

Old Dominion University

ODU Digital Commons

Sociology & Criminal Justice Theses & Dissertations

Sociology & Criminal Justice

Summer 1999

Gender Roles Presented in Children's Literature: A Random Selection and Analysis of Non-Award Winning Books

Renae M. Poarch
Old Dominion University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/sociology_criminaljustice_etds



Part of the [American Literature Commons](#), [Gender and Sexuality Commons](#), and the [Reading and Language Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Poarch, Renae M.. "Gender Roles Presented in Children's Literature: A Random Selection and Analysis of Non-Award Winning Books" (1999). Master of Arts (MA), Thesis, Sociology & Criminal Justice, Old Dominion University, DOI: 10.25777/nq6t-ys48
https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/sociology_criminaljustice_etds/142

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Sociology & Criminal Justice at ODU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Sociology & Criminal Justice Theses & Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ODU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@odu.edu.

GENDER ROLES PRESENTED IN CHILDREN'S LITERATURE:

A RANDOM SELECTION AND ANALYSIS

OF NON-AWARD WINNING BOOKS

by

Renae M. Poarch

B.S. December 1997, Old Dominion University

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculties of
Old Dominion University and Norfolk State University
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirement for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

APPLIED SOCIOLOGY

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY AND NORFOLK STATE UNIVERSITY
August 1999

Approved by:

Elizabeth Monk-Turner
(Director)

Katarina Wagar (Member)

Judi Caron-Sheppard
(Member)

ABSTRACT

GENDER ROLES PRESENTED IN CHILDREN'S LITERATURE: A RANDOM SELECTION AND ANALYSIS OF NON-AWARD WINNING BOOKS

Renae M. Poarch
Old Dominion University and Norfolk State University
August 1999
Director: Dr. Elizabeth Monk-Turner

The purpose of this study was to examine the gender role stereotyping that occurs in children's non-award winning literature. This vast selection of non-award winning books has been neglected by researchers when selecting a sample to study. Past research has concentrated on the Caldecott and Newbery Award Winning books, which are not the majority of those owned by public libraries, hence not the majority being read by young readers. The purpose of this study was not to provide a list of appropriate reading material for parents and educators to select from, but rather provide an awareness of the issues so that they can select literature that does not present limitations to either boys or girls.

This study concluded that females are still under-represented in children's literature, both overall and in production roles (roles outside the home) in society. No authors, especially female authors, are making an attempt to change the status quo of picturing more male than female characters. This research found that male authors are more apt to depict both male and female characters outside the

apt to depict both male and female characters outside the home, in the "male" arena, and female authors more often keeping both male and female characters in the home.

This thesis is dedicated to
all the children who have and will
come into my life.

Especially,
Mitchell Kreisel,
Matthew and Hannah Meinertzhagen,
Melanie, Danna and Justin Libbey.
May their reading experiences open new doors of
opportunity.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank a long list of people who, without their support I would not have been successful. First and foremost, my husband, E. Scott Poarch, my daughter, Misti Shannon Lucero, and my mother-in-law, Ms. Kay Sinclair. My dear friends Robert and Cathy Meinertzhagen, Chris and Lisa Kreisel, and Joan Libbey. Their unconditional love and endless encouragement helped me to maintain focus.

Secondly, my committee chair and mentor, Dr. Elizabeth Monk-Turner, and committee members Dr. Katarina Wegar, and Dr. Judi Caron-Sheppard who diligently stood by and pushed when I needed a push. Along with, and every bit as important is the guidance I received from Dr. Carole Seyfrit, Associate Dean of Arts and Letters.

The support I have experienced at Old Dominion University is staggering and includes Dr.'s Garland White, Ingrid Whitaker, and Karen Polonko in the Sociology Department, who always assured me I was headed in the right direction and doing a great job. Dr. Xiushi Yang who gave the best educational advice I received during my four year career as a full-time, non-traditional student and a wonderful opportunity to work as his graduate assistant. Dr. Leslie Carr who taught me a new way to see the world

around me, with my eyes wide open. Dr. Cheryl Evans, Human Services Counseling, the most incredible professor to ever step into a classroom. She gave more of herself in a summer course than any other professor I ever had. She shared her life experiences and made an impression on me that will never fade. They are all top in their fields of study and genuinely care about the education they deliver to each student that enters their classroom and I, for one, am eternally grateful.

Last, but not least I would like to thank the friends I made over the past two years especially my peers and fellow graduate students Kristin Byers and Olivia Nelson, who listened when an ear was needed, laughed when the stress levels were too much, and cried when we thought we had just had enough. We made it! To Jeff Toussaint and Darlene Hall, who shared in a critical experience in our social development. Thank you one and all.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	6
RESEARCH QUESTIONS	16
III. METHODS	18
SAMPLE COLLECTION	18
INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	21
DEPENDENT VARIABLES	22
IV. RESULTS	25
V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	37
DISCUSSION OF RESULTS	37
LIMITATIONS	41
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH	42
CONCLUSIONS	43
REFERENCES	44
APPENDIX	49
VITA	52

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Sample of Children's Books Studied	20
2. Researcher's Frequency and Mean of Production, Household and Person Variables	27
3. Cross-Rater's Frequency and Mean of Production, Household, and Personal Artifacts	29
4. Researcher/Cross-Rater Comparison of Production, Household, and Personal Variables	30
5. Regression: DV-Production, IV's-Male, Gender, and Date	32
6. Regression: DV-Household, IV's-Male, Gender, and Date	34
7. Regression: DV-Personal, IV's-Male, Gender, and Date	35

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The socialization process begins the moment a child begins to learn and interpret what is happening in his/her own environment. Gender role development and specifically, gender role behaviors are gradual processes that start with infancy and continue throughout the life-span, (Kortenhaus and Demarest 1993; Dix 1993; Martin 1990; Kohlberg 1987; Bandura 1986; Katz and Boswell 1986; Murphy and Gilligan 1980; Erickson 1968; Freud 1935) each event adding to the experiences that influence a person's perception of who they are.

Sigmund Freud's (1935) theory of personality was broken into three stages: the *id* (pleasure seeking), the *ego* (we cannot always have what we want) and the *superego* (the conscience), all of which take place in the first five years of a child's life. The superego stage, he believed, was the stage in which personality began to develop. At this point in a child's life the presence of culture within the individual is recognized, internalizing societal values and norms. Freud held childhood to be the critical formation of

The format of this thesis follows current style requirements of the *American Sociological Review*.

an individual's personality, laying the foundation for either well adjusted or maladjusted adult personas.

