GENDER STEREOTYPES AND REPRESENTATION OF FEMALE CHARACTERS IN CHILDREN'S PICTURE BOOKS

by

Kelly Crisp Paynter

Liberty University

A Dissertation Presented to

the Faculty of the School of Education

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree Doctor of Education

Liberty University

October, 2011

Gender Stereotypes and Representation of

Female Characters in Children's Picture Books

By Kelly Crisp Paynter

APPROVED:

COMMITTEE CHAIR

Kathie Morgan, Ed. D.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Karen Prior, Ph. D.

Sherry Grove, Ed. D.

CHAIR OF GRADUATE STUDIES

Amanda Szapkiw, Ph. D.

ABSTRACT

Kelly C. Paynter. GENDER STEREOTYPES AND REPRESENTATION OF FEMALE CHARACTERS IN CHILDREN'S PICTURE BOOKS. (under the direction of Dr. Kathie Morgan) School of Education, Liberty University, October, 2011.

Studies since the 1970s have found that many female characters are stereotyped and underrepresented in children's picture books. This dissertation updated a study by Hamilton, Anderson, Broaddus, and Young (2006) to examine whether stereotyping and female underrepresentation changed over the past decade. The book sample included 3 Caldecott Medal/Honor books and 48 bestselling picture books published in 2010. The study, a quantitative content analysis, utilized 6 library media specialist book raters and the coding schema of Hamilton et al. (2006). Most measures of stereotypes and underrepresentation improved since the Hamilton et al. study; however, measures that declined significantly included more male than female authors and illustrators, more anthropomorphized male main characters and illustrations, and no female characters in assertive/aggressive characterizations.

Descriptors: gender bias, gender stereotypes, children's picture books, sex typing

Acknowledgements

This dissertation is dedicated to my fantastic husband, who has endured with equanimity my perpetual student status for well over a decade…to my mother, who has always been my editor and champion of higher education…to my children, for whom I hope to provide a good example of perseverance…to my committee members, Dr. Kathie Morgan, Dr. Karen Prior, and Dr. Sherry Grove, and research consultant, Dr. Amanda Szapkiw, who provided help and expertise with a smile…and to the late Dr. Jill Jones, who was a beacon of inspiration. Thanks be to God for the guidance, blessings, and support He has bestowed upon me, not only during this process, but throughout all phases of my life.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements ii

List of Tables vi

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION 1

Background 1

Problem Statement 2

Purpose Statement 2

Significance of the Study 3

Research Questions 5

Null Hypotheses 6

Identification of Variables 8

Assumptions and Limitations 10

Research Plan 11

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW 12

Introduction 12

Theoretical Framework 13

History of American Women's Rights 15

Review of the Literature 24

Stereotypes and Female Underrepresentation in the Broader Scholarly Literature 24

Current State of Stereotypes and Female Underrepresentation in Picture Books 27

Discussion of Methods in Various Articles 35

Strategies to Address Stereotypes and Underrepresentation 35

Summary 39
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY 40
Introduction 40
Book Choice 40
Instrument 42
Procedures 43
Research Design 46
Data Analysis 47
Summary 51
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS 52
Introduction 52
Research Question 1 52
Research Question 2 55
Research Question 3 56
Research Question 4 57
Research Question 5 57
Research Question 6 59
Research Question 7 63
Conclusion.....65
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION 66
Introduction 66
Research Questions.....66
Review of Methods.....69

Review of Results 69
Changes Over the Past Decade 70
Differences from the Hamilton et al. (2006) Study 73
Research Limitations 74
Discussion 74
Implications for Practice 78
Further Study 80
Conclusion 81
REFERENCES 82
APPENDIX A: 2010 NEW YORK TIMES BESTSELLING CHILDREN'S PICTURE BOOKS 96
APPENDIX B: CODE SHEET 99
APPENDIX C: ANNOTATED CODE SHEET 104

List of Tables

Table 1: Results of Chi-square Calculations 61

Table 2: Results of *t*-test Calculations 62

Table 3: Comparison of Select Male/Female Ratios 73

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

This dissertation utilized quantitative content analysis to examine recently published children's picture books for potential instances of gender stereotypes and underrepresentation of female characters. The first chapter of the dissertation presents the background of the study, explains the problems that the study hoped to address, describes the study's significance, and presents a brief overview of the methods that the researcher utilized. The chapter concludes with a list of the study's delimitations, definitions of terms and variables used throughout the dissertation, and a brief research plan.

Background

In the 1960s, the feminist movement gained momentum in American society (Chafe, 1994). Women began to question their portrayals in the media, including representations in children's literature. A seminal study by Weitzman, Eifler, Hokada, and Ross (1972) showed that females were seriously stereotyped and ignored in most literature for young people. This piece provided a focal point around which women rallied to encourage publishers and authors to produce more egalitarian books. In subsequent decades, various researchers have duplicated and extended the research of Weitzman et al. (1972) and have generally found that while sexism and female underrepresentation continue to decrease, they still exist (Worland, 2008). The present study replicated and extended the research contribution of Hamilton, Anderson, Broaddus, and Young (2006) through examination of the 2010 *New York Times* bestselling children's picture books and the 2011 Caldecott Medal and Honor picture

books (published in 2010) for gender stereotypes and female underrepresentation. The study was framed through the lenses of Gender Schema Theory (Bem, 1981) and Social Cognitive Theory (Bussey & Bandura, 1992).

Problem Statement

Children use many internal and external factors, including books, to frame their conceptions of *male* and *female*, appropriate gendered behaviors, and their potential success as adults (Bem, 1981; Bussey & Bandura, 1992; Turner-Bowker, 1996). According to Hamilton et al. (2006), "Stereotyped portrayals of the sexes and underrepresentation of female characters contribute negatively to children's development, limit their career aspirations, frame their attitudes about their future roles as parents, and even influence their personality characteristics" (p. 757). If this is the case, then why would children's book publishers produce picture books that stereotype females or leave them out of stories altogether? One would assume that in the 21st century, females are no longer limited by their gender or steered into traditional roles due to a lack of options. Recent studies of children's picture books, however, have continued to show stereotypes and underrepresentation of female characters (Anderson & Hamilton, 2005; Diekman & Murnen, 2004; Gooden & Gooden, 2001; Hamilton et al., 2006).

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study was to examine the bestselling children's picture books of 2010 and the Caldecott Medal and Honor winners from 2011 in order to provide an update to the Hamilton et al. (2006) study. Surprisingly, few studies examine sexism in bestselling books; most of the studies focus on award winners only, which may not be the most widely circulated books (Hamilton et al., 2006; Tepper & Cassidy, 1999). The

Hamilton et al. (2006) article appears to be the most recent to examine bestselling children's books, and it is now 10 years old. (The article was published five years after the study was completed.)

Significance of the Study

There is currently a societal emphasis on equality and respect for diversity. Much news is made of the fact that women are now represented on the Supreme Court (Baker, 2010), as Fortune 500 corporate directors (Nowicki, 2009), and in other positions traditionally held by men. With each story that lauds a woman's accomplishments in breaking into a presumably nontraditional field, however, is an accompanying disclaimer that states women still have a long way to go. Vignettes abound as to why women have not been represented in such roles before. The role of the stay-at-home mother is generally not vilified anymore, and the "mommy wars" of the 1980s and 1990s seem to be a thing of the past (Sawyer & Sherwood, 2006). A woman has the right to choose her career path, and should she decide to stay at home with her children, that is perfectly acceptable as long as she is not coerced into the role or denied other roles because of her gender. Or is it? Do women choose traditional roles because they make conscious, objective decisions after receiving the necessary education and career opportunities and pick those vocations because it is their hearts' calling? Or are girls and women steered toward particular vocations and roles, either blatantly or obliviously, because of the images they see in the media, the lack of current female role models in prominent positions, and the policies of companies that continue to make it difficult to balance a family with a career?

The field of education, in particular, greatly concerns itself with educating all children equally. If public educators do not nurture the abilities of half their students, that is, females, then they have failed in their overall mission. In recent years, great emphasis has been placed on ensuring that standardized test materials, such as college admissions tests like the ACT or SAT, do not negatively discriminate against any group, whether along racial, gender, or other lines (Micceri, 2009). Educators have received a great deal of training over the past decade on being culturally and gender-sensitive, and colleges and universities now require such diversity training in many of their degree programs (Griffer & Perlis, 2007). Gender, equity, and valuing diversity are at the forefront of modern public education. Similarly, in the corporate world, new hires usually undergo training on sexual harassment and anti-discrimination; thankfully, most female employees do not face the harassing types of situations of their counterparts in prior decades (Chafe, 1994).

Gender stereotypes in various forms of children's literature are not a new research problem. The topic was studied extensively in the 1970s and 1980s and less so in the 1990s. Perhaps this coincided with Susan Faludi's (1991) so-called feminist backlash, during which feminist ideals received a great deal of criticism from the popular press. The studies seem to have tapered off since the turn of the century. Perhaps there are fewer studies because the problems of sexism and stereotypes presumably have rectified themselves, or perhaps mainstream America is overtired of the subject. It is important, however, to continue to examine gender issues in children's picture books. McCabe, Fairchild, Grauerholz, Pescosolido and Tope (2011) noted, "Change toward gender

equality is uneven, nonlinear, and tied to patterns of feminist activism and backlash" (p. 198).

Research Questions

The research questions guiding this dissertation were closely derived from the Hamilton et al. (2006) study and were as follows:

Research Question #1: Do overall adult male characters, overall child male characters, male title characters, male main characters, and male illustrations outnumber females in each category?

Research Question #2: Is there a relationship between the book author's gender and the gender(s) represented in the books?

Research Question #3: Is there a relationship between the book illustrator's gender and the gender(s) represented in the books?

Research Question #4: Do male authors and illustrators outnumber female authors and illustrators in the books under study?

Research Question #5: Is there a relationship between a main character's gender and his/her portrayal as active or passive; aggressive or nurturing; brave or fearful; being in outdoor or indoor locations; or rescuing others or being in need of rescue?

Research Question #6: Do illustrated portrayals of adult occupations mirror traditional gender stereotypes?

Research Question #7: Have gender stereotyping and underrepresentation of female characters in bestselling and award-winning children's picture books changed since the Hamilton et al. (2006) study?

Null Hypotheses

The null hypotheses guiding this dissertation were also closely derived from the Hamilton et al. (2006) study. Research questions were broken down into sub-hypotheses as follows:

$H_0$1a**:** Overall adult male characters do not statistically significantly differ from overall adult female characters.

$H_0$1b: Overall child male characters do not statistically significantly differ from overall child female characters.

$H_0$1c: Male title characters do not statistically significantly differ from female title characters.

$H_0$1d: Male main characters do not statistically significantly differ from female main characters.

$H_0$1e: Overall male illustrations do not statistically significantly differ from overall female illustrations.

$H_0$1f: Anthropomorphized male title characters do not statistically significantly differ from anthropomorphized female title characters.

$H_0$1g: Anthropomorphized male main characters do not statistically significantly differ from anthropomorphized female main characters.

$H_0$1h: Anthropomorphized overall male illustrations do not statistically significantly differ from anthropomorphized overall female illustrations.

$H_0$2a: There is no statistically significant relationship between the gender of the book author(s) and the gender(s) of the title characters.

$H_0$2b: There is no statistically significant relationship between the gender of the book author(s) and the gender(s) of the main characters.

$H_0$3a: There is no statistically significant relationship between the gender of the book illustrator(s) and the gender(s) of the title characters.

$H_0$3b: There is no statistically significant relationship between the gender of the book illustrator(s) and the gender(s) of the main characters.

$H_0$4a: The number of male authors does not statistically significantly differ from the number of female authors.

$H_0$4b: The number of male illustrators does not statistically significantly differ from the number of female illustrators.

$H_0$5a: There is no statistically significant relationship between a main character's gender and his/her portrayal as active or passive.

$H_0$5b: There is no statistically significant relationship between a main character's gender and his/her portrayal as aggressive or nurturing.

$H_0$5c: There is no statistically significant relationship between a main character's gender and his/her portrayal as brave or fearful.

$H_0$5d: There is no statistically significant relationship between a main character's gender and his/her portrayal as being in outdoor or indoor locations.

$H_0$5e: There is no statistically significant relationship between a main character's gender and his/her portrayal as rescuing others or being in need of rescue.

$H_0$6a: Adult male main characters are as likely to have stereotypical occupations as adult female main characters.

$H_0$6b: Adult male main characters are as likely to have a broad range of occupations as adult female main characters.

$H_0$6c: Adult male main characters are as likely to show a lack of evidence of an occupation outside the home as adult female main characters.

$H_0$7: Gender stereotyping and underrepresentation of female characters in bestselling and award-winning children's picture books have not changed since the Hamilton et al. (2006) study.

Identification of Variables

Independent variables in the study include gender of book author/illustrator and decade (2000s or 2010s). Study dependent variables include the number of male and female illustrations in a variety of categories and the portrayal of various types of activities, emotions, and occupations by character gender.

Active, according to Dellman-Jenkins, Florjancic, and Swadener (1993), means "characterized by energetic action or activity," and *passive* means "not participating, or acting compliant" (p. 77). Hamilton and Anderson (2005) expanded the interpretation of *active* to include giving rather than taking advice, helping rather than being helped, leading as opposed to following, deciding instead of deferring, and doing something instead of waiting to act. Prior studies that examined *aggressive behavior* (Oskamp, Kaufman, & Wolterbeek, 1996; Williams, Vernon, Williams, & Malecha, 1987) did not provide an explicit definition; *Random House Dictionary* (2010), however, defines the concept as "boldly assertive and forward; pushy."

Anthropomorphized means to "ascribe human form or attributes to an animal, plant, or material object" (*Random House Dictionary*, 2011). In this study, the term

award-winning refers to the 2011 Caldecott Medal and Honor books. (There are a host of other awards for children's literature that are outside the scope of this dissertation.) *Bestsellers* refer to books that were published in 2010 and appear on the 2010 *New York Times* bestseller list in the Children's Picture Book category.

A *Caldecott Medal* or *Caldecott Honor* book is defined by the American Library Association (2011, para. 1) as an award given to the "artist of the most distinguished American picture book for children." A c*haracter* is defined as "anything actively interacting with surroundings, and/or would change the story significantly if they [*sic*] were omitted…If not in pictures, they [*sic*] must be prominent in text" (Hamilton & Anderson, 2005, p. 1).

Children's picture book, for the purposes of this study, means a book that is intended generally for children ages 3 through 6 (preschool through 1st grade) and is comprised of illustrations on almost every page. Words may accompany the pictures, but the main focus of interpretation, especially for pre-readers, is the images, not the text. Prior studies that examined *nurturing behavior* (Kinman & Henderson, 1985; Oskamp et al., 1996; Williams et al., 1987) did not provide a definition of the concept; *Random House Dictionary*, however, defines it as "feed[ing] and protect[ing]…support[ing] and encourag[ing], as during the period of training or development; foster[ing]…to bring up; train" (2010, para. 1). The terms r*escuing behavior* and *helping behavior* are used similarly in various studies; Barnett (1986, pp. 344-345) and McDonald (1989, p. 394) both defined the concept as "solicited or unsolicited action[s] performed for another individual that is intended to obtain for that individual a desired object, situation, or outcome." The *Random House Dictionary* (2010) provides the following definition of *rescue*: "To free or deliver from confinement, violence, danger, or evil" (para. 1).

Sex and *gender* are used interchangeably; that is, not only one's physical makeup but also the total characteristics that are used to define males and females. *Stereotype* is defined as follows: "A conventional, formulaic, and oversimplified conception, opinion, or image" (*American Heritage Dictionary*, n.d.). *Traditional adult occupations* are defined by Hamilton and Anderson (2005) to include jobs such as firemen, policemen, and doctors for males, and teachers and nurses for females. *Underrepresentation*, for the purposes of this dissertation, means the depiction of a group of people (women) in a lesser proportion than their ratio to the population as a whole.

Assumptions and Limitations

Assumptions. This study utilizes the following assumptions. (1) Quantitative content analysis is the best method by which to examine the gender-fair attributes of children's picture books. (2) Book raters each received similar in-depth training and rated book attributes in a like fashion. (3) Book raters read the books in the prescribed order and did not discuss their thoughts with other raters in order to avoid skewing the results. (4) Bestselling and award-winning books are those most likely to be read by children and purchased for use in libraries, schools, and homes. (5) Children's picture books are capable of transmitting gender stereotyped and/or egalitarian messages to readers.

Limitations. This study examined 48 bestselling children's picture books published in the year 2010 and the three 2011 Caldecott Medal and Honor books (also published in 2010). The books under study do not generalize to the overall population of books, because by their very nature, most books are not award-winners or bestsellers. This study did not examine other award winners besides the Caldecott Medal and Honor

books. The study focused only on the books published in 2010 because this allowed the greatest amount of time to pass since the Hamilton et al. (2006) study, which used books that were bestsellers from 1995-2001. For example, a very popular book published in 2005 would not be included in this study, even if it remained on the bestseller list in 2010. Finally, some book raters may have had unidentified innate biases toward gender issues that could have skewed the results of the study.

Research Plan

Six library media specialist raters performed quantitative content analyses on 17 books each; every book was rated twice. In order to avoid bias or skewing of the results, the researcher did not act as a rater; she did, however, provide clarification and answer questions about the research instrument during the rating process. As a similarly designed study update, this examination of bestselling and award-winning children's books used the same rating instrument and most of the same analysis methods as Hamilton et al. (2006). These methods included chi-square calculations to test for significant differences in nominal representations, such as male to female title character ratios; *t*-tests to look for significant differences among interval variables; Cohen's Kappa tests for inter-rater reliability for nominal data, such as sex of title character and traditional vs. non-traditional jobs; and Pearson product moment correlation coefficients for inter-rater reliability for frequency data. The researcher used descriptive statistics to liken the results of this study to the results of the Hamilton et al. (2006) study.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

A large body of literature on the nature of stereotypes and female underrepresentation in children's picture books as well as other forms of media provides a foundation upon which to build the present study. This chapter explains the search process undertaken while reviewing the literature and also delves into both theoretical and research-based studies relating to the research questions. In addition, a history of the women's rights movement since the early 20th century is discussed.

Introduction

The articles selected for this literature review are included because of their additions to the field of study about stereotypes and underrepresentation of females in children's picture books. Articles are grouped by concept and are generally discussed in chronological fashion beginning with the groundbreaking study by Weitzman et al. (1972).

Some articles that covered the topic at hand were omitted because they repeated the efforts of other authors or provided little new information. Care was taken to avoid opinion pieces, articles that focused on a very narrow/specific area, or pieces that diverged from the topic. An analysis of the history of the women's movement is included because this topic directly relates to how women's changing roles have influenced their literary perceptions, and indeed, why anyone cares how women are personified in the literature. Some notation is briefly made about stereotypes and underrepresentation in other areas that affect children, such as textbooks, but these studies are not discussed in-depth so as to avoid diluting the study at hand.

