1988

Picture Images of Girls and Women in Children's Literature

Diane M. Turner-Bowker
University of Rhode Island

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/oa_diss

Recommended Citation

Turner-Bowker, Diane M., "Picture Images of Girls and Women in Children's Literature" (1988). *Open Access Dissertations*. Paper 1073.
https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/oa_diss/1073

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons-group@uri.edu.

51.25
I47
T83
1998

PICTURE IMAGES OF GIRLS AND WOMEN IN CHILDREN'S LITERATURE

BY

DIANE M. TURNER-BOWKER

A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

IN

PSYCHOLOGY

41240906
UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

1998

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the present study was to evaluate the underlying meanings conveyed by media images to preschool age children in three samples of award-winning picture books. One general hypothesis was that female characters would be underrepresented in illustrations found in children's picture books relative to male characters. A second hypothesis was that female characters would more often be portrayed in subordinate and degrading images than male characters. It was predicted that girls/women would be presented more often than boys/men in traditional and passive roles, shorter, below, behind, in deference (bent over, head tilted), as objects of ownership (arm-lock, shoulder-hold, hand-hold), employing the feminine touch, receiving instruction, smiling, attempting to hide face with hands, sucking/biting fingers, averting head/eyes, and glancing toward an unidentifiable object (mental drifting). A third hypothesis was that books written during an earlier time period (1967-1976) would contain a greater number of subordinate images of women and dominant images of men (as defined by each of the predictions in hypothesis 2) than books written during a more recent time period (1987-1996). In Part I the sample of books examined were Caldecott Medal and Honor books, Boston Globe Horn Book Award-winning and Honor books, and New York Times Choice of Best Illustrated Children's Books of the Year Award (N = 294), representing two separate time periods, 1967-1976 and 1987-1996. Twenty books were randomly selected from each time period for a total of 40 books. The researcher counted and recorded the total numbers of individual girls/women and boys/men in each of the 40 books. All pictures from each time period were reviewed and given a number. A random sample of forty pictures (twenty from each time period) were selected. The researcher recorded time period, ethnicity of characters, and author for each of the 40 pictures for use

in post hoc analyses. The forty pictures were made into slides and presented to a group of 20 raters from the Community College of Rhode Island who rated female and male characters in each picture on function ranking, physical positioning, and facial expression categories. In Part II, 111 participants from Rhode Island College and the Community College of Rhode Island enrolled in a Social Psychology, Human Services, or Marketing course and 19 parents of preschool age children (these persons were asked by the students to participate in the study) were asked to view a series of 36 slides (two pictures from each of the 18 categories listed as predictions in the second hypothesis) and rate the female and male characters on a Semantic Differential scale. Participants were then asked to complete the Modern Sexism scale. There were three main findings from the present study. First, support was provided for the hypothesis that female and male characters would not be represented equally in illustrations. Overall, there were significantly more boys/men presented than girls/women. There was a significant increase in the number of boys/men pictured over time, yet no difference was found for girls/women over time. Second, partial support was found for the hypothesis that girls/women would be presented in subordinate and degrading images more often than men. Females were more likely than males to be presented in passive roles, shorter, in deference (body bent over, head tilted), receiving instruction, and expressing fear. Boys/men were more likely to be shown grasping girls/women in shoulder-holds and hand-holds. Contrary to prediction, males were more often shown below and behind females, and employing touch more often than females. No differences were found between girls/women and boys/men on the remaining seven categories. These findings on images were strengthened through the analysis of visual cues in Part II. Raters interpreted visual cues differently for female and male characters on the factors of activity, potency, and evaluation. Specifically, boys/men were rated

as more active and potent, and were evaluated more negatively than girls/women. Third, no support was found for the third hypothesis that pictures from 1967-1976 would contain more subordinate images of girls/women and dominant images of boys/men than those from 1987-1996, with the exception of one analysis. Boys/men from 1967-1976 were more likely to be presented as sucking/biting fingers than boys/men from 1987-1996. Post hoc analyses were conducted to determine whether (a) girls/women of European ethnicity and of African/Asian/Hispanic ethnicity were portrayed in subordinating/degrading images more often than boys/men of the same cultural background and (b) a difference exists between participant scores on the Modern Sexism scale and ratings of pictures on the Semantic Differential.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

A special message of appreciation to those who have supported my efforts in completing this research endeavor. First, I would like to thank Bernice Lott for being such a wonderful mentor -- providing knowledge, guidance, constructive feedback, and words of encouragement when most needed. I would also like to thank members of my defense committee for their careful review of my manuscript -- Karen Schroeder, Larry Grebstein, Kat Quina, and Judith Anderson. Next, I would like to thank Jim & Mary Rossi, and Cathy & Jen Kennedy who freely gave of themselves during my "time of great need". My parents, Jim & Rose Turner, deserve endless gratitude for all that they have done for me. They deserve special recognition for all the support and love they have provided. I could not have accomplished this without them. Last but not least, to my husband, Bob Bowker -- a heartfelt "thank you" for so often putting my needs ahead of yours, for your friendship, support, and love.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	
Acknowledgment	v
Statement of the Problem	1
Review of Relevant Literature	4
Hypotheses	16
Method	18
Part I	18
Sample	18
Procedure	19
Part II	21
Sample	21
Instruments	22
Procedure	25
Results	25
Part I	25
Part II	29
Post Hoc	29
Discussion	34
References	46
Appendices	54
Tables	101
Figures	113
Bibliography	123

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	101
<u>Age, Ethnicity, and Relationship Status of Participants in Part II</u>	
Table 2	102
<u>Working Sample of 40 Randomly Selected Pictures</u>	
Table 3	105
<u>Prevalence of Girls/Women and Boys/Men Characters in Pictures</u>	
Table 4	106
<u>Chi Square Analyses of Overall Frequencies on Function Ranking, Physical Positioning, and Facial Expression Categories</u>	
Table 5	108
<u>Chi Square Analyses Comparing Data for Girls/Women Over Time</u>	
Table 6	109
<u>Chi Square Analyses Comparing Data for Boys/Men Over Time</u>	
Table 7	110
<u>Post Hoc Chi Square Analyses for Pictures with Characters of European Ethnicity</u>	
Table 8	111
<u>Post Hoc Chi Square Analyses for Pictures with Characters of African/Asian/Hispanic Ethnicity</u>	
Table 9	112
<u>Mean scores on Modern Sexism and Semantic Differential Scales for Different Groups of Respondents</u>	

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure 1.</u> Prevalence of girls/women and boys/men in pictures.	114
<u>Figure 2.</u> Mean scores for girls/women and boys/men on the factors of activity, potency, and evaluation.	115
<u>Figure 3.</u> Mean scores for <u>Modern Sexism</u> comparing mothers and fathers, female and male students.	116
<u>Figure 4.</u> Mean scores for mothers on the <u>Semantic Differential</u> comparing girls/women and boys/men.	117
<u>Figure 5.</u> Mean scores for fathers on the <u>Semantic Differential</u> comparing girls/women and boys/men.	118
<u>Figure 6.</u> Mean scores for female students on the <u>Semantic Differential</u> comparing girls/women and boys/men.	119
<u>Figure 7.</u> Mean scores for male students on the <u>Semantic Differential</u> comparing girls/women and boys/men.	120
<u>Figure 8.</u> Mean scores for low scorers on the <u>Semantic Differential</u> comparing girls/women and boys/men.	121
<u>Figure 9.</u> Mean scores for high scorers on the <u>Semantic Differential</u> comparing girls/women and boys/men.	122

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Media representations of women are based on sexism and misogyny, and are reflective of the power relations of our culture. The social dominance hierarchy in our culture places women at a lower status position than men. Men, in the dominant position, have access to power and control while women, as the subordinate or oppressed class, have more limited access to resources. Women often can only obtain power by elevating their status through association with men. This hierarchy simultaneously creates (through hegemonic structures) and maintains (through the reinforcement of privilege and reiteration of dominance themes) political inequality between women and men in our culture.

Representations are produced in a political social structure, in a cultural context, and have implications for development of norms and ways of behaving in our culture and for individuals' constructions of their own reality. The media often present women as desperate, dependent, child-like, weak, and passive. On the other hand, men are presented as independent, decisive, dominant, strong and active. These types of representations affect the attitudes of women and men, setting up gender categories which distinguish certain ways of behaving for those who fall within a particular group. "Cultures distinguish between two or more genders and organize beliefs and activities according to these categories. Individuals are influenced by the existence of these categories and their perceptions of the world are organized according to them" (Beall, 1993, p.144). In this way, gender is constructed socially and used as means to control women.

For women, the political and social realities of a hegemonic society are efficacious. Misogynist attitudes and stereotypes prime men to take part in negative behaviors against women. Lott (1994) proposes a model of sexist responses to women which include (in order) humor, put-downs, pornography,

institutional exclusion, personal distancing, insults and harassment, intimidation, sexual coercion, sexual abuse, physical abuse, and murder. The model is presented as a spiral, with humor and put-downs (as the broader component) at one end and murder (as the narrower component) at the other end in a continuum of hostile behaviors toward women (see Appendix A).

There exists a relationship between the subtle dimensions of misogyny (humor, pornography) and the more overt forms of violence against women. For example, pornography has "institutionalized a subhuman, victimized, and second-class status for women" (MacKinnon, 1993, p.279), presenting them as objects, stripping them of their identifications and priming them as recipients of verbal, physical, and sexual abuse. Sut Jhally examined the presentation of women as objects in his video documentaries Dreamworlds I (1993) and Dreamworlds II (1997). Women of the Dreamworld are presented in degrading images, as desperate and dependent, unable to cope in the absence of men, nymphomaniacs, and child-like. They are open to being watched, are passive things -- to be used and explored at will. There is a lack of identification for these women as their subjectivity is denied. Camera focus is almost exclusively on body parts, while the whole person (with thoughts, feelings, intelligence) is ignored. As objects, these women are open to the actions of others. They are used for sexual gratification by men, and are available as targets for the frustration and aggression of men.

Studies of pornographic material have found an association between negative images of women and violent behavior against women. Cowan, Lee, Levy, and Snyder (1988) evaluated 45 X-rated videos for themes of dominance and inequality. Of 443 sexually explicit scenes, 54% contained one or both of these themes. Men almost always ejaculated on women rather than in them. Male characters were presented as wealthier and more powerful than women.

Furthermore, women were often presented as child-like -- with soft low voices, barrettes in hair, and the absence of pubic hair. Physical aggression appeared in 23% and rape in 51% of scenes. A more recent study by Cowan and Campbell (1994) measured objectification of women among other scored items in their analysis of X-rated videos. Findings show a large proportion of characters involved in behaviors which present women as objects for use for men's sexual pleasure. Men ejaculating on a woman's face or in her mouth was found to be one of the most frequently occurring behaviors in the videotapes (32%). Anal sex was performed by 52.5% of males. Twenty-nine percent of female characters began sexual activity with fellatio. In addition, 29.8% of women served as objects of physical aggression.

Pornography exists within Lott's (1994) model as a means to reinforce and maintain gender inequality. However, this is not the only form of media which serves the political purpose of objectifying and degrading women. Research has revealed systematic subordination of women in other media image presentations.

Goffman (1979) investigated the relationship between images of women and men in advertisements and cultural behavioral scripts. He suggested that media images establish social order -- regardless of the actual experience of its participants. Advertisements do not reflect *actual* behavior of women and men; instead they reflect how we *think* women and men behave. Advertisements attempt to convince us that this is how women and men *are*, or *should* be, or *want* to be (Gornick, 1979). The advertisements appear to be "normal" presentations of the behavior of human beings, but what they are actually displaying is the performance of masculinity and femininity prescribed by societal norms (reinforcing the notion of men as naturally dominant and women as naturally subordinate). "Gender expressions are by way of being a mere show; but a considerable amount of the substance of society is enrolled in the staging of

it." (Goffman, 1979, p. 8) For example, Goffman (1979) examined the association between images of women and the behavior of children -- women posing as children, acting like children, looking like children. He suggests they are posed in ways which would save them from seriousness -- head tilted to the side, smiling, hands twisted behind the back, the toes of one foot touching the toes of another foot, hands deep in pockets, etc. According to Goffman (1979) what categorizes an individual as gender-classed members of society "is their competence and willingness to sustain an appropriate schedule of displays" (p.8) of certain behaviors. These behaviors are stripped of (historical) context, so that only the content of the displays distinguishes between the classes. The implications of this are significant as "men and women take their cues about 'gender behavior' from the image of that behavior that advertising throws back at them, and they contrive to become the 'people' in those ads" (Gornick, 1979, p.viii).

REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

"Texts are important influences that shape us by reflecting the politics and values of our society" (Fox, 1993, p.656). They are highly interactive; they mold and construct us by presenting images of ourselves. They define what it means to be female or male in our society. Books provide role models; from books, children learn what behavior is acceptable for them, for their peers, and for adults around them. They learn what to say and do, they learn what's expected of them, and they learn right from wrong.

For many years authors of children's literature have portrayed girls and women with narrow characteristics. They are often secondary characters; are regularly found in domestic settings; and are often in need of rescue by male

characters. Boys and men are also presented in stereotyped roles, but these roles are more positive and sought-after. For example, boys and men more often serve in central roles (as protagonists); are portrayed as leaders, decision-makers, and heroes; and are often involved in occupations and roles outside of the home. As McArthur and Eisen (1976) pointed out, female readers of children's literature must identify with the male characters in these stories if they are to gain any sense of achievement from literary role models.

In the early 1970s, studies of gender bias in children's literature emerged as a result of the women's movement. Since then, most research on children's literature has focused on images of women/girls and men/boys in roles, activities, and occupations. Reviewing literature from the 1960s, Key (1971) found that male characters were more often viewed in dominant, active roles (adventurous, bread-winning), while females existed in passive, victimized roles. From this data, Key (1971) concluded "boys do; girls are".

Weitzman, Eifler, Hokada, & Ross (1972) conducted one of the "hallmark" studies in the area of gender bias and children's literature. They evaluated Caldecott Medal-winning and honors picture books, Newbery Award winners and runners-up, Little Golden Books, and others described as "etiquette books" written in the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s. Their main focus was to determine if gender distinctions existed in the prevalence of characters and the representation of characters in roles. They found that females were greatly underrepresented in titles, central roles, and illustrations, by a 1:11 ratio. In fact, in approximately one-third of the Caldecott books analyzed, there were no females at all. Another major finding was that female characters were generally "inconspicuous and nameless" (p.1128). They were portrayed in roles which are not valued in the eyes of American society. Girls and women were shown as helpers, caretakers, followers, and servers of others, while boys and men were portrayed as exciting

and engaged in "heroic activity" (p.1131). More specific descriptions of roles held by girls and women included the following: passive, immobile, restricted by clothing, prize for male adventurousness, dependent, pleasers, "saved", static, "pretty dolls -- to be admired and to bring pleasure". Typical roles for boys and men included leader, independent, achiever, self-confident, outdoors "in the real world", in constant motion, interacting with the world around them, the "rescuer". For women, occupations included domestic worker, garden tender, baker, nurse, child-tender, and launderer. Most often, women were presented as mother, wife, fairy godmother, fairy, witch, or underwater maiden. On the other hand, men were storekeepers, housebuilders, kings, princes, fighters, fishermen, policemen, soldiers, cooks, and bearers of knowledge. Notice the distinctions that can be made between the roles of females and males in terms of power, strength, activity, and richness of character. Furthermore, roles prescribed for female characters in the children's books are those that are not as highly valued in our society. This creates an even greater distinction in meaning and worth for the two genders.

Rachlin and Vogt (1974) examined pictures from 30 coloring books for children which were prominently displayed in retail market stores in order to determine if differences existed in portrayal of female and male characters. Among other findings, they determined that there were qualitative distinctions between "boy activities" and "girl activities". Boys were pictured primarily in outdoor and competitive activities, while girls were shown in more passive activities inside of the home. The most notable difference was in the portrayal of children imitating, in their play activities, the career roles of women and men. The career roles occupied by women tended to require little skill and preparation, while the career roles for men "necessitated some special skill training, or higher education" (p.533).

Stewig and Knipfel (1975) analyzed 100 children's picture books published between 1972 and 1974 and found that only 68 portrayed women in an actual role/activity. In addition, 68% of those in roles were identified as homemakers or domestics.

During the 1970s, sex stereotyping in children's literature was made salient. Publishers agreed to make changes in the texts, scripts, and pictures of children's books in order to ensure equal treatment of women and men. "By 1978 almost all of the major textbook publishers had issued guidelines to discourage sexist portrayals of women in children's picture books" (Lott, 1994, p.48).

Even after the publishers' guidelines, male characters still appear more frequently in titles, central roles and illustrations than female characters (Heintz, 1987; Kortenhaus & Demarest, 1993; McDonald, 1989). Although the numbers remain unequal, some researchers have found that in the last few decades, there has been a trend towards greater equality in the literature. Specifically, there has been an increase in the number of female characters in titles, central roles and illustrations (Allen, Allen, & Sigler, 1993; Collins, Ingoldsby, & Dellman, 1984; Dellman-Jenkins, Florjancic, & Swadener, 1993; Kortenhaus & Demarest, 1993). Allen et al. (1993) included a third category, *neuter gender*, in their analysis of Caldecott Award-winners and honors books for a comparison of two time periods, 1938-1940 and 1986-1988. Characters categorized as of neuter gender were typically animal characters which were not clearly identifiable as either female or male. They found an increase in this category over time and suggested that use of gender neutral characters presents children with an opportunity to model characters that prescribe certain positive behaviors, yet do not exemplify particular gender-roles.

Consistent with past research (Marten & Matlin, 1976; Rachlin & Vogt, 1974; Weitzman et al., 1972), recent findings indicate that female characters are

still portrayed more often than male characters in passive, domestic, limited, and devalued roles, while males thrive in active, dominating, valued roles (Allen et al., 1993; Charnes, Hoffman, Hoffman, & Meyers, 1980; Kortenhaus & Demarest, 1993; McDonald, 1989). In a sample of 14 Caldecott Medal-winning children's books, Heintz (1987) evaluated the occupations of female and male characters and found gender bias. In particular, her results indicate that men were presented in three times as many different occupations as women.