This personality development, according to Freud, was also dependent on the identification children have to their same-gendered parent. Identifying boys with fathers, and girls with mothers leads to learning the proper cultural behaviors of boys and girls, men and women. They model themselves after the appropriate parent, thus leading to the either, adjusted or maladjusted adult gender role identification. This representation, again, is supported in not only their role models, but the other cultural supporting artifacts they are exposed to, like children's literature, a common transmitting tool for cultural norms and beliefs (St.Peter 1979; Fillmer and Haswell 1977).

Bandura's (1986) social learning theory is a theory of observational learning. They learn from observation (eg. Seeing someone else get praise or punishment for an act), and by direct tuition (getting praise or punishment directly for an act). The behaviors exhibited in children are the behaviors they are exposed to by their role models. They imitate. The imitation is explained through operant conditioning principles, the appropriate gender behavior, when presented, is rewarded, thus reinforcing the societal norms they are exposed to including gender role stereotypical behaviors. The model, for example, could be

symbolic rather than an actual human model, like television, cartoon characters or children's books, including both the illustrations and written words. The children observe the behaviors of the same-gendered characters and imitate them. The appropriate behaviors are rewarded with praise and attention, reinforcing the activity (Bussey and Bandura 1984; Bussey and Perry 1982). Little girls want to help bake cookies or wash dishes and the mother encourages her, while the little boy is sent away from the table to play. Likewise, the little boy wants to help dad mow the lawn, but the little girls can't because they will get dirty. Fagot (1986:1) recognized this:

system of social rules and customs concerning what males and females are supposed to be and do. As children master and internalize this system [gender as a category system], they learn to discriminate and label themselves and others on the basis of sex, to recognize attributes, attitudes, and behaviors that are typical of or considered appropriate for each sex, and to learn how to do what is seen as appropriate and to avoid what is not.

This appropriate behavior [gender specific] is observed not only in the activities of parents (Witt 1997; Ross 1987), educators, siblings and peers, but is actively portrayed in children's literature, reinforcing gender segregation into appropriate male and female categories. This representation is further reinforced by the utilization of gender appropriate toys, dress, plus personal, production and

household artifacts represented in the pictures of children's books, thus all contributing to *gender-role development*, "the complex process by which children come to understand the societal ramification of their sex" (Fagot 1995:2). Like most tasks a child learns, they want to "get it right" because in their lives there are rewards for successes. Achieving the proper gender identification could be represented in a pass/fail arena to children so they strive to be rewarded by acting in the expected gender appropriate manner, setting the stage for possible anxieties related to gender (Welch and Page 1979).

Recognition and awareness of the fact that each event shapes a child into an adolescent, and eventually into a successful adult, provides parents and educators with the advantage required to make well-balanced decisions at each hurdle of the socialization process. This would include making wise choices regarding children's reading material and picture books. Most children's reading material is short and is easily reviewed in a short amount of time before presenting the books to children. The most difficult task is to remain objective while reading and carefully look at the different ways that characters are represented not only in the written text, but the illustrations too.

The more equality represented in children's literature, and their lives as a whole, the greater the possibility that

the children will feel more flexible in their perception of not only who they are, but provide them with the ability to accept others unconditionally. Discarding prejudged notions of gender appropriate behavior represented in every facet of their lives broadens the context in which they judge each other, leaving both boys and girls free to be whomever they choose to be, without preconceived cultural expectations.

CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The transmission of culture through language is a powerful tool (Greif 1980; Weitzman, Eifler, Hokada, and Ross 1971), its impact often taken lightly when selecting books for young children to read or have read to them (Maher 1997; Allen, Allen, and Sigler 1993; Peterson and Lach 1990). In most cultures 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 (Creany 1995; Allen et al. 1993; Peterson and Lach 1990; Davis 1984; Carter and McCloskey 1983-1984; Carter and Patterson 1982; Kinder 1976). A subtle gender role stereotyped behavior presented in children's literature, both text and illustrations, is undetected by teachers and parents, but effectively transmitted to the children, not only through the words spoken, but the tone of voice and annunciation of specific passages (Peterson and Lach 1990; Kolbe and LaVoie 1981). What adults see may not always be what children see and hear. The innocence of dress, activity, and behavior often send a conflicting message to the children. Attempts to change our society, striving for a more egalitarian future for our children, are hindered by conflicting messages. Children's books reflect

the gender stereotypes of the culture (Albers 1996; Creany 1995; Weitzman et. al 1971), therefore, it is vitally important to take the time to dissect what the children in the United States are reading today and guide both them and their parents toward making gender neutral selections for story time.

Fox (1993) argues the only restriction preventing women from fulfilling their full potential are the societal barriers presented to them through language. She contends, "Gender stereotypes in literature prevent the fullness of female human potential from being realized by depriving girls of a range of strong, alternative role models" (P. 84). Girls can be or do anything until someone points out to them that they cannot. If this is true, Fox asks, "why is it, then, that in children's literature they are still portrayed more often than not as acted upon rather than active?" (P. 84). Fox (1993:84) eloquently stated,

Everything we read, from sexist advertisements and women's magazines to romance novels and children's books, constructs us, makes us who we are, by presenting our image of ourselves as girls and women, as boys and men.

Purcell and Stewart (1990:178) posit what children read affects the way they perceive themselves and is based on four assumptions:

1. Sex roles are learned behavior and are not solely biologically defined.

2. Sex role definitions can be learned from role models including people presented in media such as picture books, storybooks, and films.

3. Role definitions that are too narrow or rigid can be harmful to a child's development.

4. Such narrowly defined sex-role definitions have been found by prior research in children's literature.

Weitzman et al. (1971:1139) recognized, "role models not only present children with future images of themselves but they also influence a child's aspirations and goals." While Fox (1993:87) contended, "both genders have to be allowed to be as real in literature as they are in life." Without role models to present and depict varied options, "boys suffer from being disenfranchised from the nurturing aspect of home space which could be represented through models in books, and girls suffer from a lack of experience with book models of females engaged in the world outside the home" (Tognoli, Pullen and Lieber 1994:272). Fox (1993), also a children's writer, desires for children to realize that mothers are human, and not to have "fairytale expectations of motherhood" (P. 87) which cannot be met.

