## Women in Media Gender Scorecard
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## Foreword

The Women in Media Gender Scorecard explores the visibility of women as authors, participants, and subjects of news in Australian media. Our objective is to better understand how women are portrayed, what kind of news features women, and how often they are included as experts in their fields. The Women in Media Gender Scorecard is an index that tracks women's share of sources, experts and bylines in the Australian media.

We are grateful to research partner Isentia for their commitment to this project and support for Women in Media. This research picks up on data collected in 2016 by Isentia and Women in Media and underpins the organisation's mission to help media women excel, learn, contribute, and connect. It aims to draw attention to crucial issues of importance to women working in our sector, which includes journalism, communications, public relations, publishing and digital media. The research includes analysis of print, broadcast and online news.
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## Gisentia

Women in Media is a not-for-profit organisation developed by and for women in media across Australia. WiM strives to be part of the solution to addressing gender inequity in the media landscape, empowering women to secure jobs, progress in their careers and thrive at work.

WiM has 6000 members nationwide with branches in each state and territory.
IN MEDIA

1. Women remain severely under-represented in the media landscape, particularly as quoted sources or experts in media reporting.

Representation on visual and audio media is a vital step toward gender parity. Based on 2022 data, men account for $70 \%$ of quoted sources, with a similarly high figure included as experts ( $66 \%$ ). Males dominate as byline authors in most prolific sections of media: sport ( $82 \%$ males and $18 \%$ women), politics ( $59 \%$ male and $41 \%$ women) and finance ( $63 \%$ male and $37 \%$ women).

## 2. In some sectors, women appear in the media more than $40 \%$ less than their share of employment would suggest.

Even when adjusting for share of employment (using ABS data), females remain highly under-represented as sources and experts in media coverage. Several industries, such as retail and sport, recorded a $40 \%$ under-representation of female experts given their high share of female employment. The retail sector is most notable in this regard, with only $13 \%$ of experts being female despite the sector having a $54 \%$ share of female employees - a gap of $41 \%$.

## 3. The Media Gender Scorecard* will remain behind parity in 2034, based on current trajectory.

Based on its current trajectory, the Women in Media Gender Scorecard will remain behind parity for more than a decade (2034). Without proactive steps, significant hurdles remain to achieve equal representation of women as authors, sources and experts in Australian media. This projected timeline only underlines the positive impact media organisations and industries with lagging female gender representation can have in the journey towards parity. Action in key sectors including retail, sport, health, social issues and education can drive future progress.

## 4. More than $\mathbf{5 0 \%}$ of non-sport bylines over the reference period were women.

Efforts to achieve gender parity among media organisations has demonstrated positive results, with an over $10 \%$ upswing in byline share towards women since 2016. However, sport has an outsized effect in the media, accounting for almost one-quarter of all bylined stories. With only $18 \%$ of sport stories written by women it brings female bylines down to $43 \%$ overall. If sports coverage was to be removed from the data, women's bylines for the reference period would exceed parity at 51\%.
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The Women in Media Gender
Scorecard identifies core areas of change in media analytics so that we can monitor change over time and whether it is positive or negative towards achieving parity for women
in Australian media.


## Summary

Men continue to dominate the Australian media, from the newsroom to the boardroom with limited female share of voice and perspectives in media coverage.

There is still significant ground to cover before gender parity is reached, despite a notable improvement since 2016. The share of women journalists and sources used in media reporting has increased from the previous Isentia analysis, conducted in in 2016. 43\% of journalists (measured by listed bylines) were women in 2022, an increase of over $10 \%$ from six years ago.

There is an even greater gender disparity in the presence of sources and experts in media reporting than among bylines. Gender parity in news reporting is a vital factor in determining a fair representation of women in the media landscape. However, women made up only $30 \%$ of individuals quoted in the news, increasing from $23 \%$ in 2016. Women are more likely to be positioned as an expert than as a general source, accounting for $34 \%$ of identified experts in 2022, again, well below parity.

Even when adjusting for share of employment, females remain highly under-represented as sources and experts in media coverage. The use of female sources in reporting would be expected to be close to their share of sector employment. However several sectors, such as retail and sport, recorded a $40 \%$ under-representation of female sources given their share of employment.


The Women in Media Gender Scorecard monitors the visibility of women as authors, participants, and subjects of news in Australian media.

