

Research continuously demonstrates that women are underrepresented as sources/experts in the news, despite comprising almost half the global population as of 2017.<sup>1</sup> They were only used as sources/experts in the news 24% of the time globally,<sup>2</sup> and this percentage remained stagnant from 2010 – 2015. The gender\* bias varies greatly across countries, but it is prevalent everywhere. In Pakistan, one newspaper used identifiably female sources only 2.2% of the time<sup>3</sup>; on the other hand, 60% of correspondents on the BBC's *News Channel Business* were women.<sup>4</sup> This issue is not just isolated to certain regions of the world. Even in socially progressive countries, such as Finland, women are used as sources less than 30% of the time.<sup>5</sup> North America leads with the highest percentage of women as experts (32%), followed by the Caribbean (29%), and finally Latin America (27%). Unfortunately, research also shows that this gender gap is still prevalent and has not increased much over time. The percentage of women sources used in Canada and the United States from 1991-92 was 9.4%, and it only increased to 15.2% when the study was replicated in 2011-12.<sup>6</sup>

The 2015 Global Media Monitoring Project found that women were most frequently cited in stories about health and science. Additional research found that women were frequently included in soft news stories, but they were most absent from stories about politics and sports.<sup>7</sup> During the 2009 elections in South Africa, women were used as sources only 24% of the time though they represented 43% of the National Assembly.<sup>8</sup> Similarly, women appeared as sources/guests 28% of the time during the 2016 US presidential election.<sup>9</sup> When women were included, they were mainly used as eyewitnesses or as sources that provided their personal experience rather than expertise.<sup>10</sup> Men appeared in more authoritative roles and relied on their credentials. Women's professions also remain gendered as they were more likely to be teachers, activists, or social workers. Additionally, 79% of the words analysed reflected gendered language surrounding sources in South African media.<sup>11</sup> Words commonly associated with female sources included: home, school, sex, and withdraw. On the contrary, words commonly associated with male sources included: manage, bank, company, and court.

The articles also reflect a difference in media types. Women appeared on the radio 35% of the time as compared to 31% on television.<sup>12</sup> In South Africa, radio featured women 23% of the time,

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://ourworldindata.org/gender-ratio>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.5050foundation.edu.au/assets/reports/documents/gmmp-global-report-en.pdf>

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.globalmediajournal.com/open-access/representation-of-news-sources-gender-in-climate-change-reporting-in-pakistani-press.php?aid=87634>

<sup>4</sup> <http://downloads.bbc.co.uk/aboutthebbc/reports/reports/5050-may-2019.pdf>

<sup>5</sup> <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0963662515621470>

<sup>6</sup> <https://journals.sagepub-com.ezproxy.uct.ac.za/doi/pdf/10.1177/1077699014538832>

<sup>7</sup> <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1077699018789885>

<sup>8</sup> [https://genderlinks.org.za/wp-content/uploads/imported/articles/attachments/13667\\_gc2324\\_sa\\_election\\_report.pdf](https://genderlinks.org.za/wp-content/uploads/imported/articles/attachments/13667_gc2324_sa_election_report.pdf)

<sup>9</sup> <https://womensmediacenter.com/reports/whotalks-cable-news-analysts-gender-in-2016-presidential-election-project-t>

<sup>10</sup> <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0163443711418272>

<sup>11</sup> [http://mediamonitoringafrica.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/Gender\\_on\\_the\\_agenda\\_narratives-of-masculinity-in-SA-media.pdf.pdf](http://mediamonitoringafrica.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/Gender_on_the_agenda_narratives-of-masculinity-in-SA-media.pdf.pdf)

<sup>12</sup> <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0163443711418272>

television featured them 21% of the time, and print featured them 19%.<sup>13</sup> In the US, timing of the show also made a difference as female sources/guests were more frequently visible on primetime programming.<sup>14</sup> Some researchers found that local newspapers, papers that publish one issue per week, or papers with a small circulation did a better job of including women.<sup>15</sup> The BBC 50:50 Project encourages organisations to reach a ratio of 50% women correspondents/guests. Their April 2019 report demonstrated that many organisations are improving their ratio and 57% reached 50:50, but almost half still do not accurately represent the population.

As research concludes, women are drastically underrepresented in the news as experts/sources. Some researchers tried to understand why – was it the lack of qualified sources? Did it vary journalist to journalist? Are there journalism rules in place that prohibit gender equality? According to Baitinger, there is a major lack of qualified women in politics who could be used as sources.<sup>16</sup> On the contrary, Niemi and Pitkänen found that 92% of qualified female experts were never even approached to appear as a source for the news.<sup>17</sup> Another study revealed that some women were not confident appearing as an expert due to how they may be judged or perceived by others.<sup>18</sup> Irvin concluded that the gender of the journalist did not impact who was selected as an expert since both men and women relied more on male sources.<sup>19</sup> *Informed Opinions* maintains a database of female experts, and the members of the database stated standing in solidarity with other women, increasing their professional opportunities, and increasing their visibility as a professional as their top three reasons for being included in the database.<sup>20</sup> While research remains inconclusive as to why women are excluded, it is evident that they are drastically underrepresented.

I reviewed fifteen different reports/articles that covered different areas of the world and examined multiple types of media. I gathered these sources using Google Scholar, Primo (accessed through my UCT login), and Google Search to find media monitoring projects. The nature of this report was to examine the gender gap in news sources, and all of the data points to the same conclusion. Future projects could examine the intersectionality of the topic as many studies focused on an additional category (i.e. gender and race or gender and age).

\*Most of the articles use gender and sex interchangeably, as reflected in the following report.

