

# **A 21ST CENTURY UPDATE OF GENDER PORTRAYAL IN CALDECOTT WINNERS**

**Honors Thesis**

**Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
For the Degree of Bachelor of Arts in Psychology**

In the College of Arts and Sciences  
at Salem State University

By

Nicole Black

Dr. Joanna Gonsalves  
Faculty Advisor  
Department of Psychology

\*\*\*

Commonwealth Honors Program  
Salem State University  
2015

### Abstract

This study replicates previous studies that investigated the portrayal of gender in Caldecott award-winning books. Past studies found that females were nearly invisible. Females tended to be under-represented in titles, central roles, and illustrations (Weitzman, Eifler, Hokada, & Ross, 1972). In addition, they appeared in the illustrations to be indoors more often than outside and displayed gender-typical behavioral traits. The current study utilizes the methods and procedures of past researchers to present an updated account of gender-portrayal in the Caldecott winners for 2010 through 2015. A content analysis, and a character trait analysis were performed to analyze the books. The researchers found no significant increases or decreases for human single-gendered illustrations and human characters. However, there was a significant increase in the percent of females for non-human single-gendered illustrations and non-human characters. In addition, females were over-represented outdoors, which is in contrast to past research. Furthermore, only three traits were rated as being more salient for females than males: nurturant, rescue and traditional role. Compared with past studies, children's books are becoming more gender equitable in terms of representation, location and behavior traits. However, improvements can still be made to reflect the actuality of societal proportions.

### A 21st Century Update of Gender Portrayal in Caldecott Winners

Mass media have the ability to send many messages to viewers. These messages could be related to race, gender, sexuality, etc. In recent decades, scholars and critics have become increasingly concerned about the implications of these messages in children's lives, with scholars who work in the interdisciplinary field of girlhood studies examining the issue from a range of perspectives. For example, in her book *The Princess Problem* and other works, Rebecca Hains acknowledges the consequences of media, especially when it comes to girls and princesses. Hains claims that girls are encountering both race stereotypes as well as gender stereotypes. Media, with regard to princesses, are sending girls powerful messages about female behavior, suggesting that girls "should be passive and sweet, and maybe not as strong and empowered as we want our modern girls to be today" (Hains, 2014). As media are a powerful socializing agent in children's lives (Gerbner, Gross, Morgan, Signorielli, & Shanahan, 2002) it's crucial to examine the messages they send especially when it comes to dictating gender roles. It's important to make a distinction between sex and gender. For the purpose of this study, gender will be defined as, "a reaction and result of an action in certain situations, as determined by conventional and normative expectations regarding one's assignment of sex" (Zimmerman & West, 1998). Sex refers to, "the determination which is founded on conventional biological criterions to distinguish male from female" (Zimmerman et al., 1998). In other words, gender refers to the behaviors presented, which may coincide with or be determined by normative expectations of the person's sex. Gender roles are actions/behaviors that are deemed as appropriate for males and females. As gender roles are presented, many members of each gender may feel limited or compelled to present themselves in a certain manner.

In the field of psychology, Oskamp, Kaufman, and Wotlerbeek (1996) support this idea as they claim that, along with parents and teachers, mass media (television, radio, books, magazines, and newspaper) also shape gender roles. In trying to explain why media are a big contributor to the formation of gender roles, it's necessary to reference gender schema theory. During development, children are forming what is referred to as schema. Schemata are cognitive structures that organize and guide individual perceptions (Bem, 1981, p. 355). A significant contributor to the formation of schema is a child's social environment. In regards to gender, this environment is sending messages about what is deemed as masculine and feminine. Children are processing this information and creating ideas of what is appropriate for males versus females. As schemata are formed it changes the way children process gender-related information, which then in turn changes the way in which they behave. Therefore, it is of utmost important to monitor the early messages children are receiving because they will ultimately shape their later perceptions and behaviors. For children, an important source of early, impressionable information is picture books (Oskamp et al. 1996).

In terms of a child's exposure to books, students spend about 80 to 95% of classroom time using textbooks. Also, teachers make a lot of instructional decisions based upon textbooks (Blumberg, 2008). Supporting this idea, a Canadian study found that the average teacher uses textbooks for 70 to 90% of class time (Blumberg, 2008). Therefore, a significant portion of a child's day in school is centered on textbooks. Golombok and Fivush claim that the stories that children and adults read together provide a substantial amount of information about the world (Golombok & Fivush, 1994). A child receives a significant amount of exposure to text in school. Also, these texts are having an impact on their perceptions of the world around them. Abad and Pruden support this idea as they state, "...storybooks have the potential to change children's

gender role beliefs/behaviors” (Abad & Pruden, 2013). Gooden and Gooden add to this as they state, “children’s books have the potential of altering perceptions and possibly helping to change lives” (Gooden & Gooden, 2001). Therefore, it becomes a concern to researchers what messages these books are sending, and what impression this is having on children.

