1

PM-1 3 1/2"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

THE GOOD, THE BAD AND THE UGLY:
GENDER PORTRAYAL IN ADVERTISING
IN CRTC REGULATED TELEVISION

Faith Nixon Yerxa
August 16, 1995
School of Canadian Studies
Carleton University

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395 rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

pour la : votre référence

Ouvrage : Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-612-13777-5

Name

Faith Nixon Jones

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four digit code in the spaces provided.

Mass Communications

0708

U·M·I

SUBJECT TERM

SUBJECT CODE

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS

Architecture 0729
Art History 0377
Cinema 0900
Dance 0378
Fine Arts 0357
Information Science 0723
Journalism 0391
Library Science 0399
Mass Communications 0708
Music 0413
Speech Communication 0459
Theater 0465

EDUCATION

General 0515
Administration 0514
Adult and Continuing 0516
Agricultural 0517
Art 0273
Bilingual and Multicultural 0282
Business 0688
Community College 0275
Curriculum and Instruction 0727
Early Childhood 0518
Elementary 0524
Finance 0277
Guidance and Counseling 0519
Health 0680
Higher 0745
History of 0520
Home Economics 0278
Industrial 0521
Language and Literature 0279
Mathematics 0280
Music 0522
Philosophy of 0998
Physical 0523

Psychology 0525
Reading 0535
Religious 0527
Sciences 0714
Secondary 0533
Social Sciences 0534
Sociology et 0340
Special 0529
Teacher Training 0530
Technology 0710
Tests and Measurements 0288
Vocational 0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

Language 0679
General 0289
Ancient 0290
Linguistics 0291
Modern
Literature
General 0401
Classical 0294
Comparative 0295
Medieval 0297
Modern 0298
African 0316
American 0591
Asian 0305
Canadian (English) 0352
Canadian (French) 0355
English 0593
Germanic 0311
Latin American 0312
Middle Eastern 0315
Romance 0313
Slavic and East European 0314

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Philosophy 0422
Religion
General 0328
Biblical Studies 0321
Clergy 0319
History of 0320
Philosophy of 0322
Theology 0429

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies 0323
Anthropology
Archaeology 0324
Cultural 0326
Physical 0327
Business Administration
General 0310
Accounting 0322
Banking 0320
Management 0454
Marketing 0338
Canadian Studies 0385
Economics
General 0501
Agricultural 0503
Commerce Business 0505
Finance 0508
History 0509
Labor 0510
Theory 0511
Folklore 0358
Geography 0366
Gerontology 0351
History
General 0578

Ancient 0579
Medieval 0581
Modern 0582
Black 0328
African 0331
Asia, Australia and Oceania 0332
Canadian 0334
European 0335
Latin American 0336
Middle Eastern 0337
United States 0337
History of Science 0585
Law 0398
Political Science
General 0615
International Law and Relations 0616
Public Administration 0617
Recreation 0814
Social Work 0452
Sociology
General 0626
Criminology and Penology 0627
Demography 0938
Ethnic and Racial Studies 0641
Individual and Family Studies 0628
Industrial and Labor Relations 0629
Public and Social Welfare 0630
Social Structure and Development 0700
Theory and Methods 0344
Transportation 0709
Urban and Regional Planning 0999
Women's Studies 0451

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture
General 0473
Agronomy 0285
Animal Culture and Nutrition 0475
Animal Pathology 0476
Food Science and Technology 0359
Forestry and Wildlife 0478
Plant Culture 0479
Plant Pathology 0480
Plant Physiology 0817
Range Management 0777
Wood Technology 0746
Biology
General 0306
Anatomy 0287
Biostatistics 0308
Botany 0309
Cell 0379
Ecology 0329
Entomology 0353
Genetics 0369
Limnology 0793
Microbiology 0410
Molecular 0307
Neuroscience 0317
Oceanography 0416
Physiology 0433
Radiation 0821
Veterinary Science 0778
Zoology 0472
Biophysics
General 0786
Medical 0760

EARTH SCIENCES

Biogeochemistry 0425
Geochemistry 0996

Geodesy 0370
Geology 0372
Geophysics 0373
Hydrology 0388
Mineralogy 0411
Paleobotany 0345
Paleoecology 0426
Paleontology 0418
Paleozoology 0985
Palaontology 0427
Physical Geography 0368
Physical Oceanography 0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Environmental Sciences 0768
Health Sciences
General 0566
Audiology 0300
Chemotherapy 0992
Dentistry 0567
Education 0350
Hospital Management 0769
Human Development 0758
Immunology 0982
Medicine and Surgery 0564
Mental Health 0347
Nursing 0569
Nutrition 0570
Obstetrics and Gynecology 0380
Occupational Health and Therapy 0354
Ophthalmology 0381
Pathology 0571
Pharmacology 0419
Pharmacy 0572
Physical Therapy 0382
Public Health 0573
Radiology 0574
Recreation 0575

Speech Pathology 0460
Toxicology 0483
Home Economics 0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences

Chemistry
General 0485
Agricultural 0749
Analytical 0486
Biochemistry 0487
Inorganic 0488
Nuclear 0738
Organic 0490
Pharmaceutical 0491
Physical 0494
Polymer 0495
Radiation 0754
Mathematics
Physics
General 0605
Acoustics 0986
Astronomy and Astrophysics 0606
Atmospheric Science 0608
Atomic 0748
Electronics and Electricity 0607
Elementary Particles and High Energy 0798
Fluid and Plasma 0759
Molecular 0609
Nuclear 0610
Optics 0752
Radiation 0756
Solid State 0611
Statistics 0463

Applied Sciences

Applied Mechanics 0346
Computer Science 0984

Engineering
General 0537
Aerospace 0538
Agricultural 0539
Automotive 0540
Biomedical 0541
Chemical 0542
Civil 0543
Electronics and Electrical 0544
Heat and Thermodynamics 0348
Hydraulic 0545
Industrial 0546
Machine 0547
Mathematical Science 0794
Mechanical 0548
Metallurgy 0743
Mining 0551
Nuclear 0552
Packaging 0549
Petroleum 0765
Sanitary and Municipal 0554
System Science 0790
Technology
Aeronautics 0428
Operations Research 0796
Plastics Technology 0795
Textile Technology 0994

PSYCHOLOGY

General 0621
Behavioral 0384
Clinical 0622
Developmental 0620
Experimental 0623
Industrial 0624
Personality 0625
Physiological 0989
Psychobiology 0349
Psychometrics 0632
Social 0451

The undersigned recommend to the Faculty
of Graduate Studies and Research acceptance of the thesis

"The Good, the Bad and the Ugly: Gender Portrayal in
Advertising in CRTC Regulated Television"

submitted by Faith Nixon Yerxa, Hons. B.A.
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the degree of Master of Arts

.....
Thesis Supervisor

.....
Director
School of Canadian Studies

Carleton University
Ottawa, Ontario
August 1995

ABSTRACT

The central issue of this thesis is the examination of the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission's (CRTC) response to gender stereotyping and gender representation in television advertising. The examination focuses on the design and monitoring of content analyses conducted on behalf of the CRTC for use in developing gender portrayal policy.

To contextually place the issue, the literature relevant to television gender portrayal is extensively reviewed. The CRTC studies are analyzed relative to those reported in the literature and to their usefulness in policy development. The concerns with gender portrayal and the social influence of the lack of gender equity are also addressed.

The thesis concludes that the CRTC missed an opportunity to effectively regulate gender portrayals in Canadian television, in part due to their reluctance to study portrayals. When the CRTC did research in this area, the research was flawed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many teachers, researchers, professors, administrators, colleagues, family members and friends contributed to the conception, the progress and the completion of this thesis. I am especially grateful to my teacher and mentor Dr. George Pollard for his assistance, encouragement and guidance while I have studied at Carleton University.

I would like to thank Dr. Bruce McFarlane, my thesis supervisor, whose wisdom, patience and encouragement were indispensable to the completion of this thesis.

I want to thank my son, Shawn Yerxa, who supported this endeavour by cheerfully contributing his criticism and countless days to the formatting and revising of tables and text, and his constant insistence that, "I be consistent."

I wish to thank Lisa Prenol for her encouragement and for her assistance in editing this "thing," until it became a thesis.

I would like to express my appreciation for the assistance I received, from the personnel of the CRTC, especially the library staff; to the personnel of the Inter-library loan division of the library at Carleton University and to so many in the School of Canadian Studies who supported me in bringing this thesis to completion.

Special thanks is due Jo Smits for his unqualified support throughout this long and sometimes frustrating process, hence making it all possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acceptance Form	II
Abstract	III
Acknowledgements	IV
Table of Contents	V
List of Tables	VI
List of Appendices	VII
Introduction	1
Chapter One	5
Chapter Two	30
Chapter Three	74
Chapter Four	108
Chapter Five	140
Bibliography	159
Appendices	190

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	32
Table 2.2	37
Table 2.3	43
Table 2.4	46
Table 2.5	52
Table 2.6	58
Table 2.7	64
Table 2.8	67
Table 3.1	78
Table 3.2	79
Table 3.3	82
Table 3.4	83
Table 3.5	84
Table 3.6	86
Table 3.7	87
Table 3.8	90
Table 3.9	93
Table 3.10	96
Table 3.11	98
Table 3.12	101
Table 4.1	114
Table 4.2	116
Table 4.3	117
Table 4.4	123
Table 4.5	125
Table 4.6	126
Table 4.7	129

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix One:

Coding System, Coding Guide and Codebook for Television Advertising: From the CRTC's 1985 Study "The Portrayal of Sex-Roles in Canadian Television Advertising".....190

Appendix Two:

Coding System for Television Advertising: From the CRTC's 1988 Study "The Portrayal of Gender in Canadian Television Advertising"..... 208

INTRODUCTION

Television and its portrayals of social life play an important role in the social construction of reality (Signorielli and Morgan, 1990; Smythe, 1981; CRTC, 1982a; Comstock, 1978; Schramm, 1982). Thus, there is an on-going need to consider what, how and with what effects television portrays Canadians to Canadians. The depictions of men and women on Canadian television embody sexist, racist and ageist images (Gunter, 1986; Signorielli, 1985). These portrayals and the accompanying stereotypical images, particularly the gender stereotypes in television advertising, are of concern to those interested in the impact of those images in Canadian society and are central to this thesis.

Television is undoubtedly the most powerful and pervasive of the mass media and has "not only filtered into our experiences of external realities, but also entered into our very experience of our own selves. The mass media provide us with new identities and new aspirations of what we should like to be and what we should like to appear to be" (Mills, 1962, 217). This commentary on the influence of mass media is especially apropos when examining the impact of television advertising, since advertising contains more scenarios and behavioural scripts than are found in the rest of the content of the mass media (Singer, 1991: 103). Furthermore, since television advertising finances television programming, its images and messages are a major determinant of television program content. The pervasiveness of television advertising is illustrated by the fact that by age 16 the average television audience member has been exposed to more than 300,000 television advertisements (Singer, 1991: 103). Hence, there are

many concerns about the portrayals and stereotypes existing in television advertising and these are central to this thesis.

In Canada, broadcasting policy goals are achieved through the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC), which is the primary mechanism for policy implementation and regulation in the Canadian broadcast media. The CRTC may be said to have a two-fold responsibility with regard to policy. In some instances, policy is developed by the political executive and the CRTC is responsible for the legal implementation and regulation of the policy. Much of the regulation resulting from the latest "Broadcasting Policy for Canada," that was passed by Parliament and became law in Bill C-40 on the 1st of February, 1991, is implemented and supervised by the CRTC. In other instances, the CRTC develops both the policy and the ensuing regulation, which again is supported by the direct authorization of the state (Doern and Phidd, 1992).

A directive concerning "sex-role stereotyping" from the Minister of Communications, in April of 1979, exemplifies the two-fold aspect of the CRTC's responsibility. In the 1979 directive, the Minister, Jeanne Sauvé, told the CRTC "that Cabinet agrees that...the CRTC is the agency that can most appropriately take steps to see that guidelines and standards to encourage the elimination of sex-role stereotyping from the media it regulates, are formulated" (CRTC, 1982a: 1). In this instance, the CRTC was directed to formulate both the policy and the regulations it deemed necessary to enforce the policy of sex-role stereotyping in the broadcast media.

This study examines the effectiveness of the CRTC policy and regulatory response to the persistence of "sex-role stereotypes and stereotyped representation" of gender in television advertising. As well, the

participation and the success of the CRTC in discouraging, if not eliminating, inequitable and negative gender stereotyping from Canadian regulated media is considered. This thesis brings into question the CRTC statement made in 1989, "that important progress has been achieved," and all is well with regard to sex-role stereotyping in the media it regulates (CRTC, 1989).

Chapter One begins with an overview of concerns about the influence of television advertising and this leads to a discussion of the concerns and events that placed the problem of gender stereotyping on the CRTC's agenda. It is the CRTC's involvement and responsibility for gender stereotyping in advertising in the broadcast media that is the central issue of the thesis. This is followed by a brief discussion of stereotyping and sex-role representation, which provides a definition of stereotyping. The chapter concludes with an outline of research points and findings of stereotypes in television.

Chapter Two assesses the persistence, the pervasiveness and the manifestations of gender portrayals through a review of the accumulated literature in television gender stereotyping and representation. The review considers the research interests, methods, questions and findings of approximately fifty studies of gender portrayal in television advertising. Further, the literature review in Chapter Two provides an opportunity to examine the general problems, constraints and changes that have emerged in the study of gender portrayal.

Chapter Three provides a detailed analysis of the 1984 CRTC gender portrayal study (CRTC, 1985). One dimension of the analysis will compare the expected achievements of the CRTC assessment of the portrayals with what was actually achieved. The analysis includes a critique of the CRTC

(1984) research; this is accomplished, in part, by comparison with other studies in gender portrayal.

Chapter Four is an analysis of the 1988 CRTC study, which was published in 1990 (CRTC). The CRTC had commissioned a study of gender portrayal in the broadcast media that was to be a replication of the 1984 CRTC study. The analysis of the 1988 study will be similar to the analysis of the 1984 study in Chapter Three, with three additional components. One of these is the comparison of the 1988 findings with those of the 1984 study. The second is the related problem of the CRTC re-analysing the 1984 data which produced new or revised findings. Concluding the chapter is a discussion of the feasibility of the CRTC's decision to have the 1988 study replicate its 1984 study.

The initial focus of Chapter Five is an examination of the major shortcomings of the 1984 and 1988 CRTC studies. The chapter then discusses the role of the CRTC in the supervision, acceptance and publication of the gender portrayal research. Next, the chapter examines the CRTC statement made in response to the studies' findings that "all is well," showing why the CRTC's position was mistaken and premature. Chapter Five concludes with a discussion of the CRTC's responsibility to "eliminate [gender] role stereotyping from the television media it regulates."

In sum, this thesis will examine dysfunctional social stereotyping and gender-biased representation in Canadian television portrayals, particularly those in television advertising. An outline of the nature and scope of the problem of gender stereotyping in television advertising is conducted by first locating, defining and inquiring into "[gender] stereotyping and representation" in television portrayals.

CHAPTER ONE

The CRTC's involvement and responsibility for gender stereotyping in the broadcast media is the central issue of this thesis and the primary focus of this chapter; it is discussed within the context of advertising and the pervasiveness of stereotyping in advertising. This chapter also considers definitions and explanations of stereotyping and sex-role representation in television. The chapter will conclude with a brief outline of the findings and conclusions of research in the stereotypical images of television.

The portrayals in television advertising are extremely powerful both on their own and relative to the stereotypes seen in television programming. The revenues from television advertising finance broadcast activities; advertising, therefore, has the power to determine television content (Leiss, Kline and Jhally, 1990: 185-188). Advertising images are powerful, almost leviathan in their pervasiveness and are certainly much more influential than the images of programming. An audience views advertisements in the here and now, compared with comic and dramatic programming that is viewed in an historical, satirical, imaginary, dramatic or fictional context; hence advertising, on the surface at least, is more credible to the audience.

The influence of television advertising images and stereotypes is further increased by their repetitiveness. A further increase in the influence is attributed to the "unmeasurable but powerful audience impact created by the countless repetitions of the same and similar advertisements and images over and over again" (Kilbourne, 1994). The repetition increases the credibility and the influence of an already compelling medium.

The critical role of “high quality writing and photography, state of the art components of production, virtually unlimited availability of funding, and the presence of the most talented television directors and producers in the media industry,” determine much of the success of television advertising, to a degree that must never be underestimated (Jhally, 1994). The creative characteristics of advertising increase the influence and add to the reasons why advertising should be the most scrutinized aspect of media communications (Jhally, 1994).

The financial position of television advertising in the television industry enables the expensive creativity of its images (Jhally, 1994). Television advertising messages and images are sold, written, produced and distributed by a very small, but very powerful group of influential organizations who resist regulation (Murdock, 1982; Kline and Leiss, 1992; Wiegman, Kutt-schreuter and Barda, 1992). In 1993, television broadcast licensees reporting to the CRTC declared income from advertising of slightly more than 1.611 billion dollars (CRTC, 1994). Thus, advertising revenue defines television as we know it. Public television, such as TVOntario (TVO), is not reliant on advertising. Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) television, frequently referred to as public television, is in fact, dependent on advertising for much of its funding. The advertising industry, and by implication its clients, therefore have the means to dictate to most broadcasters and some extent the regulators, the content and format of television advertising and programming.

The influential portrayals of television are new relative to the portrayals and images of advertising. Late in the 18th century advertising was “said to influence people because of the promise, the large promise that is

the soul of advertising" (Johnson, 1759). The notion of promise is still central to the role of advertising (Janus, 1981: 13-23). The portrayals of advertising are located within constructed images promising not only dry diapers and clean floors, a desired type of home, a place in the consumption society but also the promises of acceptance, achievement, sex and success that script so many of today's advertisements. Few would disagree that "advertising is seen to alter consumer behaviours in addition to altering cognitive images, desires, wishes and wants" (Janus, 1981: 23). The problem of portrayals and influence were equally well-illustrated in an anecdote from a study of television and occupational aspirations and children's viewing habits. That story tells of a young boy who when asked what he would do when he grew up if he were a girl said, "Oh, if I were a girl, I'd have to grow up to be nothing" (Beuf, 1974: 143). The influence of gender misrepresentation, stereotyped images and sexist portrayals in television advertising has concerned many, especially women's groups and eventually governments that also represent parents, educators and citizens in general. Prior to a discussion of these concerns, it is essential that we examine advertising portrayals and the role of the CRTC in the broadcasting of those portrayals.

Offensive gender portrayals had first been the concern of women's groups who lobbied the federal government and the CRTC in opposition to the trivialization and sexual stereotyping by broadcasters (Trimble, 1990a). Women's concerns with television portrayals were expressed by the Royal Commission on the Status of Women (RCSW). The 1969 RCSW report included a condemnation of the media's stereotypical image of women and recommended that the media should portray women and men in a diverse

variety of roles and that advertising should portray women accurately (RCSW, 1970). One of the first concerns voiced by the National Action Committee (NAC) when it was formed in 1972 was sex-role stereotyping in advertising. In 1979 The Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women (CACSW) drafted a plan reported in Towards Equality For Women, which included a proposal to address concerns regarding sex-role portrayals in broadcasting.

The influence of television advertising has concerned both provincial and federal government agencies who have responded by imposing restrictions and regulations on television advertising. Regulations restrict, and in some instances prohibit, the advertising of birth control products, patent medicines and pharmaceutical products, commodity sex, condoms, wine, distilled spirits, tobacco, beer and food products. For example, both federal and provincial regulations prohibit or limit life-style activities in television advertising from being linked to specific products such as wine and distilled liquor. Similarly, laws and consumer regulations restrict television advertisers in their product claims. Further, truth in advertising regulations prevent advertisers from claiming that a product will enable people to live twenty years longer or look ten years younger, unless they have sound evidence to support the claim. The lack of gender portrayal regulations indicate that for many years the same governments were not concerned with sexism or truth in gender portrayals.

The government's position changed, however, when pushed by the United Nations for a plan of action regarding equality for women, and it "committed itself to specific action regarding sex-role stereotyping in the broadcast media" (Trimble, 1990: 44). The problem of "sexual stereotyping"

in the media vis-à-vis the Canadian government's position, was expressed by the Secretary of State, David MacDonald. In 1979 MacDonald said the government was concerned with the influence and effects of sex-stereotyping in the media and in particular the influence of this stereotyping on children (MacDonald, 1979: 1). More recently, the federal position regarding television influence was reiterated in response to controversy about broadcasting the Mighty Morphin Power Rangers television program (Spicer, 1994).

