

# 9



## REPRESENTATIONS OF GENDER IN PRINT MEDIA AND ADVERTISING

16fcfb3c0bfc2ded802b12db155e0486  
ebrary

“Welcome to Your Grown-Up Life, Girlfriend!” shouts the headline from *Redbook* magazine’s media kit.<sup>1</sup> Empowerment seems to ooze from the web page, urging women to be their best selves. According to *Redbook*’s media kit, the magazine’s mission is to be the “total-life guide for every woman blazing her own path through adulthood and taking on new roles – wife, mom, homeowner – without letting go of the unique woman she has worked so hard to become.”<sup>2</sup> The media kit also includes a note from the current editor-in-chief, Stacy Morrison, which states, “When I was growing up, I always knew I would be a mother. It was a big, defining dream, to be able to raise and adore a child. But that was never my only dream, and one of the challenges of my grown-up life is to keep feeling wonderful about who I can be, beyond a diaper-changing, runny-nose-wiping love machine.” It feels like the female empowerment poster child of magazines, finally providing women a change from the usual “how to please your man” or “drop 25 pounds in 6 weeks to fit into those size 00 jeans” that are the stock and trade of other popular women’s magazines. But *Redbook* disappoints, as mixed messages abound, as while the taglines say one thing, cover images, which put forth idealized images of beauty have been shown to say another.

For example, in July 2007, the magazine featured country music singer Faith Hill beaming on its cover. Sort of, anyway. It turns out Faith Hill with a lot of Photoshop tweaking appeared on the cover of *Redbook* magazine. Jezebel.com, a pulls-no-punches website covering Hollywood, fashion, and politics for women, secured a

---

*Diversity in U.S. Mass Media*, First Edition. Catherine A. Luther, Carolyn Ringer Lepre, Naeemah Clark.

© 2012 Catherine A. Luther, Carolyn Ringer Lepre, and Naeemah Clark.

Published 2012 by Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

16fcfb3c0bfc2ded802b12db155e0486  
ebrary



Figure 9.1: Kelly Clarkson's computer altered *Self* cover next to her real self. Reproduced courtesy of Jezebel.com



copy of the original photograph taken of Hill and wrote a scathing article ripping *Redbook* for its Photoshop hatchet job, transforming an “already above-average 39-year-old” into “a female forgery.”<sup>3</sup> Among the things changed: trimming a “saggy” earlobe, thinning an arm so it looks fatless, boneless and approximately one inch wide, removing all lines and wrinkles on face, lengthening the neck, adding hair to make it look fuller, and an overall slimming of the body. *Redbook* is not alone in idealized depictions, and some argue that this kind of airbrushing is common and just part of magazines today. Kelly Clarkson, the winner of the first season of *American Idol* (2002 debut), appeared on the September cover of *Self* magazine in 2009, and noted when asked about the final version of the cover: “It’s very colorful, and they definitely have Photoshopped the crap out of me, but I don’t care! Whoever she is, she looks great.”<sup>4</sup>

But the writers at Jezebel.com argue that the alterations of women, which perpetuate what they call “The Cover Lie,” has a damaging effect on the women who see these unrealistic and impossible to attain images day after day. They write:

Honestly, it sort of broke our hearts that it was *Redbook*; the magazine has been criticized before for some questionable covers . . . and, after all, readers of magazines like *Redbook* worry that they can’t have it all as it is (the great career, the loving husband, the healthy kids, the perfect body) . . . Magazine-retouching may not be a lie on par with [government lies] but in a world where girls as young as eight are going on the South Beach Diet, teenagers are getting breast implants as graduation gifts, professional women are almost required to fetishize handbags, and everyone is spending way too much goddamn time figuring out how to pose in a way that will look as good as that friend with the really popular MySpace profile, it’s [just] wrong.<sup>5</sup>

This chapter will address how women and men have been represented in magazines, newspapers, and print advertising. As with the previous chapter, although this



chapter is about issues regarding gender and the mass media, due to the preponderance of research on women and the press, its focus is mostly regarding female representations. First, a brief discussion about writer and activist Betty Friedan, magazines, and feminism may help explain why the representations of women are at times celebrated, problematic, and ultimately, evolving.

## HISTORICAL BACKGROUND TO WOMEN IN THE PRINT MEDIA

Women were the target audience for many of the very first magazines published in the United States. Beginning with the short-lived *The Lady's Magazine and Repository of Entertaining Knowledge*, published in 1792, women's magazines have long been a large part of print media. Several of the most prominent women's magazines, commonly known as "The Seven Sisters," were launched in the late 1800s and early 1900s. These magazines included *Better Homes and Gardens*, *Family Circle*, *Good Housekeeping*, *Ladies' Home Journal*, *Redbook*, *Women's Day*, and the now-defunct *McCall's*. From the very beginning, women were urged on to perfection. The magazines they read in the early 1900s included information on how to keep a better home, how to behave and look like a lady, how best to care for your husband and children, and how to cook to please your family. Magazine historian Frank Luther Mott notes that the constant stream of advice on how to be perfect was so prevalent he wondered if some might have grown weary of it.<sup>6</sup> Considering that the popularity of these magazines continued into the 1960s, this was probably not the case.

Writer and activist Betty Friedan, in her 1963 book "*The Feminine Mystique*," threw much blame on women's magazines and their role in perpetuating the feminine stereotype of the "happy housewife heroine."<sup>7</sup> Friedan was a former writer for many women's magazines, and she had become increasingly troubled by the image of the perfect woman she saw being formed within the pages of the popular magazines of the time: in pursuit of blissful domesticity, which was characterized by home and husband – and that happiness was impossible without both. She writes:

Experts told them how to catch a man and keep him, how to breastfeed children and handle their toilet training, how to cope with sibling rivalry and adolescent rebellion; how to buy a dishwasher, bake bread, cook gourmet snails, and build a swimming pool with their own hands; how to dress, look, and act more feminine and make marriage more exciting; how to keep their husbands from dying young and their sons from growing into delinquents. They were taught to pity the neurotic, unfeminine, unhappy women who wanted to be poets or physicists or presidents. They learned that truly feminine women do not want careers, higher education, political rights – the independence and the opportunities that the old-fashioned feminists fought for.<sup>8</sup>

Friedan summarized what she called a typical issue of a popular magazine in the early 1960s: it included seven short stories about marriage, children, or the joy of being a housewife, a feature story on maternity fashion, patterns for home sewing and crafts, one article on dieting and another on how to prevent female baldness, an article called “An Encyclopedia Approach to Finding a Second Husband,” and an article on overcoming an “inferiority complex.” In commenting on such a typical issue, she writes:

This was the image of the American woman in the year Castro led a revolution in Cuba and men were trained to travel into outer space; the year that the African continent brought forth new nations, and a plane whose speed is greater than the speed of sound broke up a Summit Conference; the year artists picketed a great museum in protest against the hegemony of abstract art; physicists explored the concept of anti-matter; astronomers, because of new radio telescopes, had to alter their concepts of the expanding universe; biologists made a breakthrough in the fundamental chemistry of life; and Negro youth in Southern schools forced the United States, for the first time since the Civil War, to face a moment of democratic truth. But this magazine, published for over 5,000,000 American women, almost all of whom have been through high school and nearly half to college, contained almost no mention of the world beyond the home. In the second half of the twentieth century in America, a woman’s world was confined to her own body and beauty, the charming of man, the bearing of babies, and the physical care and serving of husband, children, and home. And this was no anomaly of a single issue of a single women’s magazine.<sup>9</sup>

Following, and perhaps because of, Friedan’s groundbreaking book, women’s magazines did begin to change, with an increased willingness to cover career women and issues beyond beauty and home, although many observers argue the change has been slow and not nearly as dramatic as one might suppose.