### **Rationale**

As presented above, a child's environment consists of a substantial amount of exposure to books. As explained previously, a child’s environment contributes to the formation of their schema in terms of gender. As a prospective elementary school teacher, there's a concern for what kind of messages these books are sending. In particular, there’s a concern for the depiction of gender in these books and what impact this could have on students’ formation of gender roles.

In the past, researchers have analyzed the prestigious Caldecott-winning books and have found significant findings in regards to gender. This award is given to the most distinguished picture book of the year. The criterion that is judged upon is the book's illustrations. Whereas, the Newbury medal is given to the best children's book (which may or may not have pictures). Therefore, the Newbury values the written work, and the Caldecott values the illustrations. The books that receive this honor are stamped with a prestigious seal on their cover. Caldecott-winning books receive a significant amount of recognition and support by school districts, and therefore are prominent in classrooms. Furthermore, the luminous seal makes these books extremely marketable to a variety of audiences. Researchers have specifically looked at 3 main themes, (1) visibility of gender (2) location of the characters and (3) behaviors of the characters. The following sections look at three studies in detail and further elaborate upon these themes.

To begin, the earliest study was done by Weitzman, Eifler, Hokada and Ross (1972). In this study, Weitzman et al. (1972) analyzed the Caldecott winners and runner-ups for 1967-1971.

In reviewing the study, there is a significant lack of detail in terms of this researcher's methodology. Weitzman does a poor job indicating his units for analysis, his tests for statistical significance, his operational definitions and his overall procedure. However, Weitzman found that women were nearly invisible. Women were underrepresented in titles, central roles, pictures and the stories themselves. Overall, there were 261 male characters depicted, and only 23 female characters depicted. Furthermore, females were completely absent in one-third of the books. In addition to being invisible, females were depicted as passive, immobile and indoors, whereas, males were depicted as very active and adventurous. Weitzman claims that, in a number of instances, the presence of a female character was insignificant. Weitzman's findings were appalling. The gender roles presented by these books were very rigid, limiting and provided a narrow scope of reality.

As Weitzman presented such significant findings, efforts arose to promote change and make literature gender equitable. Therefore, Williams, Vernon, Williams and Malecha (1987) replicated the study to assess the effectiveness of these efforts. Williams et al. examined the Caldecott winners and runner-ups from 1972-1979, as well as, 1980-1985. Particular attention was paid to the 24 Caldecott winners of the 1980s. As Weitzman does a poor job communicating his methodology, Williams et al. adds to the literature by including a description of his various procedures. To begin, Williams noted that a text was read when gender was ambiguous and hard to decipher. In addition, each illustration was treated as a unit. The illustration was coded as being single-gendered or not, and then the number of characters were counted and noted in regards to gender. The Fisher's exact test was used to determine the statistical significance of the findings. Furthermore, Williams analyzed the behaviors and traits for the central character and the most important character of the opposite sex. Four evaluators assessed the characters. A trait

was marked as salient if 3 out of 4 evaluators marked it as present. Williams et al. found significant increases in terms of human female single-gender illustrations, non-human female single-gender illustrations, female human characters and female central characters. In addition, Williams et al. saw a subtle shift in the number of women indoors. Williams et al. did find that women appeared to be dependent, nurturant, submissive, and passive, whereas males appeared to be independent, competitive, persistent, creative and active.

Oskamp, Kaufman, and Wolterbeek (1996) also replicated the study. These researchers analyzed the Caldecott winners and runner-ups from 1986-1991. Oskamp et al. used the methods of Williams but added various dimensions for more precision. Oskamp et al. first noted the author and illustrator of each text. In addition, a tally was made for each illustration. Oskamp et al. defined an illustration as being one unit whether it occupied a page, 2 pages or 1/2 a page. Each illustration was classified as (1) only females, (2) only males, (3) both. Then, the number of characters in each illustration was counted by sex, and coded as human or non-human. Human characters were coded for location (indoors or outdoors), but non-human characters were not. Furthermore, Oskamp et al. also analyzed the traits presented by the central character and the most important character of the opposite sex. However, Oskamp et al. defined a trait as salient if it was shown or clearly mentioned in the text. Furthermore, the trait needed to be displayed more than once. In addition, two opposite traits such as independent and dependent could be marked present for a character. To do this analysis, Oskamp had four graduate psychology students do extensive training and practice with the rating system. The graduates then coded the book on two occasions, two weeks apart from each other. Overall, a trait was marked as salient if three out of four raters marked it. Oskamp et al. found (1) an increase in the percent of books with female central characters, (2) an increase in the number of female single-gender illustrations, (3) an

increase in the number of female characters, (4) a male dominance in non-human single-gender illustrations, and (5) a decrease in the number of traits that have significant differences between males and females.