The CRTC, concerned with the violence in the Power Rangers program, advised the Canadian Cable Television Association to follow in the footsteps of the Canadian Broadcast Standards Council (CBSC) which recommended that its broadcast members boycott the program (Spicer, 1994). The Canadian Government, as briefly illustrated, has expressed concern with the influence of television images but government action does not necessarily follow government rhetoric.

Previous complaints and concerns had not received any action from government. Criticisms evoked by the lack of equity and fairness in representation, distortions of societal composition, the accompanying negative portrayals and in particular the stereotyping of females and the influence of all this on society had not been acknowledged in Canadian regulated television. The examination of the results of "over 30 monitoring studies since 1971 have confirmed those criticisms and complaints" (MacDonald, 1979: 4).

The government's voiced concern with stereotyped television portrayals of women became a more active concern in 1979 when the Honourable Jeanne Sauvé officially placed it on the federal agenda (CRTC, 1982a:

1). Sauvé, then Minister of Communications, acting on the aforementioned undertaking Towards Equality For Women, wrote to the CRTC Chair regarding sex-role stereotyping in the media (CRTC, 1982a: 1). Sauvé charged the CRTC with "the task of seeing that guidelines and standards were established to encourage the elimination of sex-role stereotyping from the media regulated by the CRTC" (CRTC, 1982a: 1). The Department of Communications (DOC) was to empower the public to bring pressure on broadcasters and advertisers (CRTC, 1982a: 89-97). David MacDonald, Sauvé's successor, when speaking in 1980 of the federal government's action regarding negative and stereotyped television portrayals, cited the lack of female employment in broadcasting organizations as one of the causes of sexist and stereotypical portrayals of women (McDonald, in CRTC, 1982a: 92). In particular, MacDonald stated, "the government was concerned with stereotyping that presented males as superior to females and females as incompetent, unimportant, trivial and less equitable members of society" (CRTC, 1982a: 97). MacDonald's expectations were that the CRTC would discourage and minimize, if not eliminate, sexual stereotyping in the CRTC regulated broadcast media. The responsibility given to the CRTC in 1979 and reiterated by its own Task Force guidelines in 1982 was a reasonable assignment. The CRTC was to take the necessary steps to "encourage the elimination of sex-role stereotyping from the CRTC regulated broadcast media and they [the CRTC] were to set in place a monitoring program to ensure that the broadcasters were eliminating stereotyping, especially in advertising" (CRTC, 1982a: 2). The CRTC reacted to the task and the instructions, and "albeit reluctantly announced the appointment of a Task Force on Sex-Role Stereotyping in the Broadcast Media" (Salter, 1986:

5). One CRTC spokesperson, Ralph Hart, who was then director of Program Operations for the CRTC, told the Globe and Mail that the CRTC was not sure how to proceed because "they were uncertain about what was meant by sex-role stereotyping and were uncertain they could implement guidelines to eliminate it" (Trimble, 1990: 213). Some of the CRTC commissioners believed the matter to be one of content and were reluctant to become involved. One CRTC spokesperson said the issue was put to them at a time when the CRTC was very busy (Trimble, 1990: 213). The advertising industry, which Kline and Leiss (1992) liken to what Harold Innis might have called an oligopoly of knowledge, were opposed to CRTC guidelines and expressed a reluctance to cooperate with the CRTC on the issue (Trimble, 1990: 214). In this less-than-enthusiastic setting, the CRTC Task Force on Sex-Role Stereotyping in the Broadcast Media was appointed (CRTC, 1982a: 1).

The CRTC Task Force was composed of six public representatives appointed by the DOC, four representatives each from the advertising and broadcasting industries and representatives from both the CBC and the CRTC. Presided over by Marianne Barrie, they began meeting in 1979. The Task Force would, according to MacDonald, "delineate guidelines for a more positive and realistic portrayal of women in radio and television programming and advertising, and make policy recommendations for consideration by the Commission and the broadcast industry" (CRTC, 1982a: 1).

The Task Force subscribed to four points of reference which provided guidelines for their undertaking. One, which was and is of critical importance here, was that "sex-role stereotyping was to be considered nothing less than a problem of inequality and injustice." Second, the Task Force

decided at a preliminary stage of discussion that "they would give priority attention first to advertising, as advertising was the most blatantly offensive" (CRTC, 1982a: 3). Third, though cognizant of many forms of stereotyping, for example, the stereotyping of males or ethnic groups, the Task Force agreed to concentrate on sex-role stereotyping of women. The fourth was the Task Force's acknowledgement that the body of documentation of gender-role stereotyping was sufficient enough that the Task Force would not be required to conduct research (CRTC, 1982a: 3).

The CRTC Task Force was specifically charged with examining and recommending measures to put an end to unfavourable and discriminatory stereotyping of females in broadcast media, and it was expected to produce guidelines for the media portrayal of women (CRTC, 1982a: 3). Furthermore, the Task Force was to recommend how to implement its guidelines: through CRTC regulation, industry self-regulation or government legislation (CRTC, 1982a: 96). The Task Force opted for CRTC monitored industry self-regulation for a trial period of two years (CRTC, 1982a: 65).

Consequently, in 1982, the CRTC embarked on a two-year period of voluntary self-regulation. The broadcasting industry was to implement agreed-upon guidelines and make progress reports to the CRTC. Throughout the self-regulatory period, the CRTC monitoring group was to periodically assess and to report on stereotyping, and to publish the results of its findings at the end of the two years (CRTC, 1982a: 65). A benchmark study to use in assessing the progress of self-regulation was required. In 1984, the CRTC commissioned Erin Research to conduct a content analysis examining broadcast media for sexual stereotyping (CRTC, 1985: v). The

report to the CRTC concluded that the research had found that in the media, "women were portrayed differently than men" (CRTC, 1986a: 109).

The CRTC was apprised of the fact that little, if any, improvement in the portrayal of gender had occurred during the period of voluntary self-regulation. The 1985 publication of the 1984 content analysis of gender portrayal confirmed that, portrayals were still fraught with gender inequities. In 1986 the CRTC "mandated self-regulation" which was made a condition of licensing (1986b: 52).¹ In 1988, following two years of mandated self-regulation, the CRTC commissioned Erin Research to conduct a further study. This was completed and reported in December of 1990.

One year prior to the 1990 publication of Erin's 1988 study, the CRTC stated, "important progress has been made to eliminate the most offensive forms of sex-role stereotyping" (CRTC, 1989: 27). Shortly after the 1990 report of the 1988 content analysis, the CRTC declared, "that most of the concerns about sex-role stereotyping had been largely satisfied" (Fuller, 1992: 5). The CRTC disbanded its internal committee on gender-role stereotyping, the implication being that their responsibility had been fulfilled.

The definition of gender stereotyping and sex-role representation in television is prerequisite to both the study of the problem generally and in locating the CRTC's role with regard to gender portrayals. Gender stereotyping is a contemporary and more common term for what has frequently been called sexual stereotyping.² Care must be exercised in the interpretation and use of the term gender stereotyping, as it can be misleading or

¹ A comprehensive analysis of the industry self-regulation and mandatory self-regulation can be found in Trimble's (1990) unpublished Ph.D. dissertation.

² In many instances, the term gender will be used here, but the terms sex-roles, sex-objects and sexual stereotyping, will be used to in order to maintain consistency with other studies and research in gender portrayal.

even erroneous when used as a synonym for, or confused with, related terms such as sexist stereotyping and gender-role stereotyping. Gender stereotyping occurs when "gender is utilized to describe or explain personality characteristics of people or their status in society" (Caron, 1978). Like stereotypes in general, gender stereotypes may be neither true nor altogether false: the notion that "where there is smoke, there must be fire," is often the basis of overstated claims and exaggerated beliefs that exist in and are the foundation of stereotyping (Caron, 1978: 2).

Stereotyping, "which is founded on reality and experience is a simplified and therefore expedient means of interpreting the world around us" (Lippmann, 1922: cited in 1965 edition). Stereotyping, as defined by Lippmann could be reasonable and relatively neutral. Most frequently, however, stereotypes are of the positive or negative variety, rather than neutral expeditious devices. Negative stereotyping, that is, stereotyping not rooted in reality, but rather in the rumours and biased images of other people and the mass media, which is detrimental to the subjects of the stereotypes, closely defines stereotyping as used in this study.

There is a great deal of evidence of negative stereotyping, biased gender portrayal and gender misrepresentation in television advertising and programming. Interest and research in television content, and in analyses of television portrayals that considered the problem, originated shortly after the commencement of regularly scheduled television broadcasts.³ Accounts of stereotyped and inequitable portrayals in the early years of television came from analyses of television portrayals by Smythe (1954) and Head (1954).

³ Montreal and Toronto television stations started broadcasting on a regular schedule in September 1952 (Ellis, 1979:35). In the U.S. television was broadcast in some regions as early as 1948, with both Los Angeles and New York City having seven channels by 1952 (Barnouw, 1990).

Their studies found that females were not equitably represented and that the majority of television roles were given to male actors (Head, 1954: 181). According to Smythe (1954) television grossly exaggerated the number of males relative to the actual proportion of males in society, and also under-represented the non labour-force population. Head's (1954) findings concurred, reporting that the majority of characters were male, most of whom were employed, and that only 15% were in what Head deemed to be "lower class occupations" (Head, 1954: 182). This was accompanied by both Head's (1954) and Smythe's (1954) findings that 70 to 80% of all on-camera roles employed male characters. Studies continued to report that the dominance of male portrayals persisted and was widespread; for example, a 1974 Canadian study found that 75% of dramatic roles were played by male characters (Caron, 1978).

The dominance of male representation in television was not limited to on-camera portrayal. A more disproportionate representation of females and males was found in voice-over (off-camera narrator) analyses of television advertising. For example, nine of every ten voice-overs were found to be spoken by a male voice (Courtney and Whipple, 1974).

Inequity in proportional representation of females was found to be accompanied by inequity in the portrayals of the females that were represented. For example, female characters were not shown as valued participants in the television world of work; rather, they were frequently portrayed "doing nothing" (Head, 1954: 182). The vast majority of females were portrayed as unemployed or doing unpaid work in the home (Smythe, 1954: 152). Analyses of television advertisements found females in both a limited number and a limited variety of roles while males who were the majority

were seen in a wide range of roles (Dominick and Rauch, 1972; Culley and Bennett, 1974).

These illustrations of stereotyped representation and stereotyped portrayals reveal the weaving together of what are really two dimensions of the problem of gender portrayal. One is the stereotyping of exclusion as seen in the examples of lack of representation. The other is the stereotyped portrayal within the representation; for example, males may be equitably represented but portrayed as though they have no home and no familial concerns. A well-researched and important dimension of gender stereotyping is that of gender representation in occupational portrayals. Males, for example, have been over-represented in employment characterizations and misrepresented in occupational roles while female characters have been both under-represented and misrepresented in employment and occupational roles. A substantial body of research findings support these observations (see Table 2.1 in Chapter Two).

Smythe (1954) and Head (1954), for example, reported in occupational analyses of television portrayals that "the pictures provided by television were found to differ grossly from reality." The inequities extended beyond the number of portrayals to the nature of the portrayals, the critical locus of gender stereotyping. Head (1954) found, for example, in an analysis of 1,763 employed television characters most of whom were male, that 75% were cast in identifiable occupational roles; this was a much higher rate of occupational participation than existed in society (Head, 1954: 182). Females, meanwhile, were found to be under-represented in occupational roles; they were usually portrayed in the home, in family

scenes and most frequently in bathrooms (Culley and Bennett, 1974; O'Donnell and O'Donnell, 1978).

A three-year study of New York City television also reported very unrealistic employment and occupational portrayals (Smythe, 1954). Though only 40% of the population were employable, more than 70% of the television characters were employed (Smythe, 1954: 154).⁴ Another study found that, after excluding the 17% of characters portrayed as professional criminals, "46% of all television characters fell into only three of seven of the top rated social ranks" (Head, 1954: 182).⁵ The same study reported that two of the highest ranked occupational categories for male characters were police work and professional occupations and few if any female characters were portrayed in those occupations (Head, 1954: 182).

One study noted that television portrayals were skewed in favour of a male, white-collar world (DeFleur, 1964). The study found males over-represented while females were both under-represented and misrepresented (DeFleur, 1964). The study also reported that the social economic status of male characters was found to be misrepresented (DeFleur, 1964), with half of male television characters portrayed in occupations rated "high" in occupational rankings. An exaggerated number of characters were also found in law-related occupations such as lawyers, judges, detectives and policing (DeFleur, 1964: 62). According to then current census data, 65%

⁴ Statistics Canada (Canada, Statistics Canada, 1992) defines employable as, those in the labour force, who are civilian and not institutionalized, fifteen years and older, who are employed, and unemployed if actively seeking work. The U.S. criteria were more exclusive (1954), therefore a lesser percentage of the population was employable.

⁵ Most content analyses code criminal activity as an occupation, though some occupational ranking indices, such as Warner's Index of Social Characteristics, eliminated the criminals (even those criminals using a legitimate occupation as a cover) from the tabulations.

of employed North Americans worked in blue-collar occupations, yet very few blue-collar occupations were represented in television roles (Butsch and Glennon, 1983 cited in Jeffres, 1986: 188). Television, according to DeFleur, "perpetuated a stereotype of males in paid and prestigious employment, employed in a man's world" (DeFleur, 1964: 65).

Studies examining "good and bad" television characters, found that females were stereotyped as "good" females, if they were portrayed as "housewives" (Smythe, 1954: 182).⁶ In contrast, female characters depicted as members of the work force in paid occupations, were stereotyped as bad and frequently portrayed as "villains" (Head, 1954). Females portrayed as housewives were seldom cast as villains and were occasionally depicted as heroes (Smythe, 1954: 153). In general, the studies indicated that females were portrayed negatively, particularly if they were engaged in occupations outside of the home. In one study, most males were found to be portrayed as heroes with positive characteristics, but with few interests in family and home activities (Smythe, 1954).

A subsequent study examined the personality attributes of the television characters, reporting that one-third of female characters were portrayed with deceptive, flirtatious or neurotic characteristics (Caron, 1978: 191-192). Other studies reported that female characters were depicted as good, happy, emotional, irrational and unintelligent, while males were competent, rational and intelligent (Tedesco, 1974: 122). One study found, as did Caron (1978), that males were portrayed as conscientious, responsible, independent and dependable (Pyke and Stewart, 1974, cited in Caron 1978: 92).

⁶ Smythe's study, like most studies discussed in this thesis, do not reveal how "housewife" was operationalized.

Television's stereotyped portrayals have been found to be as persistent as they are pervasive. The portrayal of the housewife as a "good female," first reported in Smythe (1954) was manifest again in a 1974 study (Manes and Melnyk, 1974). The study found that "good" female characters with successful marriages were not portrayed as good employees, while females in successful careers did not have successful marriages (Trimble, 1990: 163).

The persistence of these stereotypes was discussed in Buttsch and Glennon (1983) who found, in an analysis of television programming from 1946 to 1978, that the working class, which accounted for 65% of North American heads of households, was represented in television portrayals by only eight percent of characters (Jeffres, 1986: 189). These findings were evidence of the persistence of the over-representation of white middle-class males and the negative under-representation of the working class (Trimble, 1990; Buttsch and Glennon, 1983).

The persistence of the misrepresentation of females was further illustrated in a 1990 study that found females portrayed almost exclusively in advertisements for body products (Craig, 1990). This was similar to the depiction of females reported by McLuhan (1951). Females portrayed in television advertising were "scrubbed, deloused germ-free good girls who relied on cleaning products such as lysol spray to clean both herself and the bathroom" (McLuhan, 1951). Other portrayals of females, according to McLuhan (1951) were those of "energetic semi-clad good time girls or as personified mechanical brides, mechanical assembly line love goddesses whose body parts could be moved from pedestal to pedestal" (McLuhan, 1951: 42).

Only infrequently are male characters seen in the denigrating or demeaning portrayals that characterize female portrayals (McLuhan, 1951). Television advertising seldom characterizes male characters as sex objects and most frequently portrays males without family responsibilities (O'Donnell and O'Donnell, 1978). Males are often portrayed as characters possessing financial acumen and means as they promote motor vehicles and business products. These, and the portrayal of females in advertisements of cleaning products for house and body, are the portrayals that persist (MediaWatch, 1986; Craig, 1990).

These persisting images are part of the television content enculturating society. Today, as Gerbner points out, television teaches the myths and moral lessons and cultivates the values of society (Gerbner, 1972). "Media is as influential as religion was," according to Gerbner, "with television having become the high priest in society; telling people what they want and need to know and what to believe!" (Gerbner, 1972).

Television, an acknowledged agent of socialization, operates in society along with families, religion and education as components of socialization. Television may play a substantial social role in determining, or at least affirming attitudes about gender groups, the elderly, ethnic groups and occupational groups, such as educators, scientists and authorities. The components of socialization determine the contemporary research questions which are: who is influenced, when are they influenced, how are they influenced and how much are they influenced by television.

A study of programming in which science was a theme illustrates one manifestation of television's influence. The grumpy, unsociable scientist of television was an adaptation of the image of the mad scientist created by

the movies; an image buttressed by newspaper stories which often twist and exaggerate scientific findings (Jeffres, 1986: 189). Science is not a common theme in television programming with only four percent of prime time and nine percent of weekend daytime programs featuring science and science workers (Gerbner, Gross et al., 1981). Programming that featured science and scientists portrayed scientists who were “frequently portrayed as smarter but less attractive, unfair, less sociable, older, and not as warm or friendly as those in other occupational roles” (Gerbner, Gross et al., 1981: 43-44).

One consequence of the media treatment of science was, according to Gerbner, that the scientific community became extremely leery of the media, media coverage and the media stereotype of the mad scientist (Gerbner, Gross et al., 1981). Hence, with the exception of a few scientists, such as celebrity scientist David Suzuki, Canadian society has been receiving a limited view of science and those doing science, as scientists tend to avoid or shun the media (Gerbner et al., 1981: 44). Studies examining influence on one group such as scientists are few. However, the negative attitudes about science and scientists posited by Gerbner, were supported by the findings of a 1974 study which developed a methodology for examining occupational attitudes of high school students (Young McFarlane, 1994). The study found that some high school students did see scientists as unsociable and unstable people who may not always be socially responsible (Young McFarlane, 1994: 203). The available research, though limited, does provide some ideas for further study of the causal links of television effects and influence.

Studies have indicated that individuals in the television audience acquire personal gender-role behaviours from the broadcast images (Busby, 1975). Negative and demeaning television portrayals of women as a group with low socio-economic status, reinforce low self-esteem and low aspirations among females (Busby, 1975). The influence on groups such as women is increased as television advertising moves beyond the promotion of new products, information and reinforcement of brand loyalties, to become more powerful persuasive communication, a part of promotional culture (Wernick, 1988: 180-210).

The preponderance of research into television influences has focused on children. According to researchers, this is because "television has become, for children, a significant part of the acculturation process" (Derevensky and Klein, 1992: 287). The societal effects of television on children can no longer be considered a serendipitous part of life; rather, research has shown that television "is a formidable educator whose effects are both pervasive and cumulative" (U. S. National Institute of Mental Health, 1982: 87). For children television has become a primary authority and a companion in addition to being a source of entertainment. For the majority of children, many of whom have very limited supervision from parents and family, television provides, vicariously, an extended family, parents and grandparents in absentia, their heroes and role models (Perloff, 1986: 202; Gunter, 1990, 1986).

Television is used more than other media, and excepting employment and sleep, dominates the activities of most Canadians who average 23.5 viewing hours per week (Derevensky and Klein, 1992: 288). Studies report that even infants and young pre-schoolers spend three to four hours or more

of each day watching television (Singer and Singer, 1983). Canadian children have been reported to watch more than 1,000 hours of television a year or about 20 hours weekly, a little more time than the children spend in school (Statistics Canada, 1989; 1990).⁷

As much as 40% of viewing time is taken up by advertisements (Derevensky and Klein, 1992: 300). It is estimated that children may be exposed to more than 50,000 advertisements (including repetitions) in one year of viewing (O'Barr, 1984). According to another estimate, by the age of 16, a child has seen more than 300,000 television advertisements (Bagdikian, 1989). Contemporary thought is that the advertisements are part of the content provided by "a medium which is probably the most important teaching medium in society" (Bloch, 1985: 16).

