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I. BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

The 2009 Hollywood Writers Report is the sixth in a series of reports released by the Writers Guild of America, West (WGAW) examining employment and earnings trends for writers in the Hollywood industry. These reports have highlighted three groups of writers -- women, minorities, and older writers -- who traditionally have been underemployed in the industry. The reports have documented the employment experiences of these study groups relative to their male, white, and younger counterparts in order to identify any patterns that suggest either progress or retreat on the industry diversity front. Using the reports as a diagnostic tool, the WGAW seeks to collaborate with the industry in efforts to increase the employment opportunities of all writers.

The 2009 report serves as a two-year follow-up to its predecessor, the 2007 Hollywood Writers Report. While it focuses primarily on hiring and earnings patterns for the latest two-year period not covered in the previous report (i.e., 2006 and 2007), it also includes updated analyses of data extending back to 2003, as well as data for select years imported from previous reports. Prior reports provide summary data on trends going back to 1982.

Organization of the Report

This report is organized as follows: Section II discusses the sources and limitations of the data and provides background information on the types of analyses performed throughout the report; Section III provides a general overview of WGAW membership, employment, and earnings trends over the study period; Section IV focuses on the experiences of women writers, particularly as they compare to those of their male counterparts; Sections V and VI present similar, detailed analyses for minority writers and for older writers, respectively; Section VII explores employment and earnings trends by company and industry sector for the purpose of identifying any patterns in writer experiences based on the records of specific employers; Section VIII provides a case study of staff writer-producer positions on shows during the 2005-2006 television season in order to take a closer look at the distribution of employment opportunity in the television sector; and Section IX summarizes the report findings and presents conclusions.

A Note on Other Groups of Writers

Depictions of gays, lesbians, and persons with disabilities have increased in film and television in recent years. Yet questions remain regarding the degree to which writers from these groups have been incorporated into the industry workforce, particularly to work on projects where their perspectives and sensitivities might be most valued. Indeed, anecdotes suggest that television and film projects featuring depictions of gays, lesbians, and persons with disabilities all too often fail to employ writers from these groups. Beyond the industry experiences reported by select guild members,
however, the data do not currently exist to systematically examine the industry position of these groups of writers.

The WGAW sponsors member committees that represent the special concerns of these groups of writers and that work with the guild’s Diversity Department to make sure that their concerns are addressed by internal guild programs and industry-guild, collaborative initiatives. The Gay and Lesbian Writers Committee has advocated using current estimates of gay and lesbian representation in the overall population as a benchmark against which to measure the group’s position in the industry. By this logic, at least one in ten voices and perspectives on a project writing staff ideally should be gay or lesbian. Meanwhile, the Writers with Disabilities Committee conducted a survey of the full WGAW membership in June 2006 in order to track the careers of writers with disabilities, provide useful information for and develop programs for these members, as well as increase awareness of the talents, language and culture of writers with disabilities.

In an effort to increase the employment opportunities of all writers, the WGAW announced the Writers Access Project (WAP) in January 2009 designed to identify and connect outstanding screenwriters from each of the diverse communities to showrunners looking to staff their shows. The WGAW’s goal is to employ data from this report in order to increase the impact of the Writers Access Program, as well as collaborate with key industry players on rewriting the all-too-familiar story about the challenges faced by diverse writers.
II. STUDY DATA

The primary data for the 2009 Hollywood Writers Report come from the computerized files of the WGAW, which are based on member reports of employment and earnings for each quarter. The guild collects these reports in the normal course of business for the purpose of establishing member dues. They include information on the nature of the employment (e.g., staff writer, rewrite, development deal, executive story consultant, and so on), whether it was provided for the television or film sectors, the company and/or conglomerate for which the work was completed, and the amount of compensation for the work. The WGAW also keeps track of basic demographic information on its members, such as gender, ethnicity, birth date, and the year in which each member joined the guild. This demographic information is linked to each work report in the computerized files. Five separate data sets – each based on member employment and earnings reports for a specific year between 2003 and 2007 – were used to produce this report.

A secondary source of data for this report is the 2008 WGA TV Series Staffing Report, which examines recent trends in staff hiring for television series. The WGAW identifies which of its writers are employed on the staff of each television series when its representatives contact or visit a series writing office. The Guild periodically collects this information for the purpose of administering its credits, residuals, and other functions. Guild researchers regularly crosscheck this information with various internal data sources in order to gather as complete a database as possible of writers employed on series staffs.

Because the cases examined in this report essentially constitute entire populations of interest (i.e., “active guild members,” “employed writers,” “television staff/writer-producers,” “pilots in the production pipeline,” and so on), inferential statistics are unnecessary for making distinctions between groups and are thus not used.

Missing Data

Despite guild efforts to collect basic demographic information on its members, some members fail to identify their gender and/or ethnicity. In the 2007 data set, for example, less than 1 percent of the cases had missing information on gender, while about 8.5 percent had missing information on age and about 20 percent on ethnicity. Whenever feasible, the first name of members was used to identify gender for cases where the information was missing. Since an analysis of cases with missing ethnicity information revealed that these cases were more similar to white writers in terms of earnings than to other writers, and because research suggests that minority respondents generally are less likely to omit ethnicity information than non-minorities, cases with missing ethnicity information were coded as “white” for the purposes of analysis (which follows the practice employed in earlier Hollywood Writers Reports). Cases with missing age information were singled out and examined separately in some of the tables that summarize age differences in employment and earnings. In other tables that examine these differences, the year a member joined the guild was used to approximate age if the
exact age of a member was missing. That is, if the data show that a given member joined the WGAW 20 years or more prior to the year for which employment and earnings were being reported (i.e., prior to 1985 in the 2005 data set), it was assumed that the member was more than 40 years old in the report year (i.e., the case was coded as “over 40 age n/a”).

**Earnings Statistics**

“Median” earnings statistics are used throughout this report to compare earnings trends among different groups of writers: non-minority writers, minority writers, white male writers, females writers, writers over 40 years of age, writers under 40 years of age, and so on.

The “median” refers to the value physically in the middle of a ranked distribution of numbers. Like the “mean” or arithmetic “average,” it is a measure of what is typical for a given distribution of numbers. But unlike the mean or average it has the advantage of not being unduly influenced by extremely high or extremely low values, which might otherwise produce a distorted view of what is typical for the distribution. For these reasons, the median is conventionally used to examine income distributions, as they often contain very low and/or very high values. In this report, the median is the primary measure used to identify any meaningful earnings differences between the different groups of writers.

The “95th percentile,” by contrast, provides us with a measure of what the highest paid writers in a particular group of writers earned in a given year. That is, only 5 percent of writers in a given group earned this amount or more, while 95 percent earned less. Using this statistic provides us with another way of thinking about any earnings differences between the groups: To what degree do earnings differences between the groups exist when we consider only the writers who are at the very top of the profession?

“Relative earnings” statistics are ratios used in some tables to compare a group’s earnings at the median or 95th percentile to those of another referent group. In this report, the earnings of women and minorities (numerator) are reported in relation to those of white males (denominator), while the earnings of writers over 40 (numerator) are reported relative to those of writers under 40 (denominator). When the ratio is below $1.00, the group in question earns less than the referent group; when it is above $1.00, the group earns more.

For reasons of writer confidentiality and because both the median and 95th percentile statistics are less reliable when the number of observations is low, earnings

---

1 While member-reported film earnings reflect the total earnings of writers from film employment, television earnings are reported on only the first $5,000 earned per week (approximately) by television staff writers. The WGAW does not require television staff writers to report any additional weekly earnings. *(verify if still true)*
statistics are reported for a given group of writers only when there are five or more observations.

**Production Companies**

Several of the tables in this report present employment and earnings statistics for each group of writers by specific conglomerate or large independent. Because of recent industry mergers and acquisitions and other industry fluctuations, the lists of conglomerates and large independents examined in this report differs slightly from those examined in the previous report.

“Conglomerates” are defined in this report as media companies that either own or are owned by large vertically integrated enterprises, which include major studios. For 2007, conglomerates included CBS, Disney, Dreamworks, Fox, MGM, NBC-Universal, Sony, Time Warner, and Viacom.

“Large Independents” are defined as media companies that are not affiliated with any of the large conglomerates and that employ 40 or more writers in a given year. The specific companies constituting this category may vary from year to year because companies hiring 40 or more writers in one year may hire fewer in another, and vice versa.

These distinctions are significant because the availability of work in the industry has traditionally varied by sector, with television and the largest companies providing a greater share of overall employment. Also, because both the nature of and modes of access to the work can vary greatly by sector, The Hollywood Writers Report series has traditionally sought to identify how the various groups of writers fare relative to one another by considering the records of specific companies within the television and film sectors.

When median earnings figures are reported for a specific company, they represent only the portion of writers’ earnings associated with employment by that company.

**Comparing Tables and Figures to the 2007 Hollywood Writers Report**

The WGAW member reports on which this study is based are received by the guild on a continual basis, sometimes significantly beyond the year in which the work was performed. For this reason, each of the five yearly data sets used to compile this report’s tables is necessarily a snapshot of member reports received by the time of the analysis. Because the 2003 through 2005 data sets have been updated in the period since the 2007 Hollywood Writers Report was released, tables and figures for a given year in the report may not exactly match those in this report. Trend analyses that include the years 2003 to 2005 are thus presented in this report based on new analyses of the updated data sets for these years, not by referring directly to tables and figures from the previous report. Data reported for the years 2001 and 2002 (and earlier) conform to those from the previous report.
III. OVERALL TRENDS

The 2009 Hollywood Writers Report updates an all-too-familiar story about the challenges faced by diverse writers on the employment and earnings fronts.

The previous report -- released in 2007 by the Writers Guild of America, West (WGAW) -- found that business-as-usual industry practices resulted in virtually no progress for women and minority writers. Indeed, these writers had actually gone backwards in some areas relative to their male and white counterparts since the Guild’s 2005 report. The 2007 report thus called for “rethinking business as usual” in the industry, which would include establishing “clear goals, reasonable timetables and effective mechanisms” for diversifying access to writing opportunities.

Despite this clarion call, the present report finds little if any improvement in the employment and earnings of diverse writers in the Hollywood industry. White males continue to dominate in both the film and television sectors. Women remain stuck at 28 percent of television employment and 18 percent of film employment. The minority share of film employment has been frozen at 6 percent since 1999, while the group’s share of television employment actually declined to 9 percent since the last report. Although women and minorities closed the earnings gaps with white men in television a bit, the earnings gaps in film grew.

These findings are clearly out of step with a nation that elected its first African American president in 2008, a nation in which more than half of the population is female and nearly a third is non-white.

Undoubtedly, these are challenging times for the Hollywood entertainment industry. The writers’ strike of November 2007 to February 2008 has changed the way the industry operates. The recent global financial crisis has undermined many of the marketplace assumptions we tend to take for granted. But America will continue to become increasingly diverse – this much is guaranteed. And reflecting these changes in staffing and stories is just good business.

This report details the most recent trends in employment and earnings for women, minority, and over-40 writers. The WGAW’s goal is to employ these findings to diagnose specific areas in need of intervention so that it can increase the impact of its new Writer Access Project (described below), as well as collaborate with key industry players on rewriting the all-too-familiar story about the challenges faced by diverse writers.

