THE STATUS OF WOMEN IN THE U.S. MEDIA 2021
THE WOMEN’S MEDIA CENTER WORKS TO MAKE WOMEN VISIBLE AND POWERFUL IN THE MEDIA

Founded in 2005 by Jane Fonda, Robin Morgan, and Gloria Steinem, the WMC is an inclusive and feminist organization that works to ensure women’s realities are covered and women’s voices are heard.

WMC works to make women visible and powerful in the media. We do so by promoting women as decision makers and as subjects in media; training women to be effective in media; researching and exposing sexism and racism in media; and creating original online and on-air journalism.

Our media programs that address the problems of unequal representation and misrepresentation of women in media include interconnected strategies that:

- Recruit and place diverse women experts in the media — print, broadcast, radio, internet, social media, and media leadership — through WMC SheSource.
- Train diverse women experts to be effective in media, and increase their thought leadership through WMC Progressive Women’s Voices and other customized training and leadership programs.
- Investigate, report, create, and publish original media to expand diverse women’s voices and representation through WMC Features, WMC IDAR/E, WMC Climate, WMC Women Under Siege, WMC FBomb, WMC Speech Project, and our syndicated radio program and podcast, WMC Live with Robin Morgan.
- Research, document, and produce reports that highlight the status of women in U.S. media, equip activists with evidence, and create benchmarks to hold media accountable for sexist and racist coverage.
- Advocate before government officials and agencies on policies affecting women’s access to media and technology, ownership of media and technology, and safe and free speech in media and technology.
“This report will help to hold news media accountable for the persistent inequalities in media. Women must be visible and powerful in all aspects of media if American society is ever to be a real democracy.”

GLORIA STEINEM
WMC CO-FOUNDER
“There is so much work that needs to be done if we are to achieve true equality and inclusion in media. Everyone wins when media executives expand opportunities to include women as sources, anchors, hosts, correspondents, and in all news positions.”

DR. JANET DEWART BELL
WMC BOARD CHAIR
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“The Status of Women in the U.S. Media 2021” report, compiled by the Women’s Media Center, draws data from 109 studies (and features over 350 charts) that together tell us the standing of women across all media, including legacy and digital news platforms, film, television, radio, technology, literature, and more. What this new report shows is that in all realms of media, representation and visibility of women are sorely lacking. The implications of this relative lack of power and visibility are profound for media and for democracy.

In September 2021, WMC released a yearlong study, “WMC Report: Gender and Race Representation on Five Big Sunday Shows.” This important research showed that more than two-thirds of the guests on these influential Sunday shows were men, and most of those guests were White men. In fact, over the span of a year, these marquee shows included no guests who are Indigenous or Native American women, fewer than 1% who are women of Middle Eastern/North African descent; 1% who are Asian American women; 2% who are Latina; 9% who are Black women; and 20% who are White women.

The proportion of stories covered by women reporters and relative numbers of experts and opinion leaders featured in the media tell us who has power — and who and what the shapers of media think we should care about. These programs and outlets have a platform that can impact policy, politics, and action.

This report finds that at this pivotal moment, just as movements for racial and gender justice are pushing powerfully and visibly for change, inclusion of women and people of color often comes up short. This marginalizes women and people of color. It also results in the news media missing major stories and an expanded audience. Both the industry and the public are ill-served by the underrepresentation of women and people of color.

The American media system represents one of the most powerful cultural and economic forces in the world. The images, the stories, the experts in media tell us who we are, what our roles in society are, and what we can be. Media frames our democratic debate and media interprets and amplifies our policies and our politics. Media tells us who has power and who matters.

“The Status of Women in the U.S. Media 2021” reports in great detail on the many ways our media does not reflect the world that we live in. We at the Women’s Media Center want to see greater gender and racial equality in the American media. This would mean seeing more diverse women in media, hearing from more diverse women in media, and reading more diverse women’s perspectives and concerns on all platforms of media.

This report is a roadmap that shows us where we are and where we need to go. We hope that the industry will take heed and implement meaningful change.

One productive step forward would be for media companies to release employment numbers by gender, race, and position. This transparency would allow comprehensive tracking of progress or regress for diverse women in the workplace. We recommend that managers and editors establish standards that require producers, bookers, and journalists to make sure the experts interpreting news stories include representative numbers of women and people of color to ensure that stories are told with authenticity and accuracy. The Women’s Media Center SheSource database of experts is a valuable resource to help journalists reach diverse women experts.
Advertisers have a role to play here too, and they should be part of the solution by spending their advertising dollars on shows and other media that demonstrate their commitment to gender and racial justice in all roles, both public and behind the scenes.

And we need more women of all backgrounds and identities on corporate boards and in all levels of media leadership.

One thing is certain: It takes deliberate effort to ensure that women as well as persons of color have an equal role in determining which narratives the media create. Change requires a steady and focused ramping up of existing inclusivity efforts.

We urge the media to choose the path to inclusion, representation, and equality. And we promise to continue to build public pressure to make the changes they need to enact in order to create a truly representative media system — where all of us matter.

Julie Burton
President and CEO, Women's Media Center
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

“The Status of Women in the U.S. Media 2021” is comprised of 109 studies and reports, including original research by the Women’s Media Center and aggregated research from academia, industry and professional groups, labor unions, media watchdogs, newsrooms, and other sources.

These are among its key findings about traditional print, TV, and online journalism:

- At 117 of the nation’s roughly 200 newsrooms affiliated with the Institute for Nonprofit News, 28% of staffers were of color and 69% were women.
- Women made up 44.7% of the local TV news workforce in 2019, fractionally down from the previous year’s record high of 44.9%. The tally of White people in local TV fell to 73.4% from 74.1% during the same period, according to the Radio Television Digital News Association (RTDNA).
- In local radio news, women accounted for 39.9% of the workforce, down from 44.4% in 2018. The tally of White people fell to 84.6% from 85.5% during the same period, according to RTDNA.
- Among the top 100 personalities on radio news talk shows, the number of women rose to only 12 in 2020 from 10 in 2019, according to Talkers.
- Of the top 100 personalities of sports talk shows on the radio, not one was a woman, according to Talkers.
- Women were 50% of podcast listeners, but men hosted 79% of the top podcasts, according to The Wrap.
- Racial diversity was the No. 1 priority of 42% of newsroom leaders responding to a nationwide newsroom survey, following unrest over George Floyd’s murder by a Minneapolis police officer; gender diversity was the No. 1 priority for 18% of them, according to Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism.
- At 41 Gannett-owned newspapers, women earned up to $27,000 less annually than men, according to the NewsGuild.
- The Los Angeles Times, in a $3 million court settlement, agreed to retroactively pay and adjust salaries of Black, Latinx, and women employees who earned less than White men. Women earned 70 cents for every $1 that men earned.
- At Reuters, where the top 10 wage-earners were men, Black and Latinx employees were paid an average of $10,083 less than their White counterparts, and women earned an average of $2,020 — or 1.6% — less, according to the NewsGuild.
- At The Washington Post, the average yearly salary for women aged 40 and older was $126,000, while men of the same age earned an average of $127,765, more than 1.5% more than women. Women younger than 40, had average annual earnings of $84,030, 14% less than the $95,890 men their age earned, according to the Washington-Baltimore News Guild.
- 79% of 115 surveyed women journalists in the United States said online harassment affected press freedom and, some added, fear of online abuse made them avoid reporting on certain kinds of stories, according to the Seattle University Department of Communication.
- U.S. newsroom employment fell 23% between 2008 and 2019, according to Pew Research Center.
- Advertising dollars declined 42% and subscription revenue by 8% at 300 newspapers during COVID-19, according to Pew.
- Women comprised 61.6% of bachelor’s-degree, 65.3% of master’s-degree, and 58.4% of doctoral-degree candidates in journalism and mass communication, and the overall proportion of female mass communications and journalism undergrad and grad students dropped, according to Texas Tech University College of Media & Communication.
- In 120 nations, from 1995 to 2020, the number of female news sources and subjects increased from 16% to 24% in newspapers, 15% to 24% in radio news, 21% to 26% in TV news, and 25% to 27% online, according to the Global Media Monitoring Project.
- Women comprised 5% of experts in science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) who were mentioned and a third of persons quoted in 146,867 articles about COVID-19 that were published by 15 leading news organizations worldwide, including CNBC, CNN, Fox, The New York Times, and USA Today.
Whites, who comprised 34.2% of the city's population, were 58.7% of people featured in Philadelphia Inquirer news articles written by full-time staffers. Whites were 61.3% of featured persons in published stories by staffers, freelancers and the wire services, combined, according to Temple University Klein College of Media and Communication.

Twenty-three of 37 murdered transgender or transsexual persons nationwide were misidentified in at least 139 news articles, according to Media Matters.

Amid a surge in anti-Asian violence, during COVID-19, two of the four network Sunday morning news shows did not feature Asian American guests during the segment addressing a mass shooting of Asian women and others in Atlanta, according to Media Matters.

Women accounted for 32% and persons of color 27% of 1,671 guest appearances on the top five cable and traditional broadcast TV Sunday news talk shows, according to the WMC.

Models of color were on the covers of 48.8% of major magazines in 2020, reflecting a roughly 12 percentage-point increase over 2019, according to Fashion Spot.

Of 751 journalists surveyed on how they chose sources of news and commentary, 58% said they were satisfied with the level of diversity among their sources; 72% said their news organizations could improve its strategic efforts at ensuring diversity, according to Expert Source and the Associated Press.

Those aged 18 through 34 drove a surge in TV news consumption in 2020 that was linked to the country's reckonings with a deadly pandemic, police slayings, and a presidential election, according to Pew.

More than any other race, Blacks trusted local news and the media's watchdog efforts, according to Pew.

57% of 9,654 surveyed U.S. adults said news organizations did a good or excellent job covering demonstrations protesting the Minneapolis police murder of George Floyd, according to Pew.

Telemundo and Univision, now owned by Whites, owned most of the largest U.S. news outlets targeting Latinx audiences, according to City University of New York Graduate School of Journalism.

Most of the smallest Latinx-focused outlets — 244 newspapers and 32 magazines — were independently owned with small or no newsrooms at all.

Women owned 5.3% of the nation’s 1,368 full-power commercial TV stations, a 7.3% decrease from 2015, according to the FCC.

People of color owned 1.9% of the nation’s 1,368 full-powered commercial TV stations, down from 2.6% in 2015, according to the FCC.

These were some major findings in entertainment TV and film:

29% of protagonists in the top 100 films of 2020 were women, representing an 11 percentage-point decrease from 2019, according to the Center for the Study of Women in Television & Film.

Black females constituted 6.5% of the U.S. population but 3.7% of leads or co-leads in the 100 top-grossing films of the decade ending in 2019, according to the Geena Davis Institute on Gender in Media.

Setting record highs, 32 of the top 100 films of 2019 had women of color as lead characters and 17 top films had women of color as co-lead characters, according to the University of Southern California Annenberg Inclusion Initiative.

No women aged 50 years and older were lead characters in the top 10 money-making films in the United States, United Kingdom, Germany, and France in 2019, according to the Geena Davis Institute on Gender in the Media.

Female-led family films almost doubled over the decade ending in 2017, and, for the first time, in 2016, annual profits on female-led films exceeded revenue on male-led films, according to the Geena Davis Institute on Gender in the Media.

A record 8% of family films featured a lead with a disability in 2019, according to the Geena Davis Institute on Gender in the Media.

Across the 100 top-grossing movies from 2007 through 2018, 4.5% of a total of 47,268 characters were Latinx; 3% of films featured Latinx actors as leads; 49% of those lead or co-lead roles — or 17 — went to women, according to the USC Inclusion Initiative and National Association of Latino Independent Producers.
In 2018, films in which actors of color comprised 21% to 30% of the cast had the highest median global box office receipts and were released in the most international markets. In 2018 and 2019, films whose casts mainly were comprised of White actors had the lowest receipts worldwide, according to the UCLA College of Science.

Women received 4.8% — or 70 — of 1,448 directing jobs on the top 1,300 movie releases of 2007 through 2019, according to the USC Annenberg Inclusion Initiative.

Of 2020's 100 films with the highest box office receipts, 16% were directed by women, a historic high, according to the Center for the Study of Women in Television & Film.

Hollywood writers who were women and persons of color each held 5% more jobs in 2019-20 television than they did in the 2018-19 season. In movies, women writers held 4% more jobs and writers of color 2% more jobs in 2019, according to Writers Guild of America West.

The percentage of female film critics in 2020 inched up to 35% from 34% in 2019, according to the Center for the Study of Women in Television & Film.

Of 205 non-acting nominees for the 2021 Oscars' non-acting categories, 65 — or 32% — were women, according to the WMC.

People of color were 19% of 230 executives, division heads, and other senior leaders at Walt Disney Company, AT&T Inc.'s WarnerMedia, Comcast Corp.'s NBCUniversal, ViacomCBS, Sony Pictures and Netflix, according to the Los Angeles Times.

For the first time, during the 2018-19 season, women and persons of color directed more than half of all entertainment TV episodes, according to the Directors Guild of America.

Men continued to dominate the non-acting Prime-time Emmy Award nominations in 2021, receiving 65% of those preliminary honors, slightly less than 2020's 68%, according to the WMC.

27.3% — a record high — of broadcast TV shows had casts comprised mainly of people of color in 2018-19, up from 2% in 2011-12, according to the UCLA College of Science.

Of 773 characters appearing regularly on traditional broadcast prime-time television shows in 2020-21, 9.1% — or 70 — were lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or queer. That was a decrease from the previous year's record high of 10.2%, according to GLAAD.

While women were 52% of the nation's population, they garnered 37.9% of screen time for the top 10 recurring characters in shows across all broadcast, cable, and subscription-based services, according to Nielsen.

63% of broadcast, cable, and streaming shows, from September 2019 to September 2020, employed five or fewer women; 16% employed five or fewer men, according to the Center for the Study of Women in Television & Film.

37% of crime series writers were women and 11% were women of color; the underrepresentation is responsible for “advancing distorted representations of crime, justice, race, and gender,” according to Color of Change.

For first time, in 2019, new U.S.-produced live-action TV series with diverse casts outnumbered non-diverse casts, with 71 in the former category and 69 in the latter, according to Parrot Analytics and Creative Artists Agency.

Though women accounted for roughly 47% of Super Bowl watchers, men in Super Bowl ads had 71% of speaking parts, 65% of screen time, and 64.2% of prominent characters, according to the Geena Davis Institute and Google.

These were some of the findings about Broadway theater and recording studios:

Twice as many Whites — who got 61.5% of all roles — worked as actors on Broadway and Off Broadway than were in the overall population of New York City, according to the Asian American Performers Action Coalition.

Women were 20.2% of Billboard's top artists and 28% of Grammy nominees, according to the University of Southern California Annenberg Inclusion Initiative.
Songs by female artists accounted for an average of 10% of the top 150 country songs on Billboard’s year-end radio airplay chart and for 10% of the top 20 songs played weekly on air, according to Country Music Television.

Of artists performing 500 of the top country songs of 2014 through 2018, an average of 16% were women, according to the USC Annenberg Inclusion Institute.

These were some major findings about gaming, STEM and publishing fields and other media-related issues:

- The top female gamer, competing in tournaments, earned 7% of what the top man earned, according to Casino.org.
- Women, persons with disabilities, Blacks, Latinos, Native Americans, and Native Alaskans were underrepresented in science and engineering, including sectors that feed the pipeline to certain jobs in technology, gaming, software development, social media, and other media, according to the National Science Foundation.
- At Twitter, in 2021, women accounted for 43.7% and men for 55.1% of the global workforce.
- Of Google’s U.S. workforce, 32% were female, according to its 2021 diversity report.
- Women accounted for 41% and men 59% of the nation’s 214.4 million video-game players, according to the Entertainment Software Association.
- Of 7,893 staffers surveyed at book publishing companies, book review journals, and literary agencies, 74% were women, 23% were men, and 76% were White, according to Lee & Low.
- Whites accounted for 95% of authors of 7,124 books published between 1950 and 2018 by five major U.S.-based publishers, according to The New York Times.
- The top 25% of 1,000 large companies, globally, with the most gender-diverse C-suites outperformed those in the bottom quartile by 25%, according to McKinsey & Co.
- After implicit bias against Asian Americans steadily declined for more than a dozen years, there was, on March 8, 2020, a 650% increase in Twitter retweets of “Chinese virus,” former President Donald Trump’s reference to COVID-19, according to Health Education & Behavior.
More women overall at The Atlantic; fewer women, people of color in newsroom

At The Atlantic, women comprised 69% of the overall staff in 2020, up from 63% in 2019; and 58% of the news staff in 2020, down from 60%, according to the company’s diversity report.

Of company executives 62% were women, up from 57% in 2018. The remainder of employees were male.

In the sales, marketing, and other departments that constitute the magazine’s B2B division, women comprised 67% of employees and men 31%; while 2% did not disclose their gender in 2020. That year was the first in which the company’s annual diversity report included B2B workers.

Overall, persons of color were 24% of employees in 2020, down from 25% the previous year; and 24% of news department employees, down from 26%. Minorities were 23% of the B2B staff, down from 24% in 2019.

For the first time, the magazine reported product, engineering, and growth (PEG) personnel separately from B2B employees. Of PEG workers, 56% were female in 2020, which was up from 54% in 2019, and 27% were of color, up from 25%.

Based on its June 2020 and December 2020 personnel profiles, The Atlantic’s diversity report also found that:

- 60% of editorial department leaders were women, up from 43% in 2017.
- 67% of B2B leaders were women, up from 62% in 2018.
- 33% of leaders on the PEG team were women.
- 22% of company executives were of color; the company did not provide a comparative rate for minorities on that level.
- 22% of B2B leaders were of color.
- 20% of newsroom leaders were of color.
- 0% of PEG leaders were of color.
Staff Composition – The Atlantic

Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Did not disclose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If a variable does not appear in a chart, the value for all years is zero.

Source: The Atlantic

Race/Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>People of Color</th>
<th>Did not disclose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If a variable does not appear in a chart, the value for all years is zero.

Source: The Atlantic
At BuzzFeed, more people of color in U.S. workforce; globally, a female majority

Women accounted for 61.9% of BuzzFeed’s global workforce, a rate that was slightly up from 60.5% in 2019, according to that news organization’s 2020 report on gender and racial diversity. BuzzFeed did not break down the gender of its U.S. workforce, where 37.5% of workers reported that they were a person of color, up from 34% in 2019.

Globally, women at BuzzFeed accounted for 60% and men for 40% of managers in 2020, which compared to 57% and 43%, respectively, in 2019.

Globally, women accounted for 40% and men for 60% of tech workers in 2020, which compared to 35% and 65%, respectively, in 2019.

Racially, in its United States workforce:

- 57.5% of all BuzzFeed workers were White, down from 62.4% in 2019.
- 13.2% were Asian, slightly down from 13.7%.
- 9.8% were Black, up from 7.7%.
- 8.9% were Latinx, up from 7.5%.
- 4.9% were multiracial, down from 5%.
- 4.9% declined to disclose their race, up from 3.2%.
- .2% were American Indian or Alaska Native, roughly the same as 2019.
- .2% were Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, down from .3%.

Of workers in the BuzzFeed news division:

- 61.9% were White, up from 58.7% in 2019.
- 11.9% were Asian, which was unchanged from 2019.
- 7.6% were Black, down from 10.3%.
- 6.5% were multiracial, slightly up from 6.3%.
- 6.5% did not disclose their race; the 2019 report did not list that group.
- 5.4% were Latinx, down from 7.1%.

Of workers in the content division:

- 55.2% were White, down from 61.9%.
- 13.6% were Black, up from 9.78%.
- 10.9% were Asian, down from 11.9%.
- 6.4% did not disclose their race, the 2019 report did not list that group.
- 4% were multiracial, slightly up from 3.5%.
- 5% were Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, down from .6%.
Among its U.S. business-side workers in 2020 (the company didn’t include this category in its 2019 report):

- 70.2% were White.
- 12.3% were Asian.
- 5.7% were Latinx.
- 5.7% were multiracial.
- 3.8% did not disclose their race.
- 1.9% were Black.
- .6% were American Indian or Native Alaskan.

Among the administrative staff:

- 41.4% were White, down from 54.2%.
- 18.1% were Black, up from 13.3%.
- 18.1% were Latinx, up from 10%.
- 13.1% were Asian, up from 10%.
- 6% did not disclose their race, the 2019 report did not list that group.
- 3% were multiracial, down from 6.7%.

Stiffs of dozens of nonprofit newsrooms were mainly White, female

In 2019, at 117 nonprofit newsrooms, 28% of staffers were of color, a rate only slightly up from 27% in 2017, according to the Institute for Nonprofit News (INN).

The 117 newsrooms represented roughly 58% of 202 that responded to the institute’s request for them to complete the diversity survey, conducted during February and March 2020. The 117 newsrooms counted 1,500 employees and self-employed contractors.

The institute’s report also concluded that 60% of all staffers at the responding newsrooms were female, and 54% of nonprofit news executives were female.

“Women make up half or more of the top executive team at nearly two-thirds of the nonprofit news organizations, more than double the rate found by the [News Leaders Association] survey,” institute leaders wrote.

Sue Cross, the institute’s executive director, told the Women’s Media Center that, although she’s impressed by the pace of efforts to ensure diversity in nonprofit news, she knows “there’s a ton of work to be done.”

“News nonprofits have made more progress and moved further in advancing diversity in staffing and coverage than traditional media have moved in 30 years,” said Cross, a former senior vice president at the Associated Press.

“Journalists of color in particular are in an extraordinary situation covering racial injustice
While living and working in a news system that is not yet equitable. So, I don’t want to downplay the challenges, but there is encouraging momentum.”

Among 24 nonprofit news outlets that launched in 2017, 2018, or 2019, 10 reported that people of color made up 40% or more of the staff. Two of 24 organizations that launched in 2013, 2014, 2015, and 2016 had similarly high percentages of staffers of color. “That trend adds to evidence that nonprofit news organizations on average are more diverse than more traditional types of news organizations, though no directly comparable statistics are available,” according to the institute’s report.

The institute also wrote that six in 10 outlets had diversity goals. But fewer than half had published a diversity statement on their website. A quarter of the outlets had a written diversity plan.

Regarding their tally of people of color at their outlets:
- 21% of newsroom leaders ranked it “high.”
- 31% ranked it “medium.”
- 23% ranked it “low.”
- 25% said they had 0 staffers of color.

Of all full-time staffers and regular freelancers of color in the responding newsrooms:
- 68% were White.
- 9% were Black.
- 9% were Latinx.
- 6% were Asian.
- 4% were multiracial.
- 2% were other.
- 1% were Middle Eastern.
- 1% were Native American or Alaska Native.
- Less than 1% were Hawaiian or Pacific Islander.

Of nonprofit news leaders:
- 81% were White.
- 9% were Latinx.
- 6% were Black.
- 2% were Asian.
- 2% were multiracial.
- 1% were Middle Eastern.

At the institute itself, the staff of 16 was 56% White and 38% of color; 6% did not specify their race for the report. Of its managers, 60% were White, 30% were of color and 10% did not specify their race.
INN’s board of directors was 73% White and 27% of color. Of its six appointed seats — one seat was open when the report was compiled — 40% were filled by people of color. Of the six members elected by institute members, one was a person of color. That translated to 17%.

**Marshall Project: 59% of workers were female; newsroom people of color count rose**

At The Marshall Project, 59% of the entire workforce was female, 39% was male, and 2% was non-binary in 2020. Those data, respectively, compared to 59%, 38% and 3% in 2019, according to the diversity report that the newsroom released in January 2021.

Of newsroom staffers, 59% were female and 41% were male; the respective 2019 figures were 60% female and 40%.

By race, 59% of the overall workforce was White in 2020, up from 57% in 2019; 62% of the newsroom was White, up from 60%; and 71% of editors were White, up from 67%. The Marshall Project’s full-time staff included no Native Americans, Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians, or Pacific Islanders.

The report’s writers said some categories would not reflect a 100% accounting.

Of all 2020 employees at The Marshall Project:
- 20% were Black, up from 19% in 2019.
- 10% were multiracial, down from 11%.
- 7% were Asian, up from 5%.
- 5% were Latinx, the same as in 2019.

In the newsroom:
- 14% of staffers were Black, up from 12% in 2019.
- 10% were multiracial, down from 12%.
- 7% were Asian, up from 4%.
- 7% were Latinx, down from 8%.

Among newsroom editors:
- 57% were female, down from 67% in 2019.
- 43% were male, up from 33%.
- 14% were Black, down from 17%.
- 14% were Latinx, down from 17%.

Among freelance photographers and illustrators:
- 56% were female, down from 67% in 2019.
- 43% were male, up from 36%.
- 1% were non-binary, a group that wasn’t recorded in 2019.
- 33% were Black, up from 31%.
- 22% were Latinx, up from 14%.
- 15% were Asian, the same count as in 2019.
- 11% were White, down from 26%.
- 11% identified as some other race, up from 2%.
- 6% were multiracial, down from 12%.
- 2% were Native American or Alaska Native, a group that wasn’t recorded in 2019.

The board of directors was:
- 73% male, up from 69% in 2019.
- 27% female, down from 31%.
- 60% White, down from 69%.
Women leaders outnumbered men leaders at The New York Times

More women than men were in leadership at The New York Times. The percentage of people of color has increased company-wide and in executive ranks.

In its annual diversity report, the company wrote that 52% of company leaders were women, up from 49% in 2019. In 2020, 48% of its leaders were men.

The proportion of people of color, across departments, rose to 34% in 2020 from 27% in 2015; there was a 1 percentage-point increase among people of color from 2019 to 2020.

The newest report did not detail the gender and race of newsroom and business division employees. It did lay out the Times’ plan for a range of structural changes related to gender and race issues, including the handling of public feedback on journalists’ coverage, hiring practices, and the creation of a new human resources office devoted to diversity, equity, and inclusion.

In light of 2020’s racial and political unrest, the Times stated, “The report found that we have made progress in diversifying the company in recent years — and that work will continue. But its central finding is that The Times is too often a difficult place to work for people of all backgrounds — particularly colleagues of color, and especially Black and Latino colleagues. It calls for us to transform our culture.”

In 2020, according to the report:

- 52% of the overall Times staff were women, up from 51% in 2019; 47% of all staffers were men in 2020. Less than 1% of staffers were non-binary.

In 2020, by race:

- 63% of all employees were White, down from 65% in 2019.
- 33% of all employees were of color, up from 32% in 2019.
- 4% did not disclose their race, up from 3% in 2019.
- 74% of leadership was White, down from 76% in 2019.
- 23% of leadership was of color, up from 21% in 2019.
- 3% did not disclose their race, the same as in 2019.

Among all employees of color in 2020:

- 14% were Asian, up from 13% in 2019.
- 9% were Black, unchanged from 2019.
- 7% were Latinx, unchanged.
- 3% were multiracial, unchanged.
- Fewer than 1% were Native American, unchanged.
- Fewer than 1% were Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, unchanged.

Among company leaders of color in 2020:

- 12% were Asian, up from 10% in 2019.
- 5% were Black, down from 6%.
- 4% were Latinx, up from 3%.
- 2% were multiracial, unchanged from 2019.
- Fewer than 1% were Native American, unchanged.
- 0% were Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, unchanged.
Gender

All Staff

Leadership

People of Color

All Staff

Leadership

Source: The New York Times
More women, fewer White journalists at female-majority NPR

According to National Public Radio’s most recent, available diversity report, Whites comprised almost 71% and persons of color 28% of its newsroom staff. Overall almost 57% of the organization’s 416-person staff were women, and 43% were men.

The report was released in November 2019, before the 2020 departure of then-NPR Public Editor Elizabeth Jensen, who had conducted that annual report for five consecutive years. Her first report had shown that Whites comprised 77.6% of newsroom staffers at NPR. In September 2020, NPR’s CEO John Lansing published his strategy for pushing that organization closer to reflecting the nation’s race and gender makeup.

Jensen noted that 48% of those hired during fiscal 2019 were persons of color. She also noted that there were 32 Latinx newsroom employees in 2018 and 2019.

Including the newsroom staff, the overall workforce at NPR was 66.4% White, down from 67.97% in 2018, 33% of color, and the race of .5% not specified.

The report also showed that, of NPR newsroom employees on September 2019:

- 56.7% were female and 43.3% were male; the respective figures were 57.3% and 42.7% in 2018.
- 70.9% were White, down from 72% in 2018.
- 9.6% were Black, up from 9.1%.
- 8.7% were Asian, up from 7.3%.
- 7.7% were Latinx, down from 8.1%.
- 2.2% were multiracial, down slightly from 2.3%.
- .7% did not specify their race, slightly up from .5%.
- .2% were Native American, about the same as in 2018.
Of all NPR employees, including in the news and business departments:

- 53.6% were women and 46.4% were men in 2019; the respective figures were 51.8% and 48.2% in 2018.
- 66.47% were White in 2019, down from 67.9% in 2018.
- 13.29% were Black, about the same as 2018’s 13.1%.
- 10.17% were Asian, up from 9.7%.
- 6.24% were Latinx, slightly up from 6%.
- 3% were multiracial, up from .9%.
- .5% did not specify their race, up from .1%.
- .2% were Native Hawaiian in both years.
- .1% roughly were Native American or Alaskan Native in both years.

Source: NPR
NPR Staff Diversity by Race/Ethnicity

- 2018:
  - Total: 67.97%
  - White: 66.47%
  - Hispanic or Latino: 10.17%
  - Black or African American: 13.29%
  - Native Hawaiian: 0.5%
  - American Indian or Alaskan Native: 0.22%
  - Asian: 0.11%
  - Two or more: 0.11%
  - Not specified: 0.97%

- 2019:
  - Total: 66.47%
  - White: 66.47%
  - Hispanic or Latino: 10.17%
  - Black or African American: 13.29%
  - Native Hawaiian: 0.22%
  - American Indian or Alaskan Native: 0.11%
  - Asian: 0.11%
  - Two or more: 0.11%
  - Not specified: 0.97%

Source: NPR

NPR Staff by Gender

- 2018:
  - Women: 51.8%
  - Men: 48.2%

- 2019:
  - Women: 53.6%
  - Men: 46.4%

Source: NPR
Union demanded that NPR newsroom reflect nation’s racial makeup

To reflect the nation’s racial makeup, National Public Radio’s 100-person newsroom must add at least 11 Black, 19 Latino, and 2 Native American reporters to its current ranks of journalists, according to a letter the union representing newsroom employees sent NPR executives in September 2020.

The letter from SAG-AFTRA (Screen Actors Guild and the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists) said 30% of news and information division employees were persons of color. Persons of color are roughly 40% of the nation’s population.

“As far back as 1978, a task force found the public broadcast system was ‘asleep at the transmitter’ when it came to serving the needs of Black, Asian, Latino and Native American listeners. And as recently as 2019, when our current CEO John Lansing took his post, he expressed surprise at how white NPR’s upper management was,” according to the letter.

Signed by SAG-AFTRA shop stewards at NPR and its ad hoc committee on diversity and inclusion, the letter noted that persons of color were 34.4% of employees in NPR’s business and non-news divisions, combined. That’s based on NPR’s most recent diversity report, released in 2019.

The union’s demands included these:

- NPR must hire more reporters, correspondents, hosts and editors of color. Most employees of color there work as lower-paid producers, news assistants, and fixers (residents of countries who act as aides to foreign correspondents).
Task supervisors with meeting HR best practices for diversity in hiring and with supporting staffers of color and assess HR’s progress on that front during annual performance reviews of HR staff.

Ensure that 50% of finalists for all newsroom openings come from underrepresented racial and ethnic groups and that hiring panels are diverse.

Tie executive bonuses to whether executives meet staffing diversity goals.

Offer confidential exit interviews to every employee who leaves NPR. Then analyze that information biannually to glean essential information related to NPR efforts toward to diversity, equity and inclusion, and report those findings to SAG-AFTRA.

Company-wide at ProPublica, women employees outnumbered men

For another consecutive year at ProPublica, women outnumbered men, representing 55% of all employees as of February 2021, according to that news organization’s latest diversity report. In 2020, 53% of employees were female.

Men were 44% of all employees in 2021 and 45% in 2020. During each of those years, 1% of all employees were transgender or non-binary, and 1% didn’t specify their gender.

Company-wide, 40% of staffers were persons of color in 2021, while 38% were in 2020.

As a further breakdown, the company reported that, by gender, among newsroom staffers:

- 51% were female in both 2021 and 2020.
- 47% and 46%, respectively, were male.
- 1% were transgender or non-binary in 2021, down from 2% in 2020.
- 1% did not specify their gender in both years.

By race, among newsroom staffers:

- Whites accounted for 57% in 2021, down from 59% in 2020.
- Latinx persons accounted for 11% in both years.
- Asians accounted for 9% in both years.
- Blacks accounted for 5% in both years.
- Middle Easterners/Arabs accounted for 5% in both years.
- Multiracial persons accounted for 5% in both years.
- South Asians/Indians accounted for 4% in both years.
- 2% did not specify their race in 2021, down from 3% in 2020.
- 1% identified as some other race in both years.
- Native Americans/Alaska Natives were 0% both years.

Among newsroom and non-newsroom staffs, combined, by race, in 2021:

- Whites accounted for 58%, which was down from 60% in 2020.
- Latinx persons accounted for 11%, up from 10%.
- Asians accounted for 9%, up from 8%.
- Blacks accounted for 8%, up from 7%.
- Middle Easterners/Arabs accounted for 4%, down from 5%.
- Multiracial persons accounted for 4% in both years.
- South Asians/Indians accounted for 4%, up from 3%.
- Those opting not identify their race accounted for 1%, down from 2%.
- Those identifying as some other race accounted for 1% in both years.
- Native Americans/Alaskans accounted for 0%, down from 1%.
Among managers, company-wide, by gender:
- 58% were female in 2021, which was up from 50% in 2019. (The company didn’t provide the respective 2020 figure.)
- 39% were male in 2021, down from 47% in 2019.
- 3% chose not to specify their gender in both years.

Among managers, by race:
- 68% were White in 2021, down from 81% in 2019.
- 13% were Black, up from 3%.
- 11% were Latinx, down from 13%.
- 3% chose not specify their race in both years.
- 3% were Middle Easterners/Arabs, up from 0%.
- 3% were multiracial, up from 0%.

Source: ProPublica
Reuters: Women were 42%, persons of color 20% of U.S. news operation

Reuters, with 200 locations in 86 countries, reported that, of its U.S. newsroom employees in 2020, women accounted for 42%, men 58%, Whites 80%, and persons of color 20%, according to its inaugural diversity report.

Globally, women were 44% and men 56% of newsroom employees. By race, 48% of the global newsroom was White, 37% was Asian; the remaining 15%, combined, was Black, Latinx, multiracial, of an unspecified race, other, or “visible minority” in Canada.

By race, in the U.S. newsroom, 80% of staffers were White, 9% were Asian, and the remaining 11%, combined, were Black, Latinx, or multiracial.

Notably, Reuters’ global data were incomplete because some categories captured “a small number of all employees. In part, that’s because … [s]ome countries don’t allow certain types of data to be collected for privacy reasons. Other countries level criminal sanctions for the information we’re asking staff to provide, and so we have chosen not to ask them to do so,” company officials wrote in that report.

Race data were available for 99.6% of the U.S. newsroom; 74.8% of the U.K. newsroom; 55.1% of global newsroom leadership; 50% of global news and business departments, combined; and 47.2% of the global newsroom.

Reuters also found that, globally, in 2020:

- Women were 34% and men 66% of newsroom leaders.
- Whites were 72% and persons of color 28% of newsroom leaders.
- Women were 43% and men were 57% of news and business-side employees, combined.
- Whites were 50% and persons of color 50% of news and business-side employees, combined.

Based on racial data available to Reuters, it listed numerical proportions for only the second- and, sometimes, third-largest groups, proportionately, after Whites:

- 72% of global newsroom leadership was White, 12% was of an unspecified race; 10% was Asian, and the remaining 6%, combined, was Black, Latinx, multiracial, other, or “visible minority” in Canada.
- 60% of the U.K. newsroom was White, 29% was of an unspecified race, and the remaining 11%, combined, were Asian, Black, Latinx, multiracial, or other.
- 50% of the global news and business side departments, combined, was White, 34% was Asian, the remaining 16%, combined, was Black, Latinx, multiracial, Native or Indigenous, of an unspecified race, other, or “visible minority” in Canada.
### Gender Identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Cisgender Male</th>
<th>Cisgender Female</th>
<th>Agender</th>
<th>Gender Non-binary</th>
<th>Gender fluid</th>
<th>Gender queer</th>
<th>Transgender Female</th>
<th>My gender identity is not available from current options</th>
<th>Prefer not to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newsroom leadership, global</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsroom, UK</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuters (global newsroom &amp; commercial combined)</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsroom, global</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsroom, UK</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Race and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
<th>Mixed or Two or more races</th>
<th>Native or Indigenous</th>
<th>Not specified</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Visible Minority (Canada)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newsroom, US</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsroom leadership, global</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsroom, UK</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuters (global newsroom &amp; commercial combined)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsroom, global</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sexual Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Heterosexual/Straight</th>
<th>Bisexual</th>
<th>Gay Man</th>
<th>Gay Woman/Lesbian</th>
<th>Queer</th>
<th>Prefer not to say</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newsroom Leadership, global</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsroom, UK</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsroom, global</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuters (global newsroom &amp; commercial combined)</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsroom, US</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Reuters
.2% drop in tally of females in local TV news; roughly 5% drop in radio

Women made up 44.7% of the local TV news workforce in 2019, fractionally down from the previous year’s record high of 44.9%, according to the Radio Television Digital News Association’s (RTDNA) 2020 report, based on data from the last quarter of 2019.

In 2019, Whites were 73.4%, overall, of TV news staffers in 2019, down from 74.1% in 2018. Of the remaining 2019 workforce, 13.3% were Black, 10.9% were Latinx, 2% were Asian, and .4% were Native American. So, combined, persons of color were 26.6% of those staffers, up from 25.9% in 2018.

The report authors wrote: “The top 25 local TV news markets are the most racially and ethnically diverse. All newsrooms in the top 50 markets include at least one person of color and, on average, include 35% people of color. Representation of people of color improved slightly for all affiliates, market sizes, and staff sizes. However, as many as 25% of newsrooms with the fewest staffers (1 to 10) and as many as 10.1% of newsrooms in the smallest markets (DMA 151+) include no people of color on staff.”

By race, Whites were 84.6% of the overall radio news workforce in 2019, down from 85.5% in 2018. Of the remainder, in 2019, 6.8% were Black, 5% were Latinx, 3.1% were Asian, and .5% were Native American. Combined, persons of color were 15.4% of radio news staffers, up from 14.4% in 2018.

In local radio news, women accounted for 39.9% — down from 44.4% in 2018 — and men, 60.1% of staffers. Of that overall group of radio news staffers, 15.4% were persons of color, reflecting the most racial diversity in radio news since 1998, just before courts struck down Federal Communications Commission Equal Opportunity Employment rules. At that time, people of color made up 16% of the radio workforce. In 2018, 14.5% of radio news staffers were of color.
Underlying television’s .7 percentage-point increase among all local female newsroom workers was the fact that women staffers of color outnumbered men staffers of color in all except the 50 largest news markets.

Additionally, the report found, the tally of women who were TV news directors increased for the fourth year in a row, standing at 36.8% in 2019 and 35.3% in 2018.

RTDNA’s annual diversity report was based on valid responses from 77.1% of the nation’s total of 1,702 local, non-satellite television stations that broadcast local news. It also was based on a representative sample of 673 of 1,996 local radio stations.

The 2020 report found that in TV in 2019:
- At least 1 woman was on the news team of roughly 90% of newsrooms with 10 or fewer staffers, a group not covered in the previous report.
- Women made up 44% of the news directors in the top 10 markets, a group not captured in the previous report.
- At Spanish-language stations, 90.9% of the news directors were Latinx, a group not captured in the previous report.
- The most racial and ethnic diversity among news directors existed in markets 1 to 25, continuing a trend.
- In the top 50 TV markets, men of color outnumbered women of color, but women of color outnumbered men of color in all other market sizes. RTDNA did not calculate this subgroup of data in previous years.
- Among Asians in other market sizes, women outnumbered men 55% to 45%.
- Among Latinx in other markets sizes, women outnumbered men 53.2% to 48.8%.
- Among Blacks in other market sizes, women outnumbered men 54.9% to 45.1%.
- Only among White staffers did men outnumber women at a rate of 58.7% to 41.3%.
- As many as 25% of newsrooms with 1 to 10 staffers, which were those with the fewest employees, had at least 1 woman on their news team.
- As many as 10.1% of newsrooms in the smallest markets, which were those whose designated market area was ranked as No. 151 or more, had 0 staffers of color.
- The 25 largest local TV news markets were the most racially and ethnically diverse.
- At Spanish-language TV stations, 98.9% of news staffers were Latinx, slightly down from 2018’s all-time high of 99.7%.

Excluding Spanish-language stations, people of color were 25% of local TV newsrooms in 2019, a record high for a fourth consecutive year. Of that 25%:
- 13.8% were Black, up from 12.4% in 2018.
- 7.8% were Latinx, down from 8.8%.
- 2% were Asian, unchanged from 2018.
- .4% were Native American, unchanged.
- 14.1% of local news directors were people of color, up from 13.4% in 2018, but slightly down from a record 14.3% in 2017.
4% of news directors were Black, down from 5.5% in 2018 and another consecutive year’s decline.
Latinx news directors were 10.5% of all news directors, slightly down from a record 10.7% in 2018.
Asians were 3.1% of news directors, up from 1.1%.
Native Americans were .4% of news directors, up from 0%.

In radio news in 2019, 23.2% of local radio newsrooms employed at least one person of color, up .5 percentage points from 2018 — following an almost 8 percentage-point gain in 2017. Also, in 2019 in radio:

47.8% of news teams had at least 1 woman, a tally not included in the previous year’s report.
47.8% of all news staffers were women, up from 44.4% in 2018.
28.8% of all news directors were women, up slightly from 28.2%.
7.1% of news directors were of color in 2019, down from 8.2% in 2018, which marked a 5-year high.
81.1% of staffers were women at major market stations, which have at least 1 million listeners. That rate was not included in the previous report.

63.2% of staffers were women at large market stations, which have 250,000 to 1 million listeners. That rate was not included in the previous report.
35.6% of staffers were women at medium market stations, which have 50,000 to 250,000 listeners. That rate was not included in the previous report.
31.4% of staffers were women at small market stations, which have fewer than 50,000 listeners. That rate was not included in the previous report.
71% of non-commercial stations had women on their news staffs.
34.7% of commercial stations had women on their news staffs.
47.8% of the news workforce was female at non-commercial stations.
26.6% of the news workforce was female at commercial stations.

These were among the report’s other major findings in TV news in 2019:
19% of general managers were female, down from 23.4% in 2018.
7.1% of general managers were people of color, down from 10.3% in 2018. When Spanish-language stations were excluded, the tally of general managers of color dropped to 3.9% in 2019.
0 stations reported a Native American general manager. That rate was not included in the previous report.

0 Midwest stations reported a general manager of color. That rate was not included in the previous report.
Network affiliate general managers were likelier to be women.
Female general managers were the most common at Fox affiliates and least common at non-network affiliated stations and CBS affiliates.
Independent commercial stations had more females, proportionately, than non-independent stations.

These were other major findings in radio news in 2019:
23.6% of station general managers were women, down from 24.2% in 2018.
6.3% of general managers were of color, down from 7.2%.
2.9% of those general managers in 2019 were Black.
1.8% of those general managers were Latinx.
1.1% of those general managers were Native American.
.5% of those general managers were Asian.
Women general managers were much more common in major markets and at the biggest radio news operations.
General managers of color were more than twice as likely to work in major markets than any others.
General managers of color were most often found in the West and the Northeast. They were the least found in the Midwest, the least diverse region of all.
General managers of color were 4 times more likely to work at non-commercial stations than at commercial ones.
Larger market radio stations and stations in the South were most likely to have a news director of color, while stations in the Midwest were the least likely.
Women were much more likely to be found in large and major markets and much less likely to be found in medium and small markets or at commercial stations.
The non-commercial workforce was about twice as diverse as the commercial workforce but lagged in diverse leadership.
Fox affiliates were the most diverse among network affiliates by about 5 percentage points.
Stations in the South and West were far more diverse than stations in the Northeast, and stations in the Midwest were the least diverse.

More women made Talkers’ top 100 radio news, news commentary shows

Fourteen women made Talkers’ 2020 list of the top 100 radio news talk shows. That was two women more than the 12 who made the 2019 “Heavy Hundred.”

Between 2019 and 2020, the number of women of color on that list rose as well from one to two: Angela Yee, of New York City’s WWPR, joined SiriusXM’s Karen Hunter, whose show has been in Talkers’ top 100 for several years.

For the 2019 and 2020 “Heavy Hundred,” Radio America’s Dana Loesch was the top-ranked woman, landing in the No. 17 slot both years. Loesch was one of nine women who broadcasted solo in 2020; in 2019, 10 women broadcasted solo. Both years, the remaining women had at least one male co-host.

In addition to Loesch, these were the top women and their rank in 2020:
Angela Yee, co-hosting with two men on WWPR in New York City, ranked 20th.
Juliet Huddy, co-hosting on WABC Radio with one man, ranked 36th.
Karen Hunter’s SiriusXM show ranked 37th.
Kim Komando’s WestStar Network show ranked 38th.
Stephanie Miller’s WYD Media show ranked 40th.
Mandy Connell’s KOA show, based in Denver, ranked 46th.
Mary Walter, co-hosting with a man on Washington’s WMAL, ranked 54th.
Joyce Kaufman’s WFTL show, aired in South Florida, ranked 57th.
Terry Gross’s NPR show ranked 58th.
Daliah Wachs’s Genesis Communications show ranked 81st.
Heidi Harris’s KMZQ show, based in Las Vegas, ranked 87th.
Judi Franco, co-hosting with one man on New Jersey’s WXXW, ranked 98th.
Jennifer Horn, co-hosting with a man on Southern California’s KRLA/KTIE, ranked 99th.
Count of “Heavy Hundred” female sports hosts doubled – to 4

Four women were hosts on shows that made Talkers’ admittedly subjective annual list of top 100 sports talk broadcasts in 2020. None of the women worked solo, but co-hosted with one or two White men.

That quartet of women — all of whom were White — broadcasted on shows that ranked 27th, 34th, 92nd, and 98th in 2020.

Just two women were in the 2019 Talkers’ roster of Sports Talk Heavy Hundred shows, appearing in slots No. 25, 29, and 95. Each woman was White and paired with male co-hosts.

White men hosted all the top 10 shows in the list of 100 in 2020, with the first non-White male host, a Black man, Rod Brooks, co-hosting with two White men, in a show ranked No. 15.

In 2019, the first person of color appearing on the list broadcast on a show ranked No. 18. That person was Carl Dukes, also a Black man.

Those four top-ranked women were:

- Sandra Golden, who co-hosts with two men on a show on Atlanta’s WCNN that came in at No. 27.
- Maggie Gray, who co-hosts with one man, on New York City’s WFAN, was 34th.
- Dawn Davenport, who co-hosts with two men on Nashville’s WGFX, was 92nd.
- Stacy Rost, who co-hosts with two men on Seattle’s KIRO, was 98th.