It is important to note that many other studies have been conducted on this topic. For a full comprehensive list, reference Appendix F. However, the three studies mentioned above were the most referenced for this study. More specifically, the current researchers followed the procedures of Williams et al. (1987) and Oskamp et al. (1996) very closely. The current study replicates these studies conducted to examine the current state of gender portrayal in Caldecott-winning books. The researchers aim to determine whether gender portrayal has improved. In other words, do these books still present sexual biases or has the literature shifted to gender equitable books? This has been a topic that has been revisited and replicated on many occasions. There is a significant opportunity to add to the literature by presenting the current state of gender portrayal in Caldecott-winning books.

The researchers hypothesize to find (1) an equal representation of human male and female characters, (2) an equal representation of non-human male and female characters and, (3) no significant difference in the traits presented by males and females.

## **Method**

### **Sample**

This study analyzed the Caldecott Medal winners and honorable-mentioned books for the years 2010 to 2015. For a complete list of the books reference Appendix A. In total, twenty-seven books were chosen for the study. However, it's important to note that various books were discluded from certain parts of the study.

From 2010, *The Lion and the Mouse* was discluded from the content analysis. *All the World* was discluded from the character trait analysis. Also, *Red Sings from the Treetops: A Year in Colors* was discluded from both, the content analysis and character trait analysis. In, *The Lion and the Mouse*, since there are no words to accompany the pictures, the researchers were unable to decipher the gender of the main characters for the content analysis. This book was included in the character trait analysis, solely because the author's note in the back of the book indicated the main characters' gender. *All the World* is a story that follows an entire family throughout one day and doesn't have a discernable main character. Therefore, with no main character a trait analysis could not be performed. *Red Sings from the Treetops: A Year in Colors* provided no indication of gender at all. The main character is gender-neutral; there is no direct conclusion of gender and the text never references any pronouns such as he or she. The book, which focuses on the various colors of different seasons throughout the year, is meant to evoke the senses and memories of the readers.

No books from the year 2011 were discluded. However, in 2012, the book, *Grandpa Green* was discluded from both, the content analysis and character trait analysis. *Grandpa Green* contained a few clearly gendered characters. However, the majority of the book contained unidentifiable plant characters. In other words, bushes and plants formed the silhouettes of a number of characters. The characters were ambiguous and hard to code and the main character didn't present clearly identifiable traits. Throughout the story, the main character narrates the story of his grandfather growing up. For those reasons, it was discluded from the character trait analysis.

In 2013, the book, *Green*, was discluded from both, the content analysis and character trait analysis. *Green* was discluded because the book contained very few gendered characters.

The majority of the book used genderless animals or objects to describe the various shades of the color green. For example, one page depicts a number of limes with the words "lime green". The emphasis of this book wasn't on gendered characters, but rather on color concepts.

In 2014, the book, *Mr. Wuffles!* was discluded solely from the content analysis. Furthermore, the book, *Locomotive* was discluded solely from the character trait analysis. *Mr. Wuffles!* contains aliens/UFOs as central characters. In addition, there are no words to accompany the pictures, and therefore the gender of these characters is not decipherable. This book was included in the character trait analysis because the main character's gender was introduced in the title, "Mr". *Locomotive* doesn't contain a main character and therefore, a trait analysis could not be done.

In 2015, the book, *This One Summer* was discluded from both the content analysis and character trait analysis. *This One Summer* is 318 pages long and follows the genre of a comic book. The purpose of this study is to analyze books that could be read-aloud to children or used by an elementary teacher to supplement curriculum. The length and structure of this book didn't meet this criterion and therefore was discluded.

Overall, the researchers viewed the discluded books in a positive manner with regard to gender stereotypes. In most of the discluded books, gender is neither present nor salient. Perhaps there is a shift towards more gender-neutral literature. Whereas, in past studies, males dominated children's literature and characters were depicted with stereotyped gender traits.

### **Procedures**

This study involved two main analyses, a content analysis and a character trait analysis. The content analysis included book information (author, illustrator, title, etc.), analysis of individual illustrations, and analysis of the location of the characters. This analysis focused on

the visibility of the two genders. Are males or females presented more? The character trait analysis analyzed personality traits displayed by the main character of the book and the most important character of the opposite sex (Williams et al). In past studies, researchers found stereotypical gendered behavior being displayed by central characters. For example, females displayed nurturant tendencies more than males.

### **Content Analysis**

**Book Information.** The coding sheet used for the content analysis is presented in Appendix B. First, the book title was written down and marked on whether gender was present in the title. For example *Mr. Wuffles!* was marked for a male presence, because of the "Mr". Then, the gender of the author and illustrator were noted. It's important to note that the researcher read the book before filling out the rest of the coding sheet. The text helped to clarify ambiguous genders in a number of situations. Therefore, the gender of the central character was noted after reading the book.

**Illustration Coding.** For the illustration analysis, each illustration was viewed as a unit, and coded individually (Williams et al, 1987). An illustration could be a page, a half page, or smaller (Oskamp et al, 1996).