Several studies over the past thirty years have looked at award winning selections available to educators and children through schools and public libraries (Albers 1996; Bowker 1996; Gerasimova, Troyan and Zdravomyslova 1996;

Wellhousen 1996; Creany 1995; Ernst 1995; Allen et al. 1993; Bauer 1993; Jenkins, Florjancic, and Swadener 1993; Kortenhaus and Demarest 1993; Temple 1993; Peterson and Lach 1990; Purcell and Stewart 1990; Grauerholz and Pescosolido 1989; Dougherty, Holden, and Engel 1987; Davis 1984; Kolbe and LaVoie 1981; Weitzman et al. 1971; Collins, Ingoldsby and Dellman 1984;). The Caldecott Medals are a favorite selection to analyze (Creany 1995; Kortenhaus and Demarest 1993; Dougherty et al. 1987; Davis 1984; Engel 1981; Kolbe and LaVoie 1981; Nilsen 1978; Weitzman et al. 1971). The Caldecott Medal is given by the Children's Service Committee of the American Library Association (ALA) for the most distinguished picture book of the year, recognized solely for the books illustrations, not literary content. The medal, according to Weitzman et al. (1971), is the most coveted prize for preschool books. Many teachers and parents look for the Caldecott gold seal when selecting books for their children to read.

The Newbery Medal was the first children's literature award, introduced by Frederic G. Melcher in 1921 with the intention to acknowledge and award outstanding pieces of children's literature by authors who are citizens or residents of the United States. The award is named after the eighteenth-century English bookseller John Newbery. The purpose of the Newbery Award was stated as follows

(Association for Library Services to Children 1996:1):

To encourage original and creative work in the field of books for children. To emphasize to the public that contributions to the literature for children deserve similar recognition to poetry, plays, or novels. To give those librarians, who make it their life work to serve children's reading interests, an opportunity to encourage good writing in this field.

The Caldecott Medal, named after the nineteenth-century English illustrator, Randolph J. Caldecott, followed in 1937, established to honor the artists who had created the most distinguished picture book of the year. Like the Newbery Award, the illustrator must also be a citizen or resident of the United States. Originally a book that was selected for one award would not be eligible for the other, but in 1977 it was decided that a book could be nominated and receive both awards regardless of whether the author and illustrator were the same person or different people. Separate committees choose the winner of the Newbery and Caldecott Awards each year (Association for Library Service to Children 1996).

Kolbe and LaVoie (1981) identified a shift in the sexism in the 19 Caldecott award winning books from 1972 through 1979, but "the shift was toward more pictures and characters that were females, not in role portrayal and characterization" (P. 373). They also noted that female-authored books were as stereotyped as male authored,

indicating that the female authors were not attempting to change the status quo.

Creany (1995) recognized a similar trend and noted, regarding the Caldecott award winning books, that "the gender roles played by male and female characters still reflected and thus transmitted traditional gender roles" (P. 292). Weitzman et al. (1971) noted that Caldecott Medal books in the years 1966-1971 lacked representation of working women, who were indeed represented in the workforce during this time-frame. Although, it has been determined that the award winning books' content are superior compared to the other picture books children are selecting to read from their schools, public libraries, and bookstore shelves they too are guilty of stereotyping characters into gender specific roles, thus limiting the opportunities that children know are available to them as adults.

Grauerholz and Pescosolido (1989) looked at *Children's Catalog*, one of the most extensive listings of children's books available. The American Library Association publishes the *Children's Catalog* to guide librarians in choosing books to purchase, in cataloging those books, and as a general reference. Grauerholz and Pescosolido (1989) identified an under-representation of female characters, both human and animal, in the storybooks they analyzed. Their research found "when all books were considered, males outnumbered

females in all categories--titles as well as central characters. The overall ratio of males to females in titles from 1900 to 1984, for instance, was 2.7:1" (P. 116). The ratio was more dramatic when the characters were portrayed by animals. The differences between male and female characters were distinguished by clothing and traditional gender roles portrayed by each character. Male, animal characters outnumbered female, animal characters by nearly 6:1.

Weitzman et al.(1971) had similar findings in their study of 18 Caldecott winners and runners-up in the book's pictures they studied published between 1967-1971, documenting that male to female ratios were heavily weighted favoring males despite the fact, according to the 1970 U.S. Census bureau, that 51% of the residents in the United States were women. They found when human characters were depicted the ratio of males to females was 11:1; animal characters 95:1; and Caldecott Medal Winners 8:3. Allen et al. (1993) used similar categories as Weitzman et al. (1971) to analyze 13 Caldecott Medal Award Picture Books from 1938-1940 and 9 Caldecott and runners-up books from 1986-1988. They performed a content analysis and categories were compared across time periods to determine where changes in role depictions had occurred. Although they did acknowledge that an under-representation of female characters still

existed, it was less prominent than Weitzman et al. had reported. Allen et al. (1993) found that the representation of both male and female characters in the pictures of the books they studied had declined, while "neuter character representation increased in the 1986-1988 period" (P. 69).

Peterson and Lach (1990), *Stereotypes in Children's Books* reviewed *The Horn Book* for years 1967, 1977 and 1987. *The Horn Book* is another resource used by pre-school teachers and librarians in the United States for making selections for book purchases. Although their findings did suggest a shift, they acknowledge a statistically insignificant trend toward the increase in female character representation, with the possibility of chance addressed by the differences.

Crabb and Bielawski (1994), examined the gender-typed portrayal of material culture in Caldecott Award children's books published between 1937 and 1989. Their analysis found that a greater proportion of female characters were represented utilizing household artifacts versus a larger proportion of male characters depicted using nondomestic production artifacts in the pictures. Social-Cognitive Theory's modeling effect (Bandura 1986) suggests that the gender representation of these artifacts molds a child into specific gender-roles for specific gender marking. This gender marking, according to Crabb and Bielawski, indicates

that a given household or production artifact should be used exclusively by either females or males, a classification system which link the world of human-made things with gender categories.

Crabb and Bielawski's (1994) study included all 220 Caldecott award and honors books published from 1937 to 1989. They identified at least one character, whose gender was unambiguous, using an artifact, defined as "employing a human-made object to produce a desired effect." The final sample included illustrations from 130 of the original 220 books. Their findings showed, contrary to expectation, female marking of artifacts did not increase over time, despite the increase of women in the manual labor market and a decrease in the need for raw, muscle power. In fact, the artifacts reflected an earlier, industrial-era classification system (Pp. 76-77).

Tognoli et al. (1994) substantiated Crabb and Bielawski's (1994) study adding that the norm for males was to be identified with the rugged outdoors, away from the confinement of "feminized space of home and family life" (P. 273), in the workforce in a variety of interesting and exciting occupations, while women were limited to the confines of the home and responsibilities that included family roles. Worthy of noting, was Crabb and Bielawski's finding that shows an increase in the representation of male

characters using household artifacts over time, acknowledging cultural lag as the possible explanation for the lack of progress in representation of female characters utilizing production type artifacts.