Membership

Over the five-year period 2003 to 2007, WGAW membership declined 1.7 percent, from 8275 to 8131 current members (see Table 1). These figures are consistent
with a long-term trend in declining guild membership identified in earlier Hollywood Writers Reports. It is important to note, however, that between 2005 (the last year reported in the 2007 Hollywood Writers Report) and 2007, the number of current members actually increased from 7969 to 8131 – a short-term increase of about 2 percent. Future reports will reveal whether this increase over this latest two-year period represents a turning point in the long-term trend or merely a momentary bump in the data. Despite this recent upturn, membership numbers have a long way to go before approaching the figure of 9056 seen in 2000.

Changes in WGAW membership between 2003 and 2007 were not evenly distributed across the study groups. Total minority guild membership increased 4.8 percent over the period, from 584 to 612 members. In 2007, minority writers comprised 7.5 percent of current WGAW members, up from 7.1 percent in 2003. Female membership was largely flat over the period, 1948 members in 2003 and 1953 members in 2007. Women writers accounted for 24 percent of current members in 2007. Meanwhile, the number of members aged 61-70 increased 30.5 percent between 2003 and 2007, from 528 to 689. By contrast, each category of younger members posted a decline in its numbers over the period, especially the category of members younger than 31 – which posted a 15.5 percent decline.

When minority status, gender, and age are considered simultaneously (see Table 2), we find that there was very little change between 2003 and 2007 in each group’s share of current guild membership. Non-minority males continued to dominate guild membership, despite a slight drop in the group’s share from 72 percent to 71.4 percent. By contrast, minority females’ share increased a bit, from 2.6 percent to 3 percent. The current membership shares for non-minority females and minority males remained flat at 21 percent and 4.5 percent, respectively.

Employment

Despite the overall decline in current members over the five-year period, the number of employed writers actually increased slightly (.7 percent), from 4325 writers in 2003 to 4356 in 2007 (see Table 1). The biggest gainers were older writers, Latino writers, Asian writers, and women writers. For example, writers aged 61 to 70 and those aged 81 and older posted employment gains of 40.8 percent and 166.7 percent, respectively, while Latino and Asian writers posted employment gains of 10.4 percent and 25.9 percent, respectively. The biggest losers were black writers and writers under 31. The number of black and under-31 employed writers declined 15.8 percent and 8.2 percent, respectively. Overall, minority employment was down 4.1 percent over the period, from 362 to 347 writers, while female employment was up 3.3 percent, from 1049 to 1084 writers.

---

2 It should be noted that the number of employed Native American writers actually declined 33.3 percent over the period, but this decline represented a loss of only 4 writers (from 12 in 2003 to 8 in 2007).
Table 2 shows that the employment rate for white males and females increased between 2003 and 2007, while it fell for minority males and females. White females were the biggest winners over the period, the employment rate for the group increasing from 51.8 percent to 55.1 percent. By contrast, minority women were the biggest losers; the employment for this group decreased from 71.1 percent (the highest for all groups in 2003) to 58 percent (still the highest for all groups in 2007, but only marginally so). In terms of raw numbers, employed minority males declined from 212 in 2003 to 206 in 2007, while employed minority females declined from 150 to 141. Meanwhile, the number of employed white females increased from 899 to 943 and employed white males remained flat at 3064.

Table 3 compares the number of employed writers from each group, by year, between 2001 and 2007. A number of interesting findings emerge from this table. Echoing the earlier finding that white women enjoyed the biggest increase in employment rate between 2003 and 2007, Table 3 shows that white women constituted the only group of writers to experience an increase in overall employment share in each of the years examined. In 2001, the group accounted for 23.2 percent of employment, a figure that was exceeded in each successive year before topping out at 24.9 percent in 2007. By contrast, minority writers’ and younger writers’ share of employment generally declined over the seven-year period. Minority writers’ share peaked at 8.5 percent in 2004 and declined each year thereafter, falling to 8 percent by 2007. The employment share of writers aged 40 and under peaked at 41.5 percent in 2001, before resting at 39.8 percent in 2007.

Earnings

Consistent with findings from previous Hollywood Writers Reports, white male writers continue to out-earn all other group of writers in the industry (see Table 3). Indeed, the median earnings of white male writers increased 18.4 percent between 2001 and 2007, from $95,000 to $112,500. But older writers enjoyed the largest increase in earnings over the period – a 39.2 percent increase, from $78,691 to $109,500, making them the second-highest earning group of writers in 2007. Women and minority writers also enjoyed gains in earnings over the period, from $81,531 to $90,686 (11.2 percent) and from $80,558 to $87,652 (8.8 percent), respectively. Younger writers aged 40 and under constituted the only group of writers to experience a decline in earnings over the period – from $104,284 to $102,500 (1.7 percent). Overall median earnings increased 15.8 percent since 2001, from $90,516 to $104,857.

These group differences, as also noted in previous reports, were generally more pronounced for the most highly paid writers. Indeed, the 95th percentile earnings of writers over 40 increased 39.2 percent over the seven-year period, from $576,611 to $795,496. White males writers – the group posting the highest earnings among high-earners – enjoyed a 34.6 percent increase in 95th percentile earnings, from $622,187 in 2001 to $837,500 to 2007. By contrast, minority writers experienced a 13.8 percent decline in earnings at the 95th percentile, from $458,724 to $395,503.
White Males Continue to Dominate in Overall Earnings; Minority Earnings Approach Those for Women

Minority writers earned $87,652 in 2007, compared to $90,686 for women and $112,500 for white males (see Figure 1). The $24,848 gap between minority earnings and white male earnings in 2007 represents nearly a $14,000 reduction in the $38,490 gap evident in 2005, the last year covered in the previous report. Meanwhile, the overall earnings gap between minority writers and women writers closed to its smallest point in 2007 ($3,034), which improved upon a much wider gap in 2005 ($12,868). Nonetheless, the overall earnings of white male writers significantly outpaced those of the other groups throughout the study period, reflecting the continuing dominance of white males in the industry.

Conclusion

The familiar story of male and white dominance told in previous Hollywood Writers Reports still characterized industry employment and earnings patterns in 2007, the last year covered in this report. Some of the key findings:

Membership

- WGAW current membership declined 1.7 percent between 2003 and 2007, a figure significantly smaller than the 12 percent decline noted in the 2007 Hollywood Writers Report
- Minority and older writers posted gains in WGAW membership, while the membership share for women was largely flat
- White male writers accounted for between 71 and 72 percent of guild membership throughout the study period

Employment

- The overall number of employed writers increased about .7 percent since 2003
- Minority employment declined 4.1 percent since 2003, while female employment was up 3.3 percent
- White male writers continued to account for more than 70 percent of industry employment in 2007

Earnings

- Overall median earnings increased 15.8 percent since 2001
- Older writers and white male writers posted the largest earnings increases,
followed by women and minority writers

* Younger writers posted a 1.7 percent decline in earnings since 2001

* These group differences were generally more pronounced when only the highest-earning writers were considered

* The earnings gap between white male writers and minority writers in 2007, while still large, closed significantly since 2005, the last year reported in the previous Hollywood Writers Report

The sections that follow provide more-detailed findings for each of the study groups, as well as specific information about production companies and television show staffs.
IV. WOMEN WRITERS

Television Employment

Table 4 presents employment trends by gender and industry sector for the seven-year study period, 2001 to 2007. Women’s share of employment in the television sector has traditionally been less than half of that enjoyed by their male counterparts. Table 4 shows that this pattern continues to hold, despite some modest gains by women relative to men in recent years. Women’s share of sector employment increased two percentage points over the period, from 26 percent in 2001 to 28 percent in 2007. The actual number of employed women writers increased 2.2 percent over the period, from 867 in 2001 to 886 in 2007 -- despite the fact that overall television employment declined 6.2 percent.

Film Employment

Relative to men, women writers seeking employment have fared even worse in the film sector than in the television sector, and this tradition shows no sign of fading. Women writers’ share of film employment peaked at 19 percent in 2005, the last year covered in the previous report (see Table 4). Since then, the group’s share has fallen back to the 18 percent levels observed in 2003 and 2004, which were a percentage-point improvement upon the 17 percent shares observed in 2001 and 2002. Meanwhile, the actual number of employed women film writers increased each year after 2002, before dropping again in 2007. Over the seven-year period covered in this study, 2001 to 2007, the actual number of employed women film writers increased 12 percent, from just 309 in 2001 to 346 in 2007. The highest number of employed women film writers in a single year during the period was 352, which was observed in 2006.

Women Writers’ Overall Employment Share Remains Largely Flat

Since 2005 -- the final year analyzed in the 2007 Hollywood Writers Report -- women writers’ share of overall employment remained unchanged at 25 percent (see Figure 2). In the television sector, 28 percent of the writers in 2006 and 2007 were women, up one percentage point from the group’s 27 percent share in 2005. The group’s share of film employment actually decreased a percentage point since the last report, from 19 percent in 2005 to 18 percent in 2007. Between 2003 and 2007, gains for women writers have not exceeded one percentage point in any of the employment areas. Women, who account for slightly more than 50 percent of the U.S. population, remain underrepresented in television employment by 2 to 1 and in film employment by nearly 3 to 1.

Television Earnings
Table 5 presents earnings trends by gender and employment sector over the seven-year study period. It shows that overall earnings increased 19.2 percent between 2001 and 2007, despite the downward pressure on 2007 earnings due to the writers strike. Women’s earnings in television increased steadily after 2001, peaking at $92,900 in 2005, before declining in 2006 and again in 2007 (the year of the strike). Over the seven-year study period, women’s earnings in television increased 15.5 percent (from $71,582 to $82,604). By contrast, male television writers enjoyed a 21 percent increase in earnings over the period (from $72,332 to $87,499).

**Gender Earnings Gap in Television Shrinks a Bit**

After nearly closing in 2003 ($2,300), the gender earnings gap in television widened between 2004 and 2006 (averaging $9,223), before shrinking again in 2007 ($5,380). Nonetheless, Figure 3 shows that women television writers earned about the same in 2007 ($82,604) as they did at the beginning of the five-year report period in 2003 ($82,000), despite spikes in earnings in 2005 and 2006. The television earnings of white male writers, by contrast, increased by nearly $4,000 over the report period (from $84,300 to $87,984), after peaking at $100,000 in 2005 and 2006.

**Film Earnings**

Previous Hollywood Writers Reports have shown that the earnings of women writers in the film sector have rarely kept pace with those of their male counterparts. The current report is no exception (see Table 5). Between 2001 and 2007, the earnings of women film writers declined 4.7 percent (from $60,000 to $57,151). By contrast, male film writers enjoyed a 31.3 percent increase in earnings over the period (from $73,332 to $96,250).

**Large Gender Earnings Gap in Film Peaks**

The gender earnings gap in film for 2007 ($41,724) was the largest since at least 2003 (see Figure 4). Film earnings for women were down from the 2003 figure of $62,500 in 2005 ($50,000), 2006 ($55,500), and 2007 ($57,151). By contrast, the earnings of white male writers increased by more than $8,000 over the period, from $90,476 in 2003 to $98,875 in 2007. The previous Hollywood Writers Report noted that while women writers had made considerable strides in television earnings, they appeared to be going backwards in film earnings. The current report suggests that these trends continue to hold for women writers relative to their white male counterparts.