---

<sup>13</sup> [http://genderlinks.org.za/wp-content/uploads/imported/articles/attachments/12273\\_sa\\_summary\\_hgkr\\_102010.pdf](http://genderlinks.org.za/wp-content/uploads/imported/articles/attachments/12273_sa_summary_hgkr_102010.pdf)

<sup>14</sup> <https://womensmediacenter.com/reports/whotalks-cable-news-analysts-gender-in-2016-presidential-election-project-1>

<sup>15</sup> <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1077699018789885>

<sup>16</sup> <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1065912915586632>

<sup>17</sup> <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0963662515621470>

<sup>18</sup> <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/10.1080/17512786.2019.1643252>

<sup>19</sup> <http://www.inquiriesjournal.com/articles/789/2/women-in-tv-broadcast-news-reporters-and-sources-in-hard-news-stories>

<sup>20</sup> <https://informedopinions.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/Counting-Ourselves-In-Final-Report-Oct-2018.pdf>

## “Gendered use of experts in the media: Analysis of the gender gap in Finnish news”

- Who conducted it?
  - Mari K. Niemi University of Strathclyde, UK and Ville Pitkänen, University of Turku, Finland
- When was it conducted?
  - Research 2013, published 2017
- Which countries did it include?
  - Finland – supposed to be more progressive
- What kind of media did it look at (broadcast, print, digital etc.)?
  - Print, digital, and broadcast
- Which publications/media companies did it look at?
  - Helsingin Sanomat, the largest subscription newspaper in Finland, the electronic archives of the Finnish News Agency (STT), and the main newscast of the Finnish Broadcasting Company, Yleisradio (YLE)
- Does it break the media into sectors (eg, financial, political, sport, education, environment, STEM)?
  - Yes, domestic, foreign, and economic categories
- What metrics did they use to measure representation (eg age/education/gender as opposed to sex/location (rural vs urban)/ability/anything else?)
- A **brief** summary of the research findings
  - Though Finland is regarded as a progressive country, men still tend to be overwhelmingly relied upon as experts. Broadcast and print media followed this trend, but the digital news used women sources slightly more than men. The professional background of experts varied greatly (domestic academic researchers, civil servants, researchers from research institutes, and foreign academic researchers), so the study also questioned if the unequal gender representation was due to lack of female experts. The second part of the research method identified that among university researchers, men were interviewed more often than women. The authors also examined the actual news coverage and found that the gender gap can somewhat be attributed to the academic seniority of male researchers.

The survey also revealed that 80% of respondents were rarely approached by the media to act as an expert (69% men, 92% women). The researchers who were frequently contacted were 31% men and 9% women. In general, 14% of women respondents were contacted regularly and 86% were contacted a couple times a year. On the contrary, 59% of men were contacted monthly or weekly and 31% were contacted a couple times a year.

- The interviews confirmed that gender did not play a factor in who to select as experts, but it also confirmed that men are predominantly used as sources.
- A **brief** understanding of the research methodology
    - They researchers used a tri-part methodology, but the first part is the most relevant for the purpose of this analysis
      1. Collected samples throughout six different weeks from the Helsingin Sanomat (print), the Finnish News Agency (digital), and the Finnish Broadcasting Company (broadcast). They collected a total of 4,773 news articles, 870 of which relied upon an expert source.
      2. Sent an internet-based survey targeted at social scientists of three Finnish universities. They sent the survey to 1,125 people and 293 participated (146 female, 147 male).
      3. Conducted semi-structured interviews with journalists and editors in domestic, foreign, or economic news departments of newspapers, television, and radio. Seven interviewees were women and four were men. They sampled the YLE, television stations (MTV3 and STT news agency), HS newspaper, and two tabloids/evening papers.
  - Were there comparative analyses? Year on year or month on month? If so, did the datasets stay the same (were apples compared with apples year on year, or were apples compared with pears?)
    - No
  - A link to the study online: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0963662515621470>
  - Did they use a tool for formal media monitoring?
    - No

### **“Women and news: A long and winding road”**

- Who conducted it?
  - Karen Ross, University of Liverpool, UK and Cynthia Carter, Cardiff University, UK
- When was it conducted?
  - Part of the 2010 Global Media Monitoring Report, but edits were made later and this was published in 2011.
- Which countries did it include (if more than one)?
  - United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland
- What kind of media did it look at (broadcast, print, digital etc.)?
  - Broadcast, print, and radio
- Which publications/media companies did it look at?
  - Newspapers: *Times*, *Telegraph*, *Guardian*, *Independent*, *Mirror*, *Mail*, *Sun*, *Express*, *The Herald*, *The Scotsman*, *Daily Record* (Scotland), *Western Mail*, *Y Cymro* (Wales), *Irish News*,

[Type here]