## GENDER IN MAGAZINES

“The Seven Sisters” reached the peak of their circulations in the mid 1970s, when they had an aggregate circulation of 46 million.<sup>10</sup> Increased competition from newer, more niche-oriented magazines slowly eroded this number. Many of these magazines reflected the social changes women were experiencing. For example, *Ms.* magazine, launched in 1972, offered a feminist alternative to the traditional women’s magazines. The magazine was successful with topics ranging from politics to global current affairs, although circulation rates, even at its most popular, never neared those of the traditional women’s magazines. But perhaps the best example of the break from the “happy homemaker heroine” occurred when author and businesswoman Helen Gurley Brown took over the reins at *Cosmopolitan* in 1964. When *Cosmopolitan* was originally launched in 1886, it was as a family magazine, with departments for women that focused on fashion, household decorating, cooking, and child-care. Within a few years, as it grew in popularity, *Cosmopolitan*’s focus



changed and became a leading market for fiction, featuring major authors including Edith Wharton, Rudyard Kipling, and Jack London. Its strength as a repository for fiction grew over the next 50 years, as did its reputation for investigative journalism. By the mid 1950s *Cosmopolitan's* circulation was declining, along with the circulations of many general interest magazines. This downward spiral continued for the next 10 years, until *Cosmopolitan* was redefined as a women's special interest magazine, but not in the mold of the women's magazines that came before, like *Ladies' Home Journal* or *Woman's Day*.

Gurley Brown, who authored the best-selling *Sex and the Single Girl*, was able to remake the magazine to assert that women should have a strong sexual identity, and emphasized the idea that independence and "living it up" were ultimate desires. *Cosmopolitan* now urges readers to believe that they have a right to enjoy sex, and that men are desirable but far from perfect. Being a "Cosmo Girl" means you are not afraid to be powerful, to dominate a man (especially in bed), and to be single. Critics would argue that *Cosmopolitan's* message though is fraught with contradictions: be single, but pursue a man; be yourself, but be beautiful and thin; be powerful, but do not work so hard as to not have lots of fun. And so the message to women remains confusing.

Nevertheless, women's magazines remain one of the most popular forms of media. The market today is flooded with women's titles, ranging from the more traditional offerings like *Glamour*, which focuses on a wide range of women's topics from beauty and fashion to health and politics, to *Bitch*, a feminist magazine focused on commentary of pop culture. Of the top ten magazines by circulation at the end of 2009, five were women's titles (*Better Homes and Gardens*, *Good Housekeeping*, *Family Circle*, *Women's Day*, and *Ladies' Home Journal*).<sup>11</sup> Media researchers Maureen Beasley and Sheila Gibbons note that celebrity culture has never been more popular in women's magazines than it is today, with women's lives routinely being explained through the experiences of well-known people.<sup>12</sup> They also argue that the confusing message of years past continues: "the mixed messages many women's magazine send – empowerment and dependency, independence and entanglement, strength and seductiveness – can be confusing to women and girls and somewhat frustrating for them as they try and decode these messages for themselves."<sup>13</sup>

Print media, in general, have been found to present stereotypical portraits of women, and – although women's magazines today do cover issues related to politics or other world issues – the general formula is still beauty, fashion, weight loss, cooking, and sex. A 2003 study of the portrayal of working women in mainstream magazines by media researcher Juanita J. Covert, found that if successful working women were presented in a positive way, they were likely to be described using stereotypically positive feminine qualities, such as having good beauty and fashion sense.<sup>14</sup> Covert also found that though there were several articles about working women or the workplace in general in the magazines studied, the most common stories were about beauty and fashion. A strong emphasis was placed on "celebrities-as-working-woman," and many of the magazines used this formula for the working-women stories.



While the women's magazine genre has flourished, magazines for men have had a slightly different history. Men's magazines first began to be published in the early nineteenth century, and covered news and information about crime, sport, adventure, hunting, and fishing. By the middle of the twentieth century, publications that focused on these topics continued and grew to not only include, but to be dominated by those niche magazines that covered urban life and sex.<sup>15</sup> In 1933, *Esquire* was founded by journalist and businessman Arnold Gingrich as a magazine that combined fashion, humor, and high quality fiction and nonfiction from America's best writers. With the help of an article written by author Ernest Hemingway that was published in the first issue, *Esquire* was a huge success right out of the gate. During the 1940s, *Esquire* began running foldout "girlie art," which appealed to the male audience's more prurient interests.<sup>16</sup>

In 1953, businessman and self-proclaimed playboy Hugh Hefner, who had previously worked as a promotional copy writer for *Esquire*, adapted the *Esquire* formula, and pushed the sex formula even further publishing the first issue of *Playboy*, which included a nude centerfold photograph of actress and iconic sex symbol Marilyn Monroe. The magazine sparked many rival publications, including *Penthouse*, and plenty of controversy throughout its many years of publication. However, though its circulation has dipped, especially since the advent of the Internet, which helped make pornography and nude content easily accessible and free, *Playboy* remains a strong part of the men's magazine landscape.

Today, Judith Levine, author of *My Enemy, My Love: Women, Men, and the Dilemmas of Gender*, argues that men's magazines fall into two basic categories: specialized magazines, such as those about squirrel hunting and CB radios, and those about sex. She writes, "My newsstand carries hundreds of both kinds. No fewer than forty publications displayed cater to automotive aficionados, almost as many to weaponry fanatics . . . and I lost count at fifty skin magazines – past *Playboy* to *Juggs* and beyond."<sup>17</sup> But, she also notes a smaller category of general interest men's magazines that continue to thrive, though not nearly on par, circulation-wise, with the general interest women's magazines. *Esquire*, *GQ*, *Details*, *Maxim*, and *Men's Journal* are included in this category, and Levine suggests that these magazines are particularly good for analyzing messages of social transformation as related to masculinity. Magazines like *Details* and *GQ* offer up content that appeals to a heterosexual and homosexual audience, (achieving the "ideal balance of 'fabness' and 'regular-guy attitude' – code for gay and straight – by assuming that whatever their sexual preference, men want to look good, feel good, read good writing, and have good relationships"),<sup>18</sup> while *Esquire* and *Men's Journal* have maintained a "man's man" attitude toward content, focusing on rugged individualism, and a mainstream straight attitude toward the audience.

*Maxim*, launched by Dennis Publishing in 1997, is targeted at young men and is part of the genre of men's magazines called "laddie magazines" or "lads' magazines." The magazine is aggressively heterosexual, filled with stories and advertisements focusing on sex, drinking, and sports. With its often lowbrow humor, one communication scholar suggests the magazine connotes an "omnidirectional contempt

## Should Men Care About Gender Stereotypes?

Consider the following excerpted article by Alex Gibson entitled, "Why Men Should Care About Gender Stereotypes."<sup>a</sup> Do you believe that his points are valid? Can you think of examples of male gender role stereotypes that media perpetuate?

Let's not kid ourselves: men as well as women are limited by gender stereotypes. The idea of men as stupid and sex-obsessed is an enduring generalization that is allowed to flourish in – dare I say it – a much more brazen way than the stereotypes about women, mainly because no man ever stands up and says: "Hey, that's sexist and it offends me!" The problem is, while women are encouraged to reject the ludicrous ideas that are held about them, men are supposed to embrace them.