Women, persons of color increased in number at USA Today

Women comprised 48.1% of newsroom personnel at USA Today, up from 36% in 2017, according to the company’s August 2020 diversity report. Men were 51.9%.

During the same periods, respectively, women comprised 56.7% and 44% of newsroom leadership. Men were 43.3%.

Also, from 2017 to 2020, the number of Black, Indigenous, and other people of color, together, increased from 21% to 30% of newsroom staffers. But the number of Latinx and Indigenous staffers did not mirror the proportion of those two groups in the U.S. population.

The report also concluded that, in comparison to the U.S. population:

- 13.3% of the newsroom staff was Black, compared to 12.5% of the national population.
- 8% was Latinx, compared to 18.5% nationally.
- 5.8% was Asian, compared to 5.7%.
- 0.4% was Indigenous, compared to 0.7%.
At Vox, more women than men continued to comprise the workforce

Representing 55% of the overall workforce in 2020, female staffers continued to outnumber male staffers at Vox Media, which owns New York Magazine and Vox news, among other editorial networks, according to Vox's January 2021 report on diversity and inclusion. In 2019, females had been 56% of the workforce.

Also, in both 2019 and 2020, persons identifying as non-binary or otherwise non-heterosexual were 1% of Vox’s personnel. Another 1% did not disclose their sexual identity.

During the first half of 2020, by race and gender, Vox's newsroom employees were:
- 54% female, 45% male; in 2019, females were 53%.
- 69% White, down from 70% in 2019.
- 11% Asian, up from 10%.
- 7% Black, up from 6%.
- 5% multiracial in both years.
- 4% Latinx in both years.
- 1% Middle Eastern in both years.
- Less than 1% were some other race in both years.
- 3% didn’t disclose their race in both years.

Executives were:
- 62% female and 38% male, up from 58% female in 2019.
- 63% White, down from 67% in 2019.
- 12% Asian in both years.
- 11% Black, up from 9%.
- 4% Latinx, down from 5%.
- 4% Middle Eastern, a group not counted among executives in 2019.
- 3% multiracial in both years.
- 1% identified as some other race, down from 2%.
- 3% didn’t disclose their race in both years.

Tech workers were:
- 44% female in both years; in 2020, 55% were male, and 1% identified non-binary or other.
- 50% White, which was down from 52% in 2019.
- 14% Black in both years.
- 13% Asian in both years.
- 11% Latinx, up from 10%.
- 5% multiracial in both years.
- 1% Native American/Alaska Native in both years.
- 1% Middle Eastern, a group that was 0% in 2019
- 6% didn’t disclose their race in both years.

Business-side workers were:
- 66% female, up from 65% in 2019; in 2020, 33% were male, and 1% didn’t disclose their gender.
- 72% White, which was up from 71% in 2019.
- 11% Asian, up from10%.
- 6% Black up from 5%.
- 6% Latinx in both years.
- 3% multiracial, down from 4%.
- 3% didn’t disclose their race, down from 4%. 
### Gender Identity & Ethnicity – All Vox Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Identity/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native American/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latinx</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not disclosed</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gender Identity & Ethnicity – Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Identity/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native American/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latinx</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not disclosed</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Vox

---

**Washington Post newsroom was 50.5% female, 71.2% White**

In its yearly analysis of its staff’s diversity, The Washington Post reported that women comprised 42.3% and people of color 39.5% of its overall organization.

Based on June 2020 information, the report also found that women made up 50.5% and men 49.3% of a newsroom staff that was 71.2% White. Newsroom management was 51% female and 49% male; and, by race, 77.5% White, 8.8% Black, 7.4% Asian, 3.4% Latinx, and 2% multiracial. 1% didn’t disclose their race.

The Post’s inaugural diversity report, which included demographics from five previous years, showed that, overall, White employees were 57% of the workforce in 2020, the same as in 2015. The proportion of Black employees, overall, fell during those five years from 27% in 2015 to 19.1% in 2020, though the decrease was slimmer in the newsroom. There, the decline was from 11% to 9%, respectively.
From 2015 to 2020, Asians remained 8% of newsroom employees. Those who were Latinx went from 4% to 5%; those who didn't disclose their race changed from 1% to 4%; those who were multiracial increased from 1% to 2%. The remaining groups represented less than 1% of newsroom employees throughout those five years.

While the Post covers national and international news, it also is home to and covers a city that once was more than 70% Black. The most recent data showed that Blacks and Whites each accounted for 46% of District of Columbia residents.

Other trends showed that 5% of all newsroom employees and 3% of newsroom leadership were Latinx, while 11% of D.C. residents were Latinx. In the U.S., 18.5% of the population was Latinx.

Additionally, according to the report:

- The Post’s company-wide leadership was 57.2% male and 42.8% female.
- By race, company-wide, 67.7% of leaders were White, 16.8% were Black, 8.2% were Asian, 3.8% were Latinx, 1.7% did not disclose their race, 1.5% were multiracial, and .2% were Native American.
- In the newsroom, .2% of employees didn’t disclose their gender, while 49.3% said they were male and 50.5% were female.
- Of newsroom employees, by race, 71.2% were White, 9% were Black, 8.2% were Asian, 4.7% were Latinx, 4.4% didn’t disclose their race, 2.1% were multiracial, .2% were Native American, and .1% were Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander.
- On the business side, 62.7% of employees were male, 37% were female, and .4% didn’t disclose their gender.

- 47.4% of all business divisions workers were White, 27.3% were Black, 14.6% were Asian, 5.9% were Latinx, 2.4% didn’t disclose their race, 2.1% were multiracial, .2% were Native American, and .1% was Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander.
- Of business-side leaders, 62.4% were male, and 37.6% were female.
- By race, among business side leaders, 61.4% were White, 21.9% were Black, 8.8% were Asian, 4.1% were Latinx, 2.2% didn’t disclose their race, 1.3% were multiracial, and .3% were Native American.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>News and Editorial—All employees</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not disclose</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Washington Post
Organization-wide—All employees
Race/Ethnicity
- White: 57.3%
- Black or African American: 19.7%
- Asian: 11.9%
- Hispanic or Latino: 5.4%
- Did not disclose: 3.2%
- Multiracial: 2.1%
- Native American: 0.2%
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander: 0.1%

Organization-wide—By Gender
- Male: 57.1%
- Female: 42.6%
- .3% did not disclose

Organization-wide—Leadership
Race/Ethnicity
- White: 67.7%
- Black or African American: 16.8%
- Asian: 8.2%
- Hispanic or Latino: 3.8%
- Did not disclose: 1.7%
- Multiracial: 1.5%
- Native American: 0.2%

News and Editorial—By Gender
- Male: 51%
- Female: 49%

News and Editorial—Leadership
Race/Ethnicity
- White: 77.5%
- Black or African American: 8.8%
- Asian: 7.4%
- Hispanic or Latino: 3.4%
- Multiracial: 2%
- Did not disclose: 1%

Source: The Washington Post
Women were 50% of podcast listeners, roughly 20% of top podcast hosts

Men hosted 79% of the most downloaded and listened to podcasts, even though women represented roughly half of the nation’s growing population of podcast listeners, according to The Wrap’s analysis of 109 podcasts and Edison Research.

The Wrap analyzed 31 consecutive days in June and July 2020 of the most downloaded podcasts. It concluded that Spotify had the most female-hosted shows on its top 20 list, which was 28% of Spotify’s top roster.

During the same period, women hosted 23% of Apple Podcasts’ top shows and 17% of Stitcher’s. At Google Podcasts, which ranks only its top 12 shows, the rate was 6%.

Stitcher and Spotify ranked the top shows by downloads, while Apple also included consumption in its analytical algorithm, The Wrap wrote.

The Wrap also found that, during the 31 days:

- Joe Rogan, a man who signed an exclusive $100 million deal with Spotify in 2020, dominated all the podcast charts.
- 23 of the 109 shows had women hosts.
- 15 of the 109 shows had a male and female co-host.
- 1 show, “Office Ladies,” was woman-led. Its co-hosts were actresses Jenna Fischer and Angela Kinsey, formerly of NBC’s “The Office.”
- Nikole Hannah-Jones’s “1619,” based on The New York Times’ 1619 Project exploring slavery’s imprint on America, was No. 1 on one of the four podcast charts, Apple’s, during six days in June.
- Sex adviser Alexandra Cooper’s “Call Her Daddy” made the Spotify and Apple top 20 lists on each of the analyzed days.
- Ashley Flowers’ true-crime “Park Predators” topped Apple’s rankings on July 8, the day after it launched. Her other true-crime podcast, “Crime Junkie,” made both Stitcher and Apple Podcasts’ top 20 lists on every day surveyed.
In 12 nations, 22% of top editors, 40% of all journalists were female

At 240 major news outlets across the United States and in 11 other countries, 22% of top editors were women, according to the 2021 Reuters Institute on the Study of Journalism’s “Women and leadership in the news media report.” Of all journalists in those nations, 40% were female.

In 2020, when the institute's same analysis covered 10 nations, 23% of top editors were women. That rate, in those same 10 nations, remained 23% in 2021.

“Whilst the last year has seen an increasing reckoning with the frequent lack of diversity in newsrooms, especially in top positions, we find no clear overall trend towards greater gender equality in top editorial positions from 2020 to 2021,” researchers wrote.

South Africa had the highest percentage of top editors who were female, the United States had the second most, and the United Kingdom the third.

For 2021, the institute examined the gender of 180 editors at top online and offline news sites in those three nations and in Brazil, Kenya, and Mexico as well as Hong Kong, Japan, and South Korea in Asia, and Finland, Germany, and Spain in Europe.

Key findings of the institute’s sample of 10 top online news outlets and 10 top offline news outlets in each of the 12 markets of 2021 included these:

- 60% of South Africa's top editors were women in 2021, up from 47% in 2020.
- 47% of the United States’ top editors were women in 2021, up from 41%.
- 33% of Finland's top editors were women, up from 27%.
- 29% of the United Kingdom's top editors were female, up from 27%.
- 27% of Germany's top editors were women, up from 19%.
- 27% of top editors were women in Kenya, which was not on the 2020 list.
- 22% of Brazil's top editors were women, up from 12%.
- 17% of Hong Kong's top editors were women, up from 13%.
- 15% of South Korea's editors were women, up from 11%.
- 8% of top editors were women in Spain, which was not on the 2020 list.
- 6% of Mexico’s top editors were women in both years.
- 0% of Japan's top editors were women in both years.
- At the 178 outlets included in both 2020 and 2021, the proportion of female top editors, year-over-year, rose to 24% from 22%.
- 16% of 37 new top editors at those 178 outlets were female; 14% of outgoing editors were women.
- In 11 out of 12 markets, men accounted for the majority of top editors, including in such countries as Brazil and Finland where more women than men were working journalists.
Percentage of female top editors in every market
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Note: Data was not collected in Kenya and Spain in 2020.
Source: Data collected by the Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism.

Survey: Staff racial diversity was No. 1 goal of most newsroom leaders

On the heels of 2020's Black Lives Matters protests over police killings of unarmed Blacks in the United States but also in Europe, 42% of newsroom leaders globally said they rated racially diversifying their employee ranks as their most pressing priority.

Gender diversity ranked No. 1 for 18% of respondents to Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism’s “Changing Newsrooms 2020: Addressing Diversity and Nurturing Talent at a Time of Unprecedented Change” survey.

Responses were collected from 136 newsroom leaders in 38 countries over 16 consecutive days in late September 2020 and early October 2020. Of those respondents from newspapers, magazines, broadcast outlets, and other news agencies, 23% worked in the United Kingdom, 8% were in the United States, and lesser percentages of respondents were from Asia, Europe, Scandinavia, and elsewhere.

Of the respondents:

■ 46% said their organization had someone officially in charge of overseeing diversity and inclusion.
■ 36% said they had a budget for internal initiatives to promote diversity.
■ 22% said their organizations did not collect diversity data, had no personnel assigned to diversity efforts, and no budget dedicated to promoting diversity.
64% said their news organization collects and shares diversity data about staff.
54% said they shared data on diversity in leadership ranks.
41% said they now monitor the makeup of their contributors and interviewees. (In addition to the BBC’s 50:50 initiative, organizations such as Dagens Nyheter in Sweden and the U.K.’s Financial Times use gender bots to track the gender diversity of experts and sources they quote.)
84% said their organization was doing a good job on diversity at junior levels.
37% said their organization was doing a good job at diversity among senior leaders.
55% agreed that remote working, during the COVID-19 pandemic, made them more efficient, 22% disagreed, and 23% said it made no difference.
34% agreed that remote working, during the coronavirus pandemic, made them more creative, 42% disagreed, and 24% said it made no difference.
10% agreed that remote working, during the coronavirus pandemic, made it easier to build and maintain team relationships, 77% disagreed, and 13% said it no difference.

Industry leaders also said the ongoing economic problems of some sectors of the news industry made it hard for them to offer salaries and benefits commensurate with those of other industries.

Gannett union: Women earned up to $27,000 less than men in some newsrooms

For a total of 441 full-time newsroom staffers, the median annual pay was $47,390 for women and $57,235 for men at 14 Gannett-owned newspapers, according to a NewsGuild study of pay equity, released in April 2021. Company executives refuted the conclusions.

According to the union, women, overall, earned $9,845 less than men, or 83% of men’s median salary. Women of color earned $15,727 less, or 73% of the median salary of White men, a group comprising 44% of the studied employees, union leaders wrote. Women with at least 30 years on the payroll of the 14 newspapers earned $27,026 less yearly, or 63% of men’s annual median salary.

The median salary was $48,006 for employees of color and $53,252 for White employees, NewsGuild leaders wrote.

Posting its emailed response to NewsGuild on Twitter, Gannett executives wrote that the union’s data were skewed and didn’t include pay in all unionized Gannett newsrooms. Executives faulted the study for not specifying job titles of the analyzed workers or how many workers were salaried versus those paid an hourly wage. Executives, who mentioned their diversity strides
and goals, also said years spent on the job didn’t equal years of experience as a news professional.

“Because of the small sample size the Guild used — which did not include all unionized newsrooms, let alone our full population — the sweeping generalizations used in your document are misleading,” Gannett’s Labor Relations Counsel Thomas C. Zipfel wrote to the union. He called the study an “inaccurate and misleading effort to disparage the company in the court of public opinion.”

Regarding the guild’s decision to allow union workers to remain anonymous as they complained about pay, Rebekah Sanders, an Arizona Republic reporter and chair of its newsroom union, told the Women’s Media Center, “This is a topic that is scary and embarrassing for many … They can describe the effects of these injustices so much more eloquently than I.”

Some of the journalists’ responses were:

“We believe there’s a serious problem when Gannett is making lots of admirable diversity pledges but failing to address pay fairness.”

“We are not claiming every single woman of color or woman is underpaid … But it’s clear from the medians, it’s an overall trend.”

“Many of our journalists, even with 10 or 20 years of experience, are working second and third jobs. They’re struggling to pay student loans. They have roommates. They are not being paid a living wage.”

Of those 441 full-time and 25 part-time employees, 77.8% were White and 59% were male, according to the guild. The data came from the Arizona Republic Guild, Indianapolis News Guild, Kitsap News Guild, Knoxville Newspaper Guild, Ledger News Guild, Memphis Newspaper Guild, Milwaukee Newspaper Guild, Palm Beach News Guild, Sarasota Newspaper Guild, South Bend News Guild, Southwest Florida News Guild, and Florida Times-Union Guild.

The largest pay gap was at the Arizona Republic, where women earned 61% of what men earned, and the narrowest was at the Kitsap Sun in Bremerton, Washington, where women earned 113% of what men earned. The Kitsap Sun and the Lakeland (Florida) Ledger in Florida were the only two of the 14 Gannett newspapers where women out-earned men.

Based on salaries of the full-time non-manager news employees, the study’s other key findings included these:

- Women aged 50 through 60 earned $6,642 less, or 90% the median salary of men their age.
- That gap widened to $10,677 less when part-timers were included.
- Journalists of color, overall, earned $5,246 less, or 90% of the median salary that White journalists earned.
- By 2 to 1, men outnumbered women aged 30 and above.
- By 2 to 1, men outnumbered women with at least 10 years of experience.
- By 4 to 1, White journalists outnumbered journalists of color aged 40 and above.
- By 4 to 1, White journalists outnumbered journalists of color with at least 10 years of service.
- Experienced female journalists and journalists of color were rare.
- 13 of the 14 newsrooms were Whiter than the communities they covered. (Only the Knoxville News Sentinel was more diverse than its county.)
- The Arizona Republic had the most diverse newsroom but the largest.
- Gender and racial pay gaps, with women earning almost $30,000 less in median wages than men and people of color earning about $25,000 less in median wages than Whites.
- Newsrooms with union contracts had a gender pay gap that was $6,846 smaller and a racial pay gap that was $5,443 smaller than non-union newsrooms.
By race and gender:
- $47,736 was the median salary for White women; the respective salary for women of color was $42,660.
- $58,386 was the median salary for White men; the respective salary for men of color was $52,407.

By gender, age and years of employment:
- $63,230 was the median salary for women and $63,439 for men with 20 through 30 years of experience.
- $55,576 was the median salary for women and $62,344 for men with 10 through 20 years of experience.
- $43,056 was the median salary for women and $44,052 for men with less than 10 years of experience.

By race, age and years of employment:
- $65,956 was the median salary for Whites and $69,032 for people of color older than 50.
- $60,508 was the median salary for Whites and $53,532 for people of color aged 40 through 50.
- $48,139 was the median salary for Whites and $48,609 for people of color aged 30 through 40.
- $40,019 was the median salary for Whites and $38,002 for people of color under 30 years old.
- $65,367 was the median salary for Whites and $67,000 for people of color with more than 20 years on the job.
- $61,489 was the median salary for Whites and $56,804 for people of color with 10 to 20 years on the job.
- $44,090 was the median salary for Whites and $42,921 for people of color with fewer than 10 years on the job.

**LA Times pay-equity settlement; Reuters’ Black-White pay gap probed**

*NewsGuild efforts* to bridge pay gaps in newsrooms around the country yielded, a *court settlement* in October 2020 requiring The Los Angeles Times to boost the salaries of lesser-paid women journalists and journalists of color. A group of newsroom employees had filed a $3 million class-action lawsuit after the NewsGuild, which the employees had joined in 2018, demanded and obtained newsroom staff salary data that showed pay inequities.

In 2020, the NewsGuild also began tackling what it concluded were pay inequities at Reuters, resulting in Black journalists earning roughly $10,000 a year less than their White male colleagues. At the international news wire with U.S. headquarters in New York, women also earned less — roughly $2,000 less — than men.

In Los Angeles, a county judge who’d preliminarily approved the settlement between the Times’ owners and its employee union was slated in March 2021 to give final approval to a plan to compensate 240 current and former Times reporters and editors. The settlement covers not just the lawsuit participants, but all women reporters and editors — women earned 70 cents for every $1 that men earned — and Black and Latinx reporters, copy editors, and line editors employed by the Times from Feb. 14, 2015 through October 20, 2020.

A *NewsGuild analysis* of Reuters, released in December 2019, revealed:
- Black and Latinx employees were paid an average of $10,083 less than their White counterparts with similar qualifications and job responsibilities. The union factored in job title, years at Reuters, age, and other relevant, related details. At the time of the analysis, Whites were 77% of the workforce.
Women earned an average of $2,020 — or 1.6% — less than men with similar experience, seniority, job titles, and work locations.

The top-10 highest paid journalists at Reuters were men.

Reuters had hired twice as many men as women during the consecutive three years preceding the union’s analysis.

29 was the median age of those newly hired women; 38 was the median age for newly hired men.

**Washington Post women, especially younger ones, earned less than men**

Women journalists at The Washington Post sometimes earned thousands of dollars less annually than men, with the pay gap widest among journalists under the age of 40, according to a study released in November 2019 by The Washington Post Guild, the union representing newsroom workers.

Of the Guild’s 950 members, 53.4% were female and 46.6% were male, according to data that Post management gave the study’s author.

The average yearly salary for women aged 40 and older was $126,000, while men of the same age earned an average of $127,765, more than 1.5% more than women. Women younger than 40, however, had average annual earnings of $84,030, 14% less than the $95,890 men their age earned.

Additionally, Whites in the newsroom earned 15% more, on average, than persons of color. Women of color earned an average of $30,000 — or 35% — less than White men. White men accounted for 47% of the studied journalists, while women of color accounted for 10%.

Some women cited what had been glaring gaps between their earnings and those of men who’d done the same jobs and sometimes had fewer years of experience on the job, the study stated.

“One veteran reporter said it took her more than two decades at the Post to feel that she had any substantial disposable income. At one point, while working as a foreign bureau chief, she learned that the man who had previously held her job, a reporter of the same age with more managerial experience but a fraction of her experience at the Post, was making $50,000 more than [she].

Another female employee, a 35-year-old award-winning journalist who started as an intern in the mid-2000s, recently found out that all of the men on her team are paid more than [she] — even though she’s been at the Post longer than all of them and has been working in journalism longer than most of them. One of the men on her team is paid more than $30,000 more than [she].”

Among the latest of salary studies conducted in recent years by a handful of the nation’s largest journalist unions, the study also concluded that there was no marked overall pay gap between women and men working non-journalism jobs on the business side of the Post organization. However, Whites in the commercial division earned 5% more than people of color.

The study, which was done by a Pulitzer Prize-winning Post journalist, was “hindered by the company’s lack of specific data on the professional experience of its employees, who sometimes have built lengthy careers before joining the Post,” according to the Guild’s press release. “The relative lack of diversity at the Post, particularly relatively low numbers of black and Hispanic or Latino newsroom employees, also complicated our analysis because of the small sample sizes … ”

The report concluded that the wage gap was narrower under billionaire Jeff Bezos, who bought the paper in 2013, than it was under the Graham family, who had owned the newspaper for more than four generations.

About those 950 newsroom employees, according to the study:

- 64.4% were White, 16.5% were Black, 8.1% were Asian, 4.7% were Latinx, 1.9% were multiracial.
- White men earned 18% more than White women.
- Men of color earned 17% more than women of color.
- Whites earned 7% more than persons of color who were younger than 40.
- Whites earned 16% more than persons of color aged 40 and older.
Among salaried workers — 707 of the 950 earn a set salary, not hourly wages — White men earned an average of $117,452 a year.
Salaried men of color earned $101,575.
Salaried White women earned $99,640.
Salaried women of color earned $86,511.
$106,212 was the average salary for Whites, overall.
$97,276 was the average salary for Blacks.
$95,205 was the average salary for Asians.
$82,890 was the average salary for Latinx persons.
$79,860 was the average salary for multiracial persons.
57.6% of White men earned more than the average annual salary.
48.9% of White women earned more than the average.
41.2% of men of color earned more than the average.
38.5% of women of color earned more than the average.
On the national, financial, investigative news, and other desks where the average annual salary was more than $125,000, 80% of journalists were White and 57% were male.
Of all those journalists earning more than $125,000, 47% were White men and 10% were women of color.
On news desks where the average annual salary was less than $92,000, 68% of journalists were White and 40% were male.

Among other recommendations, the report urged Post executives to strengthen and better formalize the salary review process, and direct managers to know how much their reports make as a means of ensuring pay parity.

Local TV newswomen were sexually harassed online, in person

A group of female journalists at local TV stations said they are regularly harassed, including being verbally assaulted, groped, and sexually propositioned both online and in person, according to a University of Oregon study.

Nineteen women, aged 23 to 34, were interviewed by researchers Kaitlin Miller and Seth C. Lewis of UO’s School of Journalism and Communication. The qualitative study, published in Journalism & Mass Communications Quarterly in February 2020, was based on in-depth interviews citing harassment from strangers, viewers, and news sources that occurred daily, weekly, and monthly. Of the 19 journalists, 10 worked in small markets, six worked in medium-sized markets, and three in large markets.

The in-person harassment included whistling, catcalling, shouting ‘fake news,’ and making obscene gestures at journalists during live reporting. Phrases included “f**k her right in the p***y,” which was popularized in 2014 by viral YouTube videos of a man calling himself Fred, hurling the invective at women journalists as they were reporting.

While the journalists who took part in the study were less likely to face physical assault than other forms of harassment, they did give these accounts of what they have suffered while working in the field, including at President Trump’s rallies:

“People were grabbing and touching, feeling … Some people were cussing at us while we were trying to get ready [for the live shot] … People just, just were really angry, and so I’d never experienced anything like that, and we got to our car after our live shot and our tires were slashed on our news vehicle,” one respondent told the two researchers, one of them a former TV news reporter.

“I’ve been to one Trump rally before, and you probably know what happens at Trump rallies. Trump literally says, like, ‘Oh the most dishonest people ever are right behind you.’ Then everyone will turn around and boo at you. We had a few people throw stuff at us at the one I went to,” reporter another respondent.
Regarding the “Fred”-type disruptions, researchers quoted one respondent as saying, “That was a lot. That was probably any time I did a live shot … That would happen almost every time, you could almost count on it. To the point where you need to go someplace where you’re hopefully not by a street, where cars are passing by, or there’s no one walking around you.”

More than anchors, meteorologists, and other women who mainly work in a studio, field reporters faced what researchers termed “in-person disruptive harassment.” Among those reporters were multimedia journalists (MMJs) who were working solo, as the reporter, photographer, and editor of their news coverage.

“I really think it’s because they see us as weak and vulnerable, and my biggest concern is that MMJs, true MMJs who are out alone, and this freaking stupid thing of MMJs doing their own live shots, which is so unsafe, is not okay,” a respondent said.

Inside the newsroom, verbal attacks, threats, criticisms, and sexual propositions flowed across the internet, including from social media platforms.

“I get penis pictures sent to me on social media. I just turned off my Facebook Messenger. I had to turn off my inbox, because all I ever got on there were penis pictures,” one respondent told the researchers.

From another respondent: “The majority of my harassment happens on Facebook Live. I’m now required to do Facebook Live twice a month. I dread it at every turn because people literally use these opportunities to harass you. They don’t want to say [things] to your face because it’s not to your face, but it is live and in a live feed of comments, so people criticize your voice, your body, your face, the way you talk, your makeup, your eyelashes, your hair, your story, the media. They hate it.”

And another: “I had a random private message on Twitter from a Twitter user who I didn’t know and never contacted, who sent me a photo of a man being beheaded violently. And there was blood, you know, and there was a knife, with the comment, ‘Welcome to [city omitted for anonymity]’. That was scary.”

That array of assaults takes a toll. “We find that women perform a significant degree of emotional labor as they regularly deal with harassment and simultaneously attempt to mitigate or prevent further harassment,” researchers wrote.

Women journalists: Online abuse suppresses news coverage

Of 115 women journalists responding to a Seattle University survey, 79% said online harassment affected press freedom and, some added, fear of online abuse made them avoid reporting on certain kinds of the stories.

Most survey respondents — 94% — said their job expected them to engage social media audiences about their work. Additionally, 9% of respondents said their organizations did not train them in how to interact online with readers and viewers; 16% said their organization had no policies regarding that interaction; and 46.5%, combined, rated that interaction either “generally neutral” or “generally negative.”

“When asked which negative interactions they had experienced, the most popular answers were general insults, insults about their work, politics, and appearance. Specific identities most often attacked included participants’ age, appearance, race, and gender,” researchers wrote in “Online harassment of U.S. women journalists and its impact of press freedom.”

Nevertheless, lead researcher Caitlin Carson, a communications professor, told the Women’s Media Center: “Women journalists, for the most part, continued to be fearless in their coverage, not shying away from topics that would undoubtedly bring out the trolls. However, the impact of this type of abuse, over time, gave them yet another reason — in addition to the low pay and tenuous job security — to consider leaving the media industry altogether.”

### Online interactions with views or readers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interactions</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generally positive</td>
<td>53.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally neutral</td>
<td>33.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally negative</td>
<td>12.93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Seattle University, Department of Communication
Here are the other results of the survey, published by University of Illinois–based First Monday, an open-access journal publishing research about the internet:

53.4% of respondents rated their interaction with online comments regarding their work as “generally positive.”

- 88% said their news sites published comments.
- 21% said they were expected to respond to audience comments on their news sites.
- 30% said their supervisors supported their efforts to manage online interactions with readers and viewers.
- 37% said their co-workers supported their efforts to manage online interactions with readers and viewers.

Of the 141 respondents to the survey, which relied partly on participants distributing the survey among women journalists they knew, 115 were White, 8 were Latinx, 8 were Asian, 4 were Black, 2 were Arab, and 1 was Native American. Researchers noted that a lack of diversity among respondents was among its scientific limitations.

Women, racial, other minority journalists especially harassed online

Women, racial and religious minorities, gender non-conforming, and other non-heterosexual journalists faced more frequent and intense online harassment than other kinds of journalists, according to a Women's Media Center report on harassment and its links to systemic bias in newsrooms.

“What Online Harassment Tells Us About Our Newsrooms: From Individuals to Institutions,” also found that harassed persons were likelier to self-censor, and that news organizations were ill-prepared to handle online hate and harassment, sometimes forcing journalists to be responsible for their own safety online.

Recommendations on how to help remedy those problems were included in the analysis.

“We want newsrooms to take online harassment seriously, not as a matter of women’s personal safety, but as central to their commitment to inclusivity and journalistic ethics,” said writer and media critic Soraya Chemaly, co-founder and director of the Women’s Media Center's Speech Project. The project raises public and media awareness of online harassment.

Many women have kept on telling their stories and voicing their opinions despite the harassment they’ve faced, Mitra Kalita, then the senior vice president of CNN Digital, said during a WMC-hosted symposium on harassment. Many of her female colleagues refuse to be silenced.

“They write again,” added Kalita, now the co-founder and CEO of URL Media.

Culling data from previous WMC analyses and analyses of other researchers, including Pew, Amnesty International, and the International Women’s Media Foundation, and input from a WMC convening of women journalists, the 2020 report on online harassment also concluded that:

- Online harassment affects organizations’ ability to recruit, retain, and reward a diversity of staffers, and to cultivate a diversity of news leaders and inclusive news media work environments.
- Chances for advancement may be lower for women and minorities who, because they’re targeted for particular types of harassment, lessen their engagement on social media, a task their bosses often require.
- Lack of diversity in media management is a primary reason that online harassment and its effects on staff and news production often are not taken seriously by those who run media institutions.
- When journalists’ credibility is undermined and threatened as a result of online harassment, the credibility of the institutions they represent also is eroded.
- Online harassment threatens press freedom by sometimes prompting journalists not to cover certain topics.
- A newsroom dominated by White men is less equipped to assess and characterize risks that would more readily be identified by a diverse newsroom staff that reflected the community it covers.
The Women’s Media Center recommended, among other things, that newsrooms:

- Hedge against harassment and the toxicity it generates by providing guidance and training in digital safety and best practices.
- Have a clear, defined cultural commitment to supporting targeted journalists, with tech, legal, and health/mental health tools and insights from those who’ve survived harassment.
- Work with social media companies to develop channels to address different levels of escalating harassment.
- Make journalists’ safety a company-wide priority, ensuring that editorial, tech, legal, and marketing departments identify the best supports, solutions, and responses.
- Commit to understanding how inclusivity, online harassment, and free speech intersect in a news operation.
- Acknowledge and engineer around gender, racial, religious, sexual-orientation, and related biases in newsrooms.
- Diversify viewpoints and perspectives by developing a more representative talent pipeline, despite constraints on newsroom resources and managers’ time.
- Embrace differences as assets.

Said Julie Burton, CEO and president of the Women’s Media Center: “Taking online harassment seriously is at the core of an inclusive newsroom and a critical step toward ensuring free speech for all. News leaders and managers must be in the vanguard in combating both harassment and the internal biases that exacerbate that harassment.”

Newspaper ad revenues fell, some TV news stations flourished amid COVID-19 pandemic

Newspapers’ years-long, downward financial spiral worsened during the coronavirus pandemic, with, overall, advertising dollars declining 42% and subscription revenue falling 8% at 300 companies, according to a Pew Research Center analysis.

Ad revenues at cable’s Fox News increased 41% and those of traditional networks ABC, CBS, and NBC, combined, rose 11% during a record spike in TV news viewership. Also, on cable, CNN’s ad revenues fell 14%, and those at MSNBC fell 27%, even as more viewers also tuned in to those two cable networks.

Pew’s analysis compared the median change in newspaper and TV advertising, newspaper subscription/circulation, and local TV retransmission revenues in the second quarter of 2020 to those of 2019’s second quarter.

“In percentage terms,” analysts wrote, “newspaper companies that reported revenue in both periods seemed to fare worse financially this spring than they did during the Great Recession of December 2007 through June 2009.”

Wages and compensation fell from 11% to 27% at four of the five major newspaper chains that owned the 300 newspapers. There was no change in wages and compensation at publications owned by The New York Times.

Pew, additionally, found that:

- At Belo, the media corporation that owns The Dallas Morning News, advertising revenue fell 40%, and subscription/circulation revenue declined 8% from 2019 to 2020.
- At Gannett, owner of USA Today and others, ad revenue fell 35%, and subscription/circulation revenue declined 14%.
- At Lee Enterprises, owner of The Omaha World-Herald and others, ad revenue fell 37%, and subscription/circulation revenue declined 14%.
- At McClatchy, owner of The Sacramento Bee and others, ad revenue fell 46%, and subscription/circulation revenue fell 8%.
At The New York Times, which owns that flagship and others, ad revenue fell 44%, but subscription/circulation revenue rose 8%.

At Tribune Media, ad revenue fell 48%, but subscription/circulation revenue rose 3%.

Increases in retransmission fees, which local stations charge cable and satellite customers for airing their programs, offset declining ad revenue at five local TV news companies that, collectively, own more than 600 local news stations.

At Gray Television, which owns stations in 94 TV markets, ad revenues declined 8% but retransmission fees rose 9%.

At Nexstar Media Group, which owns stations in 115 markets, ad revenue fell 32%, but retransmissions fees rose 16%.

At E.W. Scripps Co., which owns TV stations in 42 markets, ad revenue fell 8%, but retransmission fees 55%.

At Sinclair Broadcast Group, which owns stations in 88 markets, ad revenue fell 31%, but retransmission fees rose 175%.

At Tegna, which owns stations in 51 markets, ad revenue fell 21%, but retransmission fees rose 37%.

Ad revenue rose 21% at ABC’s nightly news shows and remained roughly the same at its morning news shows.

Ad revenue rose 3% at CBS’s nightly news shows but fell slightly at morning shows, from $50 million in 2019 to $49 million in 2020.

At NBC, ad revenue rose 7% at the nightly news shows but fell from $97 million to $90 million.
Newspapers were hardest hit during a 12-year, 23% drop in news jobs

Full-time U.S. newsroom employment fell 23% between 2008 and 2019, from roughly 114,000 to 88,000 reporters, editors, photographers, and videographers at newspapers, radio stations, traditional broadcast TV networks, cable TV, and online-only news sites, according to a Pew Research Center analysis.

Broadcast TV employees now account for a larger portion of newsroom employees, and the number of online-only newsroom employees has more than doubled since 2008, according to the report.

The greatest decline, by sector, was in newspapers, where employment dropped 51% between 2008, when the full-time worker tally was 71,000, and 2019, when the tally was 35,000, Pew found.

Among newspapers, 29% with a daily circulation of at least 250,000, 36% of those with a 100,000 to 249,000 daily circulation, and 18% of those with a 50,000 to 99,999 circulation laid off workers in 2018. The respective figures for 2017 were 50%, 32%, and 26%.
In radio newsrooms, the employment decline was 23%, or 1,000 lost jobs, which was 35 times smaller than the losses in newspapers. Traditional broadcast TV and cable TV newsroom employment remained relatively stable.

Online-only newsroom employment increased by 117% from 2008 to 2019, when there were roughly 16,000 workers. By 2014, the overall decline in newsroom employment had stabilized, according to Pew, which also found that:

- The tally of 35- to 54-year-old newsroom workers declined 42% between 2008 and 2018.
- The tally of those aged 55 and older increased by 31% during the same period.
- The tally of those aged 18 to 34 remained fairly unchanged.
- 22% of newsroom employees, from 2013 to 2017, lived in New York, Los Angeles, or Washington, cities that were home to 13% of all U.S. workers during the same years.
- In the still-emerging online news sphere, 33% of newsroom employees were in the South, home to 37% of all U.S. workers; 24% of newsroom employees were in the Northeast, home to 18% of all U.S. workers; 22% were in the West, home to 23% of all U.S. workers; and 20% of newsroom employees were in the Midwest, home to 22% of all U.S. workers.
- 24% of all newsroom employees worked in the Northeast, where 18% of all U.S. workers were employed.
- 76% of newsroom employees and 64% of all U.S. workers were non-Latinx Whites.
- 61% of newsroom employees and 53% of all U.S. workers were men; 47% of U.S. workers were women.
- 47% of newsroom employees and 34% of all U.S. workers were non-Latinx White men.
- 38% of 18- to 29-year-old newsroom employees were non-Latinx White men.
- 46% of 30- to 49-year-old newsroom employees were non-Latinx White men.
- 56% of newsroom employees aged 50 and older were non-Latinx White men.
- 79% of newsroom employees and 37% of all U.S. workers were college graduates.
- $52,000 and $61,000 were the median yearly earnings for college-degreed newsroom employees and all college-educated U.S. workers, respectively.

**Most journalism, communication grads were female; enrollment was steady**

Women continued to dominate student enrollment in college journalism and communications programs, as more students overall chose to major in electronic media, according to the “2018 Survey of Journalism & Mass Communications Enrollments,” published in February 2020. It also showed a spike in minority student enrollment.

While women comprised 61.6% of bachelor’s degree, 65.3% of master’s degree, and 58.4% of doctoral degree candidates in journalism and mass communication, the overall proportion of female undergrad and grad students dropped since the prior survey was released in 2015.

The survey — conducted by Texas Tech University’s College of Media & Communications — also found that strategic communication sequences remained the most popular choice of undergraduate students, accounting for 37.6% of enrollees at the 225 colleges answering the survey. (Researchers had asked 429 colleges to respond to the survey.) Journalism students accounted for 26.3% of enrollees and those in electronic media sequences for 8.8%.
Since 2015, when 180 universities answered this survey, the overall tally of journalism majors rose 1.4 percentage points, while the tally of strategic communication majors fell by 1.5 percentage points, and electronic media majors remained roughly the same. Between 2013 and 2015, overall undergraduate enrollment in journalism and communications programs declined.

Since 2015, the number of bachelor’s degrees conferred in electronic media sequences has increased by 2.7 percentage points and those in strategic communication has risen 1.4 percentage points. Bachelor’s degrees conferred in journalism decreased by 4 percentage points. Nevertheless, the highest percentage of bachelor degrees were awarded to strategic communication majors, followed by journalism, then, electronic media majors.

Other main findings included these:

- The tally of female undergraduate students decreased by 3.8 percentage points, the percentage of female master’s students fell by 4.1 percentage points, and the percentage of female PhD students dropped by 2 percentage points.
- Persons of color comprised 35.7% of undergraduate students, 34.6% of master’s degree students, and 24.1% of PhD students. That reflected, respectively, a 2.1 percentage-point increase, a 6.5 percentage-point increase, and a 5.8 percentage-point increase.
- The largest minority enrollment increases were among Latinx students: from 11.8% previously to 16.1% presently among bachelor’s degree candidates, and from 6.7% to 11.5% among master’s degree candidates.
- Females earned 66.7% of bachelor’s degrees, 68.9% of master’s degrees, and 62% of doctoral degrees. That reflected, respectively, a .6 percentage-point increase, a 2.8 percentage-point increase, and 2.4 percentage-point decrease.
- Persons of color earned 30.8% of bachelor’s degrees, 37% of master’s degrees, and 20.5% of doctoral degrees. That reflected, respectively, a .2 percentage-point increase, a 7.6 percentage-point increase, and an 8.4 percentage-point increase.
- Among minority grads, Latinx students posted the highest increase: from 11% to 14% for bachelor’s degree earners and from 5.5% to 11.2% for master’s degree earners.
Undergraduate enrollments by sequences for 2015 and 2018

- **Advertising**
  - 2015: 10.6%  
  - 2018: 11.5%

- **Public Relations**
  - 2015: 17.3%  
  - 2018: 15.3%

- **PR & Advertising combined**
  - 2015: 4.7%  
  - 2018: 4.4%

- **Strategic communication**
  - 2015: 6.5%  
  - 2018: 6.4%

- **Strategic communication summed**
  - 2015: 39.1%  
  - 2018: 37.6%

- **News editorial/print journalism**
  - 2015: 3.0%  
  - 2018: 1.9%

- **Broadcast news/journalism**
  - 2015: 6.3%  
  - 2018: 4.4%

- **Journalism undifferentiated**
  - 2015: 14.5%  
  - 2018: 18.4%

- **Journalism summed**
  - 2015: 24.9%  
  - 2018: 26.3%

- **Radio/TV**
  - 2015: 1.5%  
  - 2018: 2.3%

- **Media production**
  - 2015: 2.3%  
  - 2018: 2.6%

- **Electronic media summed**
  - 2015: 9.2%  
  - 2018: 8.8%

**Note:** PR = public relations

Source: Texas Tech University's College of Media & Communications
### Bachelor’s degrees granted by sequences for 2015 and 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sequence</th>
<th>2015 (%)</th>
<th>2018 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public relations</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR &amp; Advertising combined</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic communication</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic communication summed</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News editorial/print journalism</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast news/journalism</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism undifferentiated</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism summed</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio/TV</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media production</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic media summed</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graduate enrollments and degrees granted for 2015 and 2018, same schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master’s enrollment (N=52)</td>
<td>3,390</td>
<td>3,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s degrees granted (N=35)</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>1,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD enrollment (N=15)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral degrees granted (N=13)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Texas Tech University’s College of Media & Communications
A modest 25-year global rise in women as news sources, subjects

Even as the tally of female news sources rose, overall, across 120 countries, coverage of persons of color sometimes did not reflect their proportionate population in their ancestral homelands, according to a Global Media Monitoring Project’s preliminary analysis.

It found that, from 1995 to 2020, the number of female news sources and subjects increased from 16% to 24% in newspapers, 15% to 24% in radio news, and 21% to 26% in TV news. On the internet, the number of female news sources and subjects increased from 25% in 2015 to 27% in 2020.

The “Who Makes the News” report offers preliminary findings about news coverage and journalists in two-thirds of the 120 studied countries, including the United States, where the monitoring project has been reviewing 25 years of trends among journalists and what they cover.

The monitoring project’s final analysis will focus on Indigenous people, people with disabilities, elderly persons, racialized groups, and social justice movements, including Black Lives Matter.

Among the report’s findings, so far, are these:

- From 2000 to 2020, the proportion of TV news stories reported by women increased from 36% to 48%.
- Indigenous people were 1% of TV news subjects and sources in Latin America, where they are roughly 8% of the population.
- Of the 1%, 3 out of 10 Indigenous sources and subjects were women.
- In European TV news, 1% of sources and subjects were aged 80 and older.

During the COVID-19 pandemic:

- Women accounted for 31% and men 69% of subjects of and sources in COVID-19–related TV news.
- Women accounted for 27% and men 73% of COVID-19 news on the radio.
- Women accounted for 24% and men 76% of COVID-19 news on Twitter.
- The proportion of women subjects and sources in non-COVID-19 Internet news ranged from a low of 16% in parts of North Africa and the Middle East to a high of 39% in the United States and Canada.
- The proportion of women/women’s issues as subjects and sources in COVID-19 news ranged from a low of 19% in Central America, South America, North Africa, the Middle East, South Asia, Southeast Asia, East Asia, and Russia, and a high of 37% in the Caribbean.
The proportion of female reporters covering COVID-19–related news ranged from a low of 25% of reporters in South Asia, Southeast Asia, East Asia, and Russia to a high of 63% in the Caribbean, Central America, and South America.

The proportion of female reporters covering news not related to COVID-19 ranged from a low of 26% in Sub-Saharan Africa, Central Africa, and southern Africa to a high of 51% in North America, Central America, and South America.

Source: Global Media Monitoring Project

*GMMP 2020 Preliminary results. March 4, 2021
Whites, Philadelphia’s minority, dominated Philadelphia Inquirer news articles

Of more than 14,000 people featured in 3,000 online and print articles published by The Philadelphia Inquirer over six weeks spanning 2019 and 2020, roughly 26.4% were Black, 3.3% were Latinx, and 1.6% were Asian — figures that fall below each group’s share of the city’s population — according to a Temple University Klein College of Media and Communication audit.

Of Philadelphians, 40.1% were Black, 15.2% were Latinx, 7.5% were Asian, 2.4% were multiracial, and .3% each were either Native American or some other race, according to the Klein researchers, who analyzed coverage over a six-week period.

Whites, who comprised 34.2% of the city’s population, were 58.7% of people featured in news articles written by full-time Inquirer staffers. Whites were 61.3% of featured persons in published stories by staffers, freelancers, and the wire services, combined.

Women accounted for 21.2% of all people featured, men for 77.9%. Of all featured women, 63.6% were White, 25% were Black, 5.1% were Latina, 3.7% were Asian, 1.9% were biracial, multiracial, or some other racial identity, and .4% were Native American.

Additionally, .1% of featured persons were lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, or non-binary. The gender of .9% of featured persons couldn’t be determined.

The Inquirer commissioned the audit partly in response to an outcry about a headline the paper ran during 2020 city protests after George Floyd was murdered by police. Inquirer staffers of color were among the critics of “Buildings Matter, Too” and the related article on the future of the city’s buildings. Those staffers cited what they termed longstanding racial insensitivity at the newspaper, where Whites comprised 74.3% of the entire newsroom staff and 77.3% of editors.
Based on that audit’s random sample of six weeks’ worth of Monday through Sunday online and print articles, published from August 2019 through March 2020, the analysis also found that:

- When Black athletes were excluded from the count of Black persons featured, Black representation dropped to 19%.
- 1.3% of all people featured were multiracial.
- 1.1% of all people featured were Native American.
- .9% were other races.
- 7.9% were unidentifiable, racially.

Of the executives, managers, reporters, producers, photographers, news developers, and others comprising the Inquirer’s full-time staff:

- 54.7% were male.
- 77.3% of editors were White.
- 50% — or 22 of 44 — of editors were female and 50% were male.
- 40.9% of those female editors were White.
- 6.8% of female editors were Black.
- 2.8% of female editors were Asian.
- 0% of female editors were Latina.
- 74.3% of non-editors were White.
- 44.2% of non-editors were female.

Racially, by department, non-Hispanic Whites accounted for:

- 71.8% of persons in opinion desk coverage.
- 67.4% of business, health, and built environment desks coverage.
- 61.5% of features desk coverage.
- 60.7% of news desk coverage.
- 58.8% of visuals desk coverage.
- 57.5% of digital desk coverage.
- 52.8% of sports desk coverage.