Our objective is to better understand how women are portrayed, what kind of news features women, and how often they are included as experts in their fields.

Women in Media wants to ensure that women are seen and heard in media, and are called on for their leadership and as experts, commenting on issues and sharing their opinions, contributions and reactions as a fair representation of Australian society.

The Women in Media Gender Scorecard highlights that much work remains to provide gender equity and share of voice for women in, and through, representation in Australian media.

Women in Media concludes industry, organisations and the media can make quicker advances to achieving gender parity in four specific areas.

```
* Industry and organisations to develop female sources
I and experts as media representatives. Industry and organisations
to review and assess their level of female representation, invest in
training and development for spokeswomen, and commit to
monitor change. Greatest impact could begin in retail, sport, and
finance - fields with the smallest proportion of females as sources.
*
* Media to commit to increase female bylines equal to
gender percentages of the population (50/50),
带 Media to address gender imbalance in most prolific
areas of media coverage: sport, finance, health, and politics.
莱 Media to focus on gender balance in news and
reporting through inclusion and diversity in content development
by ensuring workplaces support and provide visibility for women
and pathways to leadership positions
```

Women in Media strives to be part of the solution to addressing gender inequity in the media landscape, empowering women to secure jobs, progress in their careers and thrive at work.

## Women Remain Under-represented.

Women represent half of the Australian population and 48\% of employed labour force but only $43 \%$ share of voice in media


## Media Coverage Remains Gendered.

Males dominate in most prolific areas of media: sport, finance, and politics


## 3is Sport

Nearly one-quarter (23\% ) of all media coverage is categorised as Sport, making it the highest proportion of coverage while at the same time representing the lowest proportion of byline women journalists at $18 \%$ ( $8 \%$ rise from 2016.)
$\qquad$

## III Polftics Finance

Female journalists covering Politics has risen from $26 \%$ in 2016 to $41 \%$ in 2022 , a $15 \%$ rise. Women reporting on Finance increased by $7 \%$ from 30\% in 2016 to 37\% in 2022.

[^0]Journalist gender breakdown by all industries.
Byline gender share, ranked by volume of coverage

| Vol <br> Rank | Topic | \% Male Reporters | \% Female <br> Reporters | Vol Rank | Topic | \% Male Reporters | \% Female Reporters |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | SPORT | 82\% | 18\% | 17 | TRAVEL | 37\% | 63\% |
| 2 | FINANCE/BUSINESSS/BANKING | 63\% | 37\% | 18 | EDUCATION | 33\% | 67\% |
| 3 | CRIME/JUSTICE/LAW \& ORDER | 45\% | 55\% | 19 | TRANSPORT \& INFRASTRUCTURE | 48\% | 52\% |
| 4 | POLITICS | 59\% | 41\% | 20 | INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS | 63\% | 37\% |
| 5 | HEALTH | 36\% | 64\% | 21 | TECHNOLOGY | 55\% | 45\% |
| 6 | ARTS/CULTURE | 53\% | 47\% | 22 | EMPLOYMENT | 30\% | 70\% |
| 7 | INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS | 59\% | 41\% | 23 | HOUSING | 64\% | 36\% |
| 8 | LIFESTYLE | 29\% | 71\% | 24 | SCIENCE | 50\% | 50\% |
| 9 | ENVIRONMENT | 51\% | 49\% | 25 | DEFENCE | 50\% | 50\% |
| 10 | CELEBRITY NEWS/GOSSIP | 37\% | 63\% | 26 | COMMUNICATIONS \& TECHNOLOGY | 43\% | 57\% |
| 11 | ENERGY \& RESOURCES | 74\% | 26\% | 27 | RETAIL | 43\% | 57\% |
| 12 | COMMUNITY NEWS | 36\% | 64\% | 28 | HOSPITALITY | 42\% | 58\% |
| 13 | SOCIAL ISSUES | 42\% | 58\% | 29 | BUILDING/CONSTRUCTION | 26\% | 74\% |
| 14 | AGRICULTURE | 43\% | 57\% | 30 | MOTORING | 78\% | 22\% |
| 15 | EMERGENCIES | 43\% | 57\% | 31 | IMMIGRATION | 45\% | 55\% |
| 16 | INDIGENOUS ISSUES | 49\% | 51\% | 32 | CONSUMER AFFAIRS | 41\% | 59\% |