First, each illustration was coded as being single-gendered or not. The coding sheet had five categories that could be circled: human male, human female, non-human male, non-human female or both. Therefore, the term "single-gender" referred to whether one gender was present. After a category was circled, the characters were counted and the number was written under the proper label. For example, if solely human males were present, that category would be circled on the sheet, and the proper number of characters would be written below it. This procedure was the same for non-human illustrations. However, if an illustration contained females and males, the

category "both" would be circled, and then the number of characters would be written under the proper labels.

**Location: Indoors/Outdoors.** For solely human characters, the location was marked as either indoor or outdoor (Oskamp et al, 1996). At the end, the researcher totaled the overall number of illustrations, and the number of single-gender illustrations. In addition, the researcher recorded the total number of characters, with sub-totals for number of female characters (human and non-human) and sub-totals for male characters (human and non-human). In addition, if humans were present in illustrations, the researcher recorded the number of females who were indoor or outdoor, and the number of males who were indoor or outdoor.

During the first coding session, there were numerous coding challenges that needed to be addressed. First, background characters were only included in the count if their gender was clearly visible (Oskamp et al, 1996). If there was any question in regards to gender, that character was simply not counted.

Second, non-human characters were only counted if they were personified or their gender was indicated in the text. For example, in *Extra Yarn*, a dog by the name of Mars accompanies the main character. However, Mars is never personified and there is no use of the pronoun "he" or "she" in the text, therefore Mars wasn't counted. However, in the book, *A Sick Day for Amos McGee*, the animals are counted because they display human-like characteristics, and they are referenced as "he".

Lastly, characters were only counted if their face was showing. In a number of instances, only parts of a character would be showing. In some circumstances, a character's hand was shown, or a character's foot. Although the researcher could decipher the gender based on previous pages, it was not counted. A part of a character doesn't indicate gender for the given

illustration. After these changes to the coding scheme were made, each book was coded for a second time.

### **Trait Analysis**

A character trait analysis was performed to analyze the behaviors of the characters in relation to gender. The traits included are the traits analyzed in past studies (Weitzman et al). For the trait coding sheet and a list of definitions for each trait, reference Appendix C and D.

A committee was established to judge the traits of the main characters in each book, compiled of two male college students and one female psychology college student, as well as, one female psychology college faculty member. For a trait to be marked as present for a character, there needed to be at least seventy-five percent agreement. In other words, three out of four raters needed to have marked that trait independently. The inter-rater reliability by trait, as well as, the inter-rater reliability by book is presented in Table 1 and Table 2.

## **Results**

### **Content Analysis**

**Book Information.** In terms of the presence of gender in book titles, over half of the books displayed a neutral title. In addition, only fourteen percent had a male presence, while nineteen percent had a female presence. However, in terms of authors and illustrators, males were dominant; 61.9% of authors and illustrators were males, whereas only 38.1% of authors and illustrators were female. The results are presented in Table 3.

**Illustration Coding.** It's important to note that the current study compared its data to Oskamp et al.'s study. In terms of female single-gendered illustrations, female human characters, and female central characters, there were slight decreases in percentages between the two study

periods (1986-1991 versus 2010-2015). However, none of these decreases were statistically significant. A one-tail Fisher's exact test was used to test for significance.

In terms of female non-human, single-gendered illustrations, and female non-human characters, there were statistically significant increases. For a complete table of the results reference Table 4.

### **Location: Indoors/Outdoors**

In past studies such as Weitzman et al (1972), Williams et al (1987), and Oskamp et al (1996), the researchers divided human characters into sub-categories: girls, boys, men and women. However, the current study did not make the distinction between children and adult characters. Therefore, it looked at the broader category of solely male and female human characters. The results of this study could not be compared to past studies due to the different methodology.

The locations for where characters were depicted were 39.0% indoor for females (147 of 377) and 46.2% indoor for males (247 of 535). The study found that females are significantly over-represented outdoors in the books ( $p < .02$ ). The result of the indoor/outdoor analysis is presented in Table 5.

### **Trait Analysis**

The earlier studies found that characters tended to display gender-stereotyped behaviors. More specifically, Williams et al's (1987) study showed significant differences between males and females for ten traits and Oskamp et al's (1996) study showed it for four. In the current study, the researchers found statistically significant differences for three traits. Female characters were depicted as nurturant, engaged in rescue tasks, and in traditional roles more often than males. The results of the trait analysis are presented in Table 6.

## **Discussion**

### **Content Analysis**

The overall results of the content analysis seemed to be positive in regards to gender portrayal. Although 61.9% of the authors and illustrators depicted were male, this wasn't reflected into the stories themselves. There were no significant increases or decreases in terms of human single-gender illustrations, human characters, and central characters with regard to females. However, in terms of non-human, single-gender illustrations, and non-human characters, there were significant increases in the presence of females. Past research found a large disparity in gender representation for non-human characters. Therefore, it is encouraging to see that the imbalance of male and female non-human characters is decreasing. The only discouraging aspect is that figures are still shy of actual societal proportions. The researchers hypothesized to see equal representation of gender, but that has still not been attained. Although subtle, it's still a concern as to why females are depicted less. Furthermore, females were over-represented outdoors, which is contrary to past results. In past research, females tended to be in the household. The depiction of female characters is no longer limited in terms of location. This type of result makes it seem unlikely that girls will associate themselves strictly with indoor activities.