By news department, women accounted for:

- 43.7% of people featured in news desk coverage.
- 24.1% of features desk coverage.
- 17.2% of business, health, and built environment desk coverage.
- 6.9% of digital desk coverage.
- 5.3% of sports desk coverage.
- 1.9% of visuals desk coverage.
Announcing the audit’s findings in a public letter to readers and Inquirer employees, Executive Editor Stan Wischnowski, Editor Gabriel Escobar, and Managing Editor Patrick Kerkstra wrote, “The headline offensively riffed on the Black Lives Matter movement, and suggested an equivalence between the loss of buildings and the lives of black Americans. That is unacceptable …

“[W]e apologize to Inquirer journalists, particularly those of color, who expressed sadness, anger, and embarrassment in a two-hour newsroom-wide meeting Wednesday. An enormous amount of pressure sits on the shoulders of black and brown Inquirer journalists, and mistakes like this, made by the publication they work for, are profoundly demoralizing. We hear you and will continue to listen as we work to improve.”

**54 minutes of news time went to 44 nonconforming and trans women murders**

MSNBC broadcasted more than half of a total of 54 minutes of news coverage of 44 murders of transgender and gender non-conforming women in 2020, according to Media Matters, which called that coverage insufficient.

Media Matters’ analysis concluded that ABC, CBS, CNN, Fox, and NBC each devoted less than six minutes to covering those killings during a total of 23 segments. The analysis covered January through December 2020. Victims included 23 Black and 10 Latinx transgender and gender non-conforming women.

In its sole segment about the killings, Media Matters wrote, “host Tucker Carlson lied that the epidemic of anti-trans violence is ‘[factually untrue]’ and falsely claimed that ‘[t]ransgender people are on average, safer than your typical American.’”

Media Matters found that, of TV news airtime afforded that violence:

- 31 of the 54 minutes aired on MSNBC.
- 6 of the minutes aired on CBS.
- 5 minutes each aired on ABC, CNN and Fox.
- 2 minutes aired on NBC.
- 10 of the 15 cable news segments aired on MSNBC.
- 4 segments each aired on ABC and CNN.
- 2 segments each aired on CBS and NBC.
- 1 segment aired on Fox.
- 9 of the 23 total segments mentioned the name of a slain trans person.
- 15 of the 23 cable and traditional network news segments featured a guest commentator who also was transgender or gender non-conforming.
- More than half the coverage aired during June’s annual Gay Pride Month.
News misidentified murdered trans people, 66% of them were Black women

Twenty-three of 37 murdered transgender or transsexual persons nationwide were misidentified in at least 139 news articles, including five reprints. Only 18 of those articles had been updated to reflect the victim’s trans identity and to remove birth names they no longer use, according to a Media Matters analysis of coverage from January through mid-November 2020.

Most of the 37 people were trans individuals of color; two-thirds were Black trans women.

In mid-November, Media Matters concluded that 121 of those initial 139 articles still misidentified the victims. The misidentifications were in 109 news outlets across 18 states and Puerto Rico, including almost every state where a trans person was killed in 2020, analysts wrote.


“Notably,” analysts added, “many articles were updated to reflect the status of the investigation or to note the victim was transgender but did not actually remove language that misidentified them. In one example, The Augusta Chronicle updated a report on the killing of Felycya Harris to correct the name of the [Georgia] park where her body was found but failed to correct her name and gender.”

Media Matters wrote that it culled articles from the Internet Archive Wayback Machine to track incorrect IDs and any updates of them. Still, analysts cautioned, “Our data does not represent a comprehensive sample of every article that misidentified victims in 2020, as some outlets may have updated reporting before we were able to identify the error.”

The Human Rights Campaign had tallied those 37 murdered trans/gender-nonconforming persons in 2020, calling it the deadliest year on record for trans persons. By early December 2020, the human rights group had counted 40 such deaths.

No Asian commentators on Sunday shows about shooting of Atlanta Asians

In the immediate aftermath of the slayings of eight persons, including six Asian women, at Georgia spas, two of the four network Sunday morning news shows did not feature Asian American guests during the segment addressing the mass shooting.

Amid a surge in anti-Asian violence that some have attributed to former President Trump repeatedly blaming China for the COVID-19 pandemic, Chuck Todd of NBC’s Meet the Press had three White commentators and one Black commentator weigh in on the killings at the end of a show devoted mainly to other topics. On Fox News Sunday, host Chris Wallace did likewise with three White guests.

“Study after study shows that guests on the broadcast Sunday shows are overwhelmingly White, conservative, and male,” Laura Keiter, Media Matters’ communications manager told the Women’s Media Center. Excluding Asians’ voices “is disturbing and irresponsible … [and] obscures the unique perspectives that [Asians] bring to the issues that face their community and make it harder for us to have a real conversation about the rising trend of violence against [Asians] and how that fits into a historic lens of bias and discrimination.”

The hosts of ABC’s “This Week with George Stephanopoulos” and CBS’s “Face the Nation” interviewed two women, respectively: U.S. Rep. Judy Chu (D-Calif.), chair of the Congressional Asian Pacific Caucus, and U.S. Sen. Tammy Duckworth (D-Ill.), the first Thai American elected to Congress.

Media Matters for America highlighted the race of guests on those particular, March 2021 Sunday shows.
WMC: White people were 73%, women 32% of Sunday news show guests

Men accounted for two-thirds and White people for almost three-quarters of more than 1,600 appearances by guest analysts and commentators on five prominent Sunday news talk shows, according to the Women’s Media Center’s “Gender and Race Representation on Five Big Sunday Shows: January 1, 2020 – December 31, 2020.”

The year-long review in 2020 of ABC’s “This Week,” CBS’s “Face the Nation,” CNN’s “State of the Union,” Fox News Channel’s “Fox News Sunday” and NBC’s “Meet the Press” found that White men dominated the guest rosters — no matter the headlines being discussed, even when race was unusually central to news coverage.

Women overall accounted for 32%, persons of color for 27%, and women of color less than 13% of guest appearances on the five shows, whose 2020 ratings were their highest since the 2015-16 TV news coverage of the presidential campaign pitting Donald Trump against Hillary Clinton. Across the board, guest appearances by women and people of color did not reflect how women are 51%, persons of color 40%, and women of color 20% of the U.S. population, according to the U.S. Census.

Other report highlights:

- White women, 30% of the population, made 20% of the guest appearances.
- Latinx women, 9% of the population, accounted for 2% of guest appearances.
- Black women, 7% of the U.S. population, were 9% of the guest appearances.
- Asian American women, 3% of the population, made 0.6% of guest appearances. Half of those 10 appearances were by one person.
- Only one woman of Middle Eastern/North African descent appeared on the shows.
- No Indigenous woman was a guest. Only one Indigenous man was a guest.

The WMC special report was conducted as COVID-19 created havoc globally and the United States was confronting issues of race, policing, and politics.

No regular or substitute hosts were persons of color on any of the 258 episodes, combined, of the five Sunday shows. Of those 15 hosts in 2020, 10 were White men, five were White women.

There was a dearth of #MeToo and related discussions on Sunday shows, WMC researchers concluded. Only five of the 258 episodes analyzed mentioned domestic violence, including child abuse, that was linked to COVID-19, even though reports of domestic violence soared amid the pandemic’s stay-home orders. Only
26 of the episodes mentioned any issue linked to sexual assault, sexual harassment, #MeToo, child abuse, or domestic violence.

“The lack of women in decision-making and prominent positions in media is the breeding ground for defamatory and sexist coverage and comments, and it lowers the standard of excellence by cutting in half the pool from which talent is chosen,” Women’s Media Center CEO and President Julie Burton said. “It also results in media missing major stories — and missing viewership and readership. Both the media and the public are ill-served by the underrepresentation and misrepresentation of women — including an even greater level of misrepresentation and underrepresentation for women of color — at all levels as content creators and as thought leaders.”

Overall, WMC researchers concluded, White men dominated discussions of several major 2020 headlines on all five shows, where guest appearances totaled 1,671:

- 72% of all guest appearances discussing COVID-19 were by men.
- 76% of all guest appearances discussing COVID-19 were by White guests; 58% were by White men. That, despite COVID-19 diagnoses and deaths disproportionately slamming communities of color.
- 61% of guest appearances talking about the 2020 presidential election were by men; 74% were by White people; 49% were by White men. Only among Black guests on that topic did women outnumber men. Black women accounted for 10% of guest appearances and Black men 7%.
- Only 5% of the guest appearances discussing the 2020 presidential election were by Latinx and 1% by Asian/Asian American guests.
- 51% of guest appearances to discuss issues of racial justice following the killing of George Floyd, a Black man killed by a White police officer in Minneapolis, were by Black people.
- 31% of guest appearances about racial justice were by White men; 27% were by Black men; 24% were by Black women; 10% by White women; 3% were multiracial women; 2% were Latinx women; 1% each were multiracial men or men of Middle Eastern/North African descent.
- No Asian/Asian American, Indigenous persons, Latinx men, or Middle Eastern/North African Women discussed racial justice.

Other key findings about the 2020 Sunday shows were these:

- 68% of all appearances were by men, who are slightly less than 50% of the U.S. population.
- 17% of all guest appearances were by women on CBS’s “Face the Nation,” the only one of the five shows with a female solo host. Men accounted for 83% of that show’s guest appearances.
- 38% of appearances were by women on ABC’s “This Week,” which had the highest percentage of appearances by women.
- 73% of all appearances by commentators were by White people, who comprise 60% of the U.S. population.
- 53% of those appearances were by White men, who represent 30% of the U.S. population; 20% were by White women, who represent 30% of the U.S. population.
- 63% of guest appearances were by White men on CBS’s “Face the Nation,” which had the highest proportion of White male guests across all five shows.
- 49.6% of guest appearances were by White men on NBC’s “Meet the Press,” which had the lowest tally of White male guests.
- 50% or more of all guest appearances on all three other shows were by White men.
- 67% of guest appearances were by White people on CNN’s “State of the Union,” which had the fewest appearances by White people.
- 76% of guest appearances were by White people on Fox News Channel’s “Fox News Sunday,” which had the most appearances by Whites.
WMC Report: Gender and Race Representation on Five Big Sunday Shows Jan 1–Dec, 2020

Guests on Each Show

WOMEN'S MEDIA CENTER

Guests on Each Show

WOMEN'S MEDIA CENTER

Gender Race/Ethnicity

- 75% White (52% Men, 23% Women)
- 18% Black/African American (6% Men, 12% Women)
- 4% Latinx (2% Men, 2% Women)
- 1% Asian/Asian American (1% Men)
- 1% Middle Eastern/North African (1% Men, 0.2% Women)
- <1% Multiracial (0.2% Men)
- 0% Native American or Indigenous

Totals may not add up due to rounding.

Guests on Each Show

FACE THE NATION

Gender Race/Ethnicity

- 73% White (63% Men, 10% Women)
- 14% Black/African American (9% Men, 5% Women)
- 6% Latinx (5% Men, 1% Women)
- 3% Asian/Asian American (2% Men, 1% Women)
- 2% Middle Eastern/North African (2% Men)
- 2% Multiracial (1% Men, 1% Women)
- 0% Native American or Indigenous

Totals may not add up due to rounding.

Guests on Each Show

STATE OF THE UNION

Gender Race/Ethnicity

- 67% White (51% Men, 16% Women)
- 16% Black/African American (7% Men, 9% Women)
- 5% Latinx (1% Men, 4% Women)
- 5% Asian/Asian American (2% Men, 1% Women) 5%
- Multiracial (2% Men, 3% Women)
- 2% Middle Eastern/North African (2% Men)
- 0% Native American or Indigenous

Totals may not add up due to rounding.

Guests on Each Show

FOX NEWS SUNDAY

Gender Race/Ethnicity

- 76% White (52% Men, 24% Women)
- 17% Black/African American: (10% Men, 7% Women)
- 5% Middle Eastern/North African: (5% Men)
- 1% Latinx: (1% Men, 0.3% Women)
- 1% Asian/Asian American: (1% Men)
- <1% Multiracial: (0.3% Men)
- <1% Native American: (0.3% Men)

Totals may not add up due to rounding.

Guests on Each Show

MEET THE PRESS

Gender Race/Ethnicity

- 73% White: (50% Men, 23% Women)
- 16% Black/African American: (7% Men, 9% Women)
- 4% Multiracial: (1% Men, 3% Women)
- 3% Latinx: (2% Men, 1% Women)
- 3% Asian/Asian American: (2% Men, 1% Women)
- 1% Middle Eastern/North African: (1% Men)
- 0% Native American

Totals may not add up due to rounding.

Source: Women’s Media Center
WMC Report: Gender and Race Representation on Five Big Sunday Shows Jan 1–Dec, 2020
Guests Discussing COVID-19 Across All 5 Shows

Gender
- Women: 28% (207)
- Men: 72% (541)

Race/Ethnicity
- 76% White: (58% Men, 18% Women)
- 11% Black/African American: (5% Men, 6% Women)
- 4% Middle Eastern/North African: (4% Men, 0.13% Women)
- 3% Latinx: (2% Men, 1% Women)
- 3% Asian/Asian American: (2% Men, 1% Women)
- 2% Multiracial: (1% Men, 1% Women)
- <1% Native American (0.13% Men)

Totals may not add up due to rounding.

Source: Women's Media Center
WMC Report: Gender and Race Representation on Five Big Sunday Shows Jan 1–Dec, 2020

Guests Discussing COVID-19 on Each Show

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Show</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This Week</td>
<td>Women 35% 53</td>
<td>82% White: (56% Men, 26% Women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men 65% 100</td>
<td>9% Black/African American: (3% Men, 6% Women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6% Latinx: (3% Men, 3% Women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3% Middle Eastern/North African: (2% Men, 1% Women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2% Asian/Asian American: (2% Men)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0% Multiracial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0% Native American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Totals may not add up due to rounding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Show</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Face the Nation</td>
<td>Women 13% 22</td>
<td>80% White: (72% Men, 8% Women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men 87% 145</td>
<td>11% Black/African American: (7% Men, 4% Women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4% Middle Eastern/North African: (4% Men)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2% Asian/Asian American: (2% Men)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2% Latinx: (1% Men, 1% Women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1% Multiracial: (1% Men)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0% Native American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Totals may not add up due to rounding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Show</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State of the Union</td>
<td>Women 28% 39</td>
<td>70% White: (58% Men, 12% Women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men 72% 100</td>
<td>12% Black/African American: (4% Men, 8% Women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5% Asian/Asian American: (4% Men, 1% Women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5% Latinx: (1% Men, 4% Women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5% Multiracial: (2% Men, 3% Women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4% Middle Eastern/North African: (4% Men)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0% Native American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Totals may not add up due to rounding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Show</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fox News Sunday</td>
<td>Women 31% 43</td>
<td>74% White: (51% Men, 23% Women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men 69% 97</td>
<td>15% Black/African American: (9% Men, 6% Women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5% Asian/Asian American: (5% Men)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2% Latinx: (1% Men, 1% Women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1% Asian/Asian American: (1% Men)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1% Multiracial: (1% Women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1% Native American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Totals may not add up due to rounding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Show</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meet the Press</td>
<td>Women 34% 50</td>
<td>73% White: (53% Men, 20% Women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men 66% 99</td>
<td>10% Black/African American: (3% Men, 7% Women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6% Asian/Asian American: (3% Men, 3% Women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4% Multiracial: (1% Men, 3% Women)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3% Latinx: (3% Men)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3% Middle Eastern/North African: (3% Men)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0% Native American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Totals may not add up due to rounding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Women’s Media Center
People of Color Suppressed in Election Discussions across all five Sunday shows, guests discussing the 2020 presidential election were predominately White and male. White people comprised 74% of all guest appearances on this topic. Men made up 61% of guest appearances to discuss the election, and White men were overrepresented at 1.6 times their share of the population at 49% of all guest appearances. White women were underrepresented at 25%. More than half of the guests on election issues were White men on ABC’s This Week (51%) and CBS’s Face the Nation (57%).

Gender Race/Ethnicity

- 74% White: (49% Men, 25% Women)
- 16% Black/African American: (7% Men, 10% Women)
- 5% Latinx: (3% Men, 2% Women)
- 2% Multiracial: (1% Men, 1% Women)
- 1% Asian/Asian American: (1% Men, 0.15% Women)
- 1% Middle Eastern/North African: (1% Men)
- 0% Native American

Men outnumbered women on the topic of the presidential election in all racial demographic categories, except two: Black women made 10% of appearances compared to Black men, at 7%, and multiracial women made 9 appearances compared to 4 appearances by multiracial men. On ABC’s This Week, Black women comprised 15% of all guest appearances concerning the election, compared to 4% of appearances by Black men. A majority of these appearances (12) were by one Black woman: Yvette Simpson, who ranks 16th overall in repeat appearances across all five shows. Ranking 17th in repeat appearances is another Black woman who spoke primarily about presidential election issues: political campaign strategist and former Democratic National Committee chair Donna Brazile.

Only one Asian American woman — Vanita Gupta, then president and CEO of the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights and former head of the Civil Rights Division at the U.S. Department of Justice — made a guest appearance on CBS’s Face the Nation to discuss the presidential election. And that was a single appearance.

Totals may not add up due to rounding.

Source: Women’s Media Center
WMC Report: Gender and Race Representation on Five Big Sunday Shows Jan 1–Dec, 2020
Guests Discussing the 2020 Presidential Election on Each Show

Gender

Race/Ethnicity

- 78% White: (51% Men, 27% Women)
- 19% Black/African American: (4% Men, 15% Women)
- 3% Latinx: (2% Men, 1% Women)
- 1% Asian/Asian American: (1% Men)
- 0% Middle Eastern/North African
- 0% Multiracial
- 0% Native American

Totals may not add up due to rounding.

Gender

Race/Ethnicity

- 69% White: (57% Men, 12% Women)
- 15% Latinx: (11% Men, 4% Women)
- 13% Black/African American: (7% Men, 6% Women)
- 1% Asian/Asian American: (1% Women)
- 1% Multiracial: (1% Men)
- 0% Middle Eastern/North African
- 0% Native American

Totals may not add up due to rounding.

Gender

Race/Ethnicity

- 63% White: (47% Men, 16% Women)
- 20% Black/African American: (8% Men, 12% Women)
- 8% Latinx: (1% Men, 7% Women)
- 1% Asian/Asian American: (1% Men)
- 1% Multiracial: (1% Men)
- 0% Middle Eastern/North African
- 0% Native American

Totals may not add up due to rounding.

Gender

Race/Ethnicity

- 77% White: (45% Men, 32% Women)
- 14% Black/African American: (8% Men, 6% Women)
- 5% Middle Eastern/North African: (5% Men)
- 1% Latinx: (1% Men, 0.3% Women)
- 1% Asian/Asian American: (1% Men)
- 1% Multiracial: (1% Women)
- 0% Native American

Totals may not add up due to rounding.

Gender

Race/Ethnicity

- 75% White: (46% Men, 29% Women)
- 16% Black/African American: (7% Men, 9% Women)
- 5% Latinx: (3% Men, 2% Women)
- 4% Multiracial: (1% Men, 3% Women)
- 1% Asian/Asian American: (1% Men)
- 0% Middle Eastern/North African
- 0% Native American

Totals may not add up due to rounding.

Source: Women's Media Center
WMC Report: Gender and Race Representation on Five Big Sunday Shows Jan 1–Dec, 2020
Guests Discussing Racial Justice Across All 5 Shows

Gender

- Women: 39% (57)
- Men: 61% (90)

Race/Ethnicity

- 51% Black/African American: (27% Men, 24% Women)
- 41% White: (31% Men, 10% Women)
- 4% Multiracial: (1% Men, 3% Women)
- 2% Latinx: (2% Women)
- 1% Middle Eastern/North African: (1% Men)
- 0% Asian/Asian American
- 0% Native American

Totals may not add up due to rounding.

Source: Women’s Media Center
WMC Report: Gender and Race Representation on Five Big Sunday Shows Jan 1–Dec, 2020

Guests Discussing Racial Justice on Each Show

- **Gender**:
  - Women: [Percentage] 14
  - Men: [Percentage] 18

- **Race/Ethnicity**:
  - White: 53% (Men: 40.5%, Women: 12.5%)
  - Black/African American: 44% (Men: 16%, Women: 28%)
  - Latinx: 3% (Women: 3%)
  - Middle Eastern/North African: 0%
  - Asian/Asian American: 0%
  - Multiracial: 0%
  - Native American: 0%

Totals may not add up due to rounding.

- **Gender**:
  - Women: [Percentage] 8
  - Men: [Percentage] 19

- **Race/Ethnicity**:
  - White: 70% (Men: 22%, Women: 44%)
  - Black: 26% (Men: 16%, Women: 26%)
  - Multiracial: 4% (Men: 4%)
  - Other: 0%

Totals may not add up due to rounding.

- **Gender**:
  - Women: [Percentage] 11
  - Men: [Percentage] 15

- **Race/Ethnicity**:
  - White: 54% (Men: 27%, Women: 31%)
  - Black: 31% (Men: 31%, Women: 23%)
  - Multiracial: 8% (Men: 4%, Women: 4%)
  - Latinx: 4%
  - Other: 0%

Totals may not add up due to rounding.

- **Gender**:
  - Women: [Percentage] 12
  - Men: [Percentage] 20

- **Race/Ethnicity**:
  - White: 57% (Men: 38%, Women: 19%)
  - Black: 38% (Men: 22%, Women: 16%)
  - Multiracial: 3% (Men: 3%, Women: 3%)
  - Other: 10%

Totals may not add up due to rounding.

- **Gender**:
  - Women: [Percentage] 12
  - Men: [Percentage] 18

- **Race/Ethnicity**:
  - White: 53% (Men: 30%, Women: 23%)
  - Black: 37% (Men: 27%, Women: 10%)
  - Multiracial: 7% (Women: 3%)
  - Other: 0%

Totals may not add up due to rounding.

Source: Women's Media Center
Vogue led 12 percentage-point rise in diverse magazine covers

Models of color were on the covers of 48.8% of major fashion magazines in 2020, reflecting a roughly 12 percentage-point increase over 2019, according to Fashion Spot’s annual analysis.

In 2019, compared to 2018, the number of cover models had decreased.

The data were based on 791 covers of 50 magazines, including Vogue, Harper’s Bazaar and InStyle. Fashion Spot excluded covers comprised of digitized or illustrated art.

“Lots of publications responded to all the racial unrest by picking more diverse cover stars. From models to actors to activists, mags definitely made an effort to broaden their horizons,” Fashion Spot editors wrote.

Fashion Spot’s annual analysis marked these highs and lows, showing that models of color were on:

- 100% of Vogue Taiwan covers.
- 100% of Vogue Singapore covers.
- 100% of The Gentlewoman covers.
- 91% of Vogue India covers.
- 83% of Vogue Korea covers.
- 83% of Vogue Arabia covers.
- 15% of Vogue Russia covers.
- 15% of Vogue Spain covers.
- 11% of Vogue Poland covers.
- 11% of Vogue Ukraine covers.

Also:

- 5 of 2020’s top 8 cover models were women of color.
- Plus-size models were on 2.6% of covers, up from 2% in 2019; that translated to 21 covers in 2020 and 15 in 2019.
- 16 of the 21 plus-size models were women of color.
- Women aged 50 or older doubled their presence, accounting for a record 81 cover models in 2020, up from 41 in 2019.
- Transgender/non-binary models numbered 12 in 2020, up from 7 in 2019.
USA Today joined others in spotlighting female newsmakers, issues

USA Today’s Women of the Century project, which began publishing in 2020, was among the latest endeavors by national news organizations to weave more women into everything from obituaries about notable people to news articles about everyday life.

With its profiles of women in entertainment, business, civil rights, sports, science, technology, and other fields, the project began as a commemoration of the 19th Amendment, which extended full voting rights to all women in 1920, when Tennessee became the last of the 50 states to ratify that addition to the U.S. Constitution.

Also in recent years, The Washington Post launched The Lily, which is devoted to health, lifestyle, political, and other female-focused news and, according to its website, serves as “a destination for stories central to the everyday lives of millennial women.” And The New York Times launched In Her Words, which publishes an array of stories about “women, gender, and society.”

Chastised, New York Times published more letters to the editor from women

A year after launching its Women’s Project to include more submissions from women among its letters to the editor, 43% of those published letters were written by women and 57% by men, The New York Times reported.

Though the Times has no previous year’s breakdown of letter-writers’ gender, the paper’s leadership said it was confident that far more women’s names and comments were landing on the letters page. Submissions from women — as far as the Times could determine gender — comprised 25% to 30% of all submissions.

The project launched after George Washington University historian Kimberly Probst-Stalter, in her own letter to the Times, issued a challenge: “This problem is especially concerning because unlike an op-ed — where the writer presumably has some expertise in the subject matter — anybody can submit a letter to the editor. It is, I’d argue, the most democratic section of the paper because children and adults, billionaire philanthropists and minimum-wage workers, and people of all genders can contribute. Each has an equal opportunity to express her or his thoughts and participate in a robust debate in the public sphere. Therefore, I’m troubled that in 2019, The New York Times struggles to find women’s letters that are worthy of publication.”

The letters project follows other Times efforts to strike a better gender balance. Overlooked, for example, was launched in 2018 to increase the number of women among an obituary section that historically skewed male.

72% of journalists said news organizations could better ensure sources’ diversity

Of 751 journalists answering a survey on how they decided which experts to pursue as sources of news and commentary, 58% said they were satisfied with the level of diversity among their sources. Still, 72% said their news organizations could improve its strategic efforts at ensuring diversity.

The journalists had sought experts for comments and interviews during 12 consecutive months. Of those journalists, 87% were from the United States, while the remainder were from other nations. By sector, 45% were in traditional print news media, 20% in digital-only news, 18% in radio news, 11% in traditional network news, 1% in cable network news, and 5% in other forms of news media.

Conducted by the Associated Press and Expert File, “Expert Sources Survey 2019: Exploring the challenges media face in sourcing a diverse range of experts” also found that, of the respondents:

- 44% said their newsrooms had an internal database of experts.
- 41% said their newsrooms did not have an internal database.
- 15% said they didn’t know if a database existed.
- 94% of those with access to internal databases said that information was valuable.
- 82% of those without access to internal databases said they would value such information.
- 67% said their own lists of contacts were among their top three ways of finding sources.
- 55% said Google searches were among their top three.
40% said referrals from their colleagues were among their top three.
38% said their newsrooms and institutions’ press offices were among their top three.
28% said press releases were in their top three.
25% listed social media in their top three.
23% listed newsroom directories in their top three.
6% listed online expert directories.
5% listed online research.
2% listed other sources.
1% listed videos.
51% of broadcasters said they found videos of experts valuable or very valuable.
18% of broadcasters said they always check videos of experts before booking experts.
34% of all respondents said they found press releases valuable or very valuable.
12% of all respondents each said they found LinkedIn valuable or very valuable.

### Identifying Experts

The majority of respondents rely heavily on personal networks (own contacts & referrals) & general internet searches to identify experts. Corporate and institutional newsrooms still play an important role.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My own list of contacts</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google or other search...</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ask colleagues for referrals</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsroom or press office...</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press releases</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsroom directory</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online expert directory</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online research...</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video services (YouTube)</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Associated Press Expert File

### News consumers trusted preferred sources more than news media overall

Local television was the most liked news choice, and Fox online slightly edged out Yahoo, then CNN, as the main online news source for U.S. residents responding to the 2019 Digital News Report conducted by the United Kingdom–based Reuters Institute and University of Oxford.

The same survey of news consumers in 38 nations concluded that, while 32% of the 2,012 U.S. survey participants trusted the news media overall, 50% trusted their preferred news sources. Researchers wrote that political partisanship continued to shape those preferences. Reliance on printed news also continued its downward slide, while online news, including from social media, was the No. 1 preferred source.

The report also concluded that:
- 16% of online news consumers paid for online news.
- 25% trusted news that turned up in their online searches.
- 14% trusted news posted on social media.
The top three TV, print, or online news sources were local television news stations, which 23% of respondents said they watched at least three days a week and 30% said they’d watched within the last week; Fox News, whose respective figures were 21% and 29%; and NBC/MSNBC News, whose respective figures were 16% and 25%.

Following them, in descending rank order, were:

- CNN, whose respective figures were 14% of consumers watching and/or reading CNN news at least three days a week and 22% watching/reading within the last week.
- ABC, with 13% and 22%, respectively.
- A regional or local newspaper, 10% and 20%, respectively.
- CBS, 11% and 20%, respectively.
- Local radio news, 10% and 17%, respectively.
- NPR, 9% and 13%, respectively.
- BBC, 5% and 11%, respectively.
- PBS, 4% and 10%, respectively.
- A city paper (e.g., Boston Globe), 4% and 9%, respectively.
- The New York Times, 5% and 9%, respectively.
- USA Today, 3% and 8%, respectively.
- The Washington Post, 3% and 6%, respectively.
- A free city newspaper, 2% and 6%, respectively.

The top online news sources were Yahoo! News, which 12% of respondents said they relied on for three or more days of the week and 20% said they relied on within the last week; CNN, whose respective figures were 12% and 19%; and Fox, whose respective figures were 13% and 19%.

Following them, in descending rank order were these online sites:

- HuffPost, which 9% of respondents had read at least three days a week and 18% read within the last week.
- The New York Times, respectively, were 9% and 17%.
- The Washington Post, 8% and 15%.
- BuzzFeed, 6% and 15%.
- NBC/MSNBC, 8% and 15%.
- Local TV news websites, 8% and 14%.
- BBC, 5% and 11%.
- MSN, 5% and 11%.
- A regional or local newspaper’s website, 4% and 10%.
Age, gender, politics, place, race shaped views about news media

Deliberate bias in some news coverage fueled a growing political divide and eroded trust in the news media, according to some of the 20,000 U.S. adults polled in a joint survey by Gallup and the Knight Foundation.

Forty-six percent of respondents said they saw “a great deal” of bias in coverage, up from 45% in 2017; 37% said they saw “a fair amount” of bias, down from 38% in 2017.

Based on data collected between Nov. 8, 2019 and Feb. 16, 2020, the findings of “American Views 2020: Trust, Media and Democracy” prompted researchers to write that, “Americans still value the media’s traditional roles in society, such as providing accurate news and holding powerful interests accountable for their actions.”

Still, researchers added, that “low levels of public trust in the nation’s polarized media environment have left open the possibility for dangerous false narratives to take root in all segments of society during these emergent crises. At a time when factual, trustworthy information is especially critical to public health and the future of our democracy, the striking trends documented here are cause for concern.”

These were among the key findings:

- 81% of those polled in 2019-20 — down from 84% in 2017— said that, in general, the news media were “critical” or “very important” to democracy, 42% choosing the former descriptor and 39% choosing the latter.
- 88% each said it was “critical” or “very important” for the news media to provide accurate and fair news reports and to ensure Americans are informed about public affairs.
- 82% said the news media were “critical” or “very important” to holding leaders accountable for their actions.
- 21% said they saw “a great deal” of bias in the news source they rely on most often.
- 36% saw “a fair amount” of bias in the news source they rely on most often.
- 64% said they were concerned about bias in the news other people were getting.
- 34% said they were worried about their own preferred news sources being biased.
- 68% said they saw too much bias in the reporting of news that is supposed to be objective as “a major problem,” up from 65% in the 2017 study.
- 52% said inaccurate news was intentional, because the reporter was misrepresenting the facts.
- 28% said inaccurate news was intentional, because the reporter was entirely making up what she/he was presenting as facts.
- 74% said news organizations they distrust were trying to persuade people to adopt a certain viewpoint.
16% said news organizations they distrust were trying to report the news accurately and fairly but were unable to do so.

9% said distrusted media were trying to ruin the country, driven largely by the 1 in 5 Americans who identify as “very conservative” and 1 in 7 Republicans who feel that way.

Opinions by gender or race:

- 77% of men and 71% of women said the news organizations they distrust tried to persuade people to adopt a certain viewpoint.
- 79% of Whites, 73% of Asians, 65% of Latinx and 58% of Blacks said the same.

Opinions by political party:

- 67% of Republicans had a “very” or “somewhat” unfavorable opinion of the news media. That compared to 20% of Democrats and 48% of independents.
- 65% overall — including 57% of Democrats, 75% of Republicans, and 68% of independents — said the increasing number of news sources reporting from a particular point of view is “a major problem” 34% of Democrats, 19% of Republicans, and 23% of independents said it was “a minor problem” and 7% of Democrats, 4% of Republicans, and 6% of independents said it was “not a problem.”

77% of respondents, overall, said the media were under attack politically.
- 17% of Democrats, 34% of independents, and 58% of Republicans said the attacks were justified.
- 66% of Democrats, 39% of independents, and 14% of Republicans said the attacks were not justified.

Opinions by age group, overall:

43% of those aged 65 and older had “very” or “somewhat” favorable views of the media.
- 34% of those aged 50 to 64 said the same.
- 27% of those aged 30 to 49 said the same.
- 20% of those under age 30 said the same.

Regarding diversity in news organizations (which those polled ranked their last priority for newsrooms):

- 84% of Asians, 77% of Blacks, 75% of Latinx and 74% of Whites said the media “should” racially diversify their reporting staffs.
- 84% of Democrats, 76% of independents and 66% of Republicans said the same.
- 82% of the college-educated and 66% of those with a high school diploma or less education said the same.
- 56% of Blacks prioritized racial/ethnic diversity in hiring.
- 48% of Republicans prioritized hiring for diversity in political views.
- 34% of Whites prioritized hiring for diversity in political views.
Regarding online disinformation:

- 74% said the spread of misinformation online was “a major problem,” exceeding all other challenges posed by the media environment. That was up from 73% in 2017.
- 70% said they wanted major internet companies to exclude false/hateful information online.
- 60% said it’s harder and 38% said it’s easier to be well-informed because of all the sources of information available. In 2017, 58% said it was harder to be informed.
- 51% said there were enough media sources to sort out the facts, and 45% said there was so much bias it was difficult to sort out the facts. In 2017, the split was 50% to 47%, respectively.
- 64% of Republicans, 50% of independents and 24% of Democrats said there was too much bias to sort out the facts.

About increasing reliance on local news organizations:

- 33% of Americans said they followed news about issues affecting their local community “very closely,” up from 25% in 2017.
- 75% of those who follow local news very closely either voted “always” or “nearly always.”
- 59% of those who follow local news somewhat/not too closely either voted “always” or “nearly always.”
- 33% of those who don’t follow local news at all “always” or “almost always” voted.

Persons who primarily access their news online — predominantly, younger Americans — were less likely to be knowledgeable about their local communities and to feel attached to their communities.
Media's role in political divisions:

- 47% said the media bear “a great deal” of blame for political division in this country, while 36% said they bear “a moderate amount” of blame.
- 49% said the media could do “a great deal” and 34% said the media could do “a moderate amount” to heal those divisions.

Youth, minorities drove TV news surge amid COVID-19, protests, politics

A surge in TV news consumption, driven by young adults, was linked to 2020’s reckonings over a deadly pandemic, nationwide protests over police slayings of unarmed Black people, and a presidential election, according to an October 2020 Nielsen Global Media report.

“While consumers 55 and older do watch the most news, younger generations are driving the growth of news consumption. In fact, consumers 18-34 increased their total news consumption by 134% between 2019 and 2020,” Nielsen Global Media researchers concluded. “And what’s more, news viewers are growing increasingly diverse, with Hispanic, Black, and Asian viewers driving significant gains over the past two years.”

Nielsen traced an increase in viewership back to September 2019, when news watching accounted for 31% of all TV viewing by those aged 18 and older. In 2019, they were consuming news for 5 hours and 46 minutes of news per week. News viewership peaked amid April 2020’s social unrest and, by September 2020, newscasts consumed 35% of all TV time for those aged 18 and older. By then, they were watching 7 hours and 5 minutes of news per week.

By June 2020, the average was 8 hours per week, up from 5.5 hours in June 2019.

According to Nielsen, weekly TV news viewership rose:

- 48% overall among persons 18 and older, increasing from 5 hours and 55 minutes in February 2018 to 8 hours and 34 minutes in February 2020.
- 134% among those aged 18 to 34, going from 1 hour and 2 minutes in 2018 to 2 hours and 11 minutes in 2020.
- 63% among 25- to 54-year-olds, moving from 3 hours and 18 minutes to 4 hours and 46 minutes.
- 37% among those 55 and older, rising from 10 hours and 51 minutes to 14 hours and 43 minutes.

By race, adult viewership rose:

- 86% among Asians, rising from 3 hours and 45 minutes to 6 hours and 6 minutes.
- 66% among Latinx, rising from 3 hours and 2 minutes to 4 hours and 27 minutes.
- 55% among Blacks, rising from 7 hours and 7 minutes to 10 hours and 38 minutes.
- 47% among Whites, rising from 6 hours and 20 minutes to 9 hours and 13 minutes.
Total TV News Consumption By Race/Ethnicity
Average weekly HH:MM per adult, Q2 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th></th>
<th>Black</th>
<th></th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th></th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q2 2020</td>
<td>9:13</td>
<td>10:38</td>
<td>6:06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% DIFF</td>
<td>+47%</td>
<td>+58%</td>
<td>+86%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Nielsen Global Media
Across race, most American adults said news media misunderstood them

A majority of White, Black, and Latinx adults surveyed by Pew Research said the news media misunderstood them, but gave different reasons for that belief.

Released in June 2020 but conducted before protests over George Floyd’s death magnified racial issues, the survey found that 59% of 10,300 persons aged 18 and older said the media misunderstood them; 37% said the media understood them; and 4% didn’t answer that question. Those rates compared, respectively, to 58%, 40%, and 2% in 2018, when Pew last posed the same questions.

Conducted from Feb. 18 through March 2, 2020, the survey also concluded that:

- Overall, 61% of Whites, 58% of Blacks, and 55% of Latinx persons said the news media misunderstood them.
- 29% of women and 39% of men said the news media misunderstood their political views.
- 34% of women and 26% of men said the news media misunderstood their social and economic class.
- 19% of men and 17% of women said their personal interests were misunderstood.
- 18% of women and 13% of men said their personal characteristics were misunderstood.
- 39% of Whites, 27% of Latinx persons, and 15% of Blacks said their political views were misunderstood.
- 31% of Whites, 31% of Blacks, and 29% of Latinx persons said their social and economic class were misunderstood.
- 26% of Latinx persons, 17% of Whites, and 16% of Blacks said their personal interests were misunderstood.
- 34% of Blacks, 17% of Latinx persons and 10% of Whites said their personal characteristics were misunderstood.
- 46% of Republicans or those who lean Republican and 19% of Democrats or those who lean Democratic said their political views were misunderstood.
- 34% of Democrats/Democrat-leaning and 28% of Republicans/Republican-leaning said their social and economic class were misunderstood.
- 22% of Democrats/Democrat-leaning and 15% of Republicans/Republican-leaning said their personal interests were misunderstood.
- 24% of Democrats/Democrat-leaning and 9% of Republicans/Republican-leaning said their personal characteristics were misunderstood.
- 47% of White evangelical Protestants, 39% of White mainline Protestants, 37% of Catholics, 28% of the religiously unaffiliated, and 13% of Black Protestants said their political views were misunderstood.
### Percentage who said their political views were misunderstood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Political views</th>
<th>Social and economic class</th>
<th>Personal interests</th>
<th>Personal characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All U.S. adults</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rep/Lean Rep</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dem/Lean Dem</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 18–29</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–49</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–64</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $30K</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30K–$74,999</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75K or more</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White evangelical</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White mainline</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Protestant</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaffiliated</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For statistical differences between groups, please ask Pew Research Center. Those who did not provide an answer not show.

Source: Pew Research Center
Blacks trusted local news, media’s watchdog role more than others

Black adults trusted their local news organizations as their main source of news more than White and Latinx persons did. Black Americans also believed that news organizations help keep political leaders from wrongdoing, according to a Pew Research Center analysis.

The analysis was done in conjunction with the 2019 National Association of Black Journalists Convention. Pew's “7 facts about Black Americans and the news media” found that:

- 33% of Blacks, 28% of Latinx, and 27% of Whites trusted their local news organizations.
- 23% of Blacks, 24% of Latinx, and 20% of Whites trusted national news organizations.
- 53% of Blacks, 46% of Latinx, and 36% of Whites felt connected to their main news source.
- 74% of Blacks, 72% of Latinx, and 65% of Whites said news organizations “keep political leaders from doing things that shouldn’t be done.” Conversely, 22% of Blacks, 25% of Latinx, and 32% of Whites said news organizations “keep political leaders from doing their jobs.”
- 41% of Blacks, 31% of Latinx, and 22% of Whites said news organizations “deal fairly with all sides.” Conversely, 56% of Blacks, 66% of Latinx and 76% of Whites said news organizations “tend to favor one side.”
- 42% of Blacks, 48% of Latinx, and 51% of Whites said “made-up news and information” was a very big problem.
- Blacks rated made-up news 10th on a list of 11 major issues — including race, immigration, crime, and the environment — that routinely are in headlines; Latinx rated it 8th; and Whites rated it 4th.
- 60% of Blacks, 45% of Latinx, and 43% of Whites prefer to get their news from television. (25% of Blacks prefer to get their news online, 9% from radio, and 5% from print publications.)
7% of U.S. newsroom staffers were Black, compared to 11% in the overall U.S. workforce.

Only one of the small, Black-owned community newspapers in the United States — there were more than 100 — reported a circulation exceeding 50,000. That was the St. Louis American.

**Viewing news as partisans, most COVID-19 skeptics were Trump stalwarts**

As they navigated a pandemic and an election, Republicans who relied on then-President Trump’s information and disinformation were more likely to believe falsehoods about Election 2020 and COVID-19, according to a more than yearlong Pew Research Center analysis of news consumption habits and opinions of members of the two major political parties.

Trump-reliant Republicans also held different views than did other Republicans, and 3 in 10 Republicans made Trump their major source of election and COVID-19 news.

From November 2019 through December 2020, a random sample of more than 9,000 Americans participated in Pew’s 10-part, online survey of more than 580 questions.

Key findings also included:

- 25% of Democrats and Democratic-leaning independents turned only to left-leaning news in at least two of three of the surveys.
- 24% of Republicans and Republican-leaning turned only to right-leaning news outlets in at least two of three of the surveys.
- 48% of Democrats and 34% of Republicans used news sources whose audiences were politically mixed or who tilted toward the opposite end of the political spectrum from those registered partisans.
- 44% of Republicans/Republican-leaning persons aged 65 and older, 33% of those aged 50 to 64, 18% of those aged 30 to 49, and 4% of those aged 18 to 29 used only news sources with right-leaning audiences.
- 24% of Republicans/Republican-leaning aged 65 and older, 30% of those aged 50 to 64, 31% of those aged 30 to 49, and 14% of those aged 18 to 29 used news sources with mixed and/or left-leaning audiences.
- 25% of Democrats/Democratic-leaning aged 65 and older, 31% of 50- to 64-year-olds, 31% of 30- to 49-year-olds, and 13% of 18- to 29-year-olds used news sources with mixed and/or right-leaning audiences.

Regarding Republicans’ declining consumption of what Trump said about COVID-19:

- 32% of Republicans relied on Trump and his White House task force for COVID-19 news in April 2020; 27% did so in September 2020.
- 39% of Republicans/Republican-leaning who relied on Trump’s task force, in September 2020, said the media covered the pandemic “very or somewhat well,” down from 55% in March 2020.
- 48% of Republicans/Republican-leaning who relied on a source other than Trump said, in September 2020, the media covered the pandemic “very or somewhat well,” down from 60% in March 2020.
66% of Republicans/Republican-leaning who relied on Trump’s task force said, in November 2020, news coverage of the pandemic was overblown, up from 53% in April 2020.

50% of Republicans/Republican-leaning who relied most on Trump and his task force said coronavirus news was largely inaccurate and 22% said it was largely accurate.

34% of Republicans/Republican-leaning who relied on another source for coronavirus news said that coverage was largely inaccurate and 35% said it was largely accurate.

Regarding attention Americans paid to the news on different news platforms:

- Of the 37% of Americans who got their election news from cable TV, 50% said they were following COVID-19 coverage “very closely.”
- Of the 33% of Americans who got their election news from print media, 45% said they were following COVID-19 coverage “very closely.”
- Of the 26% of Americans who got their election news from traditional network news, 50% said they were following COVID-19 coverage “very closely.”
- Of the 23% of Americans who got their election news from online news sites and apps, 44% said they were following COVID-19 coverage “very closely.”
- Of the 21% of Americans who got their election news from radio, 37% said they were following COVID-19 coverage “very closely.”
- Of the 11% of Americans who got their election news from local TV, 11% said they were following COVID-19 coverage “very closely.”

About respondents’ preferred news medium and knowledge of politics (based on their answers to a special index of nine questions):

- Of those who said they got news on local TV, 69% had low political knowledge, 21% had mid-level knowledge, and 10% had high knowledge.
- Of those who said they got news from social media, 57% had low political knowledge, 27% had mid-level knowledge, and 17% had high knowledge.
- Of those who said they got news from network TV, 36% had low political knowledge, 35% had mid-level knowledge, and 29% had high knowledge.
- Of those who said they got news from cable TV, 35% had low political knowledge, 29% had mid-level knowledge, and 35% had high knowledge.
- Of those who said they got news from print media, 31% had low political knowledge, 29% had mid-level knowledge, and 41% had high knowledge.
- Of those who said they got news from radio, 24% had low political knowledge, 34% had mid-level knowledge, and 42% had high knowledge.
- Of those who said they got news online or from apps, 23% had low political knowledge, 31% had mid-level knowledge, and 45% had high knowledge.

Regarding potential election and coronavirus disinformation disseminated as news:

- 48% of Americans, in November 2019, said they were very concerned about the influence of made-up news on the election.
- 60% of Americans, in November 2020, said that made-up news had a major impact on election outcomes.

About consumption of COVID-19 and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention news:

- 28% of Republicans/Republican-leaning said they were following news of COVID-19 “very closely” in November 2020, down from 48% in March 2020.
- 48% of Democrats/Democratic-leaning said they were following news of COVID-19 “very closely” in November 2020, down from 53% in March 2020.
37% of all U.S. adults said they were following news of COVID-19 “very closely” in November 2020, down from 51% in March 2020.

58% of Republicans/Republican-leaning said, in November 2020, that the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention were doing an “excellent/good job” of responding to COVID-19.

75% of Democrats/Democratic-leaning said, in November 2020, that the Centers for Disease Control were doing an “excellent/good job” of responding to COVID-19.

About seven-in-ten Republicans who looked to Trump as a major source of news saw media’s election coverage as inaccurate, harmful to democracy

% who said in November 2020 that the news media’s coverage of the election after the polls closed was...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trump campaign is a major source of election news</th>
<th>Largely Inaccurate</th>
<th>Largely Accurate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trump campaign is not a major source of election news</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hurting democracy Protecting democracy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trump campaign is a major source of election news</th>
<th>71%</th>
<th>10%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trump campaign is not a major source of election news</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Pew Research Center

Most said news of George Floyd was right, Trump’s response was wrong

Of 9,654 surveyed U.S. adults, 57% said news organizations did a good or excellent job covering demonstrations protesting the Minneapolis police murder of George Floyd and 42% rated the coverage fair or poor, according to the Pew Research Center.

Its analysis, conducted in June 2020, found that there were substantially different opinions about coverage, depending on respondents’ race, age, and political party.