Christ, guys, have you seen what we're supposed to be like? Looking solely at stereotypes, men do not fare well. I would never dare to suggest that men have a harder time than women in general society, because that's just patently untrue, but in terms of stereotypes we fail utterly. Male perceptions of women are designed to make us feel smug in our superiority, but the way we've chosen to label ourselves should make any man feel thoroughly humiliated and ashamed of his gender.

Men are often characterized as spoiled, helpless brats utterly unable to perform simple household tasks, too stupid to remember anniversaries and appointments and completely unable to understand these strange female creatures and their hysterical emotions. We're base brutes ruled by our overactive sex drives who simply can't help being crass and immature, because that is the way God made us. This is precisely the kind of

ridiculous stereotype that, if applied to women, would be torn to shreds in intelligent debate. So why don't men object?

Gibson makes the argument that men have never had to think about gender:

Here's the thing: men don't have anything remotely equivalent to feminism. From an early age, women are aware of their gender and what it means for their lives, far more than men are. Feminism encourages women to shed gender stereotypes and consider themselves as individuals. Men simply don't think about gender. Why would you, when it rarely impacts in a noticeable way on your life? Very rarely is your progress barred because you are a man and it is true that male culture generally does not promote frank and open discussion of such issues.

So what can we, a group of individuals who clearly care about gender equality and despise gender stereotypes, do about this? A prevailing culture of stupidity just isn't good enough for men or women, even if the former often don't realize it. Men can be the attentive and understanding partners that women want, and it is a tragic shame that society has conditioned the male mind to reject this sensitivity as weak and inappropriate. The change that needs to be made is cultural, but that doesn't make it any less difficult.

<sup>a</sup>Alex Gibson, "Why Men Should Care About Gender Stereotypes," *The F Word: Contemporary UK Feminism*, February 2, 2008, accessed March 22, 2011, [http://www.thefword.org.uk/features/2008/02/men\\_stereotypes](http://www.thefword.org.uk/features/2008/02/men_stereotypes).



and anger” toward women (particularly feminists), toward gays, toward “sensitive” men, and toward the readers themselves.<sup>19</sup> In the magazine, masculinity is defined and men are encouraged to look and perform in certain ways as to regain their “manliness” and recapture the former male power that perhaps has slipped away from them. In characterizing lads’ magazines, media professor Karen Ross writes, “Men are given nudge–nudge–wink–wink permission to be the worst example of their Neanderthal past, grunting, farting, and play fighting in the forest with their mates before going back to the cave at night to have rough sex with the women who have waited patiently and open-legged for their return.”<sup>20</sup> As a lads’ magazine, *Maxim* is a step-by-step, how-to guide in how to be a “man,” albeit some content seems so over the top that it is most likely being used either as parody or to get a quick laugh.

Men’s and women’s magazines are not the only magazine genres that appear to perpetuate gender role stereotyping. Studies have also shown parenting magazines to depict men and women in stereotypic ways. Researchers of one 2008 study of the photographic images in four major parenting magazines found that men are drastically underrepresented, shown approximately one-third as often as mothers or women. When men are portrayed they are more likely to be interacting with children in a playful or recreational way, such as participating in a sporting activity.<sup>21</sup> Women are shown as nurturers, and more often than men, are pictured expressing affection or caring for a child in a gentle way. However, in an encouraging result, the portrayals of boys and girls in photographs were not gender stereotyped, and the researchers argue that the repeated viewing of these gender-equal images might have the power to transform any existing stereotypes of how boys and girls should act.

## GENDER IN PRINT NEWS

Like the research done on many of the ethnic and social groups discussed in previous chapters, much of the research done on women has shown the representations, the stereotypes, and the overall frames used to depict women in print news to be problematic. For example, journalism professor Caryl Rivers, in her book *Selling Anxiety*, writes, “it’s all bad news” for women.<sup>22</sup> She argues that though the news media today do not relegate women to a “low-prestige ‘women’s page’” as in days past, that there is a clear narrative frame that appears regularly, and that though there are balanced, well-reported stories about women in the news media, there are innumerable “chain reaction” stories that jump from newspaper to television sound bite to magazine to the Internet and thus have thematic staying power. Women are not told they cannot achieve, but they are told that if they do, they will be miserable, as will their children. Their families and their sex lives will suffer. They will age badly. Day-care children become bullies, and nannies cannot be trusted. Women in power are scary, masculine, and lead personally unfulfilling lives. Rivers makes a strong case that these frames, coupled with the trend of women lagging



behind men as sources in news stories, influence readers' perceptions of women and feminism in general.

The way women and men have been portrayed in the news media, and the roles to which men and women have been assigned, have been the subject of research for several decades. Many of these studies have looked for basic counts on the numbers of men versus women who are present in news stories, including being used as sources or the focus. They have also looked at who are the reporters, presenters, and writers of news stories, and in what roles men and women are shown (i.e. in the



**Figure 9.2:** A harried mom. (Photo © Derek Latta/iStockphoto.com.)

home, in the workplace, as leaders, as victims, etc.) In most analyses, researchers find evidence of a general lack of representation of women.

In several studies done in the 1990s and 2000s, a distinct gender gap was reported in the use of men versus women as news sources. For example, in one of its studies, the Project for Excellence in Journalism examined 16,800 news stories across 45 news outlets over a course of nine months in 2004, and found that more than three-quarters of the stories analyzed contained male sources, compared to only one-third of stories that contained a female source<sup>23</sup> (see Table 9.1). The only topic category in which women were used as a source more than 50 percent of the time were lifestyle stories, and the subjects in which women were least likely to be cited were on foreign affairs and sports.

Overwhelmingly, males dominated the front page of newspapers, being used as sources in stories 79 percent of the time, appearing in 69 percent of the photographs, and males writing 66 percent of the stories (see Table 9.2). When stories were written about or by women, they were more likely to appear at the bottom of the



## Framing Working Women

Journalism professor Caryl Rivers, in her book *Selling Anxiety*, suggests that the news media frame working women in two basic ways: as superwomen or as "twitching wrecks." She writes, "The former are often profiled in business pages, lifestyle pages, and TV features. They are accomplished, incredibly organized, and never seem to sweat. . . . On the other end of the media spectrum are the Twitching Wrecks. They seem to inhabit every 'working woman' trend story that rolls off the presses or onto videotape. Such women are endlessly miserable, eternally frazzled."<sup>a</sup>

Consider the two following news story excerpts. Compare and contrast the working woman frames. What have your news media experiences shown you about these frames?

From *Newsweek*:<sup>b</sup>

For the New York lawyer, it all hit home in the grocery store. She had stopped in with her 6-year-old to pick up a few things, but since the babysitter normally did the shopping, she was unprepared for what was about to happen. Suddenly there was her son, whooping and tearing around the store, skidding the length of the aisles on his knees. "This can't be my child," she thought in horror. Then the cashier gave a final twist to the knife. "Oh," she remarked. "So you're the mother."

The author continues:

That was the moment when the lawyer was forced to admit that spending "quality time" with the kids didn't seem to be working. She and her husband, a journalist, had subscribed in good faith to the careerists' most treasured rule of parenting: it isn't how much time you spend with your kids, it's how you spend

the time. But despite those carefully scheduled hours of parental attention between dinner and bed, their two kids were in danger of turning into little brats. Next month the family is moving to a suburb, and she'll go to work part-time.