How, the degree to which, and how much television affects children may be mediated by their environment, their individual perceptions, comprehension and capabilities (Gunter, 1986: 60). These variables combine with cultivation, enculturation, modelling and learning in determining the influence of television on children.

Television was not considered an influence of any importance when learning theories were still founded in operant systems, mainly supported by studies in animal learning that relied on punishment and reward systems (Hull, 1943; Skinner, 1953 and Spence, 1956). More contemporary research has found that people learn from direct experience and modelling. The social learning framework delineated by Bandura's study provides an explanation of "how acquisition of information and behaviours come from observation of others" (Bandura and Walters, 1963: 23). According to

⁷ These viewing hours do not include television viewed away from home, nor the hours of television viewing combined with the use of a VCR.

Bandura, if our observations come from watching a repetitive television model, our responses will be predicated more on what we have observed on television rather than on the occasional observation of a model in our home or family (Bandura and Walters, 1963: 49).

Children who do learn behaviours from observation and modelling of family members would, in most instances, be expected to develop a different set of behaviours than would children who learned them primarily from seeing the behaviours on television (Tan, 1981: 206). Consider the influence if children are spending less time with parents and extended family and more time being exposed to the [negative] images of media including gender stereotypes. For example, children learn from television portrayals that female models are dependent, needing more nurturance than male models who are portrayed functioning independently (Henderson et al., 1980). If the same viewers were able to accompany their parents and role models to work at the office, the store or laboratory, they would see and learn, according to Bandura, a variety of models of female and male behaviour, in addition to the stereotyped model provided by television (Jeffres, 1986: 206).

Another major theoretical explanation of mass media effects is Gerbner's cultivation theory. Though similar to social learning theory, it postulates that the greater the time spent watching, the greater the influence (Tan, 1981). Gerbner asserts that television may be the particularly stronger teacher "when its messages differ from the messages provided by other socializing agents;" television, therefore, is frequently the more effective voice (Jeffres, 1986: 207). Children who watch a great deal of television are more likely to have distorted opinions of modern society.

They are more likely to believe, for example, that the vast majority of experts and doctors are male, that police use their guns on the job on a daily basis, and that few, if any, women hold positions of authority (Jeffres, 1986: 106).

Additional research indicates that the more a person, child or adult, watches television, the more distorted becomes their notion of real life (Jeffres, 1986: 206). Hence, the cumulative effects of viewing negative images and stereotypes are thought, as posited by Gerbner, to have the most impact on the heaviest users of television (Jeffres, 1986). For many, television is the primary source of information about the social and political environment; thus, for them, the influence of television becomes even more pervasive (Tan, 1981: 253). An example of this can be seen among the heavy television viewers who believe the crime rate to be worse than it actually is (Gunter, 1986: 27). Consequently, these people may arrange their life according to their perceived rate of crime; for example, they may not go out after dark (Gunter, 1986: 27).

The impact of television advertising has been thoroughly researched, with studies of children and television advertising stereotypes one of the most researched areas of media effects. Both social learning theory and cultivation theory provide explanations of the acquisition of gender role characteristics and gender role behaviours and how these are influenced by televised gender role portrayals and stereotypes (Bandura and Walters, 1963: 49, 60). The social learning framework appears to be the root of both enculturation and cultivation theory (Tan, 1981). This provides a cogent explanation of how and why television viewing is a major influence

on the social behaviour of both children and adults (Tan, 1981: 253 in Perloff, 1986; Shoemaker and Reese, 1990).

There is, for example, research evidence that children accept the stereotyped roles shown in advertising, select them as appropriate for males and females in general, and then select the stereotyped careers for themselves (Courtney and Whipple, 1978: vii). Analyses indicate that the most distorted areas of gender role stereotyping concern employment and occupational portrayals (Butler and Paisley, 1980). Other studies report that the career aspirations of young girls are most influenced by television portrayals and that the more hours of viewing, the greater that influence (Durkin, 1985a; 1985b; Morgan, 1984).

McGhee and Freuh (1980) reported that television images contribute to children's acquisition of stereotypic perceptions associated with females and males, including educational and career ambitions. The study also found that the greater the amount of time spent viewing television, the more significant was the contribution of television images to the children's perceptions, attitudes and career ambitions (McGhee and Freuh, 1980). Even those who posit that media effects are quite limited believe that the effects on children increase as viewing time increases and most particularly among the disadvantaged and the poor (Gans, 1993: 31).

One of the constraints in television influence studies results from the lack of control groups, groups of people who do not access television (MacBeth Williams, 1986). Hence, most research findings are inferential rather than causal. The focus of a unique and valuable media effects study involved subjects living in a number of British Columbia communities, one of which was Notel (town with no television). The inhabitants of Notel were

examined before and after the arrival of television in their community (MacBeth Williams, 1986). A part of the study involved people in communities who for decades had access to television. This study, whose results were causal rather than inferential did arrive at the same findings as the inferential studies. For example, the children in Notel, before television, were found "to have different and more varied opinions and perceptions about gender-roles, particularly in regard to occupation and parental roles than the children in communities that had always had access to television" (1986, MacBeth Williams: 290).

Many counter-stereotyping studies have been conducted, particularly with regard to television advertising. One of these, a study of older children and adolescents, found the career aspirations of young children as well as the occupational perceptions and career aspirations of older children and young adults were influenced by television (Jennings, Geis and Brown, 1980). In one study involving female subjects of late high-school and university age, one group of subjects was exposed to role-reversed television advertising while another group viewed regular television advertising. Those exposed to regular advertising expressed fewer career aspirations than women of the same age who had been viewing only role-reversed advertising (Geis et al., 1984: 514).

The world we have to deal with socially and politically is a media-formulated world (Tan, 1981: 253). As social individuals, we rely on "media pictures" as guides to the construction of our social realities (Tan, 1981). Jeffres (1986) maintained that all media content has an impact on political perceptions, cultural tastes and consumer preferences. He warned against looking only at news or content that purports to present "reflections of

reality;" rather all media content must be considered influential (Jeffres, 1986: 165). This of course includes advertising which, as Smythe reminded us, is important but tends to be the blind spot in our understanding of communication (Smythe, 1981).

The preceding paragraphs have outlined the highlights of research into the who and how of television influence, which indicates that the young, the impressionable and the heavy users of television are the most influenced. As discussed, the influence is complicated by the relationship between what is viewed by the audience and the powerful financial interests who directly and indirectly determine both advertising and programming content.

To enable a discussion of the CRTC's response to the government's directive to the CRTC to encourage the elimination of sex-role stereotyping from the media it regulates, this chapter first considered the social impact and influence of gender portrayals and outlined concerns with the gender stereotypes in television advertising. This provided a foundation on which to summarize the CRTC's involvement with the problem of gender stereotyping and the appointment of the CRTC Task Force on Sex-Role Stereotyping.

A brief discussion of the appearance and definitions of gender stereotyping and sex-role representation in television was followed by an outline of research findings of television portrayals.

Chapter Two is an extensive review of the research and research findings of television gender portrayal studies, many of which were examined by the CRTC Task Force in 1979-1980. The studies demonstrate both the pervasiveness and the persistence of television advertising portrayals. The review provides a longitudinal analysis of the problems, the constraints

and the findings by examining more than fifty studies of gender portrayal in television advertising.

CHAPTER TWO

The previous chapter discussed concerns with stereotyping in television advertising gender portrayals in addition to reviewing the evidence of the persistence and the influence of gender stereotyping, gender portrayal and gender representation in television. The chapter provided a succinct explanation of the role and response of the CRTC in relation to those same issues of gender in television advertising. Chapter Two illustrates and elaborates on the accumulated findings of research into gender stereotyping that demonstrate the persistence of both the misrepresentations and the stereotypes in gender portrayal. This will be done by reviewing the accumulated studies and the findings of research into gender stereotyping in television advertising (see Table 2.1).

The review of studies, in addition to providing research findings, will also serve as the foundation for assessing the CRTC's gender portrayal studies (1984, 1988). The review comprises examples of advertising portrayals that assist in understanding the CRTC Task Force's decisions, the CRTC's research, and the CRTC's response to the need to discourage or to eliminate gender-role stereotyping from the broadcast media.

In 1979, the CRTC established the Task Force on Sex-Role Stereotyping in the Broadcast Media, to address the issue "of sex-role stereotyping in the broadcast media, with the purpose of assessing the problem and recommending corrective guidelines" (CRTC, 1982: 3). The Task Force elected "to study the existing body of literature on sex-role stereotyping and not to research the problem, as it had already been well defined and well documented" (CRTC, 1982: 3).

Further, the CRTC Task Force decided to "concentrate on sex-role stereotyping of women and though it would look at programming, the Task Force stated that commercials would be the priority" (CRTC, 1982: 3). The present study, following the example of the Task Force, will focus on the portrayal of women on television and particularly those in television advertising. The literature to be reviewed here, and listed in Table 2.1, reveals the existence of an extensive accumulation of studies of gender-role stereotyping reported up to 1994. The research conducted by the CRTC (1984, 1988) is not included in Chapter Two, but is the focus of Chapters Three and Four.

Some of the early and frequently cited content analyses of gender portrayal in television advertising were commissioned by women writers and women's groups associated with the latest women's movement (1963) who voiced strong objections to television's portrayal of women. Two major National Organization of Women (NOW) studies published in 1972, Dominick and Rauch (1972), and the Toronto Women's Media Committee (TWMC) study (1974), are prime examples of research conducted in response to these women's views of television's portrayal of females in negative, unrealistic and unreasonable terms. These studies and their findings provoked even more research and public concern; hence, activist and writer Germaine Greer (1971) spoke for many when she berated the media for "concentrating on ads for things to squirt on women to stop them from being so offensive" (Dominick and Rauch, 1972: 259).

Mannes (1970), writing a criticism of television advertising, predicted that advertisers "would have to stop selling products by showing women only as teenage playgirls whose sole function is sex or as saw-voiced

TABLE 2.1, SUMMARY OF RESEARCH 1952 - 1994

WHEN/WHERE PUBLISHED	AUTHOR	SAMPLING	DAYS/TIMES	TYPE/SIZE
1954 The Quarterly of Film	Head	1953 March - May	p.m.	209 Programs - 3 US Networks
1954 Public Opinion Quarterly	Sn., ythe	1953	p.m. all days	86 Programs - 3 US Networks
1964 Public Opinion Quarterly	DeFleur	1963	all dayparts	250 Programs, 125 Hours - 3 US Networks
1972 Women In The Wasteland Fight Back	Cantor (NOW - Washington)	1972 May - June	all dayparts	2750 Advertisements - WRC - TV
1972 Journal of Communication	Dominick & Rauch	1972	primetime	986 Advertisements
1972 New York Times Magazine	Hennessee & Nicholson (NOW - New York)	1971	p.m. all days	1,241 Advertisements
1972 Public Opinion Quarterly	Katzman	1970 April	p.m. one week	14 Soap Serials with 371 Characters
1972 Journal of Communication	Tedesco	1969 - 1972	p.m.	US Networks
1973 Journal of Broadcasting	Seggar & Wheeler	1971 Feb. - March	all dayparts	250 1/2 Hour Programs - 3 US Networks
1974 Journalism Quarterly	Busby	1972 - 1973	a.m. Saturday	20 Children's Cartoons - US Networks
1974 Journalism Quarterly	O'Kelly	1973 Oct.	p.m. and Saturday	Children's Advertisements and 7 Hours Programming - 3 US Networks
1974 The Ontario Psychologist	Pyke & Stewart	1974	all dayparts	2,662 Ads and 14.5x7 days of Programming - CBC, CTV, OECA
1974 Screen Actors Guild (Hollywood)	Screen Actors Guild	1973	n.a.	340 Advertisements - (CLIO Competition entries) US Networks
1974 Screen Actors Guild (New York)	Screen Actors Guild	1974	all dayparts all days	656 Advertisements - US Television
1974 Federal Communications Bar Journal	Silverstein & Silverstein	1973 Oct - Nov.	primetime weeknights	496 Advertisements - 3 US Networks
1974 Journal of Communication	Strecher	1972 9 weeks	a.m. afternoon and weekend	Cartoons and Advertisements in Children's Programming
1974 Journal of Communication	Toronto Women (TWMC) (Courtney & Whipple)	1973 Feb.	1-3 p.m. & 8-10 p.m.	434 Advertisements - Cdn Channels
1975 PBS	Isber & Cantor	1975	p.m.	37.5 Hours - PBS

TABLE 2.1, CONTINUED

WHEN/WHERE PUBLISHED	AUTHOR	SAMPLING	DAYS/TIMES	TYPE/SIZE
1975 Journal of Social Psychology	McArthur & Resko	1971 Spring	a m and p.m. Tues Thurs	210 Advertisements - 3 US Networks
1975 Journal of Broadcasting	McNeil	1973 March	primetime 21 days	43 Programs
1975 Journal of Broadcasting	Verna	1973 Oct	a m Sat	182 Advertisements in Children's Programming - 3 US Networks
1976 Journal of Communication	Culley & Bennett	1974 Jan	primetime	359 Advertisements - CBS
1976 Journal of Communication	O'Kelly & Bloomquist	1973	all dayparts	Random (over one month) - US Networks
1977 Unpub., University of B.C.	Halpern & Ethier	1976 May	primetime 2 Weeks	Cdn & US Networks
1977 Unpub., University of Guelph	Klassen	1977	all dayparts	Advertisements from 12 Hours of Programming - 3 Cdn Networks
1977 Queen's Printer, Ontario	Williams, Zabrack & Joy	1976	evenings	63 Programs and Advertisements - 3 US Networks and CBC
1978 Unpub., PhD Thesis, Regina	Caron	1974 1975 March - April	all dayparts	2268 Advertisements - CBC, CTV
1978 Far West Laboratory	Cirksena & Butler	1977	all dayparts	1000 Advertisements - US Networks
1978 Journal of Communication	Maracek, Pillavin, et al	1974	all dayparts	1168 Advertisements - 3 US Networks
1978 Journal of Communication	O'Donnell & O'Donnell	1976 Nov	primetime 15 week days	367 Advertisements - 3 US Networks
1978 YWCA - Montreal	YWCA Montreal	1978	p m all days	285 Advertisements
1979 Sex-Roles Journal	Dominick	1977	primetime	1314 Programs - 3 US Networks
1979 Journal of Advertising Research	Scheibe	1975 1976 Oct. March	all dayparts seven days	6,262 Advertisements - 3 US Networks
1979 Journal of Marketing	Schneider & Schneider	1979 Oct	primetime	287 Advertisements
1981 Int. Journal of Women's Studies	Knill, Pesch, Pursey, Gilpin & Perloff	1980 July	evenings	1,631 Advertisements - 3 US Networks
1981 Sex-Roles Journal	Mamay & Simpson	1977 Feb	all dayparts	515 Advertisements

TABLE 2.1, CONTINUED

WHEN/WHERE PUBLISHED	AUTHOR	SAMPLING	DAYS/TIMES	TYPE/SIZE
1981 British Journal of Psychology	Manstead & McColloch	1979 July	1 week	493 Advertisements - Granada TV
1982 Programming Portrayals	CBC	1982	3 weeks	125 Programs
1983 Journal of Educational Gerontology	Erin Research Hiemstra, Roger, Goodman, Middlemiss & Vosco	1981 summer	all dayparts all days	136 Advertisements - 3 US Networks (Syracuse)
1984 Journal of Marketing Science	Cabellero & Solomon	1977	p.m. & primetime	3,967 Advertisements - 3 Major Networks
1985 Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science	Moore & Cadeau	1983 Jan - Mar	all dayparts all days	1,733 Advertisements - CBC, CTV, CITY-TV
1984 MediaWatch, Toronto, Canada	MediaWatch	1984	all dayparts all days	293 Advertisements
1986 In British Journal of Social Psychology	Harris & Stobart	1981 Feb.	p.m.	215 Advertisements - Central TV
1986 British Journal of Social Psychology	Livingstone & Green	1983 Nov.	evenings	175 Advertisements - Thames Television
1988 Sex-Roles Journal	Bretl & Cantor	1985 - 1986	a.m. & primetime	US Networks
1988 Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media	Ferrante & Haynes	1986 Oct.	5 week days	1,480 Advertisements - 3 Networks
1988 Journal of Marketing	Gilly	1987	8-4/7-11 p.m. midweek	617 Advertisements (275 US) - CBS
1989 Sex-Roles Journal	Lovdal	1989 spring	primetime	350 Advertisements - ABC, NBC
1990 Sex-Roles Journal	Craig	1990 Jan	all dayparts all days	2,209 Advertisements - 3 US Networks
1990 Sex-Roles Journal	Davis	1987 Spring	primetime	50 Hours Serials - 3 US Networks (ex Fox)
1990 Societal diversity in TVO Programming	OECA & Erin Research	1988-1989	21 days	345 Hours Programming, 1,951 Promotions - TVO
1992 Sex-Roles Journal	Mazzella & Durkin	1992	p.m. & primetime	450 Advertisements
1993 Sex-Roles Journal	Furnham & Bitar	1990 Nov.	p.m. & primetime	180 Advertisements - ITV
1994 Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media	Signorielli, McLeod & Healy	1991 Nov.	p.m. & primetime	550 Advertisements - MTV

Source: See Bibliography

matrons whose only purpose is housekeeping" (Dominick and Rauch, 1972: 259). This was stereotyping, stated the CRTC Task Force, "of inequality and injustice" (CRTC, 1982: 2).

The studies of gender portrayal in the literature have at least three research dimensions in common. First, all of the analyses examine the representation or presence of gender in on-camera appearances in television advertisements. For example, they may examine all of the characters who speak or all of the characters demonstrating a product; the findings are used to assess equity of gender representation or presence. The second common aspect of the studies is the analysis of off-camera, voice-over presence or representation of female and male characters, which again are an indicator of gender equity. Finally, the studies analyze the social roles of on-camera characters; for example, employment, occupation and family roles. The analysis of social roles can be an accurate indication of stereotyping in gender portrayals. A finding, for example, might be that even though half of the characters were female, the majority of them were portrayed in low-status occupations or unemployed.

Other categories of analysis have been the setting of the character, the use of characters as decorative objects and the gender of the character in relation to the type and value of the advertised product. An early and frequently cited study by Dominick and Rauch (1972), has been used by many as a reference point in gender analysis, and their categories have served as a model for most studies discussed in this review. Craig (1990), for example, analyzed the gender of voice-overs, the gender of on-camera

characters, product, setting, social and family roles and daypart,¹ in addition to constructing variables with those listed.

This chapter will examine the major research studies of gender in relation to voice-overs, on-camera characters, product representatives, occupation, employment and family roles, sex object portrayals, settings and age. The gender of product representatives will also be examined in terms of daypart, and the type and value of the advertised product.

Gender and Voice-Over Roles

Mannes (1970: 66) was one of many who complained that, "the voice of authority that tells us what to buy is always male." Subsequent research supported the observation that male voices were dominant in off-camera voice-overs: authorities with authoritative sounding male voices affirming and advising viewers what was right and wrong in the marketplace of consumer goods, services and ideas. Twenty-eight studies that contained voice-over analyses are reported in the following paragraphs (Table 2.2).

Three early studies, one conducted in 1972 by Dominick and Rauch, and two by NOW (Washington Chapter, New York Chapter), found that male voices were employed for 87% to 93% of the voice-over roles (Table 2.2). NOW in New York (1972) analyzed 1,241 advertisements and found male voices in 89% of voice-over roles. Similarly, the Washington NOW study, conducted in consultation with Muriel Cantor of the American University, found that 93% of the voice-overs in 2,750 television advertise-

¹ Daypart is a term used in the broadcasting and advertising industries to describe a period of the day such as "primetime." Advertising campaigns and rates are planned and paid for according to daypart.

ments were spoken by males. The findings, published in Women in The Wasteland Fight Back (1972), noted that "males by virtue of their outstanding majority, were the authorities, telling viewers what to buy and why to buy it" (Butler, 1980: 72).