Research on children's literature has generally not examined the more subtle aspects of the presentation of girls/women and boys/men, although there have been a few exceptions. The present author examined gender stereotyping in children's literature through the use of differential language (Turner-Bowker, 1996). Focusing on the adjectives in a sample of Caldecott Award-winning picture books, I found that male characters were described as more potent (powerful), active, masculine, and with more negative evaluation than female characters. Other researchers have investigated the subtleties of images in picture books for preschoolers. Key (1971) found a difference in the physical presence (power position) of characters. Males were found to be taller, in front of, or leaning over female characters. Spitz (1994) examined four children's picture books (*Angry Arthur*; *Now One Foot, Now the Other*; *Willy the Wimp*; and *Madeline*) to determine how images and text play into young children's understanding of gender. Haskell (1993) suggests that the study of images of a particular historical moment can teach us about the inner lives of people. Spitz (1994) followed this suggestion and asked "what we can learn about the psychological development (of children) if we study the visual environment that leaves its mark on them" (pp. 308-309). She suggested that adults are able to negotiate through from artistic images to reality, yet children are not as able to distinguish the boundaries between art and life. Spitz (1994) used the example of

the images of girl as nurse and boy as doctor. When children view images like this, what they assimilate is that the images reflect real life roles/occupations. This is problematic as images viewed early in life serve "a significant part of the organizing experience" (p. 311) of the mind. The implications of this are great, since the research literature has shown repeated presentations of women/girls and boys/men in stereotypical roles that do not reflect real life behavior. According to Spitz (1994), "even as greater numbers of women become influential professionals, the old images sustain a haunting power...(and) are not easily eradicated" (p.328).

Research on visual images of women/girls and boys/men in children's literature is very limited, and thus one must turn to other forms of research to learn more about the variables which may impact the social construction of gender. A number of researchers have investigated the pictorial presentation of women and men in advertising. Studies have shown that women are objectified more often than men (Ferguson, Kershel, & Tinkham, 1990). Specifically, women/girl's body parts are featured more often than their faces in print advertising (Archer, Iritani, Kimes, & Barrios, 1983; Dodd, Harcar, Foerch, & Anderson, 1989; Hawkins & Aber, 1993). In a recent analysis of 59 television beer commercials, Hall & Crum (1994) found a significant difference in the presentation of women's and men's bodies. For women there were significantly more camera shots focusing on specific parts of the body (chest, buttocks, legs, crotch) than for men. In addition, men's faces appear twice as often as women's faces (Sullivan & O'Connor, 1988). This suggests that women continue to be presented in as "empty vessels".

Past studies of media presentations have found women to be shown in degrading positions that emphasize body parts (Thomas, 1986; Duncan, 1990), that place them in submissive positions where they appear to be smaller in

stature than men (Duncan, 1990), displaying more "emotional" (Duncan, 1990) and less serious (Dodd et al., 1989; Leppard, Ogletree, & Wallen, 1993) facial expressions than men.

A more recent study by Rudman and Hagiwara (1992) examined media portrayal of women in advertisements for exercise equipment, health products, and fitness apparel. They analyzed 191 advertisements from 5 health and fitness magazines for posture, dominant versus passive placement, active versus passive behavior, dismemberment of body parts, and facial emotional display, among other variables. Results indicated that women were more often found in positions with posture inappropriate for exercise (curved and sexually exploitative poses). Also, significantly more women were placed in submissive/passive positions relative to men. In fact, in one of the magazines, more than 80% of women were in passive postures to men. In no instance was a man placed in a submissive position relative to a woman. Women were also shown in inactive poses more often than men. Approximately 40% of all advertisement photos either focused on, or unnaturally emphasized, specific body parts of the models, and approximately 50% of women photographed displayed sexual emotional facial expressions.

Other studies have examined age-ism in image presentations and found that women are regularly presented as younger than men (Leppard et al., 1993; Prather & Fidell, 1975; Schneider & Schneider, 1979). Furnham and Bitar (1993) examined the portrayal of women and men in a sample of 180 British television commercials. Findings indicated that women were more often described as younger, and men were more often described as middle-aged.

Research in the area of advertising has concentrated on the more subtle aspects of media images of women and men by examining body positioning, "face-isms" (degree to which the camera shot focuses on the face versus the

body), "body-isms" (degree to which the camera shot focuses on the whole body versus body parts), and "age-ism" (young versus old). Yet no one has taken the study of advertisements to the extreme that Goffman (1979) did. Original to his work is the analysis of minute aspects of the images, for their comprehensive meaning. He concentrated on facial expressions, head postures, head-eye aversion, relative size, body positioning and placing, finger biting and sucking. Goffman (1979) compared groups of pictures to images which contain the same scene or activity, yet with a switched-gender "character" to allow the reader to see the differences in portrayal and meaning conveyed by the images when women or men are featured in them. Goffman proposed that "(g)esture, expression, posture reveal not only how we feel about ourselves but add up, as well, to an entire arrangement -- a scene -- that embodies cultural values..."(Gornick, 1979, p.vii) He found that simple gestural messages in images from magazine advertisements function to construct and maintain gender stereotypes by presenting women in subordinate poses in comparison to men. A more recent study by Kang (1997) replicated the work of Goffman, and found no difference in the way that women are presented in picture images over time.

According to Birdwhistell (1970), people function as multisensory beings. We communicate both verbally and nonverbally with other organisms in our environment. We make statements about our situation, about what activity is going on, and about what relationship we're in through "glance, posture, and movement" (LaFrance, 1978, p. 3). Our body language is not meaningful out of context, rather it is a function of both the person and environment and is subject to the changeable nature of each (LaFrance, 1978; Lewin, 1951).

It has been suggested that gender role expectations for women and men affect nonverbal communication styles, and subsequent attributions about power differentials in relationships (Briton & Hall, 1995a; Frable, 1987; Goffman, 1979;

Henley, 1973; Henley, 1977; LaFrance, 1978). Nonverbal behavior indicative of dominance and subordination has been found to be related not only to situations involving gender, but also to more generalized situations regarding status (involving age, socioeconomic status, etc.). For instance, research has demonstrated a high similarity between women's body language and that of lower-status men. Both have been found to have tense posture, smile more, avert their gaze from direct eye contact, and covertly watch others (Dovidio, Ellyson, Keating, Heltman, & Brown, 1988).

Research has documented that women tend to smile more than men (Briton & Hall, 1995b; Mackey, 1976; Regan, 1982). Women who smile more often have been rated as more interpersonally attractive than those who do not (McGinley, McGinley, & Nicholas, 1978). Reis, Wilson, Monestere, Bernstein, Clark, Seidl, Franco, Gioiso, Freeman, & Radoane (1990) found that female and male college students rated smiling images of women and men as more attractive than nonsmiling images. In addition, stimulus persons who were smiling were rated as more sincere, sociable, and less masculine than those who were not smiling. Similarly, Burgoon, Buller, Hale, & DeTurck (1984) asked 150 undergraduate students to observe two out of 40 videotaped conversations of a female-male pair who exhibited differing combinations of nonverbal behaviors. Findings indicated that high maintenance of eye contact, smiling, and close interpersonal distance communicated higher level of composure and less emotional arousal. High maintenance of eye contact and close interpersonal distance alone communicated dominance and control.

Differences in the meaning of physical/body positionings have also been well-documented in the literature. Montepare (1995) conducted two studies to determine the influence of a stimulus person's height on impression formation among preschool-age children. Results of both studies supported children's

interpretation of taller stimulus persons as more dominant and stronger than shorter stimulus persons. In another study by Schwatz, Tesser, & Powell (1982) 144 undergraduate students were asked to evaluate 32 drawings of women and men in various body positionings. Four positions were varied - lateral opposition (positioned side-by-side), precedence (one positioned in front of the other), elevation (one positioned above the other), and posture. Participants were asked to choose the dominant figure in each drawing. Findings reveal that persons portrayed in the following positions - elevation, precedence, and posture - were considered to be dominant to the other person pictured.

Physical/body position can also serve as a function in appeasement. For instance, Ginsburg, Pollman, & Wauson (1977) examined the antagonistic behavior of 34 elementary school age boys and found that body signals of submission such as kneeling, bowing, and shoe tying serve to appease escalating antagonistic behavior among the children.

It has also been reported that women tilt or cant their heads more often than men (Regan, 1982). However, these findings have been inconsistent (Halberstadt & Saitta, 1987; Willson & Lloyd, 1990).

Finally, touch has been identified as an indicator of differing status. Henley (1973) observed 101 instances of touch in various locations in Baltimore, Maryland. She found that men were more likely to initiate touching others, while women were most often the recipients of touch. This finding has been replicated by Major, Schmidlin, & Williams (1990) who observed people in public settings (i.e., parks, beaches, airports) and found that men were more likely to touch women than vice versa. However, they did not find this gender difference to exist among children. Henley (1973) also reported that women were less likely to reciprocate a man's touch than for men to reciprocate a woman's touch. Interestingly, according to Major (1981), this result has been found to occur

outdoors more so than indoors. Also, findings have suggested that men, older persons, and those of high socioeconomic status are more likely to touch those of lower status (women, younger people, those of low socioeconomic status) (Henley, 1977). Other researchers have found that men are more likely to put their arms around women, and women are more likely to link arms with men (arm-lock) (Hall & Veccia, 1990).

Differences also exist in the way that persons interpret touch. Fisher, Rytting, & Heslin (1976) investigated 94 female and male undergraduate student's responses to interpersonal touch when handed a library card. Findings indicate the women generally reported a more positive affect and evaluation after being touched than did men, who were ambivalent to touch. Burgoon (1991) examined the ways in which 622 adolescents and adults interpreted messages associated with touch. Results indicated that people interpreted touch in a number of ways - as a sign of composure, trust, affection, similarity, dominance, and informality. Specifically, face touching and hand-holding was interpreted as indicative of the most composure and informality, while handholding and handshaking expressed the least dominance.

To summarize, a positive relationship has been demonstrated to exist between negative presentation of and hostile behavior toward women. Research on nonverbal behavior suggests that differing meanings of dominance, control, and submissiveness may be derived from images of persons, depending on their gender and status. Although a limited number of researchers have attempted to examine the more subtle aspects of sexism in children's literature, careful examination of picture images has been a neglected area of study. The present investigation will utilize techniques first developed by Goffman (1979) to analyze the body language of girls/women and boys/men in award-winning samples of children's picture books.

According to Goffman (1979) one way in which social power, authority, and rank is expressed in social situations is through *function ranking*. Men are more often portrayed in an executive role, as leader, working outside of the home and in active roles. This status position is performed in and outside of occupational role. A second method to distinguish those of differing social power is through *body positioning*. Here, differences in size and position often correlate with differences in "social weight" (Goffman, 1979, p.28). Physical positioning can also objectify/define women and children as property. Finally, *facial expression* of characters relay the subordinate position of women by removing them psychologically (emotionally or intellectually) from the situation at hand. Women are usually presented as smiling [communicates submissiveness and/or facilitating interpersonal relations (Hall, 1984; Konner, 1987)], fearful, hands blocking face as though shy or hiding something or unwilling to express themselves, sucking on finger or biting nail(s) to give the impression of anxiety, as unable to make eye contact (Tseelon, 1991), or glancing away into nothingness (Goffman, 1979).

The purpose of the present study was to evaluate three samples of children's picture books to determine if differences exist in the *function ranking*, *physical positioning*, and *facial expressions* of female and male characters. Examination of these variables will allow a comprehensive analysis of the underlying meanings conveyed by media images to preschool-age children. The importance of this research lies in the implications of gender role stereotyping for both girls and boys. Traditional media images teach young children how to behave as a girl/woman, or how to behave as a boy/man. Expectations for behavior are defined through gender roles, and are limiting for persons of either sex. Distinctive patterns are created in terms of acceptable behavior for girls (subordinate, passive, quiet, inactive, etc.) and for boys (dominant, active, "with

voice", etc.), rather than on positive human characteristics that may be sought by all. Negative consequences for girls and boys have been documented in activity level, feelings of independence/dependence, aggressive behavior, cognitive performance, school achievement, and vocational aspirations (Lott, 1994).

HYPOTHESES

One general hypothesis in this study was that female characters would be underrepresented in illustrations found in children's books relative to male characters.

A second hypothesis was that female characters would more often be portrayed in subordinate and degrading images than male characters. The following predictions were made. For each of the predictions presented, characters compared were of roughly similar age.

Function Ranking (see Appendix B)

1. Girls/women would be presented in *traditional roles* more often than boys/men. [Traditional - acting in accordance with societal expectations/tradition (i.e., females portrayed in less powerful roles, such as homemaker)]
2. Girls/women would more often be presented as *passive* while boys/men would more often be presented as active. [Active - characterized by energetic participation in a performance; Passive - characterized by compliance, lack of participation or activity]

Physical Positioning (see Appendix C)

1. Girls/women would more often be presented as *shorter* than boys/men.

2. Girls/women would more often be physically positioned *below* others boys/men.
3. Girls/women would more often be physically positioned *behind* boys/men.
4. Girls/women would more often be presented in *positions of deference* to boys/men. [Deference - lowering of oneself physically; a form of prostration; body bent over, head tilted]
5. Girls/women would more often be presented *as objects of ownership* than boys/men. [Object of ownership - held in arm-lock, shoulder-hold, or hand-hold positions (male hand facing forward)]
6. Girls/women would more often be presented *employing the "feminine touch"* than boys/men. ["Feminine touch" - lightly touching and/or caressing as opposed to grasping, manipulating, shaping]
7. Girls/women would more often be presented *as receiving instruction* than boys/men. [Instruction - as in how to complete a task; providing direction]

Facial Expression (see Appendix D)

1. Girls/women would more often be *smiling* than boys/men.
2. Girls/women would more often be presented *with expressions of fear* than boys/men.
3. Girls/women would more often be presented *as attempting to hide facial expression with hand(s)* than boys/men.
4. Girls/women would more often be presented *as sucking or biting their finger(s)* than boys/men.

5. Girls/women would more often be presented in *head/eye aversion* than boys/men. [turning head and eyes away from person who is looking directly at you]
6. Girls/women would more often be presented *as glancing toward an unidentifiable object* than boys/men. [as in a euphoric state, "mental drifting"]

A third hypothesis is that books written during an earlier time period (1967-1976) would contain a greater number of subordinate images of girls/women and dominant images of boys/men (as defined by each of the predictions in hypothesis 2) than books written during a more recent time period (1987-1996).

METHOD

Part I

Sample

Group 1. The books examined for this portion of the study are Caldecott Medal and Honor books (Association for Library Service to Children, 1996) for the periods 1967-1976 and 1987-1996. The Caldecott Medals are given by the American Library Association to honor the year's most distinguished children's books for preschoolers (ages three to six). The Caldecott award has been presented annually since 1938 for the best in picture books for preschoolers (Smith, 1957). Runners-up have also been recognized in each category, and are now called Honor books. The popularity of these books, both in libraries and in bookstores, suggests that they are accurate representations of children's actual reading material. Previous investigators have examined these books for gender stereotyping (Allen et al., 1993; Collins et al., 1984; Crabb & Bielawski, 1994;

Dellman-Jenkins et al., 1993; Turner-Bowker, 1996; Weitzman et al., 1972).

From 1967-1976 there are 35 Medal and Honor books, and from 1987-1996 there are 40 Medal and Honor books, for a total sample of 75 used in this investigation (see Appendix E).

Group 2. The books examined for this portion of the study are Boston Globe Horn Book Award winners and runners-up (Honor books) for the periods 1967-1976 and 1987-1996. This award is cosponsored by The Boston Globe and The Horn Book Magazine and has been presented annually since 1967 for the best in text and illustration. More recently the award has been presented to winners in each of three categories - outstanding fiction, outstanding nonfiction, and outstanding illustration. As many as three Honor books per year may be cited (Jones, 1988). For the present study, only those awards presented for illustration in children's picture books (ages three to six) were included in the sample. From 1967-1976 there are 34 Award and Honor books, and from 1987-1996 there are 29 Award and Honor books for a total sample of 63 used in this study (see Appendix F).

Group 3. The books examined for this portion of the study have been named The New York Times Choice of Best Illustrated Children's Books of the Year. This award was established to honor the highest quality illustrations in children's books, and was first presented in 1952. The number of books chosen for this annual award varies, but is approximately ten (Jones, 1988). For the present study, only those awards presented for illustration in children's picture books were included in the sample. From 1967-1976 there are 92 winners, and from 1987-1996 there are 99 winners for total sample of 191 (see Appendix G).

Procedure

Step 1. The researcher reviewed all books (N = 329) from each time period to determine if any duplicate award-winners were present in the sample.

Thirty-five duplications were found (as indicated with an asterisk in Appendices E, F, & G). This decreased the overall number of books in the sample to 294.

Step 2. For the time period 1967-1976, all books (N = 145) were given a number. Twenty books were randomly selected from this time period using a table of random numbers. For the time period 1987-1996, all books (N = 149) were given a number. Twenty books were randomly selected from this time period using a table of random numbers. Five of the books chosen randomly were replaced (using random selection) due to the fact that they contained images of animals whose gender was not readily apparent (see Appendix H) The researcher counted and recorded the total numbers of individual girls/women and individual boys/men pictured in each of the 40 books.

Step 3. For the time period 1967-1976, all of the pictures from the randomly selected books were reviewed. Only those pictures including two children (female/male dyad) of roughly similar age *or* two adults (female/male dyad) of roughly similar age were included in the sample. These pictures were given a number, and a random sample of 20 pictures was selected using a table of random numbers. The same was done for books selected from the 1987-1996 time period. This produced a sample of 40 pictures. The researcher recorded time period, ethnicity of characters, and author for each of the 40 pictures for use in post hoc analyses.

Step 4. The 40 pictures were made into slides and presented to a group of 20 raters. The raters were undergraduate students from the Community College of Rhode Island, participating for an extra credit assignment for their social psychology course. There were two rating sessions with 10 students in each session. Raters were given an informed consent form which was removed from the rating form to ensure anonymity of responses (see Appendix I). A list of raters was provided to the instructor for the provision of credit (amount

determined in advance by the instructor). The raters also received a set of standardized instructions (see Appendix I), training by the researcher, and an opportunity to practice rating two pictures (one practice picture was selected from each time period). The order of stimulus presentation was counterbalanced for the two sessions to control for bias. Each rating session lasted approximately 120 minutes (30 minutes for introduction and instructions; 90 minutes for rating task) and took place during one regular class meeting time. A form was designed to facilitate data collection. The raters completed one form per picture. The pictures were identified with a number at the top of each form. Each picture was rated on 18 categories, corresponding directly to the predictions made in hypothesis 2 (see Appendix J). After completing the ratings participants were debriefed regarding the intent of the study.