- Newsletter, Belfast Telegraph, Mirror* (regional version), *The Irish News, The Irish Independent* (Ireland)
- Television: Channel 4 news; ITV news (early evening); BBC1 news (1 p.m. and 10 p.m.); BBC2 *Newsnight*, STV evening bulletin, BBC Scotland evening bulletin (Scotland), S4C *Newyddion* (early evening), BBC1 Wales news (early evening) (Wales), UTV (Northern Ireland)
  - Radio: BBC Radio 1 (12.45 p.m.), BBC Radio 4 (midnight), BBC Radio 4 (7 a.m. – *Today*), BBC Radio 5 (5 a.m.), BBC Asian Network (6 p.m.), BBC Radio Scotland (8 a.m. bulletin in *Good Morning Scotland*, Real Radio (Scotland), Radio Wales (afternoon), Radio Cymru (afternoon) (Wales), BBC Radio Ulster (evening show), CodFM, Citybeat, U105, Downtown (Northern Ireland), RTE Radio 1, LMFM (Ireland)
  - Does it break the media into sectors (eg, financial, political, sport, education, environment, STEM)?
    - Somewhat – at times, the report provides specific breakdowns of categories. For example, men were used as sources in 87% of the newspaper stories about sport.
  - What metrics did they use to measure representation (eg age/education/gender as opposed to sex/location (rural vs urban)/ability/anything else)?
    - Gender, job title, professions, and subject categories
  - A **brief** summary of the research findings
    - A total of 450 print news sources had a clearly identified sex, of which 30% were women and 70% were men. Men acted as sources in 75% of the stories about domestic politics, 100% of the stories about national defence, 90% about war, 87% about sport, 83% about the legal system, and 80% about violent crime. Women sources were used in 100% of stories about political power, 80% about peace, 67% about education, and 66% about accidents/disaster. Out of 270 sources in broadcast news media, 31% were women; on the other hand, women acted as sources in 35% of radio samples. Women's occupations were still gendered, and women were likely to be identified as health or social workers, teachers, activists, or office workers than men. Women were more often featured as eye witnesses, providing public opinion, or bringing their personal experience to the story.
    - In the newspaper sample, women journalist wrote 31% of articles with a clearly defined author. Women were more likely to write about health and celebrities, while men mainly wrote about 'hard news' categories like politics, economy, and crime. Women outnumbered men as anchors in radio, and the television numbers were remarkably similar. This demonstrates that women were less likely to obtain reporter jobs, and they face more issues around workplace discrimination as they age in these roles.
  - A **brief** understanding of the research methodology
    - This study examined print (216), television (115), and radio (147) texts as part of the Global Media Monitoring Project. They used the same coding templates as all other countries participating in the programme, and they took note of what stories were included, the journalists themselves, and the sources used in each text.

[Type here]

- Were there comparative analyses? Year on year or month on month? If so, did the datasets stay the same (were apples compared with apples year on year, or were apples compared with pears?)
  - Yes and no. The GMMP report itself provides comparative analysis itself, but this article does minor comparisons between previous GMMP reports. For example, women were 75% of homemakers/parents, 54% of students/pupils, 45% of office workers, and 41% of celebrity artists/media. The GMMP shows that over the past 15 years of reporting, the number of women in each of these categories has decreased.
- A link to the study online: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0163443711418272>
- Did they use a formal media monitoring tool?
  - Yes, this was part of the 2010 *Global Media Monitoring Project*

### **“Pushy or a princess: Women experts and British broadcast news”**

- Who conducted it?
  - Lis Howell and Jane B. Singer
- When was it conducted?
  - March 2012 – October 2013
- Which countries did it include (if more than one)?
  - United Kingdom
- What kind of media did it look at (broadcast, print, digital etc.)?
  - Television and radio
- Which publications/media companies did it look at?
  - BBC News at Ten, ITV News at Ten, Sky News at Ten, and Today on BBC Radio 4
- Does it break the media into sectors (eg, financial, political, sport, education, environment, STEM)?
  - Somewhat, but it is not a large focus of this study – politics, business, education, lifestyle, health
- What metrics did they use to measure representation (eg age/education/gender as opposed to sex/location (rural vs urban)/ability/anything else)?
  - Gender, profession
- A **brief** summary of the research findings
  - Across the four organisations, four male experts appeared for every one female expert. The gender gap greatly increased based on the category of story. In business stories, six male experts were used for every one female expert. In politics, ten male experts were used for every one female expert.
  - In the interviews and questionnaires with journalists, many mentioned that they value experts who speak clearly and confidently. They also look for people who naturally fit the role and do not require a lot of training. When asked why women did not appear as experts often, they cited the societal gender gap (assuming that there were not enough women in

[Type here]

- the roles that would allow them to work as experts). Some journalists admitted that they were lazy and never took gender into consideration when selecting sources.
- The interviews and surveys also found that journalists often return to experts they previously used, or they highly consider experts recommended by their supervisors (often men). Journalists also said experts need to promote controversy in an authoritative way, and research shows that women's lack of confidence makes them reluctant to approach controversy. Finally, some journalists noted that women were used as experts, mainly on shows airing earlier in the day (health, education, lifestyle).
  - The questionnaires completed by women experts indicated that a majority of women were hesitant to put themselves forward. A variety of reasons were cited: four out of five women noted that they lacked confidence, 13 said they feared being judged by others, some did not want to appear unqualified, 12 mentioned appearance as a fear for not appearing, and these women also confirmed that men are typically more comfortable in a confrontational/assertive role. Only one female expert cited lack of childcare as a reason for not appearing.
- **A brief** understanding of the research methodology
    - The researchers took a sample from four different datasets. First, they analysed newscasts from the four most popular UK programmes on television and radio to quantify the number of women experts versus male experts. They then compiled questionnaires from 320 UK broadcast journalists in the UK. Next, they interviewed 25 journalists from the four news organisations they used for the study. Lastly, they compiled 31 questionnaires from women who attended training days sponsored by the BBC Academy (programme that attempts to increase the number of women used as sources in the news).
  - Were there comparative analyses? Year on year or month on month? If so, did the datasets stay the same (were apples compared with apples year on year, or were apples compared with pears?)
    - No, this was a one-time study conducted on British media through 2012 and 2013
  - A link to the study online: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/10.1080/17512786.2019.1643252>
  - Did they use a formal media monitoring tool?
    - No

## **“Meet the Press or Meet the Men? Examining Women’s Presence in American News Media”**

- Who conducted it?
  - Gail Baitinger
- When was it conducted?
  - Published in 2015, research January 2009 – 2011
- Which countries did it include (if more than one)?