## $3 \cdot 0$ Sport and Energy \& Resources

were represented by the lowest proportion of women journalists

## D, Hfestyle and Education

were represented by the highest proportion of women journalists

## Significant Disparity in Gender of Program Hosts.

| Program | \% Male | \% Female |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| THE PROJECT | $47 \%$ | $53 \%$ |
| Q\&A | $55 \%$ | $45 \%$ |
| AM AND FM BREAKFAST | $64 \%$ | $36 \%$ |
| AM AND FM DRIVE | $75 \%$ | $25 \%$ |

- The Project was the one program where female hosts were more prominent than male hosts, with women making up $53 \%$.
- The disparity between male and female hosts was most prominent on radio Drive programs, with only $25 \%$ of these having female hosts. This was slightly better on Breakfast programs, which had $36 \%$ female hosts, but which was still highly skewed towards male hosts.
- Q\&A had a slightly higher proportion of male panelists at the time of the research, at 55\% compared to $45 \%$ of females.


## Women Represent Just 30\% of Sources Quoted in News, While Men Make Up 70\%.

## Female sources are

 quoted much less frequently than menWomen sources made up $30 \%$ of all sources quoted in the news, up from $23 \%$ in 2016. Male sources made up $70 \%$, down from $77 \%$.


## Reporters \& Sources.

Gender of sources in reporting, gender by gender of byline


## Female reporters were more likely to quote female sources than male reporters

The difference between the proportions of male and female reporters that quoted female sources remained at similar levels to those in 2016.

## Leaders or Laggards Of Female Sources.

Source gender split by topic


More Sources are Female


The share of women sources (individuals quoted in media reporting) varies according to the topic of discussion. The overall share of women sources, 30\%, can be used as a benchmark to intentify topics that are leaders or laggards.

Only two of the 35 identified topic groups (6\%) recorded a greater share of women sources than men.

The disparity in gender of source by topic is severe in several sectors.

Retail, sport and defence stand out in this regard, with women featuring less than $20 \%$ of the time in these topic groups.

Men Dominate As Sources, Even In Industries Where Women Lead Employment.
Source gender split vs industry employment

Fewest 5 Female Sources


RETAIL



SPORT 2


HEALTH



8\%

Top 5 Female Sources


The share of female employment represents the expected use of female sources. Although other factors such as media training and seniority also influence sources used in media coverage, share of sources by gender is expected to roughly equal employment share.

The highest underrepresentation of female sources tended to be associated with topics / sectors with a high female employment share, for example, retail, sport and health.

## This suggests that women-

dominated industries are not being presented as such in the media. The sectors that demonstrate the largest gap between women employment share and media representation have an opportunity to have an outsized effect on achieving gender parity in the media landscape.

## Twice As Many Men As Women Feature As Fxperts.



## Leaders or Laggards Of Female Experts.

Expert gender split by topic


More Experts are Female


Women are far less likely than their male counterparts to be positioned as experts in media reporting. However, this gap is almost totally explained by the broader underrepresentation of females in media coverage.

Furthermore, women are more likely to feature as an expert than as a source ( $34 \%$ to $30 \%$, respectively).

Many of the same sectors appear in the lowest five and top five when comparing use of sources against experts, by topic. However, some sectors recorded significant shifts. For example, education and energy \& resources reported a much lower presence of experts relative to sources. In contrast, women are more likely to be framed as experts in the building \& construction and communications sectors.

## Men Also Dominate As Experts, Even In Industries Where Women Lead Employment.

Expert gender split vs industry employment

Fewest 5 Female Experts


Top 5 Female Experts


COMMUNICATIONS

## 



BUILDING \& CONSTRUCTION



SOCIAL ISSUES


17\%


HEALTH


ENVIRONMENT


CRIME/JUSTICE/ LAW \& ORDER


As with sources, females are notably under-represented when comparing share of experts in media reporting with share of sector employment. The pattern of media underrepresentation in women-dominated industries extends from sources to share of experts quoted.

Conversly, sectors with a high proportion of male employees often reported an overrepresentation of women sources. The presence of female sources in such sectors hints towards an effort, either by media or corporations, to achieve gender parity. However, this is more than offset by the significant underrepresentation of women in many sectors.