Part II

Sample

Participants were 130 students from area colleges in Rhode Island and parents of preschool age children. Of the 130, 111 were undergraduate students from Rhode Island College (N=9) and the Community College of Rhode Island (N=102) enrolled in a Social Psychology, Human Services, or Marketing course. Students received class credit (or extra credit) for participating in this research project. The researcher informed each instructor of the student's participation so that credit could be awarded upon completion. The amount of credit provided was determined in advance by each instructor. The remaining 19 participants were parents of preschool age children. These individuals were asked by the undergraduate students at the Community College of Rhode Island to participate in the study. The ages, ethnicities, and relationship status of the participants, 94 women and 36 men, are shown in Table 1. Overall, forty percent of participants

were parents ($N = 52$). Sixty-four percent of parents were undergraduate students and 50% of parents had preschool age children.

Instruments

A form was prepared for use in data collection. One form was used for each picture rated. Each picture was identified with a number at the top of each form. There were two pictures from each of the 18 categories listed as predictions related to the second hypothesis, for a total of 36 (see Appendixes B, C, and D). The form included 11 Semantic Differential rating scales (see Appendix K).

Semantic Differential scale. The Semantic Differential scales, originally developed by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957), employs bipolar adjectives and seven-point rating scales. The respondent is asked to rate some idea, concept, or issue by checking off one of the seven spaces between the bipolar adjectives. Test-retest reliability of the scale was determined by Osgood et al. to be .85. Reliability coefficients for individual items were not computed as the Semantic Differential scores are too consistent. On many items, there is such close agreement on scale position that variance approaches zero. Factor-score analysis produced three factors: activity, evaluation, and potency (power). Average error of measurement (expected to be smaller when the instrument is more reliable) was much smaller in the evaluative scales than in either the activity or potency scales. Criterion validity of this measure could not be assessed by Osgood et al., as no quantitative criterion of the measure of meaning was available to compare to (for correlating scores). Face validity, the extent to which the measure's "distinctions...correspond with those which would be made by most observers without the aid of the instrument" (p. 141), was determined by asking participants whether discriminations made by the instrument correspond with her/his own judgments. Data collection on participants rating 10 concepts using

the Semantic Differential scales produced three clusters, including words of similar meaning in each of the three clusters. Osgood et al. suggest that most people would cluster the concepts in the same way based upon their meanings, without the use of the Semantic Differential scale. In other words, the rating of factors on the scales often reflect what is expected through common sense.

Three factors measured by the Semantic Differential were included in the present study: activity, evaluation, and potency (power). Activity was measured by three subscales (warm-cold, loud-quiet, moving-still). Evaluation was measured by five subscales (good-bad, pretty-ugly, friendly-unfriendly, healthy-sick, happy-sad). And potency was measured by three subscales (strong-weak, big-small, heavy-light).

The 11 Semantic Differential scales were completed by participants for the girl/woman presented in each picture and the boy/man presented in each picture. Therefore, each form contained two scales with the following instructions, "Look at the girl/woman in the picture and rate her on the following scale", and "Look at the boy/man in the picture and rate him on the following scale". There were 36 pictures, with a female/male dyad of similar age in each. Thus, each participant was asked to complete a total of 72 scales (two scales per form for a total of 36 forms). The scales were counterbalanced and the order of bipolar adjectives was varied to avoid practice effects and rating error. Participant ratings on the Semantic Differential tested the meaning of visual cues in the pictures. This allowed the researcher to determine if a quantitative difference exists between the images of girls/women and the images of boys/men on the factors of activity, evaluation, and potency.

Modern Sexism scale. The Modern Sexism scale is an eight-item inventory designed to measure covert or subtle sexism. It measures "whether respondents tend to (a) deny the existence of discrimination against women, (b)

resent complaints about discrimination, and (c) resent special 'favours' for women" (Swim & Cohen, 1997, p.105). Swim, Aikin, Hall, & Hunter (1995) constructed this scale using items from McConahay's (1986) Modern Racism scale and Sears' (1988) classification of Modern Sexism items. Internal reliability for the present scale was found to be adequate ($\alpha = .84$). In addition, men's ($M = 2.63$) Modern Sexism scores were significantly higher than scores for women ($M = 2.14$), $t(628) = 8.55$, $p < .001$. This finding was replicated in a second study by the authors (Swim et al., 1995). To determine construct validity of the measure, Swim et al. (1995) examined the relationship between scores on the Modern Sexism scale and attributions for job segregation among women and men. Findings indicate that scores on the Modern Sexism scale are predictive of individual attributions for job segregation. Specifically, those who earned high scores were more likely to attribute sex segregation to biological determinants; while those with low scores were more likely to indicate that socialization, prejudice, and discrimination were causes. Modeling past research on the Modern Racism scale, Swim et al. (1995) examined the relationship between Modern Sexism scores and voting preferences to determine construct validity. They predicted that Modern Sexism would be a better predictor than Old-Fashioned Sexism for a female or male candidate. Controlling for liberalism and party affiliation, Swim et al. (1995) found that respondents with lower Modern Sexism scores were more likely to prefer to vote for a woman candidate (Modern Sexism was determined to be a better predictor of voting behavior than Old-Fashioned Sexism measures). More recent work by Swim & Cohen (1997) compared the Modern Sexism scale and the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS) (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1973). Their results lend support for convergent and discriminant evidence of construct validity. Specifically, the AWS and the Modern Sexism scales were found to tap different, but related constructs.

Both are related to negative attitudes about women, yet the AWS seems to measure overt or blatant sexism, while the Modern Sexism scale seems to measure more covert or subtle forms of sexism.

For this measure, participants were asked to rate their agreement with individual items on a 7-point Likert-type scale (from strongly disagree to strongly agree). Low scores (0-3.99) indicated less sexist attitudes, while high scores (4-7) indicated more sexist attitudes.

Procedure

Participants were asked to complete an informed consent form (student or parent version, as appropriate) and demographic survey (see Appendix L). The informed consent forms were removed from the answer form to ensure anonymity of responses. The names of student participants were provided to the instructor for the provision of credit (amount to be determined in advance by the instructor). All participants were then provided with a set of standardized instructions (see Appendix M). Pictures (transformed into slides) were presented one at a time to each group of participants. They were asked to review each slide and complete two survey forms (one for the girl/woman; one for the boy/man) for each slide presented. Next, participants completed the Modern Sexism scale (Swim et al., 1995) (see Appendix N) and were debriefed as to the intent of the study.

RESULTS

Part I

For each time period, the prevalence of girls/women and boys/men in pictures was assessed by the researcher who counted and recorded numbers of characters of each gender in the books. The numbers of female and male characters in each book was counted twice by the researcher. From 1967-1976

there are 808 girls/women and 1234 boys/men presented in pictures. From 1987-1996 there are 734 girls/women and 1589 boys/men pictured. These data are shown in Figure 1. Table 2 presents data on time period, ethnicity of characters, and author for the sample of 40 randomly selected pictures.

Differences between visual presentation of girl/women and boy/men characters were determined using 1 x k (Goodness of Fit) chi square analyses. In this analysis, the observed data on female and male characters was compared with an expected data set (based on pure chance) to determine how well the observations "fit" the expectations. This analysis was conducted three times, as follows: (1) using the entire data set (overall analysis of girl/women and boy/men pictures from 1967-1976 and 1987-1996); (2) comparing the earlier data for girls/women (1967-1976) to the more recent data for girls/women (1987-1996); and (3) comparing the earlier data for boys/men (1967-1976) to the more recent data for boys/men (1987-1996). The first step was conducted to determine if an overall difference exists in the visual presentation of girls/women and boys/men in the sample. The last two steps were conducted to determine if a difference exists in images of girls/women over time, and boys/men over time.

For the overall data set, a significant difference was found between the prevalence of girls/women (N=1542) and boys/men (N=2823) [$\chi^2(1) = 375.94, p < .05$]. No significant difference in prevalence was found for girls/women over time [$\chi^2(1) = 3.55, p > .05$]. A significant difference in prevalence was found to exist for boys/men over time [$\chi^2(1) = 44.64, p < .05$]. Table 3 presents the relevant data. It can be seen that, overall, there were significantly more boys/men pictured than girls/women, and that pictures of boys/men increased significantly from the earlier to the later time period.

For each of the 40 randomly selected pictures, participant rated girls/women and boys/men on each of the 18 categories corresponding directly to

the predictions made in hypothesis 2. Ratings were tabulated by the researcher. Chi square analyses were conducted to determine if there was a significant difference in frequencies of function ranking (traditional versus nontraditional versus not sure, active versus passive); physical positioning [shorter, below, behind, in deference (bent over, head tilted), as objects of ownership (arm-lock, shoulder-hold, hand-hold), employing the "feminine touch"; receiving instruction]; and facial expressions (smiling, showing fear, hiding face with hands, sucking/biting fingers, head/eye aversion, mental drifting) between girls/women and boys/men. Specifically, a 3 x 2 chi square analysis was used to evaluate the "traditional versus nontraditional versus not sure" category, and a 2 x 2 chi square was used to analyze the "active versus passive" category. The 16 remaining categories were evaluated using 1 x k chi square analyses.

Chi square analyses were conducted three times, as follows: (1) using the entire data set (overall analysis of the 40 pictures from 1967-1976 to 1987-1996); (2) comparing earlier data for girls/women (1967-1976) to the more recent data for girls/women (1987-1996); and (3) comparing the earlier data for boys/men (1967-1976) to the more recent data for boys/men (1987-1996). The first step was conducted to determine if there was an overall difference in the function ranking, physical positioning, and facial expressions of girls/women and boys/men in the sample. The last two steps were conducted to determine if there was a difference in the function ranking, physical positioning, and facial expressions of girls/women over time, and boys/men over time.

For the overall data set, significant differences were found between girls/women and boys/men on the following categories: function ranking (active versus passive); physical positioning (shorter, below, behind, bent over, head tilted, shoulder-hold, hand-hold, feminine touch, receiving instruction); and facial expressions (showing fear). Girls/women were more likely than boys/men to be

presented in passive roles [$\chi^2(1) = 66.02, p < .05$]. More often, females were presented as shorter [$\chi^2(1) = 28.88, p < .05$] than males. In addition, girls/women were more likely to be presented in positions of deference to boys/men, bent over [$\chi^2(1) = 42.80, p < .05$] with head tilted [$\chi^2(1) = 28.85, p < .05$]. Boys/men were more likely to be shown grasping girls/women in a shoulder-hold [$\chi^2(1) = 36.03, p < .05$] or hand-hold [$\chi^2(1) = 30.38, p < .05$]. Girls/women were shown receiving instruction [$\chi^2(1) = 68.32, p < .05$] and expressing fear [$\chi^2(1) = 34.80, p < .05$] more often than boys/men. No significant differences were found to exist between girls/women and boys/men on the remaining categories: "traditional versus nontraditional versus not sure" [$\chi^2(2) = 1.16, p > .05$], arm-lock [$\chi^2(1) = 3.00, p > .05$], smiling [$\chi^2(1) = .00, p > .05$], hiding face with hands [$\chi^2(1) = 2.46, p > .05$], sucking/biting fingers [$\chi^2(1) = 2.78, p > .05$], head/eye aversion [$\chi^2(1) = 2.74, p > .05$], and mental drifting [$\chi^2(1) = 1.59, p > .05$]. Contrary to prediction, boys/men were more often positioned below [$\chi^2(1) = 54.08, p < .05$], and behind [$\chi^2(1) = 216.32, p < .05$] girls/women. Males, more often than females, were presented employing the "feminine touch" [$\chi^2(1) = 9.13, p < .05$]. Table 4 presents these data.

Chi square analyses comparing earlier data for girls/women (1967-1976) to more recent data for girls/women (1987-1996) revealed no significant differences for each of the 18 categories. Table 5 presents these data.

Chi square analyses comparing earlier data for boys/men (1967-1976) to more recent data for boys/men revealed a significant difference only on the sucking/biting fingers category. Boys/men were more likely to be shown sucking/biting fingers in pictures from the time period 1967-1976 than in those from 1987-1996 [$\chi^2(1) = 7.00, p < .05$]. Analyses conducted on the 17 remaining categories for boys/men reveal no significant difference over time. Table 6 presents these data.

Part II

Participants rated 36 pictures, two from each of the 18 categories listed as predictions in hypothesis 2. Each participant's ratings of persons in the slides produced a score for each picture on the factors of activity, evaluation, and potency for both female and male figures. The factor means for girl/woman and boy/man pictures were calculated for each participant. Three paired t-tests (one for each of the three factors) were conducted to determine if a difference exists in the meanings of cues in girl/woman and boy/man images. All statistical analyses were based on an alpha level of .05.

All three of the calculated t-tests found significant differences. Pictures of boys/men ($M = 4.23$) were rated as more active than those of girls/women ($M = 3.99$), $t(9358) = -4.80$, $p < .05$. Pictures of male characters were also rated as more potent ($M = 4.40$) than those of female characters (3.72), $t(9358) = -22.67$, $p < .05$. And, girls/women ($M = 4.66$) were more positively evaluated than boys/men ($M = 4.42$), $t(9358) = 8.00$, $p < .05$ (see Figure 2).

Post hoc analyses

(A) Using data from Part I, post hoc analyses were conducted to determine if girls/women of majority ethnicity status (of European descent) and minority ethnicity status (of African/Asian/Hispanic descent) are portrayed in subordinate/degrading images more often than boys/men who are of the same cultural background. Of the 40 randomly selected pictures in Part 1, 25 were comprised of female and male characters of European American ethnicity. Twelve pictures included female and male characters of other ethnicities (including those from African, Hispanic, and Asian descent). Three pictures were of animal characters and, therefore, were not included in the analyses.

Chi square analyses were conducted to determine if significant differences exist in the function ranking (traditional versus nontraditional versus not sure,

active versus passive); physical positioning [shorter, below, behind, in deference (bent over, head tilted), as objects of ownership (arm-lock, shoulder-hold, hand-hold), employing the "feminine touch", receiving instruction]; and facial expressions (smiling, showing fear, hiding face with hands, sucking/biting fingers, head/eye aversion, mental drifting) between girls/women and boys/men.

Specifically, a 3 x 2 chi square analysis was used to evaluate the "traditional versus nontraditional versus not sure" category, and a 2 x 2 chi square was used to analyze the "active versus passive" category. The 16 remaining categories were evaluated using 1 x k chi square analyses. Chi square analyses were calculated twice, as follows: (1) using the data set for characters of European ethnicity, and (2) using the data set for characters of African, Hispanic, and Asian ethnicity.

Chi square analyses for the European American character data set revealed significant differences between girls/women and boys/men on the following categories: function ranking (active versus passive), physical positioning (shorter, below, behind, bent over, head tilted, shoulder-hold, feminine touch, receiving instruction), and facial expression (fear, head/eye aversion). European American girls/women were more likely than boys/men to be presented in passive roles [$\chi^2(1) = 39.80, p < .05$]. More often, females were shown as shorter [$\chi^2(1) = 29.03, p < .05$] than males, with body bent over [$\chi^2(1) = 35.24, p < .05$] and head tilted [$\chi^2(1) = 17.80, p < .05$]. Shoulder-holds [$\chi^2(1) = 22.23, p < .05$] were employed more often by boys/men than by girls/women. Females were more likely than men to be receiving instructions [$\chi^2(1) = 12.36, p < .05$]. Girls/women, more often than boys/men, were shown with expressions of fear [$\chi^2(1) = 29.07, p < .05$] and averting head/eyes [$\chi^2(1) = 4.42, p < .05$]. Boys/men were more likely than girls/women to be presented below [$\chi^2(1) = 32.45, p < .05$], behind [$\chi^2(1) = 130.60, p < .05$], and employing the feminine touch [$\chi^2(1) = 4.17, p < .05$]. No

significant differences were found to exist between girls/women and boys/men on the seven remaining categories: "traditional versus nontraditional versus not sure" [$\chi^2(2) = 2.46, p > .05$], arm-lock [$\chi^2(1) = 2.25, p > .05$], hand-hold [$\chi^2(1) = 0.53, p > .05$], smiling [$\chi^2(1) = 0.12, p > .05$], hiding face with hands [$\chi^2(1) = 1.67, p > .05$], sucking/biting fingers [$\chi^2(1) = 0.20, p > .05$], and mental drifting [$\chi^2(1) = 2.02, p > .05$]. These are the same results that were obtained overall. Table 7 presents these data.

Chi square analyses for the African/Hispanic/Asian character data set showed significant differences between girls/women and boys/men on the following categories: function ranking (active versus passive), physical positioning (shorter, below, behind, bent over, head tilted, shoulder-hold, hand-hold, receiving instruction) and facial expression (fear). Girls/women were more likely than boys/men to be portrayed in passive roles [$\chi^2(1) = 23.29, p < .05$]. Females were more likely to be presented as shorter [$\chi^2(1) = 6.02, p < .05$] than males, with body bent over [$\chi^2(1) = 33.80, p < .05$] and head tilted [$\chi^2(1) = 10.33, p < .05$]. Boys/men were more likely to be shown utilizing a shoulder-hold [$\chi^2(1) = 12.52, p < .05$] or hand-hold [$\chi^2(1) = 8.00, p < .05$] than women. Females were more likely to be shown receiving instructions [$\chi^2(1) = 22.28, p < .05$] than males. More often, girls/women were presented with expressions of fear [$\chi^2(1) = 11.11, p < .05$] than boys/men. Boys/men were more likely to be positioned below [$\chi^2(1) = 13.76, p < .05$] and behind [$\chi^2(1) = 79.54, p < .05$] girls/women. No significant differences were found between girls/women and boys/men on the eight remaining categories: "traditional versus nontraditional versus not sure" [$\chi^2(2) = 0.13, p > .05$], arm-lock [$\chi^2(1) = 0.11, p > .05$], feminine touch [$\chi^2(1) = 2.56, p > .05$], smiling [$\chi^2(1) = 0.35, p > .05$], hiding face with hands [$\chi^2(1) = 1.29, p > .05$], sucking/biting fingers [$\chi^2(1) = 3.00, p > .05$], head/eye aversion [$\chi^2(1) =$

0.00, $p > .05$], and mental drifting [$\chi^2(1) = 0.39$, $p > .05$]. These results are the same as those found overall. Table 8 presents these data.

(B) Using data from Part II, post hoc analyses were conducted to determine if a difference exists between participant scores on the Modern Sexism scale and ratings of pictures on the Semantic Differential. Specifically, Modern Sexism scores were analyzed by participant status (mothers versus fathers; women students versus men students) and score (low versus high); and then compared to factor mean ratings for girl/woman pictures and boy/man pictures using independent t-tests.

From each participants' response to items on the Modern Sexism scale, mean scores were calculated. Two independent t-tests for samples of unequal size were conducted to determine if there was a significant difference between mothers and fathers, and female and male students.