Later in the article, the author argued:

Not every family can, or wants to, make a life change on that scale. But many are starting to question whether time devoted to their children really can be efficiently penciled into the day's calendar, like a business appointment with a couple of short, excitable clients. No wonder a growing number of psychologists and educators who work with children would like to get rid of the whole idea of quality time. "I think quality time is just a way of deluding ourselves into shortchanging our children," says Ronald Levant, a psychologist at Harvard Medical School.

From *Working Mother* magazine:<sup>c</sup>

She's among a handful of top advisors who sit down each morning with President Barack Obama. But before that meeting – or chief of staff, senior staff and legislative strategy meetings – Mona Sutphen has a sit-down of a different sort: at the family breakfast table. With husband Clyde Williams, she gets their kids ready for school. "I see Sydney and Davis amid the morning chaos and mayhem," Mona laughs. "Getting dressed, eating breakfast, finding art supplies . . ." Mona may have one of the most intense jobs in the country, but she takes time in the morning to make a really mean oatmeal.

The author continues:

"She has an amazing ability to keep perspective about what's important and has



a great sense of humor," says her friend Nina Hachigian. "She doesn't take herself too seriously, even though she's in a very serious position." As one of two deputy chiefs of staff, Mona helps coordinate the President's vast domestic policy agenda. Sure, there's inherent glamour in her high-ranking position – she works a few doors down from the Oval Office – but there's also constant stress and marathon days. Mona typically works from 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., five days a week, with half-days on Saturdays.

The author concludes:

The steady stream of serious and time-sensitive decisions that need to get made require Mona to offer recommendations and move things forward faster than she might like. More than a decade of experience in government, including traveling the world as a U.S. Foreign Service officer and serving in the

White House during the Clinton administration, has primed her for the job, say colleagues. Mona realizes she's in the middle of an astonishing opportunity: "There are moments when I'm sitting in a cabinet meeting or in the Oval Office and I realize people will write about this conversation in history books."

<sup>a</sup>Caryl Rivers, *Selling Anxiety: How The News Media Scare Women* (Lebanon, New Hampshire: University Press of New England, 2007), 15.

<sup>b</sup>Claudia Kalb, Pat Wingert, Robina Riccitiello, Patricia King and Anne Underwood, "The Myth of Quality Time," *Newsweek*, May 12, 1997, 62.

<sup>c</sup>Suzanne Riss, "Real Mom Stories: White House Deputy Chief of Staff for Policy and Mom of Two," accessed March 22, 2011, <http://www.workingmother.com/web?service=direct/1/ViewRotatingPortlet/RotatingPortalBlocks/dlinkArticle&sp=S2913&sp=79>

**Table 9.1:** Male and Female Sources in the News.

Number of times referenced per story	Males	Females
0	24%	67%
1	21%	20%
2 or more	55%	14%

Note: Totals may not equal 100 due to rounding.

From "The Gender Gap: Women are Still Missing as Sources for Journalists" May 23, 2005, The Pew Research Center's Project for Excellence in Journalism.



**Table 9.2:** Male versus Female Representation on the Front Page of Newspapers.

	Males	Females
Referenced in articles	79%	21%
Shown in photographs	69%	31%
Writers of articles	66%	34%

From "The Gender Gap: Women are Still Missing as Sources for Journalists" May 23, 2005, The Pew Research Center's Project for Excellence in Journalism.

page below the fold, a less prominent location. Photographs of women were also more likely to be below the fold. This study, compared with studies of females and males on the front page over the past three decades, shows that little has changed since the 1970s. Women are as underrepresented now as they were then, although women now outnumber men in the general population.<sup>24</sup>

One argument suggests that the common use of male sources stems from the fact that men are more likely to hold positions of power in our society and are therefore more accessible. Reporters on deadline have to seek out readily available sources and tend to use the same sources over and over again, when a source proves reliable and accessible. Diversity in reporting on deadline might not be a top priority. However, some researchers have attempted to debunk this perspective. Journalism professor Cory Armstrong found in her study of the influence of reporter gender on source selection that women are more likely to seek out and use female sources in their stories, and that men are more likely to seek out and use male sources in their stories, regardless of story topic.<sup>25</sup> If reporters seek out and use sources based on accessibility or on local prominence (for instance, approximately 60 percent of all privately held firms are owned and operated by men) then, a gender discrepancy might be expected. But, if, as Armstrong's study found, women are more likely to use women as sources, then one might wonder – why are female reporters more likely to be able to locate female sources? Simple accessibility is no longer a valid argument. Armstrong suggests that it may come down to comfort level; women feel more comfortable contacting women, and men feel more comfortable contacting men.

Others have found that when women *are* used as sources, they most often are used in local news stories, and are represented as victims more often than leaders, heroes, or successful business people. In general, women are more often than men identified by personal information, such as physical description, clothing, marital or parental status, while men are more likely to be identified by occupation, experience and background.<sup>26</sup> In her study on gender-role stereotyping in the news, media scholar Judy VanSlyke Turk found that there was no statistically significant difference between male and female reporters in the use of personal attributes as descriptors for sources, both were equally likely to use them.<sup>27</sup>



Political stories, in particular, highlight gender-role stereotyping in news. Many researchers have analyzed female candidates in political races across the country. In general, these studies have found that male and female political candidates are presented in very different ways and along gender-role stereotypes.<sup>28</sup> Female candidates tend to be presented as being compassionate and warm, and male candidates are presented as being tough and aggressive. Female candidates are more likely than male candidates to have substantive column inches devoted to appearance, emotionality, and personality. The use of sources in political stories, too, takes on added importance when it is considered that expert sources used in political stories substantively impact voter attitude and understanding. Expert sources add value to a news story, and the use of a particular source by a journalist provides that source with a credibility and trust, which can build the level of authority attributed to that person. In other words, readers and viewers will trust in the credibility and authority of a particular source, in part because the journalist is telling them the person is an expert.

When thinking about how women are portrayed in print media, turning to studies on the coverage of how the press frames the most visible American woman, the First Lady, can offer an interesting perspective. The First Lady is the subject of much press scrutiny, and it has been widely held by researchers that societal norms about how women fit into the leadership realm and what the “appropriate role” for a woman should be complicates coverage of this powerful (and yet, not powerful) woman. Over the past three decades, there have been changes in how women are viewed in our society, especially in terms of their political influence, and more specifically, the public perception of what role a First Lady should play is changing. Much study has been done on the First Lady and her office with considerable attention paid in recent years to stereotyping and the use of frames.<sup>29</sup> As Jill Abraham suggests, as frames are often marked by controversy and social relevancy, and that First Ladies are often seen as symbols of American womanhood, then the cultural controversy over gender roles provides a powerful frame through which the media cover these women.<sup>30</sup>

First Lady scholar Betty Winfield defined four major frames used when a First Lady appeared in the news: as an escort, accompanying the President; as a style setter, serving as a social role model; as a “noblesse oblige,” performing charitable good works; and in a policy advisor role.<sup>31</sup> Another major frame used is one that emphasizes a stereotypical or traditionally expected gender role, such as that of the sacrificing, supportive spouse or the social function-performing lady of the house.<sup>32</sup> Research has shown that the more politically active the First Lady, and the less they fulfilled the behind-the-scenes wife stereotype, the more negative the textual coverage.<sup>33</sup>

*Time* writer Kurt Andersen writes that: “the country expects its First Lady to represent some approximate ideal of American womanhood, and that perfectly modern superwoman is, in the 1980s, powerful but feminine, romantically alive, but socially engaged.”<sup>34</sup> Another *Time* article states:



The person a pillow away from the presidency is held up to an undefined ideal: she bears all America's conflicting notions about women as wives, mothers, lovers, colleagues, and friends. A First Lady should be charming but not all fluff, gracious but not a doormat, substantive but not a co-President. She must defend her husband and smile bravely when he says stupid things.