For example, 72% of Black adults rated the coverage good or excellent, while 85% said Trump’s response to the protests had been completely or mostly wrong. Of all those surveyed, 60% said Trump’s message was completely or mostly wrong, 12% said it was completely right, and 25% said it was mostly right.

Regarding coverage of demonstrations sparked by Floyd’s murder, 42% of surveyed adults said they watched it very closely. That compared to 46% who said they very closely followed coverage of COVID-19, the year’s other major headline. Also, 42% each said they followed both headlines fairly closely.

Of Floyd’s murder, 16% either didn’t follow that news closely or didn’t follow it at all; the proportion of those who didn’t follow the COVID-19 coverage closely or didn’t follow it at all was 12%.
By race and age, there were substantially different assessments on the quality of certain aspects of the coverage of Floyd’s murder:

- 51% of Blacks and 28% of Whites said there was too little coverage of the decision to prosecute the involved officers.
- 55% of Blacks and 33% of Whites said there was too little coverage of the larger issue of race relations.
- 59% of those aged 18 to 29, 43% of those aged 30 to 49, 28% of those aged 50 to 64, and 22% of those aged 65 and older thought there was too little coverage of race relations.
- 51% of those aged 18 to 29, 37% of those aged 30 to 49, 29% of those aged 50 to 64, and 20% of those aged 65 and older thought there was too little coverage of the decision to prosecute the police officers.

The survey also concluded that, among Whites who followed protests of George Floyd’s murder:

- 29% of Republicans and 6% of Democrats rated the coverage poor.
- 31% of Republicans and 18% of Democrats rated it only fair.
- 35% of Republicans and 55% of Democrats rated it good.
- 4% of Republicans and 21% of Democrats rated it excellent.

Among Whites, regarding Trump’s response to the demonstrations:

- 4% of Republicans and 73% of Democrats rated it completely wrong.
- 16% of Republicans and 21% of Democrats rated it mostly wrong.
- 50% of Republicans and 4% of Democrats rated it mostly right.
- 27% of Republicans and 1% of Democrats rated it completely right.

Regarding news about the demonstrations:

- Of nonviolent protests, 51% of those surveyed said there was too little coverage, 12% said there was too much, 36% said there was just the right amount.
- Of violent protests and property destruction, 20% of those surveyed said there was too little coverage, 44% said there was too much, 36% said there was just the right amount.
- Of the decision to prosecute the involved police officers, 34% of those surveyed said there was too little coverage, 12% said there was too much, 53% said there was just the right amount.
- Of how Floyd was killed, 34% of those surveyed said there was too little coverage, 18% said there was too much, 47% said there was just the right amount.
- Of police response to protesters, 32% of those surveyed said there was too little coverage, 21% said there was too much, 46% said there was just the right amount.
- Of the larger issue of race relations, 38% of those surveyed said there was too little coverage, 27% said there was too much, 34% said there was just the right amount.
Americans’ high attention to news about the George Floyd protests about on par with recent high attention to COVID-19 outbreak

% of U.S. adults who are following each topic...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Very closely</th>
<th>Fairly closely</th>
<th>Not too/at all closely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The COVID-19 outbreak, April 20-26</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrations protesting the death of George Floyd, June 4-10</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Respondents who did not give an answer not shown.
"Majorities of Americans say news coverage of George Floyd protests has been good, Trump’s public message wrong" Pew Research Center

Black Americans more likely to approve of news media coverage of protests, say Trump has been giving the completely wrong message

% of U.S. adults who rate the job news organizations have done covering the demonstrations to protest the death of George Floyd as...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Only fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All U.S. adults</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of U.S. adults who say Donald Trump has been delivering the _____ message in response to the demonstrations to protest the death of George Floyd

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Message</th>
<th>Completely wrong</th>
<th>Mostly wrong</th>
<th>Mostly right</th>
<th>Completely right</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All U.S. adults</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: White and black adults include those who report being only one race and are non-Hispanic. Respondents who did not give an answer not shown.
Source: Survey of U.S. adults conducted June 4-10, 2020. "Majorities of Americans say news coverage of George Floyd protests has been good, Trump’s public message wrong" Pew Research Center
Young adults, women, Latinx persons were biggest Instagram users for news and other information

Of all Instagram users in the United States, those aged 18 to 24 were the most frequent users, representing 75% of all Instagram devotees, according to a Pew Research Center analysis released in October 2020.

Women used Instagram more often than men, accounting for 62% of those relying on the site for news. That compared to 38% of men who used Facebook-owned Instagram to get news. But just 14% of U.S. adults said they ever received news from Instagram; while 17% percent received their news from Twitter, 28% from YouTube and 52% from Facebook.

Just 6% of U.S. adults said they trusted Instagram as a venue for political and election news; 42% said they distrusted it; 37% said they neither trusted nor distrusted the site for that type of news.

These were among other main findings of “8 Facts About Americans and Instagram”:  
- 43% of women and 31% of men said they had ever used Instagram in 2019.  
- 72% of U.S. teens said they had ever used Instagram.  
- 57% of adults aged 25 to 29 used it.  
- 47% of those 30 to 49 used it.  
- 23% of those 50 to 64 used it.  
- 8% of those 65 and older used it.  
- 5% of U.S. parents of children aged 11 or younger said that, as far as they knew, their children used Instagram, despite most social media sites barring use by children younger than 13.  
- 11% of children aged 9 to 11 had used Instagram.  

By race:  
- 51% of Latinx adults said they had ever used Instagram.  
- 40% of Black adults said they had ever used Instagram.  
- 33% of White adults said they had ever used Instagram.  

By frequency, of adult Instagram users:  
- 63% said they used it daily.  
- 21% said they used it weekly.  
- 16% said they used it less often than weekly.  
- By comparison, 74% of Facebook users said they used that platform daily, and 17% said they used it weekly.  
- 37% of U.S. persons said they’d used Instagram on their digital devices, including their cellphones.
Few trust social media as a place to get political and election news
% of U.S. adults who ___ each source as a place to get political and election news

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Trust</th>
<th>Distrust</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Not heard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YouTube</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LinkedIn</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reddit</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instagram</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Survey of U.S. adults conducted Oct. 29-Nov. 11, 2019
Pew Research Center

Whites own big Latinx news outlets; small ones rarely had original content

Telemundo and Univision, now owned by Whites, owned most of the largest U.S. news outlets targeting Latinx audiences. Most of the smallest Latinx-focused outlets — 244 newspapers and 32 magazines — were independently owned with small or no newsrooms.

Of the nation’s hundreds of Spanish-language radio stations, only 37 produced news content for Latinx communities; most were small and Latinx-owned, according to the City University of New York (CUNY) Graduate School of Journalism.

It counted 624 outlets across the 50 states and Puerto Rico. Television giants Univision and Telemundo owned the bulk of those outlets: 136 of 181 TV stations. Both networks were founded in the 1950s, by a Mexican immigrant entrepreneur and a Puerto Rican entrepreneur, respectively.

As newspapers generally have shrunk in recent years, the 20 largest Latinx weekly/semi-weekly newspapers have seen their average circulation drop to 91,404 in 2018 from 93,195 in 2016, the report said.
Evening news viewership at Telemundo, however, had grown to an average of 703,056 televisions tuning in to that network in 2018. That compared to 698,064 in 2016. The number of TV sets tuned to the network’s late night news dropped to 387,078 in 2018 from 394,857 in 2016.

Univision, during the same period, saw a decline in the number of TVs tuned into its newscasts: from 609,400 to 449,620 for the morning news from 1.2 million to 997,117 for the evening news, and from 597,456 to 476,437 for the late-night news.

CUNY’s report cited a Pew Research Center analysis showing that Latinx persons were less likely than Blacks or Whites to have ever spoken to a journalist.

Further details of Latinx-focused outlets included these:

- 65 local TV stations were Univision-owned and -operated.
- 26 additional stations were run by UniMas, owned by the same company that owns Univision.
- 45 local TV stations were owned and operated by Telemundo, a Comcast/NBC Universal property.
- 49 local TV stations were owned by entities other than Univision or Telemundo.
- 2 dailies and 2 other periodicals were run by ImpreMedia, the largest newspaper company, serving New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, and Longwood, Florida.
- 1 regional newspaper and a network of digital publications were run by Atlanta-based Mundo Hispánico.
- 22 Spanish-language newspapers were owned by English-language newspaper companies.
- Of 87 digital-only publications that were identified, most had small or no newsrooms.
- Of 33 podcasts and 2 newsletters that were identified, most had small or no newsrooms.
- 77.56% of outlets delivered news only in Spanish.
- 15.22% delivered news in Spanish and in English, with a single outlet delivering news, additionally, in Portuguese.
- 7.21% delivered news only in English.

Of the Latinx news outlets:

- 91 were in California.
- 66 were in Puerto Rico.
- 65 were in Texas.
- 55 were in Florida.
- 48 were in New York.
- 23 were in North Carolina.

The aforementioned states and Puerto Rico had the most outlets. The fewest were in:

- Idaho, Nebraska, Utah, Virginia and Wisconsin, where there were 5 each.
- Arkansas and Rhode Island, with 4 each.
- Alabama, Delaware, Kansas, Louisiana, and New Mexico, with 3 each.
- Alaska, with 2.
- Mississippi, with 1.
CUNY identified no Latinx news outlets in:
- Hawaii.
- Maine.
- Montana.
- New Hampshire.
- North Dakota.
- South Dakota.
- Vermont.
- West Virginia.
- Wyoming.

Since last FCC report, female ownership of biggest TV stations has fallen

The number of full-power commercial TV stations owned by individual women or groups mainly comprised by women has decreased, according to the most recent ownership report from the Federal Communications Commission.

Of the 1,368 full-power commercial TV stations reporting the details of their ownership to the FCC, 73 of them, or 5.3%, were owned by individual women or groups mainly comprised by women, according to the report, released in February 2020 and based on 2017 data.

That proportion was down from 7.3%, according to the previous report, released in May 2017 and based on data filed in 2015.
By comparison, according to the 2020 report, men owned 735 — or 53.7% — of those 1,368 top-tier TV stations. That represents a decline from the previous report when majority-male ownership in full-power commercial stations stood at 60.1%.

Not all stations were owned by individual or groups comprised exclusively of men or women. Some had majority ownership comprised of both men and women and/or where neither men nor women were majority owners.

Full-power commercial stations are one category of broadcast outlets tracked by the FCC; the others include commercial and non-commercial Class A and low-power TV stations and AM radio and FM radio stations.

Looking at ownership by race, the 2020 report counted 26 full-power commercial TV stations owned by persons of color, out of a total of 1,368 — 1.9 %. That was down from 36 — 2.6% — of stations counted in the 2017 report. (Ten of the stations listed in the 2020 report as owned by racial minorities were in the 50 largest markets; none were in the next 50 to 100 size-ranked markets; and seven were in markets ranked outside the top 100.)

Of those racial groups:

- Whites owned 871 stations — 63.7% — in 2017, down from 74.4 in 2015.
- Blacks owned 12 stations — .9% — in 2017, the same rate in 2015.
- Asians owned 9 stations — .7% — in 2017, a rate unchanged from 2015.
- American Indian or Alaska Natives owned 4 stations — .3% — in 2017, down from .9% in 2015.
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islanders owned no stations in 2017, but 1 station in 2015.
- Multiracial persons owned 1 station each in 2017 and 2015.
- Groups without a majority of members from any race owned 471 stations — 34.4% — in 2017; up from 23% in 2015.

By ethnicity, as defined by the federal government, the FCC reported that:

- Hispanic/Latino persons or groups owned 58 — 4.2% — of the 1,368 full-power commercial television stations listed in the 2020 report, down from 4.5% in 2015.
- Non-Hispanic/Latino persons or groups owned 850 — 62.1% — of full-power commercial television stations in the 2020 report, down from 64.3% in 2015.
- Groups without a majority of members from those ethnicities owned 460 stations — 33.6%— in 2017, up from 31.2% in 2015.

The 2020 report showed that, by gender:

- Women owned 316 — or 9.3% — of 3,407 commercial AM radio stations.
- Men owned 2,669 — or 78.3% — of the 3,407 stations.
- Women owned 390 — 7.2% — of 5,399 commercial FM radio stations.
- Men owned 4,459 — 82.6% of the FM stations.

The 2020 report did not list owners from each category of racial minorities but did report that:

- Combined, American Indians/Alaska Natives, Asians, Blacks, Native Hawaiians/Pacific Islands, and multiracial persons owned 202 — 5.9% — of the commercial AM radio stations.
- Combined, those minority groups owned 159 — 2.9% — of commercial FM radio stations.

By ethnicity, as listed in the 2020 report:

- Hispanic/Latino persons or groups owned 209 — 6.1% — of commercial AM radio stations and 219 — 4.1% — of commercial FM radio stations.
- Non-Hispanic/Latino persons or groups owned 3,044 — 89.3% — of commercial AM radio stations and 4,995 — 92.5% — of FM commercial radio stations.
The 2020 report also showed that, by gender, of all 11,529 commercial TV and radio stations, across media markets of all sizes, women owned 874. Men owned 8,736.

By race, of all 11,529 commercial TV and radio stations:

- 10,076 — 87% — were owned by Whites.
- 239 — 2% — by Blacks.
- 136 — 1% — by Asians.
- 31 — .2% — by American Indians/Alaska Natives.
- 7 — .06% — by Native Hawaiians/Pacific Islander.
- 3 — .02% — by multiracial persons.
After 2019 surge, a “precipitous” fall in female film protagonists in 2020

In the top 100 films of 2020, 29% of protagonists were female, representing an 11 percentage-point decrease from 2019, when the rate was 40%, according to the Center for the Study of Women in Television & Film.

In 2018, women had accounted for 31% of protagonists in those top films.

Men accounted for 49% of protagonists and 62% of major characters in those films of 2020. In 2020, women accounted for 38% of major characters, up from 37% in 2019. Of the remaining 2020 protagonists, 22% were ensembles of male and female characters, an increase from 17% in 2019.

“It’s a Man’s (Celluloid) World: Portrayals of Females in the Top Grossing Films of 2020” released in January 2021, analyzed more than 1,700 characters, finding that 79% of the top-grossing domestic films featured more male than female characters, 17% had more female than male characters, and 4% had equal numbers of male and female characters.

The San Diego State University-based center, who called the decline “precipitous,” also found that, in 2019:

- In films with at least 1 woman director and/or writer, 60% of protagonists were female; versus 17% of female protagonists in films with only male directors.
- In films with at least 1 woman director and/or writer, 49% of major characters were female, versus 35% in films with only male directors and/or writers.
- In films with at least 1 woman director, 43% of all characters were female; versus 34% in films where all directors and/or writers were male.
36% of all speaking characters were female, up from 34% in 2019. By comparison, 64% of speaking characters were men in 2020.

23% of films featured 0 to 4 female characters; 10% featured 0 to 4 speaking male characters.

47% of films had 5 to 9 speaking females; 25% had 5 to 9 speaking males.

30% of films had 10 or more speaking females; 65% had 10 or more speaking males.

By race, of all female characters in 2020:

- 71% were White, up from 68% in 2019.
- 17% were Black, down from 20% in 2019.
- 6% were Asian, down from 7% in 2019.
- 6% were Latina, up from 5% in 2019.
- 1% were of some other race in both years.

Of major female characters, 74% were White, 13% were Black, 6% were Latina, 6% were Asian, and 1% were some other race.

By age in 2020:

- 12% of all female characters were younger than 20, 24% were in their 20s, 29% were in their 30s, 16% were in their 40s, 10% were in their 50s, and 6% were 60 or older.
- 9% of males were younger than 20, 10% were in their 20s, 31% were in their 30s, 28% were in their 40s, 14% were in their 50s, and 10% were 60 or older.

Of major female characters, 26% were in their 20s, 31% were in their 30s, and 13% were in their 40s.

Of major male characters, 27% were in their 30s, and 25% were in their 40s.

Regarding employment and personal life of all characters in 2020:

- 73% of male and 57% of female characters had an identifiable job or occupation.
- 59% of males and 42% of females were seen in their work setting, actually working.
- 59% of males and 41% of females were seen in primarily work–related roles.
- 54% of females and 36% of males were seen in primarily personal life–related roles.

By genre, among protagonists in 2020:

- 39% of females and 8% of males appeared in horror features.
- 22% of females and 49% of males appeared in dramas.
- 22% of females and 18% of males appeared in action features.
- 9% of females and 15% of males appeared in comedies.
- 4% of females and 10% of males appeared in animated features.
- 4% of females appeared in other film genres; the report didn’t provide a comparative number for males.
Historical comparison of percentages of females and males as major characters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Historical comparison of female and male characters as speaking characters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Historical comparison of percentages of race/ethnicity for female characters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latina</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Center for the Study of Women in Television & Film, San Diego State University
Black female film characters were smart, leaders; but also nude, violent

Black females constituted 6.5% of the U.S. population but 3.7% of leads or co-leads in the 100 top-grossing films of the decade ending in 2019, according to the Geena Davis Institute on Gender in Media. Its study, “Representations of Black Women in Hollywood,” also found that the gap between the number of real-life Black women and those on screen narrowed in recent years.

In the top money-making films of the decade studied, Black female characters, were more likely than all other women characters to be depicted as smart and as leaders, but also more often were violent, in the nude, and not involved in romantic relationships.

Because the number of Black females was so small, the researchers did not separate them into two categories: girls and adults. The two groups were combined throughout their study, which also parsed the gender and race of characters in the 50 most-watched television shows for children.

In those TV shows, Black female characters, proportionately, came closer to mirroring the U.S. population, accounting for 6.2% of all characters and 6.4% of leading characters.

The report notes both progress and ongoing problems: “Black women and girls now show up at the same rate as their numbers in the population in both film and TV, and they appear as leading ladies on par with their presence in the [U.S.] population ... Black girls and women with dark skin rarely appear as leading ladies in the top-grossing films. Only one-in-five leading Black female characters from the past decade has dark skin. This indicates that colorism is persistent in Hollywood. Also, a large majority of Black women who appear as film leads have European hairstyles … as opposed to natural Black hairstyles … [T]hese findings indicate a strong bias toward Black women who conform with white standards of beauty.”

According to the Geena Davis Institute, these were some of the report’s positive film findings:

- 7.5% of Black female characters, 11.8% of other females of color, and 15.2% of White female characters worked in service jobs.
- 14.3% of Black females, 9.6% of other females of color and 9.6% of White female characters worked in science, technology, engineering, or math (STEM) jobs.
- 41.3% of Black females and 43.1% of White women were leaders.
- 54.1% of Black females, 44.2%, of other females of color, and 42.6% of White females were depicted as smart in family films.
- 69.1% of Black women, 52.3% of other women of color, and 50.7% of White women characters were depicted as hardworking.
Negative film findings included these:

- 19% of Black leading ladies were dark-skinned.
- 57.1% of Black leading ladies’ hairstyles reflected European beauty standards, not natural Black hairstyles.
- 13.5% of Black women, 14.8% of other women of color, and 9% of White women were partially or fully nude.
- 41.4% of Black women, 51.2% of White women, and 56.9% of other women of color were depicted as attractive in family films.
- 29.3% of Black female characters, 24.6% of White female characters, and 14.8% of other females of color were violent.
- 22.7% of Black women, 25.9% of other women of color, and 27.2% of White women were in a romantic relationship.
- 13.3% of Black women, 14.8% of other women of color, and 16.9% of White women had at least one sexual partner.

Positive TV findings included these:

- 48.5% of Black women, 44.6% of other women of color, and 41.6% of White women were shown as attractive.
- 5.6% of Black women, 3.3% of White women, and 3% of other women of color worked in STEM occupations.
- 40.9% of Blacks, 36% of other women of color, and 34.6% of Whites were leaders.
- 32.7% of Blacks, 26.4% of Whites and 22.2% of other women of color, were depicted as smart.

Negative TV findings included these:

- 5.2% of Black women, 4.9% of other women of color, and 2.5% of White women were shown partially or fully nude.
- 10.7% of Black women, 8.7% of other women of color, and 4.5% of White women wore revealing clothing.
- 1.4% of Black women, .6% of other women of color, and .5% of White women were verbally objectified.
- 89.6% of White women, 70.5% of Black women, and 58.8% of other women of color were employed.
- 56.3% of Black women, 26.4% of White women, and 20.6% of other women of color had service-industry jobs.
- 5.6% of Black women, 8.7% of White women, and 11% of other women of color were in a romantic relationship.

In family films versus family TV shows, in terms of being sexually objectified:

- 20.3% of Black females in film and 10.7% of those in TV wore revealing clothing.
- 13.5% of Black females in film and 5.2% in TV were partially or fully nude.
- 6.7% of Black females in film and .9% in TV were, given certain camera angles, treated as sexual objects.
- 5.3% of Black females in film and 1.4% in TV were verbally objectified by other characters.

In film versus TV, regarding work and leadership:

- 39.6% of Black females in film and 10.4% in TV were jobless.
- 56.3% of Black females in film and 7.5% in TV held service jobs.
- 14.3% of Black females in film and 5.6% in TV were employed in the STEM fields.
In film versus TV, regarding violence and criminality:
- 29.3% of Black females in film and 13% in TV were violent.
- 6.7% of Black females in film and 2.3% in TV were criminals.

In film versus TV, regarding character traits:
- 55.8% of Black females in film and 30.7% in TV were depicted as funny.
- 54.1% of Black females in film and 32.7% in TV were smart.
- 69.1% of Black females in film and 43.4% in TV were hardworking.

In film versus TV, regarding relationships and sex:
- 22.7% of Black females in film and 5.6% in TV were in romantic relationships.
- 13.3% of Black females in film and 5.1% in TV had at least one sexual partner.

Source: Geena Davis Institute on Gender in Media

---

**BLACK FEMALE LEADS OVER TIME, 2009 - 2019**

**INTERSECTIONAL ANALYSIS, FILM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity Group</th>
<th>% of Black Female Characters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBTQ+</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (50+)</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Body Type</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Geena Davis Institute on Gender in Media
A record high number of films had women of color as lead characters in 2019

In 2019, setting record highs, 32 of the top 100 films had women of color as lead characters, and 17 top films had women of color as co-lead characters, according to Inequality in 1,300 Popular Films, a report released in September 2020.

The respective figures were 27 and 11 in 2018 and 13 and 1 in 2007.

Also, in 2019, women and girls accounted for 34% of speaking characters in the top 100 films, the highest proportion that the University of Southern California Annenberg Inclusion Initiative has counted in the 13 years it has analyzed this arena. By comparison, among all speaking characters, 33.1% were female in 2018, and 29.9% were female in 2007.

Of 26,618 speaking characters in 600 films released from 2014 to 2019, a total of 56 were lesbian, 161 were gay men, 33 were bisexual, and four were transgender.

The report also concluded that:

- 43 of the 2019’s top 100 films had a girl or woman as the lead or co-lead.
- 17 of the 43 were females of color.
- 3 of the 43 were 45 years or older.
- 94 of the top 100 films of 2019 had 0 female-identified LGBTQ characters.
- 78 of the top 100 films of 2019 had 0 LGBTQ characters.
- 23% of the 61 LGBTQ characters in the 2019 films were persons of color; 77% were White.
- 48 of the top 100 films of 2019 had 0 characters with disabilities.
- 77 of the top 100 films of 2019 had 0 female characters with disabilities.
- 2.3% of speaking characters were depicted as having a physical, cognitive, or communicative disability.

By race, in those 2019 films:

- 65.7% of all speaking characters were White, 15.7% were Black, 7.2% were Asian, 4.9% were Latinx, and 6.6% were some other race.
- 44 films had 0 Latinx speaking characters.
- 36 films had 0 Asian speaking characters.
- 15 films had 0 Black speaking characters.
- 99 films had 0 Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander females on screen.
- 97 films had 0 Native American/Alaska Native females on screen.
- 71 films had 0 Latinx females on screen.
- 55 films had 0 Asian females on screen.
- 45 films had 0 multiracial females on screen.
- 33 films had 0 Black females on screen.
- 7 had 0 White females on screen.

By genre:

- 38.7% of speaking characters in comedies were female in 2019, up from 36.5% in 2013 and 36% in 2007.
- 33.3% of speaking characters in animated movies were female in 2019, up from 24.6% in 2013 and 20.9% in 2007.
- 27.9% of speaking characters in action/adventure movies were female in 2019, up from 23.9% in 2013 and 20% in 2007.

Behind the scenes, of 1,518 content creators in 2019, women accounted for:

- 10.7% of directors.
- 19.4% of all writers.
- 24.3% of all producers.
- 5.2% of composers.
Across the 1,300 top films between 2007 and 2019, behind the scenes:

- 70 of 1,447 directors were women; of those, 14 were women of color (8 were Black, 3 were Asian, and 3 were Latina).
- 25 of 1,443 composers were female.
- 71% of casting directors were White women, 17.9% were White men, 9.4% were women of color, and 1.7% were men of color.

**NEW YEAR, NO PROGRESS FOR GIRLS & WOMEN ON SCREEN**
Prevalence of girls and women as speaking characters across 1,300 films, in percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% of Girls &amp; Women as Speaking Characters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROGRESS TOWARD PARITY FOR GIRLS & WOMEN AS LEADS**
Of the 100 top films in 2019...

- 43% of the films depicted a girl or woman as a lead or co-lead.
- 17% of female actors were from underrepresented racial/ethnic groups.
- 3% of female actors were at least 45 years of age or older.

**FOR GIRLS & WOMEN, NOT ALL GENRES ARE CREATED EQUAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>% of Girls &amp; Women as Speaking Characters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action and/or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comedy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: USC Annenberg Inclusion Initiative
ALL-TIME HIGH FOR UNDERREPRESENTED CHARACTERS AT THE CENTER OF STORYTELLING

Number of films with underrepresented leads or co-leads by year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>'07</th>
<th>'08</th>
<th>'09</th>
<th>'10</th>
<th>'11</th>
<th>'12</th>
<th>'13</th>
<th>'14</th>
<th>'15</th>
<th>'16</th>
<th>'17</th>
<th>'18</th>
<th>'19</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ALL UR LEADS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE UR LEADS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INCLUSION OF RACIAL/ETHNIC GROUPS ON SCREEN IN 2019

Percentage of all speaking characters by racial/ethnic group

- WHITE 65.7%
- BLACK 15.7%
- HISPANIC/LATINO 4.9%
- ASIAN 7.2%
- OTHER 6.6%

The percentage of White characters decreased 11.9 percentage points since 2007. There has been no significant increase in the percentage of characters from underrepresented racial/ethnic groups in the same time frame.

INCLUSION OF RACIAL/ETHNIC GROUPS ON SCREEN IN 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of underrepresented characters: 34.3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Films had NO Black or African American speaking characters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Films had NO Hispanic/Latino speaking characters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Films had NO Asian speaking characters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LGBTQ CHARACTERS ARE LEFT BEHIND IN FILM

Of 26,618 speaking characters across 600 films...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>'14</th>
<th>'15</th>
<th>'16</th>
<th>'17</th>
<th>'18</th>
<th>'19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GAY</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESBIAN</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BISEXUAL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRANSGENDER</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All 4 transgender characters appearing in top films were inconsequential to the story, and had a total screen time of 2 minutes.

Of the 100 top films of 2019...

- 78 had no LGBTQ characters
- 94 had no female-identified LGBTQ characters

Of the 61 LGBTQ characters in 2019...

- 77% were white
- 23% were underrepresented

Source: USC Annenberg Inclusion Initiative
CHARACTERS WITH DISABILITY FACE A DEFICIT ON SCREEN IN FILM

2.3% of all speaking characters were depicted with a disability

65% PHYSICAL*
29% COGNITIVE*
28% COMMUNICATIVE*

*Based on U.S. Census domains

48 movies did not include any characters with disabilities.

77 movies did not include any girls or women with disabilities.

MOST CASTING DIRECTORS ARE WHITE WOMEN

Across 1,300 films the demographic breakdown of casting directors...

17.9% ARE WHITE MEN
71% ARE WHITE WOMEN
1.7% ARE UNDERREPRESENTED MEN
9.4% ARE UNDERREPRESENTED WOMEN

STORYTELLERS ARE STILL PRIMARILY WHITE AND MALE

Across 1,300 films and 1,447 directors...

6.1% OR 88 BLACK OR AFRICAN AMERICAN DIRECTORS
60 MEN 8 WOMEN

3.7% OR 53 HISPANIC/LATINO DIRECTORS
50 MEN 3 WOMEN

3.3% OR 48 ASIAN OR ASIAN AMERICAN DIRECTORS
45 MEN 3 WOMEN

Source: USC Annenberg Inclusion Initiative
In a dozen years of animated films, women were 17% of the stars

Of the top animated films released from 2007 through 2018, 17% — 20 of them — had female leads or co-leads, according to a special report by Women in Animation and the University of Southern California Annenberg School for Communication and Journalism. Three of those 20 leads were women of color.

Women and girls fared better in animated television, accounting for 431 of 1,105, or 39%, lead or co-lead characters during the first episode of the top 100 series. Females of color accounted for 12% of those characters.

“Although the animation industry employs more men than women in its ranks, responses from interviews and surveys pointed to more than simply a numerical imbalance,” researchers wrote. “The existence of what participants called the ‘boy’s club’ — a masculine culture that favors and promotes men due to similarity — was highlighted as limiting women’s work and ascension through the industry ranks.”

Of 197 directors of the top 120 films of 2018 alone, five — or 2.5% — were women. Two of those five films were overseen by Jennifer Yuh Nelson, the single female of color among the five women directors.

Women directed 16, or 13%, of the television episodes, and women of color helmed 2% of those. All of the latter were Asian: Niki Yang, Lynn Wang, and Aoi Umeki.

Out of 1,200 films studied over that entire decade ending in 2018, women accounted for:

- 37% — 91 of 249 — of producers; 5%, or 12, were of color.
- 15% — 520 out of 3,398 — of producers of the 1,080 live-action films; 1% were of color. There was no meaningful improvement in the percentage of female producers in live-action features over 10 years. In animation, there has been a significant increase over time.
- 9% — 40 out of 423 — of writers; 1% — 4 Asian, 1 Latinx and 1 multiracial — were of color.
In 52 of the top-rated films from 2014 through 2018, women were:

- outnumbered by men 8.5 to 1 in key roles or unit head positions.
- 7% of heads of story; 6% of heads of story were women of color.
- 15% of editors; 3% of editors were of color.
- 8% of animation heads; 3% were of color.
- 14% of art directors; 4% were of color.
- 2% — 1 — of heads of layout; she was White.
- 21% — 10 — of heads of lighting; all were White.
- 11% — 5 — of production designers; all were White.
- 9% — 6 — of character effects supervisors; 3% — 2 — were of color.
- 10% — 14 — of character composition supervisors; 3% — 4 — were of color.
- 18% — 111 of 605 — of story department team members.
- 16% — 511 of 3,140 — of animation teams.
- 23% — 128 of 544 — of art teams.
- 24% — 251 of 1,061 — of character effects teams
- 26% — 408 of 1,571 — of composition teams.

In the top 100 animated TV series, women were:

- 25% — 198 — of the writers; 6 were Asian, 2 Latinx, 1 Black, and 1 multiracial. “Created by” or “developed by” credits went to 17% — 24 of 145 — of women; 3 of them were in underrepresented racial or ethnic groups.
- 20% of executive producers.
- 17% of co-executive producers; 6 were women of color.
- 34% of credited producers; 8% were from underrepresented racial/ethnic groups.

In the following key roles in animated TV series, females comprised:

- 28% — 20 — of story editors; 1% — 1 — were of color.
- 18% — 24 — of editors; 4% — 5 — were of color.
- 16% — 21 — of animation directors; 8% — 11 — were of color.
- 20% — 26 — of lead animators; 13% — 17 — were of color.
- 24% — 10 — of lead character designers; 7% — 3 — were of color.
- 11% — 4 — of lead storyboard artists; 3% — 1 — were of color.

In TV animation departments, where women employees numbered 1,721, they comprised:

- 35% — 330 of 937 — of animators.
- 33% — 98 of 300 — of character designers.
- 24% — 75 of 312 — of storyboard artists.
- 54% — 93 of 172 — of listed storyboard revisionists.

Among executives at 10 film and 14 TV companies, as of early June 2018:

- 52% — 53 — in film were female.
- 39% — 66 — in television were female.
- 6% — 7 — in film were of color.
- 9% — 16 — in television were of color.

On the corporate side of animation, during 2016, 2017 and 2018:

- women in film accounted for half of CEOs, CCOs, presidents and others at that level
- women in TV accounted for 6% of C-suite executives.
- all but two of the 23 women of color executives were senior vice presidents but held no positions higher than that.
“Clearly, the drop-off in female participation is between festival screenings and working within animation companies,” researchers wrote. “Females do not have the same access and opportunity as males and do not seem to be moving up the ranks as quickly in the space.”

### ANIMATED AND LIVE ACTION FEMALE PRODUCERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Animation</th>
<th>Live Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: USC Annenberg Inclusion Initiative

### FEMALE DIRECTORS ARE RARE IN ANIMATION

**Overall**
- **Animation**: 37%
- **Live Action**: 15%

**Women of Color**
- **Animation**: 5%
- **Live Action**: 1%

### Directors by platform across film & TV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Platform</th>
<th>Animation</th>
<th>Live Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: USC Annenberg Inclusion Initiative
PIPELINE PROBLEMS: CAREER PROGRESS STALLS FOR FEMALES
Percentage of females in the pipeline to directing animated feature films

3% DIRECTORS

7% HEAD OF STORY
8% HEAD OF ANIMATION
9% WRITERS

18% STORY DEPT.
16% ANIMATORS

FEMALE PRODUCERS BY POSITION
Percentage of female producers across 100 top animated series of 2018

17% CREATED BY/DEVELOPED BY
24 women
3 women of color

20% EXEC PRODUCERS
71 women
6 women of color

17% CO-EXEC PRODUCERS
10 women
0 women of color

34% PRODUCERS
64 women
16 women of color

Source: USC Annenberg Inclusion Initiative
No female characters aged 50+ led four nations’ top-grossing films

No women aged 50 years and older were lead characters in the top 10 money-making films in the United States, United Kingdom, Germany, and France in 2019, according to a Geena Davis Institute on Gender in Media analysis of those releases. More than a quarter of those top-grossers had no female characters aged 50 or older.

Conducted with the University of Southern California Viterbi School of Engineering, the “Frail, Frumpy and Forgotten” analysis also found that women characters were more likely than male characters in that age group to be shown as senile, homebound, frail, or frumpy. The analysis looked at 32 films, some of which were released in France, Germany, and the United Kingdom, the top 10 profit-makers in more than one of those nations. The analysis included a total of 1,235 female characters; 36 lead/co-lead characters, 472 supporting characters, and 727 minor characters.

The age, gender, and race of characters in those films, researchers wrote, didn’t reflect the actual makeup of the global population, which is 51% female, or global population trends. Overall, White populations are declining worldwide.

The analysis also found that:

- 78.2% of characters were younger than 50, 21.8% were 50 or older.
- 28.2% of those films had no female characters aged 50 or older.
- 25.3% of characters were at least 50 years old.
- 16.1% of female and 3.5% of male characters in that older age group were depicted as senile.
16.1% of female and 2.4% of male characters were homebound.
19.4% of female and 5.9% of male characters were feeble.
19.4% of female and 4.7% of male characters were frumpy.
46.8% of the studied films had stereotypical older female characters.
25% of the films had non-stereotypical older female characters.
Men comprised 66.9%, women 32.8% and gender non-conforming persons .3% of characters.
78.7% of characters in the 32 films were White and 21.3% were persons of color.
98.6% were heterosexual, and 1.4% were non-heterosexual.
97.1% were non-disabled, and 2.9% were disabled.

Source: Geena Davis Institute on Gender in Media
Female-led family films saw 55% profit rise, narrowing a gender gap

Overall global box-office profits on female-led family films almost doubled over the decade ending in 2017; and, for the first time, in 2016, annual profits on female-led films exceeded revenue on male-led films. By 2-to-1, however, male main characters outnumbered female leads across the studied 11 years, according to the Geena Davis Institute on Gender in Media Benchmark Report. The study was released in 2019 and analyzed 1,115 characters in the top-grossing 100 animated and live-action family films from 2007 through 2017.

It also concluded that:

- The global revenue of female-led family films increased to $80.1 million in 2017 from $44.3 million in 2007.
- Female-led family films grossed $94.3 million in 2016 — for the first time, since 2007, when the institute began this analysis — out-earning male-led films, which made $88 million. In 2007, female-led films earned $90.1 million, and male-led ones earned $172.5 million.
- In 2017, female-led family titles earned $217 million globally and male-led ones earned $235.1 million — a much narrowed, $18 million gap.
Family films led by people of color out-earned similar films featuring White actors by 14%, generating $11.5 million more in revenue.

71.3% of leads were male, 28.8% were female, throughout the decade. That compared, in 2007, to 76.2% and 23.8%, respectively; and, in 2017, 69.9% and 30.1%.

83.4% of leads on all those top-gross family films were White.

16.7% of leads were persons of color.

Of those persons of color, 74% were male, and 26% were female.

Of those persons of color, 60.4% were Black, 15.4% were Latinx, 14.2% were of Asian or Southeast Asian descent, 4% identified as some other race, 3.6% were Middle Eastern, and 2.4% were either Native American, Hawaiian, or Asian Pacific Islander.

Fewer than 1% of leads were lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, intersexual, or asexual, or had a disability, a static fact throughout those 10 years.

Nearly half of the lead characters in top-grossing family films of 2019 were female

Marking what Geena Davis Institute on Gender in Media researchers say is a milestone, females accounted for 48% of lead characters in the 100 family films with the most box-office receipts in 2019, double the rate in 2007.

Additionally, wrote the authors of “Historic Gender Parity in Family Films,” female characters again increased their talk time, progressing to 39.2% in 2019 from 31.3% of speaking time in 2014. They boosted their on-screen time to 42.6% in 2019 from 34.9% in 2014.

The study of family films — which measured everything from racial diversity to physical disability to body type of characters — concluded that:

- 67.3% of female leads were White.
- 32.6% of female leads were of color, an underrepresentation, given that persons of color accounted for 38% of the U.S. population.
- Leads of color increased to 30% in 2019 from 22% in 2007.
- 46.7% of White characters but 39.8% of characters of color were depicted as leaders.
- 14.8% of White characters but 8.7% of characters of color were portrayed as upper-class, financially.
- White characters and characters of color were equally likely to be shown as having a job, “with no significant differences … found in terms of professional, managerial, STEM, or other occupation types.”
- Male supporting characters outnumbered female supporting characters 2-to-1.
- Female characters were six times more likely than male characters to be shown in revealing clothing.
- 60.2% of female characters were aged 40 or younger, while 56.4% of male characters were aged 40 or older.
- Down from a historic high of 5% in 2018, 2% of family films in 2019 featured a leading lesbian, gay, bi-sexual, transsexual, queer or related character.
5.6% of LGBTQ+ characters but 1.6% of heterosexual characters were portrayed as sexually promiscuous.
51.9% of heterosexual but 33.3% of LGBTQ+ characters were portrayed as hardworking.
41.6% of heterosexual characters but 27.8% of LGBTQ+ characters were portrayed as smart.
A record 8% of family films featured a lead with a disability in 2019.
34.3% of characters with disabilities but 20.6% of other characters were rescued.
20.0% of disabled but 11.7% of non-disabled characters died.
9.1% of all characters and 3.5% of leading characters were aged 60 and older, a group that was 19% of the U.S. population.
97.3% of characters aged 60 and older had no sexual partners, while 87.2% of younger characters had none.
39.1% of characters aged 60 and older and 80.7% of younger characters were employed.
Characters aged 60 and older were more than younger characters to be shown as workplace managers.
8.3% of characters had large bodies, an underrepresentation, given the makeup of the U.S. population.
Reinforcing some stereotypes, 7.4% of characters with large bodies were lazy, 8.5% were physically slow, 9.6% were stupid, 8.5% were poorly dressed, 7.4% were clumsy, 9.6% were a punch line to a joke.
35.1% of large characters but 42.1% of characters who weren’t large were shown as smart.
3% of a decade’s worth of top films featured Latinx leads, co-leads

Among the 100 top-grossing movies from 2007 through 2018, 4.5% of a total of 47,268 characters were Latinx. Just 3% of those films featured Latinx actors as leads or co-leads.

Of those roles, 49% — or 17 — went to females. One Latina, Cameron Diaz, played five of those 17 roles, according to an analysis by the University of Southern California Annenberg Inclusion Initiative and the National Association of Latino Independent Producers.

Additionally, that analysis found that there were no Latinx women in 828 and no Latinx men in 688 out of 1,200 movies released from 2007 through 2018.

The Annenberg Inclusion Initiative’s “Latinos in Film: Erasure On Screen & Behind the Camera Across 1,200 Popular Movies” also found that:

- 4.5% of all speaking characters were Latinx, a rate that was 13.8 percentage points below what the U.S. Census counts as the nation’s Latinx population.
- 70 films in 2019 and 64 in 2017 featured no Latinx women.
- 8 male and 2 female leads were Latinx persons aged 45 or older when their films were released. Jennifer Lopez played both those lead female roles.
- 5 out of 500 films, between 2014 and 2018, showed a Latinx character who was lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender.
- 387 of 400 movies had no Latinx characters with a disability.
- 82% of 200 top films from 2017-18 featured one top-billed Latinx actor, 11% had 2 Latinx actors, and 5% had 3.
- 36% of all Latinx speaking characters and 60% of top-billed Latinx characters were depicted without any cultural artifacts, symbols, or references to the characters’ ethnic group.
- Cameron Diaz, Jennifer Lopez, Eugenio Derbez, and Jessica Alba were the most frequently hired Latinas.

By character profile:

- 24% of all of Latino speaking characters and 28% of top-billed Latinx talent were depicted as criminals.
- 61.9% of all Latinx characters engaged in illegal activity were gang members, drug dealers, or otherwise in organized crime.
- 17% of all top-billed Latinx talent and 13% of all Latinx speaking characters were shown poor or impoverished.
- 52% of Latinx characters had a job.
- 54% of Latinx characters worked in an occupation that did not require a college education (e.g., salesperson, construction worker, farmer).
- 31% of employed Latinx characters were in law enforcement (e.g., police officers, members of the military).
- 4% of jobs that Latinx characters worked were high-level occupations involving STEM careers.

Behind-the-scenes:

- 3% of 3,616 producer credits went to Latinx creators.
- 19 of those credits went to Latinas and 73 to Latinos, a 4-to-1 male-to-female ratio.
- 4% of 1,335 directors were Latinx.
- 1 of those 1,335 directors, Patricia Riggen, was female.
- 29% of directors were U.S. filmmakers, and 71% were from outside the United States.
- 48% of directors were clients of William Morris Endeavor, 26% were represented by Creative Artists Agency, and 17% by United Talent Agency.

On 2017 and 2018 Sundance Film Festival submissions:

- 7% of directors were Latinx.
- 11% of those directors were female, 88% were male, and 1% were gender non-conforming.
- 13% of directors on international features were Latinx.
- Of those international directors, 19% were female, and 81% were male.
LATINO CHARACTERS ARE MISSING IN FILM
Prevalence of Latino speaking characters across 1,200 films in percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% of Latino Characters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'07</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'08</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'09</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'10</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'11</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'12</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'13</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'14</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'15</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'16</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'17</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'18</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL NUMBER OF CHARACTERS 47,268

FOR LATINO CHARACTERS, LEADING ROLES ARE SPARSE
Prevalence of Latino leads/co leads across 1,200 films

The percentage of films with Latino leads/co leads ranges from 1% to 6%, with the high point occurring in 2014.

Of those Leads/Co Leads*

- 3% of the leads/co leads are Latinas
  - This represents only 17 females.
- 2 Latina lead roles were played by an actor 45 years of age or older. Both were Jennifer Lopez.

*Excludes films w/ensemble casts

LATINO CHARACTERS ARE INVISIBLE IN FILM
Across 100 top-grossing films from 2018, the number missing...

- 47 ANY LATINO CHARACTERS
- 70 ANY LATINA CHARACTERS
- 95 ANY LATINO CHARACTERS W/DISABILITIES
- 98 ANY LGBT LATINO CHARACTERS

LATINAS ARE INVISIBLE AS DIRECTORS
Across 1,200 top-grossing films from 2007 to 2018...

- Only 1 out of 1,335 directors was a Latina

Source: USC Annenberg Inclusion Initiative
**A PIPELINE TO GROW AND DEVELOP FOR FEATURE FILMS**
*Percentage of Latino Directors Submitting Dramatic Features to Sundance Film Festival 2017-18*

- **7%** of U.S. directors were Latino.
- **13%** of international directors were Latino.

**LATINO DIRECTORS ACROSS 1,200 TOP-GROSSING FILMS**

- Of the U.S. Dramatic Feature directors...
  - **142** total
  - **17** female
  - **125** male
- Of the International Dramatic Feature directors...
  - **257** total
  - **61** female
  - **196** male

2 were gender non-conforming
1 was gender non-conforming

- 29% of the directors are of Mexican descent or nationality.
- 32% are of Spanish descent or nationality.

**FEW LATINO DIRECTORS WORK ON TOP-GROSSING FILMS**

- The overall percentage of Latino directors across 1,200 films is **4%**.

Source: USC Annenberg Inclusion Initiative
In mostly White Hollywood, diversity rose, minorities bought the most tickets

An increasingly diverse U.S. film audience prefers a diversity of film content, according to UCLA College of Science’s 2020 Hollywood Diversity: A Tale of Two Hollywoods report. The report also found that U.S. films in which actors of color comprised 41% to 50% of the cast had the highest median global box office receipts and were released in the most markets internationally.

In 2018, films in which actors of color comprised 21% to 30% of the cast had the highest median global box office receipts and were released in the most international markets. In 2018 and 2019, films whose casts mainly were comprised of White actors had the lowest receipts worldwide.

In 2018, when there were 140 theatrical films, and 2019, when there were 146, those with Black lead actors and casts mainly comprised of actors of color were released in the fewest international markets, continuing a trend from previous years.

The report also found that of the top 100 U.S. films of 2019, 1.5 in 10 had directors of color and 1.5 in 10 had women directors.

In 2020, 91% of film company CEOs were White, and 82% were men, down from 94% and 100%, respectively, in 2015. In 2020, 9% of CEOs were of color, and 18% were female.

“We’ve seen quite a bit of progress in recent years in front of the camera for women and people of color,” Darnell Hunt, a UCLA sociologist who’s the study’s lead co-author, told the Women’s Media Center. “We’ve even seen some signs of things loosening up a bit for women directors, an arena in which women have had a particularly tough time over the years. But where we’ve seen the most inertia is in the executive suites — where the important green-lighting decisions are made. White men continue to dominate these important spaces well beyond their fair share of the positions.”

Also, in the 2020 C-suite:

- 93% of senior executives were White, up from 92% in 2015.
- 80% of senior executives were male, down from 83% in 2015.
- 86% of unit heads were White, down from 96% in 2015.
- 59% of unit heads were male, down from 61% in 2015.