Many of the researchers present empirical evidence showing a shift, even if it is slight, toward a higher representation of female characters in other than traditional roles. Nilsen (1978), on the other hand, provided compelling statistics that showed a decline of female representation in pictures between the years of 1951 and 1975, with a low 22 percent of characters in literature representing females. Her study looked at ninety-eight picture books that were either Caldecott Medal winners or Honor Books. Nilsen states, "The fact that in the latest five-year period (1971-1975) the percentage of female characters has shrunk to 22 percent is all the more startling considering the attention that the growing feminist movement has focused on the problem of equality in the treatment of males and females in school materials" (P. 255). Engel (1981), using the same counting method as Nilsen, analyzed 19 Caldecott Medal and Honor books for 1976-1980 and showed a representation of female characters increased to 26%. She also noted that the literature presented a "limited view of women's real activities, whereas the roles of male characters were shown closer to

reality" (P. 649). Allen et al. (1993) also found in their study of Caldecott Medal Award winning books that more traditional role stereotyping existed in books studied for the years 1986-1988 than in the past.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This process of gender role stereotyping has undoubtedly been researched *ad nauseam* in award winning pieces of children's literature. The interest of this research lies in the remaining books, which is the majority of what children are reading. The Caldecott Medal and Newbery Award are given to two books per year, where, according to Albers (1996:272), "the committees continue to choose stories about males", written by more male authors and illustrators. In reality, public libraries contain literally thousands of books for children to select from, leading to the questions:

- 1) Are there more total male characters compared to total female characters pictured in the books studied?
- 2) Do female and male authors depict characters in children's books in gender specific roles.
- 3) Are female characters being shown in role outside their home (employed outside the home, or with production artifacts) more than previously reported by studies looking at award winning books?

4) Are males pictured with more household activity than previously reported by studies looking at award winning books?

5) Are males and females equally represented using personal artifacts, which includes leisure activities?

6) Are children's easy reading books gender role stereotyped?.

The answers to these questions are worthy of attention and need be brought to the attention of parents and educators, providing them with the information necessary to make knowledgeable selections for their children's storytime.

The purpose of this study is not to provide a list of appropriate reading material for parents and educators to select from, but rather provide an awareness of the issues so that they can select literature that does not present limitations to either boys or girls.

CHAPTER III

METHODS

This research replicates work previously done by Crabb and Bielawski (1994) who analyzed the representation and utilization of household, production and personal artifacts by characters in children's literature. The difference lies in the selection process for the sample of books to be analyzed. Crabb and Bielawski analyzed only Caldecott Medal Award winners. This study's sample consists of randomly chosen books identified as belonging to a series, listed under each letter of the alphabet at a large, regional public library. Caldecott Medal Award recipients were intentionally omitted from the process to assure only non-award books were analyzed.

SAMPLE COLLECTION

The sample of books selected for this study was drawn from the Russell Memorial Library, Chesapeake, Virginia. The library keeps a hard-copy list of books that appear in a series. It is the author's name that was used for the sample selection, versus the illustrator's name, due to the way that libraries systematically shelve their books by the name of the author. The library's list was initially used to identify each series, but it was soon discovered to be

incomplete. A series, for the purpose of this study, consists of at least two books, by the same author with a similar theme or central character(s). The researcher read each book's title and author to identify books in a series. As a series unidentified by the library's list of books was recognized by the researcher, it was added to the sampling frame.

The 22 (N=22) non-award storybooks were chosen randomly by selecting one book from a series listed under each letter of the alphabet in the children's section of easy readers (see Table 1). Beginning with the letter A and working to the end of the alphabetical listing of books, a sample frame was compiled of all books belonging to a series and owned by the Russell Memorial Library. Four letters of the alphabetical listing of children's books did not have any books in a series, leaving a sample of 22 books versus 26. A sequential number, beginning with 1, was assigned to each series as it was filed on the bookshelf. One-inch by one-inch squares of paper were numbered according to the corresponding number of books in each series, for example: if the books filed under the letter "A" had 12 identified series, there were 12 1" square pieces of paper numbered 1-12. They were folded in half, shaken in a container and one piece of paper was blindly selected. One series under each

Table 1. Sample of Children's Books Studied

Title of Each Book	Copyright		Check Out	Author's Gender	Name In Title	Total	
	Date	Shelved				Males	Females
1. The Stupids Die	1981	09/1996	167	Male	-	15	14
2. Clifford The Big Red Dog	1963	09/1987	256	Male	Male	8	25
3. Better Not Get Wet, Jesse Bear	1988	08/1988	195	Female	Male	35	10
4. Dinosaur Valentine	1994	05/1995	26	Female	-	50	8
5. Hunky Dory Ate It	1992	07/1992	42	Female	-	3	7
6. McBroom's Ghost	1971	09/1987	39	Male	-	89	39
7. Educating Arthur	1987	06/1988	212	Female	Male	8	7
8. This is the Bear and the Picnic Lunch	1988	02/1990	79	Female	-	14	0
9. Mattie's Little Possum Pet	1993	04/1994	21	Female	-	0	13
10. Easter	1989	06/1993	121	Female	-	25	51
11. Tom and Pippo Make a Mess	1988	01/1989	216	Male	Male	18	0
12. Snakes and the Boy Who was Afraid of Them	1987	06/1994	25	Male	Male	25	12
13. Quail Can't Decide	1977	09/1987	58	Female	-	19	19
14. Sheep Take a Hike	1994	03/1995	28	Female	-	0	0
15. The Teacher from the Black Lagoon	1989	12/1995	34	Male	-	18	16
16. Alexander, Who's Not (Do you Hear Me? I Mean it) Going To Move	1995	11/1995	78	Female	Male	71	28
17. Max's Dragon Shirt	1991	09/1991	214	Female	Male	17	38
18. Ton and Pon	1980	19/1987	123	Male	-	50	0
19. Prehistoric Pinkerton		01/1988	314	Male	-	73	73
20. Never Ride Your Elephant to School	1995	04/1996	43	Female	-	31	46
21. Piggins	1987	01/1988	118	Female	-	54	44
22. The Cut-Ups Crack Up	1992	05/1993	52	Male	-	70	17

letter of the alphabet, was randomly selected in this manner and passed to the next phase of the selection process.

The library's data base was searched for each author's series selected in the first phase to assure that any books belonging to that series, and checked out of the library were included in the selection process. The names of all books not physically in the library at the time the visual list was compiled were added to the sampling frame.

Next, beginning with the number 1, the titles of books corresponding to the randomly chosen series were written onto one-inch by three-inch pieces of paper, each piece folded in half twice and placed in a container. The container was shaken and the researcher randomly chose a piece of paper. The title that appeared on the slip of paper was the book chosen as part of the sample. This was repeated for each series selected under each letter of the alphabet.