Much scholarly research has been conducted about sexism in the printed word. A number of studies have examined well-known award-winning books, such as the Caldecotts and Newberys, for gender stereotypes. Fewer studies have critiqued popular or bestselling books. Virtually no studies have examined lesser-known groups of award-winning books, such as the Coretta Scott King Medal or the Michael L. Printz Medal. Few studies have examined the state of stereotypes in digital media, such as online databases or virtual textbooks.

Theoretical Framework

The Gender Schema Theory framework guided this dissertation. This theory originated with Dr. Sandra Bem of Cornell University in the late 1970s. Gender schema theory states that every society prescribes roles to men and women based on their sex, and adults, whether consciously or unconsciously, "anticipate this allocation in the socialization of their children" (Bem, 1981, p. 354). A schema can be defined as a process in which "what is perceived is a product of the interaction between the incoming information and the perceiver's preexisting" beliefs (Bem, 1981, p. 355). Bem believes that children continuously process input regarding sex roles that they encounter in their environment. The child places the new information into his or her previously existing schema of how a man or woman should act. "That sex-typed behavior, in turn, further reinforces the gender-based differentiation of the self-concept through the individual's observation of his or her own behavior," with the gender schema becoming a "prescriptive standard or guide" (Bem, 1981, p. 355) that can actually dictate a child's behavior.

Another similar explanation for how children form gender conceptions is Bussey and Bandura's (1992) Social Cognitive Theory. Humans progress through three phases of gender identification: gender identity, gender stability, and gender constancy. Social cognitive theory posits that children initially behave according to what is deemed "right" for their gender as sanctioned by external parties. Later, they gradually come to behave the way they personally feel is right as they get older. In other words, children "shift from socially guided control to self-regulatory control of gender-linked behavior with increasing age" (p. 1245).

Both theories fit well with the proposed study, which seeks to examine gender stereotypes in children's picture books. Children learn via their surroundings, which include the books they read and the images they see on television. Sayers (1947) and Garfield (1992) defined the "Pre-Polly" developmental stage of children, which roughly corresponds to ages 4 through 8. A key learning strategy for children of this age is the hearing, reading, and telling of stories. Even older children in the "Poll-Parrot" phase (ages 9 through 11) rely mainly on memorization and repetition and have not yet learned to evaluate incoming stimuli critically. Oskamp et al. (1996) argued that picture books are especially important in the formation of children's gender roles, since preschoolers often request the same books to be read to them over and over again.

If children only see stereotypical images in children's picture books, they may think this is the way they should behave in or react to certain situations, and they may adjust their actions accordingly. For example, in many Disney stories, the beatific, abused maiden dutifully cleans the house or minds her cruel elders and does nothing to better her situation. The only way her station in life changes is when a man, a handsome

prince, comes along and rectifies the situation. This is this major storyline in the books and movies *Cinderella*, *Sleeping Beauty*, and *Snow White*. Ebner (2009, para. 10) stated, "Snow White, for example…is cleaning the dwarves' cottage within minutes of arriving, while the key to Sleeping Beauty is her waiting to be brought back to life by a Prince's kiss." Girls who are repeatedly exposed to such images of female traditionalism or "happily ever after" only at the hands of an external male party may not realize the extent of their own abilities of empowerment.

History of American Women's Rights

The objectives of feminism in the United States have changed over time. The main focus of American feminists in the late 1800s and early 1900s was suffrage. After receiving the vote in 1920, women in political office increased in number by 250%. There were still, however, 50 men for every one woman in office (Deutsch, 1994). So-called liberated women did not yet have a defined role to play; they could either try to be like men, or continue to subscribe to a traditional woman's role. Women who were activists were seen as unfulfilled or abnormal (Deutsch, 1994).

After achieving the goal of suffrage, women's activists turned toward other crusades such as equality in the workplace. In the early 1930s, only 11.7% of wives worked. Some states even banned married women from holding jobs (Deutsch, 1994). Women filled clerical jobs to a greater extent, as such positions began to be seen by men as dead-end career paths. The mass media did not generally feature working wives or mothers in the 1920s; single working women, however, were glamorized. Then, as the Depression took hold in America, the media began to vilify all working women. They were seen as stealing jobs from men who needed to support their families. One historian

notes, "Public officials…[called] them 'undeserving parasites.' Several cities ordered the dismissal of wives whose husbands earned what they defined as 'living wages'" (Deutsch, 1994, p. 91). Women were still expected to defer to the wishes of husbands and male authority figures and remain nonthreatening, especially in the world of work.

By 1940, more married women (15.6%) worked outside the home. This was in part due to Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal policies and the feminist activism of his wife, Eleanor. Roosevelt appointed a number of women to government positions and promoted policies that attracted and retained college women (Deutsch, 1994).

Despite gains in employment, many New Deal policies were discriminatory to women. Women were generally hired in domestic arenas and were viewed as temporary employees who were helping their husbands during this time of economic disaster. When good times returned, it was assumed that women would leave the workforce. Roosevelt's Works Progress Administration (WPA) had policies that "mandated that job preference be given to male family heads, or if none existed, to adult male children in the household" (Deutsch, 1994, p. 113). Some women resisted these policies, but at the time, the nation's general idealized home life included a gainfully employed husband and a wife who was a happy homemaker. In 1939, 90% of men (and most women) believed that women should not work after they married (May, 1994).

In the early 1940s, the Great Depression began to wane because of the United States' involvement in World War II. At this time, women's roles were once again questioned. In 1943, the government began recruiting women to fill jobs vacated by men serving overseas. Working outside the home was no longer a stigma because it was a woman's patriotic duty to support the war effort. The military took great care to "present

the image of the female recruit as very ‘feminine’ and domestically inclined. Every effort was made to dispel prevailing notions that military work would make women ‘masculine’ or ruin their moral character” (May, 1994, p. 42). These jobs, however, were still seen as temporary positions for women that would be vacated when the men returned home from the war. Nevertheless, by the end of the war, 25% of married women continued to work outside the home, albeit for low pay (May, 1994).

Many women who worked in nontraditional fields during the war did indeed give up their jobs and return to the home at war’s end. During the war, unions had not adopted women’s concerns, and there was not a united feminist effort to support working women’s rights. As a result, “gender division of labor survived the war” (May, 1994, p. 36). After the war was over, the general attitude of the country was one of admiration for traditional family values. It was assumed that most women would marry and have children. Women who worked usually did so for extra spending money and viewed their employment as a hobby, not a career. With the return of financial prosperity in the United States, there were “proportionately fewer women in professions than there had been in 1930” (May, 1994, p. 58).

In the 1950s, many women attended college, but few graduated. Ladies were expected to end their educational pursuits as soon as they married. If women did finish college and begin work, only to end their careers later when they married, many became “frustrated and bored because their desire for intellectual and creative work, which had been sparked in college, was unfulfilled” (May, 1994, p. 66). As a result, many women believed that college should prepare them to be homemakers, since they were unlikely to use other skills after graduation. Institutions of higher education changed their

curriculums to offer classes and degrees in areas such as home economics (May, 1994), and women were steered toward these programs.

A new era began in the 1960s. According to Chafe (1994), this fresh generation of women began focusing on women's rights because of three reasons: a general rebellion against social norms, the civil rights movement, and a fight against poverty, which disproportionately affected women. Chafe states,

> Daughters of women who had taken jobs in the aftermath of World War II were more likely to see themselves as playing a variety of roles in the world and as having a definition of marriage and family in which the husband and wife were equal partners. (1994, p. 73)

In 1963, Betty Friedan authored a groundbreaking book, *The Feminine Mystique*. The book was partially credited for bringing women's issues to the forefront of politics. Friedan defined her title phrase as follows:

> The feminine mystique says that the highest value and the only commitment for women is the fulfillment of their own femininity...The mistake, says the mystique, the root of women's troubles in the past, is that women envied men, women tried to be like men, instead of accepting their own nature, which can find fulfillment only in…passivity, male domination, and nurturing maternal love...The new mystique makes the housewife-mothers, who never had a chance to be anything else, the model for all women; it presupposes that history has reached a final and glorious end in the here and now, as far as women are concerned. (1963, p. 43)

The Equal Pay Act, which stated that men and women should receive the same compensation for the same job, was passed in 1963. Women adopted principles of the 14th Amendment to the Constitution, which guaranteed everyone equal protection under the law. Women's activists "believed that this clause could serve as a basis for freeing women citizens from discriminatory treatment—much in the same way that black civil rights advocates had used it" (Chafe, 1994, p. 27).

Women began to gather annually at the White House as members of state commissions that were formed to assess women's progress. This led to the formation of the National Organization for Women (NOW) in 1966 by Betty Friedan (Chafe, 1994). NOW used the courts, the media, and elected officials to focus on an "equal partnership of the sexes in job opportunities, education, household responsibilities, and government" (Chafe, 1994, p. 51).

According to Chafe (1994), before 1962, women had different roles than men solely because of their gender. They cleaned the house, took care of the kids, cooked the meals, and deferred to the opinions of the males in their lives. If a woman worked outside the home, she was "limited to certain kinds of jobs, ordinarily segregated by sex, which paid lower wages and had fewer opportunities for promotion than those held by men" (p. 44). As women became aware of their second-class status in the 1960s, they began meeting in consciousness-raising groups to discuss their struggle for equal rights. Women began to see that their problems were part of a larger movement, not just something that they experienced personally.

Chafe (1994) identified three major camps of feminists. The first, liberal feminists, focused on individual rights in the context of current social structures. Next

were radical feminists, who focused on group advancement and activities. They wanted to be independent from men and celebrate the overall class of women. Finally there were socialist feminists, who believed that the system of capitalism was the primary vehicle used to oppress women. Others, such as Christina Hoff Sommers (London, 1995), defined the movement in terms of dual camps: Gender Feminism, in which women see themselves as victims, trapped by narrow roles, or Equity Feminism, in which women view themselves as worthy of choices, respect, and honor in ways that may be similar to or different than the experiences of men.

Feminism had gained a foothold by the 1970s. Women got married and had children later, laws were passed that directly addressed gender discrimination, and "at least some men became more aware of how language and etiquette reflected sexist assumptions" (Chafe, 1994, p. 87). Before 1970, women represented only 5% to 8% of medical, law, business, and engineering school applicants. In the 1970s, women sought traditional female occupations less frequently and showed a 500% increase in applications to non-traditional school programs, such as medicine and law (Chafe, 1994). During this decade, some government and private organizations instituted affirmative action practices designed to hire more women and minorities. For example, AT&T began hiring female telephone repairpersons (Chafe, 1994). Hollywood stars recorded an album called *Free to Be You and Me*; its songs depicted children engaging in non-traditional activities. Dr. Spock, the child-rearing expert, began advocating less stereotypical treatment of boys and girls (Chafe, 1994).

A woman of the 1980s or 1990s could have a very different experience than a woman of the 1950s or 1960s. She might go to graduate school, take a high-paying job

alongside men, and marry a husband later in life from a compatible background. If she had children, she might use childcare and continue to work (Chafe, 1994). Indeed, the all-time highest peak of women in the workplace occurred in 1999, when 60% of women were in the labor force (U.S. Department of Labor, 2009).

By the year 2008, 71% of American women with children under the age of 18 worked outside the home (National Women's Law Center, 2008). Women comprised 51% of management and professional jobs in 2008, which was more than their share of total employment (47%). In 2010, 37% of women (and 35% of men) in the workforce had college degrees (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011), up from 11% in 1970. In fact, young women were 6% more likely to attend college than young men in 2008. In 1970, only 66% of women graduated from high school; in 2008, the figure was 93% (U.S. Department of Labor, 2009). Females now outnumber males in the number of graduate degrees earned (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011; Vickers, 2006).

It seems, however, that some industries are still seen as "women's work." In education and health services, leisure and hospitality, and financial occupations, women constituted more than half of 2008's workers. Similarly, women were underrepresented in the following industries: mining, construction, agriculture, transportation, utilities, and manufacturing (U.S. Department of Labor, 2009). The wage gap between men and women is well-documented and continues to persist. Since women bear the primary responsibility for childbearing and maternity leave, it is not surprising that their earnings potential suffers; childless women, however, still experience a significant gap in earnings compared to men (Sigle-Rushton & Waldfogel, 2007). In fact, only one year out of college, women earn 80% of their male counterparts' salaries; 10 years later, the gap

widens to 69%, even after controlling for variables such as childbearing, hours worked, and choice of occupation (Dey & Hill, 2007). Randolph (2011) provided similar wage gap estimates: women were paid 64% of what males earned for similar jobs in 2000; that number increased overall to 78.2% in 2010. While American women have made great gains in some areas, stereotypes and underrepresentation still remain in other facets of life.

Current events that show lingering sexism against women include a massive lawsuit against drug maker Novartis. A jury awarded punitive damages due to discrimination against females in the areas of pay, promotions, and maternity leave policies (Bray, 2010). A female champion golfer was denied playing at a public municipal golf course in Massachusetts due to her gender; she sued and won the right to play (Chambers, 2010). Women filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) after being subjected to sexual harassment at the United States Mint in Denver (Searcey, 2009). Wal-Mart faced a 1.5 million member class action lawsuit over charges that it paid women less and promoted them less often than men (Greenwald, 2007). Wal-Mart was aware of its shortcomings; consultants warned the company of potential bias against women six years before the landmark lawsuit was filed (Greenhouse, 2010). As of this writing, the Supreme Court had blocked the plaintiffs from forming together as a class and ruled that the women would have to sue separately (Savage, 2011). After the Supreme Court ruling, Wal-Mart announced a plan to source inventory from more woman-owned businesses, promote gender diversity, and steer philanthropic efforts toward women's concerns ("Wal-Mart Launches Global," 2011).

The incongruence of the experiences of female and male politicians was very evident in the 2008 presidential election. Between Hillary Clinton's bid to become the Democratic candidate for president and Sarah Palin's appointment as John McCain's vice presidential running mate, the media launched a feeding frenzy regarding the two women's appearances, dress, hairstyles, and femininity (or supposed lack thereof). Carlin and Winfrey (2009) suggested that women politicians were portrayed only in the roles of sex objects, mothers, pets, or iron maidens, and that the media frequently referred to female politicians by their first names (e.g., *Hillary* and *Sarah* instead of *Senator Clinton* or *Governor Palin*), thus reducing their credibility. (The authors noted that men were usually called by their last names or *Mister*.)

Palin and Clinton received a great deal of coverage on their personalities, families, and appearances, but less coverage than the male candidates on their stances on specific issues (Carlin & Winfrey, 2009). Palin received notorious commentary regarding her perceived sexiness; doctored photos of her holding a gun while wearing a bikini surfaced on the Internet, as well as lookalike pornographic blowup dolls available for purchase. Heflick and Goldenberg (2009) found evidence that people who focused on Palin's appearance were less likely to vote for the McCain/Palin ticket in the 2008 general election. They proposed that the media's focus on Palin's sexuality led the public to see her as robotic and incompetent. Joe Biden, Barack Obama's running mate, quipped, "There is a gigantic difference between…me and my Vice-Presidential opponent. She's good-looking" (Heflick & Goldenberg, 2009, p. 598). Meanwhile, Clinton was mocked for her hairstyles, choice of pantsuits, and the fact that she was seen crying in a diner. She was likened to a *Fatal Attraction*-type stalker, and her political

successes were implied to be a result of her husband's unfaithfulness (Carlin & Winfrey, 2009).

Why does this matter, and what does it have to do with gender issues in children's books? Assessment of women in the world of work, their roles in the home, and their place in society and politics comes from deep-seated notions that a person holds about gender and power. People's beliefs derive from society as a whole, their parents, their friends and acquaintances, and their internal reconciliations with what they perceive to be true (Bandura & Bussey, 2004). Beliefs do not spring out of thin air—they are the steady, cumulative result of exposure to various thoughts and experiences over time. It is important that children receive positive and realistic messages in books from an early age in order to provide an egalitarian base for future incoming stimuli (Trepanier-Street & Romatowski, 1999).

Review of the Literature

Researchers have focused on a variety of angles when conducting empirical studies about gender issues in children's literature. This review of the literature examines stereotypes and female underrepresentation in the broader scholarly literature; the historical progression of such studies; the different traits and angles by which various studies have approached the topic; ways to remedy stereotypes against girls; and a discussion of the methods that various authors have used in their studies.

Stereotypes and Female Underrepresentation in the Broader Scholarly Literature

In addition to bias in children's picture books, a host of researchers have examined other areas in education in which sexism may appear. One such area is textbooks. Bazier and Simonis (1991) studied high school chemistry textbooks. They

found that gender representation in the books' pictures was unbalanced; the authors encouraged chemistry teachers to review carefully potential textbooks in order to promote gender equity. Lerner and Nagai (1991) examined history textbooks for differing treatment by gender. They found that men were mentioned seven times more often than women in history textbooks, but that when women were mentioned, it was usually in a favorable light. Hawkins (2007) studied high school chorus textbooks and found that the included songs were more frequently about males than females; women and minority groups were discussed less often in the pages; and songs about males were more likely to celebrate stereotypical masculine traits. Blumberg (2008) examined textbooks from all over the world and concluded that gender stereotypes and female underrepresentation are still rampant. Although overall sexism has declined in textbooks, it is decreasing at a very slow rate. One country noted for its lack of sexism in textbooks was Sweden. Clark, Ayton, Frechette, and Keller (2005) studied history textbooks from the 1960s, 1980s, and 1990s. Women received less page space than men during all three decades, but underrepresentation lessened with each subsequent decade. In Neutze's (2008) analysis of science trade books, males outnumbered females 1.5:1 in total illustrations and 2:1 as main characters.

Other studies have examined sexism and underrepresentation in various forms of literature and media that young persons may encounter. Fitzpatrick and McPherson (2010) examined children's coloring books and found rampant gender stereotypes. Henneberg (2010) looked at various classic children's books and found that mothers and grandmothers were often absent or "killed off." If present, they were often depicted in stereotypical terms, especially the grandmothers. Zittleman and Sadker (2003) evaluated

teacher education textbooks, which are designed to instruct future educators about children. They found that many books did not mention gender at all, and several made blanket statements about the strengths, weaknesses, and differences between boys and girls. Contributions of historical female educators were given much less page space than those of male educators. Science and math teacher education materials rarely mentioned the contributions of female scientists and mathematicians.

Amare (2007) studied online grammar guides used by students and teacher trainees. She found that male references were used three times more often in example grammatical sentences than female references. Example grammatical sentences about both women and men tended to reflect traditional gender traits. Grammar guides were more likely to use "he" as opposed to "she" when referring to a theoretical person (e.g., "Everyone should take control of his own destiny"), but such instances have decreased in recent years. Brabant and Mooney (1997) compared the roles of women in the Sunday comic strips in 1994 to women in the strips in 1974. Men were still featured more than women; women were still depicted in primarily traditional roles, such as homemaking and passive activities; and fewer women than men had careers. Women were still likely to be pictured wearing aprons and taking care of children. In 1994, however, more women were depicted in careers than in 1974, and more women were drawn pursuing intellectual activities, such as reading.

