimate how many of the journalists go forth and publish stories on human
trafficking?

• For those who don’t what may some of these barriers be?

16. Do you evaluate the quality of the stories once the journalists have been trained?

• How? (Story appraisals of previous and current work, who facilitates this process)

• What can you say about the quality of story post training (accuracy)?

• As a result of the training, how would you characterise the profile of Thompson Reuters’ reporting on forced labour and human trafficking as a result of the training?

17. What are the areas that have been of most interest to journalists based on the stories that have been published to date?

18. Having completed a cycle of the training what areas do you feel need to be strengthened and why?

19. What tools did you put in place to capture learning from the training component, were the tools sufficient, what could be improved in future?

20. What do you think the impact of the training has been for individual journalists (in terms of knowledge, skills and attitude to the forced labour and human trafficking beats?). What is the impact on local journalism in India and on TRF?

21. What indicators were developed to measure success of the programme? What were the unforeseen positive and negative outcomes from this programme?

22. Out of the overall budget, how much was allocated to training and mentorship? Where the resources adequate for the demands of the training programme?

23. Judging from the impact, do you feel that having a dedicated training budget was value for money, why? What would you do differently in future?

24. If you fail to receive further funding from C&A Foundation, would you continue with this training initiative? Why?
### 7.3 Key Informants Surveyed