After selecting the 22 books included in the sample, all pictures were photocopied in black and white. Using the copies, a content analysis was performed on each page, collecting data on the following variables:

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES:

Title of each book;

Copyright Date of each book;

Date the book was purchased and placed on the shelf
of the library;

Number of times the book had been checked out since
it was shelved;

Gender of the author-

(male name or female name);

DEPENDENT VARIABLES:

Name of character listed in the title-

(neither male nor female, male, female, or both);

Total number of male characters represented in the
pictures of each book;

Total number of female characters represented in
the pictures of each book;

Artifacts used by the characters-

(male with production artifact, female with production
artifact, male with household artifact, female with
household artifact, male with personal artifact, or
female with personal artifact).

Artifacts used by characters are defined as production,
household or personal. Crabb and Bielawski (1994:73)
defined artifacts as follows: *production artifacts* are
"objects used to produce effects outside the household,
including artifacts used in construction, agriculture,
transportation and all other work outside the home."

Household artifacts were defined as "human-made objects used to produce effects in the home, including artifacts used in food preparation, cleaning, repair, family care and home manufacture." *Personal artifacts* are "human-made objects not employed in labor and used to produce effects on the immediate person of the user, including artifacts used for grooming, protection from the elements, and leisure" (Crabb and Bielawski 1994).

To ensure the reliability of the coding process, cross-rater analysis was performed by two undergraduate students enrolled in a research methods course at Old Dominion University. Each student volunteer completed a content analysis of 5 books, using the instructions and code sheet provided by the researcher. Both the researcher and the volunteers wrote directly on the copied pages, next to each character in red ink to avoid ambiguity in the identification of the artifacts. Another 5 books were analyzed by a professor in the Sociology Department of Old Dominion University for the same reliability purpose. These 15 books were compared to the original data collected by the researcher and showed a mean of 91.27 percent reliability between the cross-raters and the researcher. Both undergraduate students were unknown by the researcher and unaware of the hypothesis of the study.

Four new variables were created to run Regression Analysis:

PROD is the percent of characters with production artifacts divided by the total of all female and male characters in the sample.

HOUSE is the percent of characters with household artifacts divided by the total of all female and male characters in the sample.

LEISURE is the percent of characters with personal artifacts divided by the total of all female and male characters in the sample.

MALE is the percent of all male characters in all categories divided by all the female and male characters in the sample.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to examine the content of children's literature to determine the extent of gender role stereotyping in children's books. This content analysis of children's books replicates a study done by Crabb and Bielawski (1994) who looked at the representation and utilization of artifacts by characters in children's literature. The difference lies in the sample used, Crabb and Bielawski analyzed Caldecott Medal Award winners and this study purposely avoided award winners to provide a look at non-award winning books found in public libraries. Answers to the following questions were sought: 1) Are there a greater number of male characters pictured compared to the total number of females pictured in the books studied?; 2) Do female and male authors depict characters in children's books in gender specific roles; 3) Are females being shown in roles outside the home more than previously reported?; 4) Are males depicted with more household activity that previously reported by studies looking at award winning books?; 5) Are males and females equally represented using personal artifacts, which includes participating in leisure activities?; and 6) Are children's easy reading books gender roles stereotyped?. Answers to

these questions will provide some insight into the scrutiny required when selecting reading material for children, shedding light on stereotypes that are perpetuated in the United States through children's literature.

Systematic, quantitative analysis showing frequencies, means and total counts for each variable were calculated (see Table 2). The total number of each variable is listed in the table, 467 female characters and 693 males were represented in the sample, a ratio of female to male characters of 1:1.5. Three books in the sample had no female characters: *This is the Bear and the Picnic Lunch*, *Tom and Pippo Make a Mess*, and *Ton and Pon*, while one book, *Mattie's Little Possum Pet*, had no male characters. By eliminating these four books, the ratio of female to male characters represented in books that contained both female and male characters, changed to 1:1.35 (M=611, F=454).

The range of copyright dates for this study is 1963-1995, with 3 books published prior to 1980, 10 between 1980 and 1989, and the remaining 8 books published in the 1990's. The sample included 12 female authors and 9 male authors. Data was also collected to observe the number of female or male names that were included in the title of each book with the following results: 13 books did not contain a name in the title, 8 books contained a boys name and one book had both a female and male name in the title. There were no

Table 2. Researcher's Frequency and Mean of
Production, Household, and Personal Variables

	Male Production	Male Household	Male Personal	Males Total
Mean:	7.95	2.73	12.14	31.50
Frequency:	159.00	68.00	267.00	693.00
	Female Production	Female Household	Female Personal	Female Total
Mean:	4.91	4.59	5.59	21.23
Frequency:	80.00	99.00	149.00	467.00

books with a female name as part of the title represented in this sample.

Systematic, quantitative analysis showing frequencies and means for the cross-raters data were calculated for the production, household, and personal artifact variables (see Table 3). Reliability scores were calculated to test the reliability between the researcher and the cross-raters (see Table 4) and the validity of the instrument (see Appendix). One book was eliminated from the comparison due to the ambiguity regarding gender of the characters, sheep. The researcher and professor saw the sheep as androgynous, while the two students coded the sheep in charge as males and the followers as females. This elimination left a comparison of 14 books, with a 100 percent ($R=53/CR=53$) cross-rater reliability score for the female production variable and a 91.2 percent ($R=114/CR=125$) reliability for the analysis of the male production variable. A 95.77 percent ($R=71/CR=68$) cross-rater reliability for female characters with household artifacts and a 90.38 percent ($R=47/CR=52$) reliability for male characters with household artifacts. Comparison of females with personal artifacts showed a 83.21 percent ($R=109/CR=131$) cross-rater reliability and a reliability for males shown with personal artifacts 87.08 percent ($R=178/CR=155$).

Table 3. Cross-Rater's Frequency and Mean of
Production, Household, and Personal Artifacts

	Male Production	Male Household	Male Personal	Males Total
Mean:	10.20	3.67	10.73	22.13
Frequency:	125.00	52.00	155.00	332.00

	Female Production	Female Household	Female Personal	Female Total
Mean:	5.00	5.80	9.00	16.80
Frequency:	53.00	68.00	131.00	252.00

Table 4. Researcher/Cross-Rater Comparison of
Production, Household, and Personal Variables

	Male Production	Male Household	Male Personal
Researcher:	114	47	178
Cross-Raters:	125	52	131
	Female Production	Female Household	Female Personal
Researcher:	53	71	109
Cross-Raters:	53	68	131

The total of all female characters shown using production artifacts was 108 with a mean of 4.91, males shown using production artifacts was 175 with a mean of 7.95, a female to male character representation utilizing production artifacts ratio of 1:2.

The total of all female characters shown using household artifacts was 101 with a mean of 4.59, and males shown using household artifacts was 60 with a mean of 2.73. The ratio of female to male characters depicted with household artifacts was 1.7:1.