TABLE 2.2, GENDER AND VOICE-OVERS IN TELEVISION ADVERTISING 1972 - 1993

Author	Year	Male	Female	Other	Sample N
Dominick & Rauch	1972	87%	6%	7%	946
NOW - Washington	1972	93	7	0	2,750
NOW - New York	1972	89	11	0	1,241
Screen Actors	1973	93	7	0	340
Courtney & Whipple	1974	90	10	0	434
Pyke & Stewart (CTV - CBC)	1974	90	10	0	2,662
Pyke & Stewart (OECA)	1974	50	50	0	"
Silverstein et al.	1974	95	4	1	496
Verna	1975	87	6	7	182
Culley & Bennett	1976	84	6	10	359
Klassen	1977	94	6	0	na
Cirksena & Butler	1978	90	10	0	960
Caron	1978	96	4	0	1,922
Maracek et al.	1978	89	6	4	1,168
O'Donnell & O'Donnell	1978	93	7	0	367
Scheibe	1979	89	11	0	6,262
Knill, Pesch et al.	1981	91	8	0	1,631
Mamay & Simpson	1981	86	na	na	515
Cabellero & Solomon	1984	93	7	0	3,967
MediaWatch	1984	77	23	0	293
Livingstone & Green	1986	93	6	1	567
Bretl & Cantor	1988	91	8	1	397
Gilly	1988	88	12	0	170
Ferrante & Haynes	1988	83	8	9	763
Lovdal	1989	90	9	0	353
Craig	1990	91	9	0	2,209
Mazzella & Durkin	1992	91	9	0	450
Furnham & Bitar	1993	90	10	0	180

Source: See Bibliography

The U.S. Screen Actor's Guild (SAG) sponsored a study of the 1973 advertising industry Clio Award finalists (SAG, 1974). The study found that 93% of voice-over roles employed male voices, therefore providing few opportunities for female members (Table 2.2). The Toronto Women's Media Committee reported, as had the SAG (1974) study, that male voices were used in a disproportionate majority of voice-overs in both daytime and primetime dayparts (Courtney and Whipple, 1974: 117). Pyke and Stewart

(1974) examined 2,662 Canadian network and public television advertisements and reported that male voices accounted for 90% of the voice-overs on Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) and the Canadian Television Network (CTV). In contrast, the study found "no significant difference between the numbers of female and male voice-overs in TVOntario television (formerly OECA-TV) advertisements" (Pyke and Stewart, 1974: 68).² In fact, they found that female voices dominated in advertisements promoting cosmetics, pet food and forthcoming programs. Pyke and Stewart concluded that, "the lack of equitable female representation was an indication that television in general may be seen as reactionary in that it fails to reflect existing patterns in society and portrays females in an even more denigrating fashion than is true of our culture" (1974: 68).

Caron (1978) found that in 2,268 CBC and CTV television advertisements, an overwhelming majority of voice-overs employed male voices (Table 2.2). Caron (1978) reported that females, under-represented in voice-overs, were "even more under-represented, in network and station identifications and promotions which used male voices in 98.6% of this type of authoritarian advertisement" (Caron, 1978: 178).

One unique analysis examined and compared both Canadian and U.S. produced television advertisements (Halpern and Ethier, 1977). No significant differences were found in the proportion of females to males in voice-over roles between the Canadian and U.S. broadcast television advertisements (MacBeth Williams, 1986: 23).³

² Significant and significantly are used in this thesis in the statistical sense, i.e. probability.

³ MacBeth Williams, Tannis, is the author's correct name, but will also be found cited as Williams, Tannis. M., and MacBeth-Williams, Tannis.

With few exceptions, studies in the 1970s and the early 1980s continued to report the exclusion of female voices from voice-over roles (Table 2.2). Cirksema and Butler (1978), analyzing 960 advertisements, found male voices were employed in the vast majority of cases. Some studies (Knill, Pesch, Pursey, Gilpin and Perloff, 1981; Cabellero and Solomon, 1984; and Livingstone and Green, 1986), reported increases in the number of males in voice-over roles (see Table 2.2). An analysis of daypart and gender of voice-over indicated that male voice-overs, most dominant in the afternoon and on weekends, decreased in primetime. One report suggested that this may be the result of a noted decrease in household product advertisements in primetime, and that as these decrease, the incidence of male voice-overs decreases (Knill et al., 1981: 502).

Mamay and Simpson (1981) reported that in both daytime and primetime, 100% of the voice-overs in housekeeping product advertisements (most of which were seen in the daytime dayparts) employed male voices (Table 2.2).⁴ Their finding that, overall, 86% of voice-overs were done by male voices was a decrease from that reported by previous studies (Mamay and Simpson, 1981: 1230).

Moore and Cadeau (1985) in their analysis of CBC, CTV and CITY-TV advertisements, examined only the advertisements promoting commercial products and services; 1,733 of 2,304 (+ 75%) advertisements fell into that category. Of the 1,733 product advertisements, 76% were accompanied by voice-overs (Moore and Cadeau, 1985: 218). The voice-over analysis found

⁴ Much of the variance among voice-over findings result from some studies including only advertising with voice-overs in their sample and other studies including all advertisements. Also, some studies include public service announcements and station promotions in the sample, others do not. And in some instances, especially before recording became de rigueur, animated voices have been confused with human voices.

that 88.5% of those advertisements with voice-overs used male voices. This distribution was constant over all dayparts. One of the examined voice-over categories, "commercially sponsored public service announcements," revealed that 96% of the voice-overs were male (Moore and Cadeau, 1985: 218). The findings confirmed the 1984 report by the Alliance of Cinema Television and Radio Actors (ACTRA), which had found male voices in 88% of voice-overs.

A MediaWatch study (1984) reported an increase in the number of female voice-overs (Table 2.2). However, they noted in their report that, due to extremely small samples, the findings were spurious and advised discretion in interpretation of their findings (MediaWatch, 1984: 119). A decrease in the number of male voice-overs seldom translates into an increase in female voice-overs. Most frequently, a decrease in male voice-overs is accompanied by an increase in the number of jingles, talking toilets and other personified appliances, animals and objects (Lovdal, 1989).

Male characters continued to dominate voice-over roles in the 1980s, with Bretl and Cantor (1988), Gilly (1988), Ferrante, Haynes and Kingsley (1988) and Lovdal (1989), reporting the continued inequitable representation of females (Table 2.2). In the 1990s, studies by Craig (1990) and Mazzella (1992) arrived at findings similar to those reported in the early 1970s (Table 2.2). Craig (1990) analyzed voice-overs in 2,209 advertisements in all daytime and evening dayparts on weekdays and weekends. The study found that male voices were employed in 86% of voice-overs in weekday daytime advertisements, 91% of primetime voice-overs and 100% of those on the weekend (Craig, 1990: 207).

The voice-over analyses provided other noteworthy contributions in addition to the findings reported above. In advertising in which females do the voice-overs, the voice-overs are addressed to children, babies, appliances and animals, whereas male voice-overs are almost always directed to the audience or to everyone in general (Lovdal, 1989: 721). One study reported that when females were used in voice-overs they were used primarily in the promotion of "body" products (Craig, 1990: 207).

Some studies found that on-camera females were accompanied by male voice-overs while advertising with female voice-overs almost always had male on-camera characters. The consequence, so well described in Pyke and Stewart (1974), is that males dominate all the advertising, since male characters always appear on or off-camera or both; on the other hand, female characters are seen and/or heard in only half or less of the advertisements (Pyke and Stewart, 1974: 68).

Other studies have reported that from 1972 until 1988 the number of advertisements with voice-overs had increased by 22%, with the percentage of female voice-overs remaining constant (Cantor, 1978; Gilly, 1988; Lovdal, 1989: 720). This is reflected in the accumulated findings which indicate that in the 1990s, as in the 1970s, female voices are heard in only one of every ten voice-over roles (Table 2.2).

Concern with the unequal female representation in voice-overs, in part, relates to the extra authority and empowerment voice-overs extend to males (Courtney and Whipple, 1974). The male voice of authority and expertise is reminiscent of the not so distant past, when women were marginalized by authorities who were male. According to television advertising voice-overs, males are still "the voices of authority" (Bretl and Cantor,

1988: 605). This "extension of male authority through voice-overs assists in perpetuating the stereotypes in advertisements in addition to selling the advertised products" (Mamay and Simpson, 1981: 1231).

In sum, the above-mentioned findings indicate that television advertising voice-overs remain a primary mechanism by which females are excluded from equal roles in television advertisements. Hence, the complaints made by Mannes and Greer are as valid in the 1990s as they were in the 1970s.

Gender and On-Camera Characters

As with the voice-overs, the persistent over-representation of male characters in on-camera television advertising was another source of criticism and resulted in similar complaints. Further examples of these complaints were heard in 1969 by the Royal Commission on the Status of Women (RCSW). The Commission was told that Canadian women were angry about and tired of the exclusion of women practised by radio and television broadcasters (RCSW, 1970). For example, in 1973 the Toronto Women's Media Committee (TWMC) complained that the persistent exclusion of females from work in television advertising was the result of male actors being given almost all the on-camera television advertising roles.

Analyses of gender in on-camera roles are more complicated and more difficult than voice-over analyses. Many advertisements have one, two or even more on-camera characters and can have groups or crowds of characters; the occasional advertisement does not have any on-camera characters. Approximately half of the studies analyze only one on-camera character, the one deemed most prominent in the advertisement, or only the character who promotes or demonstrates the advertised product (Table

2.3). Other analyses have included each recognizable character who is on-camera for more than three seconds or those who are on-camera and speak one line of dialogue. Studies do not usually include all of the on-camera characters, especially those in crowd scenes, nor are the cats, dogs and other animated or personified objects included in gender analyses.

TABLE 2.3. GENDER AND ON-CAMERA CHARACTERS IN TELEVISION ADVERTISING 1972 - 1994

Author	Year	Category	Primetime		Average		N
			F	M	F	M	
Screen Actors Guild	1973	Speaking principals	na%	na%	37%	63%	340
O'Kelly	1974	All characters	na	na	33	67	347
Silverstein & Silverstein	1974	Primary characters	49	51	na	na	496
McArthur & Resko	1975	Primary characters	30	70	43	57	299
Culley & Bennett	1976	Characters	42	58	na	na	395
Halpern & Ethier	1977	On-camera characters	50	50	50	50	211
Caron	1978	On-camera characters	na	na	52	48	2,041
O'Donnell & O'Donnell	1978	Primary characters	50	50	na	na	367
Schneider & Schneider	1979	On-camera spokespersons	45	55	48	52	147
MediaWatch	1984	All characters	na	na	47	53	293
Bretl & Cantor	1988	Primary characters	46	54	na	na	347
Ferrante & Haynes	1988	On-camera representatives	na	na	43	57	326
Gilly	1988	Characters	na	na	56	44	301
Craig	1990	Primary character	48	52	45	55	1,431
Signorielli	1994	Major characters	na	na	46	54	541

Source: See *Bibliography*

This section examines the presence or representation of gender among characters that do on-camera product promotion and their gender in relation to both products and daypart. In addition, it reviews the findings of the gender of on-camera characters in general. As previously noted, the various studies reported a variety of methods and definitions for examining the gender of on-camera characters in order to produce indicators of gender representation. The U.S. Screen Actor's study (1974) found almost twice as many males as females had on-camera roles as principals and O'Kelly (1974) found less than one female for every two male characters in the advertising accompanying children's programming (Table 2.3). Though their

approaches may have differed, many of the studies came to similar conclusions about the lack of equitable gender representation in on-camera roles.

A study that examined characters who appeared on-camera for at least three seconds or spoke one line of dialogue in 359 primetime CBS network television advertisements found a significant over-representation of male characters (Culley and Bennett, 1976: 161). Similarly, a study of 199 advertisements reported that more than 66% of the characters seen on-camera in primetime were male (McArthur and Resko, 1975: 209). A study of CBC, CTV and TVOntario (formerly OECA-TV) advertisements, promotions and programming found the female to male ratio of on-camera characters fairly equal in 2,662 advertisements (Pyke and Stewart, 1974: 68). The Silverstein and Silverstein (1974) study also found near equal gender representation of on-camera characters.

By the 1980s the proportion of female representation on-camera had increased. One study reported equal numbers of advertisements that had only female characters or only male characters (MediaWatch, 1984: 121). Similarly, the study found that female and male product representatives were equally likely to appear in advertising. A larger study found that 46% of the primary characters were female (Bretl and Cantor, 1988: 600), and a decrease in the size of the majority of males as primary characters and on-camera speaking characters (Table 2.3). Ferrante et al. (1988) meanwhile found that while the majority of on-camera characters were male, it was a much smaller majority than seen in the 1970s (Table 2.3).

Overall, male characters were still a significant majority of primary characters (Craig, 1990: 203). Riffe (1993) found that in the advertisements for televised sporting events, that a substantial majority of all the

on-camera characters and on-camera characters with spoken lines were male. Similarly, Signorielli, McLeod and Healy (1994) reported that their analysis of advertisements on MTV,⁵ found that the portrayals were similar to those seen in advertisements that accompanied regular programming, and that the majority of on-camera characters were male (Table 2.3).

In a comparison of U.S. and Australian television advertisements, Gilly (1988) found that males dominated the U.S. advertisements. Fewer gender role differences were apparent in the Australian advertisements. Gilly concluded that the study's findings reflect that "Australian advertisers have apparently been responsive to women's organizations' recommendations and have adopted self-regulations limiting the use of women's bodies and sexual stereotypes to sell products" (Gilly, 1988: 83). However, the findings in recent North American studies (Signorielli et al., 1994; Riffe, 1993; and Craig, 1990) indicate the possibility of a backward shift toward a male majority on-camera.

Gender and Product Representatives

Many of the studies operationalized the on-camera character deemed central to the promotion of the advertised product. Critics have said that while slightly more than half of the population is female, far less than half of product representatives are female (Table 2.4).⁶ The analyses of product representatives, for example, revealed that most characters promoting the advertised products were male and only 33% of them were female (NOW, 1972). Another study, meanwhile, found only 35% of primetime adver-

⁵ MTV or music television is Viacom's specialty music video channel.

⁶ The 1991 census found that females comprised 50.7% of the Canadian population (Statistics Canada, 1991).

tisements had female product representatives (Courtney and Whipple, 1974).

An increase in the number of female product representatives was found by two Canadian studies conducted in the late 1970s (Caron, 1978 and Klassen, 1977). They reported finding almost equal numbers of female and male product representatives. Caron's (1978) study of CBC and CTV advertisements found a particularly high proportion of females as product representatives (Table 2.4). A 1981 study reported that generally, females and males were equitably represented as product representatives (Knill et al., 1981). MediaWatch (1984) also reported that on average, females and males were equitably represented as product representatives (MediaWatch, 1984: 121-122).

TABLE 2.4, GENDER AND PRODUCT REPRESENTATIVES IN TELEVISION ADVERTISING 1972 - 1994

Author	Year	Category	Primetime		Average		N
			F	M	F	M	
Dominick & Rauch	1972	Product representatives	40%	60%	na%	na%	523
NOW - Washington	1972	Product representatives	33	67	44	56	2,750
Courtney & Whipple	1974	Product representatives	35	65	46	54	414
Klassen	1977	Product representatives	50	50	60	40	211
Caron	1978	Product representatives	na	na	49	51	774
O'Donnell & O'Donnell	1978	Product representatives	49	51	na	na	214
Knill et al.	1981	Product representatives	48	52	55	45	1,515
Livingstone & Green	1986	Central figures	25	75	na	na	228
Lovdal	1989	Product representatives	51	49	na	na	230

Source: See Bibliography

Gender and Product Representatives and Daypart

Several studies have examined the gender of the product representative in relation to the daypart in which the advertisement appeared. Analyses of advertisements between 7:00am and 1:00am, for example, discovered that a significant majority of product representatives were male (Table 2.4). In the daytime dayparts, 7:00am to 4:30pm, one study found that as many as 46% of product representatives were female (Butler, 1980: 72).

Analyses of product representatives in the evening and primetime reported that as few as 33% were female and the majority were male (Table 2.4). Courtney and Whipple and the Toronto Women's Media Committee (TWMC) (1974) reported that males dominated primetime and generally were twice as likely as females to be seen as product representatives, except in daytime dayparts when females outnumbered males (Courtney and Whipple, 1974: 114).⁷

Caron's (1978) study found almost half of the product representative roles in all dayparts were played by females (Table 2.4). O'Donnell examined only primetime (8:00pm-10:00pm) and reported findings almost identical to those of Caron's combined daypart findings (Table 2.4). O'Donnell and O'Donnell (1978), examined primetime product representatives and found a little more than half were female (Table 2.4).

Meanwhile, another study reported equal numbers of female and male product representatives in primetime and an overall majority of female product representatives (Klassen, 1977). Two years later, Schneider and Schneider (1979) reported an increase in the number of female product spokespersons (see Table 2.3). This, concluded the authors, "indicated that marketers and society have begun to accept the changing role of women" (Schneider and Schneider, 1979: 79).

The trend continued into the 1980s with one study (Knill et al., 1981) reporting that 72% of product representatives in daytime dayparts were female and that in primetime more than 50% were male (Table 2.4). Hiemstra (1983), reported that in primetime, 66% of all the characters were

⁷ Note, primetime is a precise time in the broadcast industry; however, primetime in the research literature is almost as varied as the number of research endeavours. This thesis will, unless otherwise stated, use the various researchers' definitions of primetime.

male. Six years later, however, Lovdal (1989) who examined primetime advertising, found half (51%) of the product representatives were female (Table 2.4).

Craig reported that 80% of the primary characters in weekend time slots were male, while in weeknight primetime, 9:00pm to 11:00pm, only a slight majority of product representatives or primary characters were male (Table 2.4). During weekday dayparts, however, the occurrence of male product representatives was only 40% of all characters (Craig, 1990: 203).

These findings suggest that the representation of gender among product representatives had, especially in the late 1970s and 1980s, become more equitable, and that females were almost as likely as males to promote products in television advertising (Table 2.4). A persistent overrepresentation of males, however, is still found in the advertisements with children's programming and sporting events, and particularly in weekend advertising (O'Kelly, 1974; Craig, 1990, and Riffe, 1993).

Gender and Characters and Product

Some studies analyzed the gender of the product representatives with the type of product. For example, a Toronto study reported that 75% of the advertisements with female product representatives "were for products used in the bathroom or kitchen" (Courtney and Whipple, 1974: 113). A similar analysis (Pyke and Stewart, 1974: 67) found that male product representatives appeared in all the advertisements except those advertisements for cosmetics and pet food and program promotions; females dominated in those advertisements.

One study reported a definite correlation between value and gender, with the number of male portrayals increasing as the value of the advertised product increased -- males promoted expensive items while inexpensive items were promoted by females (McArthur and Resko, 1975: 212). A 1976 study reported the same, that the majority of all on-camera characters in advertisements for higher-priced goods and services were male (Culley and Bennett, 1976: 163).

Further examples of this phenomenon were found by Cirkseña and Butler (1978) in a study of 1,000 television advertisements. They found only male product representatives in 62% of the business advertisements, in 77% of vehicle advertisements and in 90% of alcohol advertisements (cited in Butler and Paisley, 1980: 75). The study found that female product representatives appeared in 77% of hygiene and 61% of household product advertisements (Butler and Paisley, 1980: 75).

The U.S. Screen Actor's Guild, concerned with employment equity for its members, reported that even advertisements of products intended for female use were dominated by on-camera males and male product representatives (Marecek et al., 1978: 160). A 1978 study found that 86% of the advertisements for cleaners and household items had female product representatives, while 81% of non-domestic products used male representatives (O'Donnell and O'Donnell, 1978: 158).

The findings in the 1970-1975 studies strongly supported the critics' claim that females were under-represented and that males dominated all on-camera roles in television advertisements. There were indications in the mid-1970s of a trend toward more equitable gender representation among product representatives in advertising (Table 2.4). The findings of subse-

quent studies, however, indicate that for the most part, males continue to dominate television advertisements and that on-camera females "are still typecast" (Knill et al., 1981: 505). Hence the findings in the 1980s and 1990s are not unlike those reported in 1974; male product representatives dominated and female on-camera characters and product representatives were invariably accompanied by a male voice-over, "the last word as it were"; male on-camera speakers on the other hand were frequently seen to stand alone, without a voice-over (Pyke and Stewart, 1974: 67).

The social roles of on-camera characters in television advertising are, as discussed in Chapter One and according to Jeffres (1986), Gerbner (1982), Tan (1981) and Bandura (1963), a source of influential messages to the viewer, particularly children. The characterization of social roles in television advertising is the locus of much gender stereotyping and may be a stronger influence on some groups in society than other groups, for example, those who have low self-esteem, some female cohorts, the less advantaged, the less educated and young impressionable children (MacBeth Williams, 1986; Gerbner, 1972).