### **Trait Analysis**

In the past, characters displayed very gender typical traits. Williams et al (1987) found ten traits with significant differences between males and females, whereas, Oskamp et al (1996) found four traits with significant differences between males and females. In this study, the researchers found three traits with significant differences between males and females. Females, more often than males, were depicted as nurturant, more likely to rescue others, and in traditional

roles. The researchers hypothesized to find no significant differences between males and females for a given trait. Although, some stereotypical traits still apply to females, there is definitely improvement. As years continue to pass, females and males are not displaying as many stereotypical traits. Hopefully, girls are experiencing a sense of decreasing rigidity in the way they should behave. Is there going to come a day where females will be "...free from having to be 'the good girl', the obedient one, the compliant one, the one who doesn't rock the boat..." (Cervoni, n.d.).

### **Evaluation of the Study**

Many challenges arose during the study, especially in regards to coding. One researcher was responsible for the coding of the illustrations. As a result, the judgment of gender was from the perspective of one person. Therefore, in future research, there should be more than one coder. In that manner, an inter-rater reliability can be established and books without a 100% agreement can be recoded. In terms of past research, researchers didn't discuss their coding procedure in detail, raising questions about how ambiguities were handled during the coding process. The researchers of this study tried to elaborate and provide resolutions to any problems that could arise for future researchers.

Furthermore, the researchers viewed the discluded books in a positive manner. In a number of books, gender of central characters was either ambiguous or simply not present. Authors and illustrators seem to be focusing on other concepts that don't involve gender. This is an extremely encouraging finding. No longer are books solely focusing on males or females, but rather, the books are now incorporating other interests. As books are written without the incorporation of gender, children are less susceptible to gender-stereotypes.

In evaluating the study overall, it's important to note that solely Caldecott books were analyzed. Therefore, the findings are not generalizable or representative of the entire population of children's literature.

### **Discluded Books**

In a previous section, many books were described and had a short rationale of why they couldn't be included in the study. It's important to note that the researchers viewed these discluded books in a positive manner. A lot of these books had characters that didn't reference or display a clear gender. Furthermore, a lot of these books focused on topics that didn't contain gender. For example, one book strictly focused on the various shades of the color green. Compared to previous decades, these discluded books show a slight shift in the literature to more gender-neutral topics/characters.

### **Implications for Future Teachers**

During the early years of schooling, a child's social environment consists of a substantial amount of books. Children are processing the information presented by these books and developing schemata in regards to various concepts. Therefore, it's imperative that teachers deeply consider the hidden messages these books are sending. If a teacher decides to consistently present books with tough, strong male characters, children are going to develop a schema that tells them males must be tough and strong. Knowingly or unknowingly, teachers have the power to select books that will shape the future perspectives of our youth. By careful consideration of books, teachers could be sending messages that could ultimately be empowering, if not, life-altering.

Ideally, society wouldn't have books that convey limiting, rigid, gender-roles but that doesn't seem realistic at this given time. Therefore, it's not to say a teacher can't use books that

display very stereotypical, gendered characters. If a teacher chooses to do this, it's imperative that he or she unravel and discusses the contents of the book, as well as, counterbalances these books with books that break stereotypes. It's imperative that teachers facilitate a discussion. He or she could pose questions that'll make children become diverse and critical thinkers of what's acceptable for each gender. In Appendix E, there is a list of children's books that challenge gender-stereotypes. These books could provide the counter-argument to any stereotypical thoughts a child may bring into the classroom.

## References

- Abad, C., & Pruden, S. M. (2013). Do storybooks really break children's gender stereotypes?. *Frontiers In Psychology, 4*.
- Bem, S. L. (1981) Gender schema theory: a cognitive account of sex typing. *Psychological Review, 88*(4), 354-364.
- Blumberg, R. (2008). The invisible obstacle to educational equality: gender bias in textbooks. *Prospects (00331538), 38*(3), 345-361.
- Cervoni, C. (2011). Let's change the paradigm of being the good girl. *Gender and Education Newsletter*.
- Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Morgan, M., Signorielli, N., & Shanahan, J. (2002). Growing up with television: Cultivation processes. In J. Bryant, D. Zillmann, J. Bryant, D. Zillmann (Eds.) , *Media effects: Advances in theory and research (2nd ed.)* (pp. 43-67). Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Golombok, S., & Fivush, R. (1994) *Gender Development*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gooden, A., & Gooden, M. (2001). Gender Representation in Notable Children's Picture Books: 1995-1999. *Sex Roles, 45*(1/2), 89-101.
- Oskamp, S., Kaufman, K., & Wolterbeek, L. A. (1996). Gender role portrayals in preschool picture books. *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality, 11*(5), 27-39.
- R Hains. (2014, Oct. 8) WATCH: Rebecca Hains discusses THE PRINCESS PROBLEM on Fox News. Retrieved from <http://rebeccahains.com/2014/10/08/watch-rebecca-hains-discusses-the-princess-problem-on-fox-news/>
- Weitzman, L. J., Eifler, D., Hokada, E., & Ross, C.. (1972). Sex-Role Socialization in Picture

Books for Preschool Children. *American Journal of Sociology*, 77(6), 1125–1150.