Another area in which researchers have studied gender stereotypes is in award-winning books written for older children. The major medal in this category for American children's literature is the Newbery Award. It is given for the "most distinguished contribution to American literature for children published by an American publisher in

the United States in English" (American Library Association, 2010, para. 1). The studies undertaken on sexism in Newbery books exhibit similar trends as the Caldecott book studies. Earlier Newberys were more sexist and stereotypical, and later Newbery winners showed a greater commitment to a more equal representation of gender, with some exceptions. Powell, Gillespie, Swearingen, and Clements (1993) examined the Newbery winners from 1922-1992 for evidence of sexism. They found that the books became more progressive over time; that is, showcasing non-traditional male and female characters, especially in the 1970s and 1980s. The breakdown of gender representations, however, showed a dominance of male characters in every decade except the 1970s. Kinman and Henderson (1985) similarly concluded that the Newbery books of the 1970s and 1980s were primarily non-sexist. Agee (1993) examined *Caddie Woodlawn* and *Jacob Have I Loved*, the respective 1930 and 1985 Newbery winners. She noted that although both books portrayed non-stereotypical roles for girls as children, the protagonists relapsed into stereotypical roles when they became adult women. Boster (2005) examined Newbery winners from 1995-2004 and found that adult males were more likely to be portrayed in stereotypical career roles than females. In Nisse's (2008) content analysis of Newbery winners, females were as likely as males to be a story's protagonist in books published since 1980; main supporting characters, however, continued to be dominated by boys and men.

Current State of Stereotypes and Female Underrepresentation in Picture Books

The seminal study on the topic of gender stereotypes in children's literature was completed by Weitzman et al. (1972). The authors studied the Caldecott Medal and Honor books from 1938 to 1970. They also examined a cross-section of Newbery

winners, Little Golden books, and children's etiquette books. The authors found that "females were underrepresented in the titles, central roles, pictures, and stories of every sample of books" (p. 1128) they examined. Even girls and women portrayed as successful in the books were only so because they adhered to stereotypical female roles.

Other studies have investigated similar matters of female underrepresentation and gender stereotypes. Barnett (1986) performed content analysis on over 1,500 children's picture books and found that illustrations of boys greatly outnumbered illustrations of girls. Heintz (1987) studied 14 Caldecott medal-winning books from 1971 through 1984 in an attempt to update the Weitzman et al. (1972) study. She found that males were pictured twice as often as females in illustrations. McDonald (1989) studied 41 children's picture books (half were Caldecott winners; the other half were a random sample pulled from library shelves) published between 1976 and 1987 to assess the helping behavior of characters, the distribution of male and female characters, and the propensity of males and females to be assigned to traditional roles. Sixty percent of illustrations featured males, and 68% of primary characters were male, although the male/female ratios were much more equal for secondary characters.

Allen, Allen, and Sigler (1993) examined 13 Caldecott Medal and Honor books from 1938 to 1940 and nine Caldecott Medal and Honor books from 1986-1988 in homage to the Caldecott Medal's 50th anniversary. The authors found that female and neutered illustrations, characters, and verbal references in the books increased in the 1986-1988 period; however, males still outnumbered females in all categories of representation.

Patt and McBride (1993) observed 52 preschool story times and scrutinized the books that the teachers selected for out-loud reading. In the books chosen by the educators, male characters were twice as prevalent as females, and masculine pronouns were used three times as often as feminine pronouns. The readers did not generally take gender-biased language or representations into account when choosing books to read aloud to preschoolers. Similarly, Narahara (1998) randomly studied 20 books that four kindergarten teachers chose to read aloud to their classes. While the number of female book authors was greater than male book authors, male characters outnumbered female characters significantly in central roles and somewhat in secondary roles. Illustrations of males were twice as likely as illustrations of females. Both studies issued a call to awareness to early childhood educators regarding the books they select to read aloud to their students.

Oskamp et al. (1996) analyzed the Caldecott Medal and Honor books from 1986-1991 to look for gender stereotypes and underrepresentation of female characters. The authors found that male and female character representation had stabilized when illustrations were of human males and females. However, in books that utilized personified nonhumans (such as talking pigs or cows), there was a very significant difference in the greater number of male characters and illustrations. McCabe et al. (2011) found similar significant male gender disparity among anthropomorphized characters in a study of almost 6,000 books published between the years 1900-2000.

Turner-Bowker (1996) examined 30 Caldecott Medal and Honor books from 1984-1994. She found that males were represented more in book titles and illustrations, but the number of central female and male characters was equal. Gooden and Gooden

(2001) studied gender bias in 83 American Library Association 1994-1999 Notable Books for Children. They found that females were about as likely to be the main characters in the stories as males, and that gender neutral characters had increased since previous studies. In their 2004 study, Diekman and Murnen noted that many books did not include girls or women at all, even in a stereotypical fashion.

Hamilton et al. (2006) attempted to update the Allen et al. (1993) research. Hamilton et al. (2006) examined 30 Caldecott book winners and also critiqued 170 bestselling children's picture books from 1995-2001. The study found that males still significantly outnumbered females in book titles, as main characters, and in pictorial representations. Male authors were more likely to write about male characters, but female authors wrote about characters of both genders. The study also found that the Caldecott books were more likely to underrepresent females than the non-award-winning books. Ly Kok and Findlay (2006) looked at 25 Australian Picture Books of the Year from 1974-1978 and 2001-2003. They found that overrepresentation of males from the 1970s to the 2000s had markedly stabilized, with no significant difference between male and female representations in the 2000s. Mills, Pankake, and Schall (2010) analyzed favorite "Children's Choice" book award winners. Of the 94 titles, only 23 featured women/girls in central roles, but these females were usually depicted in a non-stereotypical manner.

Career options and division of labor. Weitzman et al. (1972) found that none of the adult women pictured in the children's books in their study had an occupation outside the home. Heintz (1987) discovered that males were three times as likely to have an occupation as females (an increase from the Weitzman et al. study, but certainly not

approaching equality), and they had three times as varied occupations as the females. McDonald (1989) observed that males were shown in a much wider variety of roles than women, and almost 90% of the roles for either gender were stereotyped. Allan et al. (1993) found that men had a wider variety of occupations and were less stereotyped in their occupations than females. In fact, 100% of the female occupations depicted in the books authored between 1986-1988 included traditional female stereotypes.

Gooden and Gooden (2001) noted that men were significantly more likely to be pictured alone than women. Male adults were described as being in almost twice as many occupational roles as females. The authors noted that although many of the female roles were still traditional, a few non-traditional roles, such as doctor and chef, had crept into the picture. Most adult males were not observed doing housework or childrearing activities, although a few male children performed non-stereotypical activities, such as doing the laundry. Hamilton et al. (2006) found that males were much more likely to be shown as having an occupation, and of the females with an occupation, only two were presented in non-stereotypical jobs, whereas males had a much broader spectrum of occupations.

Diekman and Murnen (2004) coded 20 children's books that had been identified in previous studies as either "sexist" or "non-sexist." They examined the characters in regard to personality characteristics, social roles, status, gender segregation, the traditional female ideal, and unequal representation. They argued that recent children's books were less sexist in the sense that they portrayed more women in non-traditional roles or as primary characters, but they have not portrayed men in non-traditional roles, such as nurturers or secretaries. The authors stated that it is often perceived as acceptable

for girls to show masculine traits but not for boys to show feminine traits. Some books indirectly promoted stereotypes by endorsing benevolent sexism; that is, a woman was portrayed in a very positive light as a caring mother, excellent secretary, or loving wife. Diekman and Murnen (2004) noted that even though well-meaning, such depictions still reinforce traditional gender concepts. Sexist books were more likely to portray traditional female roles, but both sexist and non-sexist books showed similar levels of traditional female leisure activities and chores. Sexist books were more likely to portray men in higher status positions and to have more male characters. Sexist books were also more likely to endorse the traditional feminine ideal.

Aggressive and nurturing behavior. Weitzman et al. (1972) asserted that girls who wished to behave in ways that were not "passive" or "nice" were seen as tomboys or too masculine, and thus did not have a defined role to assume. Anderson and Hamilton (2005) studied 200 award-winning and bestselling picture books from 1995-2001 to assess the role of the father in children's literature. Mothers were 50% more likely to be present in books than fathers. They were twice as likely (and in the case of infants, 10 times as likely) to be depicted nurturing their children. Hamilton et al. (2006) also found that females were more likely to be nurturing. Both Oskamp et al. (1996) and Williams et al. (1987) established that females were more likely than males to exhibit nurturing behavior in books from the first half of the 1980s; the study did not reveal, however, any significant difference in the aggression of boys or girls.

Active and passive behavior. Heintz's (1987) study of Caldecott winners from the 1970s and 1980s noted that male characters outnumbered females in every activity, whether passive or active, although males were almost twice as likely to be depicted in

active roles as females. As compared to earlier studies, females were still shown as less adventurous than males, but not as often, and females were generally depicted as more clever and assertive than in earlier Caldecott books. Every single illustration of a female in this study's sample, however, depicted a young lady wearing a dress. Allan et al. (1993) found that males were shown as more active than females. Oskamp et al. (1996) demonstrated that 14 of 19 "typical" gender traits in their study were not noted as being unique to one gender or another (such as exhibiting aggression, performing service to others, or being persistent); however, four traits—dependency and submission (females), and independence and creativity (males)—were significantly depicted along traditional gender lines. Turner-Bowker (1996) established that males were more likely to be described as active and masculine, but females received more overall positive adjective descriptors. Hamilton et al. (2006) found that neither sex was portrayed overall as being more active or passive.

Indoor and outdoor locations. Allan et al. (1993) noted that males were more likely to be pictured in outdoor locations than females. Oskamp et al. (1996) detected no differences between girls and boys as shown in indoor or outdoor locations. Hamilton et al. (2006) stated that females were more likely to be depicted indoors than males.

Rescuing and helping behavior. Barnett (1986) posited that boys were more likely to be shown in helpful roles and that they were also more likely to be the recipients of help. This was consistent with other studies' findings that boys are more represented than girls in books in general. McDonald (1989) similarly observed that males were more likely to help others and receive help than females. Oskamp et al. (1996) discovered that females were significantly more likely to help other characters in books

from the early 1980s, but there was no significant difference in the helping behavior of either sex in books from the latter part of the decade. There was no significant difference in rescuing behavior in any part of the decade for either sex. Williams et al. (1987) similarly reported more helpful behavior from females and no significant difference in rescuing behavior between the sexes from early 1980s picture books.

Emotions. Tepper and Cassidy (1999) assessed the level and types of emotion exhibited by females and males in picture books. The authors wanted to know if girls exhibited more "traditional" emotions such as fear, shyness, and being in love, and if the boys were more likely to display feelings like anger, disgust, and contempt. They analyzed almost 200 books that had been read in the past two weeks by approximately 40 3- to 6-year olds. They established that boys were much more likely to show emotions in general than girls; this was not surprising, given that they also found that females were underrepresented in titles, character roles, and pictures. The researchers, however, found no significant differences in the frequency of anger words, fear words, or love words spoken by female and male characters.

Anderson and Hamilton (2005) observed that mothers were more likely to express emotion than fathers, including negative emotions, such as yelling at their children. Turner-Bowker (1996) theorized that girls may be described more positively when fulfilling traditional or stereotyped roles in books. Females were more likely to be described as *frightened*, *beautiful*, or *good*, whereas boys were more likely to be described by adjectives such as *big*, *hungry*, or *horrible*. Ly Kok and Findlay (2006) noted that while males and females frequently displayed stereotypical emotions in books

from the 1970s, there was no statistically significant difference between the types and frequency of emotions displayed between males and females in books from the 2000s.

Discussion of Methods in Various Articles

Following is a critical discussion of some of the methods employed by various study authors. Barnett (1986) recruited 18 female undergraduate students to examine the books in his study. Perhaps his status as their professor and the raters' gender could have influenced the outcomes of the study. Similarly, Turner-Bowker (1996) used 18 undergraduate coders to analyze the books in her study. She provided a description of their training procedures to insure inter-rater reliability. McDonald (1989) coded 85% of the books in his study, and a colleague coded the others. The researcher did not explain the discrepancy in each coder's workload. Patt and McBride (1993) noted that their research effort was an exploratory study, which justified their use of a convenience sample at an onsite university childcare center. Gooden and Gooden (2001) justified their use of a previously created coding sheet to examine the books in their study. They provided an excellent description of the ways they dealt with discrepancies in the course of the books' content analysis. Hamilton et al. (2006) described the ways in which they refined their coding instrument through peer review and provided a detailed account of the factors used for the books' content analysis, which drew upon numerous prior studies.

Strategies to Address Stereotypes and Underrepresentation

Kacerguis and Adams (1979) presented evidence that exposure to sex-typed toys and visual renderings, such as books and toy catalogs, can shape a child's future vocational aspirations. Young children engage in pretend play, much of which reflects their idealized career choice. If girls always see pictures of adult women in traditional

roles, then they may not have alternate frames of reference for pretend play. Ashton (1983) showed that children who were exposed to stereotypical stories tended to act more stereotypical in their play.

Kortenhaus and Demarest (1993) noted that cultures pass values through storytelling and children's books. If books only feature women in stereotyped roles, that makes a statement about a culture. Barnett (1986) noted that sex typing may lead to "narrow and potentially ineffectual interpersonal problem-solving styles" (p. 344). Knell and Winer (1979) presented research that showed children increased their stereotyped attitudes after being exposed to stereotypes in children's stories.

Men and boys appear to be as rigidly stereotyped as females, sometimes even more so, in children's picture books. Massad (1981) reported that girls receive high peer approval when they demonstrate both feminine and masculine behaviors, but that boys generally only receive approval for masculine behaviors. Schuette and Killen (2009) noted that as children age, some of their thinking becomes more stereotyped. Adolescents pigeonhole "acceptable" men's roles more so than "acceptable" women's roles. Boys are more likely than girls to view family roles along stereotypical lines. Perhaps this is a reflection of how children are socialized and reared. Coltrane (2000) reviewed over 200 studies on gender and household chores. He found that parents ask younger children to perform less stereotyped chores but as children age, parents tend to assign them more stereotyped chores, such as boys taking out the trash and girls cooking dinner.

The manner in which parents interact with their children can encourage or discourage gender-fair beliefs. According to Bandura and Bussey (2004), parents

reinforce gender stereotypes for their children by structuring the physical environment differently and reacting differently to gender-typed activities based on the child's sex. Tenenbaum (2008) found that parents, regardless of gender, tended to make more discouraging remarks to their daughters about high school course selections than to their sons. Daughters were steered away from science classes and toward math or language arts classes, and boys were guided away from foreign language classes and toward math and science credits. Simpkins, Davis-Keen, and Eccles (2005) reported that mothers were more likely to encourage their sons in computer, math, and science activities. If fathers held stereotypical views about science and math capabilities, girls' interest in those subjects decreased ("Dads Can Influence," 2007). Muchnik and Stavans (2009) observed mothers and fathers providing commentary to their children about the same wordless picture book and discovered that the "parents' narratives differed when directed to boys or girls, and a stereotyped view was clearly underlying this behavior" (p. 60).

Publishers and authors make choices (perhaps unconsciously) about the gender fairness of the books they produce and write. Fox (1993) asked a group of undergraduate students to write a children's story. Practically the whole class featured a little boy as the hero of the story, without stopping to contemplate their choice for a main character. Taxel (2002) noted that children's book publishers are usually interested in what will sell—generally books that perpetuate the status quo.

Books may have hidden or overt agendas, messages, and meanings. According to Kellner and Share (2005), "Critical media literacy involves cultivating skills in analyzing media codes and conventions, abilities to criticize stereotypes, dominant values, and ideologies, and competencies to interpret the multiple meanings and messages generated

by media texts" (p. 372) and that "media culture is a form of pedagogy that teaches proper and improper behavior, gender roles, values, and knowledge of the world" (pp. 371-372). The authors state that image "representations benefit dominant and positively represented groups and disadvantage marginalized and subordinate ones" (p. 370). One tenet of critical media literacy is that all media has embedded points of view and values that flow from the authors and creators. The second tenet, similar to Taxel's (2002) viewpoint, is that media are organized to gain profit and/or power, which may not align with the goals of fairness and equality.

The flip side of the coin, however, is brighter. If young girls see female adult role models in a variety of professions, then they can imagine that they, too, can seek those professions (O'Bryant & Corder-Bolz, 1978). Exposure to egalitarian literature and other forms of media decreases stereotypical thinking among children and increases children's potential vocational choices (Ashby & Wittmaier, 1978; O'Bryant & Corder-Bolz, 1978; Trepanier-Street & Romatowski, 1999). Scott (1986) showed that children, adolescents, and youth decreased their stereotypic attitudes after listening to gender-equitable stories. Berg-Cross and Berg-Cross (1978) noted that preschoolers can change their stereotyped attitudes after listening to stories, and older children can change their attitudes as well, but they need both to hear and discuss the stories.

Organizations exist to help parents and teachers locate gender-fair books. The Amelia Bloomer project is an offshoot of the American Library Association's Social Responsibility Round Table. Each year, taskforce members select a bibliography that "highlight[s] feminist books examining women's history, those that celebrate women who have blazed trails, and those that describe problems and identify solutions for

situations we face today" (Amelia Bloomer Project, 2010, para. 5). It is the hope of the committee that girls and women of all ages will be empowered by exposure to positive feminist literature.

Summary

This chapter drew upon a large body of literature on the nature of stereotypes and female underrepresentation in children's picture books, as well as other forms of media. Additionally, the chapter outlined the search process undertaken while reviewing the literature and also referenced both theoretical and research-based studies about the topic at hand. A history of the women's rights movement since the early 20th century was discussed, and critical examinations of some of the studies under review and their methodologies were undertaken. It is known that gender stereotypes and female underrepresentation were common prior to and including the 1960s, lessened during the 1970s and 1980s, and surfaced again in the 1990s and 2000s (Hamilton et al., 2006; Kinman & Henderson, 1985; Powell et al., 1993). This dissertation examined the state of gender stereotypes and female underrepresentation in the first decade of the 21st century. Following is chapter three, which explains the methodology of the current study.

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This study was a quantitative dissertation that utilized content analysis. It did not seek to manipulate variables or prove causation. It updated a study by Hamilton et al. (2006), in which quantitative content analysis was performed on children's picture books published during the period 1995-2001. The researcher contacted Dr. Mykol Hamilton and Dr. David Anderson, both of whom are professors at Centre College in Danville, Kentucky, to ask permission to update their research study. They generously provided several resources to use for the current study. This dissertation sought to examine whether gender stereotypes and female underrepresentation had changed since the Hamilton et al. (2006) study. This chapter describes the quantitative research perspective, the use of content analysis, the participants and their training, the procedures for data collection, and the data analysis methods.