One of the calculated t-tests found significant difference. Results indicated that fathers ($M = 4.40$) were more sexist than mothers ($M = 3.12$), $t(50) = 7.96$, $p < .05$. No significant difference was found to exist between female students ($M = 3.43$) and male students ($M = 3.89$), $t(123) = 1.59$, $p > .05$ (see Figure 3).

Independent t-tests were conducted to determine if differences exist between participant scores on the Modern Sexism scale and ratings of pictures on the Semantic Differential. Specifically, mean scores for mothers and fathers, female and male students, and low (0-3.99) and high (4-7) scorers were compared to factor mean ratings for girl/women pictures and boy/men pictures (see Table 9).

For mothers and fathers, all of the calculated t-tests showed significant differences. Results indicated that mothers rated boys/men ($M = 4.51$) as more active than girls/women ($M = 3.99$), $t(2806) = -6.67$, $p < .05$. Mothers also rated boys/men ($M = 4.71$) as more potent than girls/women ($M = 4.05$), $t(2806) =$

-16.50, $p < .05$. However, mothers rated girls/women ($M = 5.15$) with positive evaluation more often than boys/men ($M = 4.74$), $t(2806) = 13.66$, $p < .05$ (see Figure 5). Fathers rated characters in the same manner. Boys/men ($M = 4.66$) were rated as more active than girls/women ($M = 3.75$), $t(934) = -11.38$, $p < .05$. Male characters ($M = 4.48$) were also rated by fathers as more powerful than female characters ($M = 3.51$), $t(934) = -12.13$, $p < .05$. For evaluation, girls/women ($M = 4.66$) were rated more positively than boys/men ($M = 4.35$) by fathers, $t(934) = 3.44$, $p < .05$ (see Figure 6).

For female students and male students, all of the calculated t-tests showed significant differences. Female students rated boys/men ($M = 4.22$) as more active than girls/women ($M = 4.05$), $t(7126) = -5.67$, $p < .05$. Male characters ($M = 4.40$) were also rated as more potent than female characters ($M = 3.75$), $t(7126) = -21.67$, $p < .05$. For evaluation, girls/women ($M = 4.64$) were rated more positively than boys/men ($M = 4.43$), $t(7126) = 7.00$, $p < .05$ (see Figure 7). Male students rated characters in the same manner. Male characters ($M = 4.28$) were rated as more active than female characters ($M = 3.82$), $t(2230) = -7.67$, $p < .05$. Boys/men ($M = 4.41$) were seen as more potent than girls/women ($M = 3.65$) by male students, $t(2230) = -12.67$, $p < .05$. For evaluation, girls/women ($M = 4.72$) were once again rated more positively than boys/men ($M = 4.38$), $t(2230) = 5.66$, $p < .05$ (see Figure 8).

For low and high scorers, all of the calculated t-tests showed significant differences. Low scorers rated boys/men ($M = 4.40$) as more powerful than girls/women ($M = 3.88$), $t(1582) = -10.65$, $p < .05$. Male characters ($M = 4.64$) were also rated as more potent than female characters ($M = 4.35$), $t(1582) = -5.44$, $p < .05$. For evaluation, girls/women ($M = 4.80$) were rated more positively than boys/men ($M = 4.64$), $t(1582) = 7.66$, $p < .05$ (see Figure 9). High scorers rated characters in the same manner. Male characters ($M = 4.20$) were rated as

more active than female characters ($M = 3.96$), $t(3094) = -3.36$, $p < .05$.

Boys/men ($M = 4.64$) were seen as more potent than girls/women ($M = 3.82$) by male students, $t(3094) = -12.66$, $p < .05$. For evaluation, girls/women ($M = 4.62$) were once again rated more positively than boys/men ($M = 4.24$), $t(3094) = 5.39$, $p < .05$ (see Figure 10).

DISCUSSION

Results of this study reflect the general pattern of gender bias found in other studies of children's picture books. There are three main findings from the present study. First, female and male characters are not represented equally in illustrations. Overall, there were significantly more boys/men presented than girls/women in award-winning children's picture books. There was a significant increase in the numbers of boys/men pictured over time, yet no difference was found for girls/women over time. Partial support was provided for the prediction that girls/women would be presented in subordinate and degrading images more often than boys/men. It was found that females were more likely than males to be presented in passive roles; as shorter than males; in deference to males (with body bent over and head tilted); receiving instruction from males; and expressing fear. In addition, boys/men were more often shown grasping girls/women with hand-holds and shoulder-holds. These findings take on added significance from the fact that raters in Part II of this study interpreted visual cues differently for female and male characters on the factors of activity, potency, and evaluation. The boys/men in the illustrations were rated as more active and potent (powerful), and were evaluated more negatively than the girls/women in the illustrations. Contrary to prediction, males were more often shown below and behind females than vice versa, and as employing the "feminine touch" more often than females.

No significant differences were found for female and male characters in illustrations on the categories of traditionality of role, arm-lock, smiling, hiding face with hands, sucking/biting fingers, head/eye aversion, and mental drifting. Finally, pictures from 1987-1996 did not contain less subordinate images of girls/women and dominant images of boys/men than those from 1967-1976, with one exception: boys/men from 1967-1976 were more likely to be shown sucking/biting fingers than boys/men from 1987-1996. Specifically, there were no boys/men shown sucking/biting fingers in the pictures from 1987-1996.

Post hoc analyses revealed that regardless of ethnicity, females tended to be presented in subordinate/degrading postures more often than males. Significant differences between girls/women and boys/men were observed on 11 of the 18 visual categories for pictures with European American characters, and on 10 of the 18 categories for pictures with persons of color. European female characters were more likely to be presented as passive and shorter than males, in deference to males, grasped by males using a shoulder-hold, receiving instruction from males, expressing fear, and averting head/eyes from males, while boys/men were more likely to be presented behind and below girls/women, and employing the feminine touch more often than girls/women. Female characters of color were more likely than males to be shown as passive, shorter, in deference (with body bent over and head tilted), grasped by shoulder- and hand-holds, receiving instructions, and expressing fear, while boys/men were more often shown behind and below girls/women.

Post hoc analyses on the Modern Sexism scale found that fathers scored as more sexist than mothers, but there was no significant difference between female and male students. No differences were found to exist between participant scores on the Modern Sexism scale and ratings of pictures on the Semantic Differential. All parents (mothers and fathers), students (female and

male), and scorers (low and high) rated girls/women and boys/men in the same manner on the Semantic Differential. Male characters were rated as more active and potent than female characters, while, for evaluation, female characters were rated more positively than male characters.

Prevalence

During the 1970s, publishers set new standards for equity in children's picture books as a result of the women's movement. For more than 20 years, researchers have examined whether actual progress has been made over time. Although equitable representation has not yet been reached, recent studies have demonstrated an increasing trend for female characters to be depicted in central roles (Allen, et al., 1993; Collins et al., 1984; Dellman-Jenkins, et al., 1993; Kortenhaus & Demarest, 1993; Turner-Bowker, 1996). However, boys and men continue to be presented more frequently in book titles and illustrations.

The focus of the present study was on presentation of girls/women and boys/men in illustrations. Results indicate that girls/women continue to be underrepresented in comparison to boys/men in picture book illustrations. In addition, although there has been no change in prevalence rates over time for women, prevalence rates for boys/men in illustrations have increased over time. The disproportionate numbers are reflective neither of the gender distribution in the United States, nor of the numbers of girls and boys who use these books.

Subordinating/Degrading Images

Another main goal of this study was to determine whether physical differences exist in the ways female and male characters are presented in book illustrations. Rather than focus on the characters' activities, occupations, etc.,

this research focused on the appearance of characters - their roles, posture, body position, and facial expressions.

Three areas of concern were function ranking (traditional roles versus nontraditional roles, active versus passive roles); physical positioning (shorter, below, behind, bent over, head tilted, arm-lock, shoulder-hold, feminine touch, receiving instruction); and facial expressions (smiling, fear, hiding face with hands, sucking/biting fingers, head/eye aversion, mental drifting).

Contrary to prediction, most of the analyses conducted did not show a difference between girls/women and boys/men in traditional versus nontraditional roles, but it is important to note that most of the characters of both genders were shown in traditional roles. In the present study, as in previous ones, girls/women were more often presented in domestic roles, inside of the home, serving others, in need of help or rescue, etc., while boys/men were more often portrayed as leaders, working outside of the home, decision-maker, and hero (Allen et al., 1993; Charnes et al., 1980; Heintz, 1987; Key, 1971; Kortenhaus & Demarest, 1993; McDonald, 1989; Rachlin & Vogt, 1974; Stewig & Knipfel, 1975; Weitzman et al., 1972). These roles are social positions regulated by norms which define "proper" and acceptable behavior for women and men, boys and girls.

Overall, girls/women were shown in passive roles significantly more often than boys/men in both of the time periods examined (1967-1976 and 1987-1996). Female characters of both European and African/Asian/Hispanic ethnicity were presented as passive more often than male characters. These results demonstrate that females continue to be presented in ineffective roles. Past research from children's literature (Allen et al., 1993; Charnes et al., 1980; Key, 1971; Kortenhaus & Demarest, 1993; McDonald, 1989; Rachlin & Vogt, 1974; Weitzman et al., 1972) and advertising literature (Goffman, 1979; Rudman & Hagiwara, 1992) has also shown that girls/women are presented as weak,

passive, immobile, victimized, dependent, objectified, inconspicuous, while boys/men are portrayed as active, independent, adventurous, dynamic.

Elaborating on Key (1971), "boys (*still*) do; girls (*still*) are".

Overall, girls/women were more likely to be presented as shorter than boys/men. Female characters, both of European and African/Asian/Hispanic ethnicity, were systematically shown as shorter than male characters. These findings are also consistent with other data from children's literature (Key, 1971) and advertising (Duncan, 1990; Goffman). The implications of these findings are made salient through Montepare's (1995) studies on impression formation among preschool age children, which demonstrated that children interpret taller stimulus persons as more dominant and stronger than shorter stimulus persons.

In the present study, males were more often positioned below and behind females. This differs from the report by Key (1971) who found male characters in children's picture books to be positioned in front of and leaning over females, assuming a domineering or power position. Present findings also contradict Schwartz et al. (1982) who found that a figure preceding (one positioned in front of the other) another was more readily chosen as the dominant figure in a series of drawings presented to undergraduate students. One possible explanation for the present surprising result may, in fact, be the gender stereotypes that exist for boys/men. In American society, social interactions often require "gentlemanly" behavior on the part of boys/men that may include positioning themselves behind and/or below girls/women (i.e., men are often expected to hold a door ajar so a girl/woman may be the first to pass through).

As expected, girls/women were more likely to be placed in positions of deference to boys/men than vice versa. The overall analysis of data revealed that female characters were more likely to be physically positioned with their bodies bent over and heads tilted toward male characters. These results are

consistent with past research in children's literature (Key, 1971) and advertising literature (Ginsburg et al., 1977; Goffman, 1979; Regan, 1982; Schwartz et al., 1982), and indicate status differentials through subordination of self and appeasement of others. No significant difference was found for girls/women or boys/men over time on these categories.

Results which examined female characters as objects of ownership by male characters were mixed. No difference was found for the arm-lock category on any of the analyses conducted. However, a demonstrated difference was found to exist between girls/women and boys/men on the categories of shoulder-hold and hand-hold. Consistent with past research (Goffman, 1979; Hall & Veccia, 1990), male characters were more often shown grasping female characters with an arm over the shoulder and with a forward-facing hand-hold. Likewise, present results support findings that girls/women are more often the recipients of controlling touch by boys/men than vice versa (Henley, 1973). No differences were found for girls/women and boys/men over time on each of the three categories - arm-lock, shoulder-hold, and hand-hold.

For the overall data set, a significant difference was found to exist between girls/women and boys/men on the category of feminine touch, yet not in the predicted direction. Male characters were more likely to be shown employing the feminine touch than female characters. This was quite surprising, as past research has demonstrated difference on this factor favoring women (Goffman, 1979). For this study, feminine touch was defined as "lightly touching and/or caressing" as opposed to grasping, manipulating, and/or shaping. Instructions provided to participants may not have clearly distinguished between touch and feminine touch. If this were the case, it would explain the present results, supporting past research which also indicates that boys/men are more likely to touch girls/women (Henley, 1977; Major, 1991; Major et al., 1990). The present

findings support the work of Fisher et al. (1976) and Burgoon (1991) who suggest that touch may be interpreted in many different ways, and have a variety of meanings, depending upon context.

The overall data set reflects a significant difference between girls/women and boys/men on the category of receiving instruction. As expected, female characters were more likely to be shown receiving instruction from male characters than vice versa. No differences on this factor were observed for female or male characters over time. Results support past research (Goffman, 1979).

Contrary to prediction, most of the analyses conducted showed no significant differences between girls/women and boys/men on the smiling category. Past studies in advertising media have demonstrated a clear distinction between females and males on smiling behavior. Girls/women have been consistently shown smiling (with a less serious expression) more often than boys/men (Briton & Hall, 1995; Dodd et al., 1989; Duncan, 1990; Goffman, 1979; Leppard et al., 1993; Mackey, 1976; Regan, 1982).

Overall, pictures of girls/women were more likely than boys/men to show facial expressions of fear. This was true for illustrations of both European and African/Asian/Hispanic characters. No differences on the overall data set were found girls/women over time or boys/men over time. The present findings support past research on emotional displays of fear (Duncan, 1990; Goffman, 1979).

Contrary to prediction, no significant differences were generally found to exist between female and male characters on the categories of hiding face with hands, sucking/biting fingers, head/eye aversion, and mental drifting. However, a difference was found to exist for boys/men over time on the sucking/biting fingers category. Males from the earlier time period (1967-1976) were more likely than

those from the more recent time period (1987-1996) to be shown sucking/biting fingers. Likewise, a difference was also found to exist between European American females and males on the category of head/eye aversion. Here, girls/women were more likely to engage in head/eye aversion than boys/men. Generally, the present results do not support past findings in the advertising literature (Dividio et al., 1988; Goffman, 1979).

Visual Cues of Sexism

Taken together, the findings from this study suggest a new form of sexist discrimination, a "modern" discrimination, where overt negative behaviors toward girls/women decrease, yet subtle covert negative behaviors remain. Modern discrimination is often viewed as more insidious, a "wolf in a sheep's clothing". Here, feelings of prejudice and negative behaviors continue to exist. Yet, they are expressed only in certain situations when a person may feel safe/comfortable or in covert, socially acceptable ways that often elude notice (Gaertner & Dividio, 1986). A modern form of sexism seems to exist in children's literature. Efforts are being made to increase numbers of females in central roles, yet there continues to be sexism in more subtle areas: in the underrepresentation of girls/women in titles; and in the use of illustrations that present girls/women in deferential positions relative to boys/men.

The visual cues provided in the pictures of female and male characters were analyzed for meaning on the factors of activity, potency, and evaluation. Past researchers have not taken their analyses to this level to determine whether their assumptions about the sexist nature of function ranking, physical positioning, and facial expression of characters are accurate interpretations of the cues/messages in the pictures. Results of the present analyses showed

that raters do, indeed, interpret visual representations differently for female and male characters on the factors of activity, potency, and evaluation. Boys/men in the illustrations were rated as more active and potent (powerful) than girls/women, and boys/men were evaluated more negatively than girls/women. These results strengthen the inference that the differences in illustrations of female and male characters on the visual categories are forms of sexism.

Conclusions

The results of this study provide evidence that subtle sexist messages are conveyed through images in picture books for children. For the most part, gender illustrations have not changed over the 30 years examined in this study.

Examination of the underlying meanings conveyed by picture images to preschool age children revealed that females are systematically portrayed in body positions which indicate submissiveness and subordination to males. Gender and score on the Modern Sexism scale made no difference in the ability of raters to discern the sexist portrayals of characters in pictures from children's literature. Likewise, time period made no difference and ethnicity of characters made little difference in the visual portrayal of girls/women as deferential to boys/men. Implications of these findings may include negative consequences for both girls and boys who are read picture books. The characters portrayed in children's literature create and maintain the expectations we have for socially acceptable behavior for girls/women and boys/men in our culture, a gender schema by which children make decisions about their own behavior and interpret the behavior of others. Through this literature, girls are taught social norms of submissiveness -- passivity, weakness, deference, aversion, fearfulness; while boys are learn norms of dominance -- action, strength, prominence, control. Implications of these findings are considerable, given the demonstrated relationship between negative

visual images of girls/women and hostile behaviors toward girls/women (Cowan et al., 1988; Cowan & Campbell, 1994; Jhally, 1993; MacKinnon, 1993, O'Brien, 1997).

Past studies have examined the role of characters in children's picture books for evidence of gender stereotyping. Focus was on the type of roles, occupations, and activities of the characters. The present study differs from past research in that its focus is not on the overt content of children's literature, but on the hidden messages conveyed through the physical presentation of characters in picture images. This study looked at gender stereotyping from a different perspective, examining more subtle aspects of sexist bias. Overt signs of sexism may be on the decline, yet many of these have been replaced by modern forms of gender discrimination. First glance at a picture book may suggest that characters and topics are presented in a gender-fair manner. Yet, closer examination may reveal this to be only an illusion. Modern forms of sexism may be more insidious than blatant discrimination, because they are much more difficult to identify and address.

The present study also differs from past studies in terms of methodology. Prior studies of children's literature have been mainly qualitative, conducted through content analyses. Following an earlier study (Turner-Bowker, 1996), the present study combines both qualitative and quantitative methodologies, allowing for a more complex analysis of the data.

New questions have been generated by this study. First, the evaluation of characters needs to be examined in greater depth. Are female characters evaluated more positively because they fulfill roles deemed appropriate for their gender? Are females liked more when they take on less competent roles? Second, research must be conducted to determine the direct effects of sexist books on preschool age children. What are the behavioral consequences after

consequences after exposure to sexist forms of media? For instance, is there a direct relationship between negative presentation of girls/women in children's picture books and hostile behavior toward girls on the school playground? These questions should be examined empirically, in order to determine the direct effects of exposure to sexist media images on behavior among children. For instance, one might expose a group of preschoolers to sexist books, and another group to egalitarian books, and measure the children's play behavior (e.g., roles, activity level, physical posturing, level of aggression, etc.) immediately following exposure. Third, methods used in the present study may be applied to investigate other forms of visual media which influence preschool age children. Is there a differential impact of books versus television (e.g., cartoons) on gender role socialization? Next, what is the impact of the presence of a mediator in the acquisition of gender stereotypes? What effect, for example, does the reader have on the younger child's learning of gender, as opposed to older children who are able to read and interpret books/illustrations on their own? Furthermore, who are the judges of "the best" in children's literature? What is the selection criteria used in order to make these determinations of award-winning status? Finally, many studies, including the present one, have examined award-winning books for sexist content. In choosing this type of sample, an assumption is made that the award-winning books represent those which are typically read to children (based on anecdotal accounts of parents, librarians, preschool teachers, and bookstore employees). In order to ensure generalizability of findings, future research should address whether these books are accurate representations of books that are popular among children.