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

West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1998). Doing gender. In K. A. Myers, C. D. Anderson, B. J. Risman, K. A. Myers, C. D. Anderson, B. J. Risman (Eds.) , *Feminist foundations: Toward transforming sociology* (pp. 167-190). Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.

Table 1

*The Inter-Rater Reliability by Trait*

<b>Trait</b>	<b>Percent Agreement</b>
Independent	77.8%
Dependent	71.3%
Cooperative	68.5%
Competitive	95.4%
Directive	85.2%
Submissive	80.6%
Persistent	68.5%
Explorative	68.5%
Creative	74.1%
Imitative	97.2%
Nurturant	76.9%
Aggressive	90.7%
Emotional	75.0%
Active	74.1%
Passive	88.9%
Rescue	88.0%
Service	77.8%
Traditional	72.2%
Non-Traditional	83.3%

Table 2

*The Inter-Rater Reliability by Book*

<b>Book Title</b>	<b>Percent Agreement</b>
<i>Nana in the City</i>	71.7%
<i>Dave the Potter</i>	80.3%
<i>Viva Frida</i>	76.3%
<i>A Sick Day for Amos McGee</i>	76.3%
<i>Extra Yarn</i>	89.5%
<i>Interrupting Chicken</i>	70.4%
<i>This is Not My Hat</i>	89.5%
<i>The Adventures of Beekle</i>	75.7%
<i>The Lion and the Mouse</i>	71.7%
<i>The Noisy Paint Box</i>	81.6%
<i>Journey</i>	84.2%
<i>Me...Jane</i>	80.3%
<i>The Right Word</i>	76.3%
<i>A Ball for Daisy</i>	82.9%
<i>One Cool Friend</i>	73.7%
<i>Flora and the Flamingo</i>	92.1%
<i>Sleep like a Tiger</i>	77.6%
<i>Sam &amp; Dave Dig a Hole</i>	82.9%
<i>Blackout</i>	80.3%
<i>Creepy Carrots</i>	82.9%
<i>Mr. Wuffles!</i>	93.4%

Table 3

*The Presence of Gender Within the Title, Author and Illustrator*

<b>Presence of Gender in Title (N=21)</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Author (N=21)</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Illustrator (N=21)</b>	<b>%</b>
3	14.3%	13	61.9%	13	61.9%
4	19.0%	8	38.1%	8	38.1%
0	0.0%				
14	66.7%				

Table 4

*Comparisons of the Visibility of Female Characters*

<b>Category</b>	<b>1967-71<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>1972-1979<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>1980-1985<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>1986-1991<sup>c</sup></b>	<b>2010-2015</b>	<b>p<sup>d</sup></b>
<b>Human single-gender illustrations</b>						
Total number	188	339	178	141	240	NS
% female	11.7%	31.6%	37.1%	43.3%	42.1%	
Male/female ratio	7.5	2.2	1.7	1.3	1.4	
<b>Humans Illustrated</b>						
Total number	685	1315	1,041	1189	912	NS
% female	19.1%	32.9%	42.2%	43.7%	41.3%	
Male/female ratio	4.2	2.0	1.4	1.3	1.4	
<b>Non-human single-gender illustrations</b>						
Total number	96	39	59	37	128	p = .0001
% female	1.0%	30.8%	15.3%	2.7%	36.7%	
Male/female ratio	95.0	2.3	5.6	32.3	1.7	
<b>Non-humans illustrated</b>						
Total number	196	156	168	106	245	p = .0025
Percent female	7.1%	23.7%	28.6%	16.0%	31.4%	
Male/female ratio	13.0	3.2	2.5	5.3	2.2	
<b>Books</b>						
Total number	18	29	24	22	21	NS
Percent with no female characters	33.3%	27.6%	12.5%	5.0%	19.1%	
Percent with female central characters	11.1%	24.1%	33.3%	47.4%	42.9%	

<sup>a</sup>From Weitzman, Eifler, Hokada, & Ross (1972) and Williams, Vernon, Williams & Malecha (1989)

<sup>b</sup>From Williams et al. (1989)

<sup>c</sup>From Oskamp, Kaufman, & Wolterbeek (1996)

<sup>d</sup>The p refers to the statistical probabilities that were calculated using a one-tailed, Fisher's exact test at the p < .10 significance level