The total of all female characters represented with personal artifacts was 149 with a mean of 5.45, versus 267 males represented with personal artifacts and a mean of 22.5, a female to male ratio of 1:1.8 for personal artifacts. Note, the most common personal artifacts represented in the children's books in this study were related to leisure activity.

The percentage of production characters was regressed on the percentage of male characters in the books, the gender of the author, and the copyright dates. The results are reported in Table 5, with a $\text{Prob}>F = 0.01$ and an R-square of 0.51 indicating that the model accounts for 51 percent of the variation. For every one unit of change increase of males shown in a book there will be a .34 decrease shown using a production artifact. This is

Table 5. Regression: DV-Production, IV's-Male, Gender, and Date

Variable	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	Prob>{ T }	Prob>F
INTERCEPT	-23.5432	8.9509	0.0189	0.0109
MALE	-0.3448	0.1568	0.0439	
GENDER	0.2383	0.0789	0.0086	
DATE	0.0122	0.0045	0.0167	

significant at the 0.05 level indicated by the $\text{Prob}\{T\} = 0.04$. The gender of the author Parameter Estimate of 0.24 indicates that for each unit of change in the production variable, male authors are .24 more apt to depict characters in a production role. This too is significant at the .05 level indicated by the $\text{Prob}\{T\} = 0.01$.

The percentage of household characters was regressed on the percentage of male characters in the books, the gender of the author, and the copyright dates. The results are reported in Table 6, with a $\text{Prob}\{F\} = 0.20$ and an R-square of 0.26 indicating that the model explains 26 percent of the variation. The GENDER variable Parameter Estimate -0.19 indicates that male authors are less likely to depict characters utilizing household artifacts. This is significant at the 0.05 level indicated by the $\text{Prob}\{T\} = 0.05$.

The percentage of personal characters was regressed on the percentage of male characters in the books, the gender of the author and the copyright dates. The results are reported in Table 7, with a $\text{Prob}\{F\} = 0.08$ and R-square of 0.36 indicating that the model explains 36 percent of the variation. The MALE variable, male characters pictured in books, Parameter Estimate of 0.43 indicates that for every one unit of change in the MALE variable there is a .43 increase in the probability that the character will be shown

Table 6. Regression: DV-Household, IV's-Male, Gender, and Date

Variable	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	Prob>{T}	Prob>F
INTERCEPT	-2.2413	11.4090	0.0330	0.1964
MALE	0.0818	0.1788	0.6536	
GENDER	0.1890	0.0899	0.0528	
DATE	-0.0012	0.0051	0.8167	

Table 7. Regression: DV-Personal, IV's-Male, Gender, and Date

Variable	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	Prob>{ T }	Prob>F
INTERCEPT	26.7846	11.4090	0.0330	0.0773
MALE	0.4267	0.1999	0.0497	
GENDER	0.0492	0.1006	0.6315	
DATE	-0.1338	0.0058	0.0346	

with a personal artifact. This is significant at the 0.05 level indicated by the $\text{Prob}\{T\} = .05$. The DATE variable Parameter Estimate of -0.01 indicates that the later the copyright date in this study, the less likely it is to have this effect. This is significant at the 0.05 level indicated by the $\text{Prob}\{T\} = 0.03$.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter discusses the results previously presented, including the testing of the research questions and whether the findings are supported by the literature. It also addresses the limitations of this study and recommendations for future research.

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Findings for the first question, "are there more total male characters compared to total female characters pictured in the books studied?", suggest that the representation in this sample of non-award books supports the status quo of depicting more male than female characters overall. However, the difference was not as drastic as previously reported. The twenty-two books (662 pages) analyzed showed that females were represented by 40.24 percent of the characters and male characters were 59.75 percent of the characters, a female to male ratio of 1:1.5, in no way supporting Nilsen's finding of a low 22 percent of characters in literature representing females and Engels (1981) report of 26 percent of the all characters pictured as females. Grauerholz and Pescosolido (1989) also identified an under-representation of female characters,

both human and animal, in the storybooks they analyzed. They noted that in all the categories they measured, including central characters, males outnumbered females 2.7:1.

The present study contains 9 male authors and 12 female authors, with a majority of the books published after 1980 (n=19) attempting to answer questions regarding whether the selection of books is gender role stereotyped, and if one or both genders of the authors are perpetuating the idea of gender specific roles. Kolbe and LaVoie (1981), with a sample of 19 books, noted that female authored books were as stereotyped as male authored stories. The results of this study show a significant increase in the overall representation of female characters, when comparing the non-award sample, therefore the results found by Kolbe and LaVoie (1981) are not supported. They found that no authors, especially female authors, were making an attempt to change the status quo of picturing more male than female characters, the present study acknowledges that differences exist, but that the gap is not as prominent as previously reported.

This researcher found that male authors are more apt to depict both male and female characters outside the home, in the "male" arena, and female authors more often keeping both male and female characters in the home. Male authors (n=9)

showed a higher number of both female and male characters with production artifacts (MPRO=10.33/FPRO=8.44) than female authors (n=12) (MPRO=6.83/FPRO=2.66). Female authors showed a slightly higher representation of male characters with household artifacts (MHSE=3) than male authors (MHSE=2.66), and a significantly higher representation of female characters using household artifacts (FHSE=5.67) than male authors (FHSE=3.67). This study is somewhat supportive of Kolbe and LaVoie's (1981) findings that female authors are supporting the status quo concerning the representation of characters. This study also reveals that male authors appear to be breaking the barrier of gender stereotyping regarding activity of female characters outside the home and in the production of society. While on the other hand, female authors are opening the soft side of the female space within in the home to male characters providing them with the exposure to the nurturing aspect of home-life.

In answering the third question, "are female characters being shown in roles outside their home (employed outside the home, or with production artifacts) more than previously reported?", this study found that male characters coded as utilizing production artifacts was 2:1 over female characters pictured with production artifacts. This supports the report by Crabb and Bielawski (1994) that males were identified with the rugged outdoors, in a working

environment, or operating a motor vehicle or other form of transportation more often than females with a ratio of 4.5:1. It also supports the finding by Creany (1995) that "the gender roles played by male and female characters still reflect and thus transmitted traditional gender roles" (P. 292). The present study is also supportive of the finding of Weitzman et al. (1971) that the books lack representation of working women, who are indeed in the workforce during both the present time-frame studied and the time-frame they looked at, 1966-1971. While the female characters in this study were shown more often outside the home, utilizing production artifacts, it was in the role as a teacher or leisure activity, not the male dominated workforce, transportation or manual labor.