The article continues:

She must look great, even fashionable, when a shower and clean clothes would suffice for anyone else; possess perfect children though such critters do not exist in nature; and traipse around the globe in a suit and sensible pumps when she would rather be home with a good book. She has both a day and a night job, but is not allowed a profession of her own. Hardest of all, she has to appear to love every minute of it.<sup>35</sup>

Hillary Clinton most often was framed as a feminist career woman. During the Monica Lewinski sex scandal in 1998, interestingly, when Clinton donned her "stand by your man" persona, a very traditional gender role, her favorability rating reached some of its highest levels during her term of office.

Laura Bush was framed as the "un-Hillary,"<sup>36</sup> a First Lady drawn from the traditional Barbara Bush cloth. Reports commented on her love of books and libraries, her composure under pressure, and as a "partner in her husband's life, but not his work."<sup>37</sup> According to one *US News and World Report* article, Laura Bush is "more garden club than healthcare task force, more homebody than world traveler, more listener than stump speaker. And all, apparently by choice, ushering in her own era as perhaps the first post-feminist first lady."<sup>38</sup> She played a more traditionally feminine gender role and was as uncontroversial as any first lady in the past two decades. Her approval ratings remained extremely high for her eight years in the White House, never falling below 80 percent.

Coverage of Michelle Obama, the Ivy League educated wife of Senator Barack Obama, has to date been interesting. Early on, she came under fire for being too outspoken and too aggressive, giving more ammunition to the overall discussion of gender role portrayal and societal expectations about women. She received some daggers for comments that were considered antipatriotic. She was a fist-bumping caricature, a stereotypical "angry black woman," and to counter the negative attention, Obama changed her image. Obama showed "self-restraint and discipline by dialing back"<sup>39</sup> and worked to reassure voters that she was "just like you."<sup>40</sup> She was certain to demonstrate there was warmth between her and her candidate husband and making her children the top priority. Feminists objected, but this more traditionally feminine woman played well in the press and with voters.

After the 2008 election, a neon-bright light was focused on the Obama family – especially Michelle Obama. *Time* invited its readers to "Meet the Obamas!" as if they were sitcom characters.<sup>41</sup> In the article, Obama is not compared to any former first lady, but to Laura Petrie, the Dick Van Dyke show's "amiably needling supporter . . . asking him to take the girls to school the morning after the election."<sup>42</sup> Press to date has made her a fashion icon, mom-in-chief, and one half of an



extremely happily married couple. But it is clear that what gender role Obama will play is still in flux.

## GENDER IN ADVERTISING

Generally speaking, advertising has been slower to change with societal norms, and nowhere is that more obvious than in the way women and men are presented in advertisements. In the 1950s, as with magazines, women were portrayed as housewives, caring for their families. They cooked, cleaned, did laundry, and made themselves look beautiful for their husbands. Men, on the other hand, were shown as business-oriented and pillars of the home. The message these advertisements sent was clearly that women belonged in the home, while men were the breadwinners. The 1960s brought some change, but men were still in dominant positions in comparison to women. Women were more often portrayed as sex objects, showing more skin, and when pictured with men, were beautiful, had hourglass figures, and were clearly “arm candy.” Advertisers took advantage of the insecurities of women as pertained to their looks. Writer and marketing consultant Michelle Miller describes one ad during that period: “Beauty cream was marketed with a magazine advertisement showing a distraught wife looking on as her husband talked with a beautiful young woman; the masthead read, ‘Does Your Husband Look Younger Than You Do?’”<sup>43</sup> As the ad demonstrates, sexism continued to rule in the 1960s.

Women were pictured more often in working roles in the 1970s, but these roles were more subservient than their male counterparts. Common occupations for women were secretary, hairdresser, and waitress. The message was still that women were not equal to men, were sexual objects to be used, and did not have any real power in society. In a large content analysis of general interest magazines, media researchers Alice Courtney and Sarah Lockeretz examined images of women and men in magazine advertisements.<sup>44</sup> They found that:

- Women were rarely shown in out-of-home working roles.
- Few women were shown as a professional or high-level business people.
- Women rarely ventured far from home by themselves or with other women.
- Women were shown as dependent on men’s protection.
- Men were shown regarding women as sex objects or as domestic adjuncts.
- Females were most often shown in ads for cleaning products, food products, beauty products, drugs, clothing, and home appliances.
- Men were most often shown in ads for cars, travel, alcoholic beverages, cigarettes, banks, industrial products, entertainment media, and industrial companies.

The main message in these ads was that men were the protectors who carried out more important roles and had to make more significant decisions for themselves and for their families than did women.



A larger shift occurred in the 1980s. Women and men were still largely pictured in traditional gender roles, women in the home and men at work, but there was movement to a more modern depiction. Advertisements started showing men at home, helping out with the chores, and caring for children, and women began to be pictured with regularity in the workplace, and not always in a support role. Interestingly, though more women were shown in the workplace stereotypes of the “working woman” were loud and clear. One study asked women their opinion about a 1985 American Express ad campaign, dubbed the Betty Briefcase campaign, which appeared in magazines and on television.<sup>45</sup> In this ad, Betty, a career woman, always wore a tweed suit and carried a briefcase. She was never without the severe suit, and seemed to be clutching the briefcase with intensity. Lianne Renner, writer for the *Spokane Chronicle*, notes:

16fefb3c0bfc2ded802b12db155e0486

ebrary

When Helen Homemaker frets about the waxy buildup on her kitchen floor and ring-around-the-collar on her husband’s shirts, she’s probably not making a good sales pitch to career women. To grab their attention, advertisers have created Betty Briefcase, who turns out to be another silly stereotype . . . She [wears] a tweed suit appropriate for the boardroom but she was sitting in the bleachers at a baseball game, cheering on the team with her two daughters . . . She’s an exaggeration of the career woman, a blatant symbol in her dress-for-success suits, and she has become an advertising cliché.<sup>46</sup>

More than 75 percent of women reported that they were insulted by this portrayal, and the inherent idea that women who work outside the home must give up all hints of femininity to be successful. The superwoman image, in many of its forms, was openly derided, as Renner writes: “A perfume commercial a few years back featured a superwoman singing to a man: ‘I bring home the bacon, fry it up in pan . . . and never let you forget you’re a man.’ Cartoonist Nicole Hollander later ribbed the commercial with the remark: ‘That woman must be on drugs.’”<sup>47</sup> By 1989, advertisers listened, and the images of harsh Betty were phased out in place of a less stereotypical working woman, though the superwoman image lingered.