Table 5

*Location of Male and Female Characters*

	<b>% Indoor</b>	<b>% Outdoor</b>	<i>p</i> <sup>a</sup>
<b>Males</b>	46.2%	53.8%	
<b>Females</b>	39.0%	61.0%	0.0183

<sup>a</sup>*p* refers to the statistical probability that was calculated using a Fisher's exact test at the  $p < .10$  significance level

Table 6

*The Traits of Main Characters and Most Important Character of the Opposite Sex, 2010-2015*

	<b>Female (N=11)</b>	<b>Male (N=16)</b>	<b>Probability<sup>a</sup></b>
Independent	6	8	NS
Dependent	0	2	NS
Cooperative	1	3	NS
Competitive	0	1	NS
Directive	0	1	NS
Submissive	0	1	NS
Persistent	4	9	NS
Explorative	3	7	NS
Creative	5	4	NS
Imitative	1	0	NS
Nurturant	5	2	0.07
Aggressive	0	3	NS
Emotional	4	3	NS
Active	5	4	NS
Passive	0	0	NS
Rescue	3	0	0.06
Service	2	1	NS
Traditional	3	0	0.06
Non-Traditional	1	0	NS

<sup>a</sup>The *p* refers to the statistical probabilities that were calculated using a one-tailed, Fisher's exact test at the  $p < .10$  significance level. NS means "not significant"

**Appendix A****The Caldecott Medal and Honor Books from 2010 to 2015<sup>a</sup>****2010:**

*The Lion and the Mouse* by Jerry Pinkney (character analysis only)  
*All the World* by Liz Garton Scanlon (illustration analysis only)  
*Red Sings from Treetops: A Year in Colors* by Joyce Sidman (neither)

**2011:**

*A Sick Day for Amos McGee* by Philip C. Stead (both)  
*Dave the Potter: Artist, Poet, Slave* by Laban Carrick Hill (both)  
*Interrupting Chicken* by David Ezra Stein (both)

**2012:**

*A Ball for Daisy* by Chris Raschka (both)  
*Blackout* by John Rocco (both)  
*Grandpa Green* by Lane Smith (neither)  
*Me. . .Jane* by Patrick McDonnell (both)

**2013:**

*This Is Not My Hat* by Jon Klassen (both)  
*Creepy Carrots!* by Peter Brown (both)  
*Extra Yarn* by Mac Barnett (both)  
*Green* by Laura Vaccaro Seeger (neither)  
*One Cool Friend* by Toni Buzzeo (both)  
*Sleep like a Tiger* by Mary Logue (both)

**2014:**

*Locomotive* by Brian Floca (illustrations only)  
*Journey* by Aaron Becker (both)  
*Flora and the Flamingo* by Molly Idle (both)  
*Mr. Wuffles!* by David Wiesner (character trait only)

**2015:**

*The Adventures of Beekle: The Unimaginary Friend* by Dan Santat (both)  
*Nana in the City* by Lauren Castillo (both)  
*The Noisy Paint Box: The Colors and Sounds of Kandinsky's Abstract Art* by Barb Rosenstock (both)  
*Sam & Dave Dig a Hole* by Mac Barnett (both)  
*Viva Frida* by Yuyi Morales (both)  
*The Right Word: Roget and His Thesaurus* by Jen Bryant (both)  
*This One Summer* by Mariko Tamaki (neither)

<sup>a</sup>The first book listed under each year is the medal winner.





## Appendix D

### Trait Definition Sheet

**Independent:** Character is self-sufficient. He/she doesn't seek help from others and does things by him or herself.

**Dependent:** Character relies on others. The character is unable to do various things without the accompaniment of other characters.

**Cooperative:** Character is shown working with other characters. The character is depicted in-group tasks, and works well with other characters.

**Competitive:** The character displays a motive to win or gain something. This battle could be against oneself or against other characters.

**Directive:** The character is telling other characters what to do. The character often directs or guides various characters.

**Submissive:** The character tends to take orders. In other words, the character is easily told what to do by others.

**Persistent:** The character continually does a task or action. The character could be striving for a goal, or looking to gain a particular item. Either way, the character doesn't easily give up.

**Creative:** The character has a strong sense of imagination. The character also engages in activities involving the arts (painting, dance, etc). The character tends to think outside the box.

**Imitative:** The character simply copies another character's actions or words.

**Nurturant:** The character seems to be warm, affectionate and caring of other characters.

**Aggressive:** The character seems very forceful, hostile, or has intent to attack or confront another character.

**Emotional:** The character displays **strong** facial expressions throughout the text. The character has clear expressions that depict mood/feeling.

**Active:** The character is engaging in some sort of strenuous physical activity. Not in terms of walking but dancing, running, jumping, climbing, etc.