**Conclusion**

As observed in previous Hollywood Writers Reports, women writers continue to do better in the television sector relative to men than they do in the film sector. Women writers have made small gains in television since the last report but continue to be underemployed and underpaid relative to their male counterparts. In the film sector, by
contrast, women writers have actually taken a few steps backwards relative to men since the last report. Some key findings:

* Between 2001 and 2007, women’s share of television employment increased two percentage points, from 26 percent to 28 percent.

* Women remain underrepresented among television writers by about 2 to 1.

* Women’s share of film employment has fallen a percentage point since the last Hollywood Writer’s Report, back to the 18 percent levels observed in 2003 and 2004.

* Women remain underrepresented among television writers by nearly 3 to 1.

* The gender earnings gap in television shrank a bit since the last report, after widening between 2004 and 2006.

* The gender earnings gap in film grew to its largest size since at least 2003.
V. MINORITY WRITERS

Television Employment

Despite the overall 6.2 percent decline in television sector employment between 2001 and 2007, the number of employed minority television writers actually increased slightly, from 269 writers to 277 (see Table 6). But this modest, 3 percent gain in the number of employed minority writers was not equally distributed across the racial subgroups. Asian television writers enjoyed the largest gain -- the number of employed Asian television writers more than doubled over the period (from 24 in 2001 to 54 in 2007). Latino television writers also posted gains, albeit a more modest 7.5 percent increase (from 67 to 72 writers). By contrast, black writers were the biggest losers in television employment in terms of actual numbers (from 168 to 143), if not in terms of percentage decline. The number of employed black writers declined by 25 between 2001 and 2007 (by 14.9 percent), largely due to the demise of UPN in late 2006 and the cancellation of several black-oriented situation comedies that were responsible for a sizable chunk of black employment in the sector. Native Americans experienced the largest percentage decline (20 percent), from 10 writers in 2001 to just 8 in 2007. Still, black television writers in 2007 accounted for more than half of all minority employment in the sector (51.6 percent), down from their 62.5 percent share of minority employment in 2001. Meanwhile, the number of employed white television writers declined by 7 percent over the period, from 3083 writers to 2866.

Minority Share of Television Employment Declines Slightly

Since 2005 – the last year covered in the previous Hollywood Writers Report – minority television writers have lost a little ground relative to their white counterparts (see Figure 5). The minority share of employment in the television sector declined from 10 percent in 2005 to just 9 percent in 2007. Between 2003 and 2007, the minority share of television employment has remained remarkably stable at between 9 and 10 percent, suggesting that no meaningful progress is being made on this front. Minorities remain underrepresented by a factor of more than 3 to 1 among employed television writers.³

³ According to the 2000 Census, specific minority groups accounted for the following percentages of the U.S. population: African Americans (12.9 percent); Latinos/Hispanics (12 percent); Asian Americans (4.2 percent); Native Americans (1.5 percent). Collectively, the groups accounted for more than 30 percent of the population in 2000, a share that had undoubtedly grown by 2005. When each individual minority group’s share of television employment is considered in tandem with the group’s population share (see Table 6), we can compute the degree to which each group was underrepresented among employed television writers. Latinos were most underrepresented in 2005, at a rate of more than 6 to 1; Native Americans followed, at a rate of nearly 4 to 1; African
Film Employment

In contrast to the overall decline in television sector employment between 2001 and 2007 noted above, employment in the film sector increased slightly over the period (by 1.5 percent). Table 6 shows that the overall number of employed film writers increased from 1871 in 2001 to 1900 in 2007. But these gains were driven by the employment of white film writers, whose numbers increased by 2.3 percent over the period, from 1752 writers to 1792. By contrast, the number of minority film writers declined 9.2 percent, from 119 writers in 2001 to 108 in 2007. Asians were the only group of minority writers to post a gain in the film sector over the period. Their numbers increased 100 percent between 2001 and 2007, from 11 to 22 writers. Meanwhile Native American film writers, Latino film writers, and black film writers all posted declines between 2001 and 2007 -- from 8 to 3 writers (62.5 percent), from 31 to 23 writers (25.8 percent), and from 69 to 60 writers (13 percent), respectively.

Minority Share of Film Employment Remains Flat

Figure 6 shows that the minority share of film employment has remained flat at 6 percent since 2003. In fact, previous Hollywood Writers Reports show that this 6 percent share has remained unchanged since at least 1999. Minorities remain underrepresented by a factor of more than 5 to 1 among employed film writers.

Television Earnings

Table 7 shows that median earnings for all writers in the television sector increased 19.2 percent between 2001 and 2007 (from $72,061 to $85,932), despite a nearly $10,000 drop between 2006 and 2007 due most likely to the writers strike of 2006. This increase, however, was driven by the earnings of white television writers, which rose 19.8 percent over the period (from $72,800 to $87,211). By contrast, the largest group of minority writers – black television writers – experienced a 1.7 percent decline in their television earnings (from $68,175 in 2001 to $67,028 in 2007), making them the lowest paid among all groups of television writers. The earnings of Asian television writers were largely flat between 2001 and 2007 ($73,659 versus $73,794), while the earnings of the small group of Native American television writers increased 131.6 percent over the period (from $59,455 to $137,678) and the earnings of Latino television writers increased 80.8 percent (from $49,000 to $88,604). Indeed, the median earnings for both Native American and Latino television writers exceeded those of their white counterparts in 2007.

Americans were underrepresented by a rate of more than 2 to 1, while Asian Americans were underrepresented by a rate of about 2 to 1.
Television Earnings Gap for Minorities Closes Since Last Report

Since 2005 – the final year covered in the 2007 Hollywood Writers Report – the minority earnings gap in television declined from $22,310 to $12,326 (see Figure 7). That is, minority television writers earned $77,690 in 2005, compared to $100,000 for their white male counterparts; earnings for both minority television writers ($75,658) and white male writers ($87,984) declined in 2007 due to the strike, thereby closing the gap a bit. The gap had been increasing between 2003 and 2005, when it peaked, before narrowing thereafter.

Film Earnings

Table 7 shows that median earnings for all writers in the film sector also increased between 2001 and 2007, from $70,000 to $84,962 – a 21.4 percent increase. As was the case in the television sector, this increase was driven by earnings gains among the large group of white film writers, who posted a 20.9 percent increase in earnings over the period (from $71,500 to $86,442). Latino film writers constituted the only group of minority film writers to enjoy an increase in earnings over the period, earning $60,334 in 2001 and $111,500 in 2007 (an 84.8 percent increase). As a result, Latino writers were the highest paid film writers in 2007, followed by white writers. By contrast, the film sector earnings for African American writers declined 35.7 percent over the period (from $70,000 to $45,000), while the earnings for Asian film writers declined 31 percent (from $121,292 to $83,750).

Film Earnings Gap for Minorities Peaks

The earnings gap for minority film writers has increased each year since 2003, peaking at $36,963 in 2007 (see Figure 8). In 2003, minority film writers approached earnings parity with their white male counterparts ($87,392 versus $90,476). But minority earnings in film had declined to $61,912 by 2007, while white male earnings had increased to $98,875.

Conclusion

Despite momentary signs of progress for minority writers over the 2001 to 2007 study period, the group’s share of film employment remained flat, while its share of television employment has actually declined a bit since the last Hollywood Writers Report. On the earnings front, minority writers gained a little ground on their white male counterparts in television but lost ground in film. Some key findings:

* The number of employed minority television writers increased slightly between 2001 and 2007, despite an overall decline in sector employment over the period.

* Since 2005, however, the minority share of television employment has declined one percentage point to 9 percent.
* Black television writers were the biggest losers among minority writers in terms of numbers employed, largely due to the demise of UPN in late 2006 and the cancellation of several black-oriented sitcoms airing on the network.

* Minorities remain underrepresented by a factor of more than 3 to 1 among employed television writers.

* Minority writers have made no progress in film employment since at least 1999, remaining underrepresented by a factor of more than 5 to 1 in the sector.

* The television earnings gap for minorities closed since the last report, after increasing between 2003 and 2005.

* The film earnings gap for minorities grew to its largest since 2003, when minorities neared earnings parity with their white male counterparts.
VI. OLDER WRITERS

Television Employment

Between 2001 and 2007, employment in the television sector declined for every age group except one -- older writers aged 71 to 80 (see Table 8). This small group of writers posted a 13.3 percent increase in employment over the period, from 15 to 17 writers. Writers under 31 experienced the largest drop in television sector employment, from 280 writers in 2001 to just 177 writers in 2007. The two largest groups of writers -- writers aged 31 to 40 and writers aged 41 to 50 -- posted more modest declines. The number of writers in the former group declined 1.4 percent over the period (from 1087 to 1072 writers), while the number of writers in the latter group declined 6.9 percent (from 1074 to 1000 writers). Similarly, the number of older writers aged 51 to 60 and 61 to 70 declined from 536 to 505 writers (5.8 percent) and from 92 to 91 writers (1.1 percent), respectively. When the 40-and under and over-40 shares of television sector employment are examined, we find very little change between 2001 and 2007. That is, television writers over 40 gained less than one percentage point on their 40 and under counterparts over the period (from 55.7 percent to 56.4 percent).

Employment Share for Largest Group of Older Television Writers Remains Unchanged

In short, very little has changed since the last Hollywood Writers report in terms of the distribution of television employment between older and younger writers. The largest group of older television writers -- writers aged 41 to 50 -- accounted for 35 percent of sector employment at each of the three points examined in Figure 9 (2003, 2005, and 2007). The employment shares of younger television writers remained unchanged since 2005 (the last year examined in the previous report) -- 37 percent for writers aged 31 to 40 and 6 percent for writers younger than 31. By contrast, the employment share of the smaller group of older television writers aged 51 to 60 declined a percentage point since 2005, from 19 percent to 18 percent.

Post Baby Boomers Increase Their Majority Share of Television Employment

The general demographic process by which newer cohorts of television writers replace older ones has continued since the last Hollywood Writers Report (see Figure 10). That is, since 2005 (when they first became the majority), Post Baby Boom Generation writers (born after 1962) have increased their share of television employment from 51 percent to 59 percent. Meanwhile, the shares of Pre-Baby Boom Generation writers (born before 1946) and Early Baby Boom Generation writers (born between 1946 and 1953) declined from 4 percent to 3 percent and from 15 percent to 12 percent, respectively.
Film Employment

Between 2001 and 2007, younger writers lost considerable ground to older writers in the film sector. The 40-and-under share of film employment declined more than 4 percentage points over the period, from 48.3 percent to just 43.9 percent (see Table 8). Most of this decline was driven by the writers under 31, whose numbers decreased by 30.5 percent (from 151 to 105 writers). Without exception, the number of older writers in each age category increased over the period. The number of writers aged 41-50 increased from 547 to 574 (4.9 percent), while the number of writers aged 51 to 60 increased from 275 to 322 (17.1 percent) and those aged 61 to 70 increased from 50 to 70 (40 percent). The single largest group of film writers in 2007 was writers aged 31 to 40. These 663 writers accounted for 37.9 percent of film employment that year, despite the fact that older writers still constitute the majority of writers employed in the sector.

Post Baby Boomers Increase Their Majority Share of Film Employment

Post Baby Boom Generation writers (who first became the majority of all film writers in 2004) increased their share of film employment since the last Hollywood Writers Report -- but at a lesser rate than their television sector counterparts (see Figure 11). Between 2005 and 2007, the group’s share of film employment increased 5 percentage points, from 55 percent to 60 percent. By contrast, the employment shares for Pre-Baby Boom and Early Baby Boom Generation writers declined from 5 percent to 4 percent and from 13 percent to 12 percent, respectively.