#### 7.3.1 Journalists

Survey available here: [https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/TRFHumanTrafficking](https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/TRFHumanTrafficking)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>Media Outlet</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms</td>
<td>Raihana</td>
<td>Maqbool</td>
<td>Daily Kashmir Images</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rihanamaqbool@gmail.com">rihanamaqbool@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Zafar</td>
<td>Mehdi</td>
<td>The Witness</td>
<td><a href="mailto:armaan.jurno@gmail.com">armaan.jurno@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Tanmoy</td>
<td>Bhaduri</td>
<td>Pacific Press Agency</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bhaduritom@gmail.com">bhaduritom@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Adil</td>
<td>Lateef</td>
<td>Daily Excelsior</td>
<td><a href="mailto:adil.lateef0077@gmail.com">adil.lateef0077@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms</td>
<td>Priyanka</td>
<td>Borpujari</td>
<td>NA (independent journalist)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:priyanka.borpujari@gmail.com">priyanka.borpujari@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Gokul</td>
<td>Vannan</td>
<td>Deccan Chronicle</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gogul.vannan@gmail.com">gogul.vannan@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms</td>
<td>Amritapa</td>
<td>Basu</td>
<td>The Times of India</td>
<td><a href="mailto:amritapa.basu@gmail.com">amritapa.basu@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms</td>
<td>Senthalir</td>
<td>Sivalingam</td>
<td>The Hindu</td>
<td><a href="mailto:senthalir83@gmail.com">senthalir83@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Dennis</td>
<td>Jesudasan</td>
<td>The Hindu</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dennisjesudasan@gmail.com">dennisjesudasan@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms</td>
<td>Shivangi</td>
<td>Shukla</td>
<td>Freelance Journalist/Blogger</td>
<td><a href="mailto:shyshukla@gmail.com">shyshukla@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms</td>
<td>Shruti</td>
<td>Suresh</td>
<td>Deccan Chronicle</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sshruti1904@gmail.com">sshruti1904@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr</td>
<td>Rejimon</td>
<td>Kuttappan</td>
<td>Times of Oman</td>
<td><a href="mailto:reji@timesofoman.com">reji@timesofoman.com</a></td>
<td>India (based in Oman)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Baseera</td>
<td>Rafiquee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Srinagar</td>
<td>news deeply, caravan daily, kashmir newsline, women features services, greater kashmir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs.</td>
<td>Kanchan</td>
<td>Srivastava</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kanchansrivastava@gmail.com">kanchansrivastava@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Lucknow</td>
<td>Asia Times, Newslandry and Outlook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Karishma</td>
<td>Mehrotra</td>
<td><a href="mailto:missmishma@gmail.com">missmishma@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Mumbai</td>
<td>Novara Media, Wall Street Journal, Boston Globe, Atlanta Journal-Constitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.</td>
<td>Safienna</td>
<td>Nabi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:safina.nabi@gmail.com">safina.nabi@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Kashmir</td>
<td>Rising Kashmir, India Spend, DailyO, Grassroots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Anvit</td>
<td>Srivastava</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anvitnews@gmail.com">anvitnews@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>NEW DELHI</td>
<td>DNA - Zee Media Corporation Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs.</td>
<td>Reshmi</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td><a href="mailto:itzraysme@gmail.com">itzraysme@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Hyderabad</td>
<td>english.sakshi.com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Shuriah</td>
<td>Niazi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:shuriahn@yahoo.com">shuriahn@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Bhopal</td>
<td>BBC Hindi, India Today(Hindi), Anadolu news agency. Sometimes contribute climate change stories for Thomson Reuters Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr.</td>
<td>Suhail</td>
<td>Bhat</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Suhailb48@gmail.com">Suhailb48@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Srinagar</td>
<td>Daily Excelsior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Newspaper/Outlet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Lavanya Menon</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:lavanyamenon@hotmail.com">lavanyamenon@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>Vijayawada</td>
<td>The New Indian Express</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Uzair Rizvi</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:uzairhasan@hotmail.com">uzairhasan@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>New Delhi</td>
<td>Hindustan Times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Sneha Agrawal</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:sn3ha.agrawal@gmail.com">sn3ha.agrawal@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>South West Delhi</td>
<td>Mail Today, India Today Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Haritha John</td>
<td>The News Minute (Kerala)</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Johnharitha@yahoo.com">Johnharitha@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Kerala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Badri Chatterjee</td>
<td>The Hindustan Times</td>
<td><a href="mailto:badrichatterjee91@gmail.com">badrichatterjee91@gmail.com</a>, <a href="mailto:badri.chatterjee@hindustantimes.com">badri.chatterjee@hindustantimes.com</a></td>
<td>Mumbai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Suchetha Naik</td>
<td>Prajavanni</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Suchethana@prajavani.com">Suchethana@prajavani.com</a></td>
<td>Bangalore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Anuradha Nagarj</td>
<td>Thomson Reuters Foundation</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anuradha.nagaraj@thomsonreuters.com">anuradha.nagaraj@thomsonreuters.com</a></td>
<td>Chennai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Anahita Mukherji</td>
<td>The Times of India</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anahita.mukherji@gmail.com">anahita.mukherji@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Mumbai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Mohua Das</td>
<td>The Times of India</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mohuadazz@gmail.com">mohuadazz@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Mumbai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Nilotpal Bhattacharjee</td>
<td>The Telegraph</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nilotpalbhatt@gmail.com">nilotpalbhatt@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Assam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Kamaldeep Singh Brar</td>
<td>The Indian Express</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kamalbrar.express@gmail.com">kamalbrar.express@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Bathinda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Faizan Haidar</td>
<td>The Hindustan Times</td>
<td><a href="mailto:reporterfaizan@gmail.com">reporterfaizan@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Athar Parvaiz</td>
<td>Kashmir Times</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Atharparvaiz.ali@gmail.com">Atharparvaiz.ali@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Kashmir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Runjhun Sharma</td>
<td>CNN IBN</td>
<td><a href="mailto:runjhunsharmas@gmail.com">runjhunsharmas@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Govind Krishnan V</td>
<td>Fountain Ink</td>
<td><a href="mailto:GovindKrishnanv@gmail.com">GovindKrishnanv@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Bangalore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.3.2 Editors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mr. Suhail Bhat</th>
<th><a href="mailto:suhaib48@gmail.com">suhaib48@gmail.com</a></th>
<th>Srinagar</th>
<th>Daily Excelsior</th>
<th>Editor: +91 9419003048 <a href="mailto:Fayazbukhari@gmail.com">Fayazbukhari@gmail.com</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M. Reshami</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dsrezrums@gmail.com">dsrezrums@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Hyderabad</td>
<td>english.sakshi.com</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Safiana Nabi</td>
<td><a href="mailto:safina.nabi@gmail.com">safina.nabi@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Kashmir</td>
<td>Rising Kashmir, India Spend, DailyO, Grassroots</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Tanmoy Bhaduri</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bhaduritom@gmail.com">bhaduritom@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Pacific Press Agency</td>
<td>1. Jaskirat Singh, The Quint <a href="mailto:jaskirat.bawa@thequint.com">jaskirat.bawa@thequint.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

His email address would be ysnarayana@sakshi.com
He can also be reached on the following number
+91 94404 54015

Please connect with Pari Saikia.
E mail: parisaikia02@gmail.com
Phone no: +91 95550 74410