Book Choice

The sample included all 48 bestselling children's picture books (e.g., those on the 2010 *New York Times* bestseller list) published in 2010 and three 2011 Caldecott Medal and Honor books (also published in 2010), for a total sample of 51 books. The researcher used comprehensive sampling to select the bestselling books. Comprehensive sampling, as defined by Ary, Jacobs, and Sorensen (2010), occurs when "every unit is included in the sample" (p. 429). The *New York Times* list includes the bestselling children's picture books for any given time period. For the purposes of this study, only picture books aimed at children ages 3 through 6 (preschool through 1st grade) were examined. The

researcher located the picture books that were published in 2010 and landed on the bestseller list during that year. There were 48 unique bestselling books published in 2010 for children ages 3 through 6 in the picture book category (*New York Times*, 2010). It was important to limit the study to bestselling books that were published in the past year. Many bestsellers are older, such as the Dr. Seuss books (written in the 1950s-1980s). In order to avoid skewing the data and to reflect solely the attitudes of authors who have published in the past year, such outliers were not considered for this study. The researcher also excluded three bestselling books from 2010 that were not primarily for children ages 3 through 6 (see Appendix A, *2010 New York Times Bestselling Children's Picture Books*). The researcher utilized comprehensive sampling of all three 2011 Caldecott Medal and Honor books named on the American Library Association's (ALA) website (American Library Association, 2011). Please see Appendix A for a listing of the 51 books under study.

The Hamilton et al. (2006) study surveyed a total of 200 books, but it was much broader in scope and had greater available manpower than the present study—hence the decision to limit the current study to the bestsellers and Caldecotts published only in 2010. Since this study examined bestselling and award-winning picture books, by its very nature, the results cannot be generalized to the entire population of children's books. After all, the great majority of all books published never wins awards or become bestsellers. Most books were procured from elementary school libraries in the researcher's school district by utilizing inter-library loan. Some were checked out from the public library, and the remainder was purchased from a retail outlet.

Instrument

This dissertation utilized the same instrument that Hamilton et al. (2006) used in their study. The instrument is four pages long and asks 110 checklist questions about the characters and text in children's picture books. (Only the first 45 questions were applicable to the present study.) Most responses are in the form of circling yes/no, writing frequency counts, and listing various occupations of both genders (see Appendix B, *Code Sheet*). There was also an annotated code sheet (see Appendix C, *Annotated Code Sheet*) that further explained and clarified checklist items. It spans seven pages and includes succinct explanations and definitions of potentially confusing items. The Hamilton et al. (2006) instrument was derived from numerous prior studies (Ashton, 1978; Barnett, 1986; Clark, Guilmain, Saucier, & Tavarez, 2003; Collins, Ingoldsby, & Dellmann, 1984; Dellman-Jenkins et al., 1993; Dougherty & Engel, 1987; Heintz, 1987; Kinman & Henderson, 1985; Kolbe & LaVoie, 1981; Kortenhaus & Demerest, 1993; McDonald, 1989; Oskamp et al., 1996; Peterson & Lach, 1990; St. Peter, 1979; Tepper & Cassidy, 1999; Turner-Bowker, 1996; Weitzman et. al, 1972; Williams et al., 1987) and combined those studies' coding schemas to produce a comprehensive instrument.

The reliability and validity of the Hamilton et al. (2006) coding schema and data collection survey instrument were established during peer review and revision by a total of five male and female professors and graduate students. It was used in studies in 2005 (Hamilton & Anderson) and 2006 (Hamilton et al.), both of which were published and peer-reviewed. This researcher did not modify their instrument, thus maintaining its credibility.

Hamilton et al. (2006) used Dougherty and Engel's (1987) method of counting the number of gendered illustrations in group scenes. If there were seven or more people in a crowd, the dominant gender was recorded only once. For example, if a scene depicted 14 boys, the scene was counted as one boy illustration. If there were six boys in a scene, however, then six separate boy illustrations were noted. This was so they did not "give as much weight to each depiction of a female or male character in a crowd as [they] did to female or male characters who appeared alone or in a small group" (2006, p. 761); this dissertation followed the same protocol.

Procedures

The researcher requested IRB approval from the Liberty Institutional Review Board. The board determined that the present study did not fall under IRB human subjects guidelines and gave the researcher permission to commence.

The researcher procured six library media specialists—three males and three females, two each from elementary, middle, and high schools—to act as the book raters. The researcher paid every rater $100 after each finished the rating obligations. This did not influence the results of the study because the raters were not research subjects; they were assisting the researcher in order to increase the knowledge base in the field. Given the large amount of work the book raters performed, it was prudent to offer an honorarium for their services.

To solicit the raters, the researcher emailed the Georgia Library Media Listserv. This voluntary informational subscription listserv has over 700 school library media specialist members (C. Dunbar, personal communication, April 4, 2010) from around the state of Georgia; there are approximately 2,360 library media specialists in Georgia (J.

Serritella, personal communication, March 31, 2010). The potential raters learned the basic premise of the study—that is, to rate various children's picture books for certain attributes and frequency counts, and that they would be paid. This did not unduly influence the raters, because the listserv email did not mention that the focus of the study was about gender. That way, if a person was already passionate about sex role issues, s/he would not be predisposed to want to participate in the study. The raters also agreed to meet once in person for training purposes, as described below.

To avoid potential bias, the researcher did not code the books under study. Before meeting in person, each rater was mailed a copy of the instrument, the annotated code sheet that explained how to deal with various discrepancies, and a sample book (not one of the 51 under study). The raters and researcher rated the same practice book, *Tico and the Golden Wings* by Leo Lionni (2007), without any assistance from one another. The researcher chose the practice book because of its use of gender neutral characters.

Later, the raters and researcher met in person for several hours at the public library and compared each other's ratings. In round-robin fashion, the raters revealed their ratings for each category and defended their decisions. When responses differed from the researcher and/or other raters, the researcher would ask the rater to further clarify his/her position. Sometimes the rater was able to sway the other members, but usually the rater would concede that the interpretation of the other members was correct and change his/her own assumptions moving forward. When in doubt, the researcher and raters referred to the annotated code sheet, which addressed the vast majority of discrepancies.

Next, each rater and the researcher rated another book (not included in the 51 under study) at the same time, discussing differences as they encountered them. This book was *Tomas and the Library Lady* by Pat Mora (1997). The researcher chose this practice book because of its depiction of male and female family members. The raters coded this book much more consistently than the first book and had far fewer questions about ambivalent situations.

Finally, the raters and researcher coded a third book without discussion. This book, *Madeline* by Ludwig Bemelmans (1967), was also distinct from the 51 under study. It was chosen because of the way characters were frequently depicted in group scenes. At the end of this process, each person's ratings were compared and discussed. All raters had coded the book similarly with few discrepancies and seemed to understand the process well. The researcher did not calculate formal inter-rater reliability statistics for the practice books; rather, she utilized the method of Hamilton et al. (2006), completing "several iterations of this process… until the readers coded the books consistently" (p. 760). Raters were reminded to reference the annotated code sheet when confronted with an ambiguous situation on their own.

Most of the research analysis was undertaken in the comfort of each book rater's home. Since the study used content analysis, no specific physical data collection site was needed. The researcher randomly assigned 17 books to each rater to be read over four weeks (four to five books per week) by drawing book names out of a hat. Each rater's list was arranged in alphabetical order, and each rater was told to rate the books in order, finishing the current book before moving on to the next book. Each book was analyzed independently by two separate readers, for a total of 102 rating sessions. Raters were

asked to avoid discussing their books with anyone else or looking at the other books out of sequence. The researcher had minimal contact with the raters during the rating process except to answer clarification questions. The raters mailed their code sheets and books back to the researcher using pre-addressed stamped envelopes or inter-office mail. The researcher contacted the raters to ask about confusing items such as unclear handwriting or scratched-out numbers. The researcher then input the information from the code sheets into PASW Statistics 18 GradPack (formerly known as SPSS). Each entered item was double-checked for accuracy. Microsoft Excel software with the MegaStat add-in was also used during analysis.

Research Design

This study was quantitative in nature. By definition, quantitative research stems from a positivist approach and involves "hypothesis testing and objective data gathering to arrive at findings that are systematic…and open to replication by other investigators" (Ary et al., 2010, p. 23). The researcher attempted to find relationships and patterns among variables but did not manipulate them in any way since this dissertation was non-experimental in nature.

Content analysis was the guiding design for this study. This method, as defined by Gall, Gall, and Borg (2007), seeks to interpret the "messages encoded in the communication product" (p. 288). The content analysis process includes selecting a sample of artifacts to study, developing procedures to classify the data, coding the data, and interpreting the results. Put another way, content analysis asks, "What can be learned about this phenomenon by studying certain documents?" (Ary et al., 2010, p. 31). The phenomenon in question is the extent to which gender stereotypes and female

underrepresentation, if any, permeate children's picture books. Content analysis can be quantitative or qualitative; this researcher, by primarily examining frequency counts with pre-determined definitions of items, took a quantitative approach. The books were not examined for overall meaning; they were taken to mean the sum of their parts; that is, if a book had 95% male illustrations, it was primarily about males without further analysis needed.

Data Analysis

As a study replication, this updated examination of bestselling and award-winning children's books used the same analysis methods as Hamilton et al. (2006). Methods of analysis included chi-square and *t*-test calculations using an alpha level of 0.05 and Cohen's Kappa tests and Pearson product moment correlation coefficients for inter-rater reliability. The researcher also used descriptive statistics to liken the results of this study to the results of the Hamilton et al. (2006) study by generally comparing and contrasting means and ratios. Each of these procedures is explained in detail below.

The chi-square goodness of fit test seeks to measure the actual number of observations against the expected number of observations in a group. Chi-square tests for independence assess whether categorical variables are related or independent (McDonald, 2009). Chi-square tests are used with nominal data; that is, categories that are mutually exclusive, such as male/female. Observations must also be independent and measured as frequencies. Two conditions must be met to use a chi-square test: first, counts in each group must be greater than five, and second, numerical values must be compared (National Institute of Standards and Technology, n.d.). This research study generally met both of those criteria; however, the researcher computed five calculations using Fisher's

exact probability adjustment alongside chi-square analysis because some categories had fewer than five counts.

A *t*-test is used when the mean and standard deviation of the population are unknown. An independent samples *t*-test finds the difference of the means of two groups and divides it by the standard error of the difference (Moore, 2000). When comparing the *p*-value of the *t*-test to the alpha statistic, the researcher can tell if her findings are significant. With an alpha of 0.05, the data must "give evidence against H_0 so strong that it would happen no more than 5% of the time…when H_0 is true" (Moore, 2000, p. 327). Statistics regarding possible effect size were not advisable because this study did not utilize a simple random sample of all available children's picture books.

A Cohen's Kappa coefficient "refers to the proportion of consistent classifications observed beyond that expected by chance alone" (Ary et al., 2010, p. 255). It shows how much agreement exists between two administrations of a test that can be attributed to more than chance. Since each book was rated twice, the nominal data was compared via Cohen's Kappa tests for inter-rater reliability purposes. Landis and Koch (1977) suggested that a Kappa coefficient of .61 to .80 constitutes substantial agreement, and a Kappa coefficient of .81 to 1.00 equates to almost perfect agreement. If the two raters' responses differed on a nominal item, Hamilton et al. (2006) excluded the book from analysis for that item; this dissertation did likewise.

Cohen's Kappa tests were performed on 14 nominal variables in this study. Six of them received scores of .61 or higher—Item 8: *Classify Story* (*K* = .91), Item 9: *Gender of Title Characters* (*K* = .79), Item 14: *Does prominent female adult have an occupation*? (*K* = .78), Item 22: *Gender of Main Character #1* (*K* = .91), Item 23: *Age of*

Main Character #1 (*K* = .77), and Item #25: *Is Main Character #1 indoors or outdoors*? (*K* = .63). Eight measures had scores below .61, although some were very close to the cutoff point. Scores varied the most on variables that compared the raters' responses about Main Character #2. This was not surprising, given that the raters sometimes disagreed over whether or not a story actually had a Main Character #2. Measures with low Kappa scores included Item 15: *Is prominent female adult's occupation traditional*? (*K* = .60), Item 16: *Does prominent male adult have an occupation*? (*K* = .60), Item 17: *Is prominent adult male's occupation traditional*? (*K* = .42), Item 24: *Is Main Character #1 active*? (*K* = .58), Item 34: *Gender of Main Character #2* (*K* = .35), Item 35: *Age of Main Character #2* (*K* = .34), Item 36: *Is Main Character #2 active*? (*K* = .33), and Item 37: *Is Main Character #2 indoors or outdoors*? (*K* = .32).

A Pearson product moment correlation coefficient "indicates both the direction and the magnitude of the relationship between two variables" (Ary et al., 2010, p. 129). Since each book was rated twice, each coder's value was compared against the other for inter-rater reliability. The Pearson coefficient (*r*) indicated whether both raters counted similar numbers of frequency identifiers, such as the total number of female illustrations in a book. Hamilton et al. (2006) identified an acceptable *r* value as .70 or higher and personally analyzed any counts that had an unacceptable *r* value where the raters differed from each other by 10% or less. In those cases, the differing values were averaged. If the values differed by more than 10%, the book was not included in the calculations for that item. This study followed the same approach.

Pearson coefficients were calculated for 18 interval variables in this study. Six of them received scores of .70 or higher—Item 11: *Count of female adults* (*r* = .86), Item

13: *Count of male adults* (*r* = .91), Items 18/20: Co*unt of female pictures, including "gut feelings"* (*r* = .85), Item 26: *Main Character 1 rescues* (*r* = .73), Item 30: *Main Character 1 is fearful* (*r* = .78), and Item 45: *Main Character 2 is assertive* (*r* = .79). Twelve measures scored below .70, although some were quite close to the acceptable cutoff. Similar to the Cohen's Kappa statistic, scores varied the most on variables that compared the raters' responses about Main Character #2. Measures with an unacceptable Pearson coefficient included Item 10: *Count of female children* (*r* = .28), Item 12: *Count of male children* (*r* = .18), Items 19/21: *Count of male pictures, including "gut feelings"* (*r* = .65), Item 27: *Main Character 1 is rescued* (*r* = .50), Item 31: *Main Character 1 is brave* (*r* = .24), Item 32: *Main Character 1 is nurturing* (*r* = .57), Item 33: *Main Character 1 is assertive* (*r* = .39), Item 38: *Main Character 2 rescues* (*r* = .30), Item 39: *Main Character 2 is rescued* (*r* = .06), Item 42: *Main Character 2 is fearful* (*r* = .69), *Item 43: Main Character 2 is brave* (*r* = .41), and Item 44: *Main Character 2 is nurturing* (*r* = .17).

Hamilton et al. (2006) did not use tests of significance to compare the results of their study to the results of prior studies. Since each study used slightly different methods, they did not feel that such tests would be accurate. They stated, "Analyses of changes in representation and portrayals of the sexes since the 1980s were based on non-statistical comparisons of our percentages and ratios to data from earlier studies, a method used in several previous time comparison studies" (p. 762). This researcher uses a similar narrative fashion to compare the current study results with the Hamilton et al. (2006) results in chapters 4 and 5 of this dissertation.

The intent of this research effort was not to establish whether any specific book was gender neutral or sexist; aggregate statistics were the main focus of this dissertation. Individual books were not critiqued for egalitarianism; rather, the focus of this study was to obtain an overall snapshot of the treatment of gender in bestselling and award-winning children's picture books published in 2010.

Summary

This chapter presented the quantitative research perspective, described the use of content analysis, noted the book raters and their training, explained the procedures for data collection, and listed the data analysis methods that were used in this study.

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

Introduction

This chapter discusses the results of the content analysis performed on 51 award-winning and bestselling children's picture books published in 2010. Chi-square tests, *t*-tests, and descriptive statistics provided numerical indicators of gender equity in these books. All significance tests used an alpha level of .05. The results of this study are delineated by their associated research questions.

Research Question 1

Do overall adult male characters, overall child male characters, male title characters, male main characters, and male illustrations outnumber females in each category?

$H_0$1a**:** Overall adult male characters do not statistically significantly differ from overall adult female characters.

$H_0$1a was evaluated with a *t*-test to determine whether there was a significant difference between the number of male and female adult characters. The results of the *t*-test were not significant. Adult character means were 2.09 for male adults (SD = 5.27) and 1.42 for female adults (SD = 2.01), a 1.47:1 ratio; $t(64) = -0.84$, $p = 0.20$ (N = 102). The researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

$H_0$1b: Overall child male characters do not statistically significantly differ from overall child female characters.

$H_0$1b was evaluated with a *t*-test to determine whether there was a significant difference between the number of male and female child characters. The results of the *t*-test were not significant. The child character means were 0.58 for male children (*SD* = 0.79) and 0.75 for female children (*SD* = 1.08), a 0.77:1 ratio; $t(71) = 0.80$, $p = 0.79$ (N = 78). The researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

$H_0$1c: Male title characters do not statistically significantly differ from female title characters.

$H_0$1c was evaluated with a chi-square test to determine whether there was a significant difference between the number of male and female title characters. The results of the chi-square test were not significant. There were 13 male title characters and 12 female title characters for a ratio of 1.08:1, $X^2 = 0.04$ (1, $N = 25$), $p = 0.84$. The researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

$H_0$1d: Male main characters do not statistically significantly differ from female main characters.

$H_0$1d was evaluated with a chi-square test to determine whether there was a significant difference between the number of male and female main characters. The results of the chi-square test were not significant. There were 27 male main characters and 21 female main characters for a ratio of 1.29:1, $X^2 = 0.75$ (1, $N = 48$), $p = 0.39$. The researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

$H_0$1e: Overall male illustrations do not statistically significantly differ from overall female illustrations.

$H_0$1e was evaluated with a *t*-test to determine whether there was a significant difference between the number of overall male and female illustrations. The results of

the *t*-test were not significant. The mean number of illustrations per book was 38.62 (*SD* = 28.43) for males and 34.35 (*SD* = 33.44) for females, a 1.12:1 ratio; $t(31) = -0.51$, $p = 0.31$ ($N = 68$). The researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

$H_0$1f: Anthropomorphized male title characters do not statistically significantly differ from anthropomorphized female title characters.

$H_0$1f was evaluated with a chi-square test to determine whether there was a significant difference between the number of anthropomorphized male and female title characters. The results of the chi-square test were not significant. There were 10 male title characters and five female title characters in books with anthropomorphized characters for a ratio of 2.00:1, $X^2 = 1.67$ (1, $N = 15$), $p = 0.20$. The researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

$H_0$1g: Anthropomorphized male main characters do not statistically significantly differ from anthropomorphized female main characters.

$H_0$1g was evaluated with a chi-square test to determine whether there was a significant difference between the number of anthropomorphized male and female main characters. The results of the chi-square test were significant. There were 22 male main characters and nine female main characters in books with anthropomorphized characters for a ratio of 2.44:1, $X^2 = 5.45$ (1, $N = 31$), $p = 0.02$. The researcher rejected the null hypothesis.

$H_0$1h: Anthropomorphized overall male illustrations do not statistically significantly differ from anthropomorphized overall female illustrations.

$H_0$1h was evaluated with a *t*-test to determine whether there was a significant difference between the number of anthropomorphized overall male and female

illustrations. The results of the *t*-test were significant. In books featuring anthropomorphized characters, male means were 44.20 pictures per book (SD = 22.97) and 24.53 for females (SD = 23.25), a 1.80:1 ratio; $t(15) = -2.35$, $p = 0.02$ ($N = 41$). The researcher rejected the null hypothesis.

Research Question 2

Is there a relationship between the book author's gender and the gender(s) represented in the books?

$H_0$2a: There is no statistically significant relationship between the gender of the book author(s) and the gender(s) of the title characters.