Employment Rate for Each Group of Older Writers Remains Flat or Increases

Since the last Hollywood Writers Report, no group of older writers has experienced a decline in employment rate (see Figure 12). The employment rate for the largest group of older writers (writers aged 41 to 50) remained flat at 61 percent between 2005 and 2007. The employment rate for the next largest group of older writers (writers aged 51 to 60) increased from 45 percent to 46 percent. By contrast, the employment rate for the youngest group of writers (writers under 31) declined from 80 percent to 78 percent, while the employment rate for writers aged 31 to 40 increased from 68 percent to 69 percent.

Television Earnings

Between 2001 and 2007, median earnings in the television sector increased 19.2 percent, and most of this increase was driven by the earnings of older writers (see Table 9). That is, the largest group of older writers -- writers aged 41 to 50 -- enjoyed a 51.2 percent increase in earnings over the period (from $69,433 to $105,000). Similarly, television writers aged 51 to 50, those aged 61 to 70, and those aged 71 to 80 all enjoyed significant earnings gains over the period. Writers aged 51 to 50 saw their sector earnings increase 42.8 percent (from $52,523 to $75,000), while those aged 61 to 70 posted a 61.3 percent increase (from $34,429 to $55,525) and those aged 71 to 80 enjoyed a whopping 191.6 percent increase (from $22,534 to $65,703). By contrast,
younger writers aged 31 to 40 -- the largest group of writers -- posted a 6.4 percent decrease in sector earnings between 2001 and 2007 (from $93,500 to $87,500). The earnings of writers under 31 increased a modest 3.7 percent over the period (from $61,182 to $63,418).

Television Earnings Continue to Peak Among Older Writers

The largest group of older television writers (writers aged 41 to 50) earned $105,000 in 2007 (see Figure 13). While this figure was down slightly from the group’s median earnings of $110,818 in 2005, these older writers continued to post the highest earnings among the age groups in the television sector. Prior to 2005, younger writers aged 31 to 40 constituted the highest-earning group of television writers, posting earnings of $92,600 in 2003 -- compared to $91,500 for writers aged 41 to 50.

Film Earnings

As was case in the television sector, the overall increase in film sector earnings between 2001 and 2007 is largely due to increases in earnings among older writers (see Table 8). The largest group of older film writers -- writers aged 41 to 50 -- posted a 45.5 percent increase in sector earnings over the period (from $68,750 to $100,000). The earnings of older writers aged 51 to 60 increased 7.4 percent (from $57,500 to $61,750), while the earnings of writers aged 61 to 70 increased 96.4 percent (from $56,000 to $110,000) and those of writers aged 71 to 80 increased a whopping 199.3 percent (from $37,500 to $112,250). By contrast, earnings gains among younger writers were more modest. Writers aged 31 to 40 posted a 2.2 percent increase in earnings over the period (from $92,875 to $94,905), while writers under 31 posted a 10 percent increase (from $50,000 to $55,000).

Writers Aged 71 to 80 Become Highest Paid Film Writers

In recent years, film earnings have peaked among older writers (see Figure 14). Writers aged 71-80 posted the highest median earnings among film writers in 2007 ($112,250), followed by writers aged 61 to 70 ($110,000). In 2003, the pattern was reversed – older writers aged 41 to 50 enjoyed the highest earnings ($100,396), followed closely by writers aged 61 to 70 ($100,000). Writers aged 41 to 50 also posted the highest earnings in 2005 ($90,000).

Conclusion

As observed in previous Hollywood Writers Reports, the employment and earnings story faced by older writers continues to be a complicated one. While older writers dominate in employment and earnings in key areas, employment rate continues to decline sharply with age, raising questions about the ability of writers to find work once they pass certain age thresholds. Some key findings:
* Older writers continued to constitute the majority of employed television writers in 2007.

* Since the last report, the employment share for the largest group of older television writers remained unchanged.

* Post-Baby Boomers increased their majority share of all television writers since the last report.

* Older writers continued to constitute the majority of employed film writers.

* Younger film writers, particularly those under 31, lost ground to their older counterparts between 2001 and 2007.

* Post-Baby Boomers increased their majority share of film employment since the last report.

* The employment rate for each group of older writers remained flat or increased since the last report, despite the fact that employment rate continued to decline steeply with age.

* Television earnings continued to peak among older writers aged 41 to 50.

* Older writers aged 71 to 80 became the highest paid film writers in 2007.
VII. EMPLOYMENT AND EARNINGS TRENDS BY COMPANY

The last year covered in the 2007 Hollywood Writers Report was 2005. Since then, there have been two major developments affecting the largest companies providing employment to writers in the Hollywood entertainment industry. First, and most significantly, CBS – which had been a subsidiary of Viacom since 1999 – became an independent entity in 2006. Second, the WB and UPN networks (formerly subsidiaries of Time Warner and Viacom, respectively) merged into the CW Network in 2006, which is jointly owned by the new CBS Corporation and Time Warner.

The present section provides a snapshot of the industry landscape in 2007 in order to compare the earnings and employment records of key industry players. Of particular interest is how conglomerates and the largest independents fared relative to one another in terms of the employment and earnings of women, minority, and over-40 writers. Statistics for white male writers are provided for comparison purposes.

The Industry Landscape in 2007

Overall Employment

In 2007 there were nine conglomerates and six larger independents employing writers in the Hollywood industry (see Table 10). As noted above, CBS had become a separate entity by 2007, which has increased the number of conglomerates by one since the last Hollywood Writers Report. Meanwhile, New Regency Productions and Revolution Studios fell from the list of larger independents in 2007 and were replaced by It’s A Laugh Productions and Team Players. The conglomerates included:

1. CBS  
2. Disney  
3. Dreamworks  
4. Fox  
5. MGM  
6. NBC Universal  
7. Sony  
8. Time Warner  
9. Viacom

The larger independents (i.e., employed 40 or more writers during the year) included:

1. Bigwood Films  
2. It’s a Laugh Productions  
3. LRF Development  
4. Lions Gate  
5. Storybook Productions  
6. Team Players
The rankings of the largest employers were shuffled a bit between 2005 and 2007. While Time Warner (1067) remained the single largest employer in 2007, Viacom (451) -- which had been the second-largest employer in 2005 -- fell to sixth place due to the departure of CBS from its portfolio of companies. Indeed, the number of writers employed by Viacom declined by 51.2 percent between reports, from 925 to 451 writers. Meanwhile, Fox (822) became the second-largest employer of writers in 2007, followed by Disney (795) and NBC Universal (706).

When television and film employment are considered separately, the following rankings emerge: Disney-TV (607) became the largest employer of television writers, followed by Fox-TV (600), and Time Warner-TV (592). In 2005, Time Warner-TV and Viacom-TV held the top two spots. By 2007, Viacom-TV (190) had fallen to seventh place following its separation from CBS. In the film sector, Time Warner-Film (475) was again the largest employer of writers, followed by NBC Universal-Film (310), Viacom-Film (261) and Fox-Film (222). The largest independent employer of writers in 2007 was Bigwood Films (109) – which moved up one spot from second place -- followed by Storybook Productions (72) and Lions Gate (70).

The Employment of Women Writers

In 2007, women writers constituted 28 percent of employed television writers and 18 percent of employed film writers. Among conglomerates in the television sector, CBS-TV (37.5 percent) and Disney-TV (31 percent) posted commendable records of employing women writers. By contrast, MGM-TV (9.1 percent) was notable for its underemployment of women writers in the sector. Time Warner-TV (29.2 percent), Sony-TV (28.2 percent), and Viacom-TV (27.4 percent) hired women television writers at rates comparable to the overall sector figure. In the film sector, MGM-Film (25.6 percent) and CBS-Film (25 percent) exceeded the overall share of women’s employment, while Disney-Film (18.1 percent) hired women at a rate comparable to the overall figure. Fox-Film (10.4 percent) was notable for its underemployment of women film writers. Meanwhile, among larger independents, LRF Development (32.3 percent), Bigwood Films (30 percent), and It’s A Laugh Productions (30 percent) posted the most commendable records of employing women writers. (See Table 11 for a ranking of conglomerates and independents by percent female.)

The Employment of Minority Writers

Minority writers constituted 9 percent of television employment and 6 percent of film employment in 2007. In the television sector, Viacom-TV (11.6 percent) was the only conglomerate to significantly exceed the overall sector figure for the rate of minority employment. The second-place employer in this regard, MGM-TV (9.1 percent), employed minority writers at a rate comparable to the overall sector figure. Dreamworks-TV (0 percent) and Sony-TV (4.1 percent) were notable for their underemployment of minority television writers. In the film sector, MGM-Film (11.7 percent) exceeded the overall sector figure for the rate of minority employment, while second-place Viacom-Film (6.1 percent) matched it. Fox-Film (3.6 percent) had one of
the poorer records of hiring minority film writers, particularly in comparison to the largest players in the sector. Among larger independents, Storybook Productions (16.7 percent) led the pack in the rate of minority employment, followed by It’s A Laugh Productions (15 percent) and Bigwood Films (11 percent). (See Table 12 for a ranking of conglomerates and independents by percent minority).

**The Employment of Over-40 Writers**

In 2007, 56.4 percent of all employed television writers and 56.1 percent of all employed film writers of known age were over 40. Among conglomerates in the television sector, MGM-TV (81.8 percent), Dreamworks-TV (80 percent), and Sony-TV (66.3 percent) significantly exceeded the overall sector figure for the rate of over-40 employment. The only conglomerate that failed to exceed the overall sector figure, Viacom-TV (55.8 percent), approximated it. In the film sector, CBS-Film (66.7 percent) posted a commendable record of employing older writers, while NBC Universal-Film (47.4 percent) stood out for the underemployment of these writers. Other conglomerates in the sector employed older writers at rates comparable to the overall sector figure. Among larger independents, Lion’s Gate (71.4 percent) led in the employment of over-40 writers, followed by It’s A Laugh Productions (62.5 percent), and Storybook Productions (61.1 percent). (See Table 13 for a ranking of conglomerates and independents by percent over 40.)

**Earnings Comparisons**

Table 14 presents median earnings statistics for white male, women, minority, and over-40 writers, by conglomerate and larger independent in 2007. As was the case in 2005, the last year covered in the previous Hollywood Writers Report, minority television writers out-earned their white male, female and over-40 counterparts at just one of the nine conglomerates: Sony-TV ($63,220). In 2005, minority television writers had posted the highest earnings at Viacom-TV, which then owned the network responsible for the largest share of minority employment in the sector, UPN. Meanwhile, over-40 writers led at Fox-TV ($87,576) and NBC Universal-TV ($87,500) in 2007, while women writers led at Disney-TV ($70,361). In the previous report, it should be noted, women television writers had posted the highest median earnings at three of the conglomerates. By contrast, white male television writers have made gains relative to the other groups in conglomerate earnings since the previous report. White males out-earned the other groups at three of the conglomerates in 2007 (up from just one in 2005): CBS-TV ($78,389), Warner-TV (77,733), and Viacom-TV ($75,000).

