

On the byline gender gap

By [Steve Thorngate](#)

March 4, 2011



Last month, VIDA published a [tally](#) of male and female bylines at a variety of thought-leader magazines in 2010. The results aren't pretty. At the *Atlantic*, men outnumbered women by a three-to-one ratio. The *New Yorker* was only slightly better, and *Harper's* and the *New Republic* were worse. Worst of all? The *New York Review of Books*, which favored men by a factor of six.

I counted up *Century* bylines for comparison. (I went with print magazine authors, both to maintain an apples-to-apples situation and to dodge the issue of contributing to the problem by putting my name on a blog post about it.) In 2010, there were about twice as many men as women in our pages. In other words, we're doing better at this than a lot of folks are, but the fact that we can say this with a two-to-one ratio speaks to the enormity of the broader problem.

[This isn't a new debate](#), and if it were an easy thing to fix, the numbers would be better. But as Ann Friedman [has argued for years](#), it's inadequate to write this off as

a supply-side problem--to maintain that the real problem is not that women have a harder time getting prominently published but that there just aren't as many of them writing. Recently Friedman created a new site to underscore this point: [Lady Journos!](#), a Tumblr blog that, like other sites, curates long-form journalism published elsewhere--but focuses exclusively on female bylines.

I've added Lady Journos! to my feed reader. (Do you [read the \*Century\* by RSS feed](#)? If not, [you should try it](#).) The site doesn't just make a rhetorical point; it also offers a practical tool for encountering more magazine writing by women.