

# APPENDIX A

## Additional Exercises

---

### Exercise: Radio Time

Ask a volunteer to read the story below.



*The conservative radio station “Bharatiya Airwaves” was rapidly slipping in the ratings and the program’s corporate sponsors and advertisers were pulling their spots and asking for refunds. Facing compromise or obliteration, Bharatiya’s board relented on their policy of eschewing shock-jock strategies.*

*The station’s first foray into loud, sensationalist, partisan programming was to be an interview with a female college student from the Women’s Action Group (WAG) at the country’s largest university. The station heavily advertised the upcoming interview, using derogatory language against women and mocking the young student, and its audience grew.*

*At the time, Heena Dilawar was in her second year as a microbiology student at the university and was interested in an academic career. Teaching science at a university would give her plenty of opportunity to conduct her own research, and to stay on the cutting edge of microbiology. The problem, she discovered, was that there were very few women science professors, and not one leading female microbiologist—this despite the large number of women studying science.*

*Ms. Dilawar and several of her colleagues formed the Women’s Action Group (WAG) to address the paucity of women science professors, and more generally the glass ceiling that hindered women’s advancement in most professional fields. The members of WAG were considering a number of strategies for educating students and others about discriminatory hiring practices, and what they could do about it. One day they received a call from “Bharatiya Airwaves” asking for an on-air interview with the group’s leader. Although WAG had not officially designated a leader, it was generally agreed that Heena Dilawar would be the best person to sell their message to a radio audience.*

*In the days leading up to the interview, it became clear that “Bharatiya Airwaves” intended to humiliate the women. The women of WAG debated whether to pull out of the interview. Ms. Dilawar argued that they should not; that the interview was too valuable an opportunity for publicity to pass up.*

*On the day of the interview Heena Dilawar had time to reread some of WAG's materials on the way to the interview, as her bus rolled sluggishly through the city's traffic. She arrived at the radio station a little late and was immediately rushed into the broadcast studio. The radio host thrust a microphone in front of her and said into his own, "Well audience, Miss Heena Dilawar is finally here. I guess I'd like to begin by asking how she expects herself and her lady friends to be promoted in professional jobs when she cannot even get to an interview on time?"*

*Shocked, Ms. Dilawar took a few moments to respond. The host's follow-up question was equally rude, and moved the conversation far away from the issues that Ms. Dilawar had come to discuss. The members of WAG, listening to the interview on their radios at home, waited breathlessly for Ms. Dilawar to redirect the conversation. A third question came, this time about whether any of WAG's members were married. Ms. Dilawar's voice grew louder and angrier as she answered every one of the host's questions, each more irrelevant to WAG than the last. Ten minutes later the interview was over.*



### Questions for Group Discussion

- Did WAG achieve what it hoped to achieve by participating in the interview? Why or why not?
- Were there steps that Heena Dilawar and her colleagues could have taken to prepare her better for the interview?
- Were there other ways that Ms. Dilawar could have responded to the host's off-topic questions to bring the discussion back around to WAG and its objectives?



### Team Activity

In the story *Radio Time*, Heena Dilawar read through her organization's material before her interview. However, in the confusion and pressure of the moment, it is easy for even the most prepared or articulate person to run out of interesting or persuasive arguments. If Ms. Dilawar had prepared talking points, they might have reminded her of things to say to redirect the conversation back to the issues important to the Women's Action Group (WAG).

- If you were a member of WAG (dedicated to promoting women's professional advancement in academia and other professions), what statements, facts, anecdotes, or other information would you have wanted to convey in the radio interview?
- In teams of four or five, brainstorm three to seven points you think would be important for a radio audience to hear regarding discrimination against women in the workplace, why it is unfair, and what could be done about it.
- Write down your talking points in a succinct and clear manner so that they can be easily read and used as reminders by a spokesperson.
- Choose a spokesperson from the team **to summarize** your talking points for the whole group.