$H_0$2a was evaluated with a chi-square calculation using Fisher's exact test to determine if there was a relationship between the gender of the book author and the gender of the title characters. The results of the chi-square test were significant. Male authors were more likely to write about male title characters (75% versus 25%; 12 male versus 4 female); similarly, female authors preferred female title characters (14% male, 86% female; 1 male versus 6 female), $X^2 = 7.30$ (1, $N = 23$), $p = 0.01$. The researcher rejected the null hypothesis.

$H_0$2b: There is no statistically significant relationship between the gender of the book author(s) and the gender(s) of the main characters.

$H_0$2b was evaluated with a chi-square calculation using Fisher's exact test to determine if there was a relationship between the gender of the book author and the gender of the main characters. The results of the chi-square test were significant. Male authors were more likely to write about male main characters (74% versus 26%; 25 male versus 9 female); similarly, female authors preferred female main characters (17% versus

83%; 2 male versus 10 female), $X^2 = 11.83$ (1, $N = 46$), $p = 0.009$. The researcher rejected the null hypothesis.

Research Question 3

Is there a relationship between the book illustrator's gender and the gender(s) represented in the books?

$H_0$3a: There is no statistically significant relationship between the gender of the book illustrator(s) and the gender(s) of the title characters.

$H_0$3a was evaluated with a chi-square calculation using Fisher's exact test to determine if there was a relationship between the gender of the book illustrator and the gender of the title characters. Male illustrators drew more male title characters (65% versus 35%; 11 male versus 6 female); similarly, female illustrators drew more female title characters (25% male, 75% female; 2 male versus 6 female), $X^2 = 3.44$ (1, $N = 25$), $p = 0.08$, but the relationship was not significant. The researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

$H_0$3b: There is no statistically significant relationship between the gender of the book illustrator(s) and the gender(s) of the main characters.

$H_0$3b was evaluated with a chi-square calculation using Fisher's exact test to determine if there was a relationship between the gender of the book illustrator and the gender of the main characters. The results of the chi-square test were significant. Male illustrators drew more male main characters (67% versus 33%; 24 male versus 12 female); similarly, female illustrators drew more female main characters (25% male, 75% female; 3 male versus 9 female), $X^2 = 6.35$ (1, $N = 48$), $p = 0.01$. The researcher rejected the null hypothesis.

Research Question 4

Do male authors and illustrators outnumber female authors and illustrators in the books under study?

$H_0$4a: The number of male authors does not statistically significantly differ from the number of female authors.

$H_0$4a was evaluated with a chi-square test to determine whether there was a significant difference between the number of male and female authors. The results of the chi-square test were significant. There were 35 male authors and 14 female authors, for a ratio of 2.50:1, $X^2 = 9.00$ (1, $N = 49$), $p = 0.003$. (Similar to Hamilton et al. [2006], books that had mixed-gender authorship were not included in these calculations.) The researcher rejected the null hypothesis.

$H_0$4b: The number of male illustrators does not statistically significantly differ from the number of female illustrators.

$H_0$4b was evaluated with a chi-square test to determine whether there was a significant difference between the number of male and female illustrators. The results of the chi-square test were significant. There were 37 male illustrators and 14 female illustrators, for a ratio of 2.64:1, $X^2 = 10.37$ (1, $N = 51$), $p = 0.001$. The researcher rejected the null hypothesis.

Research Question 5

Is there a relationship between a main character's gender and his/her portrayal as active or passive; aggressive or nurturing; brave or fearful; being in outdoor or indoor locations; or rescuing others or being in need of rescue?

$H_0$5a: There is no statistically significant relationship between a main character's gender and his/her portrayal as active or passive.

All female and male main characters were depicted as active; none were shown as passive (N = 41). Chi-square statistics could not be calculated since female and male passive behaviors both equaled zero. The researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

$H_0$5b: There is no statistically significant relationship between a main character's gender and his/her portrayal as aggressive or nurturing.

$H_0$5b was evaluated with t-tests to determine whether there was a significant difference between a main character's gender and his/her portrayal as aggressive or nurturing. The results of the t-test were significant for aggressive behaviors. The results of the t-test were not significant for nurturing behaviors. Main character means for aggressive behaviors were 1.29 for males (SD = 2.06) and 0.00 for females (SD = 0.00); $t(18) = -2.72$, $p = 0.007$ (N = 31). Main character means for nurturing behaviors were 0.43 for males (SD = 1.34) and 0.86 for females (SD = 1.57), a 0.5:1 ratio; $t(10) = 0.62$, $p = 0.28$ (N = 21). The researcher rejected the null hypothesis for aggressive behaviors. The researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis for nurturing behaviors.

$H_0$5c: There is no statistically significant relationship between a main character's gender and his/her portrayal as brave or fearful.

$H_0$5c was evaluated with t-tests to determine whether there was a significant difference between a main character's gender and his/her portrayal as brave or fearful. The results of the t-tests were not significant. Main character means for brave behaviors were 0.00 for males (SD = 0.00) and 0.17 for females (SD = 0.58); $t(11) = 1.00$, $p = 0.83$ (N = 24). Main character means for fearful behaviors were 1.96 for males (SD = 3.60)

and 0.55 for females (*SD* = 0.76), a 1:3.56 ratio; $t(24) = -1.82$, $p = 0.96$ ($N = 42$). The researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

$H_0$5d: There is no statistically significant relationship between a main character's gender and his/her portrayal as being in outdoor or indoor locations.

$H_0$5d was evaluated with a chi-square test to determine whether there was a significant difference between a main character's gender and his/her portrayal as being in outdoor or indoor locations. The results of the chi-square test were not significant. Male main characters were more likely to be seen outdoors than indoors (67% versus 33%; 14 outdoors versus 7 indoors); however, female main characters were also more likely to be seen outdoors (71% versus 29%; 12 outdoors versus 5 indoors), $X^2 = 0.07$ (1, $N = 38$), $p = 0.80$. The researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

$H_0$5e: There is no statistically significant relationship between a main character's gender and his/her portrayal as rescuing others or being in need of rescue.

$H_0$5e was evaluated with *t*-tests to determine whether there was a significant difference between a main character's gender and his/her portrayal as rescuing others or being in need of rescue. The results of the *t*-tests were not significant. Main character means for rescuing behaviors were 0.15 for males (*SD* = 0.39) and 0.35 for females (*SD* = 0.90), a 1:2.33 ratio; $t(24) = 0.91$, $p = 0.81$ ($N = 46$). Means for the number of times main characters were rescued were 0.00 for males (*SD* = 0.00) and 0.06 for females (*SD* = 0.24); $t(17) = 1.00$, $p = 0.17$ ($N = 41$). The researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Research Question 6

Do illustrated portrayals of adult occupations mirror traditional gender stereotypes?

$H_0$6a: Adult male main characters are as likely to have stereotypical occupations as adult female main characters.

$H_0$6a was evaluated with a chi-square calculation using Fisher's exact test to determine if gender had a relationship to the stereotypical nature of characters' jobs. Male (3 of 3, 100%) and female (3 of 4, 75%) adult characters had stereotypical jobs, $X^2 = 0.88$ (1, $N = 7$), $p = 0.57$, but the results of the chi-square test were not significant. The researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

$H_0$6b: Adult male main characters are as likely to have a broad range of occupations as adult female main characters.

$H_0$6b was evaluated with a *t*-test in order to compare main characters' genders against the number of different jobs depicted in the books under study. The results of the *t*-test were not significant. Males held six of nine different jobs ($M = .67$, $SD = .50$), and females held four of nine different jobs ($M = .44$, $SD = .53$), a 1.52:1 ratio; $t(15) = -0.92$, $p = 0.19$ ($N = 18$). The researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

$H_0$6c: Adult male main characters are as likely to show a lack of evidence of an occupation outside the home as adult female main characters.

$H_0$6c was evaluated with a chi-square calculation to measure whether gender had a relationship to an adult being depicted in an occupation outside the home. The results of the chi-square test were not significant. Male (12 of 18, 67%) and female (18 of 24, 75%) adult characters were both more likely to show no evidence of an occupation outside the home, $X^2 = 0.35$ (1, $N = 42$), $p = 0.55$. The researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Table 1 summarizes the results of the preceding chi-square calculations. Table 2 illustrates the results of the above *t*-test calculations.

Table 1

Results of Chi-square Calculations

Measure	*N*	*df*	X^2
Male vs. female title characters	25	1	0.04
Male vs. female main characters	48	1	0.75
Male vs. female authors	49	1	9.00**
Author gender related to main character gender	46	1	11.83**
Author gender related to title character gender	23	1	7.30*
Male vs. female illustrators	51	1	10.37**
Illustrator gender related to main character gender	48	1	6.35*
Illustrator gender related to title character gender	25	1	3.44
Relationship of gender to evidence of occupation outside home	42	1	0.35
Relationship of gender to stereotypical nature of job	7	1	0.88
Females more likely to be seen indoors	38	1	0.07
Females more likely to be passive	41	n/a	n/a[a]
Male vs. female title characters (anthropomorphized books)	15	1	1.67
Male vs. female main characters (anthropomorphized books)	31	1	5.45*

[a] Chi-square statistic could not be calculated because no character was passive. * $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$.

Table 2

Results of t-*test Calculations*

Measure	*N*	*df*	*M* (*SD*) Male	*M* (*SD*) Female	*t*
More boy than girl characters	78	71	0.58 (0.79)	0.75 (1.08)	0.80
More adult male than adult female characters	102	64	2.09 (5.27)	1.42 (2.01)	-0.84
More male than female illustrations	68	31	38.62 (28.43)	34.35 (33.44)	-0.51
Males rescue others more than females	46	24	0.15 (0.39)	0.35 (0.90)	0.91
More females than males are rescued	41	17	0.00 (0.00)	0.06 (0.24)	1.00
More males than females are brave	24	11	0.00 (0.00)	0.17 (0.58)	1.00
More females than males are fearful	42	24	1.96 (3.60)	0.55 (0.76)	-1.82
More males than females are assertive/aggressive	31	18	1.29 (2.06)	0.00 (0.00)	-2.72**
More females than males are nurturing	21	10	0.43 (1.34)	0.86 (1.57)	0.62
Males have a wider variety of jobs	18	15	0.67 (0.50)	0.44 (0.53)	-0.92
More male than female illustrations (anthropomorphized books)	41	15	44.20 (22.97)	24.53 (23.25)	-2.35*

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$.

Research Question 7

Have gender stereotyping and underrepresentation of female characters in bestselling and award-winning children's picture books changed since the Hamilton et al. (2006) study?

$H_0$7: Gender stereotyping and underrepresentation of female characters in bestselling and award-winning children's picture books have not changed since the Hamilton et al. (2006) study.

The researcher cannot reject or fail to reject this null hypothesis since it does not require the use of tests of significance. Hamilton et al. (2006) used "non-statistical comparisons of [their] percentages and ratios to data from earlier studies, a method used in several previous time comparison studies" (p. 762); this dissertation uses similar reporting methods. The researcher discusses her interpretations of the data in chapter 5.

The study by Hamilton et al. (2006) showed a 1.8:1 ratio of male to female title characters; this study found a 1.08:1 ratio. The ratio of male to female main characters in Hamilton et al. was also 1.8:1; the present study saw a 1.29:1 ratio. The ratio of the number of overall male to female illustrations in the study by Hamilton et al. was 1.5:1; this dissertation found a 1.12:1 ratio. Hamilton et al. noted a 1.2:1 ratio of male to female authors; this study calculated a 2.5:1 ratio. Although Hamilton et al. did not delineate the ratio of male to female illustrators, the present study had a 2.64:1 ratio.

Hamilton et al. (2006) did not provide commentary on anthropomorphized characters. This study found statistically significant ratios of 2.44:1 male to female personified nonhuman main characters and 1.80:1 male to female anthropomorphized

overall illustrations. There was also a 2.00:1 male to female personified nonhuman title character ratio (not significant).

Hamilton et al. (2006) noted that 86% of male main characters and 79% of main female characters were active as opposed to passive; this dissertation found that 100% of main male and female characters were active. Hamilton et al. did not find a significant difference between the aggressive/assertive behavior of males and females (the article did not report exact numbers). This study, however, found a significant difference between the aggressive/assertive behavior of males and females—no main female character in this dissertation exhibited aggressive or assertive behavior. Hamilton et al. did not find a significant difference in the rescuing behavior of male or female main characters, and neither did this dissertation. Hamilton et al. reported a 3.3:1 ratio of female to male nurturing behaviors; this study found a 2:1 ratio (not significant).

Hamilton et al. (2006) did not report on the differences between the sexes regarding fearful or brave behavior. This study found a 3.56:1 fearful behavior male to female ratio, which is actually a significant relationship—males (M = 1.96, SD = 3.00) were statistically more likely to show fear than females (M = 0.55, SD = 0.76), $t(24) = -1.82$, $p = 0.04$ (N = 42). Both genders were more likely to be depicted in outdoor locations in the present study (67% male, 71% female) than in the Hamilton et al. study (57% male, 43% female). Hamilton et al. showed a 1.96:1 ratio of males to females that had evidence of an occupation outside the home; this study found a 1.32:1 ratio. Finally, Hamilton et al. noted a 2.71:1 ratio of the variety of jobs held by males and females; this dissertation saw a 1.5:1 ratio.

Conclusion

This chapter presented the results of the content analysis performed on 51 award-winning and bestselling children's picture books published in 2010. Results were broken down by research question. The following chapter discusses the inferences and interpretations that can be made from the data.

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION

Introduction

The final chapter of this dissertation serves the following purposes: to remind readers of the research questions, review the methods used, summarize the study's results, note study limitations, discuss implications for practice, and suggest ideas for further scholarly study.

Research Questions

The overarching goal of this dissertation was to examine gender stereotypes and the representation of females in children's picture books published in the year 2010. This was accomplished through examination of the following research questions and null hypotheses.

Research Question #1: Do overall adult male characters, overall child male characters, male title characters, male main characters, and male illustrations outnumber females in each category?

$H_0$1a**:** Overall adult male characters do not statistically significantly differ from overall adult female characters.

$H_0$1b: Overall child male characters do not statistically significantly differ from overall child female characters.

$H_0$1c: Male title characters do not statistically significantly differ from female title characters.

$H_0$1d: Male main characters do not statistically significantly differ from female main characters.

$H_0$1e: Overall male illustrations do not statistically significantly differ from overall female illustrations.

$H_0$1f: Anthropomorphized male title characters do not statistically significantly differ from anthropomorphized female title characters.

$H_0$1g: Anthropomorphized male main characters do not statistically significantly differ from anthropomorphized female main characters.

$H_0$1h: Anthropomorphized overall male illustrations do not statistically significantly differ from anthropomorphized overall female illustrations.

Research Question #2: Is there a relationship between the book author's gender and the gender(s) represented in the books?

$H_0$2a: There is no statistically significant relationship between the gender of the book author(s) and the gender(s) of the title characters.

$H_0$2b: There is no statistically significant relationship between the gender of the book author(s) and the gender(s) of the main characters.

Research Question #3: Is there a relationship between the book illustrator's gender and the gender(s) represented in the books?

$H_0$3a: There is no statistically significant relationship between the gender of the book illustrator(s) and the gender(s) of the title characters.

$H_0$3b: There is no statistically significant relationship between the gender of the book illustrator(s) and the gender(s) of the main characters.

Research Question #4: Do male authors and illustrators outnumber female authors and illustrators in the books under study?

$H_0$4a: The number of male authors does not statistically significantly differ from the number of female authors.

$H_0$4b: The number of male illustrators does not statistically significantly differ from the number of female illustrators.

Research Question #5: Is there a relationship between a main character's gender and his/her portrayal as active or passive; aggressive or nurturing; brave or fearful; being in outdoor or indoor locations; or rescuing others or being in need of rescue?

$H_0$5a: There is no statistically significant relationship between a main character's gender and his/her portrayal as active or passive.

$H_0$5b: There is no statistically significant relationship between a main character's gender and his/her portrayal as aggressive or nurturing.

$H_0$5c: There is no statistically significant relationship between a main character's gender and his/her portrayal as brave or fearful.

$H_0$5d: There is no statistically significant relationship between a main character's gender and his/her portrayal as being in outdoor or indoor locations.

$H_0$5e: There is no statistically significant relationship between a main character's gender and his/her portrayal as rescuing others or being in need of rescue.

Research Question #6: Do illustrated portrayals of adult occupations mirror traditional gender stereotypes?

$H_0$6a: Adult male main characters are as likely to have stereotypical occupations as adult female main characters.

$H_0$6b: Adult male main characters are as likely to have a broad range of occupations as adult female main characters.

$H_0$6c: Adult male main characters are as likely to show a lack of evidence of an occupation outside the home as adult female main characters.

Research Question #7: Have gender stereotyping and underrepresentation of female characters in bestselling and award-winning children's picture books changed since the Hamilton et al. (2006) study?

$H_0$7: Gender stereotyping and underrepresentation of female characters in bestselling and award-winning children's picture books have not changed since the Hamilton et al. (2006) study.

Review of Methods

Six library media specialist raters performed quantitative content analysis on 17 books each; every book was rated twice. The researcher did not act as a rater; she did, however, provide clarification and answer questions about the research instrument during the rating process. As a similarly designed study update, this examination of bestselling and award-winning children's books utilized the same rating instrument and most of the analysis methods used by Hamilton et al. (2006). These methods included chi-square calculations, *t*-tests, Cohen's Kappa tests, Pearson product moment correlation coefficients, and descriptive statistics such as means and standard deviations.

Review of Results

In Research Question #1, the researcher failed to reject six of eight null hypotheses. The two null hypotheses that were rejected included *anthropomorphized main characters were as likely to be male as female,* $X^2 = 5.45$ (1, $N = 31$), $p = 0.02$, and *books with anthropomorphized characters were as likely to have as many male as female illustrations,* $t(15) = -2.35$, $p = 0.02$ ($N = 41$). For Research Question #2, the researcher

rejected both null hypotheses: *no relationship between the gender of the book author(s) and the gender(s) of the title characters,* $X^2 = 7.30$ (1, $N = 23$), $p = 0.01$, and *no relationship between the gender of the book author(s) and the gender(s) of the main characters,* $X^2 = 11.83$ (1, $N = 46$), $p = 0.009$. In Research Question #3, one of two null hypotheses was rejected: *no relationship between the gender of the book illustrator(s) and the gender(s) of the main characters,* $X^2 = 6.35$ (1, $N = 48$), $p = 0.01$.

In Research Question #4, both null hypotheses were rejected: *number of male authors does not differ from the number of female authors,* $X^2 = 9.00$ (1, $N = 49$), $p = 0.003$ and *number of male illustrators does not differ from the number of female illustrators,* $X^2 = 10.37$ (1, $N = 51$), $p = 0.001$. For Research Question #5, the researcher failed to reject four of five null hypotheses. The null hypothesis that was rejected was *no relationship between a main character's gender and his/her portrayal as aggressive/assertive,* $t(18) = -2.72$, $p = 0.007$ ($N = 31$). The researcher failed to reject all three null hypotheses in Research Question #6. Research Question #7, which examined changes since the Hamilton et al. (2006) study, was not evaluated with tests of significance and is discussed in the following section.