16fefb3c0bfc2ded802b12db155e0486

ebrary

The 1990s brought more of the same. Women were still generally the ones cooking and cleaning, while men were depicted in suits, dominant at work, traveling for business, or working in the yard at home. What had grown much stronger, however, was the sexual objectification of women. Ann J. Simonton, a former top model before becoming the founder and director of MediaWatch, an educational nonprofit organization that has as one of its main focuses the exposing of the media’s role in exploiting women, writes:

The advertised woman is a conspicuous, two-dimensional artifice. Her lips are sensually parted. There is a finger in or over her mouth, as if to stop her from speaking. Sometimes her mouth is wide open, sucking and nibbling. She doesn’t smile easily. If she does, her grin is her private secret. She appears to be teasing, angry, drugged, or scared. The advertised woman is made-identified; she often competes with other females for male attention. The advertised woman is the implied bonus that goes along

16fefb3c0bfc2ded802b12db155e0486

ebrary



with the trip to Hawaii, the sofa bed, that six-pack of beer. Her link to products is so common we fail to notice her, or question her purpose.<sup>48</sup>

For the past 40 years, Jean Kilbourne, award-winning documentarian, has done pioneering work on the images of women in advertising. In the *Killing Us Softly* films (1979; 1987; 2000; 2010), Kilbourne argues that advertising is everywhere, selling not only products, but values and concepts of love, sexuality, love, romance, success, and normalcy.<sup>49</sup> Women in advertising are impossibly perfect, and the problem with these images is that they not only sell products to help create this impossible perfection but also an impossible standard of beauty and thinness. She suggests that implicit in these messages is that if women do not succeed in achieving this impossible standard, which of course they cannot, they simply are not trying hard enough, which seriously and permanently erodes women's self-esteem.

Other trends that Kilbourne notes include the practice of turning women's bodies into "things" or objects, like beer bottles or road signs. Women of color are often shown as animals, depicted in leopard skin or animal prints, with the implied message being that they are somehow "not fully human," further objectifying them. Advertising is, as Kilbourne puts it, "relentlessly heterosexual," with the often-repeated message that women need a man to be complete. Sex is everywhere, and used to sell everything from cars to watches to handbags.

Women take up less physical space in advertising than men do, and appear in stances of vulnerability, while men are depicted in stances of power and aggression. This is only reversed when race enters into the advertisement, and then the white model is depicted in the stance of power. Kilbourne acknowledges that in recent years, more advertising has appeared that objectifies men, with men appearing as body parts without heads, in lying down positions of vulnerability, and nude, but she argues that these ads do not occur nearly as often as ads that objectify women and are not as damaging. She argues that a far greater problem is that men are so often depicted as being the perpetrators of violence, and that this image of masculinity teaches young men that this is acceptable behavior and the norm. She notes,

In general, human qualities are divided up, polarized, and labeled masculine and feminine. And then the feminine is consistently devalued. . . . which causes men to devalue not only women, but also all those qualities that get labeled as feminine by the culture. And by that I mean qualities like compassion, cooperation, nurturing, empathy, sensitivity.<sup>50</sup>

Today, studies have shown that there has been no fundamental change in the percentages of women portrayed in advertisements versus men, nor in the ways in which advertisements continue to stereotype both genders and to objectify women. Media scholar David Gauntlett argues that the kind of women society expects to see is different – a more vibrant, busy, confident, attractive success – and while this is not always borne out, as the consumer changes, advertising changes too.<sup>51</sup> For instance, consumers are likely to still see a woman peddling a cleaning product, and



mopping the kitchen floor or scrubbing the range, but the message is that she wants to do it fast and easy, so she can get out the door and on to something else (though this something else is often another gender-typical task, like driving the carpool minivan).

“Freedom” and “liberation” are common themes in products marketed to women. Researchers point out that this speaks to the post-feminist superwoman: “look at me, having it all, doing it all, smiling all the while . . . thanks to this new, improved time-saving product.” Glade tells a woman she can “fool her friends” into thinking she has baked and cleaned all day by lighting a candle. Crest Whitestrips tells women they can use their product while doing anything at all, even kissing, according to a recent advertising campaign. Sketchers and Reebok encourage women to wear their new muscle-toning athletic shoes that save them the time, money, and effort of going to the gym.

Even more literally, advertising tells women they can be freed and liberated from the biologic elements of being female. Feminine health and beauty products tell women they can “fool Mother Nature,” and any number of beauty products advise women they can “turn back the clock” and “fight the signs of aging” by using certain lotions and potions. Hair dye companies urge women literally to “fight” their greys because “why be grey when you can be yourself?” Drug companies lure women into asking their doctors for certain prescription drugs, from those that can help you grow longer, thicker lashes, to shots that purportedly keep bones strong, by appealing to the fear of growing old or unattractive. Today’s beauty ideal stresses to women that “you can’t be young enough, thin enough, or beautiful enough.” Though advertising cannot alone be blamed for creating these ideas, researchers argue that consumers should hold advertisers accountable each and every time they promote them.

## GENDER TRENDS AND “THE MALE GAZE”

Though this idea has been touched on in the previous section, it is worth exploring the concept of “The Male Gaze” on its own. The theory of the *male gaze* stems from feminist and film study research, and in simplistic terms implies that the image of a woman is created from the perspective of an implied male observer. In other words, females are shown offering up their femininity for the pleasure of an absent male spectator. From this male gaze perspective, women who view these ads may form ideas about what women are supposed to look like and how women are supposed to act. For instance, women are shown as body parts, often without faces, as subservient and in lying down or crouched positions. Women are regularly depicted with their legs or mouth wide open, bending over, gazing at the camera (and thus the viewer of the advertisement) in either a sexually hungry way or in fear. Other ads show the concept of the male gaze even more directly with the women being directly ogled, appreciated, or dominated by one or more male viewers in the pho-



tograph. Researchers Amy Malkin, Kimberlie Wornian, and Joan Chrisler conducted a study of weight and body type of magazine cover models. They concluded that both men's and women's magazines communicate messages about weight, body type, and sexual attractiveness of women through their choice of cover models. Each type of magazine reflected the male gaze: "tend[ing] to portray what women should look like and what men should look for."<sup>52</sup>

The idea of reading an advertising photograph for implied meaning is not a new one.

Sociologist Erving Goffman, the author of a seminal study on women and advertising published in 1979, created a method for analyzing photographs of men and women in advertising, which codes common poses in a number of ways, in an effort to draw assumptions about the portrayed masculinity and femininity of the people shown. Goffman's classification allows for a more nuanced evaluation of pictures that moves beyond a black and white typology (a picture is sexist or not) to a consideration of how pose transmits messages about the appropriate roles, looks, or behaviors for women and men. For instance, Goffman's classification notes the use of the "feminine touch" in advertisements. Women most often are depicted lightly caressing an object, whereas men are more likely to be depicted as grasping or using an object. Women also are more likely to be touching themselves in a picture, such as resting their fingertips against their chin or neck. Body position is also considered. When a person is pictured reclining on the floor or lying on a bed, the impression is of sexual availability. If a person is pictured with the head, arm, or knee turned at an awkward or unnatural angle, this posture can be read as one of an acceptance of subordination, an expression of ingratiation, submissiveness, and appeasement."<sup>53</sup>

Goffman also describes a pattern, called *licensed withdrawal*, in which women more often than men are pictured as "removed psychologically from the social situation



**Figure 9.3:** This ad was used to promote Kahlúa liqueur. Notice the placement of the airplane. (Advertising Archives.)



at large, leaving them disoriented in it, and presumably, therefore, dependent on the protectiveness and goodwill of others.”<sup>54</sup> Goffman, as well as other researchers, argue that the “other” that is providing protection is male. Examples of this licensed withdrawal could be found if the female in the ad was depicted as gazing in an undirected way into the middle distance, as preoccupied, perhaps by twisting a piece of clothing, as retreating behind objects, covering the face to conceal an emotional reaction and snuggling into, folding into another person, generally a male.