White performers and creators outnumbered performers and creators of color. In 2019, when Whites were 84.9% of directors, people of color were:

- 15.1% of directors, which was down from 19.3% in 2018 and up from 10.1% in 2015. Of directors of color in 2019, 5.5% were Black, 3.4% were Asian, 2.7% were Latinx, 2.7% were multiracial, .7% were Middle Eastern or North African, 0% were Native American.
- 27.6% of all lead actors, up from 26.6% in 2018 and 13.6% in 2015. Of those lead actors of color, 15.7% were Black, 6.2% were multiracial, 5% were Asian, 4.6% were Latinx, .7% were Middle Eastern or North African, .3% were Native American.
- 13.9% of all writers, up from 10.4% in 2019 and 5.3% in 2015. Of 2019’s writers of color, 5.6% were Black, 2.8% were Asian, 2.8% were Latinx, 2.8% were multiracial, 0% were Middle Eastern or North African, 0% were Native American.

Men outnumbered women performers and creators. In 2019, women were:

- 44.1% of all lead actors, up from 41% in 2018 and 29% of 2015.
- 15.1% of all directors, up from 7.1% in 2018 and 7.7% in 2015.
- 17.4 % of all writers, up from 14.8% in 2018 and 13% in 2015.

Of Academy Award winners:

- White directors won 63.6% and directors of color won 36.4% of Oscars in that category in 2018; that compared to 80% and 20%, respectively, in 2017.
- Women directors won 0% and male directors 100% of Oscars in that category in 2018, 2017, 2016 and 2015. Before Chloe Zhao won that award in 2021, women directors had last won it in 2014, when they garnered 8.3% and men garnered 91.7% of those Oscars.
White lead actors won 55% and those of color won 45% of Oscars in that category in 2018. That compared to 80% and 20%, respectively, in 2017.

Women lead actors won 27.3% and men 72.7% of Oscars in that category in 2017. The compared to 30% and 70%, respectively, in 2017.

Filmgoers of color accounted for:

- The majority of tickets sold for 8 of the top 10 films in 2019, and 50% of tickets sold for 9 of 10 films.
- The majority of domestic ticket sales for 6 of the top 10 films in 2018, which was up from 5 of 10 in 2017.
### Top 10 Films and minority Box Office Share (2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Box Office (000,000s)</th>
<th>Return</th>
<th>Minority Share</th>
<th>Percent Minority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Avengers: Endgame</td>
<td>$2,797.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>11%–20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Lion King</td>
<td>$1,656.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>Over 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Frozen 2*</td>
<td>$1,373.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>11%–20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Spider-Man: Far From Home</td>
<td>$1,131.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>41%–50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Captain Marvel</td>
<td>$1,128.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>31%–40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Toy Story 4*</td>
<td>$1,073.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>21%–30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Joker*</td>
<td>$1,068.9</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>11%–20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Aladdin</td>
<td>$1,050.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>Over 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Star Wars Episode 9: The Rise of Skywalker*</td>
<td>$1,001.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>31%–40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fast &amp; Furious Presents: Hobbs &amp; Saw</td>
<td>$758.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>41%–50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UCLA College of Science

![Return on Investment, by Minority Cast Share, Theatrical Films, 2011–2019](Graphics produced by the Women's Media Center)

Source: UCLA College of Science
People of color accounted for 27.6% of the leads in top films for 2019, continuing an upward trend in the group’s representation among the most important roles in theatrical films noted in the last report. Since 2011, the first year examined in this report series, people of color’s share of lead roles has nearly tripled (from 10.5% to 27.6%) thus moving the group closer to proportionate representation in this employment arena (40.2% in 2019).

In 2019, people of color claimed a 15.1% share of the directors from that year’s top films, a four-percentage-point decline from the 19.3% figure posted in 2018. Still, the 2019 figure represents a slight improvement over the group’s 12.6% share noted for 2017 in the previous report. Over the course of the nine years examined in this report series, people of color’s share of directors has increased only marginally beyond the 12.2% figure reported for 2011. People of color would have to nearly triple their share of directors in 2019 to attain proportionate representation (40.2%).

Women accounted for 44.1% of the leads in top films for 2019, continuing an upward trend in the group’s share of these roles that has nearly closed the gender gap over the nine years examined in this report series. Indeed, the group’s share for 2019 is more than an 11 percentage point increase over the 32.9% figure for 2017 noted in the previous report.

Source: UCLA College of Science
One of the strongest upward trends noted in this report series concerns women’s share of directors for top Hollywood films. Between 2011, the first year examined in this series, and 2019, women’s share of directors has nearly quadrupled from 4.1% to 15.1%. Despite these significant gains, women remained underrepresented by a factor of more than 3 to 1 in this employment arena in 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>95.9%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>94.2%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>93.7%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>95.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UCLA College of Science

Bigger film and TV profits — if more off-screen creatives were Black

Hollywood could boost its bottom line by 7% — $10 billion annually — if it put more Black creatives to work and more adequately funded Black-run and/or Black-focused projects.

“Fewer Black-led stories get told, and when they are, these projects have been consistently underfunded and undervalued, despite often earning higher relative returns than other properties,” analysts at McKinsey & Co. wrote in “Black representation in film and TV: The challenges and impact of increasing diversity,” released in March 2021.

“Films of any kind with two or more Black professionals in off-screen creative roles (producer, writer, or director, for example) receive significantly lower production budgets — more than 40% less than other films,” according to McKinsey. “The disparities are particularly notable given that these films make 10% more in box-office revenues per dollar invested in prints and advertising, compared with films with no or just one Black creative professional.”
Budgets for such race-specific biographic and documentary films as “Lincoln,” “Selma,” and “Walk the Line” had average production budgets of $22 million, based on McKinsey’s analysis of U.S.-produced films of 2015 through 2019. Budgets for “race-adjacent” comedies such as “Barbershop 3,” “Crazy Rich Asians,” and “Knives Out” had average production budgets of $23 million. In each of those two categories, 6% of films had Black producers, writers, directors, and other off-screen talent.

“A Star is Born,” “Deadpool,” “The Martians,” “Widows,” and other “race-agnostic” films had an average production budget of $64 million. In that category, 3% of films had Black producers, writers, directors, and other off-screen talent, McKinsey concluded.

McKinsey’s data collection included what it culled from such sources as Variety Business Intelligence and University of California at Los Angeles, and from its own interviews of 50 Black and non-Black industry executives, agents, creatives, and funders. Black females offered a particular perspective. “As in other industries, many Black women in film and TV report having to work harder than their white, male counterparts — for less recognition,” McKinsey analysts wrote.

At a time when Blacks comprise roughly 13% of the U.S. population, McKinsey concluded that, of those films made from 2015 through 2019:

- 87% of TV executive and 92% of film executives were White.
- 8% had at least 1 Black producer.
- Films with at least 1 Black producer were 92% more likely than films with 0 Black producers to have Black directors and Black writers.
- 6% of all U.S.-made films had at least 1 Black director.
- Films with at least 1 Black director were 94% more likely than films with 0 Black directors to have a Black writer. (The same likelihoods existed in TV.)
11% of film leads or co-leads were Black, and 89% were of some other race.
14% of supporting casts were Black, and 86% were of some other race.
6% of directors were Black, and 94% were of some other race.
6% of producers were Black, and 94% were of some other race.

In small-screen entertainment:
76% of lead characters on traditional broadcast network shows were White in 2019, which was down from 80.2% in 2018.
11.6% of lead characters on traditional networks shows were Black in 2019, up from 8.3% in 2018.
12.4% of lead characters on traditional network shows were of some other race in 2019, up from 11.5% in 2018.
65% of lead characters on cable network shows were White in 2019, down from 72.5% in 2018.
14.1% of lead characters on cable were Black in 2019, up from 12.9% in 2018.
20.9% of lead characters on cable were of some other race in 2019, up from 14.6% in 2018.
75.9% of lead characters on online-streaming networks were White in 2019, down from 80.5% in 2018.
4.7% of lead characters on online-streaming networks were Black in 2019, down from 6.7% in 2018.
19.4% of lead characters on online-streaming networks were of some other race in 2019, up from 12.8% in 2018.

Among other recommendations, McKinsey suggested that the industry track and publicize its efforts and progress toward racial equity, and create an independent organization to promote diversity.
Films with Black off-screen talent have smaller budgets despite higher earnings per dollar of budget.

Budgets for US films, 2015–19, $M

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genres</th>
<th>Share of all films</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Average production budget</th>
<th>Share of category with 2+ Black off-screen talent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Race specific (ie, biography or documentary) | 15% | • Lincoln  
• Selma  
• Walk the Line | $22 M | 6% |
| Race adjacent (ie, comedy; when race is often critical to topic or style) | 18% | • Barbershop 3  
• Crazy Rich Asians  
• Knives Out | $23 M | 6% |
| Race agnostic (ie, all other genres) | 58% | • A Star Is Born  
• Deadpool  
• The Martian  
• Widows | $64 M | 3% |

Black off-screen talent—producer, writer, director—is twice as likely to be in race-related films, which have smaller budgets, than in race-agnostic films.

The average film typically has 6 professionals in total across the pivotal off-screen roles of producer, writer, and director.

Source: Variety Insight by Variety Business Intelligence. McKinsey & Company

Although there is a mixed progress, Black and other minority leads are still underrepresented in TV across platforms.

Racial mix of all leads in TV shows by distribution type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broadcast</th>
<th>Cable</th>
<th>Streaming</th>
<th>US population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Black off-screen talent is primarily responsible for creating opportunities for other Black off-screen talent. Racial mix of off-screen talent based on race of film leadership, 2015–19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1+ Black producers</th>
<th>No Black producers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black director</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Black director</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8% 92% Share of all films with this pairing

Likelihood of a film having a Black director based on whether 1 or more producers are Black:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1+ Black producers</th>
<th>No Black producers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black writer</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Black writer</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8% 92% Share of all films with this pairing

Likelihood of a film having a Black writer based on whether 1 or more producers are Black:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1+ Black producers</th>
<th>No Black producers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black writer</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Black writer</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6% 94% Share of all films with this pairing

Likelihood of a film having a Black writer based on whether 1 or more directors are Black:

Despite recent gains, women were 4.8% of directors in 13 years of film

Women received 4.8% — or 70 — of 1,448 directing jobs on the top 1,300 movie releases of 2007 through 2019, according to “Inclusion in the Director’s Chair: Analysis of Director Gender and Race/Ethnicity Across 1,300 Top Films from 2007 to 2019.”

Of those 70 females, 13 — or less than 1% — were of color. In 2019 alone, across the top 100 films, 12 of 113 directors — or 10.6% — were female. That was up from 4.5% in 2018 and 2.7% in 2007.

The report by the University of Southern California Annenberg School of Communications and Journalism also found that two of those 13 women of color — Ava DuVernay and Jennifer Yuh Nelson — helmed more than one movie across those 13 years’ worth of films.

White men snagged 82.5% of those 1,448 directing jobs, men of color 12.6%, and White women 3.9%.

Other main findings from the Annenberg Inclusion Initiative were:

- 20% of the 53 U.S.-made films streamed on Netflix in 2019 had a female director. (14.5% — or 8 — of those women were White, and 5.5% — or 3 — were women of color.)
- 15 women directors had their films distributed by Universal Pictures during all the analyzed years.
- 13 had theirs distributed by Warner Bros.
- 11 had theirs distributed by Sony Pictures Entertainment.
- 3 out of the 134 female-directed movies from 2007-2019 were distributed by Paramount, which distributed the fewest woman-directed films of any major studio.
- 0 films by women directors of color were distributed by Lionsgate, STX and others.
- No major studios distributed films by more than 4 women directors of color across 13 years.

Other significant findings related to race included:

- 83.2% of directors were White, and 16.8% were of color in 2019. In 2018, the respective figures were 78.6% and 21.4%. In 2007, the respective figures were 87.5% and 12.5%.
- 86.5% of directors across the 13 years’ worth of films were White, and 13.5% were of color.
- 39 of all directors of color had their work distributed by Universal Pictures across the 13 years.
- 34 of all directors of color had their films distributed by Sony Pictures Entertainment.
- 29 of all directors of color had their films distributed by 20th Century Fox.
- 10 of all directors of color had their films distributed by Disney, which distributed the fewest of all films among that minority of directors.

Among nominees for the Academy, Critics’ Choice, Directors Guild of America, and Golden Globe awards:

- Overall, 5.1% of 273 best director nominations went to women and 94.9% to men. (Four women accounted for all the female nominees — Kathryn Bigelow, Ava DuVernay, Greta Gerwig, and Angelina Jolie — and 1 woman of color, DuVernay, was among those four.)
- Women received 7.1% and men received 92.9% of Critics’ Choice director nominations.
- Women received 4.9% and men received 95.1% of Directors Guild of American director nominations.
- Women received 4.5% and men received 95.5% of Golden Globe director nominations.
- Women received 3.2% and men received 96.8% of Oscar nominations.
INCLUSION IN THE DIRECTOR’S CHAIR?
ANALYSIS OF DIRECTOR GENDER & RACE/ETHNICITY ACROSS 1,300 TOP FILMS FROM 2007 TO 2019

USC ANNEBNERG INCLUSION INITIATIVE

@Inclusionists

FEMALES ARE OUTNUMBERED IN THE DIRECTOR’S CHAIR
PREVALENCE OF FEMALE DIRECTORS ACROSS 1,300 FILMS
in percentages

![Bar chart showing the prevalence of female directors across 1,300 films.](image)

- Percentage of Female Directors Across 13 Years: 4.8%
- Total Number of Directors: 1,448

RATIO OF MALE TO FEMALE DIRECTORS ACROSS 13 YEARS
20 TO 1

UNDERREPRESENTED DIRECTORS BY YEAR
Number of underrepresented directors across 1,300 films

![Bar chart showing the number of underrepresented directors by year.](image)

- Overall: 13.5%

HOLLYWOOD’S IMAGE OF A FEMALE DIRECTOR IS A WHITE WOMAN
Race/ethnicity of 57 individual female directors across 1,300 films

- 46 WOMEN ARE WHITE
- 11 WOMEN ARE FROM UNDERREPRESENTED RACIAL/ETHNIC GROUPS

Source: USC Annenberg Inclusion Initiative
GENDER & UNDERREPRESENTED STATUS OF FILM DIRECTORS
Percentage and number of directors by gender and underrepresented status across 1,300 films from 2007 to 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>WHITE MALES</th>
<th>WHITE FEMALES</th>
<th>UR MALES</th>
<th>UR FEMALES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL %</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL #</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. POPULATION</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UNDERREPRESENTED WOMEN DIRECTORS BY DISTRIBUTOR
Number of underrepresented women directors per distributor from 2007-2019

1,300 movies.
ONLY 13 under-represented women directors.

Zero underrepresented women directors worked on top films from Lionsgate, STX, or other distributors.

PIPELINE PROBLEMS: CAREER PROGRESS STALLS FOR FEMALES
Percentage of female directors by media platform

34.5% Narrative Independent Films
31% Episodic TV Directors 2018-19
20% Netflix Directors 2019
4.8% Top-Grossing Films 2007-2019

29.7 PERCENTAGE POINT DROP FROM NARRATIVE INDEPENDENT FILMS TO TOP-GROSSING FILMS

Source: USC Annenberg Inclusion Initiative
### The Gender Gap in Awards

Percentage of Female Directors by Award Type, 2008-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award Type</th>
<th>Female %</th>
<th>Male %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Golden Globes</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>95.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DGA Awards</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>95.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academy Awards</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critics’ Choice</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1% of Best Director nominees from 2008-2020 were female. 94.9% were male.

### Top Performer in 2019: Universal Pictures

Universal distributed the most films by women directors in 2019.

### Female Directors Receiving Award Nominations

Female directors and films nominated for Best Directing awards from 2008-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Director Name</th>
<th>Film Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Golden Globes</th>
<th>DGA Awards</th>
<th>Academy Awards</th>
<th>Critics’ Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angelina Jolie</td>
<td>UNBROKEN</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ava Duvernay</td>
<td>SELMA</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greta Gerwig</td>
<td>LADY BIRD</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greta Gerwig</td>
<td>LITTLE WOMEN</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Bigelow</td>
<td>THE HURT LOCKER</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Bigelow</td>
<td>ZERO DARK THIRTY</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A black check mark indicates a nomination; a red check indicates a nomination and win.

Source: USC Annenberg Inclusion Initiative
More female directors; little uptick for other behind-the-scenes women

Of 2020’s 100 films with the highest box office receipts, 16% were directed by women, a historic high since the San Diego State University Center for the Study of Women in Television & Film began tracking key behind-the-scenes players in movie-making 23 years ago.

The 2020 figure compared to 12% in 2019 and 4% in 2018, according to the Center’s “The Celluloid Ceiling: Behind-the-Scenes Employment of Women on the Top U.S. Films of 2020” report.

Female directors, generally, made more progress than women in other key behind-the-scenes roles from 2019 to 2020, when the pool of all female directors, writers, producers, executive producers, editors and cinematographers working on the top 100 films increased from 20% to 21%.

When assessing the top 250 films, researchers found that 80% had no women directors, 73% had no women writers, 41% had no women executive producers, 26% had no women producers, 72% had no women editors, and 94% had no women cinematographers.

“Even without the release of some of this year’s most anticipated big-budget films by women — including Chloe Zhao’s ‘Eternals’ and Cate Shortland’s ‘Black”

Source: USC Annenberg Inclusion Initiative
Widow’ — the percentage of women working as directors inched upward in 2020,” Martha Lauzen, the San Diego center’s executive director and lead researcher, told the Women’s Media Center. “The good news is that we’ve now seen two consecutive years of growth for women who direct. This breaks a recent historical pattern in which the numbers trend up one year and down the next. The bad news is that fully 80% of top films still do not have a woman at the helm.”

She continued: “While 2020 was by all accounts an unusual year, with many big tentpole releases pushed into some indefinite future and the closing of theaters, it is always instructive and useful to have data to tell us how women fared. The fact is, people continued to watch films last year.”

With the Covid-19 pandemic keeping many viewers indoors, the researchers also analyzed Digital Entertainment Group data on digital sales and rentals of the top-grossing films.

Analyzing the top 100 most money-making films of 2020, the researchers concluded that women comprised:

- 28% of producers, up from 26% in 2019.
- 21% of executive producers, up from 19%.
- 18% of editors, down from 23%.
- 12% of writers, down from 20%.
- 5% of composers, down from 6%. (95% of films had 0 women composers.)
- 3% of cinematographers, up from 2%.

Of all the behind-the-scenes players on the top 250 biggest money-makers of 2020, 23% were women, and 77% were men. That compared to 21% and 29%, respectively in 2019.

Also, on those top 250 films, women were:

- 30% of producers, up from 27% in 2019.
- 22% of editors, down from 23%.
- 21% of executive producers, unchanged from 2019.
- 18% of directors, up from 13%.
- 17% of writers, down from 19%.
- 6% of cinematographers, up from 5%.

Additionally, of the top 250 films of 2020:

- 67% employed 0 to 4 women in all those key behind-the-scenes roles, versus 5% that employed 0 to 4 men.
- 24% employed 5 to 9 women, and 24% employed 5 to 9 men.
- 9% employed 10 or more women, versus 71% employing 10 or more men.

Among the top 250 films with at least 1 female director, women were:

- 53% of writers, versus 8% of writers on films with exclusively male directors.
- 39% of editors, versus 18% of editors on films with exclusively male directors.
- 13% of composers, versus 4% of composers on films with exclusively male directors.

Of the 63% of top at-home films that also were on the other lists of top-grossing films, women accounted for:

- 19% of all directors, writers, executive producers, producers, editors, and cinematographers, which compared to 21% of those same personnel working on the top 100 films.
- 9% of directors, which compared to 16% of directors on the top 100.
- 12% of writers, which was the same as the top 100.
- 15% of executive producers, which compared to 21% of executive producers on the top 100.
- 31% of producers, which compared to 28% of producers on the top 100.
- 19% of editors, which compared to 18% of editors on the top 100.
- 3% of cinematographers, which was the same as the top 100.
Indie film women writers, directors rose; behind-the-scenes was mainly men

A record high percentage of women directed and wrote independent films in 2019-20, accounting for 38% and 35%, respectively, of professionals in their sectors. In 2018-19, they accounted for 33% of independent film directors and 32% of independent film writers, new research shows.

Nevertheless, in 2019-20 women accounted for 34% — compared to 32% in 2018-19 — and men accounted for 66% of directors, writers, producers, executive producers, editors and cinematographers, according to the Center for Study of Women in Television & Film’s “Indie Women: Behind-the-Scenes Employment of Women in Independent Film, 2019-20.” The report examined more than 8,000 film credits in roughly 800 films.

The highest rate of employment was in the documentary sector, where women were 40% of all behind-the-scenes players; that was a 5 percentage-point increase over 2018-19. Their lowest employment was in narrative features, where women accounted for 29% of all directors, writers, producers, executive producers, editors, and cinematographers, the same rate as in 2018-19.

The study, conducted annually by the San Diego State University research center, also found that women accounted for:

- 40% of producers in 2019-20, up from 37% in 2018-19.
- 33% of executive producers, up from 32%.
- 28% of editors, down from 29%.
- 16% of cinematographers, the same as in 2018-19.

Additionally, of all the studied films:

- those with at least one woman director had writing staffs that were 73% female; on films with male directors only, 12% of writers were female.
- those with at least one woman director had editing staffs that were 43% female; on films with male directors only, 18% of editors were female.
- those with at least one woman director had cinematography staffs that were 27% female; on films with only male directors, 8% of cinematographers were female.
- 34% employed 0 or 1 woman versus 12% employed 0 or 1 man.
- 43% employed 2 to 5 women versus 33% employed 2 to 5 men.
- 17% employed 6 to 9 women versus 29% employed 6 to 9 men.
- 5% employed 10 or more women versus 26% employed 10 or more men.

High-profile film festivals selected and/or screened:

- an average of 16 narrative features and documentaries with at least one female director, but an average of 22 films directed exclusively by men.
- an average of 6 narrative features directed by at least one woman, but an average of 12 narrative features directed exclusively by men.
- almost equal numbers of documentaries directed by men as by women.
- an average of 10 feature-length documentaries directed by at least one woman, but an average of 11 directed exclusively by men.
Historical comparison of percentages of independent films with women directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Center for the Study of Women in Television & Film, San Diego State University

Historical comparison of percentages of independent films with women writers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Center for the Study of Television & Film, San Diego State University

Comparison of employment of behind-the-scenes women on films with at least one woman director vs. films with exclusively male directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Women Directors</th>
<th>Men Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writer</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinematographer</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graphics produced by the Women’s Media Center

Source: Center for the Study of Women in Television & Film, San Diego State University
Writers Guild: “Pervasive” discrimination; uptick in women, minority writers

A 2020 Writers Guild of America West Inclusion Report, "based on WGA writers for whom demographic info is known," concluded that women and persons of color each held 5% more jobs in 2019-20 television than they did in 2018-19 season.

In movies, women held 4% more jobs and persons of color 2% more jobs in the 2019 season than they did in 2018.

"In spite of this progress, systemic discrimination against writers from underrepresented groups remains pervasive in the entertainment industry," according to the report.

This second annual report from WGA West more deeply analyzed movie writers than did its inaugural diversity report, finding that, of the 2,000 movie screenwriters who were employed in 2019:

- 60% were White men.
- 20% were White women.
- 13% were men of color.

Source: Writers Guild of America West
7% were women of color.

Women and persons of color, combined, accounted for 37% of writers, up from 33% the previous year.

Within the group of writers who were of color, 7% were Black, a group that was 13.4% of the U.S. population, 4.8% were Asian American/Pacific Islander, a group that was 6.1% of the U.S. population, 4.7% were Latinx, a group that was 18.3% of the U.S. population, .8% were Native American/Indigenous, a group that was 1.7% of the U.S. population, and .3% were Middle Eastern, a group that was .6% of the U.S. population.

While 80% of writers were White, Whites accounted for 60.4% of the U.S. population.

81% of screen credits went to men and 19% to women.

81% of screen credits went to White writers and 19% to persons of color.

By race and gender, 67% of credits went to White men, 15% to men of color, 14% to White women, and 4% to women of color.

Of the 2,617 employed television writers during the 2019-20 season:

- 44% were female, up from 39% during 2018-19.
- 64.7% were White.
- 35% were people of color, up from 30%.
- 38% were White men.
- 27% were White women.
- 19% were women of color.
- 16% were men of color.

Within the group of writers of color, 15.9% were Black, 8.5% were Asian American/Pacific Islander, 8.7% were Latinx, 1.1% were Native America/Indigenous, and .3% were Middle Eastern.

61% of script credits went to men and 39% to women.

69% of script credits went to White writers and 31% to persons of color.

By race and gender, 43% of credits went to White men, 26% to White women, 16% to women of color, and 14% to men of color.
Men, mostly White, outnumbered female film critics roughly 2-to-1

The count of female film critics inched up to 35%, from 34% in 2019, according to the 13th-annual “Thumbs Down” report from San Diego State University’s Center for the Study of Women in Television and Film.

In addition to accounting for 65% of film reviewers in broadcast, print, and online news, men wrote 66% of reviews from January through March 2020. Women wrote 34% of reviews, up from 32% in 2019, according to the report, based on more than 4,000 reviews from 380 different U.S.-based reviewers.

Male reviewers also outnumbered women in job titles that included film critics and staff writers who also did film criticism. And White reviewers — male or female — continued to outnumber reviewers of color.

Martha Lauzen, the center’s executive director, told the Women’s Media Center that male-driven stories and films directed by men continue to be more visible in the marketplace precisely because men dominate as critics.
“In addition,” she said, “previous editions of the study have found that male critics are more likely to note and discuss the filmographies of male directors than female directors in positive ways … The differences in reviews due to the gender of the writer can be subtle but impactful, influencing how audiences evaluate the film as well as the director.”

Researchers reported that:

- 17% of those with the title of “film critics” were female in 2020, down from 29% in 2019; 83% of critics were male in 2020.
- 30% of “staff writers” who did film reviews were females in 2020, down from 34% in 2019; 70% of staff writers were male.
- 40% of those defined as “top critics” were female in 2020, up from 28% in 2019.
- 33% of films reviewed by women had women directors, up from 32% in 2019.
- 14% of films reviewed by men were directed by women, down from 17% in 2019.
- 86% of films reviewed by men had male directors, down from 83% in 2019.
- 67% of films reviewed by women had male directors, down from 68% in 2019.
- 70% of female reviewers were White, while 23% were of color, and 7% were of an unknown race. (In 2019, when the center calculated the data differently, 50% of writers were White males, 10% were males of color, 6% were of an unknown race. Also, 23% of all writers were White women, 6% were women of color, and 5% were of an unknown race.)
- 73% of male reviewers were White, while 18% were of color, and 9% were of an unknown race.
- 54% of films reviewed by women and 45% of those reviewed by men had at least one female protagonist; in 2019, the respective figures were 54% and 38%.
- 46% of films reviewed by women and 55% of those reviewed by men had male protagonists.
- In 2019, 46% of reviews written by women but 62% of reviews written by men had male protagonists.
- 72% was the average approval rating that women awarded to films with female protagonists, while men awarded a 69% average approval rating.
- In 2019, women awarded an average rating of 78% and males an average rating of 68% to films with female protagonists.
- 73% was the average approval rating that women awarded to films with male protagonists, while men gave a 67% approval rating.
- In 2019, women awarded an average rating of 70% and men 77% to films with male protagonists.
32% of non-acting Oscar nominees were women, up from 30% in 2020

Of 205 non-acting nominees for the 2021 Oscars’ non-acting categories, 65 — or 32% — were women, a small increase from the previous year, according to the Women’s Media Center’s annual report on the Academy Awards.

In 2020, women accounted for 30% of the nominees; men accounted for 68% of those nominees in 2021 and 70% in 2020.

For the first time ever, the Best Director category included two female nominees, Chloé Zhao for “Nomadland” and Emerald Fennell for “Promising Young Women,” and Zhao was the first woman of color ever nominated.

“[T]he nomination numbers for women behind the scenes have barely inched up by two percentage points since last year, and that feels discouraging. But a decade-long view shows some progress … that has been a long time coming,” WMC President and CEO Julie Burton said, adding that 21% of non-acting nominees were female a decade ago.

The WMC Oscars report also found that in the 2021 non-acting categories:

- Women were 30% and men were 70% of nominees for Best Picture, which compared to 39% and 61%, respectively in 2020.
- Women were 40% and men 60% of Best Director nominees; 100% of those nominees were men in 2020.
- Women were 0% and men 100% of cinematography nominees, the same rate as in 2020.
- Women were 20% and men 80% of film editing nominees; in 2020, the respective figures were 17% and 83%.
- Women were 10% and men 90% of original screenplay nominees; in 2020, the respective figures were 14% and 86%.
- Women were 29% and men 71% of nominees in adapted screenplay writing; in 2020, the respective figures were 17% and 83%.
Women were 54% and men 46% of feature documentary nominees; in 2020, the respective figures were 47% and 53%.

Women were 40% and men 60% of short documentary nominees; in 2020, the respective figures were 20% and 40%.

White women were 20% of all Best Director nominees in 2021; women of color were 20%.

White women were 10% of all original screenplay writing nominees in 2021; there were no women of color nominated for original screenplays.

White women were 7% of all adapted screenplay nominees in 2021; women of color were 14%.

By race, in 2021 non-acting categories:

- 60% of Best Director nominees were White.
- Of the remaining Best Director nominees, 40% were Asian, and 0% were other persons of color.
- 60% of original screenplay writing nominees were White.
- Of the remaining original screenplay nominees, 20% were Black, 10% each were Asian and multiracial, 0% were other persons of color.
- 50% of adapted screenplay writer nominees were White.
- Of the remaining nominees in that category, 21% were of unknown race, 14% were Middle Eastern, 7% each were Asian and Black, and 0% were other persons of color.
WMC INVESTIGATION 2021: GENDER AND NON-ACTING OSCAR NOMINATIONS

Academy Award Nominations for all 18 Non-Acting Categories
- Women: 65, Men: 140
- Women: 32%, Men: 68%

Academy Award Nominations for Best Picture
- Women: 7, Men: 16
- Women: 30%, Men: 70%

Academy Award Nominations for Best Director
- Women: 2, Men: 3
- Women: 40%, Men: 60%

Academy Award Nominations for Cinematography
- Women: 0, Men: 5
- Women: 0%, Men: 100%

Academy Award Nominations for Film Editing
- Women: 1, Men: 4
- Women: 20%, Men: 80%

Academy Award Nominations for Writing (Original Screenplay)
- Women: 1, Men: 9
- Women: 10%, Men: 90%

Academy Award Nominations for Writing (Adapted Screenplay)
- Women: 2, Men: 10
- Women: 29%, Men: 71%

Academy Award Nominations for Documentary (Feature)
- Women: 7, Men: 6
- Women: 54%, Men: 46%

Academy Award Nominations for Documentary (Short Subject)
- Women: 4, Men: 6
- Women: 40%, Men: 60%

Source: Women's Media Center
2021 RACE & GENDER REPRESENTATION IN NON-ACTING OSCAR NOMINATIONS

Academy Award Nominations for Best Director

- 60% White (40% Men, 20% Women)
- 40% Asian (20% Men, 20% Women)
- 0% Black
- 0% Middle Eastern
- 0% Hispanic/Latino
- 0% Native American or Indigenous
- 0% Multiracial

Academy Award Nominations for Writing (Original Screenplay)

- 60% White (50% Men, 10% Women)
- 20% Black (20% Men, 0% Women)
- 10% Asian (10% Men, 0% Women)
- 10% Multiracial (10% Men, 0% Women)
- 0% Hispanic/Latino
- 0% Middle Eastern
- 0% Native American or Indigenous

Academy Award Nominations for Writing (Adapted Screenplay)

- 50% White (43% Men, 7% Women)
- 21% Unknown (14% Men, 7% Women)
- 14% Middle Eastern (7% Men, 7% Women)
- 7% Black (7% Men, 0% Women)
- 7% Asian (0% Men, 7% Women)
- 0% Hispanic/Latino
- 0% Native American or Indigenous
- 0% Multiracial

Source: Women's Media Center
Young females said film images shape self-perceptions, possibilities

A global report exploring how film characters influence girls’ and young women’s self-perceptions and their chances of becoming leaders concluded that comparatively few women were leaders depicted in 56 top films of 2018. Those leaders were depicted as smart but also were overly sexualized and objectified.

As was true of previous years’ films, male characters dominated in the 2018 films, which were screened in the United States and 19 other nations, according to “Rewrite Her Story: How film and media stereotypes affect the lives and leadership ambitions of girls and young women,” published in 2019 by the Geena Davis Institute on Media and Gender. It analyzed gender depictions in films and asked 10,000 young females their views on the characters. The report is the latest in a Davis institute series, begun in 2007, surveying how girls and young women relate to certain film and media images and how those images might shape their choices in education, career, and so forth.

These are among the quotes included in the report:

“When we see women playing secondary roles, young women can think it’s normal life to play a secondary role and lose ambition,” said a 23-year-old Senegalese woman.

“I guess media does have a lot of power over our thoughts and how we see the world. I think it plays a significant part in my life,” said an 18-year-old Canadian female.

In those 56 top-grossing films, researchers wrote, some women characters who were leaders at home or work or in their communities were “more intelligent and more effective than male leaders.” But the roles reversed as females climbed the leadership ladder: 57% of male national leaders versus 44% of female national leaders were shown as more effective than leaders of the opposite gender.

The report also found that:

- 42% of male characters versus 27% of female characters were shown on screen as leaders.
- 81% of female leaders versus 62% of male leaders were shown as intelligent.
- 30% of female versus 7% of male leaders wore revealing clothing.
- 15% of female versus 8% of male leaders were partially nude.
- 2% of female versus .5% of male leaders were naked.
- 15% of female versus 4% of male leaders were sexually objectified.
- 5% of female versus 1% of male leaders were sexually harassed.

In addition to females in the United States, Canada, and Senegal, the institute interviewed females residing in Benin, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, Honduras, Germany, India, Japan, Netherlands, Peru, Philippines, Sierra Leone, South Sudan, Sweden, Vietnam, Uganda, and Zimbabwe.

Amid Black Lives’ protests, Whiteness of movie executives spotlighted

A Los Angeles Times’ analysis of diversity in the C-suites of Hollywood movie studios cited progress but concluded, in a July 2020 news article published amid Black Lives Matter protests, that people of color were assuming key industry posts too slowly.

“Despite some improvements, senior leadership at major studios looks much like it did two decades ago,” said the Times, noting an “entrenched whiteness.”

Times writers probed the top ranks of six companies: Walt Disney Company, AT&T Inc.’s WarnerMedia, Comcast Corporation’s NBCUniversal, ViacomCBS, Sony Pictures, and Netflix.

At a time when 13% of the U.S. population was Black and 40% was a different non-White race or Latinx, comprising roughly 230 executives, division heads, and other senior leaders at those six companies didn’t reflect that diversity, the article said.
The Times determined that:

- 19% of the 230 executives and other leaders were of color.
- 10% of the 230 were Black.
- At WarnerMedia, 20% of U.S. employees ranked as vice president or higher were people of color; 34% of middle managers were non-Whites.
- 5 of Sony’s 25 corporate and divisions executives were of color; 4 of the 5 were Black.
- 0 Blacks were on Netflix’s 8-person senior leadership team; 9 of its 100 U.S. vice presidents were Black, up from 3 in 2017; and 30% of all 100 U.S. vice presidents were of color.
- 6 — or 21% — of ViacomCBS’s top senior managers and division heads were of color; 5 of the 6, including the president of Black Entertainment Television, were Black.
- 4 — 22% — of NBCUniversal’s 18 top executives and division chiefs were persons of color; 2 of the 4 were Black.
- 7% of Disney’s 90 executives were Black; 19% were persons of color.

**Majority-minority casts in entertainment TV grew, but still were a fraction of total**

Ratings and social media showed that audiences responded favorably to diversity in TV entertainment shows, but minorities remained underrepresented in traditional broadcast TV, cable TV, and online streaming services, and women were underrepresented in all except the latter category, according to a UCLA analysis.


The report found that 27.3% — a record high — of broadcast shows had casts comprised mainly of minorities in 2018-19, up from 2% in 2011-12. Of all those 2018-19 broadcast shows, 9.9% had casts where persons of color accounted for less than 11% of actors. That compared to 23.2% in 2011-12.

Of all 2018-19 cable shows, 25.2% had casts where persons of color accounted for less than 11% of actors; that was down from 37% in 2011-12. The share of cable shows with casts comprised mainly of minorities tripled to 23.6% in 2018-19 from 8.4% in 2011-12.

Of all 2018-19 online streaming shows, 22.9% had casts where persons of color accounted for less than 11% of actors, compared to 45.5% in 2012-13.

“It should not be surprising that an America that was 40.2% people of color (and growing) and more than half female in 2019 would prefer shows that included characters from these groups, and their stories, in meaningful ways,” researchers wrote. “But while Hollywood has made great strides in certain areas with respect to diversity, it has lagged in others, despite the growing evidence that diversity is essential for the industry’s bottom line.”

In the C-suite in 2020, across the three platforms, combined:

- 92% of CEOs/chairs were White.
- 84% of senior executives were White.
- 87% of unit heads were White.
- 68% of CEOs/chairs were male.
- 60% of senior executives were male.
- 54% of unit heads were male.
In 2018-19:

- Women were 41.3% and men 58.7% of lead actors in traditional broadcast network shows; the 2017-18 figures were 39.7% and 60.3%, respectively.
- Women were 44.8% and men 55.2% of leads in cable shows; the 2017-18 figures were 41.6% and 58.4%, respectively.
- Women were 49.4% and men 50.6% of leads online; the 2017-18 figures were 45% and 55%, respectively.
- Women were 28.1% and men 71.9% of creators of broadcast TV shows; the 2017-18 figures were 21.9% and 78.2%, respectively.
- Women were 22.4% and men 77.6% of cable creators; the 2017-18 figures were 22.9% and 77.1%, respectively.
- Women were 28.6% and men 71.4% of online creators; the 2017-18 figures were 29.1% and 70.9%, respectively.
- Women were 29.3% of 2018-19 broadcast TV show directors. (The analysis did not provide 2017-18 data for directors, writers, and network heads in any of the three categories.)
- Women were 29.7% of cable directors.
- Women were 39.4% of credited broadcast writers.
- Women were 40.9% of credited cable writers.
- Women were 42.4% of credited online writers.
- Women were 32% of broadcast network TV heads.

In 2018-19, by race:

- 76% of lead actors were White, down from 80.2% in 2017-18.
- 24% of lead actors in broadcast were people of color, up from 19.8% in 2017-18.
- Of 2018-19’s lead actors, 11.6% were Black, 6.6% were Latinx, 3.3% were multiracial, 1.7% were Asian, and .8% were Middle Eastern or North African.
- 65% of leads in cable shows were White, down from 72.5% in 2017-18.
- 35% of 2018-19’s leads in cable were of color, up from 27.5% in 2017-18.
- Of 2018-19’s lead actors in cable, 14.1% were Black, 11.7% were multiracial, 5.5% were Latinx, 3.1% were Asian, and .6% were Middle Eastern or North African.
- 75.9% of lead actors in online shows were White, down from 80.5% in 2017-18.
- 24.1% of leads online were of color, up from 19.5% in 2017-18.
- Of 2018-19’s lead actors online, 8.8% were multiracial, 5.9% were Latinx, 4.7% were Black, 2.9% were Middle Eastern or North African, and 1.8% were Asian.
- 85.4% of show creators in broadcast TV were White, down from 89.4% in 2017-18.
- 10.7% of creators in broadcast were of color, up from 9.2% in 2017-18.
- 85.5% of show creators in cable were White, down from 89.4% in 2017-18.
- 14.5% of 2018-19’s cable creators were persons of color, up from 10.6% in 2017-18.
- 89.7% of online creators were White, down from 92.9% in 2017-18.
- 10.3% of online creators were persons of color, up from 7.1% in 2017-18.
- Persons of color were 24.3% of broadcast directors. (The analysis did not break down prior-year racial data for directors, writers, and network heads.)
- Persons of color were 22.9% of cable directors.
- Persons of color were 18.2% of online directors.
- Persons of color were 23.3% of credited broadcast writers.
- Persons of color were 25.8% of credited cable writers.
- Persons of color were 22.7% of credited online writers.
- Persons of color were 8% of network heads.
Minority Cast Share, by Share of Broadcast Scripted Shows, 2011–12 to 2018–19 Seasons
(n=99, 107, 121, 123, 112, 116, 121, 121)

Minority Cast Share, by Share of Cable Scripted Shows, 2011–12 to 2018–19 Seasons
(n=152, 167, 177, 202, 183, 188, 178, 163)

Source: UCLA College of Science
(n=11, 34, 54, 116, 208, 149, 170)

Leads by Race, Broadcast Scripted, 2011–12, 2018–19 Seasons
(n=99, 107, 122, 123, 112, 116, 121, 121)

Leads by Gender, Broadcast Scripted, 2011–12, 2018–19 Seasons
(n=99, 107, 122, 123, 112, 116, 121, 121)

Source: UCLA College of Science
Almost 10% of network shows’ regular characters were LGBTQ

Of 773 characters appearing regularly on traditional broadcast prime-time television shows in 2020-21, 9.1% — or 70 — were lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or queer. That was a decrease from the previous year’s record high of 10.2%, according to GLAAD’s Where We are in TV 2020-21 report.

That decline marked the first decrease in that category since GLAAD’s 2013-14 report, researchers wrote, though they expected the latest drop, given that the Covid-19 pandemic also disrupted Hollywood.

Lesbians were 34% of regular and recurring characters on 2020-21 broadcast shows, which was up from 33% in 2019-20. Bisexual+ characters, proportionately, fell to 18% from 25% during the same period.

Prime-time cable shows of 2020-21 had 81 regular LGBTQ characters, which compared to 121 in 2019-20. Cable series’ counts of recurring LGBTQ characters were 37 in 2020-21 and 94 in 2019-20.

On original series that streamed online, there were 95 regular and 46 recurring LGBTQ characters in 2020-21. In 2019-20, the respective figures were 109 and 44.

The racial diversity of LGBTQ characters on all platforms increased, year over year. But Whites comprised the bulk of LGBTQ characters, representing 48% of all broadcast, 46% of cable, and 51% of streaming series characters. In 2019-20, the respective figures for Whites were 48%, 51%, and 55%.

“LGBTQ people are a significant audience,” GLAAD President & CEO Sarah Kate Ellis wrote in the report. “GLAAD and The Harris Poll’s ‘Accelerating Acceptance’ report shows that 20% of Americans aged 18 to 34 — a significant audience demo to networks and advertisers — identify as LGBTQ. The General Social Survey from NORC at the University of Chicago reports that 23% of Black women in America 18-34 identify as bisexual, and the University's GenForward survey reports that 1 in 5 Latinx Millennials are LGBTQ.”

This 16th yearly analysis by GLAAD also found that, on traditional broadcast TV prime-time series in 2020-21:

- The number of recurring LGBTQ characters rose to 31 in 2020-21, bringing the total of all LGBTQ characters to 101. The latter total was down from the previous season’s combined total of 120 regular and recurring characters.
- Gay men comprised 40% of all regular and recurring LGBTQ characters, up from 38% in 2019-20.
- 18% of all characters were bisexual, down from 25% in 2019-20.
- Of the recurring bisexual+ characters, 13 were women, and 5 were men.
- Of transgender characters, 6 were women, and 4 were men. In 2019-20, 2 of 7 trans characters were women, 4 were men, and 1 was non-binary.
- 3.5% of the 773 regular characters were disabled, slightly up from 3.1% the previous season.
- 46% of the 773 regular characters were women, the same as in 2019-20.
- 46% of the 773 regular characters were persons of color, down from 47% in 2019-20.
On 2020-21 prime-time cable shows:

- The tally of regular LGBTQ characters dropped to 81 from 121 in 2019-20.
- The tally of recurring LGBTQ characters dropped to 37 from 94 the previous year.
- Gay men accounted for 36% of all LGBTQ regular and recurring cable characters, up from 34% in 2019-20.
- Lesbians accounted for 26% of all regular and recurring LGBTQ regular and recurring cable characters, up from 22% in 2019-20.
- Bisexual+ women accounted for 21% of all regular and recurring LGBTQ characters, down from 22% in 2019-20.
- Bisexual+ men were 9% of all regular and recurring LGBTQ characters, up from 6% in 2019-20.
- Transgender characters represented 8.5% of all regular and recurring characters, down from 9.3% in 2019-20.
- Of transgender characters in 2020-21, 5 were women, 3 were men, and 2 were non-binary. In 2019-20, 14 of 20 trans characters were women, 4 were men and 2 were non-binary.
- 14% of the 2020-21 season’s 118 LGBTQ regular and recurring characters weren’t expected to return for the 2021-22 season because of show cancellations, finales, or characters written off.

Of the 141 regular and recurring LGBTQ characters on Amazon, Hulu, and Netflix in 2020-21:

- 95 had regular and 46 had recurring roles, compared to 109 regular and 44 recurring characters in 2019-20.
- Gay men accounted for 36% of all characters, up from 30% in 2019-20.
- Lesbians accounted for 28% of all characters, up from 26% in 2019-20.
- Bisexual+ women accounted for 19% of all characters, up from 14% in 2019-20.
- Bisexual+ men were 12% of all characters, up from 9% in 2019-20.
- 28% of all characters were bisexual+, up from 26% in 2019-20.

Across all three platforms in 2020-21:

- 65 of the bisexual+ characters were women, 33 were men, and 1 was non-binary.
- Of all transgender characters, 15 of the 29 were women, 12 were men, and 2 were non-binary.
- Trans actors played or voiced 26 of those 29 characters.
By race, of LGBTQ characters in 2020-21:

- Whites were 48%, Blacks 23%, Asians 11%, Latinx persons 10%, multiracial persons 7%, and persons of some other race were 2% of all characters on traditional broadcast network shows.
- Whites were 46%, Blacks 30%, Latinx persons 7%, multiracial persons 7%, Asians/Pacific Islanders were 5%, and persons of some other race were 3% of all characters on cable shows.
- Whites were 51%, Latinx persons 19%, Blacks 13%, Asians/Pacific Islanders 8%, persons of some other race were 6%, and multiracial persons were 2% of all characters on streaming shows.
Women, 52% of the population, had 38% of screen time on 300 TV shows

Though 92% of 300 analyzed news and entertainment shows on traditional broadcast, cable and subscription-based streaming networks had recurring casts that were diverse, people of color and women were underrepresented in those 2019 airings.

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer characters, as a group, appeared in larger percentages than they were counted in the actual U.S. population.

In 2019 women were 52% of the nation’s population, but they garnered 37.9% of screen time for the top 10 recurring characters in shows across the three platforms, according to Nielsen’s “Being Seen on Screen: Diverse Representation and Inclusion on TV” report, released in December 2020.

Subscription shows were most reflective of the nation’s gender makeup, with women receiving 49% of screen time. Traditional network shows were least reflective of the nation’s gender: Women received only 33% of screen time.