In answering research question four, "are males depicted with more household activity than previously reported by studies looking at award winning books?", findings suggest a slight difference. The present study found that females were depicted with household artifacts more often than males, 1.7:1, although the difference is large, it does not represent the broad difference previously reported by Crabb and Bielawski (1994) of 4:1.

This study does not support the contention of Allen et al. (1993) or Crabb and Bielawski (1994:273) that males are kept away from the "confinement of feminized space of home

and family life". Creany (1995) noted a similar trend, regarding Caldecott award winning books with regards to male and female characters reflecting traditional gender roles. In fact, there was a generous representation of males shown in a variety of household activities in the data collected for this study, with a female to male household artifact ratio of 1.5:1.

There was no evidence to support the findings of Allen et al. (1993) stating that "neuter character representation had increased in the 1986-1988 period" (P. 69). In fact, only one book studied had characters that were gender neutral, or at least, not obviously male or female to the researcher, *Sheep Take a Hike*.

LIMITATIONS

The biggest limitation of this study, and the others studies researched is that there are no children involved in the process of analyzing the books. Professionals are selecting award winning books and analyzing books, but there are no reactions of the children who are reading the books or having the books read to them. We, as professionals, are assuming that the children are detecting the gender role stereotypes.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Including children in the data collection process, measuring their reactions to a purposely selected sample would provide researchers insight into the interpretation of children. The sample would include one obviously gender role stereotyped piece of literature, one ambiguous, one subtle, and one that has the roles totally reversed.

Public libraries today are quickly being equipped with state-of-the-art computer programs for checking books both in and out of the library for patrons, tracking books, and storing data regarding patrons of each library system. A sample consisting of the books that are actually checked out of the library the most frequently would provide a reliable sample in measuring what children are actually selecting to read, or have read to them. The cooperation of a library system in a major city to run a query report listing the most popular books would be beneficial to future studies. This selection process was requested from several surrounding systems, but cooperation was not available at this time.

Another suggestion would involve acquiring sales reports of major bookstores, providing a list of books that are purchased from a variety of locations in a number of areas in the country. By analyzing the books people are

purchasing, you can get another connection to what is actually being read by, or to children.

This sample had an under-representation of characters of color, one book pictured African American characters, *Easter*. A purposeful sample looking at books with characters of color and a comparison to books with White characters would indicate differences in the portrayal of non-White cultures to White culture.

CONCLUSIONS

Although gender role stereotyping does exist in this sample, the picture does not appear bleak as previously reported. The representation of female characters is increasing overall, but more importantly females with a production artifact, or in a role outside the home is growing. The same importance is acknowledged for the increase in the representation of males in the home. It is important that both roles continue to increase in children's literature allowing children to feel comfortable in the environment of their choice, not the choice of authors, parents, or educators. This choice could also lead to a future of a more egalitarian division of household labor, given the numbers of women that are in the workforce, spending comparable hours employed and away from home as their spouses.

REFERENCES

- Albers, Peggy. 1996. "Issues of Representation: Caldecott Gold Medal Winners 1984-1995." *The New Advocate* 9(4):267-285.
- Allen, Ann M., Daniel N. Allen, and Gary Sigler. 1993. "Changes in Sex-role Stereotyping in Caldecott Medal Award Picture Books 1938-1988." *Journal of Research in Childhood Education* 7(2):67-73.
- Association for Library Service to Children. 1996. *The Newbery and Caldecott Awards: A Guide to the Medal and Honor Books*. Chicago, IL: American Library Association.
- Bandura, Albert. 1986. *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bauer, Marion Dane. 1993. "Sexism and the World of Children's Books." *The Horn Book Magazine* September/October:577-581.
- Bowker, Diane M. Turner. 1996. "Gender Stereotyped Descriptors in Children's Picture Books: Does "Curious Jane" Exist in the Literature?" *Sex Roles* 35(7/8):461-488.
- Bussey, Kay and David G. Perry. 1982. "Same-Sex Imitation: The Avoidance of Cross-Sex Models or the Acceptance of Same-Sex Models?" *Sex Roles* 8(7):773-784.
- Bussey, Kay and Albert Bandura. 1984. "Influence of Gender Constancy and Social Power on Sex-Linked Modeling." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 47(6):1292-1302.
- Carter, D. Bruce and Laura A. McCloskey. 1983-1984. "Peers and the Maintenance of Sex-Typed Behavior: The Development of Children's Conceptions of Cross-Gender Behavior in Their Peers." *Social Cognition* 2(4):294-314.
- Carter, D. Bruce and Charlotte J. Patterson. 1982. "Sex Roles as Social Conventions: The Development of Children's Conceptions of Sex-Role Stereotypes." *Developmental Psychology* 18(6):812-824.

- Collins, Laura J., Bron B. Ingoldsby, and Mary M. Dellman. 1984. "Sex-role Stereotyping in Children's Literature: A Change From The Past." *Childhood Education* March/April:278-282.
- Crabb, Peter B. and Dawn Bielawski. 1994. "The Social Representation of Material Culture and Gender in Children's Books." *Sex Roles* 30(1/2):69-79.
- Creany, Anne Drolett. 1995. "The Appearance of Gender in Award-Winning Children's Books." *Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)* ED 391 510:289-298.
- Davis, Albert J. 1984. "Sex-Differentiated Behaviors in Non-Sexist Picture Books." *Sex Roles* 11(1/2):1-15.
- Dix, Theodore. 1993. "Attributing Dispositions to Children: An Interactional Analysis of Attribution in Socialization." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 19(5):633-643.
- Dougherty, Wilma Holden and Rosalind E. Engel. 1987. "An 80s Look for Sex Equality in Caldecott Winners and Honor Books." *The Reading Teacher* 40(4):394-398.
- Engel, Rosalind E. 1981. "Is Unequal Treatment of Females Diminishing in Children's Picture Books?" *The Reading Teacher* 34:647-652.
- Erickson, Eric H. 1968. *Identity, Youth and Crisis*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Ernst, Shirley B. 1995. "Gender Issues in Books for Children and Young Adults." Pp. 66-77 in *Battling Dragons: Issues and Controversy in Children's Literature*, edited by Susan Lehr. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Fagot, Beverly I. 1995. "Psychosocial and Cognitive Determinants of Early Gender-Role Development." *Annual Review of Sex Research* VT:1-31.
- Fillmer, Thompson and Leslie Haswell. 1977. "Sex-Role Stereotyping in English Usage." *Sex Roles* 3(3):257-263.
- Fox, Mem. 1993. "Men Who Weep, Boys Who Dance: The Gender Agenda Between The Lines in Children's Literature." *Language Arts* 70:84-88.