In the Conglomerates-Film sector, older film writers excelled in 2007, out-earning the other groups at four of the nine conglomerates: NBC Universal-Film ($122,500), Fox-Film ($118,750), Dreamworks-Film ($80,750), and MGM-Film ($30,000). This was down slightly from 2005, when over-40 film writers led at five of the eight conglomerates that existed that year. Meanwhile, white male film writers, female film writers, and minority film writers each posted the highest median earnings at two conglomerates. For white male film writers the conglomerates were Disney-Film
($105,000) and Warner-Film ($105,000); for female film writers the conglomerates were CBS-Film ($66,898) and MGM-Film ($30,000), and for minority film writers the conglomerates were Sony-Film ($168,319) and Viacom-Film ($108,990). Minority film writers, it should be noted, seem to have gained a little ground on the other groups in conglomerate earnings, as they had failed to lead at any of the conglomerates in the film sector in 2005.

Older writers fared well on the median earnings front at the larger independents, posting the highest earnings among the groups at three of the six companies: Team Players ($100,000), LRF Development ($25,000), and Bigwood Films ($16,333). In 2005, over-40 earnings had led at just one of the independents. Meanwhile, the earnings of the other groups each led at one of the three remaining independents: minority writers at It’s a Laugh Productions ($133,609), women writers at Lions Gate ($79,331), and white male writers at Storybook Productions ($42,089). Minority earnings had failed to lead at any of the independents in 2005, while female earnings had led at two of the conglomerates.

Conclusion

The Hollywood Writers Report series has consistently observed that women and minority writers are woefully underemployed and typically underpaid in the industry. It is worth noting, however, that a few industry players stood out relative to their counterparts in 2007 in the employment and compensation of women and minority writers:

* CBS-TV (women writers)
* Disney-TV (women writers)
* It’s A Laugh Productions (minority writers)

Further consideration of these examples may point to important insights about how the industry can be opened to more female and minority participation in the future.
VIII. TELEVISION STAFF/WRITER-PRODUCERS: THE 2007-08 SEASON

The previous Hollywood Writers Report considered the 1999-00 to 2005-06 seasons in order to examine a number of important developments on the industry staff/writer-producer front. Among its more notable findings: an apparent reversal in the reduction of staff/writer-producer positions since the previous report; a continuation of the underrepresentation of women and minority writers in staff employment, particularly at the rank of showrunner; older writers were twice as likely as their younger counterparts to be showrunners, despite the fact that younger writers continued to enjoy a majority share of all sector employment. Although data were not yet available when the 2007 report was released, the report projected major staffing losses for black writers due to the late-2006 demise of UPN, which had been responsible in recent years for a disproportionate share of black employment in the television sector.

This report picks up where the 2007 report left off by considering staffing data spanning the 2001-02 through 2007-08 seasons. The present section gives special consideration to the 2007-08 season in an effort to identify the degree to which significant patterns identified in the previous report were still evident two seasons later. It also measures, for the first time, the actual impact that the shuttering of UPN had on staff employment for black writers.

Overall Trends

An examination of overall staff employment between the 2001-02 and 2007-08 seasons reveals that what appeared in the previous report to be a reversal in staffing reductions was just a momentary blip in a continuing downward trend in staff employment (see Table 15). That is, between the 2001-2 and 2007-08 seasons, overall staff employment decreased by 13.7 percent, from 1695 positions in 2001-02 to 1462 positions in 2007-08. The 1833 positions noted for the 2005-06 season – the last year analyzed in the previous Hollywood Writers Report – was followed by declines in each of the two succeeding seasons (1569 positions in 2006-07 and 1462 in 2007-08).

Women Staff/Writer-Productions

Figure 15 shows that most of the staffing declines over the seven-season period was shouldered by male writers, who lost a net of 254 positions (from 1229 to 975 positions). Women writers, by contrast, lost a net of only 16 positions between the 2001-02 and 2007-08 seasons (from 466 to 450 positions). Indeed, while the overall number of staff writer positions declined by 107 between the 2006-07 and 2007-08 seasons (from 1569 to 1462), the number of women writers increased by 25 (from 425 to 450). Since the 2001-02 season, the female share of staff employment has increased by 4.1

---

4 See minority/white breakdowns in Table 15 for overall totals. Totals for age, male/female, and specific racial/ethnic breakdowns are smaller due to missing cases for these demographic characteristics.
percentage points (from 27.5 percent to 31.6 percent), continuing a trend of female gains in staffing employment noted in the previous Hollywood Writers Report.

**Older Staff/Writer-Producers**

*Figure 16* graphs the age distribution of staff/writer-producers over the seven-season period. The similar shapes of the trend lines for younger and older writers reflect the fact that, despite ups and downs in overall employment over the period, younger writers continue to enjoy a majority share of staff employment. Nonetheless, *Table 15* reveals that this advantage for younger writers in staff employment has steadily eroded, as older writers increased their share of these positions by 6 percentage points over the period (from 40.4 percent to 46.4 percent). During the 2001-02 season, the gap between the number of 40-and-under and over-40 staff/writer-producers was 321 positions (998 versus 677 positions). By the 2007-08 season, the gap had shrunk to 99 positions (728 versus 629).

**Minority Staff/Writer-Producers**

*Figure 17* charts the distribution of minority and white staff/writer-producers over the seven seasons. It shows that while the number of minority staff/writer-producers has declined by 31 positions since the last season reported in the previous report (2005-06), the number of white staff/writer-producers has dropped even more precipitously – by 340 positions. That is, between the 2005-06 seasons and 2007-08 seasons, the number of white staff/writer producers dropped from 1627 to 1287, while the numbers for their minority counterparts declined from 206 to 175. *Table 15* reveals that as a result of the disparity in the magnitudes of these declines, the minority share of staff/writer-producer positions has actually increased since the last report, from 11.2 percent of the positions in 2005-06 to 12 percent in 2007-08.

When specific minority groups are considered separately, *Table 15* shows that while the overall minority share of staffing employment has increased slightly since the last report, the black share of staffing positions – still the largest among minority staff/writers-producers – has declined by 1.1 percentage points since the 2005-06 season (from 6.9 percent to 5.8 percent). By contrast, Asian and Latino staff/writer-producers increased their shares of positions since the last report by 1.1 and .9 percentage points (to 3.1 percent and 3.2 percent, respectively). *Figure 18* presents the distribution of black staff/writer-producers over the seven seasons. It shows that since the demise of UPN following the 2005-06 season, the number of black staff/writer-producers has dropped by 33.9 percent (from 127 to 84). Whereas black staff employment peaked at 149 positions during the 2003-04 season, the figure of 84 positions for the 2007-08 season is the lowest over the seven-season study period.

**Staff Employment by Genre**

Since the last season covered in the previous Hollywood Writers Report (2005-06), the overall distribution of staffing employment between comedy and drama has
shifted rather dramatically. During the 2005-06 season, about 46 percent of all staffing employment was in comedy, compared to about 52 percent in drama. By the 2007-08 season, comedy employment had declined to less than 35 percent of all staffing employment, compared to about 64 percent for drama employment. Table 16 presents a breakdown of television staffing by genre (comedy, drama, or other) for female, older, and minority writers between the 2001-02 and 2007-08 seasons. It reports the percentage of each group of writers that staffs a particular type of show in each year. The table also provides figures for male, younger, and white writers for purposes of comparison.

Women writers were less likely to staff television comedies than their male counterparts

Since the last season covered in the previous report, women staff/writer-producers have become increasingly less likely to work on television comedies and more likely to work on dramas (see Table 16). That is, the share of women staff employment in comedy has declined 17.7 percentage points over the period, from 43.3 percent during the 2005-06 season to 25.6 percent in the 2007-08 season. By contrast, 39 percent of male staff/writer-producers worked in comedy during the 2007-08 season -- despite the overall decline in comedy employment noted above.

Older writers were less likely to staff television comedies than their younger counterparts

As the overall share of employment in comedy has declined, older writers have become increasingly less likely to staff television comedies than their younger counterparts (see Table 16). During the 2005-06 season, 43.5 percent of all staff employment for over-40 writers was in comedy, compared to 54.3 percent in drama. By the 2007-08 season, work on television comedies accounted for just 30.5 percent of all staff employment for older writers – a 13-percentage point decline. Meanwhile, 39.2 percent of 40-and-under staff/writer-producers working during the 2007-08 season did so in comedy.

Minority writers and white writers were equally likely to staff television comedies

During the 2006-07 and 2007-08 seasons, about the same percentages of minority and white staff/writer-producers worked in comedy – between about 34 and 36 percent for each group (see Table 16). Previously, minorities had been much more likely to work in comedy than their white counterparts. In the 2005-06 season, for example, 58.7 percent of minority staff/writer-producers worked in comedy, compared to just 44.4 percent of their white counterparts. The more recent development is at least partially related to the late-2006 demise of UPN, which resulted in the elimination of several black-oriented situation comedies that had accounted for a considerable share of the staff employment enjoyed by black writers.

Job Titles

Table 17 presents a percentage breakdown of staff job titles by minority/majority status, gender, and age group for the 2007-08 season. As in the last report, the table
reveals a general pattern in which two of the study groups of interest – minority writers and women writers – tend to be concentrated in lower status positions, compared to their white and male counterparts.

**Minority Writers: About Half as Likely as White Writers to Be Showrunners**

While minority writers occupied only 12 percent of all staff/writer-positions during the 2007-08 season (see Table 15), they occupied 27.3 percent of the relatively low status, “staff writer” positions (see Table 17) -- up from about 25 percent in the 2005-06 season. Meanwhile, minority staffers accounted for much smaller shares of the higher status “co-executive producer” (6.4 percent) and “executive producer” (7.1 percent) positions during the 2007-08 seasons. The minority shares of the middle-level positions of “supervising producer” (10.3 percent), “producer” (17.2 percent), “co-producer” (12 percent), “executive story editor” (21.7 percent), and “story editor” (20 percent) all approximated or exceeded the minority share of overall staff employment.

During the 2007-08 season, there were 288 white executive producers (22.4 percent of all white staff/writer-producers), compared to just 22 minority executive producers (12.6 percent of all minority staff writers). These figures represent gains for both minorities and whites at the rank of executive producer and are consistent with a trend toward a growing concentration of staff positions at the higher ranks. In the previous report, which focused on the 2005-06 season, 17.9 percent of all white staff/writer-producers occupied executive producer positions (261 executive producers), compared to 9.7 percent of all minority staff/writer-producers (20 executive producers).

**Women Writers: Half as Likely as Male Writers to Be Showrunners**

As was the case in the previous report, the distribution of job titles for women staff/writer-producers was similar to the pattern observed for minority writers. Women occupied 31.6 percent of all staff/writer-producer positions during the 2007-08 season (see Table 15), but only 12.4 percent of the high status “executive producer” positions (see Table 17). By contrast, women occupied 41.1 percent of the relatively low status, “staff writer” positions. The female shares of the middle-level, “supervising producer” (42.1 percent), “producer” (39.1 percent), “co-producer” (44 percent), “executive story editor” (35.3 percent), and “story editor” (53.6 percent) either approximated the female share of overall staff employment or exceeded it.

There were 251 male executive producers (25.7 percent of all male staff/writer-producers) during the 2007-08 season, compared to just 56 female executive producers (12.4 percent of all women staff writers).