Capturing the optimum amount of information with regard to social roles in television advertising analyses of gender portrayal requires that categories be precisely identified and defined. Advertisements portray, for example, characters as decorative objects, professionals, models, unemployed, authorities, or characters neglectful of children and family. Studies have identified and examined these roles from a variety of perspectives, frequently defining the roles in ways unique to each particular study. The majority of analyses, however, have concentrated on family roles, employment and occupational roles and the roles of decorative and sexual objects.

This thesis identifies family roles, as do the more contemporary studies, as the portrayals depicting apparent marital status and involvement with a spouse, partner, parent or offspring. This study looks first at gender roles in relation to occupational portrayals. The focus will then shift to the family roles of parent, spouse, partner, homemaker and housewife which do not have monetary remuneration.⁶ Finally, a commentary on those roles which are neither unpaid-family nor paid employment, the portrayal of characters in roles as decorative model or sex object, will conclude this section.

Gender and Occupation

Television advertising, according to a 1972 study, portrayed females in outdated social roles and most frequently characterized them either in low-status occupational or unemployed roles (Dominick and Rauch, 1972: 264). They reported that advertising portrayed almost four times as many male as female characters in occupational roles. More than half of the employed females were in service occupations, with seven of every ten employed females in jobs of a subservient nature such as maid, cook, dancer, clerk and stewardess (Dominick and Rauch, 1972: 263).

Dominick and Rauch (1972) also found that males were not portrayed as educational workers or blue collar workers, but rather, were over represented in professional, professional athlete and business roles (Table 2.5). Similarly, the NOW (1972) studies found males over-represented in high-status occupations and only one female for every four males in occupational roles (NOW, 1972). The New York NOW study also found that females

⁶ Only one (Caron) of the many studies reviewed provides an explanation of how the coding decisions for family, wife, mother, father, husband or housewife were achieved.

were portrayed in low-status occupations such as cleaners, cooks, servers, and in household and domestic employment (Hennessee and Nicholson, 1972: 12). Courtney and Whipple (1974) also reported an over-representation of male characters in business and management roles. Only a few females were portrayed in occupational roles which were for the most part low-paid and very unrepresentative of real life (Courtney and Whipple, 1974: 114).

TABLE 2.5, GENDER AND OCCUPATION IN TELEVISION ADVERTISING 1972-1988

Author	Year	Wage Earning		Service Sector		Prof/Business		Other	
		F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
Dominick & Rauch	1972	22%	86%	19%	0%	2%	12%	31%	74%
NOW - Washington	1972	22	95	5	16	2	17	2	15
Courtney & Whipple	1974	52	80	55	19	8	19	25	17
Culley & Bennett	1976	55	85	6	2	6	10	48	73
Klassen	1977	22	86	na	na	13	27	7	30
Caron	1978	15	51	na	na	na	na	32	31
Maracek et al	1978	25	75	8	9	6	19	66	71
Scheibe	1979	18	44	na	na	3	15	na	na
Bretl & Cantor	1988	47	73	na	na	11	21	9	14
Ferrante & Haynes	1988	44	77	3	0	3	16	41	60
Gilly	1988	25	52	na	na	5	16	na	na

Source: See Bibliography - rows do not total

O'Kelly (1974) studied advertisements accompanying children's television programming in the U.S. and found that 67% of all characters were male and that the majority of them, 86%, were portrayed in occupational roles. The same study found few males in family roles (Table 2.6). Conversely, the study reported a small proportion of employed females, with a vast majority of the female characters portrayed in family roles or in unpaid homemaker occupations (O'Kelly, 1974: 723).

A 1975 examination of advertisements in children's programming found, as reported by O'Kelly (1974) and Busby (1974), that while television portrays males in a variety of occupations, it portrays females in limited employment roles (Verna, 1975). The lack of female occupational portray-

als was, according to Verna, evidence that "television advertising directed toward children contains even more misrepresentation, distortion and biased images than the images seen by primetime viewers" (Verna, 1975: 308).

In Canadian research, findings were similar with a large Ontario study finding that the vast majority of females were portrayed as unemployed (Pyke and Stewart, 1974: 67). It was noted that the findings confirmed their research assumption that televised portrayals of females projected a profile that was not work-oriented or cognitive (Pyke and Stewart, 1974: 67). The report concluded that "the television medium is reactionary in that it fails to reflect society and that it portrays females in an even more denigrated fashion than is true of the culture" (Pyke and Stewart, 1974: 68). One study found that almost all male characters and only a few females (8%) were portrayed in occupational roles (Silverstein and Silverstein, 1974: 97). McArthur and Resko (1975) had similar findings, reporting that a large majority of males were portrayed in occupations while only a few females were (Table 2.5).

Small changes in portrayals were found and reported by researchers. Culley and Bennett (1976), for example, found that relative to previous studies, there was an increase in the number of females portrayed in occupational roles (Table 2.5). The study also found, however, that females were portrayed in a limited number of roles; for example, as teachers, cooks, maids, models, clerks, servants and stewardesses (Culley and Bennett, 1976: 164).

One study reported misrepresentations in occupational portrayals with very few females in occupational roles (Cirksena and Butler (1978). The study noted a "distortion between the television occupations and real

life occupations and that the distortion was positively exaggerated in favour of men" (Cirksena and Butler, 1978; cited in Butler and Paisley, 1980: 79). A study of 1,168 television advertisements found that three-quarters of characters in occupational portrayals were males, and conversely, three-quarters of those without occupational roles were female characters (Maracek, Piliavin, Fitzsimmons, Krogh, Leader and Trudell, 1978). Males were found in eight highly ranked occupational categories while females were found dominant only in clerical occupations (Marecek et al., 1978: 162).

Scheibe's 1979 study of more than 10,000 characters in television advertisements reported that less than one-fifth of female characters were seen in occupational roles (Table 2.5). The study also noted that male characters were portrayed in twice as many occupations as female characters (Scheibe, 1979: 24).

Caron (1978) found more than 50% of males and less than 15% of females were in occupational roles (Table 2.5). Similarly, Schneider and Schneider (1979) found few females and too many males in employment roles (Table 2.6). They noted, however, that there were indications that television portrayals were moving closer to real employment pictures (Schneider and Schneider, 1979: 82).

A 1980 study reported that male characters continued to dominate occupational role portrayals while females were under-represented, and the females who were employed were in few occupations (Knill et al., 1981). This was not unlike the findings reported by Cabellero and Solomon (1984), who in a three-year study, discovered a negative trend in female occupational portrayals. In 1977, 15% of female characters were portrayed in

occupational roles, but by 1980 only 10% of them were (Caballero and Solomon, 1984: 100).

One study that examined occupational roles and daypart reported that 33% of females and 67% of males were seen in occupational roles in evening dayparts (Harris and Stobart, 1986: 157-160). In the daytime dayparts, however, only 15% of females were in occupational roles. Females who were portrayed in occupational roles were reported to be in stereotyped and traditional employment roles (Harris and Stobart, 1986: 163). The findings were substantiated by a 1988 study that reported most male characters were employed and most females unemployed (Ferrante et al., 1988).

Bretl and Cantor (1988) reported more gender equity in occupational portrayals in 1988 than had been reported by the 1972 studies (Table 2.5).

Fewer males and more than twice as many female characters were found portrayed in occupational roles than in 1972. As well, employed female characters were reported in a wider variety of occupations (Bretl and Cantor, 1988: 600). Almost twice as many male characters as females were found portrayed in high-status occupations (Table 2.5).

An analysis of television advertisements in three countries found U.S. advertisements more likely to portray females unemployed and/or in family roles than were Mexican and Australian advertisements (Gilly, 1988: 83). In the Australian advertisements, the majority of female characters were portrayed at work and in a wide range of occupations, with many females portrayed in professional, executive and management roles (Gilly, 1988). Female characters in both U.S. and Mexican advertisements were not portrayed as professionals or business executives; only 5% of employed females were portrayed in white collar positions (Gilly 1988: 82). These

findings were consistent with those of Bretl and Cantor (1988) and Lovdal (1989) who found three times as many males as females portrayed in occupational roles. Employed females were portrayed in only one-third the number of occupations that male characters were; females were seldom seen in professional or high-status occupational roles (Lovdal, 1989: 721).

In a 1990 study, males were found more frequently portrayed in occupational roles on weekend television, and overall, males were still more likely than females to have occupational roles (Craig, 1992: 208). A 1993 study also reported that males were most often portrayed in occupational roles while females were most often seen in dependent and unemployed roles (Furnham and Bitar, 1993: 308).

Occupational portrayals illustrate that television advertising misrepresents females in occupational roles, and negatively stereotypes them by portraying them in low-skilled occupations. The findings show that only 10% to 25% of all female characters were characterized as part of the labour force.⁹ In the majority of depictions of employed females, they were portrayed in subservient and dead-end occupational roles. Male characters, on the other hand, were over-represented in the labour force, and concentrated in a few high-status occupations, relative to real employment situations. The occupational findings reveal the stereotyping that was the concern of the CRTC Task Force (1979).

Gender and Family and Employment Roles

The previous section examined occupational portrayals; this section examines family role portrayals. The two categories are not completely

⁹ The 1991 Canadian census reported that females comprised 45.6% of the labour force (Statistics Canada, 1991).

independent of one another since some studies have categorized parenting and housewife roles as occupations. For example, Dominick and Rauch (1972) defined husband and father characterizations as occupational roles. Many studies would first code the character's occupational role. If there were no occupational role, the family role information was captured. Bretl and Cantor (1988) for instance, only coded family role if there was no occupational role. Finally, some studies examined only the character's primary or central role.

An analysis of primary roles in television advertising revealed that 20% of all females were characterized in roles as wives and/or mothers. (Dominick and Rauch, 1972: 264). The same study analyzed occupational roles and found a further 56% of females were categorized as "housewives" and 14% of males in husband and father roles (Dominick and Rauch, 1972: 263). Similar findings were reported in other studies of the early 1970s; for example, a NOW (1972) study found that 43% of females were portrayed as housewives or mothers (Hennessee and Nicholson, 1972: 48). A study of Canadian network advertising found 55% of females were characterized as mothers and housewives and 5% as girl-friends (Bystydzienski and Rose, cited in Malloch, 1973: 11). McArthur and Resko (1974) found there were 34% more females than males in family roles, and Courtney and Whipple (1974) reported an outstanding over-representation of females and an under-representation of males in family roles (Table 2.6).

Gender stereotyping and family role portrayals in children's television were examined by O'Kelly (1974) and Verna (1975). More than one-third of the female characters in the advertisements were characterized as "housewives" or mothers (O'Kelly, 1974). The same study found more than

70% of the male characters were employed, but only 14% in family roles (O'Kelly, 1974: 723). Together, the advertising in children's programming revealed an over-representation of males except in family roles where males were under-represented. Females, however, were found to be over-represented in family roles, while being a minority in all other categories (O'Kelly, 1974; Verna, 1975). The findings, said Verna, indicate that "Saturday morning television advertising directed toward children - contains more misrepresentation, distortion and biased images than that seen by primetime viewers" (Verna, 1975: 308).

TABLE 2.6. GENDER, FAMILY AND EMPLOYMENT ROLES IN TELEVISION ADVERTISING 1972-1990

Author	Year	Family Role		Employment	
		F	M	F	M
Dominick & Rauch	1972	56%	14%	22%	86%
NOW - Washington	1972	78	5	22	95
Courtney & Whipple	1974	43	12	52	80
O'Kelly	1974	35	14	na	70
McArthur & Resko	1974	51	36	11	89
Culley & Bennett	1976	45	15	15	85
Klassen	1977	78	14	22	86
Caron	1978	47	18	15	51
Maracek et al.	1978	na	na	25	75
Scheibe	1979	21	na	18	44
Schneider & Schneider	1979	41	21	18	48
Manstead & McColloch	1981	68	10	na	na
Bretl & Cantor	1988	53	27	47	73
Ferrante & Haynes	1988	54	23	46	77
Gilly	1988	na	na	25	52
Lovdal	1989	na	na	25	75
Craig	1990	27	12	na	na

Source: See Bibliography - rows do not total

Caron (1978) operationalized family role so that it captured only characters that were not portrayed as employed or in occupational roles. Family roles were further defined by the character's participation in nurturing or helping activities. Those seen serving a meal to a family or partner, for example, or helping a family member or doing children's laundry were

coded in a family role (Caron, 1978: 180). Caron (1978) reported that 18% of male and 47% of female characters were in family roles (Table 2.6).

One study noted the limitations of female roles and concluded that "the picture of females by television advertisements remains unchanged, a woman's role is with the family and in the home" (O'Donnell and O'Donnell, 1978: 158). A 1979 study reported that "women were depicted in more narrowly defined roles than males," with few males and most females portrayed in family roles (Schneider and Schneider, 1979: 83). Scheibe's study of 6,262 advertisements found fewer females in family and home-maker roles than reported by previous studies (Table 2.6). They also reported a near absence of unmarried, single males, and found that single males were not portrayed in activities such as cleaning, cooking, caring for their surroundings or in family roles (Scheibe, 1979: 24). The study also found an overall decrease in the number of males portrayed in home and family roles (Scheibe, 1979: 24).

Manstead and McColloch (1981), using Caron's definition of family role, found more females and fewer males in family roles than reported by Caron (Table 2.6). One study categorized female characters into three roles: housekeeping, maternal, and aesthetic, reporting that 52% of the females were portrayed in parental roles and 21% in homemaking roles (Mamay and Simpson, 1981: 1224). They found, as had Caron (1981), that more than two-thirds of females were in family roles and there was little diversity in the role of males (Mamay and Simpson, 1981: 1226). The study found that "the advertisements not only promote products but they perpetuate harmful stereotypes" (Mamay and Simpson, 1981: 1231).

One study reported that more than half of the females were in family roles while a significant number of females were portrayed without any categorical role (Cabellero and Solomon, 1984: 102). The authors suggested that advertisers seemed to be countering criticism of female role portrayals in advertisements by not providing any identifiable social characteristics (Caballero and Solomon, 1984).

Bretl and Cantor (1988) found an increased number of male characters portrayed in family roles, though females were still twice as likely to be portrayed in family roles (Table 2.6). Another 1988 study reported a significant increase in the number of males portrayed in family roles, but found the percentage of females in family roles to be twice that of male characters (Ferrante et al., 1988). Gilly (1988), however, reported that few males were depicted in family roles. Instead, males were portrayed in autonomous roles, while females were portrayed in roles relative to others, such as in family roles (Gilly, 1988: 83).

Craig (1990) paid special attention to males and to daypart (Craig, 1990: 201). The study found more characters without families, portrayed in autonomous roles, and a smaller proportion of both males and females in family roles than were found in other studies (Table 2.6). In primetime, only 12% of males and 32% of females were found portrayed in family roles. The study further reported that, overall, only nine percent of males were portrayed in family roles and that males were least likely to be portrayed in family roles in weekend advertisements and most likely (17%) to be portrayed in these roles during weekday daytime dayparts (Craig, 1990: 204).

As the studies illustrate, family roles are not reasonably represented in television advertising. Females are over-represented while males are

under-represented in family portrayals. Some findings indicate a trend toward character depictions without categorical social roles. The dominant portrayal of females is in family roles without which they might be, and are, portrayed as "nothing." The analyses of family roles also reveal male stereotypes: male characters who lack the skills of daily life, do not have families, or do not care about family responsibilities (Courtney and Whipple, 1980: 10).

Sexual and Decorative Roles

If female characters are not portrayed in family, occupational or "nothing" roles, they are most likely to be depicted as decorative or sexual objects. The portrayal of females in roles as sexual lure or decorative object was, according to the CRTC Task Force (1982), "the least realistic and most offensive of the stereotypes" (CRTC, 1982: 2).

The major criteria used by researchers to identify a role as that of sex object or decorative model, were styles of clothing, the revealing aspects or lack of clothing and the absence of any other role. Generally, characters identified as sexual or decorative objects do not speak or are relatively inactive (Caron 1978: 124). Studies have reported difficulty with operationalizing and defining the role and with low inter-coder reliability. One study, for instance, that found 32% of female characters portrayed in roles as decorative or sexual objects, reported difficulties in coding and only achieved 85% reliability associated with sex object role findings (Dominick and Rauch, 1972: 264).

Another 1972 study reported that 17% of females were portrayed in roles as sex objects (Hennessee and Nicholson, 1972: 48). In 1973, a

Canadian study found 18% of females in roles as "seductive sex objects" commenting that "the advertisements in the analysis were, representative of a male viewpoint, where males are subjects and females the objects" (Bystydzienski and Rose, cited in Malloch, 1973: 11). Culley and Bennett (1976) found only 5% of female characters in roles as decorative or sexual objects. This was a significant decrease from the 18% to 32% reported by previous studies. However, in 1978, Caron reported that among females not in family or occupational roles, 30% were in sex object or decorative roles (Caron, 1978: 172).

One study categorized female characters in three types of roles, one of which was considered an "aesthetic" role, a category for females interested only in their appearance. This analysis found that 26.7% of characters seen in the aesthetic role were used in the advertisements as "sex objects" to entice or to attract attention (Mamay and Simpson, 1981: 1224). MediaWatch (1984) did not operationalize the sex object role but did analyze categories of dress. They reported that 16% of females were partially clothed or nude, and 67% were depicted in inappropriate, revealing or provocative clothing. Only 17% of female characters were portrayed wearing conventional clothing (Media Watch, 1985: 130).

Portrayals of females as sex objects have persisted, according to a number of studies reported in the 1990s. A 1990 analysis of 1,431 characters found that 17% of the females in weekend advertisements were portrayed as sex objects or models (Craig, 1990: 204). Two studies reported that female characters were seen wearing less clothing and had fewer speaking roles both on and off-camera in weekend advertisements than in primetime (Craig, 1992: 198; Riffe, 1993). An analysis of MTV advertise-

ments also found a large proportion of female characters in roles as sex objects or models. Females were portrayed wearing much less clothing, and more revealing, skimpier clothing than they did in regular television advertisements (Signorielli et al., 1994: 99). The researchers commented that "despite MTV's status as a cutting edge genre of television, their advertising persists in using negative images in their advertisements and to perpetuate stereotypes of women" (Signorielli et al., 1994: 99).

Gender and Settings

Analyses of the characters' settings or on-camera locations are by themselves informative. In addition they serve to confirm findings of other categories; for example, the findings of characters depicted in kitchen and bathroom settings support the findings of characters in housekeeping roles. The portrayal of a disproportionate number of females in kitchen or bathroom settings was one of the concerns addressed by the Task Force on Sex-Role Stereotyping (CRTC, 1982).

Studies conducted in the early 1970s examined the settings of characters, and found that a third of female characters were located in kitchen and bathroom settings, some in indeterminate settings and an inordinately small representation of females in occupational or business settings (Dominick and Rauch, 1972: 262). In summary, the study noted that according to the settings used in advertising, "woman's place is in the home," and particularly in the kitchen (Dominick and Rauch, 1972: 263).

A 1974 study of gender and settings analyzed settings while controlling for advertisements of household products, and still found significantly more females than males portrayed in home settings (Silverstein and Silver-

stein, 1974: 87). The same study also reported a number of females who were not in a determinable setting, particularly in advertisements promoting personal cleansing products. The report suggested this indicated a relationship between the increase in "nowhere settings" and a decrease in females depicted in home settings (Silverstein and Silverstein, 1974: 87).

Other studies, for example, Culley and Bennett (1976) and Schneider and Schneider (1979) reported almost identical findings of character settings as those reported by Dominick and Rauch (1972). The O'Donnell (1978), Caron (1978) and MediaWatch (1984) studies all found three times as many female as male characters in home settings, but at the same time reported small increases in the number of male characters in home settings (Table 2.7).