Changes Over the Past Decade

Ten years (or more) have passed since the books that Hamilton et al. (2006) studied were published. The researcher was interested in whether the progression of time changed authors' and publishers' values, thus providing the impetus to include more girls in story lines and illustrations. Although comparing a small-scale dissertation to one prior study does not provide the grounds for an authoritative decision as to whether or not gender stereotyping and female underrepresentation have improved overall, it offers clues

about the state of the children's picture book industry. When comparing the results of this study to prior studies on 13 measures, nine measures seem to have improved, two measures appear to have stayed the same, and two measures may have worsened.

Improvements. As compared to Hamilton et al. (2006), this dissertation found that the ratios for male to female title characters, male to female main characters, male to female overall number of pictures, male to female nurturing behaviors, and the variety of jobs held by adults improved. The percentages of active female (and male) characters increased, and the percentages of females (and males) shown outdoors also increased.

While Hamilton et al. (2006) did not report on fearful or brave behavior, Tepper and Cassidy (1999) found no statistical difference between the sexes on these attributes. Turner-Bowker (1996) noted that *frightened* was the second most common adjective used to describe females in the books she studied. In the books under consideration for this dissertation, boys were significantly more likely to show fear than girls. Perhaps the theory that girls are scared and boys are brave is being dispelled.

Ratios of male to female anthropomorphized illustrations improved since Oskamp et al. (1996) and McCabe et al. (2011); these authors found best-case ratios of 3.50:1 and 2.00:1, respectively. The present study discovered a 1.80:1 ratio, although the researcher found that anthropomorphized males were still significantly more likely to be featured as main characters and in overall illustrations than anthropomorphized females.

Unchanged/neutral. There was no change in the depiction of rescuing behaviors since the Hamilton et al. (2006) study. In fact, the girl mean for rescuing behaviors in this dissertation was actually larger than the boy mean, although the difference was not significant. This study did not find a difference in the number of women and men shown

working outside the home, unlike the Hamilton et al. study, but the researcher cannot assume an improvement since their study. Hamilton et al. found a 1.96:1 ratio of males to females working outside the home, and this study found a 1.32:1 ratio, but this is only because the number of males without evidence of a career increased. The percentage of women depicted as having a career outside the home (25%) stayed the same as the Hamilton et al. study.

Declines. Two measures appeared to have worsened since the Hamilton et al. (2006) study. One is the number of male versus female authors. The ratio of male to female authors more than doubled since the Hamilton et al. study (1.2:1 in 2006, 2.5:1 in 2011). This did not seem to affect negatively the general depiction of females in this study (except possibly in anthropomorphized characterizations), but it may raise an eyebrow toward the publishing industry to ensure that females continue to have as many opportunities as males. Although Hamilton et al. did not provide a male to female illustrator ratio, in this study there were 2.64 male illustrators for every female illustrator. For the second measure, aggressive/assertive behaviors, Hamilton et al. did not discover a difference between males and females, but this dissertation found that males were significantly more likely than females to exhibit such characteristics. In fact, no main female character in this study was aggressive or assertive.

Table 3 presents a comparison of selected male to female ratios from the Hamilton et al. (2006) study to the present dissertation.

Table 3

Comparison of Select Male/Female Ratios

Measure	Hamilton et al. (2006)	Present Study
Title Characters	1.80:1	1.08:1
Main Characters	1.80:1	1.29:1
Overall Illustrations	1.50:1	1.12:1
Number of Authors	1.20:1	2.50:1
Nurturing Behavior	1:3.30	1:2.00
Evidence of Occupation Outside Home	1.96:1	1.32:1
Variety of Jobs Held by Adult Characters	2.71:1	1.50:1
Overall Anthropomorphized Illustrations	3.50:1[a]	1.80:1

[a] As compared to the best-case scenario in Oskamp et al. (1996). Hamilton et al. (2006) did not provide ratios for anthropomorphized character representations.

Differences from the Hamilton et al. (2006) Study

There were a few differences between this dissertation and the Hamilton et al. (2006) study. Hamilton et al. included books that were published before 1995-2001 if they were still bestsellers during those years. The average publication date of the books in their study was 1993. This study only used books published in the year 2010. The researcher wanted to gain a feeling for the books that had been written recently; she did not want earlier books, which may have been more gender-biased, to skew the study. Hamilton et al. also attempted to compare the Caldecott books against the bestselling

books, but this study did not take that approach since there were only three Caldecott books in the sample. Unlike Hamilton et al., this study compared fearful and brave behaviors of males and females, and it also examined the frequency of occurrence of anthropomorphized characters and illustrations. The researcher compared the results of these unique measures to studies by McCabe et al. (2011), Oskamp et al. (1996), Tepper and Cassidy (1999), and Turner-Bowker (1996).

Research Limitations

This study examined 48 bestselling children's picture books published in the year 2010 and the three 2011 Caldecott Medal and Honor books (also published in 2010). The study focused only on the books published in 2010 because this allowed the greatest amount of time to pass since the Hamilton et al. (2006) study, which used books that were bestsellers from 1995-2001. The books under study did not generalize to the overall population of books, because by their very nature, most books are not award-winners or bestsellers. The researcher used a purposive sample rather than a simple random sample, thus limiting her ability to calculate statistics such as effect size. The small sample size may have limited the usefulness of the end results. This study did not examine other award winners besides the Caldecott Medal and Honor books. Finally, some book raters may have had unidentified innate biases toward gender issues that could have skewed the results of the study.

Discussion

Representations of women and girls appear to have moderately improved since the Hamilton et al. (2006) study, but illustrators and authors should consider depicting female characters as taking the initiative more often, since no female main characters

were assertive or aggressive in the books in this study. Authors and illustrators should also feature more female personified nonhumans in their stories. As demonstrated by Lambdin, Greer, Jibotian, Wood, and Hamilton (2003), most people assume animals are male, so a concerted effort must be made to include female characters and drawings in animal and object stories. In this study, of the 10 books that featured male anthropomorphized title characters, men wrote nine of the books. Of the five books that featured female anthropomorphized title characters, men wrote three of the books. Although male authors and illustrators in this study did not demonstrate significantly different preferences overall regarding the gender of the characters they chose for their stories, it appears that male authors may have unconscious biases toward writing about male anthropomorphized characters. Female underrepresentation is just as troubling even when the characters are not human.

Authors and illustrators seemed to show a softer side of boys in 2010. The mean number of nurturing behaviors performed by boys (M = 0.43, SD = 1.34) doubled since the study by Hamilton et al. (M = 0.21, SD = 0.49). Although the comparative nurturing behaviors of males and females did not represent a statistical significance, it appears that it has become more normal for boys to nurture others. Similarly, in this dissertation, males were statistically more likely to appear frightened than girls. Males also had lower mean brave actions than girls, but the difference was not significant. Perhaps it is becoming more acceptable in American culture for boys and men to display vulnerability, fear, and emotions in general, and to not always have to play the hero. This is in contrast to studies by authors such as Massad (1981) and Schuette and Killen (2009), who proposed that males are more rigidly stereotyped than females.

This study, while admittedly small-scale, uncovered prominent adult females in only four different occupations: librarians, teachers, a singer, and superheroes. Librarians and teachers constitute very traditional occupations; a singer is a gender neutral profession; and a superhero is certainly a non-traditional job for a woman. The book that included the female superheroes, however, chronicled DC Comics' characters over the past 50 years, and primarily featured scantily-clad sex objects such as Wonder Woman. The book *Bats at the Ballgame* depicted the female singer performing the national anthem at a baseball game; she too, exuded sexiness and was the lone female illustration in the entire book. Male adults were depicted as artists and potters, pirates, superheroes, a zookeeper, and the Easter bunny. None of these occupations relied upon the good looks or perceived sexiness of the male characters, and the male jobs were arguably more exciting than the female jobs. While no significant difference was found between the variety of jobs held by males and females or the stereotypical nature thereof, the researcher was still concerned about the prospects presented to girls regarding their future occupational choices. May (1994) noted that advertisements for the armed forces used to proclaim that women would not lose their femininity by serving in the military. Perhaps illustrators feel a similar, unfounded need to continue to sketch females in sexy characterizations, especially when depicting them in non-traditional roles, to assure readers that these women are not "unsexing" themselves.

Several of the books in the present study featured characters that were gender neutral. Indeed, there seemed to be an increase in such androgynous characterizations from the Hamilton et al. (2006) study. Hamilton et al. noted 6 out of 200 (0.03:1) neutral title characters and 2 out of 194 (0.01:1) neutral main characters. This dissertation found

3 of 51 (0.06:1) neutral title characters and 5 of 53 (0.09:1) neutral main characters. The book raters noted their ambivalence about some characters' lack of apparent gender or the fact that a character might look female on one page and male on the next.

Mo Willems is currently one of the hottest authors in children's book publishing. He wrote seven of the bestselling books of 2010 and illustrated six of them (see Appendix A). He included several gender neutral characters in his books. Raters questioned the sex of the frog in *City Dog, Country Frog*; the pig ("Piggie") in *Can I Play Too*?, *We Are in a Book!*, and *I Am Going!*; the stuffed animal Knuffle Bunny in *Knuffle Bunny Free*; and Cat the Cat's friends in *Let's Say Hi to Friends Who Fly!* and *Cat the Cat, Who is That?*.

Other authors and illustrators who made an effort to depict androgynous characters included Nancy Tillman in *Wherever You Are, My Love Will Find You*; Jamie Lee Curtis and Laura Cornell in *My Mommy Hung the Moon*; Anna Dewdney in *Llama Llama Holiday Drama*, John Grogan and Richard Cowdrey in *Marley and the Kittens*, and Deborah Underwood and Renata Liwska in *The Quiet Book*. Perhaps children of both genders can imagine themselves in the place of any of these characters since the authors and illustrators leave the gender determination up to the reader. When children identify with egalitarian book characters, their stereotypical thinking may decrease, and they may envision themselves in a wider array of occupational roles as adults (Ashby & Wittmaier, 1978; O'Bryant & Corder-Bolz, 1978; Trepanier-Street & Romatowski, 1999).

Rider (2000) found that books, movies, comics, and music made for boys sold better than similar products specifically made for girls. The researcher did not study this

issue specifically, but in this dissertation, that does not seem to be the case. An examination of the *New York Times* bestselling books that achieved double-digit weeks on the list in 2010 (see Appendix A) reveals that five of the seven books had female main characters; the other two books had predominantly gender neutral main characters. Books made for and about girls sold quite well in 2010. Hamilton et al. (2006) noted, "Modern children's picture books continue to provide nightly reinforcement of the idea that boys and men are more interesting and important than are girls and women" (p. 764). This dissertation seems to contradict that statement. Although some indicators of sexism and underrepresentation persisted in 2010, such as a lack of aggressive/assertive characterizations of females and a scarcity of female anthropomorphized characters and illustrations, the idea that girls and women were generally less interesting or important does not wholly apply.

Implications for Practice

Although this study shows a relaxation in the rigidity of stereotypes that both male and female characters have exhibited in the past, as well as a lessening of female underrepresentation, this dissertation serves as a call to action to parents to ensure that the books they select for their young children feature positive and equitable images of boys and girls. After all, school and public libraries do not have only the most recent, non-stereotypical books on their shelves. Many of their books still derive from prior decades when stereotypes and underrepresentation were rampant. All readers must exercise critical media literacy (Kellner & Share, 2005) to become aware of hidden or overt agendas, messages, and meanings in picture books. If such instances are found, parents and teachers can turn them into learning moments for children. Parents must also make

an effort to interact with their daughters and sons in a gender-fair manner (Muchnik & Stavans, 2009; Simpkins, Davis-Keen, & Eccles, 2005). By providing daughters and female pupils with books that show positive images, strong female role models, and non-stereotypical pictures of women and their roles, perhaps parents and educators can enable the nation's girls to recognize their potential and achieve greatness.

Publishers and authors must continue to make concerted efforts to include both sexes in their stories. Publishers worried about profit margins when featuring gender neutral or female characters should not fear—the success of Mo Willems's books and the top bestsellers of 2010 should cast those doubts aside. Similarly, organizations such as the Amelia Bloomer Project (2010) should continue to promote gender-fair books. Educators need to make critical and informed choices when selecting books to read aloud to their classrooms instead of relying on the books they have always used in the past (Narahara, 1998; Patt & McBride, 1993).

The findings of this dissertation are applicable and important because every person has a vested interest in the future of the children of America. Whether or not a person is a parent or teacher, the proper and equal education of boys and girls affects society at large. The success of a country depends on the education of its children (Szente, 2007). Gender stereotypes, no matter how subtle, can undermine children's self-worth and future potential (Barnett, 1986; Kortenhaus & Demarest, 1993). Gender equality should be part of a larger movement that tries to ensure every American has equal opportunities through the removal of barriers such as racism, sexism, ageism, and religious persecution (Chafe, 1994).

Further Study

Suggestions for further study are as follows. Other award-winners besides the Caldecott Medal and Honor books could be studied for gender parity; these include the ALA Notable Children's Books, the Parents' Choice Awards, the Tomás Rivera Mexican American Children's Book Award, the Coretta Scott King Children's Book Award, and many others. Bestsellers lists such as those from *Publisher's Weekly* and Amazon.com could be used instead of the *New York Times*. A large-scale study could break down gender behaviors by race or ethnicity. Researchers could examine the state of stereotypes in digital media, such as online databases or virtual textbooks. Most content analyses about gender equity focus on books published in the United States; scholars could analyze children's picture books from other countries.

The researcher felt that illustrators sometimes depicted adult females in sexy characterizations when drawing them in nontraditional occupations or roles. Further studies could examine if this is a widespread trend. Similarly, scholars could question whether there is a counterpart to this notion when men are illustrated in nontraditional roles such as nurses, librarians, and secretaries.

Studies that demonstrate how gender-fair and stereotyped portrayals of the sexes affect children's attitudes and behaviors need to be updated. The researcher had a difficult time uncovering recent articles about such topics; most studies dated from the 1970s and 1980s (Ashby & Wittmaier, 1978; Ashton, 1983; Berg-Cross & Berg-Cross, 1978; Kacerguis & Adams, 1979; Knell & Winer, 1979; O'Bryant & Corder-Bolz, 1978; Scott, 1986). The fact that gender neutral characters seem to be increasing in frequency

lends itself to further study. Topics could include how children perceive such illustrations and the willingness of authors, illustrators, and publishers to include them.

Scholars could assess parents' rationale behind the books they select to read to their children; most studies examined read-alouds selected primarily by teachers (Narahara, 1998; Patt & McBride, 1993). Similarly, researchers could study the gender parity of books that librarians read aloud for story time and recommend to children for checkout. Children's picture book publishers could be interviewed to compile a snapshot of the thought processes that such individuals undergo when deciding what kinds of stereotypical or gender neutral books to produce. Wide scale studies could assess society's current attitude toward the embracing of feminine ideals or feminist backlash.

Conclusion

Researchers should continue to study gender parity because prior studies suggest that gender depictions improved during the 1970s and 1980s, but worsened again in the 1990s (Kinman & Henderson, 1985; McCabe et al., 2011; Powell et al., 1993). Just because this dissertation found mostly positive and equal depictions of females does not mean that these trends will continue into the future. As McCabe et al. (2011) noted, gender depictions in books seem to ebb and flow with the current political state. Parents and educators must remain on the alert.

REFERENCES

Agee, J. M. (1993). Mothers and daughters: Gender-role socialization in two Newbery Award books. *Children's Literature in Education, 24*(3), 165-183.

Aggressive. (2010). *Random House Dictionary*. Retrieved from http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/aggressive

Allen, A. M., Allen, D. M., & Sigler, G. (1993). Changes in sex-role stereotyping in Caldecott medal award picture books 1938-1988. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 7*(2), 67-73. Retrieved from http://www.acei.org/jrcehp.htm

Amare, N. (2007). Where is she? Gender occurrences in online grammar guides. *Research in the Teaching of English, 42*(2), 163-187.

Amelia Bloomer Project. (2010). *2010 introduction*. Retrieved from http://ameliabloomer.wordpress.com/2010-amelia-bloomer-list/2010-introduction/

American Library Association, Association for Library Service to Children. (2011). *Welcome to the Caldecott Medal home page*! Retrieved from http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/alsc/awardsgrants/bookmedia/caldecottmedal/caldecottmedal.cfm

American Library Association, Association for Library Service to Children. (2010). *Welcome to the Newbery Medal home page*! Retrieved from http://www.ala.org/ala/mgrps/divs/alsc/awardsgrants/bookmedia/newberymedal/newberymedal.cfm

Anderson, D. A., & Hamilton, M. C. (2005). Gender role stereotyping of parents in children's picture books: The invisible father. *Sex Roles, 52*, 145-151.

Anthropomorphized. (2011). *Random House Dictionary*. Retrieved from http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/anthropomorphized

Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Sorensen, C. (2010). *Introduction to research in education* (8th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Ashby, M. S., & Wittmaier, B. C. (1978). Attitude changes in children about exposure to stories about women in traditional and nontraditional occupations. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 70,* 945-949.

Ashton, E. (1978). The effect of sex-role stereotyped picture books on the play behavior of three- and four-year-old children. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 39, 1310.

Ashton, E. (1983). Measures of play behavior: The influence of sex-role stereotyped children's books. *Sex Roles*, *9*(1), 43-47.

Baker, P. (2010, August 8). Kagan is sworn in as the fourth woman, and 112th justice, on the Supreme Court. *New York Times*. doi:2103641851

Bandura, A., & Bussey, K. (2004). On broadening the cognitive, motivational, and sociostructural scope of theorizing about gender development and functioning: Comment on Martin, Ruble, and Szkrybalo (2002). *Psychological Bulletin*, *130*(5), 691-701. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.130.5.691

Barnett, M. (1986). Sex bias in the helping behavior presented in children's picture books. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, *147*(3), 343. Retrieved from http://www.heldref.org/pubs/gnt/about.html

Bazier, J., & Simonis, D. (1991). Are high school chemistry textbooks gender fair? *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, *28*(4), 353-362.

Bem, S. L. (1981). Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex typing. *Psychological Review, 88*(4), 354-364. Retrieved from http://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/rev/index.aspx

Bemelmans, L. (1967). *Madeline*. New York, NY: Viking.

Berg-Cross, L., & Berg-Cross, G. (1978). Listening to stories may change children's social attitudes. *Reading Teacher, 31*(6), 659-663.

Blumberg, R. (2008). The invisible obstacle to educational equality: Gender bias in textbooks. *Prospects, 38*(3), 345-361. doi:10.1007/s11125-009-9086-1

Boster, M. A. (2005). *Gender equity of traditional and non-traditional career roles in Newbery award-winning and honor books* (Doctoral dissertation, Liberty University). Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/doctoral/26/

Brabant, S., & Mooney, L. (1997). Sex role stereotyping in the Sunday comics: A twenty year update. *Sex Roles, 37*(3/4), 269-281.

Bray, C. (2010, May 20). Novartis is hit with damages. *Wall Street Journal*.