[Type here]

- United States
- What kind of media did it look at (broadcast, print, digital etc.)?
  - Broadcast, specifically Sunday morning news programmes
- Which publications/media companies did it look at?
  - *This Week* and *Face the Nation*, the researcher did not specifically disclose the other programmes she analysed but there was a total of five Sunday morning programmes
- Does it break the media into sectors (eg, financial, political, sport, education, environment, STEM)?
  - Yes, female journalists were the largest group, followed by political activists and members of the administration. The smallest profession comprised by women was that of former elected officials.
- What metrics did they use to measure representation (eg age/education/gender as opposed to sex/location (rural vs urban)/ability/anything else)?
  - Gender and profession
- A **brief** summary of the research findings
  - A total of 1,007 individuals participated as guests on the programmes throughout three years, but only 23% were women. As far as repeated guests go on the appearance level, women comprise about 25%. Women were also more likely to be part of a roundtable discussions (1/3) than a solo interview (15%). The researcher claims that this representation is actually in line with the percentage of women in politics. For example, 37% of all reporter appearances are by women, and women make up 38% of newsrooms across the country.

The research demonstrated the guests on the show were more likely chosen based on their extreme voting record, time in the Senate, and leadership positions they hold, all of which women historically lack/are not part of. The researcher concludes that women are less likely to appear on the show because fewer women possess the desired credentials/experience. When women with proper qualifications arise, they often lack the desired characteristics for guests appearing on the programmes.

- A **brief** understanding of the research methodology
  - The researcher analysed transcripts from all five Sunday programmes from January 2009 – 2011 and examined all guests on the show (not just politicians). She also noted the appearance level of each guest to see if certain guests appeared multiple times.
- Were there comparative analyses? Year on year or month on month? If so, did the datasets stay the same (were apples compared with apples year on year, or were apples compared with pears?)
  - No, the data was only compiled over a three-year period and was not compared to previous data
- A link to the study online: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1065912915586632>
- Did they use a formal media monitoring report?
  - No

[Type here]



## “Female Voices in the News: Structural Conditions of Gender Representations in Norwegian Newspapers”

- Who conducted it?
  - Helle Sjøvaag and Truls André Pedersen
- When was it conducted?
  - 5 – 12 October, 2015
- Which countries did it include (if more than one)?
  - Norway
- What kind of media did it look at (broadcast, print, digital etc.)?
  - Print and digital (online newspapers)
- Which publications/media companies did it look at?
  - The following names were mentioned in the study: *Bergens Tidende*, *Aftenposten*, *Stavanger Aftenblad*, *Fædrelandsvennen*, *Bygdanytt*
  - Does not specifically mention the names of all 125 organisations
- Does it break the media into sectors (eg, financial, political, sport, education, environment, STEM)?
  - Yes – politics (28.8%), culture (41.3%), sports (12.4%), social issues (44.2%), lifestyle (48.3%), economy (27.6%), infrastructure (24.9%), crime (27.3%), accidents (19.8%), “unsung heroes” (48.7%), science/technology (28.4%), weather (41.8%), and other (32.2%).
- What metrics did they use to measure representation (eg age/education/gender as opposed to sex/location (rural vs urban)/ability/anything else)?
  - Gender and profession
- A **brief** summary of the research findings
  - The content analysis revealed that a total of 32.9% of the sources from the sample were women. The percentage of females was higher than males when they appeared as children or friends/family of other sources (51.8%). The computational analysis showed ownership did not make a major difference on the percentage of women in the news. Local newspapers did a better job of including women than national papers, and they perform somewhat better than metropolitan newspapers. Additionally, papers that publish one issue per week or papers with a smaller circulation did better including women in the news coverage. Lastly, the researchers found that there is no difference in representation of women in the news between papers that receive state support and those that don’t.
- A **brief** understanding of the research methodology
  - The researchers used two different datasets to gather data in regards to gender representation in the news. First, they conducted a content analysis of 75 news outlets to analyse gender distribution among source categories and gender among topical category. They then conducted a computational analysis of gender distribution in 125 news outlets according to ownership, distribution, circulation, market position, and press support.

[Type here]

- Were there comparative analyses? Year on year or month on month? If so, did the datasets stay the same (were apples compared with apples year on year, or were apples compared with pears?)
  - No
- A link to the study online: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/1077699018789885>
- Did they use a formal media monitoring report?
  - No

## “Global Media Monitoring Project 2015”

- Who conducted it?
  - Each area of the world had a regional coordinator who managed many national coordinators
- When was it conducted?
  - 25 March, 2015
- Which countries did it include (if more than one)?
  - Total of 114 countries – Africa (32), Asia (11), Caribbean (15), Europe (30), Latin America (14), Middle East (6), North America (2), Pacific (4)
- What kind of media did it look at (broadcast, print, digital etc.)?
  - Newspaper, radio, television, Twitter, and digital
- Which publications/media companies did it look at?
  - Not specifically disclosed, each country monitored different organisations
- Does it break the media into sectors (eg, financial, political, sport, education, environment, STEM)?
  - Yes, the project monitored which sectors women most/least frequently appeared in
- What metrics did they use to measure representation (eg age/education/gender as opposed to sex/location (rural vs urban)/ability/anything else)?
  - Gender, age, and profession, and location
- A **brief** summary of the research findings
  - Women still only made up an average of 24% of people mentioned in newspapers, radio, or television programming. They are most frequently visible in stories about science and health (35%), but least frequently seen in programming about politics and the government (16%). The 2015 report was the first to include social media monitoring as well, and it found that women were only included in 26% of internet news stories and media news Tweets. Women are just barely seen more in local news (26-27%) when compared to national news (23%). They are most likely to appear as experience providers (38%), but women as experts are seen much less frequently (19%). North America has the highest percentage of women as experts (32%), followed by the Caribbean (29%), and finally Latin America (27%).
- A **brief** understanding of the research methodology

[Type here]