TABLE 2.7. GENDER AND SETTINGS IN TELEVISION ADVERTISING 1972 - 1993

Author	Year	In/at Home		Public/Business		Outside/Leisure		Nowhere/Other	
		F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M
Dominick & Rauch	1972	39%	14%	7%	44%	23%	46%	31%	26%
Silverstein & Silverstein	1974	10	12	14	24	na	na	na	na
Culley & Bennett	1976	34	21	6	8	17	21	16	16
Caron	1978	48	18	15	51	8	23	29	7
Schneider & Schneider	1979	34	22	27	32	19	30	20	16
O'Donnell & O'Donnell	1978	42	13	na	na	na	na	na	na
Cabellero & Solomon	1984	36	21	13	18	12	21	na	na
MediaWatch	1984	48	44	na	na	na	na	na	na
Harris & Stobart	1986	54	39	8	24	16	28	9	10
Bretl & Cantor	1988	37	30	na	na	30	43	na	na
Ferrante et al.	1988	30	15	13	25	26	26	31	34
Gilly (US)	1988	34	23	4	15	20	14	42	48
Lovdal	1989	64	36	na	na	na	na	36	64
Mazzella, Durkin et al.	1992	36	20	19	23	9	10	36	47
Furnham & Bitar	1993	50	14	18	25	9	16	24	46

Source: See Bibliography - rows do not total

Several of the studies concentrated on home and public settings of all characters while others focused only on the settings of female characters. For example, the studies conducted by NOW (1972), Courtney and Whipple (1974), Pyke and Stewart (1974), Culley and Bennett (1976) and Maracek et al. (1978), found the majority of females were concentrated in kitchen

and bathroom settings. Two Canadian studies, Caron (1978) and MediaWatch (1984), similarly found that almost half of the female characters were in home settings (Table 2.7).

Studies from the 1980s found the number of male characters portrayed in home settings increased while fewer males were found in occupational settings (Table 2.7). It is possible that television advertisers were finding it profitable to give males a little more presence in the home. Meanwhile, recent studies indicate that today there are as many, and possibly more, female characters portrayed in home settings than in 1972 (Table 2.7).

It had been anticipated that as the findings of females in occupational roles increased, the number of females found portrayed in those settings would increase and the number found portrayed in home settings would decrease. This has not occurred: in fact, recent studies, Craig (1990) and Lovdal (1989), provide strong support for the persistent stereotype, that females do not have a place in the occupational and business settings of television advertising (Table 2.7).

The finding that characters, most of them female, were located in neutral or "nowhere" settings was first noted by Dominick and Rauch (1972), and this was later reported to be on the increase (Silverstein and Silverstein, 1974). The incidence of females in indeterminate settings has continued to increase: for example, Cabellero and Solomon (1984) and Furnham and Bitar (1993) reported a significant number of female characters in "nowhere" settings. The studies concluded that females previously located in kitchen and bathroom settings, were now found in "nowhere or neutral settings."

Goffman (1979: 65) contended that "carefully selected settings of advertisements create a pseudo-reality that is better than real." The study findings demonstrate that the world of television advertisements is overburdened with males who do not have a home or who do not go home, females who stay home and/or who are unemployed and an increasing number of characters set in some kind of "pseudo nowhere."

Gender and Age

The CRTC Task Force on Sex-Role Stereotyping Report expressed concern that people of all ages were not properly represented in the broadcast media and that the media should portray people, particularly women, of all ages (CRTC, 1982: 29). Studies conducting analyses of portrayals with age had reported the exclusion of the older cohorts from television advertising (Table 2.8). One study, for example, found few portrayals of those aged 50 or more, and of those over age 50, the majority were male. The portrayals were "skewed toward younger aged people and in particular young females, hence older, mature females were rarely portrayed in advertising" (Dominick and Rauch, 1972: 59).

NOW (1972) reported finding that female product representatives were much younger than male product representatives and particularly so in primetime (Hennessee and Nicholson, 1972). Courtney and Whipple (1974) found the apparent age of characters more skewed toward the young than reported in 1972 (Table 2.8). They found 75% of all characters to be younger than 40, and 84% of all females to be under age 40 (Courtney and Whipple, 1974: 117).

TABLE 2.8, GENDER AND AGE IN TELEVISION ADVERTISING 1972 - 1988

Author	Year	< 35 - 35		36-50		> 50	
		F	M	F	M	F	M
Dominick & Rauch	1972	71%	44%	23%	42%	6%	14%
Caron	1978	80	43	9	23	0.4	na
Schneider & Schneider	1979	61	33	27	44	12	23
Cabellero & Soloman	1984	64	na	31	na	5	na
MediaWatch	1984	59	46	16	26	3	5
Ferrante & Haynes	1988	70	41	25	46	5	14
Gilly (US)	1988	40	20	51	62	9	18

Source: See Bibliography - rows do not total

In a study of more than 2,000 advertisements, a low incidence of older adults was found, and again it was reported that it was the older females who were "missing" (Caron, 1978: 168). Caron (1978) reported that 80% of all female characters were aged 35 years or less and that three times as many middle-aged and older males than females were represented in the advertisements. The study noted that advertising discriminated against the elderly of both genders, while promoting "youngish" females and "older" males (Caron, 1978: 171).

Hiemstra (1983) found only 8% of all television advertisements with characters appearing to be age 50 or older. Similarly, Cabellero and Solomon (1984) found a significantly large proportion of young females and few older female portrayals (Table 2.8). The study noted a trend toward even more young female characters in the advertisements which was, they said, in contradiction to a decrease in the number of young females in the population (Cabellero and Solomon, 1984: 98).¹⁰

MediaWatch (1984) reported that between 55% and 63% of female characters were aged 25 to 34 years; they also found a significant under-representation of females in older age groups. MediaWatch (1984) ac-

¹⁰ Comparison of cohorts in the Canadian population shows for example, that in 1961, 7.2% of the population was comprised of females aged 15-24 years while in 1991 that percentage had decreased to 6.9% (Statistics Canada, 1991).

knowledgeed problems in their study related to their small samples, and noted the necessity of their testing for significance with tests designed for small samples (Ferguson, 1971).

Ferrante et al. (1988) found few older females in a study of 1,480 primetime advertisements (Table 2.8). Gilly (1988) also found that females were significantly more likely than males to be portrayed as young, under 35 years of age (Table 2.8). However, Gilly (1988) found more female and males in mid-age (36-50) than most other studies (Table 2.8).

In sum, the findings show that television advertising characters are more concentrated in the 20 to 35 year age range than would be seen in the population. There are few portrayals of older characters and in particular, older females. Analyses have also found that there are more male than female portrayals of children and adolescents. The television bias in favour of the younger cohorts of society, especially 20 to 30 year old females, appears to validate the criticism put forward by the CRTC Task Force (1982).

Summary of Studies' Findings

Summarizing the findings of twenty years of research reveals that in almost all instances, advertising portrayals of women were and are, at best unreasonable. For the most part, despite a few positive changes, television advertising of stereotyped portrayals and misrepresentation of women has persisted. For example, the findings of voice-over analyses indicate the existence of a gross and systemic bias in favour of male representation. In fact, over the years, advertisements with voice-overs have increased while the proportion of female voice-overs has not. The representation of males

in voice-overs, therefore, has not diminished and may even have increased. The representation or presence of gender among on-camera characters is more equitable than that in voice-overs and became increasingly more equitable, with Craig (1990), for example reporting 45% to 48% of characters were female. Study findings indicate that by 1990 there was a more positive and equal female presence in on-camera portrayals than was the case in 1972 (Table 2.3). Some studies, however, cautioned that while advertisers are responding to criticism of inadequate female presence by having more females appear on-camera, women may still lack a voice, since more females are being seen in silent roles (Furnham and Bitar, 1993).

There were, as described by the CRTC Task Force (1982), problems with the portrayals of the on-camera females. The findings in the literature indicate that portrayals characterize females inaccurately and inadequately. These unrealistic portrayals were confirmed by studies which examined gender in relation to various facets of portrayal such as social roles, product types, settings, dress and age.

The studies' findings of gender in social role portrayals revealed a disproportionate representation of female characters without employment or occupational credentials and only a few females portrayed in professional or business roles. There was, however, an over-representation of male characters employed in high-status occupations with few males portrayed in service sector occupations or in family roles (Table 2.5).

A number of the studies found a significant number of females depicted gratuitously in sex object roles or with no apparent role, and depicted in various modes of inappropriate dress. The trend toward locating female characters in non-categorical or "nothing" roles, first noted in 1972 studies,

has, according to studies by Furnham and Bitar (1993) and Cabellero and Solomon (1984), increased.

Analyses of gender with the advertised product found, as McLuhan had observed in 1951, that females were most associated with products used to clean something, someone or themselves. The relationship between low-cost products and female portrayals reported by the NOW studies (1972) held constant over time and has been reported in studies right up to the present time. Studies which examined product price and social roles found females portrayed in only 2% of advertisements for higher-priced products, and those female characters were unemployed (Cirksena and Butler, 1978: 73).

Studies examining gender and daypart reported a negative bias toward women and their portrayals in children's programming advertising (Verna, 1975; O'Kelly, 1974). In the few instances where females were portrayed in weekend dayparts, they were reported to be scantily dressed, only partly dressed or inappropriately dressed (Craig, 1990 and Riffe, 1993).

Analyses of gender and settings confirmed the findings of social role analyses: that a bias exists in favour of portraying females in bathrooms, kitchens, or in indeterminable "nowhere" settings rather than in business, managerial, professional or executive settings. The portrayal of females in a "nowhere" setting is construed by some as just another variation of the lesser social status conferred to females in television advertising. The reported findings of females and settings persist in spite of the recommendation of the CRTC Task Force on Sex-Role Stereotyping in The Broadcast Media that television should present women in a more balanced and realistic manner (CRTC, 1982: 30).

The findings demonstrate that females of all ages, excepting young adult women, are grossly under-represented in television advertising, relative both to the population and to portrayals of male characters. Females who appear to be in the 20-35 year-of-age cohort are over-represented in television advertising. With the exception of the elderly, portrayals of all age groups of males were reported to be much more reasonable.

There is, when considering the totality of all the findings, evidence of a systematic and persistent bias in favour of males. The findings further indicate a bias that associates males of all ages with high-status occupations, expertise, and authority while disassociating them from home and family. Similarly, there is a bias in the portrayals of young females who are most frequently observed in dead-end employment situations or doing nothing in "nowhere" settings. And, in contradiction to the portrayals of males, females are over-represented in home and family roles. Numerous studies reported females who were inappropriately dressed or portrayed as sex objects; the more contemporary findings reported even larger numbers of females in revealing clothing and states of undress (Signorielli et al., 1994; Riffe, 1992; Craig, 1992).

The preponderance of the research has focused on female portrayals; hence, it appears that television portrayals of males have gone relatively unnoticed. The apparent lack of attention to male portrayals occurred, in part, because of the lack of criticism of male portrayals in television advertising, and the inherent bias of the early studies, many of which were commissioned by feminist groups. They focused only on the most contentious portrayals, the female portrayals. Despite some noted unreasonable and negative stereotyping of males, attention was given to male portrayals

only through their function as the benchmark or standard by which female portrayals were assessed (Craig, 1992: 198).

A longitudinal analysis and comparative review of studies in gender representation and portrayal in television advertising serves as an assessment of the reliability and validity of the studies. Scrutiny of the research variables and findings provides the opportunity to determine that the studies' objectives had been achieved. The review is also a measure with which to assess change, and, in addition, suggests directions for future research. Most importantly, the review here provides a foundation for the assessment of the 1984 and 1988 CRTC studies.

Analyses of representation or presence do not capture information about new or old stereotypes in gender portrayals. Studies have become more focused on the portrayals themselves rather than the "mere body counts" of female and male presence that dominated some of the early 1970s research. More contemporary studies indicate the usefulness of a multi-variable analysis of gender with role, setting, participation, clothing and even daypart. This is essential, "otherwise gender portrayal analyses fail to establish exactly what is there" (Fiske and Hartley, 1978: 21).

This chapter has examined the findings reporting "what is there," in its review of the accumulated research on gender in television advertising. The longitudinal approach to the research has revealed evidence of misrepresentations and negative stereotypes and their persistence in advertising. It appears that little change has occurred since the CRTC Task Force on Sex-Role Stereotyping in The Broadcast Media first looked at the problem in 1979 and decided not to conduct its own research since sufficient evidence of the problem had already been captured in the social science literature. In

1982, one of the Task Force recommendations was that the CRTC should conduct regular monitoring of "sex-role stereotyping" in the media, a monitoring that would be able to assess the problem and would measure for evidence of change in gender portrayal. The review in Chapter Two will be used as a guide in analyzing the CRTC monitoring studies of gender portrayal in the broadcast media. An analysis of the first of the CRTC (1984) monitoring studies is the thrust of Chapter Three.

CHAPTER THREE

Chapter Two provided an extensive survey of more than fifty research reports published between 1954 and 1994 of gender portrayal in television. Females were found to be under-represented in almost all areas and when they were represented they were portrayed, for the most part, as unemployed, in dependent roles or as decorative objects and sexual lures.

In 1984, as the two-year period of industry self-regulation of gender portrayal in broadcasting was concluding, the CRTC's role was, as part of the 1979 assignment from the Minister of Communications, to assess success of the period of mandatory self-regulation and develop policy founded on that assessment (Trimble, 1990: 140). The CRTC had decided not to conduct monitoring studies as recommended by the CRTC Task Force on Sex-Role Stereotyping in the Broadcast Media (hereafter referred to as the "Task Force") at the conclusion of the first self-regulatory period. In 1984 the CRTC announced that it would conduct a content analysis to monitor gender portrayal which would satisfy, in part, the Task Force recommendation, provide a measure for use in policy evaluation of self-regulation, and supply the CRTC with "benchmark" data.

The CRTC commissioned Erin Research to conduct a content analysis of "the portrayals of sex roles in the Canadian broadcast media" (CRTC, 1985: 4). Erin Research and its principal researchers, George Spears and Kasia Seydegart, were experienced in analyzing gender in the media by virtue of having conducted research with Nancy Torrance, for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) in 1981-82 and for the Alliance of Canadian Television and Radio Artists (ACTRA) in 1984. The report of the 1984

analysis (CRTC, 1985) of "sex-role portrayals in television advertising," will be assessed in this chapter using the review of gender portrayal studies described in Chapter Two as a measure. The CRTC's 1984 content analysis, and its subsequent influence on CRTC regulation of gender stereotyping, is the focus of this chapter.

The details of the CRTC study and its mandate were determined by the Task Force's recommendations as well as the CRTC's consultations with industry representatives, the Advertising Advisory Board (AAB), the Canadian Association of Broadcasters (CAB) and public interest groups (CRTC, 1985: 4).¹ The study was to examine programming and advertising on radio and television in both English and French. Although much of the research reviewed in Chapter Two was available to the CRTC, it appeared that the CRTC and the researchers chose not to review previous research in depth, since only limited references to a few other studies in gender portrayal in television and radio broadcasting were discussed in one page of the report (CRTC, 1985: 3). Consequently, the implementation and design of the CRTC study did not benefit from what could be learned from research in this area including its strengths and weaknesses, recommendations for further research and the methodological problems encountered in previous studies.

The CRTC stated that the primary objective of the research was to document the portrayal of "sex roles" in Canadian broadcast media (CRTC, 1985:4). The study "was not to examine stereotypes" but, according to the report, was "to document 'sex-role' portrayals in the larger sense" (CRTC, 1985: 4). The study, according to the CRTC, was to provide factual infor-

¹ The Canada Advertising Advisory Board (CAAB), referred to in the CRTC report, since 1985 has been renamed, and is now the Canadian Advertising Foundation (CAF). References to both the CAAB, AAB in addition to the CAF are found throughout CRTC documents.

mation to assist the CRTC in making informed assessments regarding sex-role portrayals (CRTC, 1985: 4). Further, the report said, "the research was designed as a benchmark that would be useful now and for use in the future" (CRTC, 1985: 15). The methodology and findings of much of the 1984 CRTC study into English language television advertising, as it was published in the 1985 report, will be reviewed in the following pages.

The sample was drawn from 6,000 advertisements taped with programming in October, 1984 by the CRTC. The taping comprised 21 station days of English television broadcasting and resulted in 378 hours of tapes. CBC, CTV and independent network broadcasts were included in the taping which coincided with the rating period and launching of fall programming (CRTC, 1985: 7). The sample included advertisements from governments, crown corporations, private and public travel organizations and charities, in addition to the usual commercial advertisements for products and services.

The researchers systematically drew the sample from the CRTC tapes, selecting every seventh eligible advertisement from the advertisements on the broadcast tapes, with the goal of achieving a sample of fewer than 780 advertisements (CRTC, 1985: 7). This would have produced a sample of 857 advertisements however, the report stated that they "over-sampled to ensure a sufficient database," resulting in a sample of 900 advertisements (CRTC, 1985: 9, 10). The sampling method would ordinarily have resulted in a sample which included duplicate advertisements, hence it must be inferred that the sample did include duplicate advertisements, although such an explanation was omitted from the report.² A higher quality sample with

² The 1990 CRTC report of the 1984 content analysis states that repetitions of advertisements were included in the sample.

less sampling error might have resulted if the researchers had controlled for the duplications.

Many of the defined and reported variables in the CRTC study had no direct relationship with the research objective or research questions. For example, the “product and service” variable was operationalized so as to have 27 categories that originated with categories used by the Canadian Television Commercials Festival (CRTC, 1985: 17). The industry festival used a unique set of categories to judge entries and award prizes and was unlike the categorization used in content analysis research.

Of the 27 categories of products and services, the three largest were retail outlets, packaged food and health and beauty products, which accounted for a total of 35.4% of the advertised products (Table 3.1). Content analyses typically use fewer classifications of items, usually eight or nine groups of products and services. An alternative to using fewer classifications of a category, as seen in other content analyses, is to initially operationalize a large number of categories in a way that they can be reliably and validly recoded. Fast food restaurants, take-out restaurants, delivery restaurants, delicatessens and other restaurants could, for example, be coded as separate items and be recoded into a “restaurant food” variable.

The lack of reliability in the product and service variable is more apparent when examining the items in Table 3.1 (CRTC, 1985: 17). For example, an advertisement promoting a special sale of apple juice at a supermarket might be coded as “retail,” as a “non-alcoholic beverage” or as “packaged goods, food.” It is almost impossible to determine where advertising of loose food items, such as grapes or apples, would have been coded unless coded as “other.” Similarly, jars of pumpkin, applesauce or cherry pie

TABLE 3.1

ENGLISH TELEVISION ADVERTISING
Product Category of Advertisements

Category	No. of Ads	Percent
Automobile manufacturers	35	3.8
Automobile supplies, services	61	6.8
Banks, financial services, insurance	10	1.1
Beverages, alcoholic	34	3.8
Beverages, non-alcoholic	19	2.1
Business to business	21	2.3
Charitable organizations	28	3.1
Children's products	37	4.1
Clothing, fashion	14	1.6
Confectionery, snack food	24	2.7
Corporate image ads	13	1.4
Feminine hygiene	9	1.0
Food producers organizations	11	1.2
Government, federal and provincial	26	2.9
Health and beauty	94	10.4
Home furnishings	61	6.8
Leisure, sports, newspapers	34	3.8
Lotteries	11	1.2
Packaged goods, food	108	12.0
Packaged goods, non-food	49	5.4
Pet food	14	1.6
Publicly regulated corporations	11	1.2
Real estate	4	0.4
Retail outlets	117	13.0
Restaurants	32	3.6
Travel, tourism (non-government)	10	1.1
Other	13	1.4
Total	900	100

Source: CRTC, 1985: 17

filling advertised by a department store could have been coded with "retail outlets" or "packaged goods, food." Supermarket pizza could have been coded "retail" or as "packaged goods, food," while pizza from a pizzeria would have been coded "restaurant." The ambiguity of the categories was exacerbated by the lack of definition and explanation in the code book and coding system (Appendix I). The lack of attention to the use of well defined, discrete and exclusive categories not only jeopardized the findings of

the "product" variable, but did not meet expected levels of reliability and validity and therefore limited or impugned other analyses that drew on the "product" variable data.

A subtle, but important, operationalization problem was evident in the "product variable" categories, while the product and service categories in some cases refer to "types of organizations or locations" that supply the products, other categories refer to the actual "products and services." For example, the retail category refers to a location rather than a product or service. A critical measure of both reliability and validity in research is replication. The preceding discussion of the definition and categorization of the product and service variables in this study illustrates the improbability that the same or similar findings would result from an attempt to replicate the analysis.

TABLE 3.2

ENGLISH TELEVISION ADVERTISING
Value of Products and Services Advertised

Value	No. of Ads	Percent
Free	10	1.1
\$0 - \$2	132	14.7
\$2 - \$10	272	30.2
\$10 - \$50	63	7.0
\$50 - 200	21	2.3
\$200 - \$1,000	34	3.8
\$1,000 - \$5,000	12	1.3
\$5,000 - \$20,000	44	4.9
Over \$20,000	3	0.3
No fixed cost	309	34.3
Total	900	100

Source: CRTC, 1985: 18

A lack of reliability is also evident in the "value of the advertised products and services" variable (Table 3.2). The definition and description of three value categories, items of "no fixed cost," "free" items and a category for the "\$0 - \$2 range," were not precise or mutually exclusive (Table 3.2). The coding guide explained that the "no fixed cost" items were those that did not have a specific value, such as telephone service, airlines, restaurants and retail outlets (Appendix I). No differentiation was made in the report between advertisements for free items and those that cost \$0, in the \$0 - \$2 category (CRTC, 1985: 18). Thus, it is likely that different coders could categorize the same item differently or different items the same.