People of color — Black, Latinx, Asian, Native American, and Middle Eastern — comprised 41% of the U.S. population. Yet, as characters, they garnered only 26.7% of screen time, researchers wrote. LGBTQ characters received 6.7% of screen time and were 4.5% of the U.S. population.
The casts of shows on subscription streaming services, overall, were more reflective of the U.S. population, Nielsen concluded. Of all the shows, 8% of those on streaming, 7% of those on cable, and 5% of those on traditional TV networks reflected the racial makeup of the country.

Also, on traditional TV networks:

- 66.9% of screen time was devoted to male characters.
- 33.1% to women characters.
- 5% to LGBTQ characters.
- 64.2% to non-Latinx White characters.
- 24.7% to Black characters, while Black people were roughly 13.4% of the U.S. population.
- 9.1% to South/Southeast Asian characters.
- 5.1% to Latinx characters. (White, Black, Brown, and mixed-race Latinx persons were 18% of the U.S. population.)
- 2.5% to East Asian characters. (East Asians, South Asians, and Southeast Asians — groups that the U.S. Census lists together as Asian — were 5.6% of the U.S. population.)
- 1.7% went to Middle Eastern and North African characters. Middle Eastern and North African people have complained that not having their own U.S. Census category forces many of them to check the “White” box.
- .3% of screen time went to Native American characters, a group that is 1.6% of the U.S. population.

On Cable shows:

- 62.2% of screen time went to men.
- 37.8% went to women.
- 7.5% to LGBTQ.
- 88.7% to non-Latinx Whites.
- 7% to Blacks.
- 3% to Latinx.
- 1.6% to Middle Easterners and North Africans.
- 1% to East Asians.
- .3% to South/Southeast Asians.
- .1% to Native Americans.

On subscription streaming services:

- 51.1% of screen time went to men.
- 48.9% went to women.
- 8.3% to LGBTQ.
- 64.7% to non-Latinx Whites.
- 18.9% to Blacks.
- 10.1% to Latinx.
- 3.3% to East Asians.
- 2.1% to South/Southeast Asians.
- 1.9% to Middle Easterners and North Africans.
- .8% to Native Americans.
Among the study’s additional findings were these:

- 82% of Asians subscribe to a streaming service, and Asians were 28% more likely to watch alternative content.
- Afro-Latinx, who are .9% of the U.S. population, received .3% of screen time on traditional network shows, 1.1% on subscription streaming shows, and 1.8% of cable shows.
- Asian and Pacific Islander women, who are 3.3% of the U.S. population, received 1.2% of screen time on cable shows, 2.2% of traditional network shows, and 2.7% of subscription stream shows.
- Black women, who are 7.4% of the U.S. population, received 2.5% of screen time on cable shows, 6.8% of traditional network shows, and 7.4% of subscription streaming shows. (Black men had significantly more screen time than Black women.)
- Native American women, who make up .8% of the population, received 0% screen time on cable shows, .2% on traditional network shows, and .4% on subscription streaming shows.

### Share of Screen by Platform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Broadcast</th>
<th>Cable</th>
<th>SVOD</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>62.2%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.1%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*White = White non-Hispanic or White non-multipathic

### Gender equality for streaming protagonists; disparity on cable, broadcast

Equal proportions — 42% each — of women and men were sole protagonists on streaming entertainment shows during 2019-20. In the remaining 16% of streaming shows, ensembles headed the cast, according to the Center for the Study of Women in Television & Film’s “Boxed In 2019-20: Women On Screen and Behind the Scenes in Television.”

By comparison, women were the sole protagonists in 27% of cable entertainment shows and 24% of traditional broadcast network shows during the same season, according to researchers at the San Diego State University-based center.

Behind-the-scenes, 63% of programs employed five or fewer women. By comparison, 16% of programs employed five or fewer men. The report examined 4,100 characters and 4,200 behind-the-scenes credits on drama, comedy, and reality programs appearing on the traditional broadcast networks, basic, and premium cable channels and on streaming services from September 2019 through May 2020.
The report also found, across entertainment streaming, cable, and traditional network shows, women comprised:

- 31%, overall, of key behind-the-scenes employees, the same as in 2018-19.
- 42% of producers, up from 41% in 2018-19.
- 41% of writers, up from 35%.
- 35% of executive producers, up from 30%.
- 33% of creators, up from 29%.
- 32% of directors, up from 15%.
- 27% of editors, up from 21%.
- 17% of directors of photography, up from 3%.

When women were showrunners:

- On programs with at least 1 woman creator, women accounted for 69% of writers.
- On programs with only male creators, 20% of writers were women.
- On programs with at least 1 woman executive producer, women accounted for 39% of writers.
- On programs with only male executive producers, women accounted for 12% of writers.

No women were:

- Directors of photography in 94% of the analyzed programs.
- Editors in 81% of programs.
- Directors in 76% of programs.
- Creators in 73% of programs.

On-screen in 2019-20, across all three platforms, female characters accounted for:

- 43% of all speaking characters, down from 45% in 2018-19.
- 45% of major characters, the same as in 2019-20.
- 29% of clearly identifiable sole female protagonists. That compared to 37% of male protagonists and 33% of ensemble protagonists.

By race, in 2019-20, of female characters, across all three platforms:

- 66% were White, down from 70% in 2018-19.
- 20% were Black, up from 17%.
- 8% were Asian, up from 7%.
- 5% were Latina, down from 6%.
- 1% were of some other race during both years.
By age, occupation, and other markers, across platforms in 2019-20:

- 58% of female characters were in their 20s and 30s.
- 53% of male characters were in their 30s and 40s.
- 65% of female characters and 75% of male characters had identifiable occupations.
- 47% of females and 57% of males were seen in their work environment, actually working.
- 52% of females and 38% of males were seen playing personal-life roles, such as wife and mother.
- 42% of females and 56% of males were seen playing work-oriented roles.

Female leads fell in children’s TV; female screen, speaking time at its highest

Female leads in children’s television episodes declined to 45% of all leads in 2019, down from 52% in 2018. The study, “See Jane 2020 in TV: Historic screen and speaking time for female characters” also found that females garnered 58.7% of screen time and 58.8% of speaking time in kids’ television shows, the highest rate since the Geena Davis Institute on Gender in Media began its research in 2004.

This latest “See Jane,” conducted with the University of Southern California Viterbi School of Engineering, analyzed the gender, race, sexual identity, disability, age, and body size of 4,631 characters in the top 25 most-watched, Nielsen-rated, live-action and animated shows of 2019 for 2- to 6-year-olds and the 25 most-watched shows for 7- to 13-year-olds. Those characters represented a total of 621 leads/co-leads, 2,619 supporting characters, and 1,391 minor characters.

Additional key findings, by gender:

- Female characters were 3 times more likely than male characters to be shown in revealing clothing: 6% versus 2.2%.
- Female characters were 3 times more likely than male characters to be partially nude: 3.3% versus 1%.
- Male characters were more likely than female characters to be shown as violent: 16.2% versus 12.8%.
- Male characters were twice as likely as female characters to be depicted as criminal: 6% versus 3.2%.
- Male characters were more likely than female characters to be shown as doctors, lawyers, and other professionals: 16.8% versus 12.3%.
- Female characters were more likely than male characters to be shown in service jobs: 25.8% versus 21.2%.
- By 2-to-1, males outnumbered females in science, tech, engineering, and math (STEM) positions: 70.2% versus 29.8%.
- Roughly two-thirds — or 62.6% — of children’s TV episodes passed the Bechdel-Wallace Test of how well females are represented in entertainment TV and film.

By race/ethnicity:

- People of color constituted 31.9% of leads in children’s television in 2019, up from 26.1% in 2018.
- Characters of color were more likely than Whites to be shown as violent: 16.1% versus 13.8%.
- Characters of color were more likely than Whites to be shown as leaders: 38.4% versus 34.7%.
By sexual identity:
- Fewer than 1% of all characters in the top children’s TV shows were lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, or otherwise non-heterosexual.
- 3.3% of children’s TV episodes passed the Vito-Russo test of how adequately LGBTQ+ characters were represented.

By disability:
- 8% of all characters in the top children’s TV shows had a physical, communication, or cognitive disability, though people with disabilities were 19% of the U.S. population.
- 7.1% of characters with disabilities were shown as “The Super Crip” trope of a person who overcame disability.
- Characters without disabilities were somewhat more likely than characters with disabilities to be depicted as having a job: 90.1% versus 85.7%. They also were more likely to be shown in formal management positions: 3.5% versus 0%.
- Characters without disabilities were over 3 three times more likely than characters with disabilities to be shown as smart: 24% versus 7.1%.
- Characters with disabilities were 4 times more likely than characters without disabilities to be depicted as worse-than-average-looking: 46.4% versus 11.7%.

By age, 50 plus:
- People older than 50 comprised 9.5% of all characters and 1% of leading characters, though they comprise roughly 34% of the U.S. population.
- Characters aged 50 years and older were 3 times more likely than those younger than 50 to be shown as worse-than-average-looking: 32.6% versus 10.7%.
- Characters 50 and older were more likely than characters younger than 50 to be shown as leaders: 48.6% versus 33.7%.

By body size:
- People with large body types were 11.3% of all characters and 5.9% of leading characters, but made up 39.8% of the U.S. population.
- Characters with large body types often were stereotypically depicted as clumsy (12.9%), a “loser” (7.5%), or poorly dressed (7.8%).
- Characters with large body types were more likely than those with small/medium body types to be shown as worse-than-average-looking or repulsive: 42.3% versus 9.9%.
- Characters with large body types were almost twice as likely as those with small/medium body types to be depicted as stupid: 12.5% versus 6.5%.
- 36.3% of children’s TV episodes passed the Geena Davis Institute’s Cooper Test that measures how well represented people with large body types are.
GENDER

IN 2019 45% OF CHILDREN’S TV EPISODES HAVE A FEMALE LEAD

FEMALE CHARACTERS ACCOUNT FOR

58.7% OF SCREEN TIME
58.8% OF SPEAKING TIME

MALE CHARACTERS ARE MORE LIKELY TO BE IN

PROFESSIONAL POSITIONS

16.8% MALE
12.3% FEMALE

MALE CHARACTERS ARE MORE LIKELY TO BE SHOWN AS

VIOLENT & CRIMINAL
18.2% COMPARED WITH 12.8%
6.0% COMPARED WITH 3.2%

FEMALE CHARACTERS ARE 3X MORE LIKELY TO BE SHOWN

IN REVEALING CLOTHING & PARTIALLY NUDE
6.0% COMPARED WITH 2.2%
8.3% COMPARED WITH 1.3%

FEMALE CHARACTERS ARE MORE LIKELY TO BE IN

SERVICE POSITIONS

25.8% FEMALE
21.2% MALE

MALE CHARACTERS OUTNUMBER FEMALE CHARACTERS TWO-TO-ONE IN STEM PROFESSIONS
70.2% COMPARED WITH 29.8%

BECHDEL WALLACE TEST

62.6% OF CHILDREN’S TV EPISODES HAVE POSITIVE REPRESENTATION OF FEMALE CHARACTERS

Source: Geena Davis Institute on Gender in Media
RACE/ETHNICITY

People of color are 38% of the US population. But only 31.9% of children’s TV episodes have a lead of color.

Characters of color are more likely to be shown as violent (18.1% compared with 13.8%).

Characters of color are more likely to be shown as leaders (38.4% compared with 34.2%).

LGBTQ+

LGBTQ+ people are 4.5% of the US population. But only >1% of characters in children’s television are LGBTQ+.

3.3% of children’s TV episodes have positive representation of LGBTQ+ people.

Source: Geena Davis Institute on Gender in Media
DISABILITY

People with disabilities are 19% of the US population. But only 0.8% of characters in children’s TV have a disability.

Characters with disabilities are less likely to be shown having a job. 85.7% compared with 90.3%.

Characters with disabilities are 4x more likely to be shown as worse than average looking. 46.6% compared with 11.2%.

7.1% of characters with disabilities are shown as “the super crip” trope.

Characters with disabilities are 3x less likely to be shown as smart. 7% compared with 24.0%.

AGE (50+)

People over 50 are 34% of the US population. But only 9.5% of characters in children’s TV are older than 50.

Source: Geena Davis Institute on Gender in Media
BODY SIZE

PEOPLE WITH LARGE BODY TYPES ARE 39.8% OF THE US POPULATION

BUT ONLY 11.3% OF CHARACTERS IN CHILDREN’S TV HAVE A LARGE BODY TYPE

A SIZEABLE NUMBER OF CHARACTERS WITH LARGE BODY TYPES ARE PRESENTED AS

CLUMSY (12.9%)  A “LOSER” (7.5%)  POORLY DRESSED (7.8%)

CHARACTERS WITH LARGE BODY TYPES ARE 4X MORE LIKELY TO BE SHOWN AS WORSE THAN AVERAGE LOOKING

42.3% COMPARED WITH 9.9%

CHARACTERS WITH LARGE BODY TYPES ARE 2X MORE LIKELY TO BE SHOWN AS STUPID

12.5% COMPARED WITH 6.5%

36.3% OF CHILDREN’S TV EPISODES HAVE POSITIVE REPRESENTATION OF CHARACTERS WITH LARGE BODY TYPES

Source: Geena Davis Institute on Gender in Media
Top kid shows’ male characters likelier to be violent, lack empathy, etc.

Overly aggressive. Uncaring. Hands-off when it came to parenting. These were among the predominant traits of male characters in the top 25 U.S. shows most watched by 7- to 13-year-old boys, according to a report co-conducted by the Geena Davis Institute in Gender in Media. But the report also lauded those shows for having roughly the same numbers of female and male characters.

The study “If He Can See It, Will He Be It?” released in June 2020, analyzed 3,056 characters from 447 episodes of Nielsen-rated top shows from 2018. The joint research was done with Promundo, an international organization promoting healthy masculinity and gender equality, Kerig Foundation, and the University of Southern California’s Viterbi School of Engineering.

These were among the study’s key findings about those top shows’ characters:

- Male characters committed 62.5% of violent acts against another person.
- 23.1% of male characters and 13.6% of female characters were likely to be victims of violence.
- 22.5% of male characters and 30.6% of female characters displayed empathy.
- 68.3% of male characters and 75.2% of female characters projected happiness.
- 28.8% of male characters and 36.6% of female characters projected anger.
- 20% of male characters and 14% of female characters engaged in risky behavior.
- 4.5% of male characters and 7.7 of female characters engaged in hands-on parenting.
- 3.9% of male characters and 7.5% of female characters were very competent parents.
- 57% of boys and 42.8% of girls were shown without parents.
- 3.8% of boys and 6.4% of girls were in close relationship with their mothers.
- Overall, 50.4% of leading characters were male, and 49.6% were female.
- Overall, 55.5% of characters were male, 44.5% were female.
- 36% of leading characters were of color, while 38% of the U.S. population were people of color.
- Female characters accounted for 68% of speaking time among all characters.
- Female characters garnered 57.2% of screen time among all characters.
- 1.5% of characters overall had a disability.
- .4% of leading characters were lesbian, gay, bisexual, transsexual, or otherwise not heterosexual.
- Females, persons of color, those with disabilities, or who were non-heterosexual were underrepresented in supporting and minor roles.
- No LGBTQIA+ leading characters were in the most popular boys’ television shows.
White-written crime dramas fueled race, gender, criminal justice myths

TV crime dramas were guilty of “advancing distorted representations of crime, justice, race, and gender,” largely because those show’s writers were overwhelming White and male, and heavily reliant on outside law enforcement and court consultants who looked like them, according to Color of Change.

It found that 37% of crime series writers were women and 11% were women of color.

The writing teams were entirely White, for example, on five of 19 series that researchers analyzed. Nine series had no Black writers, according to “Normalizing Injustice: The Dangerous Misconceptions That Define Television’s Scripted Crime Genre.” Only five of the 26 studied series — “Criminal Minds,” “Shades of Blue,” “Orange is the New Black,” “Seven Seconds,” and “Luke Cage” — had showrunners who were not White men, according to the report released in January 2020.

“Viewers will change the channel if we make the crime victim Black, so you’ll have to rewrite those characters and make them white instead.” That is an order we know some writers have been instructed to follow by showrunners, producers, and network executives,” wrote Rashad Robinson, Color of Change’s president. “It is one of many deeply disturbing stories we have heard while looking at what goes on behind the scenes of one of television’s most popular genres — scripted crime and legal series.”

The study is the result of a collaboration between Color of Change, a civil rights advocacy organization, and USC Annenberg Norman Lear Center’s Media Impact Project. Researchers reviewed 26 different scripted crime series from the 2017-18 season that were aired by traditional TV networks and online streaming platforms, depicting a total of 1,983 characters. It also reviewed the race and gender of show creators, showrunners, and writers on 19 of those series that continued airing during 2018-19 season.

The study faulted Hollywood for feeding stereotypes of who cycles through the justice system and why, and for failing to convey a more nuanced message to tens of millions of crime-show fans, at a time when criminal justice reform is a much discussed topic nationwide.

Of the 275 writers, 27 showrunners, and 42 creators with credits for the 26 series 2017-2018 season, researchers wrote that:

- 81% of showrunners were White men.
- 5 shows (“Criminal Minds,” “Shades of Blue,” “Orange is the New Black,” “Seven Seconds,” and “Luke Cage”) had non-White showrunners.
- At least 78% of writers were White, and 9% were Black.
- 20 of 26 series had either no Black writers or just 1 Black writer.
- 3 series (“NCIS,” “Blue Bloods,” and “Mindhunter”) had only White writers.
- 5 series (“The Blacklist,” “Law & Order: Special Victims Unit,” “Blindspot,” “9-1-1,” and “Criminal Minds”) had or likely had writing teams that were 90% White.
- 18 series had writing teams that were at least 80% White.
- Only 2 series (“Seven Seconds” and “Luke Cage”) had writing teams that were 50% White and 50% persons of color.
- Black women were rarely portrayed as victims. They were depicted as victims in 9% of all crimes and 6% of primary crimes. There was a 35% likelihood that White men would be victims of primary crimes; the respective figures were 28% for White women, 22% for all men of color, and 13% for all women of color.
- Only 5 series had writing teams that were 50% female or had more women writers than men writers. (“Orange is the New Black,” “Bull,” “Mindhunter,” “How to Get Away with Murder,” and “Criminal Minds.”)
100% of writers were White, and 80% were male on “NCIS.”
100% of writers were White, and 75% were male on “Blue Bloods.”
82% of writers were White, and 82% were male on “NCIS: Los Angeles.”
80% of writers were White, and 80% were male on “Elementary.”
93% of writers were White, and 80% were male on “The Blacklist.”
93% to 100% of writers were White, and 57% were male on NBC’s “Law & Order: Special Victims Unit.”
92% of writers were White, and 58% were male on “Blindspot.”
80% to 90% of writers were White, and 60% were male on “Chicago P.D.”

On the 19 series continuing into the 2018–19 season:

- 84% of the writers were White.
- 5 series had only White writers: “The Blacklist,” “Law & Order: Special Victims Unit,” “Blindspot,” “NCIS,” and “Blue Bloods.”
- Only 4 series had writing teams that were 80% or less White.
- 5 series had or likely had writing teams that were 90% to 92% White. (“Bull,” “Criminal Minds,” “NCIS: Los Angeles,” “Chicago P.D.,” and “Brooklyn Nine-Nine.”)
- All but one series (“S.W.A.T.”) had 15% or fewer writers who were Black.

Gauging the link between characters of color in crime shows and writers of color on crime shows, the study found that:

- Netflix’s “Narcos” had the worst Racial Integrity Index score, with an average of 11.5 depictions of featured characters of color per episode and a writing team that was 80% White.
- Following “Narcos” on the list of the worst-ranked were Fox’s “9-1-1,” NBC’s “Chicago P.D.,” CBS’s “Hawaii Five-0,” CBS’s “Criminal Minds,” NBC’s “The Blacklist,” and CBS’s “NCIS.”

The report’s recommendations included having all series reviewed and, as needed, rewritten to reflect the precise realities of who commits crime and who are crime victims as well as hiring a diversity of writers with a true understanding of the criminal justice system and who’s in it.
## Racial Integrity Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network</th>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Racial Integrity Index Score</th>
<th>Avg # of POC Char. Per Episode</th>
<th>Total # of Writers (2017-18)</th>
<th>% White Writers</th>
<th>% Black Writers</th>
<th>% Total POC Writers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Netflix</td>
<td>Narcos</td>
<td>-110</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox</td>
<td>9-1-1</td>
<td>-75</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC</td>
<td>Chicago P.D.</td>
<td>-69</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>80-90%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>Hawaii Five-0</td>
<td>-60</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>75-83%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>Criminal Minds</td>
<td>-58</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC</td>
<td>The Blacklist</td>
<td>-57</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>NCIS</td>
<td>-56</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazon</td>
<td>Bosch</td>
<td>-54</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>Bull</td>
<td>-53</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>-52</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>NCIS: New Orleans</td>
<td>-49</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox</td>
<td>Brooklyn Nine-Nine</td>
<td>-48</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox</td>
<td>Lethal Weapon</td>
<td>-45</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Color of Change
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network</th>
<th>Series</th>
<th>Racial Integrity Index Score</th>
<th>AVG # of POC Char. Per Episode</th>
<th>Total # of Writers (2017-18)</th>
<th>% White Writers</th>
<th>% Black Writers</th>
<th>% Total POC Writers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>BLUE BLOODS</td>
<td>-44</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>NCIS: LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>-44</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>S.W.A.T.</td>
<td>-43</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50-58%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazon</td>
<td>GOLIATH</td>
<td>-41</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>86-100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC</td>
<td>LAW &amp; ORDER: SVU</td>
<td>-37</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>93-100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC</td>
<td>BLINDSPOT</td>
<td>-36</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netflix</td>
<td>ORANGE IS THE NEW BLACK</td>
<td>-26</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazon</td>
<td>SNEAKY PETE</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50-75%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Color of Change
Gender parity but no race parity in Netflix original films, series

On Netflix, in 2018-19, 48.4% of live-action films and 54.5% of series had female leads or co-leads, a University of Southern California Annenberg Inclusion Initiative study concluded.

The study examined 126 live-action films and 180 series. In 2019, 40% of all leads and co-leads were women of color, an increase from 31.9% in 2018.

Also, in 2019, 38.9% of Netflix films and 38.4% of Netflix series had casts reflecting the nation’s racial makeup; that compared to 35.5% and 33.1%, respectively in 2018. People of color had 40.2% of speaking parts in Netflix series and 32% of Netflix films, compared to 37.9% and 35.2%, respectively, in 2018.

Source: USC Annenberg Inclusion Initiative
During both years, females of color and White women, combined, accounted for 47.2% of all speaking and non-speaking film characters and 39.9% of all series characters. Characters with disabilities or who were lesbian, gay, bisexual, transsexual, or queer were rare.

“…[T]his report provides an acknowledgment of where Netflix has made progress toward inclusion — for women on screen and behind the scenes, for Black casts and creatives, and for women of color in leading and main cast roles,” these researchers wrote. “This study also points to where accelerated change is necessary, particularly for specific racial/ethnic groups, the LGBTQ community, and people with disabilities.”

Among other key findings, of lead/co-leads:

- White males accounted for 42.1% of characters in Netflix films, compared to 35% of characters in top-grossing industry films.
- Males of color, respectively, accounted for 19% and 17%.
- White females accounted for 30.2% of Netflix film characters and 28.5% of characters in top-grossing industry films.
- Women of color, respectively, accounted for 19% and 12%.

Regarding female characters of color, of the studied films:

- 97.6% had 0 Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander female characters.
- 96.8% had 0 American Indian/Alaska Native female characters.
- 88.9% had 0 Middle Eastern/North African females.
- 72.2% had 0 Latina characters.
- 56.3% had 0 Asian female characters.
- 55.6% had 0 multiracial female characters.
- 31.7% had 0 Black female characters.
- 4.8% had 0 White female characters.

Regarding female characters of color, of the studied series:

- 96.7% had 0 American Indian/Native American female characters.
- 96.1% had 0 Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander female characters.
- 88.9% had 0 Middle Eastern/North African females.
- 65.6% had 0 Latinas.
- 42.2% had 0 Asian females.
- 38.3% had 0 multiracial females.
- 27.2% had 0 Black females.
- 4.4% had 0 White female characters.

Of key behind-the-scenes players, persons of color accounted for:

- 16.9% of Netflix directors and, by comparison, 20.5% of non-Netflix top-grossing film directors.
- 16.4% of Netflix writers and 12.2% of top-grossing film directors.
- 13% of Netflix producers and 15.1% of top-grossing film producers.

Of key behind-the-scenes players in film, women accounted for:

- 29% of Netflix producers, compared to 19% of producers in non-Netflix top-grossing films.
- 25.2% of Netflix writers, compared to 16.7% of non-Netflix writers.
- 23.1% of Netflix directors, compared to 7.6% of non-Netflix directors.

Of key behind-the-scenes players in series, women accounted for:

- 36.7% of Netflix producers, compared to 40% of non-Netflix top-grossing films.
- 36.4% of Netflix writers, compared to 30% in top-grossing films.
- 29.8% of Netflix creators, compared to 23.5% in top-grossing films.
- 27.7% of Netflix directors, compared to 28% in top-grossing films.
Among behind-the-scenes players, females of color accounted for:

- 6.2% of Netflix film directors and 2.2% of the industry’s top film directors.
- 5.9% of Netflix series directors and 7.1% of industry-wide series directors.

#2 INCLUSION IS UNDERCUT BY IMBALANCE & INVISIBILITY

Percentage of Netflix films & series that met or exceeded proportional gender representation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FILM</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERIES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 films met &amp; exceeded proportional representation</td>
<td>11 films met &amp; exceeded proportional representation</td>
<td>15 series met &amp; exceeded proportional representation</td>
<td>21 series met &amp; exceeded proportional representation</td>
<td>61 stories met &amp; exceeded proportional representation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STORIES ERASING GIRLS AND WOMEN FROM EACH RACIAL/ETHNIC GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Latina</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>AI/AN</th>
<th>NH/PI</th>
<th>MENA</th>
<th>Multi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER OF FILMS MISSING GIRLS/WOMEN FROM EACH GROUP</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>72.2%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>96.8%</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUMBER OF SERIES MISSING GIRLS/WOMEN FROM EACH GROUP</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>96.7%</td>
<td>96.1%</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AI/AN=American Indian/Alaskan Native; NH/PI=Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander; MENA=Middle Eastern/North African; Multi=Multiracial/Multiracial

Source: USC Annenberg Inclusion Initiative
Women in key creative positions working across Netflix and top-grossing films, 2018-19

**DIRECTORS**
- Netflix Films: 25.2%
- Top-Grossing Films: 16.7%

**WRITERS**
- Netflix Films: 29%
- Top-Grossing Films: 19%

**PRODUCERS**
- Netflix Films: 23.1%
- Top-Grossing Films: 7.6%

**WOMEN IN KEY CREATIVE POSITIONS ACROSS NETFLIX AND ALL SERIES, 2018-2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Netflix</th>
<th>Industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netflix</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRODUCERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netflix</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRITERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netflix</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRECTORS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netflix</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDUSTRY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Series with at least one woman creator featured more girls and women as leads/co leads, main cast, and speaking characters than series without any women creators.

**WOMEN OF COLOR DIRECTORS OF NETFLIX AND INDUSTRY FILMS & SERIES, 2018-19**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Netflix</th>
<th>Top Films</th>
<th>Industry-Wide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FILM</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SERIES</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: USC Annenberg Inclusion Initiative
### #4 Women of Color Lead Netflix Movies More Than Top Films

Leads/co leads across Netflix films, 2018-2019

- **White Males:**
  - Netflix Films: 35% 
  - Top-Grossing Films: 28.5%
- **White Females:**
  - Netflix Films: 42.1% 
  - Top-Grossing Films: 30.2%
- **UR Males:**
  - Netflix Films: 19% 
  - Top-Grossing Films: 17%
- **UR Females:**
  - Netflix Films: 19% 
  - Top-Grossing Films: 12%

Note: columns do not total to 100% due to ensemble casts and films with multiple lead roles.

### #5 Racial/Ethnic Representation Rises in Netflix Content

Underrepresented main cast across Netflix films & series, 2018-19

- **Film & Series Main Cast Were Underrepresented:**
  - 34.1% of film & series main cast were underrepresented.
- **Main Cast in Netflix Film (38.9%) & Series (38.4%) Approached Proportional Representation (39.9%) in 2019.**

### Underrepresented Speaking Characters in Netflix Films & Series, 2018-19

- **Overall:** 36.2%
- **In Film:** 37.9%
- **In Series:** 35.2%

Source: USC Annenberg Inclusion Initiative
#6 INCLUSION VARIES BY STORYTELLING MEDIUM AND ROLE
Underrepresented key creatives across Netflix films, 2018-2019

**16.9% OF DIRECTORS WERE UNDER-REPRESENTED**
VS. 20.5% TOP-GROSSING FILMS*

**16.4% OF WRITERS WERE UNDER-REPRESENTED**
VS. 12.2% TOP-GROSSING FILMS*

**13% OF PRODUCERS WERE UNDER-REPRESENTED**
VS. 15.1% TOP-GROSSING FILMS*

UNDERREPRESENTED KEY CREATIVES ACROSS NETFLIX SERIES, 2018-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CREATORS</th>
<th>PRODUCERS</th>
<th>WRITERS</th>
<th>DIRECTORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NETFLIX</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDUSTRY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DIRECTORS BY RACIAL/ETHNIC GROUP ACROSS NETFLIX FILMS & SERIES, 2018-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>H/L</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>AI/AN</th>
<th>NH/PI</th>
<th>MENA</th>
<th>Multi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FILM</strong></td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SERIES</strong></td>
<td>79.9%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H/L=Hispanic/Latino; AI/AN=American Indian/Alaskan Native; NH/PI=Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander;
MENA=Middle Eastern/North African; Multi=Multiracial/Multiethnic

Source: USC Annenberg Inclusion Initiative
#7 Strong Black Lead is More Than a Marketing Slogan

Black leads/co leads and main cast across Netflix films & series, 2018-2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEADS/CO LEADS</th>
<th>MAIN CAST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>Series</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21.4%</strong></td>
<td><strong>20.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **15.2%** of leads/co leads were Black. These protagonists were equally likely to be male- or female-identified.
- **19.5%** of main cast were Black. This percentage increased from 2018 to 2019 for film & series.

#8 Racial/Ethnic Representation Varies by Group

Leads/co leads & main cast by racial/ethnic group, films and series

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FILM LEADS/CO LEADS</th>
<th>MAIN CAST</th>
<th>SERIES LEADS/CO LEADS</th>
<th>MAIN CAST</th>
<th>U.S. POPULATION*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LATINX</strong></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASIAN</strong></td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MENA</strong></td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AI/AN</strong></td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NH/PI</strong></td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AI/AN=American Indian/Alaskan Native; NH/PI=Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander; MENA=Middle Eastern/North African
Latino refers to Latinos born in the U.S. or its territories.

Source: USC Annenberg Inclusion Initiative
ASIAN MAIN CAST IN NETFLIX FILM AND SERIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNITY</th>
<th>FILM %</th>
<th>SERIES %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesian</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singaporean</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laotian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepalese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tibetan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THERE WERE 14 ASIAN COMMUNITIES REPRESENTED IN NETFLIX FILM & SERIES

The ethnicity or descent of Asian main cast was assessed and includes individuals of any nationality.

LATINX CREATIVES BEHIND THE SCENES IN NETFLIX FILMS & SERIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIRECTOR</th>
<th>FILM</th>
<th>CREATORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>PRODUCERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRITER</td>
<td></td>
<td>PRODUCERS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>DIRECTORS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Across 200 top-grossing movies from 2018 & 2019, 4 directors, 4 writers, and 25 Producers were Latinx.

Source: USC Annenberg Inclusion Initiative
For the first time ever, during the 2018-19 season, women and persons of color directed more than half of all entertainment TV episodes, according to the Directors Guild of America’s most recent report. The proportion of all episodes directed by women increased to 31% in 2018-19 from 25% in 2017-18. Men accounted for 69% and 75% of directors during the same periods, concluded the DGA’s “Episodic Television Director Inclusion Report.”

Combined, directors who were female or Black, Latinx, or Asian of either gender, directed 58% of episodes during that season, up from a combined 49% during the 2017-18 season.

The proportion of episodes directed by White men and women fell to 71% in 2018-19 from 76% in 2017-18.
DGA’s analysis, examining 4,300 episodes, also found that in 2018-19:

- White men directed 50% of all episodes, down from 57% in 2017-18.
- Men of color directed 19% of episodes, up from 17%.
- White women directed 22% of episodes, up from 19%.
- Women of color directed 8% of episodes, up from 6%.
- Combined, women and persons of color directed 51% of episodes produced by the eight largest studios.

Of 227 directors directing their first episodes in 2018-19:

- 49% were women, up from 41% in the 2017-18 season and 33% in 2016-17.
- 29% were of color, down from 2017-18’s record high of 31% and up from 27% in 2016-17.

Among the 8th largest studios, women directed:

- 40.1% of episodes at Disney/ABC.
- 36.7% at Home Box Office.
- 34.2% at Twentieth Century Fox.
- 31.9% at NBC Universal.
- 30.2% at Warner Bros.
- 26.9% at CBS.
- 26.6% at Sony.
- 24.8% at Netflix.

At those eight studios, persons of color directed:

- 33.8% of episodes at Netflix.
- 29.3% at Disney/ABC.
- 28.3% at Warner Bros.
- 27.6% at Twentieth Century Fox.
- 27.4% at Sony.
- 26.6% at Home Box Office.
- 26.4% at NBC Universal.
- 24.8% at CBS.

---

**Percentage of Episodes Directed By:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018–19</th>
<th>2017–18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directors of Color</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– African American</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Asian American</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Latino</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Directors Guild of America
### Analysis & Ranking of Television Studios
The eight largest industry employers oversaw the production of 71% of the episodes covered in this report. Their hiring records follow.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Studio</th>
<th># Series</th>
<th># Episodes</th>
<th>% Female Directed</th>
<th>% Minority Directed</th>
<th>% Female or Minority Directed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Disney/ABC Companies</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Home Box Office</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Twentieth Century Fox Companies</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Netflix</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Warner Bros Companies</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>NBC Universal Companies</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CBS Companies</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sony</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>229</strong></td>
<td><strong>3081</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>27.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expanded Studio Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Studio</th>
<th># Series</th>
<th># Episodes</th>
<th>% Female Directed</th>
<th>% Minority Directed</th>
<th>% Female or Minority Directed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lionsgate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Disney/ABC Companies</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Paramount</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Home Box Office</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Twentieth Century Fox Companies</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Netflix</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Warner Bros.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>NBC Universal Companies</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CBS Companies</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sony</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Amazon (Picrow)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Viacom Music &amp; Ent.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Directors Guild of America
For first time, new TV series with diverse casts outnumbered non-diverse casts

In 2019, the 71 new live-action U.S.-produced television series with diverse casts of regular characters exceeded the 69 series debuting with non-diverse casts, according to the study “The Impact of Talent Diversity on Audience Demand for Television” by Parrot Analytics and Creative Artists Agency (CAA).

Across scripted broadcast, cable, and online-streaming series, live-action was defined as drama, comedy, action/adventure and horror, including children’s and animated series.

Between 2017 and 2019, audience demand for debuting live-action series where persons of color comprised at least 40% of the regular casts — mirroring the nation’s diversity — increased by 112.5%, researchers wrote. That compared to 50% growth in demand for live-action debuts whose casts had less than that level of diversity.

Also, from 2017 and 2019, there was a 42% increase in the supply of debuting scripted live-action series where characters of color comprised at least 40% of the cast. During the same period, there was a 16% increase in the supply of such series that did not have a similarly diverse cast of regular characters.

Wrote Kevin Huvane, CAA’s co-chair: “As demographics continue to shift, it’s important that we create and support content that reflects this new majority of diverse consumers … We must listen to audiences, otherwise we miss out on reaching them by not telling the stories that they crave. We hope that showing the increasing success of shows with strong racially and ethnically diverse representation will encourage more creative decisions that will continue to shift the complexion of who we see on our television screens.”

The study — released in October 2020 — analyzed the race and ethnicity of 5,585 regular characters in 380 series that debuted between 2017 and 2019 on traditional broadcast networks, cable networks, and streaming services, and audience demand for those shows.

Here are the other findings about those analyzed series:

- The overall tally of premiering series with diverse regular casts increased from 30% in 2017 to 39% in 2019.
- Compared to 2017, there were 1.4 times more premiering shows in 2019 in which persons of color comprised at least 40% of the cast.

Among the yearly top 25 most in-demand TV series premieres, or “tentpoles,” those with diverse casts were 46% more in demand than tentpoles without diverse casts.

Demand for diverse tentpoles doubled, surging 86%. That compared to an 8% increase in demand since 2017. The demand for non-diverse debuting series has increased 36% since 2017.

In 2019, 2 out of 5 regular actors/talents were persons of color. That compared to 1 out of 3 in 2017.

Overall, there was a 9% increase in talent diversity between 2017 and 2019.

- In 2019, only 5% of regular talent were Hispanic or Latinx, while 18% of the U.S. population were Hispanic or Latinx.
Source: Parrot Analytics, Creative Arts Agency (CAA)
Slight, insufficient progress for Emmy-nominated, behind-the-scenes women

Men continued to dominate the non-acting Prime-time Emmy Award nominations when, in 2021, they received 68% of those preliminary honors. The number of women nominated decreased by three percentage points, according to the Women’s Media Center’s “2021 Report: Gender & Non-acting Primetime Emmy Nominations.”

Women accounted for 757 — or 32% — of the 2,337 people nominated for non-acting Prime-time Emmys in 2021. Men accounted for the remaining 1,580 of non-acting nominees. In 2020, women accounted for 35%, or 801 of 2,286 non-acting nominees.

Women saw progress in some categories, but in most, there was no substantial improvement from 2020 to 2021.

That year-over-year dip in the overall number of behind-the-scenes, female nominees wasn’t enough forward movement, said Julie Burton, president and CEO of the Women’s Media Center (WMC).

“Award nominations,” Burton said, “are often the springboard to better opportunities. Until women and people of color achieve equal status in employment behind the scenes, it is difficult to imagine these nominations representing anything near gender and race equality, nor truly reflecting the diversity of enormous talent we know exists.”

The report also found that, in 2021:

- Women accounted for 36% and men 64% of nominees in all categories of producing. That compared to 39% and 61%, respectively, in 2020.
- Women accounted for 12% and men 88% of nominees in all directing categories. That compared to 14% and 86% in 2020.
- Women accounted for 33% and men 67% of nominees in all writing categories. That compared to 28% and 72% in 2020.
- Women accounted for 25% and men 75% of nominees in all editing categories. That compared to 20% and 80% in 2020.
- Women accounted for 32% and men 68% of producing, directing, writing and editing nominations. That compared to 34% and 66% in 2020.
- Women accounted for 34% and men 66% of 908 nominees in the less high-profile but still essential categories of production design, casting, choreography, cinematography, costume, hairstyling, interactive program, lighting design/direction, main title design, makeup, music, sound, performance, special effects, and stunt coordination. In 2020, the respective rates were 37% for women and 63% for men.
- Women continued to dominate in casting, makeup, hairstyling, and costumes, accounting for at least 53% of nominees in each of those categories in 2021 and 2020, when men accounted for 47%.
- Men remained the majority of nominees in production design, music, lighting design/direction, main title design, sound, special effects, and stunt coordination, accounting for at least 72% of the nominees in each of these categories in 2021, a proportion that mirrors 2020.
- Women reached parity with men in the two choreography categories, accounting for 50% of nominees in 2021, which was up from 33% in 2020.
- No women were nominated for outstanding interactive program in 2021, though they were 50% of individual nominees in that category in 2020.

“Gender inequities have no place in Hollywood — or anywhere else,” said WMC Board Chair Janet Dewart Bell. “The Academy of Television Arts and Sciences needs not only to take note, but to implement change.”
WMC Investigation 2021:
Gender and Non-Acting Emmy Nominations

Source: Women's Media Center
Men got more talk time, leads, and showed less flesh in Super Bowl ads

While a number of big-name, big-dollar advertisers have, over the years, featured more female characters and messages of female empowerment in their Super Bowl ads, male characters still prevail, according to a joint analysis by the Geena Davis Institute on Gender in Media and Google.

Researchers praised the progress but, they wrote, the gender balance in those ads still hasn’t caught up with the reality that women accounted for 46% to 47% of Super Bowl watchers between 2014 and 2018.

Their analysis of a sampling of 273 Super Bowl ads from 2015 to 2019 showed that:

- Male characters consumed 71% of speaking time, female characters, 29%.
- Male characters consumed 65% of screen time, while female characters consumed 35%.
- Male characters held 64.2% of prominent roles, female characters, 35.8%.
- 74.4% of male characters but 48.8% of female characters had average-sized bodies.
- 15.8% of male characters but 45.5% of female characters were skinny or very skinny.
- 1.2% of male characters but 10.2% of female characters wore revealing clothes.
- 2.1% of male characters but 7.5% of female characters were partially nude.
- 43.2% of male characters but 22.6% of female characters appeared to be older than 40.
- 77.4% of female characters were younger than 40; Nielsen didn’t provide a male age in this category.

Female characters are about 9X more likely to be shown in revealing clothing than male characters

Female characters are about 3X more likely than male characters to be shown as “skinny” or “very skinny”

Male characters are about 2X more likely to be portrayed as leaders than female characters

Source: Geena Davis Institute on Gender in Media, Google
Billions saw male YouTube characters 56% of time, female ones 44%

Male characters edged out female characters in 2.7 million YouTube videos uploaded by advertisers of certain products and services. Worldwide, 550 billion viewers saw male characters 56% of the time and female characters 44% of the time in those ads, according to a study by the Geena Davis Institute on Gender, Google and the University of Southern California Viterbi School of Engineering.

In ads uploaded in the United States, the gender gap was wider, with men getting 60% of screen time and women getting 40%, according to the analysis of ads uploaded to that platform between January 1, 2015 and March 31, 2019.

That study, which also measured other trends over a decade, concluded that when roughly equal numbers of men and women appeared in YouTube advertisements, those ads garnered more views. Women-led and gender-balanced videos drew 30% more views than other videos.

The study was partly based on information gleaned from persons who self-identified as either male or female in 51 different locales.

Among the additional findings about YouTube ads in the United States:

- Over the last 10 years, women characters’ share of prominent roles increased 4%.
- During the five analyzed years, in retail ads, men were seen 58% but women 42% of the time.
- In consumer packaged-goods ads, the respective figures were 55% and 45%.
- In health care ads, the respective figures were 52% and 48%.
- Men snagged 66% of speaking time, but women received 34% of speaking time during the five years.
- In retail ads, men were heard 54% but women 46% of the time.
- In consumer packaged-goods ads, the respective figures were 52% and 48%.
- In health care ads, the respective figures were 49% and 51%.
- Male characters were four years older than female characters.
Narrower gap, but male characters outnumbered female characters in Cannes ads

For a decade ending in 2017, Cannes Lions Film Craft ads had significantly more male than female characters but that gap narrowed in 2018, according to a Geena Davis Institute on Gender in Media analysis. The study also showed an overall lessening of gender stereotypes in the ads at Cannes, the international film festival.

The 2018 advertisements also had more male than female characters, but the gap narrowed. In 2018, 59.8% of those characters were male, 39.9% were female, and .4% were transgender, according to the study of 133 English-speaking commercials. In Cannes ads airing between 2006 and 2017, 65.1% of characters were male, and 34.9% were female.

Released in 2019, the study also parsed race, sexual orientation, and physical ability/disability of characters in those 2018 advertisements, which originated in the United States and 22 other countries.

For the 2018 ads, researchers concluded that:

- 26% of male characters but 11% of female characters were shown working. That compared, respectively, to 29% and 20.6% during the decade ending in 2017.
- 25.6% of male characters but 13.8% of female characters were shown as having an occupation. That compared, respectively, to 38.5% and 24.5% during the decade ending in 2017.
- 16.4% of male characters but 8.3% of female characters were portrayed as leaders. That compared, respectively, to 14.2% and 9.2 % during the decade ending in 2017.
- 13.3% of male characters and 8.5% of female characters performed physical comedy; 9.8% but 4.1%, respectively, performed verbal comedy. By comparison, during the decade ending in 2017, 9.2% of male characters and 3.9% of female characters performed physical comedy; and 8.4% and 6.7%, respectively, performed verbal comedy.

Also, in those 2018 ads:

- 43.1% of characters were persons of color, 54.5% were White.
- 22.9% of White characters and 17.9% of characters of color had an occupation.
- 1.9% of characters were lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or queer, though the LGBTQ community comprised 10% of the world’s actual population.
- .8% of characters had cognitive or physical disabilities, though they comprised 15% of the world’s actual population.
Women were almost half of Netflix’s global workforce, company leaders

In its first-ever workforce diversity report, streaming entertainment giant Netflix reported that women comprised 47.1% of its overall workforce in 2020, up from 40.3% in 2017.

Of its U.S. employees, persons of color were 46.4% of the overall workforce in 2020, up from 39.7% in 2017, and 42% were company leaders in 2020, up from 24.3% in 2017, according to the January 2021 report. It was based on data collected in October 2020.

In Netflix’s C-suite, women accounted for 47.8% of those at or above the level of directors, 43.7% of vice presidents, and 47.6% of those who were vice presidents and chief executives, combined.

That inaugural report also found that:

- Of the 11, among 23 Netflix vice presidents and chief executives who were women, 1 was Asian, 2 were Latinx, 3 were Black, and 5 were White in 2020.
- Among the 12 male vice presidents and chief executives, 1 was Black, 1 was Latinx, and 10 were White in 2020.
- 55.1% of creative and corporate employees globally were women in 2020, down from 56.3% in 2017.
- 47.8% of directors globally were women in 2020, up from 41.1% in 2017.
- 34.9% of tech workers globally were women in 2020, up from 27.1% in 2017.
- 45.5% of all U.S. workers were White in 2020, down from 46.1% in 2017.
- 23.9% of all U.S. workers were Asian in 2020, down from 25.9% in 2017.
- 8.1% of all U.S. workers were Latinx, up from 6%.
- 8% of all U.S. workers were Black, up from 3.8%.
- 5.1% of all U.S. workers were multiracial, up from 3%.
- 1.3% of all U.S. workers were of Middle Eastern, North African, American Indian, Native Alaskan, or Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander descent. That was up from 1% in 2017.
- 65.3% of employees at the director’s level or higher in the United States were White in 2020, down from 76.7% in 2017.
- 15.7% of employees at the director’s level or higher in the United States were Asian in 2020, up from 14% in 2017.
- 9.5% of those at the U.S. director’s level or above were Black, up from 4.2%.
- 4.9% of those at the U.S. director’s level or above were Latinx, up from 4.5%.
- 4.1% of those at the U.S. director’s level or above were multiracial, up from .3%.
- .5% of those at the U.S. director’s level or above were of Middle Eastern, North African, American Indian, Native Alaskan, or Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander descent, up from .3%.
Global gender representation trends 2017–2020

*Data as of October 2020, at approximately 8,000 full time Netflix streaming employees. Leadership is defined as employees with titles director and above.