Bussey, K., & Bandura, A. (1992). Self-regulatory mechanisms governing gender development. *Child Development*, 63, 1236-1250.

Carlin, D. B., & Winfrey, K. L. (2009). Have you come a long way baby? Hillary Clinton, Sarah Palin, and sexism in 2008 campaign coverage. *Communication Studies, 60*(4), 326-343.

Chafe, W. H. (1994). *Road to equality: American women since 1962*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Chambers, M. (2010, April 4). Court rules for woman and against public course. *New York Times*.

Clark, R., Ayton, K., Frechette, N., & Keller, P. (2005). Women of the world, re-write! Women in American world history high school textbooks from the 1960s, 1980s, and 1990s. *Social Education*, *69*(1), 41.

Clark, R., Guilmain, J., Saucier, P. K., & Tavarez, J. (2003). Two steps forward, one step back: The presence of female characters and gender stereotyping in award-winning picture books between the 1930s and the 1960s. *Sex Roles*, 49, 439-449.

Collins, L. J., Ingoldsby, B. B., & Dellmann, M. M. (1984). Sex-role stereotyping in children's literature: A change from the past. *Childhood Education*, 60, 278-285.

Coltrane, S. (2000). Research on household labor: Modeling and measuring the social embeddedness of routine family work. *Journal of Marriage & Family*, *62*(4), 1208-1233.

Dads can influence daughters' interests in math, science. (2007, October). *NSTA Reports*!, 12.

Dellman-Jenkins, M., Florjancic, L., & Swadener, E. B. (1993). Sex roles and cultural diversity in recent award-winning picture books for young children. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 7*(2), 74–82.

Deutsch, S. J. (1994). *From ballots to breadlines: American women 1920-1940*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Dey, J. G., & Hill, C. (2007). *Behind the pay gap*. Washington, DC: American Association of University Women Educational Foundation.

Diekman, A. B., & Murnen, S. K. (2004). Learning to be little women and little men: The inequitable gender equality of nonsexist children's literature. *Sex Roles, 50*(5/6), 373-385. Retrieved from http://www.springerlink.com/content/0360-0025

Dougherty, W. H., & Engel, R. E. (1987). An 80s look for sex equality in Caldecott winners and Honor books. *The Reading Teacher, 40*(4), 394-398.

Ebner, S. (2009, August 4). The princess and the pay gap: Little girls love Disney's glamorous princesses, but as it prepares to launch its newest, Tiana, Sarah Ebner asks if the stereotype holds women back. *The Times* (London, England). Retrieved from http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/

Faldui, S. (1991). *Backlash: The undeclared war against American women*. New York, NY: Anchor.

Fitzpatrick, M., & McPherson, B. (2010). Coloring within the lines: Gender stereotypes in contemporary coloring books. *Sex Roles, 62*(1/2), 127-137. doi:10.1007/s11199-009-9703-8

Fox, M. (1993). Men who weep, boys who dance: The gender agenda between the lines in children's literature. *Language Arts, 70*(2), 84-88.

Friedan, B. (1963). *The feminine mystique*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Company.

Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2007). *Educational research: An introduction* (8th ed.). New York, NY: Allyn & Bacon.

Garfield, T. (1992). *Lost tools wall chart* [Map]. Moscow, ID: Logos School Materials.

Gooden, A., & Gooden, M. (2001). Gender representation in notable children's picture books: 1995-1999. *Sex Roles, 45*(1/2), 89-101. Retrieved from http://www.springerlink.com/content/0360-0025

Greenhouse, S. (2010, June 4). Lawyers alerted Wal-Mart to risks years before a bias suit. *New York Times*. Retrieved from Academic Search Complete database.

Greenwald, J. (2007). Biggest-ever bias suit may fuel tort trend. *Business Insurance*, *41*(7), 1, 29. Retrieved from OmniFile Full Text Mega database.

Griffer, M., & Perlis, S. (2007). Developing cultural intelligence in preservice speech-language pathologists and educators. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*, *29*(1), 28-35. Retrieved from http://cdq.sagepub.com/

Hamilton, M., & Anderson, D. (2005). *New annotated code sheet* [Word document]. Unpublished instrument, Department of Psychology, Centre College, Danville, KY.

Hamilton, M., Anderson, D., Broaddus, M., & Young, K. (2006). Gender stereotyping and under-representation of female characters in 200 popular children's picture books: A twenty-first century update. *Sex Roles*, *55*(11-12), 757-765. doi:10.1007/s11199-006-9128-6

Hawkins, P. (2007). What boys and girls learn through song: A content analysis of gender traits and sex bias in two choral classroom textbooks. *Research and Issues in Music Education, 5*(1).

Heflick, N. A., & Goldenberg, J. L. (2009). Objectifying Sarah Palin: Evidence that objectification causes women to be perceived as less competent and less fully human. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 45, 598-601.

Heintz, K. E. (1987, May). *An examination of the sex-role and occupational-role presentations of female characters in award-winning children's picture books*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Quebec, Canada.

Henneberg, S. (2010). Moms do badly, but grandmas do worse: The nexus of sexism and ageism in children's classics. *Journal of Aging Studies*, *24*(2), 125-134. doi:10.1016/j.jaging.2008.10.003

Kacerguis, M., & Adams, G. (1979). Implications of sex typed child rearing practices, toys, and mass media materials in restricting occupational choices of women. *Family Coordinator*, *28*(3), 369-375.

Kellner, D., & Share, J. (2005). Toward critical media literacy: Core concepts, debates, organizations, and policy. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, *26*(3), 369-386. doi:10.1080/01596300500200169

Kinman, J. R., & Henderson, D. L. (1985). An analysis of sexism in Newbery Medal Award books from 1977 to 1984. *Reading Teacher,* 38, 885-889.

Knell, S., & Winer, G. A. (1979). Effects of reading content on occupational sex roles stereotypes. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *14*, 78-87.

Kolbe, R., & LaVoie, J. (1981). Sex-role stereotyping in preschool children's picture books. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *44*, 369-74.

Kortenhaus, C. M., & Demarest, J. (1993). Gender role stereotyping in children's literature: An update. *Sex Roles*, *28*(3/4), 219-232.

Lambdin, J. R., Greer, K. M., Jibotian, K. S., Wood, K. R., & Hamilton, M. C. (2003). The animal = male hypothesis: Children's and adults' beliefs about the sex of non-sex-specific stuffed animals. *Sex Roles*, *48*, 471-482.

Landis, J. R., & Koch, G. G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*, *33*(1), 159-174.

Lerner, R., & Nagai, A. (1991). Filler feminism in high school history. *Academic Questions, 5*(1), 28.

Lionni, L. (2007). *Tico and the golden wings*. New York, NY: Knopf.

London, S. (1995). *The future of feminism: An interview with Christina Hoff Sommers*. Retrieved from http://www.scottlondon.com/interviews/sommers.html

Ly Kok, J., & Findlay, B. (2006). An exploration of sex-role stereotyping in Australian award-winning children's picture books. *Australian Library Journal*, *55*(3), 248-261. Retrieved from http://alia.org.au/publishing/alj/

Massad, C. M. (1981). Sex role identity and adjustment during adolescence. *Child Development, 52*, 1290-1298.

May, E. T. (1994). *Pushing the limits: American women 1940-1961*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

McCabe, J., Fairchild, E., Grauerholz, L., Pescosolido, B. A., & Tope, D. (2011). Gender in twentieth-century children's books: Patterns of disparity in titles and central characters. *Gender & Society, 25*(2), 197-226.

McDonald, J. (2009). *Chi-square test of independence*. Retrieved from http://udel.edu/~mcdonald/statchiind.html

McDonald, S. (1989). Sex bias in the representation of male and female characters in children's picture books. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, *150*(4), 389. Retrieved from http://www.heldref.org/pubs/gnt/about.html

Micceri, T. (2009). *How we justify and perpetuate the wealthy, white, male academic status quo through the use of biased admissions requirements*. Paper presented at

the Annual Meeting of the Florida Association for Institutional Research, Cocoa Beach, FL.

Mills, S. J., Pankake, A., & Schall, J. (2010). Children's books as a source of influence on gender role development: Analysis of female characters using Jung's four archetypes. *Journal of Women in Educational Leadership*, *8*(2), 99-117.

Moore, D. S. (2000). *The basic practice of statistics* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: W. H. Freeman & Company.

Mora, P. (1997). *Tomas and the library lady*. New York, NY: Knopf.

Muchnik, M., & Stavans, A. (2009). Telling the same story to your child: Mothers' versus fathers' storytelling interactions. *Women & Language*, *32*(1), 60-69.

Narahara, M. (1998). *Gender bias in children's picture books: A look at teachers' choice of literature* (Master's thesis). Retrieved from ERIC database.

National Institute of Standards and Technology. (n.d.). *Engineering statistics handbook*: *Chi-square goodness of fit test*. Retrieved from http://www.itl.nist.gov/div898/handbook/prc/section2/prc211.htm

National Women's Law Center. (2008). *The reality of the workforce: Mothers are working outside the home*. Retrieved from http://www.nwlc.org/pdf/WorkingMothersMarch2008.pdf

Neutze, D. (2008). Picturing science: The who, what, and where of images in children's award-winning science trade books (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. ED512850)

New York Times. (2010). *Best sellers: Children's picture books*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/bestsellers-books/picture-books/list.html

Nisse, M. (2008). *Do you see what I see? Portrayals of diversity in Newbery-Medal-winning children's literature* (Unpublished master's thesis). Retrieved from http://www.allacademic.com//meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/2/7/2/1/0/pages272102/p272102-1.php

Nowicki, E. (2009). Economic concerns, beleaguered corporations, and women in corporate boardrooms. *Hamline Journal of Public Law & Policy*, *30*(2), 549-561.

Nurturing. (n.d.). *Random House Dictionary*. Retrieved from http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/nurturing

O'Bryant, S., & Corder-Bolz, C. (1978). The effects of television on children's stereotyping of women's work roles. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *12*(2), 233-243.

Oskamp, S., Kaufman, K., & Wolterbeek, L. (1996). Gender role portrayals in preschool picture books. *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality*, *11*(5), 27-39. Retrieved from http://www.sbp-journal.com/

Patt, M., & McBride, B. (1993, April). *Gender equity in picture books in preschool classrooms: An exploratory study*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA.

Peterson, S. B., & Lach, M. A. (1990). Gender stereotypes in children's books: Their prevalence and influence on cognitive and affective development. *Gender and Education*, 2, 185-197.

Powell, J., Gillespie, C., Swearingen, B., & Clements, N. (1993). Gender roles in the Newbery Medal winners. *Yearbook of the American Reading Forum*, 13, 97-115.

Randolph, K. K. (2011). *More working women have college degrees than men*. Retrieved from http://www.fastweb.com/student-life/articles/3109-more-working-women-have-college-degrees-than-men?utm_source=nlet&utm_content=fw_c2_20110503_

Rescue. (2010). *Random House Dictionary*. Retrieved from http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/rescue

Rider, E. A. (2000). *Our voices: Psychology of women*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Savage, D. G. (2011, June 21). Supreme Court blocks huge class-action suit against Wal-Mart. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from http://articles.latimes.com/2011/jun/21/nation/la-na-court-walmart-20110621

Sawyer, D., & Sherwood, B. (2006). 'Mommy Wars' incited by irresponsible media, says NOW president Kim Gandy. *Media Report to Women*, *34*(2), 1-3.

Sayers, D. (1947). *The lost tools of learning*. Retrieved from http://www.newcovenantchristianschool.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2010/11/TheLostToolsofLearning.pdf

Schuette, C., & Killen, M. (2009). Children's evaluations of gender-stereotypic household activities in the family context. *Early Education and Development*, *20*(4), 693-712.

Scott, K. P. (1986). Effects of sex-fair reading materials on pupils' attitudes, comprehension, and interest. *American Educational Research Journal*, *23*(1), 105-116.

Searcey, D. (2009, April 14). Harassment is said to persist at U.S. mint in Denver. *Wall Street Journal*.

Sigle-Rushton, W., & Waldfogel, J. (2007). Motherhood and women's earnings in Anglo-American, Continental European, and Nordic countries. *Feminist Economics*, 13(2), 55-91. doi:10.1080/13545700601184849

Simpkins, S. D., Davis-Kean, P. E., & Eccles, J. S. (2005). Parents' socializing behavior and children's participation in math, science, and computer out-of-school activities. *Applied Developmental Science, 9*(1), 14–30.

St. Peter, S. (1979). Jack went up the hill...but where was Jill? *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 4, 256-260.

Stereotype. (n.d.). *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* (4th ed.). Retrieved from http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/stereotype

Szente, J. (2007). Empowering young children for success in school and in life. *Early Childhood Education Journal, 34*(6), 449-453. doi:10.1007/s10643-007-0162-y

Taxel, J. (2002). Children's literature at the turn of the century: Toward a political economy of the publishing industry. *Research in the Teaching of English, 37*(2), 145-197.

Tenenbaum, H. R. (2008). "You'd be good at that": Gender patterns in parent-child talk about courses. *Social Development, 18*, 2, 447-462. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9507.2008.00487.x

Tepper, C., & Cassidy, K. (1999). Gender differences in emotional language in children's picture books. *Sex Roles, 40*(3/4), 265-280. Retrieved from http://www.springerlink.com/content/0360-0025

Trepanier-Street, M. L., & Romatowski, J. A. (1999). The influence of children's literature on gender role perceptions: A reexamination. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, *26*(3), 155-159.

Turner-Bowker, D. (1996). Gender stereotyped descriptors in children's picture books: Does “Curious Jane” exist in literature? *Sex Roles*, *35*(7/8), 461-488. Retrieved from http://www.springerlink.com/content/0360-0025

U.S. Census Bureau. (2011). *More working women than men have college degrees, Census Bureau reports* (Report CB11-72). Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/archives/education/cb11-72.html

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2009). *Women in the labor force: A databook* (Report 1018). Retrieved from http://www.bls.gov/cps/wlf-databook-2009.pdf

Vickers, M. Z. (2006, January). Where the boys aren’t: The gender gap on college campuses. *Weekly Standard*, *11*(16), 33-35.

Wal-Mart launches global women's economic empowerment initiative. (2011). Retrieved from http://walmartstores.com/pressroom/news/10692.aspx

Weitzman, L., Eifler, D., Hokada, E., & Ross, C. (1972). Sex-role socialization in picture books for preschool children. *American Journal of Sociology*, *77*(6), 1125-1150. Retrieved from http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/toc/ajs/current?cookieSet=1

Williams, J. A., Vernon, J. A., Williams, M. C., & Malecha, K. (1987). Sex role socialization in picture books: An update. *Social Science Quarterly*, 68, 148-156.

Worland, J. (2008). Girls will be girls…and so on: Treatment of gender in preschool books from 1960 through 1990. *Children and Libraries*, *6*(1), 42-46.

Zittleman, K., & Sadker, D. (2002). Teacher education textbooks: The unfinished gender revolution. *Educational Leadership*, *60*(4), 59.

APPENDIX A: 2010 NEW YORK TIMES BESTSELLING CHILDREN'S PICTURE BOOKS[a]

Title	Author (Illustrator, if different)	Weeks on List
Ladybug Girl at the Beach	David Soman & Jacky Davis (David Soman)	15
The Very Fairy Princess	Julie Andrews and Emma Walton Hamilton (Christine Davenier)	14
City Dog, Country Frog	Mo Willems (Jon Muth)	13
Poet Extraordinaire!	Jane O'Connor (Robin Preiss Glasser)	13
The Quiet Book	Deborah Underwood (Renata Liwska)	12
Knuffle Bunny Free	Mo Willems	11
My Garden	Kevin Henkes	10
Art and Max	David Weisner	9
The Easter Egg	Jan Brett	9
Fabulous Fashion Boutique	Jane O'Connor (Robin Preiss Glasser)	9
Heads	Matthew Van Fleet	9
Ooh La La! It's Beauty Day!	Jane O'Connor (Robin Preiss Glasser)	9
Wherever You Are, My Love Will Find You	Nancy Tillman	9
Llama Llama, Holiday Drama	Anna Dewdney	8
How Rocket Learned to Read	Tad Hills	7
Olivia Goes to Venice	Ian Falconer	7
Scaredy-Cat, Splat!	Rob Scotton	7
Bats at the Ballgame	Brian Lies	6
My Mommy Hung the Moon	Jamie Lee Curtis (Laura Cornell)	6
Can I Play Too?	Mo Willems	5
I Am Going!	Mo Willems	5

Instructions	Neil Gaiman	5
It's Christmas, David!	David Shannon	5
Marley and the Kittens	John Grogan (Richard Cowdrey)	5
Shark vs. Train	Chris Barton (Tom Lichtenheld)	5
Zen Ghosts	John J. Muth	5
Of Thee I Sing	Barack Obama (Loren Long)	4
The Sandwich Swap	Queen Rania of Jordan and Kelly DiPucchio (Tricia Tusa)	4
The Three Little Dassies	Jan Brett	4
Children Make Terrible Pets	Peter Brown	3
DC Super Heroes: The Ultimate Pop-Up Book	Matthew Reinhart	3
The Earth Book	Todd Parr	3
The Jellybeans and the Big Book Bonanza	Laura Numeroff and Nate Evans (Lynn Munsinger)	3
Over the Rainbow	E. Y. Harburg (Eric Puybaret)[b]	3
Pete the Cat: I Love My White Shoes	Eric Litwin (James Dean)	3
We Are in a Book!	Mo Willems	3
Cat the Cat, Who is That?	Mo Willems	2
Dog Loves Books	Louise Yates	2
LMNO Peas	Keith Baker	2
Miss Brooks Loves Books! (And I Don't)	Barbara Bottner (Michael Emberley)	2
The Odious Ogre	Norton Juster (Jules Feiffer)	2
Ollie's Easter Eggs	Oliver Dunrea	2
Buzz Boy and Fly Guy	Tedd Arnold	1
Can't Wait Till Christmas	Mike Huckabee (Jed Henry)	1
Fly Guy Meets Fly Girl	Tedd Arnold	1

Late for School	Steve Martin (C. F. Payne)	1
Let's Say Hi to Friends Who Fly!	Mo Willems	1
Party Animals	Kathie Lee Gifford (Peter Bay Alexandersen)	1

[a] This list only includes books published in 2010. *It's a Book*, by Lane Smith (16 weeks), *The Junkyard Wonders*, by Patricia Polacco (4 weeks), and *Sit-In*, by Andrea Davis Pinkney (Brian Pinkney) (3 weeks) were excluded because they were written for older audiences than children ages 3 through 6.

2011 Caldecott Medal Winner and Honor Books[b]

Title	Author (Illustrator, if different)	Award/ Honor Book
A Sick Day for Amos McGee	Philip C. Stead (Erin E. Stead)	Award
Dave the Potter: Artist, Poet, Slave	Laban Carrick Hill (Bryan Collier)	Honor
Interrupting Chicken	David Ezra Stein	Honor

[b] All three 2011 Caldecott Medal and Honor books were published in 2010.