Many researchers have followed up on Goffman’s work, and concluded that though some of his gender stereotypes have lessened over time, many still remain as commonplace. For instance, mass communication professor Mee-Eun Kang conducted a study of magazine advertisements that appeared in *Vogue*, *Mademoiselle*, and *McCall’s*, using Goffman’s categories and two categories she added, (1) body display, defined as the level of body display shown, either in the form of body-revealing clothing or in nudity; and (2) independence, designed to look at the “big picture” of the advertisement in terms of implied self-assurance.<sup>55</sup> In this study, body-revealing clothes include, among others, mini-skirts, tight shirts, evening gowns that expose cleavage, “see-through” clothes, or bathing suits. Nudity was defined as unclothed models, including models translucent under apparel and lingerie, models clothed in nothing except a towel, or models depicted with no clothing at all. She concluded that the images of women in 1991 advertisements did not significantly change from the images found in 1979 advertisements, except in two of the coding categories: licensed withdrawal and body display. In these two categories, advertisements in 1991 showed significantly higher levels of female licensed withdrawal, with women appearing to often appear “mentally lost” or “mentally drifting,” and significantly higher levels of body display. She concludes that the advertising industry has not changed much at all in its depiction of women, except, perhaps to be even worse and certainly more sexually explicit.

Although much discussion focuses on the sexualization of women in advertisements, evidence exists that men are also increasingly being targets for sexualization. For example, social researchers Tom Reichert and his colleagues examined the portrayals of men and women in six US magazine advertisements from 1983 and 1993. They found that both men and women were more often sexualized in 1993 than in 1983. Furthermore, in that time span women were three times more likely to be dressed in a sexually explicit manner than men for both time frames.<sup>56</sup> In a more recent study, mass communication researchers Tiffany Shoop, Catherine Luther, and Carolynn McMahan examined images of sexuality in advertisements featured in US and Japanese fashion magazines. In their cross-cultural study, the authors found that all of the magazines they examined (U.S.: *Cosmo*, *Glamour*, *Details*, *GQ*; Japanese: *Vivi*, *Cam Can*, *Men’s Joker*, *Men’s Non-No*) presented sexualized images of both men and women. Overall, however, the percentages of female models being shown in sexually provocative poses and dress were still higher than the percentages of male models.<sup>57</sup>

It appears, therefore, that with strides being made toward gender equality, rather than portraying women in less sexualized ways, advertisers have opted to express



equality by sexualizing both men and women in their ads. Perhaps it is hard for advertisers to veer away from the tenet that “sex sells.”

## GENDER IN NEW MEDIA

The widespread use and popularity of the Internet has opened up opportunities for women’s groups to advocate for equality and less stereotypical representation and to provide an outlet and a virtual gathering place for the exchange of ideas and friendship. Some interesting sites include the following:

- National Organization for Women – <http://www.now.org> NOW, founded in 1966, is the largest feminist organization in the United States and has as its goal to take action to bring equality for all women. The website offers news stories, calls to action, hot topics, chapter information, and blog links, among other resources.
- The Third Wave Foundation – <http://www.thirdwavefoundation.org> Third Wave is a feminist, activist foundation that works nationally to support young women and transgendered youth through grant making, leadership development, and advocacy. The website offers links to leadership and job opportunities, as well as news stories and documentaries detailing Third Wave grant projects.
- BlogHer – <http://www.blogher.com> BlogHer is a blogging community for women. More than 38,000 women have registered more than 18,000 blogs with this growing network, which connects info savvy bloggers, advertisers, and readers. BlogHer hosts a large social media conference for women each year. According to their mission statement, BlogHer’s goal is to “facilitate and curate a community that empowers our members and creates value for all.”

## CONCLUDING REMARKS

It would be easy to deduce, based on the discussion in this and the previous chapter on gender and entertainment media, that men and women continue to fall victim to stereotypes. Men, however, tend to fare better in these stereotypes by being portrayed as the dominant and more important sex in our society. Although the mass media have increasingly started to objectify men as sex objects, women continue to be the ones who are marginalized and objectified in advertising. Even news portrayals often fail to show women as three-dimensional, productive, and intelligent human beings.

Nonetheless, positive changes are happening. Women’s magazines, such as *O*, *The Oprah Magazine*, and *More*, boast high circulation numbers and include a sense of today’s more empowered, multifaceted woman. More women are moving into



the newsrooms of both print and broadcast outlets, and there is a trend for women to appear more often than in the past in news stories, both in focus and as sources.

Clearly, there is still work to be done. For instance, marginalizing and stereotypical images of women in advertising are not just the norm but are expected. A recent study of college women found that though they recognized the highly sexualized way that women were portrayed in advertising, they saw little wrong with it. It was just the status quo. Many reported that this was just the way things were, and there was no reason to take offense. Perhaps this is the larger issue for consideration here – not just that these stereotypes exist, but that they are so prevalent that they are simply part of our cultural vocabulary. And in a world where harmful images are commonplace, and stereotypes are just part of the landscape, there is no impetus to change.

### Reflection Questions and Thoughts to Consider

1. Compare and contrast the way women are presented in a variety of consumer magazines. Choose magazines targeted a range of audiences: for instance: a teen magazine, a men's magazine, a Latina magazine, a traditional women's magazine. How do the portrayals vary? Do you see different manifestations or versions of stereotypes? What similarities do you see?
2. Perform the same exercise. Only this time, consider how men are represented. How are men stereotyped? Do the stereotypes vary across magazines? As discussed in Box C of the previous chapter, common male stereotypes include the action hero, the buffoon, the big shot, the strong silent type, the jock and the joker. Can you find examples of any of these in print media, as well as in entertainment media? Which are the most common? Are some more common than others in certain publications?
3. Consider the concept of the male gaze. Why do you believe it is such a pervasive form of vision in advertising and other forms of media? Can you locate any examples that show the male gaze?
4. The news media frame women in politics in a variety of ways. Examine several recent news stories written about Hillary Clinton, Sarah Palin, Nancy Pelosi, Olympia Snowe, or any other female politician you choose. Do you see certain themes repeated? Do you believe female politicians are treated the same as their male counterparts? How so or how not?

### Notes

- 1 *Redbook* is a popular women's magazine targeted at women between 25 and 49, and more than half their readers are married or engaged and a third are working mothers.
- 2 "Redbook Media Kit," accessed September 13, 2009, <http://www.redbookmediakit.com>.
- 3 "Faith Hill's Photoshop Crop Shop and Why We're Pissed," accessed March 22, 2011, <http://jezebel.com/gossip/photoshop-of-horrors/faith-hills-redbook-photoshop-chop-why-were-pissed-279203.php>.
- 4 "Kelly Clarkson: Cover Controversy?" accessed September 12, 2009, [www.etonline.com/news/2009/08/77270/](http://www.etonline.com/news/2009/08/77270/).
- 5 "Faith Hill's Photoshop Crop Shop."
- 6 Frank Luther Mott, *A History of American Magazines, Volume 5: 1905–1930* (Cambridge, MA: Belnap Press, 1968), 497.
- 7 Betty Friedan, *The Feminine Mystique* (New York, NY: W.W. Norton and Company, 2001), 79–123.
- 8 Friedan, *The Feminine Mystique*, 58.
- 9 Friedan, *The Feminine Mystique*, 83.
- 10 Maureen Beasley and Shelia Gibbons, *Taking Their Place: A Documentary History of Women and Journalism, 2nd edition* (State College, PA: Strata Publishing, 2003), 180–85.
- 11 "FH2009 Top 100 ABC Magazines by Average Total Paid and Verified Circulation," accessed