---

5 That is, during the 2007-08 season, just 77 of the 1462 positions (5.3 percent) were at the rank of “staff writer,” compared to 666 positions at the rank of “supervising producer” or above (45.6 percent). Meanwhile, “freelance” writers accounted for another 289 positions (19.8 percent).
Older Writers: Twice as Likely as Younger Writers to Be Showrunners

As in the previous report, the pattern describing the distribution of job title for older writers was the reverse of the one observed for minority and women writers. That is, writers over 40 were more likely than their younger counterparts to occupy the higher status positions. While older writers occupied only 46.4 percent of all staff positions during the 2007-08 season (see Table 15), they claimed nearly two-thirds of the high status “executive producer” (65.9 percent) and “co-executive producer” (60.2 percent) positions (see Table 17). Meanwhile, younger writers 40 and under occupied a disproportionate share of the lower status “staff writer” positions (90.5 percent).

During the 2007-08 season, there were 195 over-40 executive producers (31 percent of all over-40 staff writers), compared to just 101 executive producers aged 40 and under (13.9 percent of all 40-and-under staff writers).

Staff Employment by Network

Table 18 presents breakdowns of television staffing by age group, gender, minority/majority status, and network for the 2007-08 season. It reveals that ABC (271) led the way in the number of writers staffing its shows, followed by CBS (253), Fox (225), NBC (217), the CW (114), and USA (61). Combined, the shows on these six networks were responsible for 1,182 of the 1,462 staff/writer-producers working during the 2007-08 season (80.1 percent). By contrast, for the 2005-06 season -- the last season analyzed in the 2007 Hollywood Writers Report -- Fox (312) led the way in the number of writers staffing its shows, followed by ABC (278), CBS (243), NBC (238), WB (189), and UPN (133). These six networks accounted for 1393 of the 1833 staff/writer-producers working that season (76 percent). Among the other networks, HBO (50), FX (37), and Showtime (36) were notable for the employment of writers during the 2007-08 season.

Older Staff/Writer-Producers

Writers aged 40 and over accounted for 46.4 percent those staffing television shows during the 2007-08 season (see Table 15). When employment by network is considered for older writers, we see that this group of writers tended to do better at smaller, cable networks than at the major networks. That is, Table 18 shows that 40-and-over writers significantly exceeded their overall share of staff employment at the following cable networks: Lifetime (81.8 percent), AMC (69.2 percent), TNT (66.7 percent), and FX (61.8 percent). Meanwhile, the 40-and-over share of employment on the major networks either approximated the overall share for the group or trailed it: CBS (50.2 percent), Fox (49.8 percent), NBC (43.7 percent), and ABC (40.8 percent).

---

6 For network totals, please see breakdowns for percent minority/white from Table 18, as 40-and-under/over-40 and male/female breakdowns have missing cases.
Women Staff/Writer-Producers

Women writers constituted 31.6 percent of employed staff/writer-producers during the 2007-08 season (see Table 15). Like older writers, women writers were more likely to excel at smaller cable networks than at the major ones. Table 18 shows that women staff/writer-producers significantly exceeded their overall share of employment at the following networks: Showtime (48.6 percent) and A & E (46.7 percent). The group’s share of employment on the major networks tended to approximate its overall share – for example, 38.2 percent on the CW, 38.1 percent of employment on ABC, 35.2 percent on NBC, and 31.4 percent on CBS. Fox (19.3 percent) was notable among the major networks for its underemployment of women writers during the 2007-08 season.

Minority Staff/Writer-Producers

Minority writers accounted for 12 percent of those staffing television shows during the 2007-08 season (see Table 15). When employment by network is considered, Table 18 shows that the heir to the WB and UPN – the CW (21.9 percent) – was notable among the major networks for its employment of minority writers during the 2007-08 season. With the exception of Fox (8 percent), the minority share of employment on the other major networks approximated the overall share for the group: NBC (14.8 percent), ABC (11.8 percent), and CBS (10.3 percent). Meanwhile, Nick (43.5 percent) led the smaller, cable networks in the employment of minority staff/writer-producers, followed by ABC Family (14.6 percent) and A & E (13.3 percent).

Staff Employment by Television Show

Table 19 presents an alphabetical listing of television shows for the 2007-08 season and provides figures for percent female, percent minority, and percent over 40 for each show staff. A total of 133 shows were examined, which was down from 152 examined in the 2005-06 season – the season considered in the last Hollywood Writers Report.

Women Staff/Writer-Producers

The top-five writing staffs for percent female were Showtime’s The L Word (100 percent), CBS’s Cold Case (69.2 percent), Showtime’s Californication (66.7 percent), the CW’s Life is Wild (66.7 percent), and NBC’s Lipstick Jungle (66.7 percent).

Fourteen of the 133 show staffs examined included no women writers (10.5 percent). These shows included the following, in alphabetical order (see Table 19):

1. 24 (Fox)

---

7 Although staffing data for 24 refer to episodes that aired during the 2008-09 season, some of the writing occurred during the 2007-08 season and was counted as such in this
2. American’s Funniest Home Videos (ABC)
3. Burn Notice (USA)
4. The Closer (TNT)
5. Curb Your Enthusiasm (HBO)
6. Flight of the Chonchords (HBO)
7. Futurama (Fox)
8. Monk (USA)
9. Quarterlife (Bravo)
10. Rescue Me (FX)
11. Sarah Silverman Program (COMC)
12. The Tudors (Showtime)
13. The Wire (HBO)
14. Zoey 101 (Nick)

By contrast, the previous Hollywood Writers Report (which examined the 2006-06 season) found that only 10 of the 152 show staffs considered included no women writers (6.6 percent).

**Minority Staff/Writer-Producers**

The top-five shows for percent minority were Nick’s Just Jordan (71.4 percent), the CW’s The Game (60 percent), the CW’s Girlfriends (54.5 percent), the CW’s Everybody Hates Chris (50 percent), and ABC Family’s Lincoln Heights (44.4 percent). It should be noted that three of the top five shows — The Game, Girlfriends, and Everybody Hates Chris — were black-themed situation comedies airing on the CW that had survived the UPN/WB merger in 2006 (see Table 19). In the previous Hollywood Writers Report, four of the top-five shows for minority writers had aired on UPN.

Forty-four of the 133 show staffs examined for the 2007-08 season included no minority writers (33.1 percent). These figures represent an improvement over the figures for the 2005-06 season — 61 of 152 show staffs had no minority writers that season (40.1 percent).

**Older Staff/Writer-Producers**

Older staff/writer-producers were well represented among the 133 show staffs. Indeed, at least 127 of the show staffs (95.5 percent) had one or more one writers over 40 (see Table 19).8 Fox’s 24, which employed a staff of 12 writers, stood out among shows for the employment of older writers. All twelve of the show’s writers were over 40.

---

8 Note that these findings likely understate the actual employment of over-40 writers on show staffs during the 2007-08 season. That is, 105 of the 1462 staff/writer-producers for the season had missing information for age (7.2 percent), which involved 62 of the 133 shows (46.6 percent).
Conclusion

This section tells a story very similar to the one told in the 2007 Hollywood Writers Report. That is, the small pockets of promise observed for women and minority writers, at certain networks and in certain genres, were largely overshadowed by the groups’ continuing underemployment and lagging compensation in the industry. By contrast, older writers continued to fare relatively well in this story, obtaining representation on nearly every television show staff and outpacing their younger counterparts among higher-level staff positions. Some key findings:

* The female share of television staffing employment has increased 4.1 percent since the 2001-02 season, continuing a trend noted in the previous report.

* While younger writers continued to constitute the majority staff/writer-producers during the 2007-08 season, their advantage over their older counterparts has eroded since the last report.

* The minority share of all staff/writer-producer positions has increased slightly since the last report covering the 2005-06 season, despite a loss of 31 minority positions over the period.

* Women writers were less likely to staff television comedies than their male counterparts during the 2007-08 season.

* Older writers were less likely to staff television comedies than their younger counterparts during the 2007-08 season.

* For the first time in the Hollywood Writers Report series, minority and white writers were about equally likely to staff television comedies during the 2007-08 season.

* As in the last report, minority writers were about half as likely as white writers to be showrunners.

* Similarly, women writers were about half as likely as male writers to be showrunners.

* Older writers were twice as likely as younger writers to be showrunners.

* During the 2007-08 season, older writers tended to face better staff employment prospects at smaller, cable networks than at the major networks.

* Like older writers, women writers excelled in staff employment at the
smaller, cable networks.

* The CW – heir to the remaining UPN black-oriented sitcoms – posted, by far, the largest minority share of staff/writer-producers among the networks for the 2007-08 season.

* About 11 percent of the television shows during the 2007-08 season had no women writers on staff (up from about 7 percent in 2005-06).

* About 33 percent of the television shows during the 2007-08 season had no minority writers on staff (down from about 40 percent in 2005-06).

* As in the previous report, nearly every television show during the 2007-08 season had at least one over-40 writer of staff.
IX. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Diverse writers continue to be underemployed and underpaid in Hollywood. Women remain stuck at about 28 percent of television employment and only about 18 percent of film employment – figures that have scarcely changed in years. While the gender earnings gap in television has closed a bit since the last Hollywood Writers Report, the gap has increased to its widest margin in years in film.

Minorities also have closed the earnings gap a bit in television since the last report and seen a similar widening of the gap in film. But while the minority share of film employment has remained flat at a paltry 6 percent since 1999, the group’s share of television employment actually decreased a percentage point to 9 percent between 2005 and 2007.

As noted in previous Hollywood Writers Reports, the situation remains more complex for older writers. Older writers dominate in employment and earnings in key areas, but employment rate continues to decline sharply with age, raising questions about the ability of writers to find work once they pass certain age thresholds.

New Approaches for a New Era: Writers Access Project

Many observers point to the election of America’s first black president in 2008 as confirmation that this nation -- in which more than half of the population is female and nearly a third is non-white -- has finally turned the corner and embraced the diversity that increasingly defines it.

In January 2009, the Writers Guild of America West (WGAW) instituted a new program designed to increase television employment for writers with diverse backgrounds. The Writers Access Project (WAP) is a script-judging contest aimed at identifying outstanding, mid-level diverse writers who appeal to showrunners looking to staff their shows. Four categories of contestants are considered – minority writers and writers with disabilities, women writers, writers 55 and older, and gay and lesbian writers. The goal is to actively engage television decision makers in the process of ferreting out and recognizing talent in a sizable pool of diverse writers.

By all accounts, the initial incarnation of the WAP has more than succeeded in achieving this goal. A total of 154 writers submitted scripts to be judged – 74 in the category of minority writers and writers with disabilities; 47 in the category of women writers; 15 in the category of writers 55 and older; and 18 in the category of gay and lesbian writers. First-round judges, who were all at the level of co-executive producer or above, were so impressed by the quality of the scripts they read that some asked for the identities of the writers. (It should be noted that judges were blind to both the identities of the writers and to the category in which they were judging.) A total of 54 writers were advanced to the final round of judging (18 in comedy and 36 in drama), which was
conducted by judges exclusively at the level of showrunner and/or creator. The standard for winning submissions was simply, “Based on what you have read, would you consider this writers for staffing on a show?” Over 140 WGA members, all high-level television writers, participated in the judging process, which reflects a strong interest in the writing community in gaining more access for diverse writers.

The success of the WAP, it seems, dispels a key myth that has worked to excuse the stagnation we continue to see in the diversification of the Hollywood writing corps: the idea that the pool of diverse writers is limited. To be sure, the success of the program suggests that the underemployment of diverse writers in the industry really has more to do with access, networking, and opportunity than with a shortage of talent. Before we can hope to significantly address the unsatisfactory numbers for diverse writers presented in this report (and the reports preceding it), industry decision makers must embrace this truth. We must address the problem of diverse writers being trapped in entry-level positions (when they are fortunate enough to work), which would necessarily involve a better understanding of writers room dynamics that may retard the progress of diverse writers.