Source: Netflix
Even Broadway shows with playwrights of color continued to mainly have White directors

White actors got 58.6% of all roles on Broadway and Off Broadway in 2018-19 — the last full season before pandemic closures — which compared to 61.5% during the 2017-18 season, according to the Asian American Performers Action Coalition, citing several examples of what it termed systemic bias favoring Whites in the theater industry.

Released in June 2021, “The Visibility Report: Racial Representation on New York City Stages” also found that Whites directed 100% of Broadway shows that had writers of color in 2018-19 and 2017-18.

Whites directed 81.3% of all Broadway and Off-Broadway productions, combined, in 2018-19, which compared to 85.5% in 2017-18.

Of 2018-19 Broadway and Off Broadway productions with writers of color, 58.8% had a White director, which was down from 64.7% in the previous season.

Of all Broadway show writers, 89% were White in 2018-19, up from 80% in 2017-18, when the first-ever Asian woman playwright, Young Jean Lee, saw her work produced on Broadway.

Of all arts funding, 92.2% went to predominantly White institutions, with 94.6% of private funding, 76.4% of government funding funneled to those institutions.

“The story of the 2018-19 theatre season is one of an industry under pressure to diversify without a clear idea of how best to do it without fundamentally upsetting existing power structures,” researchers wrote. “We tackle the power structures head on in this year’s report by expanding our tracking of artistic directors to include other gatekeepers such as board members at the non-profits and producers and general managers on Broadway.”
The analysis also found that during the 2018-19 season:

- For every $1 earned by actors of color at nine analyzed Off-Broadway theaters, White actors earned as much as $1.82.
- 22.7% of all available roles were “inclusively cast,” without regard to race or where race did not matter, which compared to 20% in 2018-19.
- 1 Broadway production with at least 1 Asian American writer accounted for 13.6% of Asian American actors hired; 7 Off-Broadway productions with at least 1 Asian American writer accounted for 51.9% of Asian American actors hired.
- 2 Broadway productions with at least 1 Black writer accounted for 90.9% of Black actors hired; 22 Off-Broadway productions with at least 1 Black writer accounted for 76.1% of Black actors hired.
- 2 Broadway productions with at least 1 Middle Eastern or North African writer accounted for 0% of Middle Eastern or North African actors hired. 1 Off-Broadway production with at least one Middle Eastern or North African writer accounted for 100% of Middle Eastern or North African actors hired.
- 0 Broadway productions had at least 1 Latinx writer. 1 Off-Broadway production with at least 1 Latinx writer accounted for 100% of Latinx actors hired.
- Of Broadway producers, a group not counted in the previous report, 93.6% were White.
- Of general managers on Broadway, a group not counted in the previous report, 100% were White.

Regarding Broadway and Off Broadway show playwrights in 2018-19:

- 76.1% were White, up from 79.1% in 2017-18.
- 11.7% were Black, up from 9.6%.
- 4.4% were Asian, down from 6.2%.
- 1.5% were Middle Eastern/North African, down from 2.8%.
- 1.5% were Indigenous, up from 0%.
- .5% were Latinx, down from 2.3%.

Regarding who directed shows in 2018-19:

- 100% of Broadway musicals had White directors, the same as in 2017-18.
- 81.3% of Broadway and Off-Broadway shows had White directors, a 4.3% decrease from the 2017-18 count of White directors.
- 53.5% of Off-Broadway shows with writers of color were directed by Whites, which was down from 57.1% in 2017-18.
- 78.7% of Off Broadway shows had White directors, down from 84.6% in 2017-18.
- 18.7% of Broadway and Off-Broadway shows had directors of color, which was up from 14.4% in 2017-18.
- Directors of color helmed 8.9% shows written by Whites, which was up from 7% in 2017-18.
Who is Visible? Who is Invisible?

58.6% of all roles on New York City stages went to White actors during the 2018–2019 season, making them the most visible on stage.

People of color were less visible.

- 29% Black actors
- 6.3% Asian American actors
- 4.8% Latinx actors
- 1.3% MENA actors
- 0% Indigenous actors
- 18% BIPOC actors who identified as Mixed-race

Source: The Asian American Performers Action Coalition (AAPAC)
Inclusive Casting: How Often Are BIPOC Actors Hired Without Regard to Race?

22.7%

of all available roles were cast with BIPOC actors without regard to race.

- 14.9% Black
- 3.9% Latinx
- 3.1% Asian American
- 0.8% MENA
- 0% Indigenous
- 11.3% BIPOC actors who identified as Mixed-race

Source: The Asian American Performers Action Coalition (AAPAC)
Percentage of roles that went to BIPOC actors in non-racially-specific roles at **non-profits**, down nominally from 22.4% the year prior, primarily because they hired more actors in racially-specific roles.

Percentage of roles that went to BIPOC actors in non-racially-specific roles on **Broadway**, a giant 12.2% increase from last season's showing at 16.2% and a record high.

**Broadway was more likely to cast without regard to race, though predominantly in less visible chorus roles.**

**Inclusive Casting**

(referred to as “Non-Traditional Casting” in previous reports) allows for BIPOC actors to be cast in roles regardless of their race—either because they have been cast in traditionally White roles or have been cast when race is not germane to the role. Inclusive casting is one way to help address the inequity of opportunities for BIPOC actors on NYC stages.

There is much room for improvement with only 22.7% of all roles cast without regard to race. That said, this is the highest marker in the 13 years for which we have data, up from 20% the season prior. It is also the third year in a row inclusive casting has increased after remaining relatively unchanged for 10 years. Of the 22.7% of roles cast inclusively, Black actors were hired the most at 65.8%.

In the 2018-19 season, Broadway far surpassed the non-profits with regards to the hiring of BIPOC actors in non-racially-specific roles. This was primarily attributed to musicals where 40.1% of roles were considered inclusive casting, an increase of almost double from 21.8% the previous season. Of note, BIPOC actors in musicals were twice as likely to be cast inclusively in chorus roles as opposed to principal roles—Of the BIPOC actors who were cast inclusively, 31 were hired on principal contracts and 63 on chorus contracts this season.

Source: The Asian American Performers Action Coalition (AAPAC)
Whose Stories Are Being Told?

80.5%
White

The New York theatre industry continues to uphold a strong bias for White writers.

11.7%
Black

4.4%
Asian American

1.5%
MENA

1.5%
Indigenous

0.5%
Latinx

30%
BIPOC writers who identified as Mixed-race

only 19.5%
of all writers hired were BIPOC.

Source: The Asian American Performers Action Coalition (AAPAC)
At the non-profits and on Broadway, White writers were disproportionately produced over BIPOC writers during the 2018-19 season.

BIPOC representation on Broadway plummeted 9% from the season prior but increased 3% at the non-profits.

The New York theatre industry continued to show a bias for White writers with overall BIPOC writer representation dipping slightly to 19.5% during the 2018-19 season from 20.8% last season. Asian American, Latinx and MENA representation all fell, while Black writers increased over 2 points to 11.7% from 9.6% and Indigenous writers increased to 1.5% from 0%. At the non-profits, BIPOC writers increased 3 percentage points to 23.9% primarily due to Black representation jumping nearly 6 points to 16.7% of all writers, up from 10.8% the season prior. Indigenous representation increased to 0.7% from 0% (the equivalent of 1 writer), while Asian American, Latinx and MENA writer representation all fell this season. On Broadway, BIPOC writers plummeted 9 points to just 11% down from 20% last season. Asian American, Black, Latinx and MENA writers all dropped while Indigenous writers increased to 2.7% from 0% last season due to there being an Indigenous composer in the musical group The Go-Go’s who contributed their catalog to HEAD OVER HEELS and an Indigenous source material author, Lynn Riggs, who wrote GREEN GROW THE LILACS, the play that OKLAHOMA! was based on.

Source: The Asian American Performers Action Coalition (AAPAC)
Who Gets to Shape the Stories?

81.3%
White

10.4%
Black

4.5%
Asian American

3%
Latinx

0.7%
MENA

0%
Indigenous

28%
BIPOC directors who identified as Mixed-race

There is a clear bias for White directors in the New York theatre industry.

18.7%
of all NYC theatre productions were shaped by BIPOC directors, an overall increase of 4.3% from last season.

Note: Each sound decibel ([]) represents one director.

Source: The Asian American Performers Action Coalition (AAPAC)
The percentage of BIPOC directors at non-profits increased by 5.9% over the previous season while staying exactly the same on Broadway.

Source: The Asian American Performers Action Coalition (AAPAC)
What is the Economic Impact of Racism?

**Racial Equity and Arts Funding**

- **92.2%** of all funding was awarded to Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs)
- **76.4%** of all government grants and contributions was awarded to Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs)

- Predominantly White Institutions (PWIs)
- Theaters of Color

Note:
Size of bars are NOT relative.

Data Source:
IRS Form 990's from
causeq.com

Source: The Asian American Performers Action Coalition (AAPAC)
“For media to offer accurate, fair and complex reporting, women must be at all levels of decision-making and work throughout news organizations. The data gathered and reports produced by the Women’s Media Center are critical tools for raising uncomfortable but urgent conversations about the need for media to not simply say better, but do better — today.”

ERICA GONZÁLEZ MARTÍNEZ
WMC BOARD VICE CHAIR
“There’s still a long road ahead on the journey to equality and inclusion in Hollywood.”

JANE FONDA
WMC CO-FOUNDER
Women were a fifth of Billboard charts artists, 28.1% of Grammy nominees

Females were 20.2% of 173 artists who made Billboard’s 2020 Hot 100 Year-End chart; 79.8% of those top artists were men, according to the University of Southern California Annenberg Inclusion Initiative.

The 2020 figure for female chart-toppers compared to 22.5% in 2019 and 28.1% in 2016. The latter had the highest rate of female chart-toppers across nine years analyzed in Annenberg’s “Inclusion in the Recording Studio? Gender and Race/Ethnicity of Artists, Songwriters & Producers across 900 Popular Songs from 2012-2020” study.

Across all the studied years, women accounted for 21.6% of all 1,797 artists.

In 2020, artists of color accounted for 59%, and White artists accounted for 41% of the chart-toppers, marking the fourth consecutive year of increase for artists of color.

The analysis also found:

- 22.5% of solo artists were female in 2020, a decrease from 27.3% in 2019 and from 35.8% in 2012.
- 7.1% of duos had a female artist in 2020.
- 6.9% of band members were female in 2020.
- 10.3% top duos were women-only and 79.3% were men-only across the nine studied years.
- 10.3% of the duos had both men and women members during those years.
- 51.7% of the duos were all-White.
- 37.9% of the duos were only persons of color.
- 3.9% of band across the 9-year sample were all-female.
- 70.6% of bands were all-male.
- 25% of bands were comprised of males and females.
- 58.8% of bands were all-White.
- 27.4% of bands had members who were White and members who were of color.
- 13.7% of bands were comprised only of persons of color.
Among songwriters, by gender:

- 12.9% of all songwriters were women in 2020, a decrease from 14.4% in 2019 but up from 11% in 2012. Respectively, for men, the figures were 87.1%, 85.6%, and 89%.
- Across the nine years, 12.6% of songwriters were women, and 87.4% were men.
- No female writers were among the writers of 65% of top songs of 2020.
- No females were among the writers of 57.3% of the 900 studied songs of the 9 years.
- 1 female was among the writers of 30.6% of the 900 songs.

Among producers, by gender and race:

- 2% were women in 2020, down from 5% in 2019. The respective figures for men were 98% and 95%.
- 2.6% of producers were women, and 97.4% were men across the nine years studied.
- Mariah Carey was the only woman of color credited as a producer in 2020.
- 9 of 1,291 producers counted in 2012, 2015, 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020, combined, were female.
- 9 of 33 female producers across those 6 years were women of color.
- 1 woman was nominated for Grammy Producer of the Year across the entire sample.

By gender, of Grammy nominees:

- 28.1% of nominees were female in 2021, a record high and up from 20.5% in 2020. Respectively, 71.9% and 79.5% were male in those years.
- 13.4% — or 182 — of 1,359 Grammy Award nominees between 2013 and 2021 were women, and 86.6% were men.
- Across 9 years, 8.5% of nominees for Album of the Year were female, and 91.5% were male.
- Across 9 years, 9.8% of nominees for Record of the Year were female, and 90.2% were female.

By race, of female Grammy nominees:

- 61.5% of the 182 female nominees were White, and 38.5% were women of color in those 9 years.
- 73.1% of female nominees for Song of the Year were White, and 26.9% were of color, the widest racial gap among women of any Grammy category.
- 55.9% of White nominees and 69.8% of nominees of color received 1 nomination.
- 25.4% of White nominees and 16.3% of nominees of color received 2 nominations.
- 8.5% of White nominees and 7% of nominees of color received 3 nominations.
- 5.1% of White nominees and 2.3% of those of color received 4 nominations.

### WOMEN ARE MISSING IN POPULAR MUSIC

Prevalence of Women Artists across 900 Songs, in percentages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Women (Prevalence)</th>
<th>Total Number of Artists</th>
<th>Ratio of Men to Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'12</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>1,797</td>
<td>3.6:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'13</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'14</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'15</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'16</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'17</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'18</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'19</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'20</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: USC Annenberg Inclusion Initiative
WOMEN ARE PUSHED ASIDE AS PRODUCERS

THE RATIO OF MEN TO WOMEN PRODUCERS ACROSS 600 POPULAR SONGS WAS

38 to 1

WRITTEN OFF: FEW WOMEN WORK AS SONGWRITERS

Songwriter gender by year...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>88.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WOMEN ARE MISSING IN THE MUSIC INDUSTRY

Percentage of women across three creative roles...

- 21.6% are artists
- 12.6% are songwriters
- 2.6% are producers

Source: USC Annenberg Inclusion Initiative
### VOICES HEARD: ARTISTS OF COLOR ACROSS 900 SONGS

Percentage of artists of color by year...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% of Artists of Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘12</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘13</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘14</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘15</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘16</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘17</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘18</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘19</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘20</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46.7% of artists were people of color across 900 songs from 2012-2020.

### CREATIVE CONSTRAINTS: FEW WOMEN PRODUCERS WORK IN MUSIC

Percentage of men and women producers by year...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Men (%)</th>
<th>Women (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>98.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>98.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>97.7%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>97.4%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WOMEN OF COLOR ARE INVISIBLE AS PRODUCERS

9 out of 1,291 producing credits went to women of color.

Source: USC Annenberg Inclusion Initiative
### CREDITS & DEFICITS: MEN OUTPACE WOMEN IN SONGWRITING

Leading men and women songwriters by number of credits...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Men Songwriters</th>
<th># of credits</th>
<th>Top Women Songwriters</th>
<th># of credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martin Sandberg (Max Martin)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Onika Maraj (Nicki Minaj)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aubrey Graham (Drake)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Robyn Fenty (Rihanna)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin Levin (Benny Blanco)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Taylor Swift</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lukasz Gottwald (Dr. Luke)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Belcalis Almanzar (Cardi B)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savan Kotecha</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Ariana Grande</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry Walter (Cirkut)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Katheryn Hudson (Katy Perry)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johan Schuster (Shellback)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Selena Gomez</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dijon McFarlane (DJ Mustard)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Bieber</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacob Hindlin (JKash)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The top 11 male songwriters are responsible for 22.5% of the 900 most popular songs from 2012 to 2020.

### WOMEN SURGE IN KEY CATEGORIES

Women Grammy® Nominees by Category, 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>% Nominees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Song of the Year</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record of the Year</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best New Artist</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: USC Annenberg Inclusion Initiative
The Gender Gap at the Grammys® Is Real
Percentage of Women Nominees by Category, 2013-2020

13.4% of Grammy® nominees from 2013-2021 were women. 86.6% were men.

Women recorded 10% of top 150 country songs over a decade

During the decade ending in 2019, songs by female artists accounted for an average of 10% of the top 150 country songs on Billboard’s year-end radio airplay chart and for 10% of the top 20 songs played weekly on air, according to an analysis by CMT Equal Pay Campaign and Canada-based SongData. "Inequality on Country Radio: 2019 in Review" found that 16% — or 24 — of the top 150 artists were women. In 2017, 8.7% — or 13 — of the top 150 were female. That was the lowest proportion during decade. The analysis is based on Mediabase’s year-end airplay report.

Additionally, 4 — or 6.6% — of the top 60 songs of 2019 were recorded by women. Persons of color accounted for five of 184 artists — of 2.7% — recording those top 150 songs.

Other key findings were these:

- 10% of the daily spins on Mediabase’s and Billboard’s weekly airplay reports were recorded by women in 2019.
- 12.4% — or 18 — songs by women were in top 150, on average, each year.
- 7.3% of songs by women were in the top 150 in 2014, the year with the fewest women.
- 12.4% of unique or individual songs were by women.
- 81.6% of unique/individual songs were by men.
- 6% of unique/individual songs were by women-men ensembles.
- 89 of the songs occupying the top 10 slots were by male artists, across the decade.
- .9% of songs by women ranked in the top 10.
- 13 — or 1.4% — of songs by women ranked from No. 31 through No. 40, the positions that women most occupied.
- 12 — or 1.3% — of songs by women ranked from No. 61 through No. 79, the second-most positions that women occupied.
1.3% of the spins in 2019 were by female-male ensembles, a decline from 10.6% in 2010.

11.4% of spins in 2019 were by women and by male-female ensembles, combined, compared to 25.2% in 2010.

---

| Gender representation across all and unique songs on Yearend Country Airplay Reports, 2010–2019 |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| # of songs overall | % of songs overall | # of unique songs | % of unique songs | # of unique artists | % of unique artists |
| Men (solo/group)    | 1,224 | 81.6% | 751 | 79.9% | 131 | 71.2% |
| Women (solo/group)  | 186  | 12.4% | 130 | 13.8% | 42  | 22.8% |
| Male-female ensembles | 90  | 6.0%  | 59  | 6.3%  | 11  | 6.0%  |
| Total Songs        | 1,500 | 100.0% | 940 | 100.0% | 184 | 100.0% |

Source: CMT Equal Pay Campaign, Song Data

---

“Equal Play:” Most listeners wanted more country music women on radio

A majority of country music fans wanted female artists’ music played on country stations for the same amount of air time granted to male artists’ music, according to a survey prompting CMT’s January 2020 launch of its “Equal Play” project.

The CMT Insights and Coleman Insights survey of 1,000 25- to 54-year-old country music radio listeners found that:

- 84% of listeners wanted equal play for female artists.
- Roughly 70% of listeners wanted more female artists in country music, overall.
- 72% of listeners said they heard more songs by men on country radio than songs by women.
- 44% of listeners would be very interested in a radio station that spotlights women.
- 28% of listeners would listen to country radio more if female artists were featured more frequently.
- 11% said they would listen less if female artists were featured more frequently.
- 88% of listeners said they believed women have played a large role in the history of country music.
- Contrary to the trope that listeners don’t want to hear country songs by women, 53% of survey respondents said they had no gender preference in artists.

Source: CMT Insights and Coleman Insights
Women were 16% of top country music artists, 15% of award nominees

Of artists who performed 500 of the top country songs of 2014 through 2018, an average of 16% were women and 84% were men, according to the University of Southern California Annenberg Inclusion Initiative. During all the studied years, there were a total of 816 artists.

In both 2016 and 2018, 19% of country artists were female. That tally was 12% in 2017, 13% in 2014, and 16% in 2015.

Among all songwriters, two women — Carrie Underwood and Miranda Lambert — accounted for 12% across the studied years. By comparison, female songwriters accounted for 13% of all songwriters in 2018 and 11% in 2014. The remaining songwriters were men.

“The current reality in country music does not have to be the future of the genre,” wrote researchers, echoing country singer Reba McEntire, who’d criticized the “bro’ culture” of her industry.

The researchers continued: “By taking action as an industry, executives, programmers, advocates, and even consumers can leverage their influence to create a space that produces great music — by male and female artists.”

“No Country for Female Artists: Artist & Songwriter Gender on Popular Country Charts from 2014 to 2018” also found that:

- 29% of the 101 solo artists who recorded the five years’ worth of top songs were female; 71% were men.
- 15%, on average, of all duo members were women across the five years.
- 10% of duo members were female in 2018, up from 6% in 2017 but down from 21% in 2014.
- 15%, on average, of band members were female across the five years.
- 25% of band members were female in 2018, up from 6% in 2017 and 11% in 2014.
- 29 was the average age of female solo artists; 42 was the average of male solo artists.

Among Academy of Country Music award nominees during the studied years:

- 15% of nominees were female in the four categories that were not gender-specific (Entertainer, Songwriter, Duo, or Group of the Year); 85% of nominees were male in those four categories.
- 11% — or 3 — of Entertainer of the Year nominations went to women and 89% to men.
- No women were nominated for Entertainer of Year in 2019 and 2018, down from a high of 20% in 2017.
- 12% — or 3 — Songwriter of the Year nominees were female and 88% were male.
- No women were nominated for Songwriter of the Year in 2019, 2016 and 2015; that compared to 40% in 2017 and 20% in 2018.
- 14% — or 15 — of artists in the Group of the Year category were women across the five years and 86% were male.
- 15% of nominated artists in the Group of the Year category were female in 2019, down from a high of 19% in 2015.
- 20% of artists in the Duo of the Year category were female across the five years and 80% were male.
- 20% of artists in the Duo of the Year category were female in 2019, compared to a high of 30% in 2016.
Recently, the Academy of Country Music (ACMs) announced – for a second year in a row – all male nominees for the prestigious Entertainer of the Year award. The host of their award ceremony, Reba McEntire, not only pointed out the lack of female representation among the candidates but also that a “bro culture” seems to be pervading country music. Speaking of male-dominated networks, she also added “I think it’s kind of going away from that a little bit.”

But is it? This research brief is designed to test this claim. We examined performer gender across 500 songs on the Year-End Billboard Hot Country charts from 2014 to 2018. Further, we assessed the number of male and female songwriters who received credit across two years (2014, 2018) of this sample. We wrap up this research brief by examining the gender of nominees across 4 categories at the ACMs that parallel the sample time frame. Only differences of 5 percentage points or greater are noted below.

Findings

Only 16% of all artists were female across 500 of the top country songs from 2014-2018. This translates into 5.2 male country artists to every 1 female country artist. While 2018 (19%) was higher than 2014 (13%) and 2017 (12%), it did not differ from 2016 (19%). As shown in Infographic 1, females held a smaller proportion of the top charts in country music than across the Billboard Hot 100 Year End Charts for four of the five years sampled. Thus, the “bro culture” is still alive and well in country music and things are not getting better.

Where are the Female Songwriters?

Note: Graphic presents the percentage of female writers across 200 songs in country and popular music from 2014 and 2018.

Finally, the nominations at the ACMs over the last 5 years were assessed for gender. Only four non gender specific nominations were examined (i.e., Entertainer of the Year, Songwriter of the Year, Duo of the Year, Group of the Year) in areas that reflect individual artists’ contributions and were in line with the categories measured above. Put differently, gender specific awards (e.g., Male/Female Artist of the Year, New Male/Female Artist of the Year) and those involving companies and/or labels were excluded from analysis (e.g., Album of the Year, Single of the Year, Song of the Year, Music Event of the Year).

As shown in Infographic 4, only 15% of the ACM nominees across 4 categories measured were women. Less than a sixth of all nominees (11%, n=3) were women in the Entertainer of the Year category. In reality that figure reflects only 2 women who were nominated across the sample time frame: Carrie Underwood (1 nomination) and Miranda Lambert (2 nominations).
Finally, the nominations at the ACMs over the last 5 years were assessed for gender. Only four non-gender specific nominations across the sample time frame: Carrie Underwood (1 nomination) and Miranda Lambert (2 nominations).

As shown in Infographic 4, only 15% of the ACM nominees across 4 categories measured were women. Less than a sixth of labels were excluded from analysis (e.g., Album of the Year, Single of the Year, Song of the Year, Music Event of the Year).

Twelve percent of songwriters nominated were women across 5 years. Again, this number and percentage reflects only 2 women who were recognized for their achievements. Hillary Lindsey received 2 nominations in the sample time frame and Lori McKenna earned 1 nomination.

Antebellum, and The Band Perry. The over time nominations as well as the frequency of females per category are shown in Infographic 5.

FEW FEMALE NOMINEES AT THE ACM AWARDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entertainer of the Year</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Songwriter of the Year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duo of the Year</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group of the Year</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of women</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Only the percentage of females is shown in the graphic. The percentage of males nominated in each category by year can be found by subtracting each cell from 100. Numbers in the bottom row reflect the total number of female nominees in each year across all four categories.

Source: USC Annenberg Inclusion Initiative
Apple, overall, counted slight increases in women and employees of color

Globally, 34% of Apple’s workforce was female in 2020; that compared to 33% in 2019, according to an annual diversity report. The figures for men were 66% and 67%, respectively.

In 2020, in the United States, where Apple reported the race of employees, 59% of the overall workforce was White, a 3 percentage-point decline from 2019, when White employees comprised 62% of the workforce.

Globally, in the C-suite in 2020:
- 31% of executives were female, up from 30% in 2019. The remainder were male in both years.
- 24% of tech workers were female in both years.
- 42% of non-tech workers were female, up from 41% in 2019.
- 35% of retail workers were female in both years.

In 2020, in the United States, by race:
- 27% of all employees were Asian, up from 25% in 2019.
- 14% were Latinx in both years.
- 9% were Black in both years.
- 3% were multiracial in both years.
- 1% were Indigenous in both years.

Of the U.S. C-suite in 2020:
- 59% of executives were White, down from 62% in 2019.
- 27% were Asian, up from 25%.
- 8% were Latinx in both years.
- 4% were Black in both years.
- 2% were multiracial, up from 1%.
- 0% were Indigenous in both years.
Of the U.S. tech workforce in 2020:
- 44% of the overall workforce were White, down from 47% in 2019.
- 39% were Asian, up from 36%.
- 8% were Latinx in both years.
- 6% were Black in both years.
- 2% were multiracial in both years.
- 1% were Indigenous in both years.

Of the U.S. non-tech workforce in 2020:
- 49% were White, down from 50% in 2019.
- 21% were Latinx, up from 20%.
- 13% were Asian in both years.
- 12% were Black in both years.
- 4% were multiracial in both years.
- 1% were Indigenous in both years.

Of the U.S. retail workforce in 2020:
- 48% were White, up from 29% in 2019.
- 23% were Latinx, up from 22%.
- 15% were Black, down from 16%.
- 8% were Asian in both years.
- 5% were multiracial, up from 4%.
- 1% were Indigenous in both years.
### Tally of women at Dell rose slightly; count of minorities rose more robustly

Women were 31.1% of the global workforce in 2020 at Dell Technologies, up .7% from 2019, when the figure was 30.4, according to the computer-maker’s diversity report.

In the United States, American Indians, Alaska Natives, Asians, Blacks, Latinx, and multiracial persons were 31.2% of the overall workforce during the fiscal year ending on Feb. 1, 2020, up from 29.2% in the fiscal year ending on Feb. 1, 2019. Asians represented roughly half of those persons of color during both years.

---

### U.S. Race and Ethnicity

#### Overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latinx</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Tech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latinx</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Non-tech

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latinx</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latinx</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Retail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latinx</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Apple
Also, in 2020, globally, women were:

- 20.1% of the technical workforce, up from 19.2% in 2019.
- 35.8% of non-tech workers, up from 35.1%.
- 24.4% of leadership, up from 23.4%.

By race, Dell’s overall U.S. workforce in 2020 was:

- 68.9% White, up from 68.9% in 2019.
- 14.5% Asian, up from 14.2%.
- 8.2% Latinx, up from 7.7%.
- 5.1% Black, up from 4.9%.
- 1.7% multiracial, unchanged.
- .5% American Indian or Alaska Native, unchanged.
- .2% Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, unchanged.
- .7% were of an unspecified race, down from .9%

By race, Dell’s technical workforce was:

- 60.7% White, down from 62.1% in 2019.
- 25.6% Asian, up from 24.8%.
- 6.5% Latinx, up from 6.2%.
- 4.2% Black, unchanged.
- 1.4% multiracial, up from 1.3%.
- .5% American Indian or Alaska Native, unchanged.
- .1% Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, unchanged.
- .7% were of an unspecified race, down from .8%

By race, Dell’s non-technical workforce was:

- 72.8% White, down from 73.8% in 2019.
- 9.1% Asian, unchanged.
- 9% Latinx, up from 8.4%.
- 5.5% Black, up from 5.3%.
- 1.8% multiracial, down from 1.9%.
- .5% American Indian or Alaska Native, unchanged.
- .2% Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, unchanged.
- .7% were of an unspecified race, down from .9%

By race, Dell’s leadership was:

- 76.1% White, down from 77.4% in 2019.
- 11.7% Asian, up from 11.4%.
- 6.9% Latinx, up from 6.2%.
- 3% Black, up from 2.9%.
- .9% multiracial, down from 1%.
- .4% American Indian or Native Alaskan, up from .3%.
- .1% Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, unchanged.
- .6% were of an unspecified race, unchanged.
Global Gender Diversity by the Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Non-technical</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>People Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^0.7%

2019 – FY19 fiscal year reporting is dated 2/1/19
2020 – FY20 fiscal year reporting is dated 2/1/20

Global Gender Diversity by the Numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hispanic or Latino</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Non-technical</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>People Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^0.5%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Black or African American</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Non-technical</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>People Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^0.2%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Non-technical</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>People Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^0.3%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American Indian or Alaska Native</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Non-technical</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>People Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Non-technical</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>People Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Two or More Races</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Non-technical</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>People Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Non-technical</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>People Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^1.0%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Specified</th>
<th>Overall</th>
<th>Non-technical</th>
<th>Technical</th>
<th>People Leaders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dell

2019 – FY19 fiscal year reporting is dated 2/1/19
2020 – FY20 fiscal year reporting is dated 2/1/20
Facebook’s global tally of female workers, U.S. workforce diversity rose slightly

Across its C-suite and in its technical and non-technical workforce, the percentage of women workers globally increased slightly between 2019 and 2020, continuing a trend extending back to 2014, according to its June 2020 diversity report.

Of its U.S. workforce, Facebook reported increased racial diversity among its leadership and technical workforce, but a slight decrease in racial diversity among its non-technical workers.

Globally, men still held 65.9% of leadership roles, 75.9% of tech jobs, and 41.5% of non-tech jobs.

Globally, women comprised:

- 37% of the entire workforce in 2020, up from 36.9% in 2019. The respective numbers for men were 63% and 63.1%.
- 34.2% of Facebook’s leaders, up from 32.9%. The respective numbers for men were 65.8% and 67.1%
- 24.1% of tech workers, up from 23.1%. The respective numbers for men were 75.9% and 76.9%
- 58.5% of non-technical employees, up from 57.2%. The respective numbers for men were 41.5% and 42.8%

By race, among Facebook’s total U.S. workforce:

- 44.4% were Asian, up from 43%.
- 41% were White, down from 44.2%.
- 6.3% were Hispanic, up from 5.2%.
- 4% were multiracial, up from 3.1%.
- 3.9% were Black, up from 3.8%.

By race, among Facebook’s U.S. leadership:

- 63.2% of executives were White, down from 65.4%.
- 25.4% were Asian, up from 24.9%.
- 4.3% were Hispanic, up from 3.5%.
- 3.4% were Black, up from 3.1%.
- 3.4% were multiracial, up from 2.9%.

By race, among Facebook’s U.S. tech workers:

- 53.4% were Asian, up from 52.3%.
- 37.2% were White, down from 40%.
- 4.3% were Hispanic, up from 3.5%.
- 3.2% were multiracial, up from 2.3%.
- 1.7% were Black, up from 1.5%.

By race, among Facebook’s U.S. non-tech workers:

- 49.4% were White, down from 52.5%.
- 24.5% were Asian, down from 24.7%.
- 10.7% were Hispanic, up from 8.8%.
- 8.9% were Black, up from 8.2%.
- 5.8% were multiracial, up from 4.6%.
### U.S. Ethnicity

#### % Representation—Black

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Roles</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Technical</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### % Representation—Hispanic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Roles</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Technical</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### % Representation—2 or more

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Roles</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Technical</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### U.S. Ethnicity

#### % Representation—White

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Roles</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Technical</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### U.S. Ethnicity

#### % Representation—Asian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Roles</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Technical</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Global Gender

#### % Representation—Male

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Roles</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Technical</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Data points from 2018–2020 have been rounded to the nearest tenth of a percentage point. Historical data points from 2014–2017 were rounded to the nearest whole number. Data was pulled June 30, 2020.

Source: Facebook
Google’s female workforce increased by less than 1% in the United States

Of Google’s U.S. workforce, 32.2% were female, according to its 2021 diversity report, released in July 2021. That was up slightly from 31.6% in the 2020 report. The remainder of the 2021 report’s U.S. workforce was male.

Of the global workforce, 32.5% were female in the 2021 report, up from 32% in the 2020 report.

Among company leaders in the United States, 28.1% were female, and 71.9% were male in 2021, which compared to 26.9% and 73.1% in 2020.

By race, in 2021, the overall U.S. workforce was 50.4% White, down slightly from 51.7% in 2020. The respective figures were 42.3% and 41.9% for Asians; 6.4% and 5.9% among Latinx persons; 4.4% and 3.7% for Blacks; and .8% and .8% in both years for Native American, Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander persons.

Google’s 2021 report also concluded that, among its total U.S. workforce:

- 15% were White females and 35.4% were White males; that compared to 15.2% and 36.5% in the 2020 report.
- During the same periods, 14.6% were Asian females and 27.7% were Asian males; that compared to 14.2% and 27.7%.
- 2.2% were Latinx females and 4.2% were Latinx males; that compared to 2% and 3.9%.
- 1.8% were Black females and 2.6% were Black males; that compared to 1.6% and 2.1%.
- .3% were females and .5% were males who were Native American, Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific; those figures were the same in the 2020 report.
- Racially, among company leaders in the United States, 65.5% were White in 2021, down slightly from 65.9% in 2020.
- Respectively, during the same periods, 29.4% and 29.6% of leaders were Asian; 3.9% and 3.7% were Latinx; 3% and 2.6% were Black; .6% and .5% were Native American, Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander.
- By gender and race in 2021, among those leaders:
  - 17.8% were White females and 47.7% were White males; that compared to 16.8% and 49.1% in the previous report.
  - 8.7% were Asian females and 20.7% were Asian males; that compared to 8.5% and 21.1% in the previous report.
  - 1.4% were Latinx females and 2.5% were Latinx males; that compared to 1.5% and 2.2% in the previous report.
  - 1.3% were Black females and 1.8% were Black males; that compared to 1.1% and 1.5% in the previous report.
  - 0% of male and female leaders each were Native American, Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander; that compared to .3% and .2% in the previous year.
Leadership representation by gender

U.S. 2020 and 2021

- **Women**: 2020: 26.9%, 2021: 28.1%
- **Men**: 2020: 73.1%, 2021: 71.9%

GLOBAL 2020 and 2021

- **Women**: 2020: 26.7%, 2021: 28.1%
- **Men**: 2020: 73.3%, 2021: 71.9%

Representation by race/ethnicity

U.S. 2020 and 2021

- **Asian+**: 2020: 41.9%, 2021: 42.3%
- **Black+**: 2020: 3.7%, 2021: 4.4%
- **Latinx+**: 2020: 5.9%, 2021: 6.4%
- **Native American+**: 2020: 0.8%, 2021: 0.8%
- **White+**: 2020: 51.7%, 2021: 50.4%

Source: Google
Intersectional representation

U.S. 2020 and 2021

Leadership representation by race/ethnicity

U.S. 2020 and 2021

Leadership intersectional representation

U.S. 2020 and 2021

Source: Google
Intel’s female and people of color workforces were mostly stagnant

Throughout Intel's international operations, women were 27.8% of the workforce in 2020, fractionally up from 27.4% in 2019, according to the company's latest diversity report.

Globally, women executives were 21.1% and 20.3%, respectively, of the C-suite in those same years, according to Intel's diversity report.

That report also showed that women were 26.3% and men 73.7% of Intel's U.S. workforce in 2020. That compared to 26.5% and 73.5%, respectively, in 2019.

Additionally, by race, the overall U.S. workforce in 2020 was:

- 45.8% White. (In 2019, when Intel combined Whites and Asians as its majority population, that accounted for 61.2% of all employees.)
- 37.6% Asian.
- 10.5% Latinx, up slightly from 10% in 2019.
- 4.9% Black, unchanged from 2019.
- .8% Native American, unchanged.
- .4% Pacific Islander, a group not in the 2019 count.

The U.S. C-suite, by gender and race, in 2020 was:

- 21.8% women and 78.2% men, compared, respectively, to 20.8% and 72.5% in 2019.
- 61.3% White. (In 2019, the combined White and Asian majority population accounted for 72.5%.)
- 30.2% Asian.
- 5.6% Latinx, about the same as 2019’s 5.7%.
- 2% Black, compared to 2.3% in 2019.
- .9% Native American; this group was not in the 2019 count.
- 0% Pacific Islander.

U.S. tech workers, by gender and race, in 2020 were:

- 23.5% women and 76.5% men, compared to 23.7% and 76.3% in 2019.
- 43.9% White. (In 2019, Whites and Asians, combined, were 63.6%.)
- 39.7% Asian.
- 10.3% Latinx, up from 9.9% in 2019.
- 4.9% Black, barely changed from 4.8% in 2019.
- .8% Native American, the same as in 2019.
- .3% Pacific Islander.

U.S. non-tech workers, by gender and race, in 2020 were:

- 56.5% women and 43.5% men, compared to 56.9% and 36% in 2019.
- 66.8% White. (In 2019, Whites and Asians, combined, were 36%.)
- 14.2% Asian.
- 12% Latinx, up from 11.6% in 2019.
- 5.5% Black, down from 5.9%.
- 1.1% Native American, up slightly from 1%.
- .4% Pacific Islander.
By gender and race, 2020’s U.S. directors, which Intel did not count as a separate category in 2019, were:

- 20.2% women and 79.8% men.
- 55.6% White.
- 36.8% Asian.
- 4.6% Latinx.
- 2.4% Black.
- 0.6% Native American.
- 0.1% Pacific Islander.

By gender and race, 2020’s U.S. senior managers, who also weren’t counted as a separate category in 2019, were:

- 23.6% women and 76.4% men in 2020.
- 46.9% White.
- 42.3% Asian.
- 7.2% Latinx.
- 3% Black.
- 0.5% Native American.
- 0.1% Pacific Islander.
### Technical

**U.S. Gender**
- **Women**: 23.5%
- **Men**: 76.5%

**U.S. Ethnicity**
- **White**: 43.9%
- **Asian**: 39.7%
- **Hispanic/Latinx**: 10.3%
- **African American**: 4.9%
- **Native American**: 0.8%
- **Pacific Islander**: 0.3%

### Non-Technical

**U.S. Gender**
- **Women**: 56.5%
- **Men**: 43.5%

**U.S. Ethnicity**
- **White**: 66.8%
- **Asian**: 14.2%
- **Hispanic/Latinx**: 12%
- **African American**: 5.5%
- **Native American**: 1.1%
- **Pacific Islander**: 0.4%

Source: Intel
### Directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. Gender</th>
<th>U.S. Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic/Latinx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Executives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. Gender</th>
<th>U.S. Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hispanic/Latinx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Native American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Intel
LinkedIn counted more women worldwide, fewer Whites in the U.S.

Women represented 44.7% of LinkedIn employees worldwide in 2020, up from 41.9% in 2019. Men were 55.3%.

In the United States, workers of color increased 2.5%, to a total of 54.8%; Asians comprised 42.2% of that total, according to the company’s diversity report.

The global gender divide was greatest in LinkedIn’s tech workforce, where women were 24% of employees, up from 22.4% in 2019. Men were 76% of the tech workforce in 2020 and 77.6% in 2019.

Globally, 2020 the non-tech workforce was 56.2% female and 43.8% male. That compared to 55% and 45% in 2019. The 2020 leadership figures were 41.9% female and 58.1% male. That compared to 40.8% and 59.2%, respectively, in 2019.

LinkedIn provided global numbers for gender and U.S. data for race/ethnicity. Whites were 45% of the overall U.S. workforce in 2020, down from 47.5% in 2019.
LinkedIn reported that its overall 2020 workforce in the United States was:
- 42.2% Asian, up from 40.3% in 2019.
- 6% Latinx, slightly up from 5.9%.
- 3.9% Black, slightly up from 3.5%.
- 2.7% multiracial, slightly up from 2.6%.
- .2% other, unchanged.

Its 2020, U.S. tech workforce was:
- 68.1% Asian, up from 65.2% in 2019.
- 25% White, down from 27.6%.
- 3.3% Latinx, slightly down from 3.4%.
- 2.3% multiracial, slightly down from 2.4%.
- 1.3% Black, slightly down from 1.2%.
- .2% other.

Its 2020 U.S. non-tech workforce was:
- 63% White, down from 64.8% in 2019.
- 19.1% Asian, up from 18.7%.
- 8.5% Latinx, up from 8%.
- 6.3% Black, up from 5.5%.
- 3% multiracial, up from 2.8%.
- .2% other, unchanged.

Its 2020 non-tech U.S. workforce was:
- 58% White, down from 61.1% in 2019.
- 33.8% Asian, up from 32.3%.
- 3.6 Latinx, up from 2.8%.
- 2.2% Black, up from 1%.
- 2.2% multiracial, down from 2.8%.
- .2% other, up from 0%.

The company also reported that 1.8% of its 2020 U.S. employees and 1.7% in 2019 had a disability.
Women comprised roughly 28% of Microsoft’s workforce, globally; less growth among minorities

Women accounted for 28.6% of Microsoft’s workforce globally in 2020, reflecting a 1 percentage-point increase from 2019.

While the company’s Asian employees increased to 34.7% in 2020 from 33.1% in 2019, overall, other people of color saw increases of less than 1 percentage point.

According to the Microsoft’s annual diversity report, of its global workforce in 2020:

- 71.3% was male, down from 72.3% in 2019.
- 20% of its C-suite were women, up from 19.3% in 2019.
- 21.1% of directors were women, up from 20.5%.
- 26.3% of managers were women, up from 25.4%.
- 22.8% of tech workers were women, up from 21.4%.
- 40.4% of non-tech workers were women, up from 39.4%.
- 38.5% of retail workers were women, up incrementally from 38.2%.
Microsoft analyzed the race of its U.S. workforce but not its international workforce to report that in 2020:

- 50.2% of all employees were White, down from 53.2% in 2019.
- 34.7% were Asian, up from 33.1%.
- 6.6% were Latinx, slightly up from 6.3%.
- 4.9% were Black, slightly up from 4.5%.
- 2.3% were multiracial, slightly up from 2.1%.
- .5% were Native American/Alaskan Native in both years.
- .2% were Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander in both years.

By race, in the C-suite in 2020:

- 65.2% were White, down from 67.3% in 2019.
- 25.2% were Asian, up from 23.9%.
- 4.4% were Latinx in both years.
- 2.9% were Black, slightly up from 2.7%.
- 1.1% were multiracial, slightly up from .9%.
- .3% were Native American/Alaskan Native, slightly down from .4%.
- .1% were Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander in both years.

By race, among directors in 2020:

- 60.3% were White, down from 63.2% in 2019.
- 29.8% were Asian, up from 27.8%.
- 4.8% were Latinx, slightly up from 4.7%.
- 2.6% were Black, slightly up from 2.5%.
- 1.4% were multiracial, slightly up from 1.2%.
- .4% were Native American/Alaskan Native, slightly up from .3%.
- .1% were Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander in both years.

By race, among managers in 2020:

- 58.7% were White, down from 61.8% in 2019.
- 30.6% were Asian, down from 28.6%.
- 5.4% were Latinx, slightly up from 5%.
- 2.9% were Black, slightly up from 2.7%.
- 1.5% were multiracial, slightly up from 1.2%.
- .4% were Native American/Alaskan Native.
- .2% were Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander.

By race, among tech workers in 2020:

- 45.8% were White, down from 49% in 2019.
- 41.8% were Asian, up from 40.1%.
- 5.3% were Latinx, up from 4.9%.
- 3.6% were Black, up from 3.3%.
- 2.2% were multiracial, up from 2%.
- .5% were Native American/Alaskan Native, down from .6%.
- .1% were Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander in both years.
By race, among non-tech workers in 2020:
- 61.8% were White, down from 63.1% in 2019.
- 16.5% were Asian, down from 16.6%.
- 9.9% were Latinx, up from 9.6%.
- 8.1% were Black, up from 7.5%.
- 2.6% were multiracial, up from 2.3%.
- .4% were Native American/Alaskan Native in both years.
- .4% were Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander in both years.

By race, among retail workers in 2020:
- 41.2% were White, down from 43% in 2019.
- 25.9% were Latinx, up from 25%.
- 19.6% were Black, up from 18.6%.
- 9.9% were Asian, down from 10.2%.
- 2.1% were multiracial, up from 1.8%.
- .8% were Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, down from 1%.
- .4% were Native American/Alaskan Native, down from .5%.

Slack counted slightly fewer women and minorities in its global workforce

Women comprised 44.9% of the overall global workforce at Slack in 2020, a decline from 45.8% in 2019. In one category, directors or leaders above the director level, there was a .3 percentage-point increase in women workers globally.

According to the company’s 2020 analysis, globally, female workers were:
- 33.4% of tech workers, down from 34.6% in 2019.
- 52.3% on non-tech workers, down from 53.7%.
- 46.1% of managers, down from 50.2%.
- 29.9% of directors and leaders above that level, up from 29.6%.

Slack did not provide a gender breakdown of its overall U.S. workforce. It did report that 7.8% of the U.S. workforce identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or queer in 2020, compared to 8.3% in 2019. Of its U.S. managers, 7.8% were LGBTQ, compared to 8.7% in 2019.
But, by race, it reported that in 2020:

- 52.2% of its overall U.S. workforce was White, up from 51.8% in 2019.
- 28.3% was Asian, down from 30.6%.
- 7.9% was Latinx, slightly down from 8%.
- 4.4% was Black, down from 4.9%.
- 4.2% was multiracial, up from 3.1%.
- 1.3% didn’t disclose their race, up from .4%.
- 1.1% were Middle Eastern, slightly up from 1%.
- .4% Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, up from .3%.
- .1% were Native American/Alaska Native, down from .2%.

In 2020, its U.S. C-suite was:

- 69.1% White, down from 71.1% in 2019.
- 15.8% Asian, up from 14.9%.
- 5.3% Black, up from 4.4%.
- 3.3% multiracial, down from 4.4%.
- 2.6% Latinx, up from 1.8%.
- 2.6% of undisclosed race, up from .9%.
- 1.3% Middle Eastern, down from 2.6%.

Its U.S. managers were:

- 57.1% White, down from 51.6% in 2019.
- 24.2% Asian, up from 23.4%.
- 5.5% Black, down from 6%.
- 5.5% Latinx, slightly up from 5.4%.
- 4.4% multiracial, unchanged from 2019.
- 2.2% of undisclosed race, up from 1.6%.
- 1.1% Middle Eastern, down from 1.6%.
Its U.S. tech employees were:
- 48% White, down from 51.8% in 2019.
- 32.5% Asian, up from 30.6%.
- 8.4% Latinx, slightly up from 8%.
- 4.7% Black, slightly down from 4.9%.
- 4% multiracial, up from 3.1%.
- 1% Middle Eastern, unchanged from 2019.
- 0.2% Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, up from 0%.
- 0.2% Native American/Alaska Native, unchanged.