According to Kortenhaus & Demarest (1993) "...the most important and effective way of transmitting values and attitudes is through story telling, and in literate cultures, this process includes children's books" (p. 219). Children's

literature serves a socializing role; it serves as a social guide, defining and shaping behavior that is appropriate for girls and boys, women and men. Picture books continue to provide an inaccurate message of how girls/women and boys/men are, or want to be, or should be. It is imperative to transform this message by providing accurate depictions of females and males in literature for children. Authors and publishers have the responsibility to ensure that our culture's diversity is reflected in books for children. In order to live up to this responsibility, they must ensure the inclusion of multiple, diverse, and socially supported role models for children to emulate.

REFERENCES

- Allen, A. M., Allen, D. N., & 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.
- Archer, D., Iritani, B., Kimes, D. D., & Barrios, M. (1983). Face-ism: Five studies of sex differences in facial prominence. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45, 725-735.
- Association for Library Service to Children (1996). The Newbery and Caldecott awards. Chicago, IL: American Library Association.
- Beall, A. E. (1993). A social constructionist view of gender. In A. E. Beall, & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), The Psychology of Gender. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Birdwhistell, R. L. (1970). Kinesics and context. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Briton, N. J., & Hall, J. A. (1995a). Beliefs about female and male nonverbal communication. Sex Roles, 32(1-2), 79-91.
- Briton, N. J., & Hall, J. A. (1995b). Gender-based expectancies and observer judgements of smiling. Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 19(1), 49-66.
- Burgoon, J. K. (1991). Relational message interpretations of touch, conversational distance, and posture. Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 15(4), 233-259.
- Burgoon, J. K., Buller, D. B., Hale, J. L., & DeTurck, M. (1984). Relational messages associated with nonverbal behaviors. Human Communication Research, 10(3), 351-378.
- Charnes, R., Hoffman, K. E., Hoffman, L., & Meyers, R. S. (1980). The Sesame Street Library--bad books bring big bucks. Young Children, 35(2), 10-12.

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

Cowan, G., & Campbell, R. R. (1994). Racism and sexism in interracial pornography: A content analysis. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 18, 323-338.

Cowan, G., Lee, C., Levy, D., & Snyder, D. (1988). Dominance and inequality in X-rated videocassettes. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 12, 299-311.

Crabb, P. B., & Bielawski, D. (1994). The social representation of material culture and gender in children's books. Sex Roles, 30(1/2), 69-79.

Davis, S. (1990). Men as success objects and women as sex objects: A study of personal advertisements. Sex Roles, 23(1-2), 43-50.

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.

Dodd, D. K., Harcar, V., Foerch, B. J., & Anderson, H. F. (1989). Face-ism and facial expression of women in magazine photos. Psychological Record, 39(3), 325-331.

Dovidio, J. F., Ellyson, S. L., Keating, C. F., Heltman, K., & Brown, C. E. (1988). The relationship of social power to visual displays of dominance between men and women. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54, 233-242.

Duncan, M. C. (1990). Sports photographs and sexual differences: Images of women and men in the 1984 and 1988 Olympic Games. Sociology of Sport Journal, 7, 22-43.

Ferguson, J. H., Kreshel, P. J., & Tinkham, S. F. (1990). In the pages of Ms.: Sex role portrayals of women in advertising. Journal of Advertising, 19(1), 40-51.

Fischer, J. D., Rytting, M., & Heslin, R. (1976). Hand touching hands: Affective and evaluative effects of an interpersonal touch. Sociometry, 39(4), 416-421.

Fox, M. (1993). Politics and literature: Chasing the "isms" from children's books. The Reading Teacher, 46(8), 654-658.

Frable, D. E. (1987). Sex-typed execution and perception of expressive movement. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53(2), 391-396.

Furnham, A., & Bitar, N. (1993). The stereotyped portrayal of men and women in British television advertisements. Sex Roles, 29(3-4), 297-310.

Ginsburg, H., Pollman, V. A., & Wauson, M. S. (1977). An ethological analysis of nonverbal inhibitors of aggressive behavior in male elementary school children. Developmental Psychology, 13(4), 417-418.

Goffman, E. (1979). Gender advertisements. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc.

Gornick, V. (1979). Introduction. In E. Goffman, Gender Advertisements. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc.

Graebner, D. B. (1972). A decade of sexism in readers. The Reading Teacher, 26, 52-58.

Halberstadt, A. G., & Saitta, M. B. (1987). Gender, nonverbal behavior, and perceived dominance: A test of the theory. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53(2), 257-272.

Hall, C. C., & Crum, M. J. (1994). Women and "body-isms" in television beer commercials. Sex Roles, 31(5-6), 329-337.

Hall, J. A. (1984). Nonverbal sex differences: Communication accuracy and expressive style. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.

Hall, J. A. (1996). Touch, status, and gender at professional meetings. Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 20(1), 23-44.

Hall, J. A., & Veccia, E. M. (1990). More "touching" observations: New insights on men, women, and interpersonal touch. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59, 1155-1162.

Haskell, F. (1993). History and its images: Art and the interpretation of the past. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Hawkins, J. W., & Aber, C. S. (1993). Women in advertisements in medical journals. Sex Roles, 28, 233-242.

Heintz, K. E. (1987). An examination of sex and occupational-role presentations of female characters in children's picture books. Women's Studies in Communication, 10(2), 67-78.

Henley, N. M. (1973). Status and sex: Some touching observations. Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 2, 91-93.

Henley, N. M. (1977). Body politics: Power, sex, and nonverbal communication. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kang, M. (1997). The portrayal of womens' images in magazine advertisements: Goffman's gender analysis revisited. Sex Roles, 37(11-12), 979-997.

Key, M. R. (1971) The role of male and female in children's books: Dispelling all doubt. In R. Unger, & F. Denmark (Eds.), Women: Dependent or Independent Variable? New York: Psychological Dimensions.

Klassen, M. L., Jasper, C. R., & Schwartz, A. M. (1993). Men and women: Images of their relationships in magazine advertisements. Journal of Advertising Research, 33(2), 30-39.

Konner, M. (1987, March). The enigmatic smile. Psychology Today, 42-46.

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

LaFrance, M. (1978). Moving bodies: Nonverbal communication in social relationships. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.

Leppard, W., Ogletree, S. M., & Wallen, E. (1993). Gender stereotyping in medical advertising: Much ado about something? Sex Roles, 29(11-12), 829-838.

Lewin, K. (1951). Field theory in social science: Selected theoretical papers. New York: Harper.

Lott, B. (1994). Women's lives: Themes and variations in gender learning (2nd ed.) Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

MacKinnon, C. (1985). On collaboration. In S. Jackson (Ed.), Women's Studies: Essential Readings. New York: New York University Press.

Mackey, W. C. (1976). Parameters of the smile as a social agent. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 129, 125-130.

Major, B. (1981). Gender patterns in touching behavior. In C. Mayo & N. M. Henley (Eds.), Gender and Nonverbal Behavior. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Major, B., Schmidlin, A. M., & Williams, L. (1990). Gender patterns in social touch: The impact of setting and age. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58, 634-643.

Marten, L. A., & Matlin, M. W. (1976). Does sexism in elementary readers still exist? The Reading Teacher, 29, 764-767.

McArthur, L. Z., & Eisen, S. V. (1976). Achievements of male and female story book characters as determinants of achieving behavior by boys and girls. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 33, 467-473.

McConahay, J. B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the Modern Racism Scale. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), Prejudice, discrimination, and racism (pp. 91-125). Orlando, Florida: Academic Press.

McDonald, S. M. (1989). Sex bias in the representation of male and female characters in children's picture books. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 150(4), 389-401.

McGinley, H., McGinley, P., & Nicholas, K. (1978). Smiling, body position, and interpersonal attraction. Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 12(1), 21-24.

Montepare, J. M. (1995). The impact of variations in height on young children's impressions of men and women. Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 19(1), 31-48.

O'Brien, S. (1997). Dreamworlds II: Desire, sex, and power in music video. Journal of Mass Media Ethics, 12(2), 121-122.

Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., & Tannenbaum, P. H. (1957). The measurement of meaning. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press.

Prather, J., & Fidell, L. S. (1975). Sex differences in the content and style of medical advertisements. Social Science and Medicine, 9, 23-26.

Rachlin, S. K., & Vogt, G. L. (1974). Sex roles as presented to children in coloring books. Journal of Popular Culture, 8, 549-556.

Regan, J. M. (1982). Gender display in portrait photographs. Sex Roles, 8, 33-43.

Reis, H. T., Wilson, I. M., Monestere, C., Bernstein, S., Clark, K., Seidl, E., Franco, M., Gioioso, E., Freeman, E., & Radoane, K. (1990). What is smiling is beautiful and good. European Journal of Social Psychology, 20, 259-267.

Rudman, W. J., & Hagiwara, A. F. (1992). Sexual exploitation in advertising health and wellness products. Women and Health, 18(4), 77-89.

Schneider, K. C., & Schneider, S. B. (1979). Trends in gender roles in television commercials. Journal of Marketing, 43, 79-84.

Schwartz, B., Tesser, A., & Powell, E. (1982). Social Psychology Quarterly, 45(2), 114-120.

Sears, D. O. (1988). Symbolic racism. In P. A. Katz & D. A. Taylor (Eds.), Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy (pp. 53-84). New York: Plenum Press.

Smith, I. (1957). A history of the Newbery and Caldecott medals. New York: The Viking Press, Inc.

Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1973). A short version of the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS). Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 2, 219-220.

Spitz, E. H. (1994). Good and naughty/boys and girls: Reflections on the impact of culture on young minds. American Imago, 51(3), 307-328.

Sprinthall, R. C. (1990). Basic statistical analysis (3rd ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Stewig, J. W., & Knipfel, M. L. (1975). Sexism in picture books: What progress? The Elementary School Journal, 76, 151-155.

Sullivan, G. L., & O'Connor, P. J. (1988). Women's portrayals in magazine advertising: 1958-1983. Sex Roles, 18, 181-188.

Swim, J. K., Aikin, K. J., Hall, W. S., & Hunter, B. H. (1995). Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudices. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68(2), 199-214.

Swim, J. K., & Cohen, L. L. (1997). Overt, covert, and subtle sexism: A comparison between the Attitudes Toward Women and Modern Sexism scales. (Special issue: Measuring beliefs about appropriate roles for women and men) Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21(1), 103-119.

Thomas, S. (1986). Gender and social-class coding in popular photographic erotica. Communication Quarterly, 34, 103-114.

Tseelon, E. (1992). What is beautiful is bad. Physical attractiveness as stigma. Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 22(3), 295-309.

Turner-Bowker, D. M. (1996). Gender stereotyped descriptors in children's picture books: Does 'curious Jane' exist in the literature? Sex Roles, 35(7-8), 461-489.

Weitzman, L. J., Eifler, D., Hokada, E., & Ross, C. (1972). Sex-role socialization in picture books for preschool children. American Journal of Sociology, 77, 1125-1150.

Willson, A., & Lloyd, B. (1990). Gender vs. power: Self-posed behavior revisited. Sex Roles, 23(1-2), 91-98.

Appendix A

Lott's (1994) ~~Model~~ of Sexist Responses to Women

Function Ranking

(a) Traditional versus Nontraditional

(b) Active versus Passive

Appendix C
Physical Positioning

(a) Shorter

(b) Below

(c) Behind

(d) Body bent over

(e) Head tilted

(f) Arm-lock

(g) Shoulder-lock

(h) Hand-hold

(i) "Feminine touch"

(j) Receiving instruction

Appendix D
Facial Expression

(a) Smiling

(b) Fearful

(c) Hiding face with hands

(d) Sucking/biting finger(s)

(e) Head/eye aversion

(f) Glancing toward an unidentifiable object ("mental drifting")

Appendix E

Caldecott Award and Honor Books

(* indicates duplicate)

<i>year</i>	<i>title</i>	<i>author (A) / illustrator (I)</i>
-------------	--------------	-------------------------------------

MEDAL BOOKS (1967-1976):

1967	Sam, Bangs, & Moonshine	Evaline Ness (A)
1968	Drummer Hoff	Ed Emberley (I)
1969	Fool of the World and His Flying Ship	Uri Shulevitz (I)
1970	Sylvester and the Magic Pebble	William Steig (A)
1971	Story, a Story *	Gail Haley (A)
1972	One Fine Day	Nonny Hogrogian (A)
1973	Funny Little Women	Blair Lent (I)
1974	Duffy and the Devil	Margot Zemach (I)
1975	Arrow to the Sun	Gerald McDermott (A)
1976	Why Mosquitoes Buzz In People's Ears	Leo & Diane Dillon (I)

MEDAL BOOKS (1987-1996):

1987	Hey, Al	Arthur Yorinks (A) Richard Egielski (I)
1988	Owl Moon	Jane Yolen (A) John Schoenhorr (I)
1989	Song and Dance Man	Karen Ackerman (A) Stephen Gammell (I)

1990	Lon Po Po: A Red-Riding Hood Story from China *	Ed Young (A)
1991	Black and White	David Macauley (A)
1992	Tuesday	David Weisner (A)
1993	Mirette on the High Wire *	Emily Arnold McCully (A)
1994	Grandfather's Journey *	Allen Say (A)
1995	Smoky Night	Eve Bunting (A) David Diaz (I)
1996	Officer Buckle and Gloria	Peggy Rathmann (A)

HONOR BOOKS (1967-1976):

1967	One Wide River to Cross	Ed Emberley (I)
1968	Frederick *	Leo Lionni (A)
	Emperor and the Kite	Ed Young (I)
	Seashore Story *	Taro Yashima (A)
1969	Why the Sun and the Moon Live in the Sky	Blair Lent (I)
1970	Alexander and the Wind-Up Mouse	Leo Lionni (A)
	Goggles	Ezra Jack Keats (I)
	Judge	Margot Zemach (I)
	PopCorn & Ma Goodness	Robert Parker (I)
	Thy Friend, Obadiah *	Brinton Turkle (A)
1971	The Angry Moon *	William Sleator (A) Blair Lent (I)
	Frog and Toad Are Friends	Arnold Lobel (A)

	In the Night Kitchen *	Maurice Sendak (A)
1972	Hildilid's Night	Arnold Lobel (I)
	If All the Seas Were One Sea *	Janina Domanska (I)
	Moja Means One	Tom Feelings (I)
1973	Anansi the Spider	Gerald McDermott (A)
	Hosie's Alphabet *	Hosea, Tobias, & Lisa Baskin (A) Leonard Baskin (I)
	Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs	Nancy Berkert (I)
	When Clay Sings	Tom Bahti (I)
1974	Cathedral: The Story of its Construction *	David Macauley (A)
	Three Jovial Huntsmen	Susan Jeffers (I)
1975	Jambo Means Hello: Swahili Alphabet Book *	Muriel Feelings (A) Tom Feelings (I)
1976	The Desert Is Theirs *	Byrd Baylor (A) Peter Parnell (I)
	Strega Nona	Tomie dePaola (A)

HONORS BOOKS (1987-1996):

1987	The Village of Round and Square Houses	Ann Grifalconi (A)
	Alphabetics	Suse MacDonald (A)
	Rumpelstiltskin	Paul O. Zelinsky (A)
1988	Mufaro's Beautiful Daughters: An African Tale *	John Steptoe (A)

1989	Mirandy and Brother Wind	Patricia McKissack (A) Jerry Pinkney (I)
	Goldilocks and the Three Bears	James Marshall (I)
	The Boy of the Three-Year-Nap *	Dianne Snyder (A) Allen Say (I)
	Free Fall	David Wiesner (I)
1990	Color Zoo	Lois Ehlert (A)
	Herchel and the Hannukah Goblins	Eric Kimmel (A) Trina Schart (I)
	Bill Peet: An Autobiography	Bill Peet (A)
	The Talking Eggs	Robert San Souci (A) Jerry Pinkney (I)
1991	Puss in Boots	Fred Marcellino (A)
	"More, More, More," Said the Baby: 3 Love Stories	Vera B. Williams (A)
1992	Tar Beach *	Raith Ringgold (A)
1993	The Stinky Cheese Man & Other Fairly Stupid Tales *	Jon Scieszka (A) Lane Smith (I)
	Working Cotton	Sherley Anne Williams (A) Carole Byard (I)
	Seven Blind Mice *	Ed Young (A)
1994	Peppe the Lamplighter	Elisa Bartone (A) Ted Lewin (I)
	In the Small, Small Pond	Denise Fleming (A)
	Owen *	Kevin Henkes (A)
	Raven: A Trickster Tale from the Pacific Northwest *	Gerald McDermott (A)
	Yo! Yes?	Chris Raschka (A)

1995	Swamp Angel *	Anne Isaacs (A) Paul Zelinsky (I)
	John Henry *	Julius Lester (A) Jerry Pinkney (I)
	Time Flies	Eric Rohmann (A)
1996	Alphabet City *	Stephen Johnson (A)
	Zin! Zin! Zin! a Violin *	Lloyd Moss (A) Marjorie Priceman (I)
	The Faithful Friend	Robert San Souci (A) Brian Pinkney (I)
	Tops & Bottoms	Janet Stevens (A/I)

Appendix F

Boston Globe - Horn Book Awards

(* indicates duplicate)

<i>year</i>	<i>title</i>	<i>author (A) / illustrator (I)</i>
AWARD BOOKS (1967-1976):		
1967	London Bridge is Falling Down!	Peter Spier (A/I)
1968	Tikki Tikki Tembo	Arlene Mosel (A) Blair Lent (I)
1969	The Adventures of Paddy Pork	John Goodall (A/I)
1970	Hi, Cat!	Ezra Jack Keats (A/I)
1971	If I Built a Village	Kazue Mizumura (A/I)
1972	Mr. Gumpy's Outing *	John Burningham (A/I)
1973	King Stork	Howard Pyle (A) Trina Schart (I)
1974	Jambo Means Hello: Swahili Alphabet Book *	Muriel Feelings (A) Tom Feelings (I)
1975	Anno's Alphabet: An Adventure in Imagination *	Mitsumasa Anno (A/I)
1976	Thirteen *	Jerry Joyner & Remy Charlip (A/I)
AWARD BOOKS (1987-1996):		
1987	Mufaro's Beautiful Daughters: An African Tale *	John Steptoe (A/I)
1988	The Boy of the Three-Year-Nap *	Dianne Snyder (A) Allen Say (I)
1989	Shy Charles	Rosemary Wells (A/I)