## Outsized Effect of Sport on Australian Media.

| Measure | Overall | Excluding Sport |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Byline Female | $43 \%$ | $51 \%$ |
| Source Female | $30 \%$ | $34 \%$ |
| Expert Female | $35 \%$ | $36 \%$ |


| Topic | Share of Coverage |
| :---: | :---: |
| SPORT | $23 \%$ |
| CRIME/JUSTICE/LAW \& ORDER | $9 \%$ |
| HEALTH | $8 \%$ |
| POLITICS | $8 \%$ |
| FINANCE/ECONOMICS/BANKING | $7 \%$ |
| ARTS/CULTURE | $5 \%$ |
| INTERNATIONALAFFAIRS | $5 \%$ |
| ALL OTHER TOPICS | $36 \%$ |

Removing sport, women's bylines for the reference period would exceed parity at 51\%.

Almost a quarter of analysed media coverage over the reference period was sport. Male dominance as authors of sports coverage has an outsized effect, hindering women's overall representation in media.<br>The share of female bylines shifted much more to the positive than sources or experts from 2016 to 2022. This disparity stems from the nature of sports reporting. Limited usage of sources in sports media, and an even lighter presence of experts, means further proactive action is required to move share of sources and experts toward parity.<br>With only $18 \%$ of sport stories written by women it brings female bylines down to $43 \%$ overall. If sports coverage was to be removed from the data, women's bylines for the reference period would exceed parity at 51\%.

# Methodology Appendices 

This research was conducted by the Insights team at Isentia, and each assessment was based on manual human verification and coding, rather than automation.

The analysis is based on three levels of assessment. At the most basic level, our researchers identified the gender of all journalists, reporters and hosts of the content and programs analysed.

The second level of analysis involved categorising each report analysed into the topic that best represented the content discussed.

The third level of analysis required researchers to identify all spokespeople quoted or paraphrased in a report and their gender, and then to make a further assessment as to whether the report framed these sources as 'expert' (i.e. as someone who has been approached by the news outlet to comment on something that they have no immediate personal involvement in).

## Appendix 1: Media type and organisation

Analysed media coverage by type and leading ownership groups*


## Appendix 2: Source gender split by topic

| Topic | \% Male Sources | \% Female Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RETAIL | 84.1\% | 15.9\% |
| SPORT | 84.1\% | 15.9\% |
| DEFENCE | 83.3\% | 16.7\% |
| MOTORING | 79.4\% | 20.6\% |
| FINANCE/BUSINESS/BANKING | 78.7\% | 21.3\% |
| AGRICULTURE | 75.9\% | 24.1\% |
| EMERGENCIES | 74.7\% | 25.3\% |
| REAL ESTATE | 74.1\% | 25.9\% |
| INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS | 73.1\% | 26.9\% |
| HOSPITALITY | 72.9\% | 27.1\% |
| POLITICS | 72.7\% | 27.3\% |
| ENERGY \& RESOURCES | 72.1\% | 27.9\% |
| BUILDING/CONSTRUCTION | 71.2\% | 28.8\% |
| TRANSPORT \& INFRASTRUCTURE | 69.9\% | 30.1\% |
| TRAVEL | 67.3\% | 32.7\% |
| PHARMACEUTICALS | 66.7\% | 33.3\% |
| technology | 65.8\% | 34.2\% |
| COMMUNICATIONS | 65.5\% | 34.5\% |


| Topic | \% Male Sources | \% Female Sources |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CRIME/JUSTICE/LAW \& ORDER | $64.8 \%$ | $35.2 \%$ |
| SCIENCE | $61.7 \%$ | $38.3 \%$ |
| TERRORISM | $61.1 \%$ | $38.9 \%$ |
| INDIGENOUS ISSUES | $59.5 \%$ | $40.5 \%$ |
| HEALTH | $59.1 \%$ | $40.9 \%$ |
| ENVIRONMENT | $58.3 \%$ | $41.7 \%$ |
| INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS | $57.9 \%$ | $42.1 \%$ |
| ARTS/CULTURE | $57.0 \%$ | $43.0 \%$ |
| IMMIGRATION | $54.7 \%$ | $45.3 \%$ |
| SOCIAL ISSUES | $54.4 \%$ | $45.6 \%$ |
| EMPLOYMENT | $53.9 \%$ | $46.1 \%$ |
| COMMUNITY NEWS | $52.9 \%$ | $47.1 \%$ |
| CONSUMER AFFAIRS | $52.6 \%$ | $47.4 \%$ |
| HOUSING | $52.5 \%$ | $47.5 \%$ |
| CELEBRITY NEWS/GOSSIP | $50.6 \%$ | $49.4 \%$ |
| EDUCATION |  | $43.7 \%$ |
| LIFESTYLE | $39.4 \%$ | $56.3 \%$ |
|  |  |  |