Likewise, it was uncertain how a "no cost" item such as a recipe book offer was coded, whether it was coded as a \$0 item, or as a free item. Similarly, was a free book offered to those who paid the \$3.95 shipping charge coded as free? Moreover, the free, \$0, no fixed cost groupings, seven of the value categories, the \$2 to \$10, \$10 to \$50 and over \$20,000 are not mutually exclusive categories. Thus, it would be impossible to determine how items or services that were valued at \$2, \$10, \$50, \$200, \$1000, \$5000, and \$20,000 were recorded. According to the codebook, both a \$2 lottery ticket and a \$10 garbage can could have been placed in the \$2 - \$10 category or in two separate categories, with the garbage can reported in the \$10 - \$50 and the \$2 lottery ticket in the \$0 - \$2 slot. The questions posed above are evoked by the details illustrated in Table 3.2.

One consequence of the illustrated problems of the value variable is that the results cannot be compared with those of other studies since the findings are subject to question with regard to reliability. One further consequence of the spurious findings is the impact on all other analyses in the

study which employ the "value" variable data. For example, findings in the following pages regarding value and gender representation or voice-overs are invalidated by the operationalization of the value variable categories. Overall, the consequences are inestimable. It is therefore unfortunate that these data were published by the CRTC without more careful scrutiny of an analysis which appeared to ignore much of the criteria demanded by reliable quantitative research (CRTC, 1985).

The 1984 CRTC study reported a variable labeled the "presence of women and men." It was found that of 330 advertisements with only female or male characters, 65% of the advertisements had only male characters (CRTC, 1985: 20). The analysis examined a category which included advertisements with "both sexes" and reported that 53% of the advertisements fell into that category (Table 3.3). Twenty-four percent of the advertisements had only male characters and 13%, only female characters (Table 3.3). The analysis included 95 (11%) advertisements in which "people were absent."

The analysis and the operationalization of female and male portrayals is central to a study of gender in television advertising. Therefore, the disclosure that 11% of the advertisements in the data had no people in them suggests that one of the criteria for eligibility in the sample should have been that there be one or more people in the advertisement (Table 3.3). The study, after all, was intended to report on the portrayal of gender-roles, hence it would have been more correct had the research examined only those advertisements with a gender presence.

The study examined the gender of on-camera characters and in a variable labeled "sex," reported that 57% of the 2,876 on-camera characters

TABLE 3.3

Source: CRTC, 1985: 20

in 805 advertisements were male and that 43% or 1,237 characters were female (Table 3.4). The representation of males was somewhat higher than that found in other studies. For example, Caron (1978) found 48% male characters, MediaWatch (1984) found 53% and Craig (1990) reported 55% male characters.

The representation of female and male characters in advertisements, regardless of the category label, is an important measure in gender portrayal studies. The lack of equity in gender representation which results in one gender being over-represented and another under-represented time after time, according to learning and cultivation theories discussed in Chapter

One, cause the audience to associate the frequencies with the worth or value of the gender. The Task Force concurred, and expressed particular concern with the possible influence of repetitive, persistent unequal gender representation and the repetition of scenarios with large representations of male characters and under-representation of females (CRTC, 1982). Or as Caron (1978: 2) asserted, there is reason to believe that "viewers may interpret the high frequency of male roles as an indication that males are more socially valued than females who were seen less frequently."

TABLE 3.4

ENGLISH TELEVISION ADVERTISING

Sex of Persons in Advertisements

Sex	No. of Persons	Percent
Female	1240	43
Male	1636	57
Total	2876	100

$\chi^2=54.5$, 1df, $p<.001$

Source: CRTC, 1985: 26

An analysis of product-users in advertisements revealed that "the large majority of advertised products and services are used by both sexes and that only 5% of the advertisements promoted products that were used exclusively by one sex" (Table 3.5). Women's clothing, cosmetics and men's shaving products were provided as examples of items used only by females or males. The analysis reported that "both sexes could use 93.4% of the advertised products and services," such as shampoo, toothpaste, cars, garden tools and laundry detergents (Table 3.5). The finding that non-

humans used almost 2% of the products was not of any value, as the gender of the user was operationalized for this variable, and "non-human" is not a viable option in an analysis of human gender portrayal (Table 3.5).

Knowledge of the gender of the person who would use an advertised item would be useful and germane to the study objectives; however, the CRTC (1984) examined the gender of those who "could" use the item. The decision-making and coding to determine "who could use" an advertised product is straightforward compared with the task of determining the gender of those who "would" most likely use the item. Determining who can use an item or service is relatively simple; an advertised curling iron can be used by females and males, but will be used most often by a female

TABLE 3.5

ENGLISH TELEVISION ADVERTISING
Users of Advertised Products and Services

Sex	No. of Ads	Percent
Female only	38	4.2
Male only	6	0.7
Both sexes	841	93.4
Non-human use, e.g., pet food	15	1.7
Total	900	100

Source: CRTC, 1985: 21

The task of operationalizing the "who would use" an advertised product variable with gender is more difficult, but more informative relative to

the objectives of the study. Analysis of the gender of the character who would be most likely to use an advertised product in conjunction with other characteristics of the advertisement may reveal, for example, that products females "would use" were almost always promoted by male product representatives.

The 1984 study also examined characters portrayed as consumers and reported that 64% of all on-camera characters were portrayed as consumers (Table 3.6). Characters were defined as consumers if they appeared to be purchasers, potential purchasers or characters in the company of purchasers. The report explained that "members of a family who are portrayed driving to a restaurant are considered consumers, even though they are not actually seen in the restaurant" (CRTC, 1985: 22). Portrayals of females and males as consumers occurred in almost equal proportions in 82% of the advertisements (Table 3.6). Of the remaining 98 characters represented as consumers, 82 were less than 12 years of age and their gender was not reported, and 18 were described as non-human consumers (Table 3.6).

The operationalization of the "consumer" variable was fraught with reliability problems, some of which are illustrated (Table 3.6). The variable was not precisely defined, the coding system for the variable makes replication virtually impossible and in addition adds little useful information to a study of gender portrayal in advertising. It is most unusual that a study mandated to look at sex-role portrayals would observe occurrences but not record the gender of those involved. One of the aspects of questionable reliability is related to the researchers' failure to capture gender, this in turn

prohibits comparison of the findings with those of other analyses which capture the gender of all characters.

TABLE 3.6

ENGLISH TELEVISION ADVERTISING

Portrayal of Consumers

Consumer	No. of Ads	Percent
Women only	159	27
Men only	147	25
Both women and men	175	30
Children only	82	14
Non-human only, e.g., cartoons	16	3
Total	579	100

Source: CRTC, 1985: 22

The analysis of advertisements with voice-overs (off-camera narration) was more straightforward. The study reported that in the 76% of the advertisements with voice-overs, male voices accounted for 86% of the voice-overs (CRTC, 1985: 23). In advertisements that had only one female or male voice-over, 89% employed male voices (CRTC, 1985: 23). Overall, the study reported that male voice-overs were found to outnumber female voice-overs by more than eight to one (CRTC, 1985: 23). These findings are consistent with those found in other studies in the 1980s (Knill et al. 1981; Cabellero and Solomon, 1984; Bretl and Cantor, 1988; Gilly, 1988).

TABLE 3.7

ENGLISH TELEVISION ADVERTISING
Voiceovers for Higher and Lower Cost Products

Cost of Product	Number of Ads <u>Percent</u>		Total
	Female Voice	Male Voice	
Less than \$10	37 <u>80</u>	257 <u>66</u>	294 <u>67</u>
\$10 to \$1,000	8 <u>17</u>	86 <u>22</u>	94 <u>21</u>
More than \$1,000	1 <u>2</u>	49 <u>13</u>	50 <u>11</u>
Total	46 <u>100</u>	392 <u>100</u>	438 <u>100</u>

$\text{Chi}^2=5.60$, 2df, $p<.10$

Source: CRTC, 1985: 24

Some studies have reported finding 85% to 88% of advertisements with spoken voice-overs while the CRTC study reported that 76% of the advertisements had voice-overs. The somewhat low incidence of advertisements with voice-overs may be attributed to the sampling method: for example, the inclusion of advertisements with non-humans, advertisements with no human presence, and the inclusion of duplicate advertisements in the sample. It should be noted that, Moore and Cadeau (1985) reported voice-overs in only 76% of commercial product advertisements. However,

as only 76% of the 900 advertisements and 11% did not have human characters, it is curious that 972 cases of gender and spoken or sung voice-overs were found. Other studies suggest that few advertisements are accompanied by more than one voice-over; consequently, other analyses report only one or no voice-over in each advertisement (see Figure 2 in Chapter Two). These anomalies that were reported, *vis-à-vis* voice-overs, were not explained or addressed in the report (CRTC, 1985: 25).

The 1984 findings of an analysis of "product cost and voice-overs" found 438 advertisements with voice-overs for fixed-cost products (CRTC, 1985: 24). Female voice-overs were most frequent in advertisements promoting products valued at ten dollars or less (Table 3.7). Female voices, even in the low-cost product advertisements, were only employed in 12.6% of voice-over roles (Table 3.7). Male voice-over roles were associated with advertisements promoting products valued at more than \$1,000, with 98% of those advertisements employing male voices (Table 3.7).

The findings, it should be noted, are at best ambiguous and possibly invalid. It appears that the findings of the troubled value variable referred to and illustrated in the CRTC report (CRTC, 1985: 18, Table 2) and previously discussed in this chapter (see Table 3.2), were used to construct the lower-higher cost variable.

The analysis of a "preparation and consumption of food and beverages" variable (a reliable indicator of the subservient role portrayal of female characters), found that males were portrayed eating or drinking in 82% of the advertisements (CRTC, 1985: 25). The serving and preparation was done in 63% of the advertisements by female characters (CRTC, 1985:

2

PM-1 3½"x4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

25).³ The findings were consistent with the findings of other studies in which the majority of males were consuming food and beverages and a similar majority of female characters did the preparation and serving (Courtney and Whipple, 1974: 116).

An analysis of gender and "characters in different product categories" revealed that the majority of products were associated with male characters in all but one category, "packaged goods-non-food" (Table 3.8). This category included the items television has traditionally associated with female characters: cleaning products, detergents, and paper goods such as toilet tissue and paper towels (CRTC, 1985: 83). The higher-status and more costly advertised products and services, such as automobiles, financial and business products and insurance, were promoted by male characters (Table 3.8). A near equitable portrayal of gender was found in the category of advertisements promoting government activity, with 52% male and 48% female representation (CRTC, 1985: 29).

Previous studies (Dominick and Rauch, 1972; Courtney and Whipple, 1974; and Caron, 1978) have consistently reported cleaning products and bathroom tissue as the products most frequently associated with female portrayals. The findings in the CRTC study appear, on the surface, to be quite consistent with those of other studies, with females promoting the inexpensive and mundane and males promoting the high cost, high status products.

The report of the study's findings relating to gender with product types contains a number of inconsistencies, and as they influence the validity and reliability of the analysis, examples are reviewed here (CRTC,

³ This study defined, coded and reported consumers in three different variables (CRTC, 1985: 22, 25, 35)

1985: 17, 29). For example, the report indicated there were 140 characters in advertisements for "packaged goods, non-food" and then indicated a further 386 characters in advertisements for "packaged goods, non-food" (Table 3.8). Acceptance of these results requires us to assume that the two identical categories were the result of word processing or typesetting errors, and that one of the references, probably the second, may have been intended to read "packaged goods, food." (Tables 3.1, 3.8).

TABLE 3.8

ENGLISH TELEVISION ADVERTISING
Characters in Different Product Categories

Category	Percent Female	Percent Male	No. of Characters
Packaged goods, non-food	57	43	140
Government	48	52	105
Retail outlets	47	53	372
Children's products	47	53	135
Snack food, confectionery	46	54	90
Health and beauty	45	55	266
Alcoholic beverages	45	55	114
Packaged goods, non-food	42	58	386
Home furnishings	42	58	132
Restaurants	41	59	123
Food producer organizations	41	59	58
Non-alcoholic beverages	41	59	51
Car manufacturers	40	60	105
Charitable organizations	39	61	94
Leisure and sports	38	62	139
Financial and insurance	38	62	58
Business-to-business	35	65	97
Automobile supplies and services	15	85	132
Total	43	57	2597

Source: CRTC, 1985: 29

The usefulness of the data reported (see Table 3.8) was further eroded by other imprecisions in the list of products and services. For ex-

ample, a product category designated "automobile manufacturers" appeared in both Table 3.1 and in the code books (see Appendix 1), while in Table 3.8, it was omitted and replaced with "car manufacturers." This raises questions of how, where, and if trucks and other vehicles were coded: are car manufacturers and automobile manufacturers the same; and where are automobile dealers in either of the analyses? Similarly, "banks, financial services, insurance" in Table 3.1 became "financial and insurance," in Table 3.8, while "leisure and sports and newspapers" in Table 3.1 became "leisure and sports" in Table 3.8, and the newspaper category vanished.

The findings of the analysis of "gender and different product categories" reported only 18 product categories (Table 3.8), whereas, earlier in the report, 27 product categories were reported (Table 3.1). Nine product and service categories were excluded because, according to the report, "there were less than 50 characters in each category, too few to give a reliable indication of the proportion of women" (CRTC, 1985: 29). It is highly possible that recoding the variables would have prevented the data from nine product categories being omitted from the analysis. In view of the use of the Television Commercials Competition list, the problem was not unanticipated and was the consequence of faulty operationalization. The confusion and lack of precision of this variable has a negative impact on all analyses in the study relating to product categories. Further, the inaccuracies add to the concern of the reliability and validity, of the variable findings, as well as the overall study.

The study analyzed gender and "higher and lower cost products," reporting a significant relationship between gender and product value (CRTC, 1985: 30). In advertisements of lower-valued items, females and

males were more equitably represented, with 44% of products in the two dollars or less category promoted by female characters (CRTC, 1985: 30). The majority of characters in all value categories were male with male representation seen to increase as the product values increased. For example, more than 67% of items in the \$50 or more category were promoted by male characters (CRTC, 1985: 30). This reflects one of the concerns expressed by the Task Force, that female portrayals are associated with low-value products while male portrayals are used with higher-value products, and that this is endemic to television advertising (CRTC, 1982).

The analysis of "higher and lower cost product" and gender was said to include 1,769 (Table 3.9) of the 2,597 characters portrayed in the product and service advertisements (Table 3.8). It must be assumed, in lieu of no other explanation, that the remaining 32% or 838 of the reported characters were portrayed in advertisements for free or no fixed cost items (Table 3.9).⁴ That is, to say the least, an unusual phenomenon and unfortunate in that such a large proportion of the reported characters were excluded from association with any valued product or service, and/or not accounted for, in an otherwise potentially informative analysis.

The lack of mutually exclusive categories in the CRTC study is evinced again in the analysis of gender and "higher and lower cost products." The product values were, as illustrated, in six value categories commencing with less than \$2 to a category for products valued at over \$1,000. None of the divisions were exclusive; for example, a \$10 item could be in either or both of the value categories. Hence, the findings of

⁴ The study initially reported 2,876 characters in the 805 advertisements; in total, 1,107 (38%) characters were not defined as portrayed or associated in any way with any valued product or service (CRTC, 1985: 20, 26).

product value and gender representation are of little value as their lack of mutually exclusive categories jeopardized the validity of the analysis. Had this variable been validly operationalized, the results would have provided the CRTC with an extremely useful indicator, locating the presence of gender, with value, in the advertising.

TABLE 3.9

Source: CRTC, 1985: 30

The dress of the on-camera characters is a complex category in the study of gender portrayals and proved to be one of the most problematic analyses in the CRTC study (1984). The analysis first of all excluded athletes and dancers from the analysis, examining those in bathing suits, underwear, skin-tight clothing and no clothing, including even those seen in grooming activities (CRTC, 1985: 44). Equal numbers of males and females

were reported dressed in bathing suits. Little else that related to the study's mandate was reported.

Though the report did not comment on coding problems, there were apparent difficulties in operationalizing the "dress" variable (CRTC, 1985: 31). The definition and operationalization of "characters' dress" was problematic, first, by the inclusion of washing and grooming activities with the dress style categories. Washing and grooming activity is not a mode of dress. Further, very generalized categories for tight clothing and nightwear obfuscated the findings. Similarly, there appeared to be confusion relating to athletic clothing; inadequate provision was made for the fact that revealing athletic clothing in athletic situations is appropriate and perceived very differently than revealing clothing worn gratuitously.

The report indicated that some categories had very few cases; for example, six of the eight categories had fewer than 39 characters, and the category designated skin-tight clothing, had only three characters. This, in addition to the "activity category," suggests that statistical analysis would be less than reliable.

The data from a dress analysis is a useful indicator in determining the use of characters as sexual lures in advertising (CRTC, 1982), and particularly when combined with other variables. The character's dress variable can be analyzed in combination with gender and other variables such as lack of dialogue, product, action in the advertisement or social role to establish the presence of character portrayals as decorative objects or in roles as sexual objects (Signorielli, 1994; Craig, 1992). This approach, for example, was taken by Dominick and Rauch (1972), who constructed a "sex object" variable using data from the dress variable and the primary role. In view of

the mandate of the CRTC study, the "dress" analysis was essential "to provide factual information on sex-role portrayal" (CRTC, 1985: 4). However, the dress variable definition, operationalization and ensuing data were of little value in meeting the study's objectives.

The 1984 CRTC study included an analysis of gender and "major characters." According to the report, major characters were determined "by how much information could be acquired about the portrayed character, but generally only the characters with speaking roles were defined as major characters" (CRTC, 1985: 32). Of the 2,876 characters found in the 900 advertisements, 1,010 were designated as major characters. This differs somewhat from previous studies that have defined only the characters that are on-camera three seconds or more, the characters that are on camera for the longest time or the dominant or product-promoting characters, as major characters. Hence, most studies report more advertisements than major characters; for example, Caron (1978) examined 2,268 advertisements and reported 1,037 major characters, while a 1985 analysis of 1,733 advertisements reported finding only 595 major or central characters (Moore and Cadeau, 1985). (Caron, 1978). An explanation for this might be that more contemporary advertisements are including more characters in each advertisement, or that the CRTC study used a more inclusive definition of major characters.

The analysis of gender and major characters revealed that 59% of major characters were male and 41% female (Table 3.10). The findings differed from those in previous studies that reported a greater representation of female portrayals: Caron (1978) reported 49% females; O'Donnell and O'Donnell (1978) 50%; and Gilly (1988) found that 56% of major charac-

ters were female. The results suggest that female representation was becoming less equitable and the CRTC "self-regulation and mandatory self-regulation of gender portrayals" was ineffective and/or that there were problems of validity and reliability in the analysis.

TABLE 3.10

**Major Characters
in English Television Advertising**

Source. CRTC, 1985: 32

In order to meet with contemporary guidelines of equitable gender representation, broadcasters and advertisers could be, or may be, employing greater numbers of the discriminated cohort as minor characters in advertisements, while maintaining the use of members of the "traditional" social cohort in the influential or central roles, hence, circumventing equity guidelines. If this were occurring, one would expect to see an increase in the

overall number of characters coinciding with a decrease in the proportion of females with major roles in the advertisements. There are indications in the CRTC findings discussed here, that this may have been the case in the 1984 findings. Analyses should examine both the major characters and all characters with the key variables to assess the levels of representation.

In most instances, major characters, product representatives or central figures are one and the same and are considered one of the most critical indicators of on-camera gender representation in television advertising. The analysis of major characters is premised on the notion that these characters and the ensuing portrayals have a greater impact on the audience than do the less central characters in the advertisements. A different type of support for this notion is evidenced by the employment of very highly paid actors and celebrities to play the central role.

The major characters in the 1984 study were examined for age, race, ethnicity, social roles, settings, urban and rural locations, leisure activities, presence in a vehicle, friendships, romantic involvements, physical violence, the camera shots of their bodies and participation in home management (CRTC, 1985: 35-41). The findings from analyses of age, setting and social roles of the major characters are reviewed below.