- Freud, Sigmund. 1935. *A General Introduction to Psychoanalysis*. (J. Riviere, Trans.) New York, NY: Liveright.
- Gerasimova, Katarina, Natalya Troyan, and Elena Zdravomyslova. 1996. "Gender Stereotypes in Pre-School Children's Literature." Pp. 71-87 in *Women's Voices in Russia Today*, edited by Anna Rotkierh and Elima Haavio Mannila. Brookfield, VT: Dartmouth Publishing Company.
- Grauerholz, Elizabeth and Benice A. Pescosolido. 1989. "Gender Representation In Children's Literature: 1900-1984." *Gender & Society* 3(1):113-125.
- Greif, Esther Blank. 1980. "Sex Differences in Parent-Child Conversations." *Women's Studies International Quarterly* 3:253-258.
- Jenkins, Mary Dellman, Lisa Florjancic, and Elizabeth Blue Swadener. 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.
- Katz, Phyllis A. and Sally Boswell. 1986. "Flexibility and Traditionality in Children's Gender Roles." *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs* 112(1):105-147.
- Kinder, Donald R., Tom Smith, and Harold B. Gerard. 1976. "The Attitude-Labeling Process Outside of the Laboratory." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 33(4):480-491.
- Kohlberg, Lawrence. 1987. "Child Psychology and Childhood Education a Cognitive-Developmental View." White Plains, NY: Longman Inc.
- Kolbe, Richard and Joseph C. LaVoie. 1981. "Sex-Role Stereotyping in Preschool Children's Picture Books." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 44(4):369-374.
- Kortenhaus, Carole M. and Jack Demarest. 1993. "Gender Role Stereotyping in Children's Literature: An Update." *Sex Roles* 28(3/4):219-233.
- Maher, Anne, Barrie Wade, and Maggie Moore. 1997. "Goslob is a Boy's Name." *English in Education* 31(1):24-35.

- Martin, Carol Lynn. 1990. "Attitudes and Expectations About Children with Nontraditional and Traditional Gender Roles." *Sex Roles* 22(3/4):151-165.
- Murphy, John Michael and Carol Gilligan. 1980. "Moral Development in Late Adolescence and Adulthood: A Critique and Reconstruction of Kohlberg's Theory." *Human Development* 23:77-104.
- Nilsen, Alleen Pace. 1978. "Five Factors Contributing to the Unequal Treatment of Females in Children's Picture Books." *Top of the News* Spring 1978:255-258.
- Peterson, Sharyl Bender and Mary Alyce Lach. ,1990. "Gender Stereotypes in Children's Books: Their Prevalence and Influence on Cognitive and Affective Development." *Gender and Education* 2(2):185-197.
- Purcell, Piper and Lara Stewart. 1990. "Dick and Jane in 1989." *Sex Roles* 22(3/4):177-185.
- Ross, Catherine E. 1987. "The Division of Labor at Home." *Social Forces* 65(3):816-833.
- St. Peter, Shirley. 1979. "Jack Went Up the Hill.....but Where Was Jill?" *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 4(2):256-260.
- Temple, Charles. 1993. "What If Beauty Had Been Ugly? Reading Against The Grain of Gender Bias in Children's Books." *Language Arts* 70:89-93.
- Tognoli, Jerome, Jane Pullen, and Judith Lieber. 1994. "The Privilege of Place: Domestic and Work Locations of Characters in Children's Books." *Children's Environments* 11(4):272-280.
- Weitzman, Lenore J., Deborah Eifler, Elizabeth Hokada, and Catherine Ross. 1971. "Sex-Role Socialization in Picture Books for Preschool Children." *American Journal of Sociology* 77(6):1125-1149.
- Welch, Michael R. and Barbara Miller Page. 1979. "Sex Differences in Socialization Anxiety." *The Journal of Social Psychology* 109:17-23.
- Wellhousen, Karyn. 1996. "Girls Can Be Bull Riders, Too! Supporting Children's Understanding of Gender Roles Through Children's Literature." *Young Children* 51(5):79-83.

Witt, Susan D. 1997. "Parental Influence on Children's Socialization to Gender Roles." *Adolescence* 32(126):253-259.

CODEBOOK (EACH BOOK)

TITLE	Title of each book	Name
COPYRIGHT	Copyright date of each book	MM/DAY/YR
SHELVED	Date the book was placed on The shelf of the Russell Mem. Library	MM/DAY/YR
CHECKED OUT	The total number of times Each book has been checked out of the library	###
AUTHORS GENDER	Gender of the author	1 male 2 female
NAME IN TITLE	Name of character/characters listed in the title of each book	1 male 2 female 3 both, male and female
MALES	Total number of pictures with male characters in each book Note: this will include duplicate pictures of the same characters	###
FEMALES	Total number of pictures with female characters in each book Note: this will include duplicate pictures of the same characters	###

CODEBOOK (EACH PICTURE)

TITLE	Title of the book	Name
M PRO	Male with production artifact	1
F PRO	Female with production artifact	2
M HSE	Male with household artifact	3
F HSE	Female with household artifact	4
M PER	Male with personal artifact	5
F PER	Female with personal artifact	6

Definition of artifacts:

PRODUCTION ARTIFACTS	Objects used to produce effects outside the household, including artifacts used in construction, agriculture, transportation and all other work outside the home
HOUSEHOLD ARTIFACTS	Human-made objects used to produce effects in the home, including artifacts used in food preparation, cleaning, repair, family care and home manufacture
PERSONAL ARTIFACTS	Human-made objects not employed in labor and used to produce effects on the immediate person of the user, including artifacts used for grooming, protection from the elements, and leisure
EXCLUDED ARTIFACTS	Characters using architectural structures, and gender-specific clothing

VITA

Renaë M. Poarch

Old Dominion University, Department of Sociology and
Criminal Justice, Norfolk, VA 23529 (757) 683-3791

Education:

M.A. Applied Sociology, August 1999; Old Dominion
University, Norfolk, VA

B.S. Sociology, (minor in Human Services Counseling),
December 1997; Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA

Related Experience:

Research Assistant, Old Dominion University, Norfolk,
VA, January 1998-June 1999.

Substitute Teacher, Suffolk Public Schools, Suffolk, VA
January 1996-June 1997.

Activities and Awards:

Summa Cum Laude December, 1997

Phi Kappa Phi Honor Society, 1996

Alpha Kappa Delta, Administrative Assistant, 1997

Golden Key National Honor Society, 1996

Master of Arts Applied Sociology Graduate Student
Representative, 1998-1999

Steve Russell Morrison Memorial Endowed Scholarship,
1997-1998 Academic Year

Hampton Scholarship, 1996-1997 Academic Year

Hampton Scholarship, 1997-1998 Academic Year