- GMMP provided each researcher in each country with guidelines on how to find samples, how many to include, country-specific information, and how to code the data based on media type. Coders noted the story placement (especially in newspapers), sex of the reporter, sex of the sources/featured people, age of the sources/featured people, profession of the sources/featured people, subject, and relevant policies mentioned.
- Were there comparative analyses? Year on year or month on month? If so, did the datasets stay the same (were apples compared with apples year on year, or were apples compared with pears?)
  - Yes, between 2010 – 2015, the number of women who appeared in newspapers went from 24% - 26%. There was a decrease in radio from 22% - 21%, but television remained stagnant at 24%. This project has been conducted for the past 20 years, so there are frequent comparisons between years to see improvements/declines.
- A link to the study online: <https://www.5050foundation.edu.au/assets/reports/documents/gmmp-global-report-en.pdf>
- Did they use a formal media monitoring report?
  - Yes, this is the *Global Media Monitoring Project* from 2015

### **“Women in TV Broadcast News: Reporters and Sources in Hard News Sources”**

- Who conducted it?
  - Mariah Irvin
- When was it conducted?
  - 8 – 19 October, 2012
- Which countries did it include (if more than one)?
  - United States
- What kind of media did it look at (broadcast, print, digital etc.)?
  - Broadcast
- Which publications/media companies did it look at?
  - ABC, CBS, and NBC – three similar news programmes on air from 6:30 – 7:00 pm
- Does it break the media into sectors (eg, financial, political, sport, education, environment, STEM)?
  - Somewhat – the research divided news topics into hard and soft news and then examined the representation of women in each of the two categories
- What metrics did they use to measure representation (eg age/education/gender as opposed to sex/location (rural vs urban)/ability/anything else)?
  - Gender and profession (only used journalists, not news anchors)
- A **brief** summary of the research findings
  - Male journalists who appeared in a story during the sample period outnumbered female journalists, but females appeared in hard news stories 55% of the time. Out of 259 sources in the stories, 94 were women and 165 were men. Male sources were more frequently used

[Type here]

in both hard (93 male and 43 female) and soft news (72 male and 51 female). The gender of the journalist did not impact who they chose as a source as both male and female reporters relied more on male sources. The researchers also found that women used as sources usually were classified as nonexperts.

- A **brief** understanding of the research methodology
  - Researchers analysed all three shows each weekday night looking for who reported on the story, what the topic was, and the gender of the sources. They defined hard news as breaking news or stories of political/international matters. Soft news included health and feature stories, as well as stories that could be reported any day without altering the message. They also defined experts as those with expertise relevant to the story, while nonexperts were people interviewed solely for their opinion. This time period included heavy political coverage as the US prepared for presidential elections.
- Were there comparative analyses? Year on year or month on month? If so, did the datasets stay the same (were apples compared with apples year on year, or were apples compared with pears?)
  - No
- A link to the study online: <http://www.inquiriesjournal.com/articles/789/2/women-in-tv-broadcast-news-reporters-and-sources-in-hard-news-stories>
- Did they use a formal media monitoring report?
  - No

### **“BBC 50:50 Project 2019”**

- Who conducted it?
  - BBC 50:50
- When was it conducted?
  - April 2019
- Which countries did it include (if more than one)?
  - Mainly United Kingdom
- What kind of media did it look at (broadcast, print, digital etc.)?
  - Radio, digital, and broadcast
- Which publications/media companies did it look at?
  - BBC programmes
- Does it break the media into sectors (eg, financial, political, sport, education, environment, STEM)?
  - No, but it examined media based on its type (ie. digital, radio, broadcast)
- What metrics did they use to measure representation (eg age/education/gender as opposed to sex/location (rural vs urban)/ability/anything else?)
  - Gender
- A **brief** summary of the research findings

[Type here]

- 57% of the teams that reported data during April 2019 reached the goal of 50% female representation in their content.
  1. BBC Newsroom – Started at 39% and reached 58%
  2. World News Business – Started at 27% and reached 51%
  3. News Channel Business – Started at 49% and reached 60%
  4. News at Ten – Started at 40% and reached 49%
  5. Politics Live – Started at 44% and reached 53%
  6. BBC Future Online – Started at 30% and reached 50%
  7. Sport TV News – Started at 20% and reached 43%
  8. BBC Azeri digital video – Started at 42% and reached 51%
  9. BBC Arabic Newshour – Started at 18% and reached 50%
  10. BBC Look East (Norwich) – Started at 39% and reached 51%
  11. BBC Radio Norfolk Pilot – Started at 33% and reached 50%
  12. Newsbeat – Started at 42% and reached 51%
  13. Inside Science – Started at 35% and reached 52%
  14. News Online (UK) – Started at 34% and reached 50%
- A **brief** understanding of the research methodology
  - This report explained how English language programmes involved in the 50:50 project for more than one year performed during April 2019. Companies that sign up for the project focus on voluntary self-monitoring that does not disrupt the workflow. Self-monitoring is designed based on the three following guidelines: we collect data to affect change, measure what you can control, and never compromise on quality (use the best source/contributor). The goal of this project is to reach a 50:50 gender ratio in the programming.
- Were there comparative analyses? Year on year or month on month? If so, did the datasets stay the same (were apples compared with apples year on year, or were apples compared with pears?)
  - Yes and no – this was a report from one month only. The report does make comparisons between the programme’s data on inception and where they are now.
- A link to the study online: <http://downloads.bbc.co.uk/aboutthebbc/reports/reports/5050-may-2019.pdf>
- Did they use a formal media monitoring report?
  - Yes, *BBC 50:50 Project*

## “Gender and Media Progress Study”

- Who conducted it?
  - Gender Links
- When was it conducted?
  - 19 October – 16 November, 2009 (outside of the ten-year timeframe, but there is limited research on African media so I still wanted to include it)

[Type here]