1990	Lon Po Po: A Red-Riding Hood Story from China *	Ed Young (A/I)
1991	The Tale of the Mandarin Ducks *	Katherine Peterson (A) Leo & Diane Dillon (I)
1992	Seven Blind Mice *	Ed Young (A)
1993	The Fortune Tellers *	Lloyd Alexander (A) Trina Schart Hyman (I)
1994	Grandfather's Journey *	Allen Say (A)
1995	John Henry *	Julius Lester (A) Jerry Pinkney (I)
1996	In the Rain with Baby Duck	Amy Hest (A) Jill Barton (I)

HONOR BOOKS (1967-1976):

1967	(none)	
1968	All in Free but Janey	Elizabeth Johnson (A) Trina Schart Hyman (I)
	Giglamesh: Man's First Story	Bernarda Bryson (A/I)
	Jorinda and Joringel	Jacob & Wilhelm Grimm (A) Adrienne Adams (I)
	Rosie's Walk	Pat Hutchins (A/I)
1969	Monkey in the Jungle	Edna Mitchell Preston (A) Clement Hurd (I)
	New Moon Cove	Ann Atwood (A/I)
	Thy Friend, Obediah *	Brinton Turkle (A/I)
1970	A Story, A Story *	Gail Haley (A/I)
1971	The Angry Moon *	William Sleator (A) Blair Lent (I)

	A Firefly Named Torchy	Bernard Waber (A/I)
	If All the Seas Were One Sea *	Janina Domanska (A/I)
1972	(none)	
1973	The Magic Tree	Gerald McDermott (A/I)
	The Silver Pony *	Lynd Ward (A/I)
	Who, Said Sue, Said Whoo?	Ellen Raskin (A/I)
1974	All Butterflies: An ABC	Marcia Brown (A/I)
	Herman, the Helper	Robert Kraus (A) Jose Aruego & Ariane Dewey (I)
	A Prairie Boy's Winter *	William Kurelek (A/I)
1975	The Bear's Bicycle	Emilie Warren McLeod (A) David McPhail (I)
	Scram, Kid!	Ann McGovern (A) Nola Langer (I)
	She Come Bringing Me that Little Baby Girl	Eloise Greenfield (A) John Steptoe (I)
1976	The Desert Is Theirs *	Byrd Baylor (A) Peter Parnall (I)
	Six Little Ducks	Chris Conover (A/I)
	Song of the Boat	Lorenz Graham (A) Leo & Diane Dillon (I)

HONOR BOOKS (1987-1996):

1987	In Coal Country *	Judith Hendershot (A) Thomas Allen (I)
	Cherries and Cherry Pits	Vera B. Williams (A/I)
	Old Henry	Joan Blos (A) Stephen Gammell (I)

1988	Where the Forest Meets the Sea	Jeannie Baker (A/I)
	Stringbean's Trip to the Shining Sea *	Vera B. Williams (A/I) Jennifer Williams (I)
1989	The Nativity	Julie Vivas (I)
	Island Boy	Barbara Cooney (A/I)
1990	Chicka Chicka Boom Boom	Bill Martin, Jr. & John Archambault (A) Lois Ehlert (I)
	We're Going on a Bear Hunt	Michael Rosen (A) Helen Oxenbury (I)
1991	Aardvarks, Disembark!	Ann Jonas (A/I)
	Sophie and Lou	Petra Mathers (A/I)
1992	In the Tall, Tall Grass	Denise Fleming (A)
1993	Raven: A Trickster Tale from the Pacific Northwest *	Gerald McDermott (A/I)
	Komodo!	Peter Sis (A/I)
1994	Owen *	Kevin Henkes (A)
	A Small Tall Tale from the Far Far North *	Peter Sis (A)
1995	Swamp Angel *	Anne Isaacs (A) Paul Zelinsky (I)
1996	Fanny's Dream	Caralyn Buehner (A) Mark Buehner (I)
	Home Lovely	Lynne Rae Perkins (A/I)

Appendix G

New York Times Choice of Best Illustrated Children's Books of the Year

(* indicates duplicate)

1967

Animals of Many Lands	Hanns Reich (A)
Brian Wildsmith's Birds	Brian Wildsmith (A/I)
A Dog's Book of Bugs	Elizabeth Griffen (A) Peter Parnall (I)
Fables of Aesop	Sir Robert L'Estrange (A) Alexander Calder (I)
Frederick *	Leo Lionni (A/I)
The Honeybees	Franklin Russell (A) Collette Portal (I)
Hubert, the Caterpillar Who Thought He Was a Mustache	Susan Richards & Wendy Stang (A) Robert Anderson (I)
Knee-Deep in Thunder	Sheila Moon (A) Peter Parnall (I)
Seashore Story *	Taro Yashima (A/I)

1968

Harriet and the Promised Land	Jacob Lawrence (A/I)
A Kiss for Little Bear	Else Holmelund Minarik (A) Maurice Sendak (I)
Malachi Mudge	Edward Cecil (A) Peter Parnall (I)
Mister Corbett's Ghost	Leon Garfield (A) Alan Cober (I)
The Real Tin Flower: Poems about the World at Nine	Aliki Barnstone (A) Nicole Claveloux (I)

The Secret Journey of Hugo the Brat	Francois Ruy-Vidal (A) Nicole Claveloux (I)
-------------------------------------	--

Spectacles	Ellen Raskin (A/I)
------------	--------------------

Story Number 1	Eugene Ionesco (A) Etienne Delessert (I)
----------------	---

Talking Without Words	Marie Hall Ets (A/I)
-----------------------	----------------------

The Very Obliging Flowers	Claude Roy (A) Alain LeFoll (I)
---------------------------	------------------------------------

1969

Arm in Arm	Remy Charlip (A/I)
------------	--------------------

Bang, Bang You're Dead	Louise Fitzhugh & Sandra Scoppettone (A) Louise Fitzhugh (I)
------------------------	--

Birds	Juliet Kepes (A/I)
-------	--------------------

The Circus in the Mist	Bruno Munari (A/I)
------------------------	--------------------

The Dong with a Luminous Nose	Edward Lear (A) Edward Gorey (I)
-------------------------------	-------------------------------------

Free as a Frog	Elizabeth Hodges (A) Paul Giovanopoulos (I)
----------------	--

The Light Princess	George MacDonald (A) Maurice Sendak (I)
--------------------	--

Sara's Granny and the Groodle	Joan Gill (A) Seymour Chwast (I)
-------------------------------	-------------------------------------

What Is It For?	Henry Humphrey (A/I)
-----------------	----------------------

Winter's Eve	Natalia Belting (A) Alan Cober (I)
--------------	---------------------------------------

1970

Alala	Guy Monreal (A) Nicole Claveloux (I)
Finding a Poem	Eve Merriam (A) Seymour Chwast (I)
The Gnu and the Guru Go Behind the Beyond	Peggy Clifford (A) Eric von Schmidt (I)
Help, Help, the Globolinks!	Gian-Carlo Menotti (A) Milton Glaser (I)
In the Night Kitchen *	Maurice Sendak (A/I)
Lift Every Voice and Sing	J. Rosamund & James Johnson (A) Mozelle Thompson (I)
Matilda Who Told Lies and Was Burned to Death	Hilaire Belloc (A) Steven Kellogg (I)
Timothy's Horse	Vladimir Mayakovsky (A) Flavio Constantini (I)
Topsie Turvies: Pictures to Stretch the Imagination	Mitsumasa Anno (A/I)
You Are Ri-di-cu-lous	Andre Francois (A/I)

1971

Amos and Boris	William Steig (A/I)
Bear Circus	William Pene du Bois (A/I)
The Beast of Monsieur Racine	Tomi Ungerer (A/I)
Changes, Changes	Pat Hutchins (A/I)
Look Again!	Tana Hoban (A/I)
Look What I Can Do	Jose Aruego (A/I)

The Magic Tears	Jack Sendak (A) Mitchell Miller (I)
Mr. Gumpy's Outing *	John Burningham (A/I)
One Dancing Drum	Gail Kredddenser & Stanley Mack (A) Stanley Mack (I)
The Shrinking of Treehorn	Florence Parry Heide (A) Edward Gorey (I)

1972

Behind the Wheel	Edward Koren (A/I)
Count and See	Tana Hoban (A/I)
George and Martha	James Marshall (A/I)
Hosie's Alphabet *	Hosea, Tobias, & Lisa Baskin (A) Leonard Baskin (I)
Just So Stories	Rudyard Kipling (A) Etienne Delessert (I)
A Little Schubert	M. G. Goffstein (A/I)
Miss Jaster's Garden	N. M. Bodecker (A/I)
Mouse Cafe	Patricia Coombs (A/I)
Simon Boom Gives a Wedding	Yuri Suhi (A) Margot Zemach (I)
Where's Al?	Byronn Barton (A/I)

1973

Cathedral: The Story of its Construction *	David Macauley (A/I)
The Emperor's New Clothes: A Fairy Tale	Hans Christian Anderson (A) Monika Laimgruber (I)

Hector Penguin	Louise Fatio (A) Roger Duvoisin (I)
The Juniper Tree and other Tales from Grimm	Lore Segal & Edgar Taylor (translators) Maurice Sendak (I)
King Grisly-Beard: A Tale from the Brothers Grimm	Edgar Taylor (translator) Maurice Sendak (I)
The Number 24	Guy Billout (A/I)
A Prairie Boy's Winter *	William Kurelek (A/I)
The Silver Pony *	Lynd Ward (A/I)
Tim's Last Voyage	Edward Ardizzone (A/I)

1974

The Girl Who Cried Flowers	Jane Yolen (A) David Palladini (I)
A Home	Lennart Rudstrom (A) Carl Larsson (I)
Lumberjack	William Kerelek (A/I)
The Man Who Took the Indoors Out	Arnold Lobel (A/I)
Miss Suzy's Birthday	Miriam Young (A) Arnold Lobel (I)
A Storybook	Tomi Ungerer (A/I)
There Was an Old Woman	Steven Kellogg (A/I)

1975

Anno's Alphabet: An Adventure in Imagination *	Mitsumasa Anno (A/I)
A Book of A-maze-ments	Jean Seisser (A)

Mr. Michael Mouse Unfolds His Tale	Walter Crane (A/I)
The Pig-tale	Lewis Carroll (A) Leonard Lubin (I)
There's a Sound in the Sea: A Child's Eye View of the Whale	Tamar Griggs (A) schoolchildren (I)
Thirteen *	Jerry Joyner & Remy Charlip (A/I)
The Tutti-Frutti Case: Starring the Four Doctors of Goodge	Harry Allard (A) James Marshall (I)

1976

As Right as Right Can Be	Anne Rose (A) Arnold Lobel (I)
Ashanti to Zulu: African Traditions	Margaret Musgrove (A) Leo & Diane Dillon (I)
The Bear and the Fly	Paula Winter (A/I)
Everyone Knows What a Dragon Looks Like	Jay Williams (A) Mercer Mayer (I)
Fly By Night	Randall Jarrell (A) Maurice Sendak (I)
Little Though I Be	Joseph Low (A/I)
Merry Ever After: The Story of the Two Medieval Weddings	Joe Lasker (A/I)
The Mother Goose Book	Alice & Martin Provensen (A/I)
A Near Thing for Captain Najork	Russell Hoban (A) Quentin Blake (I)

1987

The Cremation of Sam McGee	Robert Service (A) Ted Harrison (I)
----------------------------	--

Jump Again!	Joel Harris (A) Barry Moser (I)
17 Kings and 34 Elephants	Margaret Mahy (A) Patricia MacCarthy (I)
The Yellow Umbrella	Henrik Drescher (A/I)
The Mountains of Tibet	Mordicai Gerstein (A/I)
Handtalk Birthday	Remy Charlip & Mary Beth Miller (A) George Ancona (Photos)
Fox's Dream	Tejima (A/I)
In Coal Country *	Judith Hendershot (A) Thomas Allen (I)
Halloween ABC	Eve Merriam (A) Lane Smith (I)
Rainbow Rhino	Peter Sis (A/I)
1988	
Sir Francis Drake: His Darling Deeds	Roy Gerrard (A/I)
Theodore and Mr. Balbini	Petra Mathers (A/I)
Cats Are Cats	Nancy Larrick (A) Ed Young (I)
Fire Came to the Earth People	Susan Roth (A/I)
Swan Sky	Tejima (A/I)
Shaka: King of the Zulus	Diane Stanley & Peter Vennema (A) Diane Stanley (I)
Look! Look! Look!	Tana Hoban (A/I)
A River Dream	Allen Say (A/I)
I Want to Be an Astronaut	Byron Barton (A/I)

Stringbean's Trip to the Shining Sea *	Vera B. Williams (A/I) Jennifer Williams (I)
--	---

1989

Does God Have a Big Toe? Stories About Stories In the Bible	Marc Gellman (A) Oscar de Mejo (I)
Peacock Pie: A Book of Rhymes	Walter de la Mare (A) Louise Brierly (I)
Nicholas Cricket	Joyce Maxner (A) William Joyce (I)
Turtle in July	Marilyn Singer (A) Jerry Pinkney (I)
Olsen's Meat Pies	Peter Cohen (A) Olof Landstrom (I)
The Heartaches of a French Cat	Barbara McClintock (A)
Hot Pizza Came to Queens	Dayal Kaur Khalsa (A/I)
Whales	Seymour Simon (A)
Theseus and the Minotaur	Warwick Hutton (A/I)
The Dancing Skeleton	Cynthia DeFelice (A) Robert Parker (I)

1990

The Fool and the Fish: A Tale from Russia	Alexander Afanasyey (A) Gennedy Spirin (I)
Fish Eyes: A Book You Can Count On	Lois Ehlert (A/I)
War Boy: A Country Childhood	Michael Foreman (A/I)
I'm Flying!	Alan Wade (A) Petra Mathers (I)
Beach Ball	Peter Sis

One Gorilla: A Counting Book	Atsuko Morosumi (A/I)
Beneath a Blue Umbrella	Jack Prelutsky (A) Garth Williams (I)
The Dancing Palm Tree: And Other Nigerian Folk Tales	Barbara Walker (A) Helen Seigl (I)
A Christmas Carol	Charles Dickens (A) Roberto Innocenti (I)
The Tale of the Mandarin Ducks *	Katherine Paterson (A) Leo & Diane Dillon

1991

Another Celebrated Dancing Bear	Gladys Sheffrin-Falk (A) Barbara Garrison (I)
Diego	Jonah Winter (A) Jeannette Winter (I)
Follow the Dream	Peter Sis (A/I)
Old Mother Hubbard: And Her Wonderful Dog	James Marshall (A/I)
Tar Beach *	Faith Ringgold (A/I)
Ooh-la-la: (Max In Love)	Maira Kalman (A/I)
The Marvelous Night	Helme Heine (A/I)
Punch in New York	Alice Provensen (A/I)
What Can Rabbit Hear?	Lucy Cousins (A/I)
Little Red Riding Hood	Charles Perrault (A) Beni Montresor (I)

1992

Oscar de Mejo's ABC	Oscar de Mejo (A/I)
---------------------	---------------------

Mirette on the High Wire *	Emily Arnold McCully (A/I)
The Cataract of Lodore	Robert Southey (A) David Catrow (I)
When the Sky Is Far Away	Mary-Joan Gerson (A) Carla Golembe (I)
Martha Speaks	Susan Meddaugh (A/I)
The Stinky Cheese Man and Other Fairly Stupid Tales *	Jon Scieszka (A) Lane Smith (I)
Where Does It Go?	Margaret Miller (A/I)
The Fortune Tellers *	Lloyd Alexander (A) Trina Schart Hyman (I)
Boodil My Dog	Pija Lindenbaum (A/I)
Li'l Sis and Uncle Willie	Gwen Everett (A) William Johnson (I)
1993	
How Dogs Really Work!	Alan Snow (A/I)
Grandfather's Journey *	Allen Say (A/I)
The Perilous Pit	Orel Protopopescu (A) Jacqueline Chwast (I)
A Small Tall Tale from the Far Far North *	Peter Sis (A/I)
Harvey Siumfenburger's Christmas Present	John Burningham (A/I)
A Number of Animals	Chrisopher Wormell (A/I)
Hue Boy	Rita Phillips Mitchell (A) Caroline Binch (I)
Gulliver's Adventures in Lilliput	Jonathan Swift (A) Gennady Spirin (I)

Stephen Biesty's Cross-Sections:	Richard Platt (A)
Man-of-War	Stephen Biesty (I)
The Bracelet	Yoshiko Uchida (A) Joanna Maudley

1994

The Boy Who Ate Around	Henrik Drescher (A/I)
Ship of Dreams	Dean Morrissey (A/I)
A Teeny Tiny Baby	Amy Schwartz (A/I)
The Boy and the Cloth of Dreams	Jenny Koralek (A) James Mayhew (I)
The Three Golden Keys	Peter Sis (A/I)
How Georgie Radburn Saved Baseball	David Shannon (A/I)
The Wave of the Sea-Wolf	David Wisniewski (A/I)
The Sunday Outing	Gloria Jean Pinkney (A) Jerry Pinkney (I)
Swamp Angel *	Anne Isaacs (A) Paul Zelinsky (I)
My House	Lisa Desimini (A/I)

1995

Why the Sun & Moon Live in the Sky	Niki Daly (A/I)
My Mama Had a Dancing Heart	Libba Moore Gray (A) Raul Colon (I)
When the Whippoorwill Calls	Candice Ransom (A) Kimberly Bulcken Root (I)

Zin! Zin! Zin! a Violin *	Lloyd Moss (A) Marjorie Priceman (I)
Alphabet City *	Stephen Johnson (A/I)
Buz	Richard Egielski (A/I)
Someplace Else	Carol Saul (A) Barry Root (I)
Kashtanka	Anton Chekhov (A) Gennady Spirin (I)
Dogs Everywhere	Cor Hazelaar (A/I)
She's Wearing a Dead Bird on Her Head!	Kathryn Lasky (A) David Catrow (I)

1996

The Lonely Lioness and the Ostrich Chicks: A Masai Tale	Verna Aardema (A) Yumi Heo (I)
The Graphic Alphabet	David Pelletier (I)
The Fantastic Drawings of Danielle	Barbara McClintock (A/I)
The Wizard of Oz	L. Frank Baum (A) Lisbeth Zwerger (I)
My Very First Mother Goose	Iona Opie (A) Rosemary Wells (I)
The Seasons Sewn: A Year in Patchwork	Ann Whitford Paul (A) Michael McCurdy (I)
Golem	David Wisniewski (A/I)
Roman Numerals 1 to MM: Numerabilia Romana Uno and Duo Mila	Arthur Geisert (A/I)
Market!	Ted Lewin (A/I)
Clown	Quentin Blake (A/I)

Appendix H

Working Sample of 40 Picture Books

1967-1976

1. Sylvester & the Magic Pebble
2. The Girl Who Cried Flowers
3. The Juniper Tree and Other Tales from Grimm
4. Where's Al?
5. All Butterflies: An ABC
6. King Grisly-Beard: A Tale from the Brothers Grimm
7. Strega Nona
8. Duffy & the Devil
9. Pop Corn & Ma Goodness
10. Jorinda & Joringel
11. She Come Bringing Me That Little Baby Girl
12. The Light Princess
13. George & Martha
14. Simon Boom Gives a Wedding
15. Ashanti to Zulu: African Traditions
16. The Mother Goose Book
17. Merry Ever After: The Story of Two Medieval Weddings
18. Harriet and the Promised Land
19. Arm in Arm*
20. Tikki Tikki Tembo*

* Marked items selected to replace the following which contained images of animals whose gender was not apparent:

Frederick

Malachi Mudge

1987-1996

1. Oscar de Mejo's ABC
2. The Boy Who Ate Around
3. Home Lovely
4. Island Boy
5. Li'l Sis and Uncle Willie
6. Old Henry
7. Bill Peet: An Autobiography
8. Sophie and Lou
9. Ooh-la-la: (Max in Love)
10. Song and Dance Man
11. She's Wearing a Dead Bird on Her Head
12. Rumpelstiltskin
13. Grandfather's Journey
14. Owen
15. The Village of Round and Square Houses
16. Tar Beach
17. The Fortune Tellers
18. Swamp Angel*
19. The Tale of the Mandarin Ducks*
20. Mirandy and Brother Wind*

* Marked items selected to replace the following which contained images of animals whose gender was not apparent:

In the Tall, Tall Grass

Turtle in July

My House

Appendix I

Informed Consent & Standardized Instructions

Informed Consent

The University of Rhode Island
Department of Psychology
Chafee Building
Kingston, RI 02881

CONSENT FORM FOR RESEARCH

I have been asked to take part in the research project described below. The researcher will explain the project to me in detail. I should feel free to ask questions. If I have more questions later, Diane Turner-Bowker, the said person responsible for this study [(401)874-2193], will discuss them with me.