- March 22, 2011, [http://www.magazine.org/CONSUMER\\_MARKETING/CIRC\\_TRENDS/FH2009Top100ABCtotalPaid.aspx](http://www.magazine.org/CONSUMER_MARKETING/CIRC_TRENDS/FH2009Top100ABCtotalPaid.aspx).
- 12 Beasley and Gibbons, 180.
  - 13 Beasley and Gibbons, 181.
  - 14 Juanita J. Covert, "Working Women in Mainstream Magazines: A Content Analysis," *Media Report to Women* 31, no. 4 (2003): 5.
  - 15 Darwin Payne, "Magazines for Men," in Alan Day (ed) *History of Mass Media in the United States: An Encyclopedia* (Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn, 1998), 332.
  - 16 David E. Sumner, *The Magazine Century: American Magazines Since 1900* (New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2010), 82–3.
  - 17 Judith Levine, "The Man in the Mirror: What Esquire, GQ, Men's Journal, and Details tell us about the American Male," *Columbia Journalism Review* 6, no. 32 (March/April 1994): 27–31.
  - 18 Levine, "The Man in the Mirror," 30.
  - 19 James Davis, "Maxim Magazine and the Management of Contempt," *Journal of Popular Culture* 6, no. 38 (2005):1011–21.
  - 20 Karen Ross, *Gendered Media: Women, Men, and Identity Politics* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 2010), 19.
  - 21 Melissa Martinson, Amanda Hinnant, and Barbara Martinson, "Visual Depictions of Gender in Parenting Magazines," *Media Report to Women* 36, no. 4 (2008):12–21.
  - 22 Caryl Rivers, *Selling Anxiety: How The News Media Scare Women* (Lebanon, NH: University Press of New England, 2007), 1–15.
  - 23 "The Gender Gap: Women are Still Missing as Sources for Journalists," The Project for Excellence in Journalism, May 2005, accessed March 22, 2011, <http://www.journalism.org/node/141>.
  - 24 Cynthia M. Lont and M. Junior Bridge, "Confronting the Front Pages: A Content Analysis of U.S. Newspapers," in *Race/Gender/Media* ed. Rebecca Ann Lind (Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 2010), 128–34.
  - 25 Cory L. Armstrong, "The Influence of Reporter Gender on Source Selection in Newspaper Stories," *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly* 81, no. 1 (2004):139–54.
  - 26 Diane Silver, "A Comparison of Newspaper Coverage of Male and Female Officials in Michigan," *Journalism Quarterly* 59 (1985): 456–60.
  - 27 Judy VanSlyke Turk, "Sex-Role Stereotyping in Writing the News," *Journalism Quarterly* 64 (1987):613–17.
  - 28 See for example, James G. Benze and Eugene R. Declercq, "Content of Television Political Spot Ads for Female Candidates," *Journalism Quarterly* 62 (1985):278–88.
  - 29 Betty H. Winfield and Barbara Friedman, "Gender Politics: News Coverage of the Candidates' Wives in Campaign 2000," *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly* 80, no. 3 (2003):548–66. ; Erica Scharrer and Kim Bissell, "Overcoming Traditional Boundaries: The Role of Politics and Political Activity in Media Coverage of First Ladies," *Women and Politics* 21 (Winter 2000): 55–83.; Liz Watts, "Magazine Coverage of First Ladies from Hoover to Clinton: From Election Through the First 100 Days of Office," *American Journalism* 14, no. 3–4 (Summer–Fall 1997): 495–519; Kara E. Stooksbury and Lou M. Edgemon, "The First Lady Scholarship Reconsidered: A Review Essay," *Women and Politics* 25, no. 3 (2003): 97–111.
  - 30 Jill Abraham, "Media Frames, Public Opinion, and The First Lady," (paper presented at the meeting of the Midwest Political Science Association, Chicago, Illinois, April 15–18, 2004).
  - 31 Betty H. Winfield, "The First Lady, Political Power, and the Media: Who Elected Her Anyway?" in *Women, Media and Politics*, ed. Pippa Norris (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 166–79.
  - 32 Scharrer and Bissell, "Overcoming Boundaries," 55–83.
  - 33 Scharrer and Bissell, "Overcoming Boundaries," 55–83.
  - 34 Kurt Andersen, "Co-Starring at The White House," *Time*, January, 14, 1985, 22–30.
  - 35 "The Silver Fox," *Time*, January 23, 1989, 22–30.
  - 36 Martha Brant, "The Steel Behind the Smile," *Newsweek*, January 29, 2001, 31.



- 37 Gregory Curtis, Timothy Roche, and Hilary Hylton, "At Home with Laura," *Time*, January 8, 2001, 32–4.
- 38 Kenneth T. Walsh and Angie Cannon, "Laura's Moment," *U.S. News and World Report*, April 30, 2001, 20.
- 39 Allison Samuels, "What Michelle Means To Us," *Newsweek*, December 1, 2008, 28–32.
- 40 Nancy Gibbs and Michael Scherer, "Michelle Up Close," *Time*, June 1, 2009, 26.
- 41 James Poniewozik, "Meet the Obamas!" *Time*, December 1, 2008, 24.
- 42 Poniewozik, "Meet the Obamas!" 24.
- 43 Michele Miller, "Sexism in Advertising and Marketing to Women," *International Journal of Advertising* 24, no. 1 (2005): 113–24.
- 44 Alice Courtney and Sarah Lockeretz, "A Woman's Place: An Analysis of The Roles Portrayed By Women in Magazine Advertisements," *Journal of Marketing Research* 8 (1971): 92–5.
- 45 Tina Pieraccini and Robert Schell, "You're Not Getting Older . . . You're Getting Better!" in ed. Cynthia Lont, *Women and Media: Content, Careers, Criticism* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1995), 121–9.
- 46 Lianne Renner, "A 'Briefcase' Doesn't Help Cliché 'Betty'," *Spokane Chronicle*, August 28, 1985, B1.
- 47 Renner, "A 'Briefcase' Doesn't Help."
- 48 Ann J. Simonton, "Women for Sale," in ed. Cynthia M. Lont *Women and Media: Content, Careers, Criticism* (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth, 1995), 148.
- 49 Jean Kilbourne, *Killing Us Softly 3: Advertising's Image of Women* (Media Education Foundation, 2002).
- 50 *Killing Us Softly*.
- 51 David Gauntlett, *Media, Gender, and Identity: An Introduction* (London: Routledge, 2002), 83–5.
- 52 Amy Malkin, Kimberlie Wornian, and Joan C. Chrisler, "Women and Weight: Gendered Messages on Magazine Covers," *Sex Roles* 40, no. 7/8 (1999): 647–55.
- 53 Erving Goffman, *Gender Advertisements* (New York: Colophon, 1979): 46.
- 54 Goffman, *Gender Advertisements*, 57.
- 55 Mee-Eun Kang, "The Portrayal of Women's Images in Magazine Advertisements: Goffman's Gender Analysis Revisited," *Sex Roles* 37, no. 11/12 (1997): 979.
- 56 Tom Reichert, Jacqueline Lambiase, Susan Morgan, Meta Carstarphen, and Susan Zavoina, "Cheesecake and Beefcake: No Matter How You Slice It, Sexual Explicitness in Advertising Continues to Increase." *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly* 76, no. 1 (1999): 7–20.
- 57 Tiffany Shoop, Catherine A. Luther, and Carolyn McMahan, "Advertisement Images of Men and Women in Culturally Diverging Societies: An Examination of Images in U.S. and Japanese Fashion Magazines," *Journal of International Business and Economics* 8, no. 3 (2008): 188–99.