- Which countries did it include (if more than one)?
  - South Africa
- What kind of media did it look at (broadcast, print, digital etc.)?
  - Radio, broadcast, and print
- Which publications/media companies did it look at?
  - The report does not specifically mention the companies researched, but the following companies are mentioned in the findings section: *Kaya FM*, *702 Talk Radio*, *Sowetan*, *ETV*, *Highway Radio*, *Sunday Independent*, *SABC 3*, *Business Day*, and *The Citizen*
- Does it break the media into sectors (eg, financial, political, sport, education, environment, STEM)?
  - Somewhat – the research divided news topics into hard and soft news and then examined the representation of women in each of the two categories
- What metrics did they use to measure representation (eg age/education/gender as opposed to sex/location (rural vs urban)/ability/anything else)?
  - Age, gender, profession
- A **brief** summary of the research findings
  - This study examined coverage of HIV/AIDS, gender-based violence, gender in newsrooms, media practice, and gender in media content. For the purpose of this report, I will only explore the findings in relation to gender and news coverage. Women sources were used 20% of the time, as compared to 19% in the 2003 Gender and Media Baseline Study. Radio used women 23% of the time, television used them 21% of the time, and print used them 19%. Additionally, women constituted 25% of all images in South African newspapers in comparison to 19% of news sources. This finding signified that women were more likely to be seen than read about. The average age of women prevalent in the media was 26 – 49. Women were more often included in soft news sources (sex and sexuality, education, gender equality). They were rarely included in sports (10%), mining and culture and tradition (15%), and economics (16%). Professionally, women sources dominated as homemakers, beauty contestants, social workers, and sex workers.
- A **brief** understanding of the research methodology
  - The methodology is not discussed in this report, but it does mention the following features that were not included in the 2003 report: a survey of general media practice, differences between media with different reaches (state, private, and community media), differences between media types (print, broadcast, radio), deeper interrogation of people behind the news, chapters on gender-based violence and HIV/AIDS, and case studies.
- Were there comparative analyses? Year on year or month on month? If so, did the datasets stay the same (were apples compared with apples year on year, or were apples compared with pears)?
  - They compared the findings of this study with the 2003 Gender and Media Baseline Study
- A link to the study online: [http://genderlinks.org.za/wp-content/uploads/imported/articles/attachments/12273\\_sa\\_summary\\_hgkr\\_102010.pdf](http://genderlinks.org.za/wp-content/uploads/imported/articles/attachments/12273_sa_summary_hgkr_102010.pdf)

[Type here]

- Did they use a formal media monitoring report?
  - Yes, the research was commissioned by *Gender Links*. This study was part of a regional study that incorporated research from 14 SADC countries

## **“Representation of News Sources’ Gender in Climate Change Reporting in Pakistani Press”**

- Who conducted it?
  - Rashid Ali Khuhro, Hamed Mohd Adnan, Mohsin Hassan Khan, Zaffar Iqbal Junejo, and Haifa Aljiuaid
- When was it conducted?
  - The study was submitted for publishing in 2019, but it examined events regarding climate change in 1992, 1997, 2005, 2009, and 2015.
- Which countries did it include (if more than one)?
  - Pakistan
- What kind of media did it look at (broadcast, print, digital etc.)?
  - Print
- Which publications/media companies did it look at?
  - Jang (Urdu), The Dawn (English), and Kawish (Sindhi)
- Does it break the media into sectors (eg, financial, political, sport, education, environment, STEM)?
  - No, this only focused on news coverage around climate change
- What metrics did they use to measure representation (eg age/education/gender as opposed to sex/location (rural vs urban)/ability/anything else)?
  - Gender
- A **brief** summary of the research findings
  - Out of 1,498 sources, 59.3% were identifiably male while only 3.1% were identifiably female (23.1% were both and 14.5% were unspecified). This gap was identified in all of the newspapers: The Dawn (58% male, 2.2% female, 23.8% both, and 16% unspecified), Jang (61.8% male, 2.9% female, 16.2% both, and 19.1% unspecified), and Kawish (60% male, 5.3% female, 28% both, and 6.7% unspecified). The pattern remained rather consistent over time as researchers examined five events from different years: Earth Summit 1992 (54.4% male, 1.3% female, 16.5% both, and 27.8% unspecified), Kyoto Protocol 1997 (69.2% male, 0% female, 23.1% both, and 7.7% unspecified), Ratification of Kyoto Protocol (49.2% male, 4.6% female, 33.8% both, and 12.3% unspecified), COP15 2009 (67% male, 7.4% female, 18.6% both, and 7% unspecified), and COP21 2015 (63.1% male, 2.7% female, 23.4% both, and 10.8% unspecified).
- A **brief** understanding of the research methodology

[Type here]

- The researchers sampled three different papers, each published in a different language in Pakistan. The Dawn (English) and Jang (Urdu) were both national newspapers, whereas Kawish (Sindhi) was a regional newspaper. They used systematic random sampling to select each alternate day of newspapers, and they picked up the newspapers one month before and one month after the event. They analysed coverage about five different events in relation to climate change over a span of 23 years. The researchers noted the gender of each source in the articles.
- Were there comparative analyses? Year on year or month on month? If so, did the datasets stay the same (were apples compared with apples year on year, or were apples compared with pears?)
  - Yes, the researchers examined coverage from five different events over a span of 23 years.
- A link to the study online: <http://www.globalmediajournal.com/open-access/representation-of-news-sources-gender-in-climate-change-reporting-in-pakistani-press.php?aid=87634>
- Did they use a formal media monitoring report?
  - No

### **“#WhoTalks – Cable/News Analysts & Gender in 2016 Presidential Election Project Totals”**

- Who conducted it?
  - *Who Talks?* by GenderAvenger
- When was it conducted?
  - 1 March – 11 November, 2016
- Which countries did it include (if more than one)?
  - United States
- What kind of media did it look at (broadcast, print, digital etc.)?
  - Broadcast
- Which publications/media companies did it look at?
  - CNN (morning show: *New Day*, primetime show: *Anderson Cooper 360*), Fox (morning show: *Fox and Friends*, primetime show: *The Kelly File*), and MSNBC (morning show: *Morning Joe*, primetime show: *The Rachel Maddow Show*)
- Does it break the media into sectors (eg, financial, political, sport, education, environment, STEM)?
  - No, only politics
- What metrics did they use to measure representation (eg age/education/gender as opposed to sex/location (rural vs urban)/ability/anything else)?
  - Gender and time of the show (morning vs. primetime)
- A **brief** summary of the research findings
  - The networks used female sources 28% of the time and male sources 72% of the time. On average, primetime shows used female sources more frequently.