## Appendix 3: Source gender split vs industry employment

| Topic | Female Source \% | Female <br> Employment \% | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RETAIL | $15.9 \%$ | $54.3 \%$ | $-38.4 \%$ |
| SPORT | $15.9 \%$ | $52.6 \%$ | $-36.7 \%$ |
| HEALTH | $40.9 \%$ | $75.8 \%$ | $-34.9 \%$ |
| SOCIAL ISSUES | $45.6 \%$ | $75.8 \%$ | $-30.2 \%$ |
| HOSPITALITY | $27.1 \%$ | $55.9 \%$ | $-28.8 \%$ |
| FINANCE/BUSINESS/BANKING | $21.3 \%$ | $48.3 \%$ | $-27.0 \%$ |
| REAL ESTATE | $25.9 \%$ | $52.4 \%$ | $-26.5 \%$ |
| INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS | $26.9 \%$ | $48.0 \%$ | $-21.1 \%$ |
| POLITICS | $27.3 \%$ | $48.0 \%$ | $-20.7 \%$ |
| EDUCATION | $56.3 \%$ | $72.2 \%$ | $-15.9 \%$ |
| TRAVEL | $32.7 \%$ | $45.4 \%$ | $-12.7 \%$ |
| DEFENCE | $16.7 \%$ | $27.0 \%$ | $-10.3 \%$ |
| TECHNOLOGY | $34.2 \%$ | $43.8 \%$ | $-9.6 \%$ |
| COMMUNICATIONS | $34.5 \%$ | $42.1 \%$ | $-7.6 \%$ |
| AGRICULTURE | $24.1 \%$ | $31.3 \%$ | $-7.2 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |


| Topic | Female Source \% | Female <br> Employment $\%$ | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS | $42.1 \%$ | $48.0 \%$ | $-5.9 \%$ |
| SCIENCE | $38.3 \%$ | $43.8 \%$ | $-5.5 \%$ |
| HOUSING | $47.5 \%$ | $52.4 \%$ | $-4.9 \%$ |
| ARTS/CULTURE | $43.0 \%$ | $47.7 \%$ | $-4.7 \%$ |
| EMERGENCIES | $25.3 \%$ | $29.8 \%$ | $-4.5 \%$ |
| CRIME/JUSTICE/LAW \& ORDER | $35.2 \%$ | $36.8 \%$ | $-1.6 \%$ |
| MOTORING | $20.6 \%$ | $20.1 \%$ | $0.5 \%$ |
| COMMUNITY NEWS | $47.1 \%$ | $45.9 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ |
| EMPLOYMENT | $46.1 \%$ | $43.8 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ |
| CELEBRITY NEWS/GOSSIP | $49.4 \%$ | $45.9 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ |
| ENERGY \& RESOURCES | $27.9 \%$ | $21.6 \%$ | $6.3 \%$ |
| TRANSPORT \& INFRASTRUCTURE | $30.1 \%$ | $23.7 \%$ | $6.4 \%$ |
| ENVIRONMENT | $41.7 \%$ | $33.7 \%$ | $8.0 \%$ |
| BUILDING/CONSTRUCTION | $28.8 \%$ |  | $13.3 \%$ |
|  |  |  | $15.5 \%$ |