---

## Exercise: “Elect Hoda Qurashi!”

Ask a volunteer to read the story below.



Parliamentary candidate Hoda Qurashi had wanted to back out of the rally. Five days earlier Ms. Qurashi’s brother, who lived abroad, had been arrested for drunk driving. The news programs, gossip shows, tabloids, and even the national daily paper were all covering the story. She felt it was a waste of time and a loss of dignity to hold a rally surrounded by journalists who would only want to hear about her brother. His mistake was an extremely painful and deeply personal tragedy for herself and her whole family. She felt she could not adequately address the important issues in her political platform while all the attention was focused on the scandal.

Nevertheless, Ms. Qurashi’s campaign coordinators prevailed, and the rally went on as planned. Wearing a cheerful pink suit and trying to look serene, Ms. Qurashi mounted the podium armed with her prepared remarks. Nearly 300 people had shown up and were waiting expectantly. She spoke for 20 minutes about the need for parliamentary reform and legislative changes to help ordinary women and men. She hoped that her appeal to common people would persuade them to vote for her.

For a moment after Ms. Qurashi concluded her remarks, the crowd was silent. Then the voice of a woman shouted, “But what changes are you suggesting to Parliament? What sort of legislation would you want to pass?”

“I think I have been very clear about the sort of reform I am proposing,” Ms. Qurashi answered hurriedly. She pointed to a female journalist whose hand was raised.

“Can you provide more specific information about your reform ideas?” the journalist asked.

“Of course I can. And I did.” Ignoring the dozen or so male journalists frantically trying to get her attention, Ms. Qurashi again pointed to a female journalist.

“How are you going to fund your candidacy?” the journalist asked. “Who is supporting your reforms?”

The funding question was complicated. Although all of the “Elect Hoda Qurashi” funding contributions had been lawfully gathered and reported, most of the money had come from supporters of stronger laws against honor crimes—prior to the announcement of her candidacy. Vowing to press for more stringent punishment for perpetrators of honor crimes, the End Honor Crimes Coalition (EHCC) had poured its funding into her campaign coffers. She could not figure out how to answer the question without getting bogged down in the technicalities of campaign finance law, or branded a feminist for pandering to the EHCC. Without making eye contact with the questioner, she responded vaguely, “All of my campaign’s funding

*comes from lawful sources that support a reformed Parliament. Are there any more questions?”*

*By now the journalists were growing restive, shouting rude questions and demanding answers. A male journalist who spoke loudly into a microphone could be heard over the crowd, “When will your brother be put on trial? Aren’t you ashamed of him?”*

*Although she had expected questions relating to her brother’s arrest, Ms. Qurashi still felt stung. It hurt so much that he was in jail far away from his family; and at the same time she was furious with him for getting into trouble just as she was launching her bid for Parliament. She cleared her throat. “The truth is,” she began, “that his arrest is extremely painful for me and my family. We are very sad about what has happened and we are praying for him. But what happened to my brother is a private, family matter and has no bearing on my qualifications to be an MP. So that is all that I will say about my brother.”*

*At first there was only the sound of a few hands clapping. Then others joined in. Someone called out, “Elect Hoda Qurashi!” With that the audience erupted, the people clapping and shouting their support.*



### Questions for Group Discussion

- What were some of the mistakes made by Hoda Qurashi? How do you think her speech and answers to questions might have affected constituents’ perception of her?
- What could Ms. Qurashi have done differently?
- How would you have answered the question about the funding for her candidacy?
- What did Ms. Qurashi do or say that was successful?
- Why do you think the audience liked her answer about her brother? Did you like her answer about her brother? Why or why not?
- Do you think the public has a right to know the specifics of a candidate’s political platform? Does the public have a right to know the source of a candidate’s funding? Does the public have a right to know about a candidate’s brother’s arrest for drunk driving?
- What questions and issues do you believe a political candidate is responsible for addressing frankly?