[Type here]



- Morning shows
  1. CNN: 32% female and 68% male
  2. Fox: 22% female and 78% male
  3. MSNBC: 23% female and 77% male
  4. Average: 26% female and 74% male
- Primetime show
  1. CNN: 46% female and 54% male
  2. Fox: 16% female and 84% male
  3. MSNBC: 34% female and 66% male
  4. Average: 35% female and 65% male
- A **brief** understanding of the research methodology
  - This report tracked the number of appearances by analysts during the presidential election. The researchers analysed six shows on three different networks, including one morning and one primetime show. Any guest on the show who was asked to comment on the election was included in the data.
- Were there comparative analyses? Year on year or month on month? If so, did the datasets stay the same (were apples compared with apples year on year, or were apples compared with pears?)
  - No
- A link to the study online: <https://womensmediacenter.com/reports/whotalks-cable-news-analysts-gender-in-2016-presidential-election-project-t>
- Did they use a formal media monitoring report?
  - Published on *Women's Media Center*

## **“Gender in the 2009 South African Elections”**

- Who conducted it?
  - Gender Links and Media Monitoring Africa
- When was it conducted?
  - 2009 (outside of the ten-year timeframe, but there is limited research on African media so I still wanted to include it)
- Which countries did it include (if more than one)?
  - South Africa
- What kind of media did it look at (broadcast, print, digital etc.)?
  - Print and broadcast
- Which publications/media companies did it look at?
  - The report does not specifically mention where the sample was pulled from, but the following media programmes were mentioned in the findings: ETV, SABC morning

[Type here]

and evening shows, SABC International, IEC, Financial Times, Independent, Sunday Independent, the Star, and the Mail & Guardian

- Does it break the media into sectors (eg, financial, political, sport, education, environment, STEM)?
  - No, this only focused on political news coverage
- What metrics did they use to measure representation (eg age/education/gender as opposed to sex/location (rural vs urban)/ability/anything else)?
  - Gender and race (somewhat)
- A **brief** summary of the research findings
  - During the 2009 elections, 24% of the sources were women. This increased from 10% during the 1994 elections. The global average from the 2005 GMMP was only 21%. The Mail & Guardian was praised for frequently using black female experts and opinion shapers in their election coverage. Gender stereotypes were prevalent throughout the coverage (claims that Helen Zille got Botox). Much of the coverage also focused on sexuality and Zuma's polygamous lifestyle, rather than information relevant to politics.
- A **brief** understanding of the research methodology
  - While not explicitly discussed, it is evident the researchers sampled a variety of news coverage (mainly print). The researchers noted when an expert was used and what their gender was. They also did a qualitative analysis to examine gender stereotypes in the news coverage, as well as what topics were published.
- Were there comparative analyses? Year on year or month on month? If so, did the datasets stay the same (were apples compared with apples year on year, or were apples compared with pears?)
  - No
- A link to the study online: [https://genderlinks.org.za/wp-content/uploads/imported/articles/attachments/13667\\_gc2324\\_sa\\_election\\_report.pdf](https://genderlinks.org.za/wp-content/uploads/imported/articles/attachments/13667_gc2324_sa_election_report.pdf)
  - The following links provide a summary of the report commission by Gender Links and Media Monitoring Africa
    1. <http://www.aibd.org.my/node/1097>
    2. <https://mediamonitoringafrica.org/2009/04/14/women-what-women-media-contributes-to-the-disempowerment-of-women/>
- Did they use a formal media monitoring report?
  - *Gender Links and Media Monitoring Africa*

### **“Counting ourselves in: Understanding why women decide to engage with the media”**

- Who conducted it?
  - Nancy Worth, Alkim Karaagac, Shari Graydon, and Samantha Luchuk
- When was it conducted?
  - Summer of 2018

[Type here]

- Which countries did it include (if more than one)?
  - Canada
- What kind of media did it look at (broadcast, print, digital etc.)?
  - NA – this study collected responses from expert women
- Which publications/media companies did it look at?
  - NA – this study collected responses from expert women
- Does it break the media into sectors (eg, financial, political, sport, education, environment, STEM)?
  - NA
- What metrics did they use to measure representation (eg age/education/gender as opposed to sex/location (rural vs urban)/ability/anything else)?
  - Membership to the online database, willingness to interact with the media, and gender
- A **brief** summary of the research findings
  - Researchers identified and labelled three types of experts in the database, based on their experience and eagerness to interact with the media: savvy and seasoned, eager engager, and motivated but wary. The core group represented in the database was eager engager – women who recognise the value of media engagement and want to do more, even if it is not always easy. About 17% of respondents joined the database to increase their visibility as a professional. 15% of experts wanted to stand in solidarity with other women experts, and 13% wanted to increase their professional opportunities.
- A **brief** understanding of the research methodology
  - Since inception in 2010, *Informed Opinions* has amplified the voices of more than 2,500 women across Canada and created a database of women actively ready to respond as sources in the news. Researchers sought to learn what motivated these women to engage with the media, despite all of the barriers women usually face. The database contained 550 profiles at the time of the study; 193 of these women completed the online survey, and 34 of the surveyed women agreed to in-depth interviews.
- Were there comparative analyses? Year on year or month on month? If so, did the datasets stay the same (were apples compared with apples year on year, or were apples compared with pears)?
  - No
- A link to the study online: <https://informedopinions.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/Counting-Ourselves-In-Final-Report-Oct-2018.pdf>
- Did they use a formal media monitoring report?
  - Yes – non-profit organisation *Informed Opinions*