**Passive:** The character tends to sit around, unengaged with others or activities.

**Rescue:** The character saves another character.

**Service:** The character is helping or doing work for another character.

**Traditional Role:** A job/role that is seen as typical (usual) for that gender.

**Male:** police officer, construction worker, soldier, mechanic, firefighter, engineer, scientists

**Female:** nurse, teacher, dancer, artists, housewife

**Non-Traditional Role:** A job/role that is seen as ATYPICAL (unusual) for that gender.

## Appendix E

### Books that Challenge Gender Stereotypes

1. *Oliver Button is a Sissy* by Tomie dePaola

Oliver likes things such as playing with paper dolls, dressing up, drawing and reading. However, the boys in school deem Oliver as a "sissy". It's not until Oliver performs in the school's talent show that the boys start to see him in a different light.

2. *A Fire Engine for Ruthie* by Leslea Newman

Ruthie visits her grandmother who has all intentions of having a tea party and doing "girly things". However, Ruthie requests to play with the boy next door. Ruthie deeply enjoys playing with trucks and trains, and this quickly changes Ruthie's grandmother's intentions.

3. *Not All Princesses Dress in Pink* by Jane Yolen

This book depicts girls engaging in a variety of activities: from farming, to ball-playing and even skipping in the mud. All of the girls are wearing sparkly crowns, however none of them are wearing pink. Why can't girls engage in rough and tough activities, while also enjoying a little bit of sparkle?

4. *William's Doll* by Charlotte Zolotow

William wants a doll, but no one is sympathetic towards his desire. His friends make fun of him, and his dad denies him. However, things change as William's grandmother steps in.

5. *The Sissy Duckling* by Harvey Fierstein

Elmer isn't like the other boy ducklings. He enjoys baking and acting among other things. When Elmer's dad is hurt but a hunter, he proves that even a "sissy" can be a hero.

6. *Ira Sleeps Over* by Bernard Waber

Ira plans to spend the night at his friend's house. However, he finds himself questioning whether he can bring his teddy bear or not. This book shows that it's okay for boys to have a teddy bear.

7. *Tough Boris* by Mem Fox

Boris von der Borch is a mean, rough and tough pirate. However, when his pet parrot dies, even the toughest of pirates can break down.

8. *Pinky and Rex and the Bully* by James Howe

Pinky is a boy who loves the color pink. However, when another student bullies him he learns to stand up for himself and what he likes, with a little help from his friend Rex, a girl who loves dinosaurs.

9. *Knit Your Bit: A World War I Story* by Deborah Hopkinson

As Mikey's dad heads off to fight in the war, Mikey asks himself what he can do on the homefront to help. His teachers among others encourage him to knit. Mikey and his boy friends see this as "girlish". The girls end up posing a challenge that the boys can't resist.

10. *Ballerino Nate* by Kimberly Brubaker Bradley

Nate wants to take ballet lessons. His brothers tease him, and Nate begins to doubt himself. However, his mother remains supportive and puts him in Ballet lessons. Nate is encouraged and sticks with his interest.

## Appendix F

### More Studies that Reviewed this Topic

- 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, 67–73.
- Clark, R., Guilmain, J., Saucier, P. K., & Tavarez, J. (2003). Two steps forward, one step back: The presence of female characters and gender stereotyping in award-winning picture books between the 1930s and the 1960s. *Sex Roles*, 49, 439–449.
- Collins, L. J., Ingoldsby, B. B., & Dellmann, M. M. (1984). Sex-role stereotyping in children's literature: A change from the past. *Childhood Education*, 60(4), 278-285.
- Dougherty, W. H., & Engel, R. E. (1987). An 80s look for sex equality in Caldecott winners and honor books. *Reading Teacher*, 40, 394–398.
- Hamilton, M. C., Anderson, D., Broaddus, M., & Young, K. (2006). Gender Stereotyping and Under-representation of Female Characters in 200 Popular Children's Picture Books: A Twenty-first Century Update. *Sex Roles*, 55(11-12), 757-765. doi:10.1007/s11199-006-9128-6
- Kolbe, R., & LaVoie, J. C. (1981). Sex-role stereotyping in pre-school children's picture books. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 44, 369–374.
- Kortenhaus, C. M., & Demarest, J. (1993). Gender role stereotyping in children's literature: An update. *Sex Roles*, 28, 219–232.

- McDonald, S. M. (1989). Sex bias in the representation of male and female characters in children's picture books. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 150, 389–401.
- Oskamp, S., Kaufman, K., & Wolterbeek, L. A. (1996). Gender role portrayals in preschool picture books. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 11(5), 27–39.
- Paynter, K. C. (2012). Gender stereotypes and representation of female characters in children's picture books. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A*, 73, 727.
- Turner-Bowker, D. M. (1999, February). Picture images of girls and women in children's literature. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 59, 4544.
- Weitzman, L., Eifler, D., Hokada, E., & Ross, C. (1972). Sex role socialization in picture books for preschool children. *American Journal of Sociology*, 77, 1125–1130.
- Williams, J. A., Vernon, J. A., Williams, M. C., & Malecha, K. (1987). Sex role socialization in picture books: An update. *Social Science Quarterly*, 68, 148–156.