The WGAW long has been committed to advancing the employment opportunities of all writers. The Writers Access Project represents just one small step forward in the process of rewriting the all-too-familiar story of stagnant employment and earnings gaps for diverse writers told in the 2009 Hollywood Writers Report. The WGAW plans to eventually expand the WAP to the film sector, which will require Guild collaboration with the major studios so that judges who are decision makers can be identified there as well. In short, the Guild encourages the broader industry to rethink business-as-usual practices on the diversity front. The Guild encourages key industry players to join with it to establish clear goals, reasonable timetables, and effective mechanisms for progressive change.

It’s extreme folly to continue to do the same thing and to expect a different outcome. Breaking out of the stagnation in writer diversity documented in the last few WGAW reports will require bold, new approaches. Only then will we begin to make appreciable progress toward catching up with a changing America. Only then will we move closer to making sure that all of our stories are told.
Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of the WGAw Current Membership, Employed and Unemployed Writers, 2007 and 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th></th>
<th>% Change in Current Membership</th>
<th>% Change in Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Percent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Members of Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex: Male</td>
<td>6176</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>3270</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
<td>2906</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex: Female</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>869</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex: NA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Minority</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Other</td>
<td>7519</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>4009</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>3510</td>
<td>93.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Category: &lt;31</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Category: 31-40</td>
<td>2144</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>1486</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Category: 41-50</td>
<td>2208</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
<td>1348</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Category: 51-60</td>
<td>1603</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Category: 61-70</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Category: 71-80</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Category: 81+</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Age Known</td>
<td>7437</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3992</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3445</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: All Ages</td>
<td>8131</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>4356</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>3775</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Current Membership, Employment and Unemployment by Group, 2007 and 2003

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th></th>
<th>2003</th>
<th></th>
<th>% Change in Current Membership</th>
<th>% Change in Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Membership by Gender, Ethnicity, and Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-MINORITY MALES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40</td>
<td>3741</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>3696</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 and under</td>
<td>1596</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age unknown</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: All Ages</td>
<td>5807</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>5954</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-MINORITY FEMALES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>1010</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 and under</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age unknown</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: All Ages</td>
<td>1710</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>1737</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINORITY MALES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 and under</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age unknown</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: All Ages</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MINORITY FEMALES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 and under</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age unknown</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total: All Ages</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>8131</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>8275</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3: Overall Trends in Employment and Earnings by Group, 2001 - 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NUMBER EMPLOYED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Males</td>
<td>3064</td>
<td>3073</td>
<td>3093</td>
<td>3038</td>
<td>3064</td>
<td>3115</td>
<td>3237</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>1071</td>
<td>1082</td>
<td>1058</td>
<td>1049</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40</td>
<td>2259</td>
<td>2259</td>
<td>2268</td>
<td>2247</td>
<td>2183</td>
<td>2182</td>
<td>2250</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 and under</td>
<td>1733</td>
<td>1724</td>
<td>1749</td>
<td>1714</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>1866</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALL</strong></td>
<td>4356</td>
<td>4360</td>
<td>4481</td>
<td>4315</td>
<td>4325</td>
<td>4330</td>
<td>4492</td>
<td>-3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **MEDIAN EARNINGS** |               |               |               |               |               |               |               |                   |
| White Males       | $112,500      | $118,412      | $118,500      | $108,692      | $103,620      | $97,236       | $95,000       | 18.4%             |
| Women             | $90,686       | $95,108       | $93,678       | $86,527       | $86,499       | $81,531       | $80,000       | 11.2%             |
| Minority          | $87,632       | $82,500       | $80,010       | $80,000       | $84,475       | $87,222       | $80,558       | 8.8%              |
| Over 40           | $109,500      | $100,000      | $106,000      | $95,000       | $96,490       | $84,922       | $80,569       | 39.2%             |
| 40 and under      | $102,500      | $111,809      | $115,324      | $107,594      | $108,168      | $101,095      | $104,284      | -1.7%             |
| **ALL**           | $104,857      | $106,470      | $109,132      | $100,000      | $99,889       | $91,681       | $90,516       | 15.8%             |

### Table 4: Employment Trends by Gender, by Sector, 2001-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NUMBER EMPLOYED-TV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2255</td>
<td>2259</td>
<td>2307</td>
<td>2264</td>
<td>2317</td>
<td>2485</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>886</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>854</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex n/a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>3143</td>
<td>3137</td>
<td>3174</td>
<td>3119</td>
<td>3116</td>
<td>3352</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **NUMBER EMPLOYED-FILM** |               |               |               |               |               |               |               |                   |
| Male              | 1553          | 1567          | 1527          | 1501          | 1503          | 1513          | 1562          | 81.7%             |
| Female            | 346           | 352           | 351           | 332           | 330           | 307           | 309           | 18.2%             |
| Sex n/a           | 1             | 3             | 2             | 0             | 0             | 0             | 0             | 0.1%              |
| **TOTAL**         | 1900          | 1922          | 1880          | 1833          | 1833          | 1820          | 1871          | 100.0%            |
Table 5: Earnings Trends by Gender, by Sector, 2001-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEDIAN EARNINGS-TV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>$87,499</td>
<td>$97,500</td>
<td>$94,500</td>
<td>$87,500</td>
<td>$81,562</td>
<td>$75,750</td>
<td>$72,332</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>$82,604</td>
<td>$90,486</td>
<td>$92,900</td>
<td>$78,945</td>
<td>$82,000</td>
<td>$75,562</td>
<td>$71,582</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$85,932</td>
<td>$95,579</td>
<td>$94,047</td>
<td>$84,696</td>
<td>$81,770</td>
<td>$75,750</td>
<td>$72,061</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEDIAN EARNINGS-FILM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>$96,250</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$89,000</td>
<td>$83,357</td>
<td>$88,909</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$73,332</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>$57,151</td>
<td>$55,500</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$65,341</td>
<td>$62,500</td>
<td>$59,553</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>-4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$84,962</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$79,750</td>
<td>$84,375</td>
<td>$78,125</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Employment Trends by Race/Ethnicity, by Sector, 2001-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NUMBER EMPLOYED-TV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>168</td>
<td></td>
<td>-14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>125.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>-20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Other</td>
<td>2866</td>
<td>2844</td>
<td>2869</td>
<td>2817</td>
<td>2809</td>
<td>2889</td>
<td>3083</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3143</td>
<td>3147</td>
<td>3174</td>
<td>3119</td>
<td>3116</td>
<td>3352</td>
<td></td>
<td>-6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NUMBER EMPLOYED-FILM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>-13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>-25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>-62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Other</td>
<td>1792</td>
<td>1807</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>1722</td>
<td>1729</td>
<td>1718</td>
<td>1752</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1833</td>
<td>1833</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7: Earnings Trends by Race/Ethnicity, by Sector, 2001-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEDIAN EARNINGS-TV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>$67,028</td>
<td>$77,829</td>
<td>$79,151</td>
<td>$84,989</td>
<td>$81,096</td>
<td>$92,159</td>
<td>$68,175</td>
<td>-1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>$88,604</td>
<td>$89,643</td>
<td>$87,901</td>
<td>$77,264</td>
<td>$64,916</td>
<td>$69,432</td>
<td>$72,500</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>$73,794</td>
<td>$87,349</td>
<td>$54,608</td>
<td>$61,164</td>
<td>$69,432</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$73,659</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>$137,678</td>
<td>$149,061</td>
<td>$39,523</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$38,173</td>
<td>$18,000</td>
<td>$59,455</td>
<td>131.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Other</td>
<td>$87,211</td>
<td>$97,588</td>
<td>$99,000</td>
<td>$87,138</td>
<td>$82,720</td>
<td>$76,250</td>
<td>$72,800</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$85,932</td>
<td>$95,579</td>
<td>$94,047</td>
<td>$84,696</td>
<td>$81,770</td>
<td>$75,750</td>
<td>$72,061</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEDIAN EARNINGS-FILM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$52,275</td>
<td>$66,666</td>
<td>$71,250</td>
<td>$84,327</td>
<td>$73,750</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>-35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>$111,500</td>
<td>$61,305</td>
<td>$51,688</td>
<td>$80,688</td>
<td>$135,000</td>
<td>$49,523</td>
<td>$60,334</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>$83,750</td>
<td>$78,500</td>
<td>$103,750</td>
<td>$142,500</td>
<td>$61,667</td>
<td>$66,500</td>
<td>$121,292</td>
<td>-31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$87,500</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
<td>$85,836</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$59,500</td>
<td>$44,333</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Other</td>
<td>$86,442</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$76,516</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$83,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$71,500</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>$84,962</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$79,750</td>
<td>$84,375</td>
<td>$78,125</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 8: Employment Trends by Age Group, by Sector, 2001-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NUMBER EMPLOYED-TV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;31</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>1072</td>
<td>1054</td>
<td>1066</td>
<td>1055</td>
<td>1032</td>
<td>1067</td>
<td>1087</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>1001</td>
<td>992</td>
<td>1074</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-80</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 and over</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Age Known</strong></td>
<td>2866</td>
<td>2857</td>
<td>2909</td>
<td>2866</td>
<td>2839</td>
<td>2874</td>
<td>3088</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Age N/A</strong></td>
<td>277</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>264</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>3143</td>
<td>3137</td>
<td>3174</td>
<td>3119</td>
<td>3116</td>
<td>3151</td>
<td>3352</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NUMBER EMPLOYED-FILM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;31</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>663</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-80</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 and over</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Age Known</strong></td>
<td>1751</td>
<td>1761</td>
<td>1711</td>
<td>1680</td>
<td>1675</td>
<td>1667</td>
<td>1702</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, Age N/A</strong></td>
<td>149</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1833</td>
<td>1833</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>1871</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% Change 2001-2007
Table 9: Earnings Trends by Age Group, by Sector, 2001-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEDIAN EARNINGS-TV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;31</td>
<td>$63,418</td>
<td>$79,047</td>
<td>$75,630</td>
<td>$67,500</td>
<td>$78,409</td>
<td>$75,075</td>
<td>$61,182</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>$87,500</td>
<td>$104,406</td>
<td>$100,184</td>
<td>$92,199</td>
<td>$92,600</td>
<td>$89,156</td>
<td>$93,500</td>
<td>-6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$106,133</td>
<td>$110,818</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$91,500</td>
<td>$79,178</td>
<td>$69,433</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$82,500</td>
<td>$76,000</td>
<td>$66,212</td>
<td>$58,750</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
<td>$52,523</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>$55,525</td>
<td>$50,034</td>
<td>$56,484</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$49,000</td>
<td>$33,069</td>
<td>$34,429</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-80</td>
<td>$65,703</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$32,500</td>
<td>$43,665</td>
<td>$48,750</td>
<td>$19,438</td>
<td>$22,534</td>
<td>191.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 and over</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Age Known</td>
<td>$86,817</td>
<td>$94,744</td>
<td>$92,900</td>
<td>$84,616</td>
<td>$82,252</td>
<td>$75,843</td>
<td>$72,000</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Age N/A</td>
<td>$82,500</td>
<td>$105,660</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$86,799</td>
<td>$79,591</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$72,978</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$85,932</td>
<td>$95,579</td>
<td>$94,047</td>
<td>$84,696</td>
<td>$81,770</td>
<td>$75,750</td>
<td>$72,061</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIAN EARNINGS-FILM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;31</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$68,750</td>
<td>$66,565</td>
<td>$65,425</td>
<td>$72,516</td>
<td>$48,500</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>$94,905</td>
<td>$82,500</td>
<td>$79,875</td>
<td>$90,018</td>
<td>$87,500</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$92,875</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$85,000</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
<td>$81,500</td>
<td>$100,396</td>
<td>$92,500</td>
<td>$68,750</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>$61,750</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$56,250</td>
<td>$65,750</td>
<td>$57,500</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>$110,000</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
<td>$64,975</td>
<td>$90,615</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$112,500</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
<td>96.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-80</td>
<td>$112,250</td>
<td>$62,500</td>
<td>$58,182</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$37,500</td>
<td>199.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 and over</td>
<td>$48,292</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Age Known</td>
<td>$85,850</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$77,500</td>
<td>$76,094</td>
<td>$87,500</td>
<td>$80,431</td>
<td>$71,500</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total, Age N/A</td>
<td>$73,750</td>
<td>$66,250</td>
<td>$73,254</td>
<td>$97,500</td>
<td>$67,250</td>
<td>$68,750</td>
<td>$61,493</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$84,962</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$79,750</td>
<td>$84,375</td>
<td>$78,125</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10: Employment by Conglomerate and Larger Independent, by Group, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conglomerate</th>
<th>Total Writers</th>
<th>Percent Wht Male</th>
<th>Percent Female</th>
<th>Percent Minority</th>
<th>Percent Over 40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>56.0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISNEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DREAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>90.9%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC UNIVERSAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Warner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viacom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARGER INDEPENDENTS (40 or more writers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigwood Films</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s A Laugh Productions</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRF Development</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lions Gate</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storybook Productions</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Players</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11: Conglomerates and Larger Independents, Ranked by Percent Female, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conglomerate/Independent</th>
<th>Percent Female</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBS-TV</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRF Development</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disney-TV</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigwood Films</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s A Laugh Productions</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner-TV</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sony-TV</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viacom-TV</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGM-Film</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS-Film</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC Universal-TV</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lions Gate</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox-TV</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storybook Productions</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dream-TV</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disney-Film</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sony-Film</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dream-Film</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viacom-Film</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner-Film</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC Universal-Film</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox-Film</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGM-TV</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Players</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12: Conglomerates and Larger Independents, Ranked by Percent Minority, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conglomerate/Independent</th>
<th>Percent Minority</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storybook Productions</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's A Laugh Productions</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGM-Film</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viacom-TV</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigwood Films</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGM-TV</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner-TV</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disney-TV</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS-TV</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox-TV</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC Universal-TV</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRF Development</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viacom-Film</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner-Film</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lions Gate</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC Universal-Film</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Players</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disney-Film</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sony-TV</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox-Film</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dream-Film</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sony-Film</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS-Film</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dream-TV</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13: Conglomerates and Larger Independents, Ranked by Percent Over 40, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conglomerates/Independents</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MGM-TV</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dream-TV</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lions Gate</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS-Film</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sony-TV</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's A Laugh Productions</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disney-TV</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storybook Productions</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox-Film</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox-TV</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigwood Films</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC-Universal TV</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS-TV</td>
<td>58.2%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sony-Film</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Players</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner-TV</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viacom-TV</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disney-Film</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner-Film</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGM-Film</td>
<td>53.5%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dream-Film</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viacom-Film</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC Universal-Film</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRF Development</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14: Median Earnings by Conglomerate and Larger Independent, by Group, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conglomerate/Split Media Company</th>
<th>All Writers</th>
<th>White Male Writers</th>
<th>Female Writers</th>
<th>Minority Writers</th>
<th>Over 40 Writers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>$75,462</td>
<td>$78,389</td>
<td>$72,656</td>
<td>$77,505</td>
<td>$76,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>$33,412</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$66,898</td>
<td>$30,823</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISNEY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>$66,750</td>
<td>$66,191</td>
<td>$70,361</td>
<td>$67,485</td>
<td>$63,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>$98,334</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$96,667</td>
<td>$64,938</td>
<td>$103,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DREAM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>$72,188</td>
<td>$67,662</td>
<td>$13,125</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$80,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>$79,501</td>
<td>$87,652</td>
<td>$72,353</td>
<td>$77,128</td>
<td>$87,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>$111,250</td>
<td>$112,500</td>
<td>$90,268</td>
<td>$77,250</td>
<td>$118,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$43,750</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>$27,500</td>
<td>$27,500</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC UNIVERSAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>$77,620</td>
<td>$81,218</td>
<td>$79,032</td>
<td>$71,446</td>
<td>$87,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$83,333</td>
<td>$122,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SONY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>$55,719</td>
<td>$58,230</td>
<td>$52,000</td>
<td>$63,220</td>
<td>$54,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>$87,500</td>
<td>$97,350</td>
<td>$71,250</td>
<td>$168,319</td>
<td>$122,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Warner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$77,733</td>
<td>$76,500</td>
<td>$56,248</td>
<td>$75,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$105,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$42,500</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viacom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>$72,411</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$69,092</td>
<td>$70,721</td>
<td>$71,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>$91,847</td>
<td>$90,924</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$108,990</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LARGER INDEPENDENTS (40 or more writers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bigwood Films</td>
<td>$14,250</td>
<td>$15,400</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
<td>$9,700</td>
<td>$16,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s A Laugh Productions</td>
<td>$71,529</td>
<td>$69,847</td>
<td>$65,647</td>
<td>$133,609</td>
<td>$110,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRF Development</td>
<td>$18,577</td>
<td>$23,912</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lions Gate</td>
<td>$36,393</td>
<td>$35,418</td>
<td>$79,331</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$47,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storybook Productions</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$42,089</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$38,750</td>
<td>$30,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Players</td>
<td>$62,500</td>
<td>$72,801</td>
<td>$16,667</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15: Race, Age, and Gender Breakdowns, 2001-02 to 2007-08 Seasons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>%Minority</th>
<th>%White</th>
<th>%Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1695</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>%40 &amp; under</th>
<th>%Over 40</th>
<th>%Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>1357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>1767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>%Female</th>
<th>%Male</th>
<th>%Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>68.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>1833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1695</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>%Asian</th>
<th>%Black</th>
<th>%Latino</th>
<th>%White</th>
<th>%Tot</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>1576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1695</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16: Gender, Age, and Minority/White Breakdowns by Genre, 2001-02 to 2007-08 Seasons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Comedy</th>
<th>Drama</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 &amp; under</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 &amp; under</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 &amp; under</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 &amp; under</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 &amp; under</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 &amp; under</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>99.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 &amp; under</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>100.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17: Job Titles by Minority Status, Gender, and Age, 2007-08 Season