## Appendix 4: Expert gender split by topic

| Topic | \% Female <br> Expert | \% Male Expert |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SPORT | $9.7 \%$ | $90.3 \%$ |
| RETAIL | $13.8 \%$ | $86.2 \%$ |
| MOTORING | $14.3 \%$ | $85.7 \%$ |
| DEFENCE | $15.0 \%$ | $85.0 \%$ |
| ENERGY \& RESOURCES | $17.5 \%$ | $82.5 \%$ |
| TRANSPORT \& INFRASTRUCTURE | $22.0 \%$ | $78.0 \%$ |
| EMERGENCIES | $23.6 \%$ | $76.4 \%$ |
| INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS | $23.7 \%$ | $76.3 \%$ |
| FINANCE/ECONOMICS | $25.6 \%$ | $74.4 \%$ |
| AGRICULTURE | $28.7 \%$ | $71.3 \%$ |
| REAL ESTATE | $28.7 \%$ | $71.3 \%$ |
| TRAVEL | $31.8 \%$ | $68.2 \%$ |
| POLITICS | $34.8 \%$ | $65.2 \%$ |
| BUILDING/CONSTRUCTION | $36.8 \%$ | $63.2 \%$ |
| TECHNOLOGY | $40.0 \%$ | $60.0 \%$ |
| HOUSING |  | $40.2 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |


| Topic | \% Female Expert | \% Male Expert |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS | $41.3 \%$ | $58.7 \%$ |
| ARTS/CULTURE | $43.8 \%$ | $56.3 \%$ |
| SOCIAL ISSUES | $44.1 \%$ | $55.9 \%$ |
| ENVIRONMENT | $44.3 \%$ | $55.7 \%$ |
| HOSPITALITY | $44.4 \%$ | $55.6 \%$ |
| HEALTH | $44.9 \%$ | $55.1 \%$ |
| SCIENCE | $45.5 \%$ | $54.5 \%$ |
| EDUCATION | $46.2 \%$ | $53.8 \%$ |
| CRIME/JUSTICE/LAW \& ORDER | $46.7 \%$ | $53.3 \%$ |
| CELEBRITY NEWS/GOSSIP | $48.4 \%$ | $51.6 \%$ |
| INDIGENOUS ISSUES | $50.0 \%$ | $50.0 \%$ |
| COMMUNITY NEWS | $52.4 \%$ | $47.6 \%$ |
| EMPLOYMENT | $52.6 \%$ | $47.4 \%$ |
| COMMUNICATIONS | $59.4 \%$ | $40.6 \%$ |
| LIFESTYLE | $69.2 \%$ | $30.8 \%$ |

## Appendix 5: Expert gender split vs industry employment

| Topic | Female Source \% | Female <br> Employment \% | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SPORT | $9.7 \%$ | $52.6 \%$ | $-42.9 \%$ |
| RETAIL | $13.8 \%$ | $54.3 \%$ | $-40.5 \%$ |
| SOCIAL ISSUES | $44.1 \%$ | $75.8 \%$ | $-31.7 \%$ |
| HEALTH | $44.9 \%$ | $75.8 \%$ | $-30.9 \%$ |
| EDUCATION | $46.2 \%$ | $72.2 \%$ | $-26.0 \%$ |
| FINANCE/BUSINESS/BANKING | $23.3 \%$ | $48.3 \%$ | $-25.0 \%$ |
| INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS | $23.7 \%$ | $48.0 \%$ | $-24.3 \%$ |
| REAL ESTATE | $28.7 \%$ | $52.4 \%$ | $-23.7 \%$ |
| TRAVEL | $31.8 \%$ | $45.4 \%$ | $-13.6 \%$ |
| POLITICS | $34.8 \%$ | $48.0 \%$ | $-13.2 \%$ |
| HOUSING | $40.2 \%$ | $52.4 \%$ | $-12.2 \%$ |
| DEFENCE | $15.0 \%$ | $27.0 \%$ | $-12.0 \%$ |
| HOSPITALITY | $44.4 \%$ | $55.9 \%$ | $-11.5 \%$ |
| INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS | $41.3 \%$ | $48.0 \%$ | $-6.7 \%$ |
| EMERGENCIES | $23.6 \%$ | $29.8 \%$ | $-6.2 \%$ |