I have been asked to take part in a study which will investigate how women and men are presented in pictures taken from children's literature. Specifically, I will evaluate the physical positioning of persons in pictures to determine similarities/differences in the placement of women and men. I will be asked to view some pictures and answer a series of questions; it will take approximately 80 minutes to complete. The research will take place during one regular class meeting time. Remaining class time will be dedicated to a debriefing session, allowing for questions and answers.

I will receive class credit for participating in this research project. The researcher will inform my instructor of my participation and the amount of credit awarded will be determined by my instructor.

My part in this study is strictly confidential. None of the information will identify me by name. The decision whether or not to take part in this study is up to me. I do not have to participate. If I decide to take part in the study, I may quit at any time. If I am not satisfied with the way this study is performed, I may discuss my complaints with Diane Turner-Bowker, anonymously, if I choose. In addition, I may contact the office of the Vice Provost for Research, 70 Lower College Road, University of Rhode Island [(401) 874-2635].

I have read this consent form. My questions have been answered. My signature on this form means that I understand the information and I agree to participate in this study.

Signature of Participant

Typed/Printed Name

Date

Signature of Researcher

Typed/Printed Name

Date

Standardized Instructions

The purpose of this study is to examine the placement of persons in relation to one another in a series of pictures. In taking this test, you will need to answer a series of questions for each picture you see.

Each picture will be represented by a number, as indicated on the top of each survey form. You will need to answer a total of 18 questions for each picture. Some of the questions have more than one section for you to respond to.

Overall, there are two types of questions that you may encounter:

Set I

The first (#1) will ask you to rate each person in the picture as **traditional** versus **nontraditional**, and as **active** versus **passive**.

If the girl/woman is presented inside of the home, in the kitchen, cleaning, cooking, caring for children, playing with dolls, or otherwise engaged in domestic work or play, you should check that she is presented in a **traditional** role. If the girl/woman is presented outside of the home, in a business, working on the car, playing with trucks, engaged in nondomestic activities, etc. you should check that she is presented in a **nontraditional** role.

If the boy/man is presented outside of the home, in a business, working in the car, playing with trucks, engaged in nondomestic activities, etc. you should check that he is presented in a **traditional** role. If the boy/man is presented inside of the home, in the kitchen, cooking, caring for children, playing with dolls, or otherwise engaged in domestic work or play, you should check that he is presented in a **nontraditional** role.

If you cannot tell the role of the girl/woman or boy/man from looking at the picture, check the box labeled **not sure**.

If the girl/woman appears to be in motion or involved in a task, you should check that she is presented in an **active** role. If the girl/woman appears to be motionless, inert, or the recipient of the actions of others, you should check that she is presented in a **passive** role.

If the boy/man appears to be in motion or involved in a task, you should check that he is presented in an **active** role. If the boy/man appears to be motionless, inert, or the recipient of the actions of others, you should check that he is presented in a **passive** role.

Set II

The next series of questions (#2-18) will ask you to respond "yes" or "no" to each statement. The questions may be very specific about the body placement of each person in the picture. Some of these questions will be one-part, for example:

Is the girl/woman's body bent over?

yes

no

☐
☐

Here, you will answer the one-part question by simply placing a check mark in the the box labeled "yes" or the box labeled "no".

Other questions may have more than one part or section to complete, for example:

Is the boy/man using a(n) _____ on the girl/woman?

	yes	no
arm-lock	☐	☐
shoulder-hold	☐	☐
hand-hold	☐	☐

Here, you must choose "yes" or "no" for each section of the question individually. Therefore, you must place a check mark in the box labeled "yes" or the box labeled "no" for arm-lock. You must place a check mark in the box labeled "yes" or the box labeled "no" for shoulder-hold. And, finally, you must place a check mark in the box labeled "yes" or the box labeled "no" for hand-hold.

You will receive training from the researcher on how to identify each body position by viewing a sample of pictures which clearly identify each category.

Please work at a steady pace through the test, as you will be viewing and rating 40 pictures.

Appendix J

Data Collection

Picture # _____

1. Describe how each character is displayed in the picture (by checking the appropriate box):

	girl/woman	boy/man
traditional	☐	☐
nontraditional	☐	☐
not sure	☐	☐
active	☐	☐
passive	☐	☐

2. Is the girl/woman _____ than the boy/man?

	yes	no
shorter	☐	☐
below	☐	☐
behind	☐	☐

3. Is the girl/woman's body bent over?

yes	no
☐	☐

4. Is the boy/man's body bent over?

yes	no
☐	☐

5. Is the girl/woman's head tilted?

yes

no

☐
☐

6. Is the boy/man's head tilted?

yes

no

☐
☐

7. Is the boy/man using a(n) _____ on the girl/woman?

yes

no

arm-lock

☐
☐

shoulder-hold

☐
☐

hand-hold

☐
☐

8. Is the girl/woman using a(n) _____ on the boy/man?

yes

no

arm-lock

☐
☐

shoulder-hold

☐
☐

hand-hold

☐
☐

9. Is the girl/woman lightly touching the boy/man?

yes

no

☐
☐

10. Is the boy/man lightly touching the girl/woman?

yes

no

☐
☐

11. Is the girl/woman receiving instruction from the boy/man?

yes

☐

no

☐

12. Is the boy/man receiving instruction from the girl/woman?

yes

☐

no

☐

13. Is the girl/woman _____ ?

yes

no

smiling

☐☐

showing fear

☐☐

attempting to hid face

☐☐

with her hands

sucking/biting her finger(s)

☐☐

14. Is the boy/man _____ ?

yes

no

smiling

☐☐

showing fear

☐☐

attempting to hid face

☐☐

with his hands

sucking/biting his finger(s)

☐☐

15. Is the girl/woman averting her head and/or eyes from the boy/man?

yes

☐

no

☐

16. Is the boy/man averting his head and/or eyes from the girl/woman?

yes
☐

no
☐

17. Is the girl/woman "mentally drifting"?

yes
☐

no
☐

18. Is the boy/man "mentally drifting"?

yes
☐

no
☐

Appendix K

Semantic Differential

Picture #: _____

Look at the girl/woman *OR* boy/man in the picture and rate her/him on the following scale:

good _____ bad

ugly _____ pretty

unfriendly _____ friendly

healthy _____ sick

sad _____ happy

strong _____ weak

small _____ big

light _____ heavy

warm _____ cold

loud _____ quiet

still _____ moving

Appendix L

Informed Consent & Demographic Survey

Informed Consent

The University of Rhode Island
Department of Psychology
Chafee Building
Kingston, RI 02881

CONSENT FORM FOR RESEARCH

I have been asked to take part in the research project described below. The researcher will explain the project to me in detail. I should feel free to ask questions. If I have more questions later, Diane Turner-Bowker, the said person responsible for this study [(401)874-2193], will discuss them with me.

I have been asked to take part in a study which will investigate how women and men are presented in pictures taken from children's literature. Specifically, I will evaluate the physical positioning of persons in pictures to determine similarities/ differences in the placement of women and men. I will be asked to view some pictures and answer a series of questions; it will take approximately 30 minutes to complete. Afterwards, a debriefing session will occur, with time for questions and answers regarding the study.

Although there is no direct benefit to me for taking part in this study, the researcher may learn more about the placement of persons in pictures.

My part in this study is strictly confidential. None of the information will identify me by name. The decision whether or not to take part in this study is up to me. I do not have to participate. If I decide to take part in the study, I may quit at any time. If I am not satisfied with the way this study is performed, I may discuss my complaints with Diane Turner-Bowker, anonymously, if I choose. In addition, I may contact the office of the Vice Provost for Research, 70 Lower College Road, University of Rhode Island [(401) 874-2635].

I have read this consent form. My questions have been answered. My signature on this form means that I understand the information and I agree to participate in this study.

Signature of Participant

Signature of Researcher

Typed/Printed Name

Typed/Printed Name

Date

Date

Informed Consent

The University of Rhode Island
Department of Psychology
Chafee Building
Kingston, RI 02881

CONSENT FORM FOR RESEARCH

I have been asked to take part in the research project described below. The researcher will explain the project to me in detail. I should feel free to ask questions. If I have more questions later, Diane Turner-Bowker, the said person responsible for this study [(401)874-2193], will discuss them with me.

I have been asked to take part in a study which will investigate how women and men are presented in pictures taken from children's literature. Specifically, I will evaluate the physical positioning of persons in pictures to determine similarities/differences in the placement of women and men. I will be asked to view some pictures and answer a series of questions; it will take approximately 30 minutes to complete. The research will take place during one regular class meeting time. Remaining class time will be dedicated to a debriefing session, allowing for questions and answers.

I will receive class credit for participating in this research project. The researcher will inform my instructor of my participation and the amount of credit awarded will be determined by my instructor.

My part in this study is strictly confidential. None of the information will identify me by name. The decision whether or not to take part in this study is up to me. I do not have to participate. If I decide to take part in the study, I may quit at any time. If I am not satisfied with the way this study is performed, I may discuss my complaints with Diane Turner-Bowker, anonymously, if I choose. In addition, I may contact the office of the Vice Provost for Research, 70 Lower College Road, University of Rhode Island [(401) 874-2635].

I have read this consent form. My questions have been answered. My signature on this form means that I understand the information and I agree to participate in this study.

Signature of Participant

Typed/Printed Name

Date

Signature of Researcher

Typed/Printed Name

Date

Demographic Information

Please answer the following questions by placing a check mark on the appropriate response:

Gender: woman_____ man_____

Age (years): 18-20_____ 21-30_____ 31-40_____ 41-50_____

51-60_____ 61-70_____ 70+_____

Ethnicity: European American (Caucasian)_____

African American_____

Hispanic American (Latina/Latino)_____

Asian American_____

American Indian/Alaskan Native_____

Other (please describe)_____

Relationship
Status: married_____ single_____ divorced_____ widowed_____

other (please describe)_____

Number of
Children: _____

Ages of
Children: _____

Appendix M

Standardized Instructions

The purpose of this study is to measure the meaning of pictures by having people judge them against a series of descriptive scales. In taking this test, please make your judgments on the basis of what you see in each picture.

Each picture you observe will contain a girl/woman and a boy/man. You will be asked to rate the same picture twice -- once for the girl/woman and once for the boy/man. Therefore, you will complete two forms per picture.

The way you will rate each person in the picture is to look at the image and check one of the lines on each of the 11 scales presented. Here is how you use the scales:

If you feel that the person in the picture is **very closely related** to one end of the scale, you should place your check-mark as follows:

ugly ✓ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ pretty

or

ugly _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : ✓ pretty

If you feel that the person in the picture is **quite closely related** to one end of the scale, you should place your check-mark as follows:

ugly _____ : ✓ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ pretty

or

ugly _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : _____ : ✓ : _____ pretty

If you feel that the person in the picture is **only slightly related** to one end of the scale, you should place your check-mark as follows:

ugly _____:_____:☒:_____:_____:_____:_____pretty

or

ugly _____:_____:_____:☒:_____:_____:_____pretty

The direction which you check, of course, depends upon which of the two ends of the scale seem most characteristic of the person/picture you are judging.

If you feel that the person in the picture **to be neutral** on the scale, you should place your check-mark as follows:

ugly _____:_____:_____:☒:_____:_____:_____pretty

IMPORTANT:

- (1) Place your check-marks in the **middle of the spaces**, not on the boundaries:

this
not this

_____:_____:☒:_____:☒:_____

- (2) Be sure to check every scale for every concept -- **do not omit any!!!**
- (3) Never put more than one check-mark on a single scale.

Sometimes you may feel as though you've rated the same picture before in the test. This will not be the case, so do not look back and forth through items. Do not try to remember how you checked similar items earlier in the test. Make each item a separate and independent judgment. Work at a quick pace through this test. There are no right or wrong answers. It is your first impressions, the immediate "feelings" about the items we want. On the other hand, please do not be careless, because we want your true impressions.

Appendix N

Modern Sexism Scale

1. Discrimination against women is no longer a problem in the United States. *

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly agree			unsure			strongly disagree

2. Women often miss out on good jobs due to sexual discrimination.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly agree			unsure			strongly disagree

3. It is rare to see women treated in a sexist manner on television. *

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly agree			unsure			strongly disagree

4. On average, people in our society treat husbands and wives equally. *

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly agree			unsure			strongly disagree

5. Society has reached the point where women and men have equal opportunities for achievement. *

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly agree			unsure			strongly disagree

6. It is easy to understand the anger of women's groups in America.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly agree			unsure			strongly disagree

7. It is easy to understand why women's groups are still concerned about societal limitations of women's opportunities.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly agree			unsure			strongly disagree

8. Over the past few years, the government and news media have been showing more concern about the treatment of women than is warranted by women's actual experiences. *

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
strongly agree			unsure			strongly disagree

(* items with an asterisk require reversed scoring)

Table 1

Age, Ethnicity, and Relationship Status of Participants in Part II *

	<u>Women</u>	<u>Men</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Age</u>			
18-20 years	22% (29)	6% (8)	28% (37)
21-30 years	30% (39)	14% (18)	44% (57)
31-40 years	12% (16)	5% (6)	17% (22)
41-50 years	8% (10)	3% (4)	11% (14)
51+ years	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
<u>Ethnicity</u>			
African American	7% (9)	3% (4)	10% (13)
Hispanic American	7% (9)	4% (5)	11% (14)
European American	51% (67)	13% (17)	64% (84)
Asian American	2% (2)	2% (3)	4% (5)
Alaskan/Native American	0% (0)	1% (1)	1% (1)
Other	5% (7)	5% (6)	10% (13)
<u>Relationship Status</u>			
Married	16% (21)	6% (7)	22% (28)
Single	49% (64)	20% (26)	69% (90)
Divorced	6% (8)	2% (3)	8% (11)
Separated	1% (1)	0% (0)	1% (1)
Widowed	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Other	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)

* Percentages are based on total number of participants (N = 130). Actual frequencies are in parentheses.