2007-08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>%Minority</th>
<th>%White</th>
<th>%Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec Prod</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Exec Prod</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup Prod</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Prod</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exec Story</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story Editor</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exec Consult</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult Prod</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Writer</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freelance</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>289</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2007-08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>%Female</th>
<th>%Male</th>
<th>%Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec Prod</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Exec Prod</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup Prod</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Prod</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exec Story</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story Editor</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exec Consult</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult Prod</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Writer</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freelance</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2007-08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>%40 &amp; under</th>
<th>%Over 40</th>
<th>%Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exec Prod</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Exec Prod</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sup Prod</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Prod</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exec Story</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Story Editor</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exec Consult</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult Prod</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Writer</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freelance</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18: Age, Gender, and Minority/White Breakdowns by Network, 2007-08 Season

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network</th>
<th>%40 &amp; Under</th>
<th>%Over 40</th>
<th>%Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; E</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC Family</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMC</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bravo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMC</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FX</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBO</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SciFi</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showtime</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBS</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The N</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNT</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network</th>
<th>%Female</th>
<th>%Male</th>
<th>%Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; E</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC Family</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMC</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bravo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FX</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBO</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SciFi</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showtime</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBS</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The N</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNT</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Network</th>
<th>%Minority</th>
<th>%White</th>
<th>%Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; E</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC Family</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMC</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bravo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMC</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FX</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBO</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NBC</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SciFi</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showtime</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBS</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The N</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNT</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19: Television Shows, by Percent Female, Percent Minority, and Percent Over 40, 2007-08 Season

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Show</th>
<th>All Writers</th>
<th>Percent Female</th>
<th>Percent Minority</th>
<th>Percent Over 40</th>
<th>Number Female</th>
<th>Number Minority</th>
<th>Number Over 40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Rock</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4400, The</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>According to Jim</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aliens in America</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>America's Funniest Home</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Dad</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Wives</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back to You</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battlestar Galactica</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Bang Theory</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Love</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Shots</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Engvall Show, The</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bionic Woman</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bones</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston Legal</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaking Bad</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brotherhood</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brothers and Sisters</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burn Notice</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Californication</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cane</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury’s Law</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpoolers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashmere Mafia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caveman</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chuck</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaner, The</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closer, The</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold Case</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Minds</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI: Miami</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSI: New York</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb Your Enthusiasm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dead Zone, The</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desperate Housewives</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dexter</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirt</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirty Sexy Money</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eli Stone</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entourage</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ER</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Show</td>
<td>Epis.</td>
<td>Viewers</td>
<td>Share</td>
<td>Rating</td>
<td>STV</td>
<td>SV</td>
<td>CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eureka</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everybody Hates Chris</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Guy</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flash Gordon</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight of the Choncho</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday Night Lights</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futurama</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game, The</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghost Whisperer, The</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girlfriends</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gossip Girl</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey's Anatomy</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heroes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How I Met Your Mother</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Plain Sight</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Treatment</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It's Always Sunny In</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jericho</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journeyman</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just Jordan</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-Ville</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King of the Hill</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyle XY</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L Word, The</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Vegas</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law &amp; Order</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law &amp; Order: CI</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law &amp; Order: SVU</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life is Wild</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Heights</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipstick Jungle</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lost</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mad Men</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men in Trees</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleman, The</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss/Guided</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monk</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moonlight</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Boys</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Name is Earl</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naked Brothers Band</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navy NCIS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Adventures of Old</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Amsterdam</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nip/Tuck</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes from the Underbelly</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October Road</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office, The</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Tree Hill</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison Break</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Practice</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushing Daisies</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterlife</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaper</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rescue Me</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return of Jezebel Jam</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riches, The</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules of Engagement</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samantha Who?</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Silverman Program</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saving Grace</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scrubs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shark</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simpsons, The</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smallville</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of Nowhere</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supernatural</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swintown</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell Me You Love Me</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminator: The Sarah</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Til Death</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tudors, The</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two and a Half Men</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ugly Betty</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit, The</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viva Laughlin</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeds</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildfire</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wire, The</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without a Trace</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Murder Club</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoey 101</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5: Television Employment by Minority Status, 2003-2007

Figure 6: Film Employment by Minority Status, 2003-2007
Figure 7: The Earnings Gap for Minorities, TV

Figure 8: The Earnings Gap for Minorities, Film
Figure 11: Employed Film Writers by Generation Cohort, 2003-2007
Figure 14: Film Earnings by Age Group, 2003, 2005, and 2007

Figure 15: Distribution of Male and Female Staff Writers, 2001-02 to 2007-08
Figure 18: Distribution of Black Staff Writers, 2001-02 to 2007-08