| Topic | Female Source \% | Female <br> Employment \% | Difference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MOTORING | $14.3 \%$ | $20.1 \%$ | $-5.8 \%$ |
| ENERGY \& RESOURCES | $17.5 \%$ | $21.6 \%$ | $-4.1 \%$ |
| ARTS/CULTURE | $43.8 \%$ | $47.7 \%$ | $-3.9 \%$ |
| TECHNOLOGY | $40.0 \%$ | $43.8 \%$ | $-3.8 \%$ |
| AGRICULTURE | $28.7 \%$ | $31.3 \%$ | $-2.6 \%$ |
| TRANSPORT \& INFRASTRUCTURE | $22.0 \%$ | $23.7 \%$ | $-1.7 \%$ |
| SCIENCE | $45.5 \%$ | $43.8 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ |
| CELEBRITY NEWS/GOSSIP | $48.4 \%$ | $45.9 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ |
| COMMUNITY NEWS | $52.4 \%$ | $45.9 \%$ | $6.5 \%$ |
| EMPLOYMENT | $52.6 \%$ | $43.8 \%$ | $8.8 \%$ |
| CRIME/JUSTICE/LAW \& ORDER | $46.7 \%$ | $36.8 \%$ | $9.9 \%$ |
| ENVIRONMENT | $44.3 \%$ | $33.7 \%$ | $10.6 \%$ |
| COMMUNICATIONS | $59.4 \%$ | $42.1 \%$ | $17.3 \%$ |
| BUILDING/CONSTRUCTION | $36.8 \%$ |  | $13.3 \%$ |

## Appendix 6: Change from share of women source to share of women expert

| TOPIC | FEMALE SOURCE \% | EXPERT \% | DIFFERENCE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RETAIL | 15.9\% | 13.8\% | -2.1\% |
| SPORT | 15.9\% | 9.7\% | -6.2\% |
| HEALTH | 40.9\% | 44.9\% | 4.0\% |
| SOCIAL ISSUES | 45.6\% | 44.1\% | -1.5\% |
| HOSPITALITY | 27.1\% | 44.4\% | 17.3\% |
| FINANCE/BUSINESS/BANKING | 21.3\% | 23.3\% | 2.0\% |
| REAL ESTATE | 25.9\% | 28.7\% | 2.8\% |
| INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS | 26.9\% | 23.7\% | -3.2\% |
| POLITICS | 27.3\% | 34.8\% | 7.5\% |
| EDUCATION | 56.3\% | 46.2\% | -10.1\% |
| TRAVEL | 32.7\% | 31.8\% | -0.9\% |
| DEFENCE | 16.7\% | 15.0\% | -1.7\% |
| TECHNOLOGY | 34.2\% | 40.0\% | 5.8\% |
| COMMUNICATIONS \& TECHNOLOGY | 34.5\% | 59.4\% | 24.9\% |
| AGRICULTURE | 24.1\% | 28.7\% | 4.6\% |


| TOPIC | FEMALE SOURCE \% | EXPERT \% | DIFFERENCE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS | 42.1\% | 41.3\% | -0.8\% |
| SCIENCE | 38.3\% | 45.5\% | 7.2\% |
| HOUSING | 47.5\% | 40.2\% | -7.3\% |
| ARTS/CULTURE | 43.0\% | 43.8\% | 0.8\% |
| EMERGENCIES | 25.3\% | 23.6\% | -1.7\% |
| CRIME/JUSTICE/LAW \& ORDER | 35.2\% | 46.7\% | 11.5\% |
| MOTORING | 20.6\% | 14.3\% | -6.3\% |
| COMMUNITY NEWS | 47.1\% | 52.4\% | 5.3\% |
| EMPLOYMENT | 46.1\% | 52.6\% | 6.5\% |
| CELEBRITY NEWS/GOSSIP | 49.4\% | 48.4\% | -1.0\% |
| ENERGY \& RESOURCES | 27.9\% | 17.5\% | -10.4\% |
| TRANSPORT \& INFRASTRUCTURE | 30.1\% | 22.0\% | -8.1\% |
| ENVIRONMENT | 41.7\% | 44.3\% | 2.6\% |
| BUILDING/CONSTRUCTION | 28.8\% | 36.8\% | 8.0\% |

## Research Overview

The Women in Media Gender Scorecard identifies core areas in media analytics (bylines, sources, experts) to monitor change over time and positive or negative shifts towards achieving parity for women in Australian media.

Isentia analysis included 18,346 reports from Australian press, radio and TV news coverage over a 14-day period, from 18-31 July 2022. Press coverage was drawn from major metropolitan and national publications, while broadcast reporting was drawn from the major evening news bulletin on free-to-air television stations, AM on Radio National, and the 6pm News on 702 ABC Sydney.

The Women in Media Gender Scorecard defines male-female parity as ' 100 ' with any number under 100 showing an under-representation of women in the media. Share of female bylines as well as use of sources and experts in media reporting are considered in this data.

Analysis of 18,346 reports from Australian press, radio and TV news coverage.
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