APPENDIX B: CODE SHEET

(Used with permission from Hamilton et al., 2006)

Rater Name: _____

1. Title _____
2. Copyright year _____
3. Author(s) _____
4. Author sex. Circle number: 1 female 2 male 3 mixed
5. Illustrator(s) _____
6. Illustrator sex. Circle number. 1 female 2 male 3 mixed
7. Target age: _____
8. Classify story: (circle number) 1 Human 2 Animal 3 Object 4 mixed
9. Gender of title character(s) (explicit or implied):
   0 none 1 female 2 male 3 neutral 4 both

ALL CHARACTERS

<u>Count of female characters.</u>

10. Children ____
11. Adults ____

<u>Count of male characters.</u>

12. Children ____
13. Adults ____

14. Occupation of most predominant adult female character: (circle and fill in blank if necessary)
    - 0 no evidence of occupation
    - 1 _____
    - 2 No such character

15. Occupation is: (circle number)
    - 0 no occupation/character 2 nontraditional/masculine
    - 1 traditional/feminine 3 neither/neutral

16. Occupation of most predominant adult male character: (circle and fill in blank if necessary)
    - 0 no evidence of occupation
    - 1 _____
    - 2 No such character

17. Occupation is: (circle number)
    - 0 no occupation/character 2 nontraditional/feminine
    - 1 traditional/masculine 3 neither/neutral

PICTURES

18. Count of female pictures: _____
    number: ____

19. Count of male pictures: _____
    number: ____

20. Count of "gut feeling" female pictures: _____
    number: ____

21. Count of "gut feeling" male pictures: _____
    number: ____

MAIN CHARACTERS

Main character #1. Name/other identifier: _____
Circle number in each group.

22.	0 none	1 female	2 male	3 neutral
23.	0 none	1 child	2 adult	3 can't tell

Role of main character #1 OVERALL is: (circle number)

24.	0 none	1 active	2 passive	3 both
25.	0 none	1 indoors	2 outdoors	

Times main character #1 does these behaviors or shows these qualities:

26.	rescues another character or characters	____
27.	is rescued by another character	____
28.	asks questions of an other-sex character	____
29.	answers the questions of an other-sex character	____
30.	behaves fearfully	____
31.	behaves bravely	____
32.	nurtures/cares for another character	____
33.	acts assertively/aggressively	____

Main character #2. Name/other identifier: _____
Circle number in each group.

34.	0 none	1 female	2 male	3 neutral
35.	0 none	1 child	2 adult	3 can't tell

Role of main character #2 OVERALL is:

36.	0 none	1 active	2 passive	3 both
37.	0 none	1 indoors	2 outdoors	

Times main character #2 does these behaviors or shows these qualities:

38. rescues another character or characters ____
39. is rescued by another character ____
40. asks questions of an other-sex character ____
41. answers the questions of an other-sex character ____
42. behaves fearfully ____
43. behaves bravely ____
44. nurtures/cares for another character ____
45. acts assertively/aggressively ____

OTHER

46. Number of unspecified gender animal/object/person given masculine generic. ____
page number: ____

47. Number of unspecified gender animal/object/person given feminine generic. ____
page number: ____

48. Number of unspecified gender animal/object/person given neuter pronoun/name/title.
____
page number: ____

49. "Impossible male critter" appears in picture or is referred to. Give number of types.
____

50. "Impossible female critter" appears in picture or is referred to. Give number of types. ____

51. The toys girls are seen playing with are: (circle one)
0 none 1 just stereotypical 2 just non-stereotypical 3 both

52. The toys boys are seen playing with are: (circle one)
0 none 1 just stereotypical 2 just non-stereotypical 3 both

MOTHERS/FATHERS

Parent-child pairs (give number of images)

53. mother-son ____
54. mother-daughter ____
55. father-son ____
56. father-daughter ____

57. Scenes with Just Mom but not Dad: ____
58. Scenes with Just Dad but not Mom: ____
59. Scenes with Both Parents: ____

60. Mentions of Mom in Text ____
61. Mentions of Dad in Text ____
62. Mentions of Parents in Text ____

Mom's actions with children. Give number.

63. Mom Touches (with hand) Baby ____Toddler ____ Older Child ____
64. Mom Carries Baby ____Toddler ____ Older Child ____
65. Mom Hugs Baby ____Toddler ____ Older Child ____
66. Mom Kisses Baby ____Toddler ____ Older Child ____
67. Mom Makes Other Contact with Baby ____Toddler ____ Older Child ____
68. Mom Talks with Baby ____Toddler ____ Older Child ____
69. Mom Feeds child Baby ____Toddler ____ Older Child ____

Mom's other actions. Give number.

70. Mom mentions money ____
71. Mom expresses happiness ____
72. Mom expresses sadness ____
73. Mom cries ____
74. Mom expresses anger ____
75. Mom yells in anger ____
76. Mom is "inept" in stereotypically feminine role ____
77. Mom is "inept" in stereotypically masculine role ____
78. Mom plays with child in stereotypically feminine way ____
79. Mom plays with child in stereotypically masculine way ____
80. Mom disciplines/scolds ____
81. Child disobeys Mom ____
82. Girl child refers to Mom ____
83. Boy child refers to Mom ____

Mom performs home-related Chores. Give number.

84. Traditional chores ____
85. Nontraditional chores ____

86. If mom is seen in the workforce or going to work, is occupation traditional or not?
0 no occupation, 1 traditional, 2 non-traditional, 3 neutral, 4 can't tell gender of job

Dad's actions with children Give number.

87. Dad Touches Baby ____ Toddler ____ Older Child ____
88. Dad Carries Baby ____ Toddler ____ Older Child ____
89. Dad Hugs Baby ____ Toddler ____ Older Child ____
90. Dad Kisses Baby ____ Toddler ____ Older Child ____
91. Dad Makes Other Contact with
Baby ____ Toddler ____ Older Child ____

92. Dad Talks with Baby ____ Toddler ____ Older Child ____
93. Dad Feeds child Baby ____ Toddler ____ Older Child ____

Dad's other actions Give number.

94. Dad mentions money ____
95. Dad expresses happiness ____
96. Dad expresses sadness ____
97. Dad cries ____
98. Dad expresses anger ____
99. Dad yells in anger ____
100. Dad is "inept" in stereotypically feminine role ____
101. Dad is "inept" in stereotypically masculine role ____
102. Dad plays with child in stereotypically feminine way ____
103. Dad plays with child in stereotypically masculine way ____
104. Dad disciplines/scolds ____
105. Child disobeys Dad ____
106. Girl child refers to Dad ____
107. Boy child refers to Dad ____

Dad performs home-related Chores. Give number.

108. Traditional chores ____
109. Nontraditional chores ____

110. If dad is seen in the workforce or going to work, is occupation traditional or not?
0 no occupation, 1 traditional, 2 non-traditional, 3 neutral, 4 can't tell gender of job

APPENDIX C: ANNOTATED CODE SHEET

(Used with permission from Hamilton et al., 2006)

Rater Name: _____

1. Title _____
2. 1st Copyright Year _____
3. Author(s) _____
4. Author sex. Circle number: 1 female 2 male 3 mixed
5. Illustrator(s) _____
6. Illustrator sex. Circle number. 1 female 2 male 3 mixed

If author and illustrator are same person, still circle twice. If can't tell sex from name, circle entire question to research later.

7. Target age: _____ **if clearly stated, otherwise leave blank**
8. Classify story: (circle number) 1 Human 2 Animal 3 Object 4 Mixed

Use mixed only if the animals are anthropomorphized or central characters

9. Gender of title character(s) (explicit or implied):

0 none 1 female 2 male 3 neutral 4 both

if name or pronoun. Count as whichever sex the character is even if it is unclear from JUST reading the title

ALL CHARACTERS

Begin counting when the text begins. "Character" is anything actively interacting with surroundings, and/or would change the story significantly if they were omitted; not just referred to, seen, or nonactively involved. A character MUST appear in text (and probably mentioned singularly, not as part of a group) if there is text and will probably appear in pictures. If not in pictures, they must be prominent in text. Count ONLY if sex is completely clear from text or picture. For repetitious, undifferentiated characters, count the most that occur in any scene up to 7. If character has ANY explicit sex indicator, that's the sex. (he, male name...) Let researcher make the call if it is unclear whether "you guys" type references are male indicators. "Adults" and "children" refer to adult and children humans, animals, AND objects.

Count of female characters.

10. Children ____
11. Adults ____

Count of male characters.

12. Children ____
13. Adults ____

OCCUPATIONS

14. Occupation of most predominant adult female character: (circle and fill in blank if necessary)

0 no evidence of occupation

1 _____ **write in general title of occupation**

2 No such character

traditional means to us in the USA
15. Occupation is: (circle number)
0 no occupation/character 2 nontraditional/masculine
1 traditional/feminine 3 neither/neutral
refer to list of traditional and nontraditional jobs for females and males

16. Occupation of most predominant adult male character: (circle and fill in blank if necessary)
0 no evidence of occupation
1 _____ **write in general title of occupation**
2 No such character

17. Occupation is: (circle number)
0 no occupation/character 2 nontraditional/feminine
1 traditional/masculine 3 neither/neutral

PICTURES
Count ALL pictures, not just those of characters. For the below items, for nameless crowds or groups of 7 or more, treat the group as one picture and whichever sex dominates the group is the sex of the picture (so 6 people count as 6 and 7 in a crowd count as 1). If the sexes are balanced or you can't tell the sex, it is a neuter image, and don't count it. For indistinguishable characters in one scene, count a maximum of 7 (so 7 are 7 and 50 are 7) (see Eloise's Guide to Life for example). For parts of people/animals, count as whole image if the reader would know the sex of the image from context. Seven or more similar characters in one scene is counted as one picture, they don't necessarily have to be grouped together. See I Love You Like Crazy Cakes—babies=1, nannies=3. If sex is CLEARLY understood, count it Only count as sexed AFTER we learn the sex. **see Dougherty and Engel, p. 395, and Engle, p. 648 for method on counting images. **

18. Count of female pictures: _____

19. Count of male pictures: _____

if no sex markers/ questionable sex markers, but reader would interpret them as one sex or the other
20. Count of "gut feeling" female pictures: _____

21. Count of "gut feeling" male pictures: _____

MAIN CHARACTERS
**Must be main character for entire book, not just for a story within a book. If there is one clear main character, do not code a second main character. Following Turner-Bowker 1996, when it's difficult to determine who's the main character, we count the

number of scenes each appears in, and the one with the most appearances is main character #1, and MC #2 is the one with the 2nd most appearances. Also, there may not be any main characters or no 2nd character. If is the case, write in "none" in identifier spot. If equal # of pages or within 3, both identified as central (Turner-Bowker). In that case select #1 and #2 randomly (flip coin).**

Main character #1. Name/other identifier: _____
Circle number in each group.

22.	0 none	1 female	2 male	3 neutral
23.	0 none	1 child	2 adult	3 can't tell

Role of main character #1 OVERALL is: (circle number)
Use the both category only if it is impossible to classify

24.	0 none	1 active	2 passive	3 both
25.	0 none	1 indoors	2 outdoors	

**see p. 77 Dellman-J: operational definitions of these:
Active: Characterized by energetic action or activity, gives rather than takes advice, helps rather than being helped, leading not following, deciding not deferring, doing not waiting; passive: not participating, or acting, compliant. Use image count if shown in both. **

Times main character #1 does these behaviors or shows these qualities: **0 if no appropriate character**

26.	rescues another character or characters **from imminent physical danger**	____
27.	is rescued by another character	____
28.	asks questions of an other-sex character	____
29.	answers the questions of an other-sex character	____
30.	behaves fearfully	____
31.	behaves bravely	____
32.	nurtures/cares for another character	____
33.	acts assertively/aggressively	____

**only do a 2nd main char if it/she/he is pretty much equal in importance to first main char. or if it is too hard to distinguish which is the main one. **

Main character #2. Name/other identifier: _____
Circle number in each group.

34.	0 none	1 female	2 male	3 neutral
35.	0 none	1 child	2 adult	3 can't tell

Role of main character #2 OVERALL is:
Use the both category only if it is impossible to classify

36.	0 none	1 active	2 passive	3 both
37.	0 none	1 indoors	2 outdoors	

Times main character #2 does these behaviors or shows these qualities: **0 if no #2 character**

38. rescues another character or characters **from imminent physical danger** ____
39. is rescued by another character ____
40. asks questions of an other-sex character ____
41. answers the questions of an other-sex character ____
42. behaves fearfully ____
43. behaves bravely ____
44. nurtures/cares for another character ____
45. acts assertively/aggressively ____

OTHER

For below, "he or she", "they," "it" or other nonsexist pronoun/term COULD have been used, but wasn't. For example, a distant bunny that even the storyteller couldn't sex. Mark if unsure and show to researcher.

46. Number of unspecified gender animal/object/person given masculine generic. ____
ex.: he, him, his, Mr., sir, mister**** page number: ____

47. Number of unspecified gender animal/object/person given feminine generic. ____
ex.: she, her, hers, Ms., Miss, Mrs, ma'am, etc.**** page number: ____

for below, when the nonsexist WAS used
48. Number of unspecified gender animal/object/person given neuter pronoun/name/title.
ex: Little Horsie, it, "he or she", they. ____
page number: ____

49. "Impossible male critter" appears in picture or is referred to. Give number of types. **If a group of ants are referred to as male, only count once. Examples: male mosquito, bee, termite(?), ant, dog Lassie as 'he'.** ____

50. "Impossible female critter" appears in picture or is referred to. Give number of types. ____

For below items, see list of stereotypical toys. Toy balls count but not sports per se
51. The toys girls are seen playing with are: (circle one)
0 none 1 just stereotypical 2 just non-stereotypical 3 both 4 just neutral
"both" can include neutral
52. The toys boys are seen playing with are: (circle one)
0 none 1 just stereotypical 2 just non-stereotypical 3 both 4 just neutral

MOTHERS/FATHERS
In cases where it is unclear if a character is technically the mother or father, "Mom" is the primary female parent/guardian/caregiver, (and also for "Dad") and therefore could include a nanny, grandfather, etc. Can be multiple moms and dads.

Parent-child pairs (give number of pictures)
(only if 1 parent and 1 gender of kids). 1 parent and 2+ same-sex kids count as one pair. Count only if both sexes are KNOWN. Count even if there are other non-parents, non-kids in scene.

53. mother-son ____
54. mother-daughter ____
55. father-son ____
56. father-daughter ____

for below, there does not have to be a child present in scene

57. Scenes with Just Mom but not Dad: ____
58. Scenes with Just Dad but not Mom: ____
59. Scenes with Both Parents: ____

for below, count only one mention of each person per sentence

60. Mentions of Mom in Text **ANY mom or dad** ____
Count Mom, mother, she, name, I.
61. Mentions of Dad in Text ____
Count Dad, father, he, name, I
62. Mentions of Parents in Text ____
Count Parents, them, they, us

If appears both in pic and text, only count once per scene. For 63-67 below, only count the one action that is the most involved. E.g., a hug is just a hug, not a hug and a touch. Follow the order of involvement by the number of the item.
Mom's actions with children Give number.

63. Mom Touches (with hand) Baby ____Toddler ____ Older Child ____
64. Mom Carries Baby ____Toddler ____ Older Child ____
65. Mom Hugs Baby ____Toddler ____ Older Child ____
66. Mom Kisses Baby ____Toddler ____ Older Child ____
67. Mom Makes other contact with Baby ____Toddler ____ Older Child ____
68. Mom Talks with Baby ____Toddler ____ Older Child ____
69. Mom Feeds child Baby ____Toddler ____ Older Child ____

for expressions of emotions, count both verbal and facial expressions
Mom's other actions Give number.

70. Mom mentions money ____
71. Mom expresses happiness ____
laughing, smiling, cheering
72. Mom expresses sadness ____
73. Mom cries ____
this is a subset of sadness
74. Mom expresses anger ____
75. Mom yells in anger ____

subset of anger
76. Mom is "inept" in stereotypically feminine role ____
e.g. cooking, cleaning, childcare
77. Mom is "inept" in stereotypically masculine role ____
such as car maintenance, sports
78. Mom plays with child in stereotypically feminine way ____
such as playing house, dolls
79. Mom plays with child in stereotypically masculine way ____
e.g. outdoor play, wrestling, sports
80. Mom disciplines/scolds ____
81. Child disobeys Mom ____
82. Girl child refers to Mom ____
83. Boy child refers to Mom ____

Don't count child care here
Mom performs home-related Chores. Give number.
84. Traditional chores ____
85. Nontraditional chores ____
refer to lists of trad/nontrad chores for males/females

If more than one mom, mark what the MAJORITY of their jobs are, refer to list of trad jobs
86. If mom is seen in the workforce or going to work, is occupation traditional or not?
0 no occupation, 1 traditional, 2 non-traditional, 3 neutral, 4 can't tell gender of job

Dad's actions with children Give number.

87. Dad Touches	Baby ____	Toddler ____	Older Child ____
88. Dad Carries	Baby ____	Toddler ____	Older Child ____
89. Dad Hugs	Baby ____	Toddler ____	Older Child ____
90. Dad Kisses	Baby ____	Toddler ____	Older Child ____
91. Dad Makes Other Contact with			
Baby ____	Toddler ____	Older Child ____	
92. Dad Talks with	Baby ____	Toddler ____	Older Child ____
93. Dad Feeds child	Baby ____	Toddler ____	Older Child ____

Dad's other actions**.** Give number.
94. Dad mentions money ____
95. Dad expresses happiness ____
laughing, smiling, cheering
96. Dad expresses sadness ____
97. Dad cries ____
this is a subset of sadness
98. Dad expresses anger ____
99. Dad yells in anger ____
subset of anger
100. Dad is "inept" in stereotypically feminine role ____

e.g. cooking, cleaning, childcare
101. Dad is "inept" in stereotypically masculine role ____
such as car maintenance, sports
102. Dad plays with child in stereotypically feminine way ____
such as playing house, dolls
103. Dad plays with child in stereotypically masculine way ____
e.g. outdoor play, wrestling, sports
104. Dad disciplines/scolds ____
105. Child disobeys Dad ____
106. Girl child refers to Dad ____
107. Boy child refers to Dad ____

Don't count child care here
Dad performs home-related Chores. Give number.
108. Traditional chores ____
109. Nontraditional chores ____
refer to lists of trad/nontrad chores for males/females

If more than one dad, mark what the MAJORITY of their jobs are
110. If dad is seen in the workforce or going to work, is occupation traditional or not?
0 no occupation, 1 traditional, 2 non-traditional, 3 neutral, 4 can't tell gender of job

Household chores lists
men

take out garbage	plumbing	carpentry-related things	put in light bulbs in high places
climb on ladders	paint house	move heavy things	barbecue

women

clean house	cook	prepare kids' bag lunches	sew
decorate	make appts.	write thank you letters	

Traditional/nontraditional jobs lists
Men – Doctor, Fireman, Policeman**, etc.**
Women – Teacher, Nurse**, etc.**

Stereotypical/nonstereotypical toys lists
Boys – cars, trucks, construction, sports equipment, items from male occupations

Girls – dolls, tea sets, doll houses, jewelry, makeup, dress up items, EZ-bake ovens, items from female occupations

Neutral – blocks, art, stuffed animals, computer unless it has gendered content