Table 2

Working Sample of 40 Randomly Selected Pictures

Book Name	Author	Time Period	Ethnicity *	
			Female	Male
Jorinda & Joringel	Grimm (A) Adams (I)	1967-1976	W	W
She Come Home Bringing Me That Little Baby Girl	Greenfield (A) Steptoe (I)	1967-1976	B	B
Duffy and the Devil	Zemach (I)	1967-1976	W	W
King Grisly Beard	Grimm (A) Sendak (I)	1967-1976	W	W
The Girl Who Cried Flowers	Yolen (A) Palladini (I)	1967-1976	W	W
Harriet and the Promised Land	Lawrence (A/I)	1967-1976	B	B
Merry Ever After	Lasker (A/I)	1967-1976	W	W
Jorinda and Joringel	Grimm (A) Adams (I)	1967-1976	W	W
All Butterflies: An ABC	Brown (A/I)	1967-1976	W	W
Simon Boom Gives a Wedding	Suhi (A) Zemach (I)	1967-1976	W	W
Tikki Tikki Tembo	Mosel (A) Lent (I)	1967-1976	A	A
Duffy and the Devil	Zemach (I)	1967-1976	W	W
Ashanti to Zulu	Musgrove (A) Dillon (I)	1967-1976	B	B
Strega Nona	dePaola (A)	1967-1976	W	W

King Grisly Beard	Grimm (A) Sendak (I)	1967-1976	W	W
The Juniper Tree	Grimm (A) Sendak (I)	1967-1976	W	W
Simon Boom Gives a Wedding	Suhi (A) Zemach (I)	1967-1996	W	W
Sylvester and the Magic Pebble	Steig (A)	1967-1976	n/a	n/a
Duffy and the Devil	Zemach (I)	1967-1976	W	W
Sylvester and the Magic Pebble	Steig (A)	1967-1976	n/a	n/a
Ooh-la-la: Max in Love	Kalman (A/I)	1987-1996	W	W
Swamp Angel	Isaacs (A) Zelinsky (I)	1987-1996	W	W
Rumpelstiltskin	Zelinsky (A/I)	1987-1996	W	W
Grandfather's Journey	Say (A)	1987-1996	A	A
Home Lovely	Perkins (A/I)	1987-1996	W	W
The Fortune Tellers	Alexander (A) Hyman (I)	1987-1996	B	B
Tale of the Mandarin Ducks	Peterson (A) Dillon (I)	1987-1996	A	A
Grandfather's Journey	Say (A)	1987-1996	A	A
Rumpelstiltskin	Zelinsky (A/I)	1987-1996	W	W
Oscar de Mejo's ABC	de Mejo (A/I)	1987-1996	H	H
The Boy Who Ate Around	Drescher (A/I)	1987-1996	W	W
Island Boy	Cooney (A/I)	1987-1996	W	W
Song and Dance Man	Ackerman (A) Gammel (I)	1987-1996	W	W

Mirandy and Brother Wind	McKissack (A) Pinkney (I)	1987-1996	W	W
Tale of the Mandarin Ducks	Peterson (A) Dillon (I)	1987-1996	A	A
Li'l Sis and Uncle Willie	Everett (A) Johnson (I)	1987-1996	B	B
Mirandy and Brother Wind	McKissack (A) Pinkney (I)	1987-1996	B	B
Owen	Henkes	1987-1996	n/a	n/a
Song and Dance Man	Ackerman (A) Gammel (I)	1987-1996	W	W
Oscar de Mejo's ABC	de Mejo (A/I)	1987-1996	H	H

* abbreviations: B = Black, African/American
 H = Hispanic/American (Latina/Latino)
 A = Asian/American
 N = Native American (not represented above)
 W = White, European/American
 n/a = nondiscernable (animal characters)

Table 3

Prevalence of Girl/Women and Boy/Men Characters in Pictures

Time Period	Girls/Women	Boys/Men
1967-1976	808	1234
1987-1996	734	1589
Overall	1542	2823

Table 4

Chi Square Analyses of Overall Frequencies on Function Ranking, Physical Positioning, and Facial Expression Categories

	Girls/Women	Boys/Men	χ^2
Traditional	567	570	1.16
Nontraditional	87	75	
Not sure	146	155	
Active	390	550	66.02 **
Passive	410	250	
Shorter	476	324	28.88 **
Below	296	504	54.08 **
Behind	192	608	216.32 **
Bent over	266	135	42.80 **
Head tilted	368	236	28.85 **
Arm-lock	9	18	3.00
Shoulder-hold	33	136	36.03 **
Hand-hold	21	75	30.38 **
Feminine touch	117	168	9.13 **
Receiving Instruction	216	75	68.32 **
Smiling	272	271	0.00
Fear	98	31	34.80 **
Hiding face with hands	17	9	2.46
Sucking/biting fingers	2	7	2.78

Head/eye aversion	241	206	2.74
Mental drifting	163	141	1.59

* significant at $p < .05$

** also significant at $p < .01$

Table 5

Chi Square Analyses Comparing Data for Girls/Women Over Time

	<u>1967-1976</u>	<u>1987-1996</u>	<u>χ^2</u>
Traditional	285	282	0.33
Nontraditional	41	46	
Not sure	74	72	
Active	189	201	2.37
Passive	221	189	
Shorter	226	250	1.21
Below	156	140	0.87
Behind	98	96	0.08
Bent over	145	121	2.17
Head tilted	183	185	0.01
Arm-lock	4	5	0.11
Shoulder-hold	20	13	1.49
Hand-hold	10	10	0.48
Feminine touch	58	59	0.01
Receiving instruction	116	100	1.19
Smiling	140	132	0.24
Fear	49	49	0.00
Hiding face with hands	10	7	0.53
Sucking/biting fingers	0	2	2.00
Head/eye aversion	122	119	0.04
Mental drifting	79	84	0.15

* significant at $p < .05$

Table 6

Chi Square Analyses Comparing Data for Boys/Men Over Time

	<u>1967-1976</u>	<u>1987-1996</u>	χ^2
Traditional	286	284	1.18
Nontraditional	41	34	
Not sure	73	82	
Active	277	273	0.29
Passive	131	119	
Shorter	165	159	0.11
Below	241	263	0.96
Behind	284	324	2.63
Bent over	69	66	0.07
Head tilted	130	106	2.44
Arm-lock	10	8	0.22
Shoulder-hold	51	52	0.01
Hand-hold	41	34	0.65
Feminine touch	81	87	0.21
Receiving instruction	34	41	0.65
Smiling	132	139	0.18
Fear	17	14	0.29
Hiding face with hands	5	4	0.11
Sucking/biting fingers	7	0	7.00 **
Head/eye aversion	104	102	0.02
Mental drifting	72	69	0.06

* significant at $p < .05$ ** also significant at $p < .01$

Table 7

Post Hoc Chi Square Analyses for Pictures with Characters of European Ethnicity

	<u>Girls/Women</u>	<u>Boys/Men</u>	<u>χ^2</u>
Traditional	361	367	2.46
Nontraditional	60	46	
Not sure	78	86	
Active	237	336	39.80 **
Passive	251	155	
Shorter	308	188	29.03 **
Below	185	312	32.45 **
Behind	120	374	130.60 **
Bent over	163	72	35.24 **
Head tilted	235	152	17.80 **
Arm-lock	5	11	2.25
Shoulder-hold	20	63	22.23 **
Hand-hold	13	17	0.53
Feminine touch	74	101	4.17 *
Receiving instruction	138	49	42.46 **
Smiling	169	163	0.12
Fear	68	18	29.07 **
Hiding face with hands	10	5	1.67
Sucking/biting fingers	2	3	0.20
Head/eye aversion	156	121	4.42 *
Mental drifting	109	89	2.02

* significant at $p < .05$ ** also significant at $p < .01$

Table 8
Post Hoc Chi Square Analyses for Pictures with Characters of African/Asian/Hispanic Ethnicity

	<u>Girls/Women</u>	<u>Boys/Men</u>	χ^2
Traditional	181	180	0.13
Nontraditional	23	21	
Not sure	57	59	
Active	127	179	23.29 **
Passive	132	77	
Shorter	153	113	6.02 *
Below	97	156	13.76 **
Behind	61	207	79.54 **
Bent over	95	30	33.80 **
Head tilted	111	68	10.33 **
Arm-lock	4	5	0.11
Shoulder-hold	11	35	12.52 **
Hand-hold	8	24	8.00 **
Feminine touch	42	58	2.56
Receiving instruction	66	21	22.28 **
Smiling	88	96	0.35
Fear	28	8	11.11 **
Hiding face with hands	5	2	1.29
Sucking/biting fingers	0	3	3.00
Head/eye aversion	73	73	0.00
Mental drifting	49	43	0.39

* significant at $p < .05$

* also significant at $p < .01$

Table 9
Mean Scores on Modern Sexism and Semantic Differential Scales for Different Groups of Respondents

<u>Modern Sexism</u>		<u>Semantic Differential</u>					
		<u>Activity</u>		<u>Potency</u>		<u>Evaluation</u>	
		<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Male</u>
		<u>Images</u>	<u>Images</u>	<u>Images</u>	<u>Images</u>	<u>Images</u>	<u>Images</u>
<u>Parent</u>							
Mothers	3.12	3.99	4.51	4.05	4.71	5.15	4.74
Fathers	4.40	3.75	4.66	3.51	4.48	4.66	4.35
<u>Student</u>							
Female	3.43	4.05	4.22	3.75	4.40	4.64	4.43
Male	3.89	3.82	4.28	3.65	4.41	4.72	4.38
<u>Scorers</u>							
Low	2.74	3.88	4.40	4.35	4.64	4.80	4.64
High	5.11	3.96	4.20	3.82	4.64	4.62	4.24

Figure Caption

Figure 1. Prevalence of girls/women and boys/men in pictures.

Figure 2. Mean scores for girls/women and boys/men on the factors of activity, potency, and evaluation.

Figure 3. Mean scores for Modern Sexism comparing mothers and fathers, female students and male students.

Figure 4. Mean scores for mothers on the Semantic Differential comparing girls/women and boys/men.

Figure 5. Mean scores for fathers on the Semantic Differential comparing girls/women and boys/men.

Figure 6. Mean scores for female students on the Semantic Differential comparing girls/women and boys/men.

Figure 7. Mean scores for male students on the Semantic Differential comparing girls/women and boys/men.

Figure 8. Mean scores for low scorers on the Semantic Differential comparing girls/women and boys/men.

Figure 9. Mean scores for high scorers on the Semantic Differential comparing girls/women and boys/men.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, A. M., Allen, D. N., & 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.

Archer, D., Iritani, B., Kimes, D. D., & Barrios, M. (1983). Face-ism: Five studies of sex differences in facial prominence. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45, 725-735.

Association for Library Service to Children (1996). The Newbery and Caldecott awards. Chicago, IL: American Library Association.

Beall, A. E. (1993). A social constructionist view of gender. In A. E. Beall, & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), The Psychology of Gender. New York: The Guilford Press.

Birdwhistell, R. L. (1970). Kinesics and context. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Briton, N. J., & Hall, J. A. (1995a). Beliefs about female and male nonverbal communication. Sex Roles, 32(1-2), 79-91.

Briton, N. J., & Hall, J. A. (1995b). Gender-based expectancies and observer judgements of smiling. Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 19(1), 49-66.

Burgoon, J. K. (1991). Relational message interpretations of touch, conversational distance, and posture. Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 15(4), 233-259.

Burgoon, J. K., Buller, D. B., Hale, J. L., & DeTurck, M. (1984). Relational messages associated with nonverbal behaviors. Human Communication Research, 10(3), 351-378.

Charnes, R., Hoffman, K. E., Hoffman, L., & Meyers, R. S. (1980). The Sesame Street Library--bad books bring big bucks. Young Children, 35(2), 10-12.

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

Cowan, G., & Campbell, R. R. (1994). Racism and sexism in interracial pornography: A content analysis. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 18, 323-338.

Cowan, G., Lee, C., Levy, D., & Snyder, D. (1988). Dominance and inequality in X-rated videocassettes. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 12, 299-311.

Crabb, P. B., & Bielawski, D. (1994). The social representation of material culture and gender in children's books. Sex Roles, 30(1/2), 69-79.

Davis, S. (1990). Men as success objects and women as sex objects: A study of personal advertisements. Sex Roles, 23(1-2), 43-50.

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.

Dodd, D. K., Harcar, V., Foerch, B. J., & Anderson, H. F. (1989). Face-ism and facial expression of women in magazine photos. Psychological Record, 39(3), 325-331.

Dovidio, J. F., Ellyson, S. L., Keating, C. F., Heltman, K., & Brown, C. E. (1988). The relationship of social power to visual displays of dominance between men and women. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54, 233-242.

Duncan, M. C. (1990). Sports photographs and sexual differences: Images of women and men in the 1984 and 1988 Olympic Games. Sociology of Sport Journal, 7, 22-43.

Ferguson, J. H., Kreshel, P. J., & Tinkham, S. F. (1990). In the pages of Ms.: Sex role portrayals of women in advertising. Journal of Advertising, 19(1), 40-51.

Fischer, J. D., Rytting, M., & Heslin, R. (1976). Hand touching hands: Affective and evaluative effects of an interpersonal touch. Sociometry, 39(4), 416-421.

Fox, M. (1993). Politics and literature: Chasing the "isms" from children's books. The Reading Teacher, 46(8), 654-658.

• Frable, D. E. (1987). Sex-typed execution and perception of expressive movement. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53(2), 391-396.

Furnham, A., & Bitar, N. (1993). The stereotyped portrayal of men and women in British television advertisements. Sex Roles, 29(3-4), 297-310.

Ginsburg, H., Pollman, V. A., & Wauson, M. S. (1977). An ethological analysis of nonverbal inhibitors of aggressive behavior in male elementary school children. Developmental Psychology, 13(4), 417-418.

Goffman, E. (1979). Gender advertisements. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc.

Gornick, V. (1979). Introduction. In E. Goffman, Gender Advertisements. New York: Harper & Row Publishers, Inc.

Graebner, D. B. (1972). A decade of sexism in readers. The Reading Teacher, 26, 52-58.

• Halberstadt, A. G., & Saitta, M. B. (1987). Gender, nonverbal behavior, and perceived dominance: A test of the theory. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53(2), 257-272.

• Hall, C. C., & Crum, M. J. (1994). Women and "body-isms" in television beer commercials. Sex Roles, 31(5-6), 329-337.

Hall, J. A. (1984). Nonverbal sex differences: Communication accuracy and expressive style. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.

Hall, J. A. (1996). Touch, status, and gender at professional meetings. Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 20(1), 23-44.

Hall, J. A., & Veccia, E. M. (1990). More "touching" observations: New insights on men, women, and interpersonal touch. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59, 1155-1162.

Haskell, F. (1993). History and its images: Art and the interpretation of the past. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Hawkins, J. W., & Aber, C. S. (1993). Women in advertisements in medical journals. Sex Roles, 28, 233-242.

Heintz, K. E. (1987). An examination of sex and occupational-role presentations of female characters in children's picture books. Women's Studies in Communication, 10(2), 67-78.

• Henley, N. M. (1973). Status and sex: Some touching observations. Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 2, 91-93.

Henley, N. M. (1977). Body politics: Power, sex, and nonverbal communication. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

• Kang, M. (1997). The portrayal of womens' images in magazine advertisements: Goffman's gender analysis revisited. Sex Roles, 37(11-12), 979-997.

Key, M. R. (1971) The role of male and female in children's books: Dispelling all doubt. In R. Unger, & F. Denmark (Eds.), Women: Dependent or Independent Variable? New York: Psychological Dimensions.

Klassen, M. L., Jasper, C. R., & Schwartz, A. M. (1993). Men and women: Images of their relationships in magazine advertisements. Journal of Advertising Research, 33(2), 30-39.

Konner, M. (1987, March). The enigmatic smile. Psychology Today, 42-46.

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

LaFrance, M. (1978). Moving bodies: Nonverbal communication in social relationships. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.

Leppard, W., Ogletree, S. M., & Wallen, E. (1993). Gender stereotyping in medical advertising: Much ado about something? Sex Roles, 29(11-12), 829-838.

Lewin, K. (1951). Field theory in social science: Selected theoretical papers. New York: Harper.

Lott, B. (1994). Women's lives: Themes and variations in gender learning (2nd ed.) Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

MacKinnon, C. (1985). On collaboration. In S. Jackson (Ed.), Women's Studies: Essential Readings. New York: New York University Press.

Mackey, W. C. (1976). Parameters of the smile as a social agent. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 129, 125-130.

Major, B. (1981). Gender patterns in touching behavior. In C. Mayo & N. M. Henley (Eds.), Gender and Nonverbal Behavior. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Major, B., Schmidlin, A. M., & Williams, L. (1990). Gender patterns in social touch: The impact of setting and age. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58, 634-643.

Marten, L. A., & Matlin, M. W. (1976). Does sexism in elementary readers still exist? The Reading Teacher, 29, 764-767.

McArthur, L. Z., & Eisen, S. V. (1976). Achievements of male and female story book characters as determinants of achieving behavior by boys and girls. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 33, 467-473.

McConahay, J. B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the Modern Racism Scale. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), Prejudice, discrimination, and racism (pp. 91-125). Orlando, Florida: Academic Press.

McDonald, S. M. (1989). Sex bias in the representation of male and female characters in children's picture books. Journal of Genetic Psychology, 150(4), 389-401.

McGinley, H., McGinley, P., & Nicholas, K. (1978). Smiling, body position, and interpersonal attraction. Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 12(1), 21-24.

Montepare, J. M. (1995). The impact of variations in height on young children's impressions of men and women. Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 19(1), 31-48.

O'Brien, S. (1997). Dreamworlds II: Desire, sex, and power in music video. Journal of Mass Media Ethics, 12(2), 121-122.

Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., & Tannenbaum, P. H. (1957). The measurement of meaning. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press.

Prather, J., & Fidell, L. S. (1975). Sex differences in the content and style of medical advertisements. Social Science and Medicine, 9, 23-26.

Rachlin, S. K., & Vogt, G. L. (1974). Sex roles as presented to children in coloring books. Journal of Popular Culture, 8, 549-556.

Regan, J. M. (1982). Gender display in portrait photographs. Sex Roles, 8, 33-43.

Reis, H. T., Wilson, I. M., Monestere, C., Bernstein, S., Clark, K., Seidl, E., Franco, M., Gioioso, E., Freeman, E., & Radoane, K. (1990). What is smiling is beautiful and good. European Journal of Social Psychology, 20, 259-267.

Rudman, W. J., & Hagiwara, A. F. (1992). Sexual exploitation in advertising health and wellness products. Women and Health, 18(4), 77-89.

Schneider, K. C., & Schneider, S. B. (1979). Trends in gender roles in television commercials. Journal of Marketing, 43, 79-84.

Schwartz, B., Tesser, A., & Powell, E. (1982). Social Psychology Quarterly, 45(2), 114-120.

Sears, D. O. (1988). Symbolic racism. In P. A. Katz & D. A. Taylor (Eds.), Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy (pp. 53-84). New York: Plenum Press.

Smith, I. (1957). A history of the Newbery and Caldecott medals. New York: The Viking Press, Inc.

• Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R., & Stapp, J. (1973). A short version of the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS). Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 2, 219-220.

Spitz, E. H. (1994). Good and naughty/boys and girls: Reflections on the impact of culture on young minds. American Imago, 51(3), 307-328.

Sprinthall, R. C. (1990). Basic statistical analysis (3rd ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Stewig, J. W., & Knipfel, M. L. (1975). Sexism in picture books: What progress? The Elementary School Journal, 76, 151-155.

• Sullivan, G. L., & O'Connor, P. J. (1988). Women's portrayals in magazine advertising: 1958-1983. Sex Roles, 18, 181-188.

• Swim, J. K., Aikin, K. J., Hall, W. S., & Hunter, B. H. (1995). Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudices. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68(2), 199-214.

• Swim, J. K., & Cohen, L. L. (1997). Overt, covert, and subtle sexism: A comparison between the Attitudes Toward Women and Modern Sexism scales. (Special issue: Measuring beliefs about appropriate roles for women and men) Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21(1), 103-119.

Thomas, S. (1986). Gender and social-class coding in popular photographic erotica. Communication Quarterly, 34, 103-114.

• Tseelon, E. (1992). What is beautiful is bad. Physical attractiveness as stigma. Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 22(3), 295-309.

Turner-Bowker, D. M. (1996). Gender stereotyped descriptors in children's picture books: Does 'curious Jane' exist in the literature? Sex Roles, 35(7-8), 461-489.

Weitzman, L. J., Eifler, D., Hokada, E., & Ross, C. (1972). Sex-role socialization in picture books for preschool children. American Journal of Sociology, 77, 1125-1150.

Willson, A., & Lloyd, B. (1990). Gender vs. power: Self-posed behavior revisited. Sex Roles, 23(1-2), 91-98.