Its non-tech employees were:
- 56% White, down from 56.7% in 2019.
- 24.7% Asian, up from 21.7%.
- 7.3% Latinx, slightly down from 7.4%.
- 4.4% multiracial, down from 6%.
- 4.3% Black, down from 5.1%.
- 1.5% of undisclosed race, down from 1.8%.
- 1.2% Middle Eastern, up from .7%.
- .6% Native American/Pacific Islander, down from .7%.
At Snap, women were roughly a third of all workers and executives

Snap Inc.’s 2020 diversity report concluded that women comprised 32.9% of its global workforce in 2019, a .9% increase over the rate in 2018.

Men accounted for 66.5% of the global workforce, while the gender of .7% of employees, internationally, was undeclared.

Regarding its U.S. workforce, Snap also provided a racial breakdown, showing that 51.1% were White, 33.3% were Asian, 6.8% were Latinx, 4.4% were multiracial, 4.1% were Black, .3% were Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and 0% were Native American/Alaska Native.

In each of those racial categories, men outnumbered women.

Findings, in the C-suite, included these:

- Globally, 74.3% of those at the director level or higher were men, 24.3% were women, and the gender of 1.4% was undeclared.
- Of U.S.-based directors or persons above that level, 70.4% were White, 16.5% were Asian, 7% were multiracial, 2.6% were Black, 2.6% were Latinx, .9% were Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and 0% were Native American/Alaska Native.
- Globally, 69.7% of those at the vice-president level or higher were men, and 30.3% were women.
- Of U.S.-based vice presidents or higher-level leaders, 74.2% were White, 12.9% were Asian, 6.5% were multiracial, 3.2% were Black, 3.2% were Latinx, 0% were Native American/Alaska Native, and 0% were Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander.
- Globally, 66.7% of executives were men, and 33.3% were women.
- Of U.S.-based executives, 83.3% were White, 8.3% were Black, and 8.3% were multiracial; 0% were other races.

Among tech workers:

- Globally, 82.8% were men, 16.1% were women, and the gender of 1.1% was undeclared.
- 91.1% of global leadership were men, 6.7% were women, and the gender of 2.2% was undeclared.
- In the United States, 48.4% were Asian, 42.6% were White, 3.4% were Latinx, 3.1% were multiracial, 2.3% were Black, .2% were Native Hawaiian/Alaska Native, and 0% were Native American/Alaska Native.

Among non-tech workers:

- Globally, 54.1% were women, 45.8% were men, and the gender of .1% was undeclared.
- 66.3% of global leadership were men, 32.6% were women, and the gender of 1.1% was undeclared.
- In the United States, 61.6% were White, 14.6% were Asian, 11% were Latinx, 6.2% were Black, 6% were multiracial, .5% were Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, and .1% were Native American/Alaska Native.
Representation

Gender (Global)  Intersectional Race/Ethnicity (U.S.)

- **66.5% Men**
  - 9.3% Women: 24.0% Men
  - 1.3% Women: 2.8% Men
  - 2.4% Women: 4.3% Men
  - 1.8% Women: 2.6% Men

- **32.9% Women**
  - 0.0% Women: 0.0% Men
  - 0.1% Women: 0.3% Men

- **0.7% Undeclared**
  - 18.7% Women: 92.4% Men

**Leadership | Director+**

Gender (Global)  Race/Ethnicity (U.S.)

- **74.3% Men**
  - 16.5% Asian
  - 2.6% Black/African American
  - 2.6% Hispanic/Latinx
  - 7.0% Multiracial

- **24.3% Women**
  - 0.0% Native American/Alaskan Native*
  - 0.9% Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander

- **1.4% Undeclared**
  - 70.4% White

Source: Snap
## Leadership | Vice President+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender (Global)</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity (U.S.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>69.7%</strong> Men</td>
<td>12.9% Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2% Black/African American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2% Hispanic/Latinx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.5% Multiracial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0% Native American/Alaskan Native*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30.3%</strong> Women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0% Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>74.2%</strong> White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Leadership | Executive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender (Global)</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity (U.S.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>66.7%</strong> Men</td>
<td>0.0% Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3% Black/African American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0% Hispanic/Latinx</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3% Multiracial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0% Native American/Alaskan Native*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>33.3%</strong> Women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0% Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>83.3%</strong> White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Snap
Leadership is defined as Director level and above.

**Race/Ethnicity (U.S.)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Tech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black/African American</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latinx</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American/Alaskan Native</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We define Tech at the individual team member level based on the specific characteristics of their job.
Globally, roughly 44% of Twitter’s employees were women

At Twitter, in 2021, women accounted for 43.7% and men for 55.1% of the global workforce, while non-binary persons and persons who did not disclose their gender each accounted for less than 1%, according to the company's June 2021 diversity report. In 2020, women were 42.7% of the global workforce.

In its global C-suite in 2021, 37.7% of executives were women, 61.8% were men, and less than 1% each were non-binary or didn’t disclose their gender. Globally, 29.2% of the tech workforce were women, 69% were men, less than 1% were non-binary, and 1.5% didn’t disclose their gender in 2021. In 2020, women were 42.7% of the global workforce.

In the United States only, where Twitter broke down its workforce by race:

- 39.4% of the overall workforce was White in 2021, which compared to 41.2% in 2020.
- 28.7% was Asian, which compared to 28.4% in 2020.
- 8.4% was Black, up from 6.9%.
- 6.7% was Latinx, up from 5.5%.
- 4.4% was multiracial, up from 4.1%.
- Less than 1% was Indigenous in both years.

In the C-suite in 2021:

- 54.6% of executives were White, down from 55.8% in 2020.
- 17.7% were Asian, compared to 18.3% in 2020.
7.3% were Black, up from 6.9%.
3.9% were Latinx, up from 3.8%.
3.7% were multiracial, up from 3.6%.
Less than 1% were Indigenous in both years.

In the tech workforce in 2021:
35.2% of employees were Asian, down from 35.6% in 2020.
34% were White, down from 34.6%.
6.7% were Black, up from 5.8%.
6.1% were Latinx, up from 4.7%.
3.9% was multiracial, up from 3.6%.
Less than 1% were Indigenous in both years.

### Global gender

**Leadership roles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-binary / Non-conforming</th>
<th>Undisclosed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1.0%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### U.S. ethnicity

#### All roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latinx</th>
<th>Multiracial</th>
<th>Indigenous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>&lt;1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Technical roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latinx</th>
<th>Multiracial</th>
<th>Indigenous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>&lt;1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Leadership roles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White</th>
<th>Asian</th>
<th>Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latinx</th>
<th>Multiracial</th>
<th>Indigenous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>&lt;1.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Twitter
News on social media “largely inaccurate”; Facebook was favorite purveyor

Facebook was the preferred social media source for news, according to a Pew Research Center report, with 36% of adults saying they got their news on that site regularly. The runners-up were YouTube and Twitter, respectively.

“News Use Across Social Media Platforms” issued in January 2021, reported that 53% of U.S. adults said they “often” or “sometimes” get their news on social media, while 18% said they “rarely” and 21% said they “never” get news on social media.

In 2020 and 2019, 59% of adults said they expected news on social media to be largely inaccurate, which was up from 57% in 2018.

Pew found that:

- 23% of adults regularly got news from YouTube.
- 15% of adults regularly got news from Twitter.
- 11% regularly got news from Instagram.
- 6% regularly got news from Reddit.
- 59% of Twitter users said they regularly consumed news on Twitter.
- 54% of Facebook users said they regularly consumed news on Facebook.
- 42% of Reddit users said they regularly consumed news on Reddit.
- 32% of YouTube users said they regularly consumed news on YouTube.
- 28% of Instagram users said they regularly consumed news on Instagram.

By gender, of regular social media news consumers:

- On Facebook, 63% were women, and 35% were men.
- On Instagram, 60% were women, and 35% were men.
- On Twitter, 43% were women, and 54% were men.
- On YouTube, 42% were women, and 55% were men.
- On LinkedIn, 41% were women, and 56% were men.
- On Reddit, 29% were women, and 67% were men.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of U.S. adults who get news from social media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Facebook stands out as regular source of news for Americans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Platform</th>
<th>Use site</th>
<th>Regularly get news on site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouTube</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instagram</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reddit</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snapchat</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LinkedIn</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TikTok</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WhatsApp</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumblr</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitch</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Pew Research Center
By race, of regular social media news consumers:

- On Facebook, 60% were White, 18% were Latinx, 13% were Black, and 5% were Asians.
- On Reddit, 59% were White, 17% were Latinx, 10% were Asian, and 8% were Black.
- On Twitter, 54% were White, 20% were Latinx, 12% were Black, and 9% were Asian.
- On LinkedIn, 52% were White, 16% were Latinx, 15% were Black, and 14% were Latinx.
- On YouTube, 50% were White, 20% were Latinx, 12% were Black, and 7% were Asian.

By major political party, of regular social media news consumers:

- On Reddit, 79% were Democratic/Democratic leaning, and 21% were Republican/Republican leaning.
- On Twitter, 65% were Democratic/Democratic leaning, and 33% were Republican/Republican leaning.
- On Instagram, 64% were Democratic/Democratic leaning, and 32% were Republican/Republican leaning.
- On LinkedIn, 61% were Democratic/Democratic leaning, and 37% were Republican/Republican leaning.
- On YouTube, 55% were Democratic/Democratic leaning, and 42% were Republican/Republican leaning.
- On Facebook, 50% were Democratic/Democratic leaning, and 46% were Republican/Republican leaning.
In the opinion of 47% of U.S. adults, major social media/tech companies should be more regulated by the government; 11% said they should be less regulated; and 39% said regulation should remain at its current levels.

That’s among the findings of a Pew Research Center survey released in December 2020. Pew conducted the survey after the Federal Trade Commission and almost every state sued to force Facebook to drop its ownership of WhatsApp and Instagram; as a smaller group of states sued Google for alleged antitrust; and as Amazon, whose CEO owns The Washington Post, also came under congressional scrutiny.

According to the survey:

- 72% of U.S. adults said social media companies wielded too much influence and power over politics.
- 82% of Democrats and 63% of Republicans agreed with that sentiment.
- 64% said social media mainly had a negative effect on the direction that the nation was taking.

A separate Pew survey, whose results were released in May 2019, showed that 69% of U.S. adults had ever used Facebook; that usage was surpassed only by YouTube: 73% of adults reported ever using the video-sharing site.

The latter survey, “10 facts about Americans and Facebook,” also found that:

- 75% of U.S. women and 63% of U.S. men used Facebook.
- 37% of U.S. adults had ever used Facebook-owned Instagram.
- 74% used Facebook at least once a day. In contrast, 63% of Instagram users were on that site at least once a day, and 61% of Snapchat users were on that site at least daily.
- 74% of college-degree holders and 61% of those with a high school diploma or less had ever used Facebook.
- 79% of those aged 18 to 29 had ever used Facebook.
- 46% those 65 and older had ever used Facebook, which compared to 20% in 2012.
- 51% of those aged 13 to 17 used Facebook, which compared to 71% in 2014.
- 85% of teens used YouTube; 72% of teens used Instagram; and 69% of teens used Snapchat.
- 70% of teens whose households earned less than $30,000 a year and 36% of those from households earning at least $75,000 a year used Facebook.
- 43% of U.S. adults got news from Facebook, while 21% of YouTube users got news from that site, 12% of Twitter users got news from that site, and 8% of Instagram users got news from that site.
- 14% of Facebook users said ordinary users have a lot of control over what lands in their Facebook newsfeeds, 28% said they had no control, and 57% said they had little control.
- 74% of U.S. adult Facebook users did not know the site collected information about them until they were directed to Pew’s 2018 analysis on how Facebook algorithms catalogued their personal data.
About half of Americans back more government regulation of big tech companies, with conservative Republicans growing more supportive of the idea since 2018.

% of U.S. adults who say that major technology companies should be regulated by the government ___ they are currently

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>U.S. Adults</th>
<th>Rep/Lean Rep</th>
<th>Dem/Lean Dem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CONSERVATIVE</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOD/LIB</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONS/MOD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIBERAL</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More than 🔵 The same as 🔴 Less than 🔴

Note: Those who did not give an answer are not shown.


Top woman in esports earned roughly 7% of what top man took in

Just one woman was among the top 500 esports champions. Her tournament prize earnings, as of January 2019, totaled $296,000 — $3.8 million less than the top-earning male gamer. When ranked by earnings, the woman who made the most money, Sasha “Scarlett” Hostyn, who is transgender, came in at No. 301, according to “Women in Esports.”

The Casino.org analysis also compared the 25 most-followed male and female streamers on Twitch, Amazon’s social video platform. As part of that analysis, 388 female gamers gave Women in Esports their assessment of the gender divide in video gaming and on related issues, such as online harassment of female gamers.

Among other main findings:

- The top two most-followed male streamers on Twitch had more followers than the top 25 female streamers.
- The top 25 women, together, had an average of 595,829 followers.
- The top 25 male streamers on Twitch on average had more than 2.3 million followers.
- The top female gamer on Twitch had roughly 2.7 million followers.
- The top male gamer on Twitch — Tyler “Ninja” Blevins, who was criticized in 2018 for saying he deliberately doesn’t play with female gamers — had roughly 12.9 million followers.
- 96% of surveyed female gamers said women and men should compete in the same esports tournaments.
- 57% of female gamers said they were harassed online.
- 71% of female gamers said game developers should be responsible for curbing harassment.
Regarding online harassment of women gamers:

- 53.4% involved sexist comments.
- 44.8% involved insults about their gaming skills.
- 41% involved profanity.
- 33% involved insults about their intelligence.
- 22.4% involved rape jokes.
- 13.7% involved online stalking.
- 12.1% involved rape threats.
- 8.8% involved death threats.
- 4.9% involved threats against the women’s relatives.

After revealing online that they were female gamers:

- 54% were asked a sexual favor.
- 26% were accused of hacking or cheating.
- 69% considered withdrawing from a gaming session.

What’s it like to be a female gamer?

- 57% of female gamers were harassed while playing online video games after revealing their gender.
- 54% were asked for a sexual favor.
- 26% were accused of hacking or cheating.
- 69% considered withdrawing from a gaming session.

Most common types of harassment experienced while gaming online:

- Threats against loved ones: 4.9%
- Death threats: 8.8%
- Rape threats: 12.1%
- Online stalking: 13.7%
- Rape jokes: 22.4%
- Insults about intelligence: 33.0%
- Insults about gaming skills: 41/0%
- Sexist comments: 53.4%

Top methods used to avoid harassment while gaming online:

- Block or mute toxic players: 74.5%
- Avoid verbal communication with other players: 70.4%
- Avoid visual communication with other players: 57.0%
- Gender-neutralize screen names: 50.3%
- Lie about real name: 27.8%
- Lie about gender: 23.2%
- Create a male avatar: 22.2%
- Lie about age: 17.8%
- I don’t do anything to avoid harassment: 2.8%

71% of female gamers said video game developers should be responsible for curbing general harassment in online gameplay.

Source: Women in Esports
Tally of women gamers fell; younger men preferred shooter games

Women accounted for 41% and men 59% of the nation’s 214.4 million video-game players, according to the Entertainment Software Association’s 2020 report.

By comparison, 46% of players were women, according to the association’s 2019 report, which was rolled out as the comparative lack of female game developers continued to make headlines.

The most recent report also provided snapshots of the types of games men and women preferred in 2020.

Among women aged 18 to 34:
- 50% said racing games were among their favorites.
- 52% said action games were among their favorites.
- 59% said family games were among their favorites.

Among men aged 18 to 34:
- 65% favored role-playing games.
- 68% favored adventure games.
- 80% favored shooter games.

Among women aged 35 to 54:
- 30% favored action games.
- 37% favored family games.
- 40% favored arcade games.

Among men aged 35 to 54:
- 54% favored adventure games
- 61% favored shooter games.
- 67% favored casual games, e.g., Tetris or solitaire.

Among women aged 55 to 64:
- 14% favored adventure games.
- 16% favored action games.
- 25% favored family games.

Among men aged 55 to 64:
- 26% favored racing games
- 31% favored role-playing games.
- 32% favored shooter games.

Among women aged 65 and over:
- 13% favored family games.
- 24% favored arcade games.
- 95% favored casual games.

Among men aged 65 and older:
- 26% favored action, adventure, and racing games.
- 41% favored arcade games.
- 86% favored casual games.
WOMEN 18-34

77% play video games on a smartphone
46% most often play casual games
48% prefer to play with friends

FAVORITE GAMES
59% Family games (e.g., Super Mario Party, Just Dance)
52% Action games (e.g., Grand Theft Auto, Super Mario Odyssey, God of War)
50% Racing games (e.g., Need for Speed, Mario Kart)

55% say games help them stay connected with friends and family

MEN 18-34

75% play video games on a console
51% most often play action games
68% prefer to play with friends

FAVORITE GAMES
80% Shooter games (e.g., Call of Duty, Fortnite)
68% Adventure games (e.g., Tomb Raider, Uncharted)
65% Role-playing games (e.g., World of Warcraft, The Witcher)

70% say games help them stay connected with friends and family

Source: Entertainment Software Association
WOMEN 35-54

- 78% play video games on a smartphone
- 67% most often play casual games
- 58% prefer to play with friends

Favorite Games

- 40% Arcade games (e.g., Pac-Man, Pinball FX3)
- 37% Family games (e.g., Super Mario Party, Just Dance)
- 30% Action games (e.g., Grand Theft Auto, Super Mario Odyssey, God of War)

77% say games help them relax

MEN 35-54

- 70% play video games on a console
- 38% most often play action games
- 44% prefer to play with friends

Favorite Games

- 67% Casual games (e.g., Tetris, Solitaire)
- 61% Shooter games (e.g., Call of Duty, Fortnite)
- 54% Adventure games (e.g., Tomb Raider, Uncharted)

83% say games help them relax

Source: Entertainment Software Association
**WOMEN 55-64**

- **63%** play video games on a smartphone
- **74%** most often play casual games
- **37%** prefer to play with friends

**FAVORITE GAMES**

- **25%** Family and arcade games
- **16%** Action games (e.g., Grand Theft Auto, Super Mario Odyssey, God of War)
- **14%** Adventure games (e.g., Tomb Raider, Uncharted)

- **82%** say games provide mental stimulation

---

**MEN 55-64**

- **56%** play video games on a smartphone
- **48%** most often play casual games
- **42%** prefer to play with friends

**FAVORITE GAMES**

- **32%** Shooters, adventure, and action games
- **31%** Role-playing and arcade games
- **26%** Racing games (e.g., Need for Speed, Mario Kart)

- **87%** say games provide mental stimulation

Source: Entertainment Software Association
Of women responding to the annual First Round *State of Startups* survey, 40% reported that being a woman hurt their hiring prospects or chances of landing senior roles at tech firms. And 70% of women who had founded firms — a range that included startups in consumer, financial tech, health care, e-commerce, gaming, and other sectors — said their gender hindered their fundraising.

By gender, 19.3% of the 950 respondents were women and 80.7% were men.

Of all those respondents, 55.6% said their companies had an informal diversity-and-inclusion strategy and 23% said their companies had a formal plan or policy, while 14.9% said their companies had no plan and none in progress, and 6.5% said theirs had no plan but planned to adopt one.

Among founders of those 3- through 11-year-old companies, 80.1% said having a more diverse team would positively impact company value; 19.9% said it would have no such direct effect. Employees who believed their leadership didn’t prioritize diversity and inclusion were three times more likely than co-workers who didn’t share that belief to anticipate leaving their company within the following year. (In 2019, for the first time, responses from rank-and-file workers were included in this annual survey, which began in 2015.)

Conducted before the Covid-19 pandemic hit in 2020, the 2019 survey, which is the most recent, also found that:

- 49% of respondents said they knew someone who had been sexually harassed at work.
- 51% said they did not know someone who had been sexually harassed at work.
- 52.5% of respondents said their companies were inclusive of workers who also were caregivers.
- 47.5% said their companies were not inclusive of worker-caregivers.
- 74.7% of respondents said their leadership team’s political beliefs mattered to them.
- 25.3% said those political beliefs did not matter to them.

By gender, among company founders:

- 51% said their team of founders was all-male.
- 18.4% said their team was mostly male.
- 21.1% said their team was gender-balanced.
- 5.8% said their team of founders either was all-female or non-binary.
- 3.8% was mostly female or non-binary.

By gender, of boards of directors:

- 48.7% were all male.
- 26.1% were mostly male.
- 13% were gender-balanced.
- 1.5% were all female or non-binary.
- 1.9% were mostly female or non-binary.

About aged-based discrimination at their companies:

- 26.8% are aged 36 through 40.
- 27.6% said the discrimination starts when workers are aged 46 through 50.
- 17.2% said it starts when workers are aged 41 through 45.
- 8% said it starts when workers are aged 51 through 55.
7.7% said it starts when workers are younger than 31.
6.5% said it starts when workers are older than 55.
6.1% said it starts when workers are aged 31 through 35.

By age, of respondents:
21.7% each were aged 30 through 34 and 35 through 39.
20.3% were aged 40 through 44.
18.7% were 50 years and older.
10% were aged 45 through 49.

---

What is the gender representation of your board?

- All female or non-binary: 1.5%
- Mostly female or non-binary: 1.9%
- Gender-balanced: 13.0%
- Mostly male: 26.1%
- All male: 48.7%
- We don’t have a board: 8.8%

Have you or has someone you know personally experienced sexual harassment in the workplace?

- Yes: 49.0%
- No: 51.0%

---

U.S. government: Women, minorities underrepresented in science, engineering

Women, persons with disabilities, Blacks, Latinos, Native Americans, and Native Alaskans were underrepresented in science and engineering, including in those sectors that feed the pipeline to certain jobs in technology, gaming, software development, social media, and other media, according to data released by the National Science Foundation in 2019.

“Women, Minorities, and Persons with Disabilities in Science and Engineering,” a federal report released every two years, also found that, in 2017, of those with college degrees in science and engineering:

- 15.1% of women and 33.7% of men had science and engineering jobs.
- 36.6% of women and 24.6% of men had science- and engineering-related jobs.
- 48.2% of women and 41.8% men were employed in non-science and non-engineering occupations.

By race, of those with science and engineering degrees:

- 23.5% of Whites, 37.7% of Asians, and 20.4% of Black, Latinx, and Native Americans/Alaskan Natives, combined, had science and engineering jobs.
- 30.5% of Whites, 29.4% of Asians, and 30.4% of Black, Latinx, and Native Americans/Alaskan Natives, combined, had science- and engineering-related jobs.
- 46% of Whites, 32.9% of Asians, and 49.2% of Black, Latinx, and Native Americans/Alaskan Natives, combined, were employed in non-science and non-engineering occupations.
Other findings included:

- 70% of full-time scientists and engineers were White in 2017.
- 10% of full-time scientists and engineers had disabilities in 2017.
- 41% of science and engineering doctoral degrees were earned by women in 2016.
- 31% of those 2016 doctorates were earned by Asians.
- 11% of those 2016 doctorates were earned by Black, Latinx and Native Americans/Alaska Natives, combined.
- 55.7% of science bachelor degrees were earned by Whites in 2016.
- 13.5% of 2016 bachelor degrees in science were earned by Latinx persons.
- 9% of 2016 bachelor degrees in science were earned by Blacks.
- 9% of 2016 bachelor degrees in science were earned by Asians.
- 7.3% of 2016 bachelor degrees in science were earned by multiracial persons.
- 0.5% of bachelor's degrees in science were earned by Native Americans and Alaskan Natives.
- 0.2% of bachelor's degrees in science were earned by Native Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders.
- 59.3% of bachelor's degrees in engineering were earned by Whites.
- 10.8% of 2016 bachelor degrees in engineering were earned by Asians.
- 10.4% of 2016 bachelor degrees in engineering were earned by Latinx persons.
- 5.9% of 2016 bachelor degrees in engineering were earned by multiracial persons.
- 3.9% of 2016 bachelor degrees in engineering were earned by Blacks.
- 0.3% of 2016 bachelor degrees in engineering were earned by Native Americans and Alaskan Natives.
- 0.1% of 2016 bachelor degrees in engineers were earned by Native Hawaiians or other Pacific Islanders.

Source: National Science Foundation
Advertisers’ group: Sales surge when ads accurately depicted women

Product advertisements with realistic portrayals of women and girls yielded stronger sales for companies placing those kinds of ads, according to “Accurate Portrayals of Women and Girls in Media: Proven to be Good for Business,” an analysis by the Association of National Advertisers’ #SeeHer campaign.

The 2019 analysis, released in March 2020, found that 29% of women in ads were wrongly objectified, stereotyped, or diminished in character.

Partnering with researchers at the IRI Media Center for Excellence and using its “gender equality measure” (GEM), the association concluded that ad campaigns that accurately portray women “can garner 2x to 5x incremental sales lift.”

Some of the companies that have signed onto the SeeHer effort have seen positive results, according to the analysis:

- L’Oréal Paris ads on TV shows with GEM scores greater than 100, saw a 2.36% sales spike.
- Hershey, placing ads in shows with GEM scores of 119, saw a 4.45% spike.
- Keurig Dr Pepper’s 7UP, placing ads on shows with a GEM score of more than 100, saw an increase of 1.7%.
- Clorox experienced a more than 6% sales lift from its ads.

“Ads with the highest sales lift had the highest GEM scores, whereas ads with the lowest sales lift had the lowest GEM scores,” researchers found.

Additionally, they wrote, “There is a financial incentive for consumer product marketers to portray women accurately in advertising, but brands and products must be inclusive for the right reasons, including equality in marketing messages that also support the brand’s mission.”

“There is a financial incentive for consumer product marketers to portray women accurately in advertising, but brands and products must be inclusive for the right reasons, including equality in marketing messages that also support the brand’s mission.”
Since last FCC report, female ownership of biggest TV stations fell

The number of full-power commercial TV stations owned by individual women or groups mainly comprised of women has dropped, the Federal Communications Commission has reported.

Of the 1,368 stations, 73 — or 5.3 % — were owned by individual women or groups mainly comprised of women, according to the FCC’s most recent ownership report, released in February 2020 and based on 2017 data.

According to the FCC’s previous analysis, women owned 102 of 1,385 — or 7.3% — of 1,368 top-tier stations. Its May 2017 analysis was based on 2015 data.

By comparison, according to the 2020 report, men owned 735 — or 53.7 % — of those TV stations, down from 60.1%, the percentage of majority-male ownership of full-power commercial stations cited in the previous report.

Not all stations were owned by individual or groups comprised exclusively of men or women. Some stations had majority ownership comprised of both men and women; in others, neither men nor women were majority owners.

Full-power commercial stations are one category of broadcast outlets tracked by the FCC; it also tracks commercial and non-commercial Class A and low-power TV stations and AM radio and FM radio stations.

By race, among the latest report’s 1,368 full-power commercial TV stations, 26 — 1.9% — were owned by persons of color. That was down from 36 — 2.6 % — of stations counted in the 2017 report. (Ten of the stations listed in the 2020 report that were owned by racial minorities were in the 50 largest markets; none were in next 50 to 100 size-ranked markets; and seven were in markets ranked outside the top 100.) Of those racial groups:

- Whites owned 871 stations — 63.7 % — in 2017, down from 74.4% in 2015.
- Blacks owned 12 stations —— .9 % — in 2017, the same rate in 2015.
- Asians owned 9 stations — in .7 % — in 2017, a rate unchanged from 2015.
- American Indian or Alaska Natives owned 4 stations — .3 %— in 2017, down .9 % in 2015.
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islanders owned no stations in 2017, but 1 station in 2015.
- Multiracial persons owned 1 station each in 2017 and 2015.
- Groups without a majority of members from any race owned 471 stations — 34.4 % — in 2017; up from 23 % in 2015.
By ethnicity, as defined by the federal government, the FCC reported that:

- Hispanic/Latino persons or groups owned 58 — 4.2 % — of the 1,368 full-power commercial television stations listed in the 2020 report, down from 4.5 % in 2015.
- Non-Hispanic/Latino persons or groups owned 850 — 62.1 % — of full-power commercial television stations in the 2020 report, down from 64.3 % in 2015.
- Groups without a majority of members from those ethnicities owned 460 stations — 33.6 % — in 2017, up from 31.2 % in 2015.

The 2020 report showed that, by gender:

- Women owned 316 — or 9.3 % — of 3,407 commercial AM radio stations.
- Men owned 2,669 — or 78.3 % of those stations.
- Women owned 390 — 7.2 % — of 5,399 commercial FM radio stations.
- Men owned 4,459 — 82.6 % of those stations.

The 2020 report did not list owners from each category of racial minorities but did report that:

- Combined, American Indians/Alaska Natives, Asians, Blacks, Native Hawaiians/Pacific Islands, and multiracial persons owned 202 — 5.9 % — of those commercial AM radio stations.
- Combined, those minority groups owned 159 — 2.9 % — of commercial FM radio stations.

By ethnicity, as listed in the 2020 report:

- Hispanic/Latino persons or groups owned 209 — 6.1 % — of commercial AM radio stations; and 219 — 4.1 % — of commercial FM radio stations.
- Non-Hispanic/Latino persons or groups owned 3,044 — 89.3 % — of commercial AM radio stations; and 4,995 — 92.5 % — of FM commercial radio stations.

The 2020 report also showed that, by gender, of all 11,529 commercial TV and radio stations, across media markets of all sizes, women owned 874. Men owned 8,736.

By race, of all 11,529 commercial TV and radio stations:

- 10,076 — 87 % — were owned by Whites.
- 239 — 2 % — by Blacks.
- 136 — 1 % — by Asians.
- 31 — .2 % — by American Indians/Alaska Natives.
- 7 — .06 % — by Native Hawaiians/Pacific Islander.
- 3 — .02 % — by multiracial persons.

Of Forbes top 100 media, tech execs, 16 were women and 84 were men

Sixteen female movers-and-shakers in media, music, movies, and tech from the United States made Forbes 2020 “List of the World’s 100 Most Powerful Women,” a roster that includes presidents, government ministers, financiers, investors, inventors, and other headliners.

In descending order and rank, they are:

- No. 13, YouTube CEO Susan Wojcicki.
- No. 14, Oracle CEO Safra Catz.
- No. 16, Google Senior Vice President and CFO Ruth Porat.
- No. 20, Oprah Winfrey, Chairwoman, CEO, and CCO of the Oprah Winfrey Network.
- No. 22, Facebook COO Sheryl Sandberg.
- No. 24, ViacomCBS Chairwoman Shari Redstone.
- No. 28, Microsoft Executive Vice President and CFO Amy Hood.
- No. 51, Disney Television Studios and ABC Entertainment/Walt Disney Chairwoman Dana Walden.
Survey: Fewer respondents in book world said they were White

Of 7,893 staffers at book publishing companies, book review journals, and literary agencies, 74% were women and 23% were men.

That 2019 survey also found that 76% of those staffers were White, 7% were Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander, 6% were Latinx, 5% were Black, 3% were multiracial, and fewer than 1% each were Native American and Middle Eastern.

Those anonymous responses came from 36.2% of the 21,753 employees at each of the five top book publishers, eight review journals, 47 trade publishers, 35 university presses, and 63 literary agencies who were sent the survey, conducted by Lee and Low Books and Boston University's language and literacy department. Their “Diversity in Publishing 2019” survey followed up their 2015 report. It found that 78% of 3,706 respondents were female and 79% were White.

Also, of respondents, by gender:

- 60% of executives in 2019 said they were female, compared to 59% in 2015.
- 38% of 2019 executives were male; 2% listed their gender as other; 1% were gender-fluid, non-binary, or queer; fewer than 1% were transsexual women.
- 77% of 2019 editorial employees were female, compared to 84% in 2015.
- 21% of 2019 editorial employees were male; 1% listed their gender as other; fewer than 1% each were transsexual women, transsexual men, or gender-fluid, non-binary, or queer.
- 78% of 2019 book reviewers were women, compared to 87% in 2015.
- 18% of 2019 book reviewers were male; 2% were gender-fluid, non-binary, or queer; 1% listed their gender as other; fewer than 1% each were transsexual women or transsexual men.
- 84% of literary agents were women in 2019, the first year that workforce was included.
- 12% of literary agents were male, 2% were gender-fluid, non-binary, or queer, and 1% listed their gender as other.
By race, of respondents:

- 78% of 2019 executives reported that they were White, compared to 86% in 2015.
- Of the remaining 2019 executives, 9% were multiracial, 5% were Asian, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, 4% were Black, 3% were Latinx, and fewer than 1% were Middle Eastern.
- 85% of 2019 editorial employees were White, compared to 82% in 2015.
- Of the remaining 2019 editorial employees, 5% were Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander, 5% were multiracial, 2% were Latinx, 1% each were Black or Middle Eastern, 1% were listed as other, and fewer than 1% were Native American.
- 80% of book reviewers were White, compared to 89% in 2015.
- Of the remaining 2019 book reviewers, 7% were multiracial, 4% were Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander, 4% were Black, 3% were Latinx, and fewer than 1% each were Native American or Middle Eastern.
- 80% of literary agents were White in 2019, the first year that literary agents were included in report.
- Of the remaining 2019 literary agents, 7% were Asian, Native Hawaiian, or Pacific Islander, 5% were Latinx, 4% were Black, 2% were Middle Eastern, and 1% were multiracial.

![Graph showing race distribution](image-url)
People of color were 11% of authors; Whites authored 95% of books


Of those 3,471 authors across all analyzed years, 11% were persons of color, a group currently accounting for 40% of the U.S. population and projected to exceed the nation’s tally of non-Hispanic Whites by 2045.

“We guessed that most of the authors would be white, but we were shocked by the extent of the inequality once we analyzed the data,” the op-ed authors wrote in December 2020. The op-ed was based on research by author, essayist, and McGill University cultural analytics researcher Richard Jean So and visual journalist Gus Wezerek of the data-focused FiveThirtyEight news site.


The initial culling yielded 8,004 books and 4,010 authors. Because So and Werzek and their team couldn’t discern every author’s race, they ended up with 3,471 authors whose race they did identify, based on social media, bios, and other data.

The op-ed also noted the #publishingpaidme Twitter thread of summer 2020 showing how Black authors sometimes were being paid hundreds of thousands of dollars less than White writers, including unknown White ones. For example, U.S. author Jesmyn Ward tweeted that she “fought and fought” for a $100,000 advance on a then upcoming title, even though she’d already won a National Book Award. In support of the protests against pay inequities, Canadian Mandy Len Catron, who had never written a book, tweeted that she got a $400,000 advance to write a book based on article that went viral, “How to Fall in Love With Anyone.”

McKinsey: Slow progress on diversity, which boosts corporate profits

The top 25% of 1,000 large companies, globally, with the most gender diverse C-suites outperformed those in the bottom quartile by 25%, according to McKinsey & Co.’s 2019 “Diversity wins: How inclusion matters” report.

That compared to 21% in 2017 and 15% in 2014. Nevertheless, its researchers described overall progress on diversity as “slow.”

Additionally, McKinsey found that the most gender-diverse firms out-performed the least gender-diverse ones by as much as 48%.

By racial metrics, companies in the top quartile of having racially diverse C-suites outperformed those in the bottom quartile by 36%. That compared to 33% in 2017 and 35% in 2014, wrote McKinsey, which also issued a February 2021 report, “Race in the workplace: The Black experience in the US private sector,” finding that Blacks were underrepresented in the highest-paying private-sector jobs and in regions with the highest private-sector growth.

“On the current trajectory,” researchers wrote, “it will take about 95 years for Black employees to reach talent parity (or 12 percent representation) across all levels in the private sector. Addressing the major barriers that hold back the advancement of Black employees could cut that duration to about 25 years.”

In the 2019 report on workplace race and gender, McKinsey’s researchers wrote that gains in diversity were not happening quickly or expansively enough. “This lack of material progress is evident across all industries and in most countries.”
Other major findings in the 2019 analysis were these:

- Companies whose executive ranks were more than 30% female outperformed those where females occupied less than 30% of the C-suite.
- Women accounted for 20% of corporate executive team members in the United States and the United Kingdom in 2019, up from 15% in 2014.
- Persons of color comprised 13% of U.S. and U.K. executive teams in 2019, up from 7% in 2014.
- Women accounted for 28% of corporate board members in the United States and the United Kingdom in 2019, up from 24% in 2017 and 21% in 2014.
- Persons of color comprised 17% of U.S. and U.K. corporate boards, up from 14% in 2017 and 13% in 2014.
- Women accounted for 15% of corporate executive team members at 1,000 companies across 15 nations in 2019 and 14% in 2017. (In 2017, McKinsey expanded their research to 1,000 companies in 15 nations.)
- Persons of color comprised 14% of executive teams at those 1,000 companies in 2019 and 12% in 2017.
- Women accounted for 24% of corporate board members at those 1,000 companies in both of those analyzed years.
- Persons of color comprised 16% of corporate boards at those 1,000 companies in 2019 and 14% in 2017.

Of surveyed respondents’ sentiments about diversity hiring:

- 52% were positive.
- 17% were neutral.
- 31% were negative.

Of surveyed respondents’ sentiments regarding inclusion efforts that foster a sense of “equality, openness, and belonging”:

- 29% were positive.
- 10% were neutral.
- 61% were negative.

Major findings of the 2021 report on how Black employees fare in the private sector were these:

- Black employees comprised 12% of entry-level workers. By comparison, White employees comprised 59%, Asian employees 13%, Latinx employees 11%, and other employees of color 5%.
- Black employees comprised 6% of executives. By comparison, White employees comprised 76% of executives, Asian 9%, Latinx 6%, and other persons of color 3%.
- Black employees comprised 11% of corporate boards of directors. By comparison, Whites comprised 73% of boards, Latinx 6%, Asian 3%, and other persons of color 7%.
- 10% of Black workers live in the fastest-growing cities and counties.
- 60% of Black workers live in the South, where private-sector growth is comparatively less than other regions.
- 45% of Black workers were employed in health-care, retail, accommodations, and food service sectors, where there are a disproportionate number of lower-paying frontline and other entry-level jobs.
- 73% of Black retail workers earned less than $30,000 a year.
- 84% of Black food service workers earned less than $30,000 a year.
- Overall, 43% of Black private-sector workers earned less than $30,000 yearly.
- Overall, 29% of all other private-sector workers earned less than $30,000 yearly.
The business case for inclusion & diversity is stronger than ever

Diverse companies are more likely to financially outperform their peers

Difference in likelihood of outperformance of 1st vs 4th quartile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The penalty for lagging on gender diversity is growing, while top quartile companies are more likely to be at an advantage

Progress on executive team diversity in our 2014 dataset continues to be slow

Representation in US and UK

Penalty for bottom quartile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>-19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advantage for top quartile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1 Difference in likelihood of financial outperformance vs the national industry median of five years average EBIT margin, using the full dataset of companies in each year.

2 Difference in likelihood of financial outperformance vs the national industry median of five years average EBIT margin for 4th quartile vs 1st-3rd quartile, and 1st quartile vs 2nd-4th quartiles, using the full dataset of companies in each year.
News, social media’s “China virus” linked to anti-Asian bias

On March 8, 2020, there was a 650% increase in Twitter retweets of “Chinese virus,” former President Donald Trump’s term for Covid-19, by which he sought to blame China for the pandemic. The next day, there was an 800% increase in the use of that term and “the China virus” by conservative politicians and in conservative news media articles.


For their analysis, researchers culled information from the Atlantic Council’s Digital Forensic Lab and data from the responses of 339,063 non-Asian participants who took Project Implicit Mental Health’s “Asian Implicit Association Test.” Implicit bias against Asian Americans steadily declined for more than a dozen years before 2020, and the analysis aimed to determine whether the spike in conservative politicians’ and news media references to “the China virus” increased bias against Asian Americans. Researchers tracked media coverage following the World Health Organization’s January 2020 official declaration of the pandemic, including, for example, then-CIA Director Mike Pompeo using “China virus” on the Fox and Friends news show and GOP U.S. Representative Paul Gosar tweeting “Wuhan virus.”

“The trend reversal in bias was more pronounced among conservative individuals,” researchers, based at universities across the country, wrote of the uptick in bias against Asians. “This research provides evidence that the use of stigmatizing language increased subconscious beliefs that Asian Americans are ‘perpetual foreigners.’”

The researchers concluded that:

■ A March 8 through March 31 surge in beliefs that Asians were less American than other Americans almost offset three previous years of decline in such beliefs.
■ Among five political groups, extreme conservative respondents had the highest rate of anti-Asian bias.
■ Among five political groups, extreme liberal respondents had the lowest rate of anti-Asian bias.
■ White respondents, particularly, grew more anti-Asian.
TOWARD PARITY: A WOMEN’S MEDIA CENTER ROADMAP

Tumult over race, policing, and politics has revealed deep divisions within the nation — and underscored how crucial it is to ensure that these subjects are well-examined in newsrooms, other media, and the national narrative.

Documenting these critical stories requires newsroom diversity, media staffs that include persons of color, women, and gender non-conforming individuals. Media professionals within underrepresented categories have been calling for better coverage of issues at the front and center of these fraught times, some of which — racism and sexism, for example — are not new. But too often, their calls have been ignored.

With those realities in mind, the Women’s Media Center is doubling down on its call for news and all other media to do their jobs better, more rigorously, more justly, more comprehensively.

FOR EVERY MEDIA SECTOR:

Conduct a personnel audit. What are the gender and ethnic make-up of your organization’s rank-and-file employees, its decision-makers and those in the pipeline for promotions? Set achievable goals for creating and maintaining a workplace that reflects the general population’s diversity. Redesign processes and systems engineered around biases in order to facilitate outcomes.

Staff with intention. Hire those who will take on a diversity of issues in news coverage, entertainment, gaming, social media, et cetera.

Mentor and encourage. In ways formal and informal, provide guidance, reassurance and advice to young women of all races and classes who are considering or emerging in your profession.

Get serious about work-life balance for women and men. Flexible schedules, paid maternity/paternity/elder-care leave can be tools for boosting worker productivity and devotion to their workplace. Employers need to provide workers with more options about how, when, and where to do their work throughout various life stages and amid various life demands.

Encourage candid conversation about gender and racial parity. You do not have to be a woman or person of color to speak out about why media content and context should be balanced and well-rounded, and how to achieve those ends.

Raise awareness. Educate your colleagues, bosses, neighbors and friends about areas of film, TV, radio, newspapers, and online where women and people of color are acutely underrepresented and/or misrepresented and the impact of those realities on the corporate bottomline and on society.

FOR NEWS ORGANIZATIONS:

Staff with intention. Hire reporters, editors and producers who show proof and capacity for reporting accurately and are mindful of gender, class and ethnic diversity and how different groups, ideals, et cetera intersect.

Diversify the source list. The Women’s Media Center’s SheSource.org, the online brain trust of female experts on diverse topics, is explicitly designed to serve journalists, bookers, and producers who seek women experts as on-air guests and other sources of news and/or commentary.

Avoid biased or coded language and imagery. Just as good journalists examine their words for correct spelling, punctuation, grammar, usage, and style, so too—at all levels of the news delivery process—should they guard against biased language that could unfairly depict issues and people in the news. “Unspinning the Spin: The Women’s Media Center Guide to Fair and Accurate Language,” is a searchable online database and guide to bias-free words and phrases, their meanings, sources, backgrounds, suggested uses, and non-sexist, non-racist alternatives to biased language.
Establish standards and mechanisms for meeting them. Clearly, define sexism, racism, and ageism, the federal, state, and local laws against those ills and your organizations system of ensuring they don’t creep into the workplace.

Monitor reader/viewer comments. Responses to news coverage that are posted on your site can shape perception/misperception of your news organization’s own philosophies and bent. Make sure reader/viewer feedback is neither needlessly inflammatory, provocatively, maliciously racist or sexist or a vehicle for spreading disinformation.

FOR ENTERTAINMENT PROFESSIONALS:

Re-examine whom to bankroll. Movie studios need to do a better job in providing opportunities to women behind the scenes as directors and producers, especially in major feature films.

Get to know communities/constituencies beyond your own. It’s imperative that more historically white male-run studios seriously consider scripts pitched to them by women and people of color, and to understand what makes many of those projects saleable to a diverse audience of ticket-buyers.

FOR CONCERNED CONSUMERS OF MEDIA:

Demand Accountability by:

- **Writing** letters to the editor and station managers or taking other action—collective, if necessary—when you’ve concerns about coverage, newsroom staffing, et. al. Press news executives for a speedy, reasonable, and reasoned response.

- **Knowing** Federal Communications Commission (FCC) rules on broadcast media ownership and joining the chorus of players who have been demanding that more efforts be made to increase the comparatively low number of TV and radio stations owned by women and people of color.

- **Letting your wallet do the talking.** Whether at the box office, newsstand, or local game store, women consumers and consumers of color are spending their dollars. As needed, let the media powers-that-be know that you can choose when and where to spend that cash.

FOR ADVERTISING & MARKETING PROFESSIONALS

**Investing your funds.** Advertisers and marketing professionals have financial power. It’s important that they advertise and market products that portray women and girls accurately. Research by the Association of National Advertisers’ #SeeHer campaign has shown that product advertisements with realistic portrayals of women and girls yield stronger company sales.
RESEARCH, REPORTS, PUBLICATIONS, AND CONTENT CHANNELS


WMC Report: Gender and Race Representation on Five Big Sunday Shows (2021)


Superpowering Women in Science Fiction and Superhero Film: A 10-Year Investigation (2019 — WMC in association with BBC America)


WMC Media Watch: Women & Elections — #WhoTalks — U.S. Presidential Election Tracking of Cable/TV News Show Analyzed by Gender and Race (2016) (Partnership project with the Rutgers Center for American Women and Politics and GenderAvenger)


WMC Investigation: 10-Year Analysis of Gender & Oscar Nominations in Non-Acting Categories (2016)


WMC Media Watch: The Gender Gap in Coverage of Reproductive Issues (2016)

WMC Media Watch: Writing Rape — How U.S. Media Cover Campus Rape and Sexual Assault (2015)


Name It Change It: The Women's Media Center Media Guide to Gender Neutral Coverage of Women Candidates & Politicians

10 Do's and Don’ts on How to Interview Sexualized Violence Survivors (2017)

Name It. Change It: An Examination of the Impact of Media Coverage of Women Candidates’ Appearance

Name It. Change It — WMC Infographic — Stick Figures Explain Negative Impact of Appearance Coverage on Women Candidates (2013)

Bias, Punditry, and the Press — Where Do We Go From Here? (2008) (Report from the Women's Media Center, the White House Project, and the Maynard Institute for Journalism Education)

Unspinning the Spin: The Women’s Media Center Guide to Fair and Accurate Language (2021)

WMC Women Under Siege Syria Crowdmap

WMC Women Under Siege Reports: Sexualized Violence in Conflict Zones (Burma, Mexico, North Korea, Democratic Republic of Congo, Libya, Egypt, Sri Lanka, Darfur-Sudan, Rwanda, Bosnia, Sierra Leone, Liberia, Colombia, Bangladesh, Holocaust, Nanking)

WMC: What Online Harassment Tells Us About Our Newsrooms: From Individuals to Institutions (2020)
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