## “Gender on the Agenda: Narratives of Masculinity in South African Media”

- Who conducted it?
  - Sandra Banjac and Lethabo Dibetso

[Type here]

- When was it conducted?
  - 16 – 22 November 2012
- Which countries did it include (if more than one)?
  - South Africa
- What kind of media did it look at (broadcast, print, digital etc.)?
  - Print – newspapers
- Which publications/media companies did it look at?
  - Daily Sun, Sowetan, Business Day, City Press, and Mail & Guardian
- Does it break the media into sectors (eg, financial, political, sport, education, environment, STEM)?
  - Not really, but they did analyse what types of stories both men and women were more commonly cited in
- What metrics did they use to measure representation (eg age/education/gender as opposed to sex/location (rural vs urban)/ability/anything else)?
  - Only gender – used both men and women in the focus groups and when interviewing journalists
- A **brief** summary of the research findings
  - Only 20% of 1,207 sources analysed were women, and 79% of words collected in the first part of the story were spoken by men. The language surrounding news sources was also very gendered – words associated with male sources reflected professions and words usually associated with men (ie. manage, bank, company, court). Words associated with female sources were home, school, sex, or withdraw. The focus groups revealed that men felt the media overwhelmingly portrayed them as violent, rapists, and monsters, and this was perpetuated by stories without a follow-up or that lack context. Lastly, the journalists were shocked at the findings from the media analysis. Many stated they don't deliberate over words to strike a conscious balance in gender language. They also said that time pressures in news journalism often prevented them from seeking out female sources when male sources are more readily available. This can partially be attributed to female sources allegedly retracting their comments too often, which makes it difficult to generate time sensitive stories. Journalists confirmed that race and gender impacted how the news is produced mainly due to media ownership (owned by white men).
- A **brief** understanding of the research methodology
  - This tri-part study began by analysing media and collecting over 21,000 words from male and female sources to find differences in their linguistic patterns and portrayals in the media. Researchers then presented focus groups with excerpts from media articles dealing with gender issues that would elicit masculine or feminine reactions to assess men's and women's perceptions of masculinity in relation to issues that affect both sexes. Lastly, they interviewed journalists to understand their response to gendered language in the media and findings from focus group discussions.

[Type here]

- Were there comparative analyses? Year on year or month on month? If so, did the datasets stay the same (were apples compared with apples year on year, or were apples compared with pears?)
  - No
- A link to the study online: [http://mediamonitoringafrica.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/Gender\\_on\\_the\\_agenda\\_narratives-of-masculinity-in-SA-media.pdf.pdf](http://mediamonitoringafrica.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/Gender_on_the_agenda_narratives-of-masculinity-in-SA-media.pdf.pdf)
- Did they use a formal media monitoring report?
  - Produced in collaboration with *Media Monitoring Africa*

### **“You’ve Come a Short Way, Baby: Gender of Information Sources in American and Canadian Business Magazines, 1991-92 and 2011-12”**

- Who conducted it?
  - Karen Grandy
- When was it conducted?
  - July 2011 – June 2012
- Which countries did it include (if more than one)?
  - Canada and United States
- What kind of media did it look at (broadcast, print, digital etc.)?
  - Print – Canadian and American business magazines
- Which publications/media companies did it look at?
  - *Canadian Business*, *Report on Business*, *Fortune*, and *Bloomberg Businessweek*
- Does it break the media into sectors (eg, financial, political, sport, education, environment, STEM)?
  - No
- What metrics did they use to measure representation (eg age/education/gender as opposed to sex/location (rural vs urban)/ability/anything else)?
  - Gender and profession of source
- A **brief** summary of the research findings
  - 1991-92: 1,404 sources
    1. 9.4% female
    2. Senior Management was the most common source occupation (62%)
      - Analysts/consultants/researchers was second (16.5%)
    3. Almost every magazine underrepresented women as sources in almost every profession (exception: Other Management/Government Officials in *Canadian Business*)
  - 2011-12: 1,130 sources
    1. 15.2% female
    2. Senior Management was still number one (40.2%)
      - Analysts/consultants/researchers was still second (34%)

[Type here]

3. Some magazines did better represented women in some professions (examples: Professors in *Canadian Business* and *Bloomberg Businessweek*, Other Management in *Fortune*)
  - Some magazines still drastically underrepresented women in certain professions (examples: Government Officials in *Report on Business* and *Bloomberg Businessweek*, Professors in *Fortune*)
- A **brief** understanding of the research methodology
  - Researchers replicated the methodology from the original studied and sampled the four same magazines. They pulled a total of 160 articles through systematic random sampling, only included features or articles longer than one page. They identified the gender of each journalist and used LinkedIn to resolve any ambiguities. The sources were then placed into one of seven occupational categories: senior management, other management, other employees, analysts/consultants/researchers, government officials, professors, or others.
- Were there comparative analyses? Year on year or month on month? If so, did the datasets stay the same (were apples compared with apples year on year, or were apples compared with pears?)
  - Yes, compared data from previous study (1991-92) with data from 2011-12. Researchers in the most recent study replicated the original study step by step.
- A link to the study online: <https://journals-sagepub-com.ezproxy.uct.ac.za/doi/pdf/10.1177/1077699014538832>
- Did they use a formal media monitoring report?
  - No