In an analysis of the age of major characters, the study found males dominant in three of the six age categories (CRTC, 1985: 33). More male than female characters appeared in the advertisements in the following age categories: under 12 years of age; 36 to 50, and 51 to 65 (CRTC, 1985: 33). The report did not provide a detailed age analysis, thereby, limiting the usefulness of their data for secondary analysis (see Table 3.11). The analysis of "age and major characters," reported the age of 1,073 "major

characters," while earlier in the same report, it was noted that there were only 1,010 "major characters" (CRTC, 1985: 32, 33). No explanation for this difference of 63 characters was provided. These discrepancies give rise to concerns with the validity and reliability of the specific analyses and the overall level of precision in the study.

TABLE 3.11

Source: CRTC, 1985: 33

The CRTC study concluded, as have other studies, that television does not reflect age categories as they exist in society; rather advertising portrays most people in society, especially females, as young. Unless the advertising relates to illness or death, portrayals of mature characters, particularly older females, are virtually non-existent. These findings are consistent with those of other studies and reflect the CRTC Task Force's

recommendation that people of all ages, particularly females of all ages, should be represented in advertising (CRTC, 1982).

The 1984 study, in an analysis of roles of 1,004 major characters, reported that of the 675 major characters depicted in consumer roles, 48% were female (CRTC, 1985: 35). They found that females were seldom portrayed in roles as experts or authorities: 90% of the "experts" and 78% of the "salespeople" were portrayed by males. Male dominance persisted among major characters, and 66% of those seen in the "other" and "celebrity" roles were also male (CRTC, 1985: 35).

The findings of the role analysis were consistent with those reported by Caballero and Solomon (1984) and Bretl and Cantor (1988), who also reported that, as in the past, the majority of experts, salespeople and celebrities were portrayed by male characters. However, the most dominant role, that of "consumer" which was portrayed by 67% of the major characters, was problematic. The definition of consumer was, as noted previously, any character consuming, any character considered a prospective or potential consumer and any character seen near a product or another consumer of the product (CRTC, 1985: 22). The reliability of the consumer variable was negatively influenced by imprecise categorization, suggesting that replication of the analysis would be not be feasible.

The operationalization of family roles, which was specific to this study, resulted in findings that addressed four categories of family and home management roles. They were: child care, interaction with children, presence in family, and participation in home management tasks.⁵

⁵ The CRTC study categorized all those over 12 years of age as major characters, while other researchers have only categorized adults as major characters. The implications of children being major characters should be taken into account especially when examining child care and employment roles of the major characters.

Female characters were found in 72% of the portrayals of home management tasks, tasks described in the report that included "fixing the roof, washing clothes, washing dishes, washing cars, cutting lawns, fixing the plumbing, meal preparation and the preparation of tax returns" (CRTC, 1985: 89). The second family and home role involved interacting with children. The study reported that 52% of the major characters seen interacting with children were females. A third role of the family and home activities was child care, and of the major characters portrayed in child care roles, 78% were female (CRTC, 1985: 36). The fourth role in family and home activities was "presence in family," in which 56% of the characters were female (CRTC, 1985: 36). Of all the 1,010 characters defined as major characters, 624 were reported in family and home roles and 366 of these were females.

These findings reflect those of previous studies that found females dominate in family and home management roles in advertising portrayals while males are much less often portrayed in these roles. In the past, television portrayals have trivialized home and family roles. The findings in this study suggest, that to a great extent, the portrayals continue to diminish the importance of the male presence in family roles.

The analysis of gender and "paid occupations" found that only 24% of the 288 major characters in occupational roles were female (Table 3.12). The findings are similar to those reported previously, for example in Women on Words and Images (1975), only 33% of major characters shown employed were female. A study examining major characters in Canadian network product commercials found only 15% of females in occupational portrayals (Caron, 1978: 172). Other studies reported that male major

characters were more than twice as likely as females to be found in occupational roles (Gilly, 1988; Scheibe, 1979).

The study classified major characters in five occupational categories: professional, sales, clerical and small business, trades, creative and other. Male characters were dominant in all occupations, with male representation lowest in the "creative" occupational roles and greatest in sales and business roles (Table 3.12). Females were a minority in all occupational categories (Table 3.12).

TABLE 3.12

Source: CRTC, 1985: 38

Broadcasters and advertisers, as discussed earlier, have been accused of trivializing females by frequently portraying them in low-status occupations or unpaid roles in television advertising. This was demonstrated once again in the findings of the "paid occupation" variable which portrayed many more males than females in paid employment, and more females than males in low-status employment (Table 3.12).

An analysis of gender and "primary settings" of major characters revealed significant differences between the settings of females and males (CRTC, 1985: 39). Of the 368 characters portrayed in home settings, a majority (203) were female, while in the other four settings male characters were in the majority. The settings most dominated by male characters were occupational settings where 77% of the 165 major characters portrayed in "paid work" settings were male characters.

The tendency to portray female characters in home settings and male characters in all settings except at home, has also been reported in previous research: Caron (1978); Gilly (1988); and Lovdal (1989). This supports the findings that females were involved in home roles and not represented in paid employment, as more female representation in occupations and employment would result in more females being portrayed in occupational settings and fewer in home settings.

A number of the CRTC study's analyses were not closely related to its objectives while others lacked utility, requiring prohibitively complex definition and coding schemes, which provided little useful information. For example, analyses examined the gender of major characters in relation to geographical settings, leisure activities, friendships, romantic involvement and presence in vehicles. These variables and their findings are not exam-

ined in this thesis, while “apparent race” and “apparent ethnicity” variables are discussed, albeit briefly .

Summary

The 1984 CRTC study and analysis can be assessed from a number of perspectives. The primary perspective involves an assessment of the findings, the reliability of the findings and the efficacy of the study as a whole. Further perspectives to be touched on here, involve the CRTC research as it relates to previous research and the CRTC reaction to the study and its findings.

On the surface, many of the findings from the study reiterated the findings reported by studies examined in Chapter Two. For example, the CRTC study reported that male voices were found to outnumber female voices in voice-over roles by more than eight to one. These findings were almost identical to findings reported by Mamay and Simpson (1981), Cabelero and Simpson (1984) and Gilly (1988). Similarly, the CRTC study found that 76% of characters portrayed in occupational roles and 77% of those in occupational settings were male; this corresponded to the observations reported by Caron (1978) Bretl and Cantor (1988) and Gilly (1988).

The CRTC study's findings indicated, as had other studies, that males heavily dominate all aspects of television advertising, with one exception. The on-camera representation of gender in advertising overall, and among product representatives or central characters in particular, was found by other research, MediaWatch (1984) Knill et al. (1981) and Gilly (1988) to have reached equitable proportions. The CRTC study reported that males represented 57% of all characters, which is a decrease in the on-camera

female representation, relative to other studies' findings. It is probable that the apparent lack of on-camera gender equity reported by the CRTC study was an anomalous finding originating with the study's troubled sampling and coding schemes (see Appendix 1).

The 1984 study, however, is rife with problems. The majority were explained in passing or discussed in the preceding review, and will be briefly brought together in this synopsis, and more thoroughly discussed when compared with the 1988 study in Chapters Four and Five. First, however, a matter of concern in the 1984 CRTC study was the inclusion of, and lack of control for, an unspecified number of duplicate advertisements in the sample. Second, was the negative influence of the use of a systematized sample (as opposed to a more randomized sample) which did not control for, and did not report the number of duplications. Finally, it was an unfortunate that the report failed to provide a definition of what constituted an "eligible" advertisement for sampling purposes.

Additional concerns were related to statistical factors. The study did not report levels of statistical significance for most variables. As well, the report did not provide reliability levels for each variable but did report that the inter-coder reliability ranged from less than 75% to more than 99% and reached an overall level of more than 95% (CRTC, 1985: 13). The coders were trained, the report explained, so that, "when coding disagreements occurred, the taped advertisement was replayed and replayed until agreement was attained" (CRTC, 1985: 12). But this approach has its own problems. As Krippendorff notes, an accurate indication of reliability is attained "only by calculating the reliability prior to the resolution of the

disagreements, to do it otherwise makes the data seem more reliable than it is" (Krippendorff, 1980: 132).

The categories, which are the most critical aspect of quantitative analysis, were not always valid nor closely related to the objectives of the study, and some, such as the product user analysis, did not capture precise information. In other instances, categories were not clearly defined and there were overlapping variable categories such as those found in the value and product analyses which were plagued with non-exclusive categories. As noted in the earlier discussion of the "dress" variable, the operationalization of the "characters' dress" variable was flawed. The faulty categories combined with the lack of mutual exclusivity, make it impossible to have "the degree of reliability or reproducibility required to meet even the minimum standards for content analysis" (Weber, 1990: 17).

Other problems related to previously mentioned variables, such as "apparent race" and "apparent ethnicity" were poorly operationalized; with one category of ethnicity, for example, was defined as "American," which is more a condition of citizenship than ethnicity, while "Canadian" was employed as a category of "apparent race" (CRTC, 1985: 34). These inadequately categorized analyses, in addition to the analyses noted earlier regarding "urban and rural settings" of major characters or gender of major characters and "romantic involvement," provided little information of use in meeting the objectives of the study. They were not crucial elements of a study whose primary mandate was to 'provide factual information on sex-role portrayal" (CRTC, 1985: 4).

The exacting nature of content analysis requires that it be conducted and reported with meticulous and precise methodology. The lack of preci-

sion was apparent in the reporting of a larger sample than actually existed; for example, in the analysis of age and major characters, the number changed from 1,010 to 1,073 without explanation (CRTC, 32, 33). This was one of a multitude of omissions or errors in the text or computations found throughout the report of a study that had too many variables, too many categories and too many problems. Together, these problems make it appear that the study was conducted and reported with minimal concern for precision and reliability.

The CRTC's publication of the 1984 study would indicate that it accepted the troubled research and its misleading findings or that the CRTC was oblivious to the imprecision and overall lack of efficacy of the study. According to Trimble (1990: 351), the CRTC used the study's findings to measure the compliance of broadcasters with self-regulatory gender portrayal guidelines. Further, the CRTC stated that the research had shown that "women and men were portrayed differently, especially in English television advertising" (CRTC, 1986c). Subsequent to a CRTC staff analysis of the data, the CRTC concluded, in keeping with the content analysis findings (CRTC, 1985), that "no reasonable change had taken place in gender portrayal" (CRTC, 1986d; 1986e). It would appear, therefore, that the CRTC was oblivious to (or overlooked) the shortcomings of their sought-after "benchmark" study.

Following the 1984 study and the end of the "self-regulation" of gender portrayal, the CRTC commenced another round of meetings and hearings which concluded that self-regulation of gender portrayal had been only "partially successful" (Fuller, 1992: 6). And so began a period of "mandatory self-regulation" of gender portrayal in the broadcast media with

"compliance of sex-role stereotyping guidelines" made a condition of licensing (CRTC, 1986b: 52).

The mandatory "condition of licensing" was not that effectively enforced (Fuller, 1992). Consequently, it could be said that another period of self-regulation occurred, only the name had changed. The CRTC stated that in two years, another assessment of gender portrayal in the broadcast media would re-examine the problem. Two years later, in 1988, the CRTC announced its intention to conduct a second study of gender portrayal in the broadcast media.

The examination of the initial CRTC study in this chapter illustrated that the 1984 study had serious problems of reliability and validity. Further, the chapter described that the findings, albeit frequently dubious, agreed with previous studies; in almost every respect, Canadian television advertising portrayals misrepresent and under-represent women. Finally the chapter provided a brief account of the events leading to the CRTC's decision to conduct a second study of gender portrayal. The second study was commissioned in 1988. Examination and discussion of that study and its findings of the portrayal of gender in Canadian television advertising will be the focus of Chapter Four.

CHAPTER FOUR

The members of the CRTC Task Force on Sex-Role Stereotyping agreed at one of their initial meetings that "they would not conduct research since the problem of sex-role stereotyping had already been well defined and well documented." They further agreed, that while they acknowledged that other forms of stereotyping existed, they would concentrate on the "sex-role stereotyping" of women, particularly in advertisements. Finally they agreed that the problem of stereotyping of women in the media was more than bad taste - it was a problem of inequality and injustice (CRTC, 1982: 3). The review in Chapter Two confirmed their conclusion of the documentation of the problem, while the findings of the 1984 content analysis in Chapter Three indicated that gender stereotyping still existed and that it was a serious problem, particularly in the portrayal of women.

The CRTC stated that there was evidence "that self-regulation of sex-role stereotyping had been only partially successful and that further action was necessary" (CRTC, 1986: 52). One component of that CRTC action was to conduct a second study that was to determine "whether the portrayal of men and women had changed since 1984, and was to replicate the 1984 study" (CRTC, 1986e: 52). The CRTC reported that the 1984 study researchers, Erin Research, had been commissioned to conduct the 1988 study (CRTC, 1990: 5).¹

¹ Two CRTC studies are referred to in this chapter: the 1984 content analysis of advertising reported in 1985; and the 1988 content analysis of advertising which was published in 1990 with re-analyzed 1984 findings and a comparison of both CRTC studies. References to the 1985 report will refer to the 1984 study, similarly references to the 1990 report will refer to the 1988 study.

A comprehensive review of the method, findings, and some of the shortcomings in the validity and reliability of the 1984 study was conducted in Chapter Three. This was accompanied by, where possible, a comparison of the 1984 findings with findings reported by other research. In addition, the events surrounding the CRTC studies in gender portrayal were briefly reviewed. Chapter Four will focus on a critique of the 1988 study, examining its objectives, methods, and findings. The chapter will also compare, where feasible, the 1984 research and findings with the 1988 research and findings, and with other research findings in an attempt to determine, if and how the changes, if any, in gender portrayal of advertising were determined.

The CRTC mandated the 1988 study to focus on two issues: one, the proportional representation of men and women; and, two, the roles of men and women in broadcast advertising. The report indicated that the study did indeed focus on proportional representation, but examined to a much lesser extent, the roles of men and women in the advertising (CRTC, 1990: 3).² The CRTC, further mandated that the goal of the 1988 study was to compare gender portrayal at two points in time, 1984 and 1988, and this required, said the CRTC, that the 1988 study replicate the 1984 research as closely as possible (CRTC, 1990: 6). The notion of replicating the 1984 study in the 1988 CRTC research study will be addressed in the chapter summary.

The following discussion reviews points in the general methodology, such as sampling, intercoder reliability and research variables of the 1988 study, followed by an examination of more specific analyses. The method

² The researchers were also mandated to conduct research on gender portrayal in television programming and news which is, however, beyond the scope of this thesis.

used to draw the sample for the 1988 content analysis was similar to the 1984 method of sampling. The sample was drawn from 378 hours of 21 consecutive station days of CTV, CBC and independent network television broadcasting taped by the CRTC and the DOC (CRTC, 1990: 7). The taping coincided, as did the 1984 taping, with the fall rating period. Of particular importance was the fact that taping coincided with the first days of the November, 1988 federal election campaign.

The tapes provided "approximately 8,400 advertisements from which the researchers systematically drew every 10th to attain a sample of 840 advertisements" (CRTC, 1990: 9). According to the report, the systematic selection assured the researchers that advertisements from each station were drawn in proportion to their frequency on the air. The sampling was also done systematically over the times and days: a certain number from Wednesday, the same number from Thursday, et cetera, ensuring that the advertisements came from an even distribution (CRTC, 1990: 9). The sample included station promotions, political advertisements and advertisements promoting government and commercial services. The 1988 study reported, as did the 1984 study, the inclusion of an undeterminable and uncontrolled number of duplicate advertisements (CRTC, 1990: 9). Therefore, if six of the advertisements were duplicated 15 times, which was not entirely unlikely, the six advertisements could account for more than 10% of the sample (CRTC, 1990: 9).

The study reported that "a 95% rate of inter-coder reliability was maintained or exceeded throughout the study" (CRTC, 1990: 13). The reliability rate is the result of a test of consistency which in this case tests agreement. If two or more coders, for example, apply the same categoriza-

tion to the same observation, the goal is that their findings should agree. Setting the rate at 95% presumed that on average, in 95 of every 100 codings there would be coder agreement. If both the categorization and the coding system are carefully constructed, an overall rate of 95% is achievable as found by previous studies.

The reported reliability of some variables in the 1988 study fell below the goal of 95%. These variables were not published; the study commented that "certain variables were prone to error and fell below the minimum standard of inter-coder reliability, in these instances, they were not reported" (CRTC, 1990: 24). The study did not note if this method of maintaining a high level of reliability complemented or replaced the system used in 1984, when the tape was played over and over until consensus was achieved (cf. Chapter Three - p. 104).

The 1988 CRTC study reported that an additional 18 variables, such as human presence, station, time, day, offensive language, mood and geographical setting, that had been included in the 1984 study were deleted from the 1988 study. If an analysis, for example, resulted in insufficient data for statistical analysis or, *ex post facto*, it appeared the variables were not related to gender portrayal, the variables were not published in the 1990 report (CRTC, 1990: 24).

The 1988 study used a somewhat altered version of the 1984 coding system, in which 22 variables were revised for use in 1988. One of the revisions which was particularly noteworthy, provided for the coding of more than 18 people in an advertisement, whereas the 1984 coding system had imposed a maximum 18 characters, nine female and nine male charac-

ters (CRTC, 1990: 10). The report noted that this change would provide for the coding of every character in an advertisement.

Another revision was reported with the "occupations" variable analysis, where a new category was achieved by "combining findings from skilled trade and unskilled trade, to form a new trades variable" (CRTC, 1990: 23). This explanation is problematic as "unskilled trades" was not an item in the 1984 study (cf. Appendix 2). The 1984 study included unskilled labour and skilled trades in the code book, as did the 1990 report of the 1984 study (CRTC, 1985: 80). In addition to previously discussed examples of the "trades" and "characters" categories, substantial changes were made to 22 other variables, in contradiction of the CRTC's intervening request that the research report all items as they had been in 1984 (CRTC, 1990: 23).

The 1988 study was not published on its own. The report of the 1988 study was combined with a report of the 1984 study, thus providing for the comparison of the two studies. However, the 1984 results published in the 1990 report had been revised, re-formatted and re-analysed. The report did not provide a straightforward explanation to that effect; hence, it appeared that the 1984 findings that were compared with those of the 1988 study were as originally reported (CRTC, 1990: 4). Further information provided in the 1990 report demonstrates that the 1984 data were re-analyzed prior to comparison with the 1988 data (CRTC, 1985, 1990). However, the 1984 data and findings as they appeared in the 1990 report were different than originally reported, in a substantial number of catego-

ries.³ This was a misleading manoeuvre, obfuscating a substantial comparison of the two studies.

The report presented the 1988 study findings and the 1984-1988 study comparisons in four parts; the first part was a brief summary of all the results and will not be examined here. The other three sections--a report on the features of the advertisements, the findings of all characters in the advertisements, and the findings of the major characters in the advertisements--will be examined.

Features of Advertisements

First, to be examined is the portion of the study that dealt with analyses of "numbers of advertisements and features of the advertisements." (CRTC, 1990: 31-39). This section analyzed nine categories of advertisements, including product categories, users, consumers and voice-over variables which are reviewed in the following paragraphs.

Products and services promoted by the advertisements were classified as they had been in the 1984 study, according to a list used by the Canadian Television Commercials Festival (CRTC, 1990: 31). Consequently, the problems of the first study's product categorization, discussed in Chapter Three, were repeated in the 1988 study.

In coding the product and service items, for example, a promotion extolling the quality of workmanship in General Motors vans and trucks could have been coded as automobile manufacturers, automobile dealers or corporate image advertisements (Table 4.1). Only the coder would know

³ Throughout, the 1984 study reported in 1985, will be referred to as the 1984 or first CRTC study, likewise the 1988 study reported in 1990, will be referred to as the 1988 or second CRTC study.

how it had been coded. In spite of overlapping categories, the report did not indicate any coding or inter-coder reliability problems. Comparisons of the two sets of findings is complicated by the inclusion of a category for automobile dealers, which was not included in the 1984 study.

TABLE 4.1

Products Advertised
English Television Advertising

Product	Number and Percent of Ads					
	1984		1988		Change, 84-88	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Automobile manufacturers	35	3.8	38	4.5	3	1
Automobile services, dealers	61	6.8	53	6.3	-8	0
Banks, financial services, insurance	10	1.1	21	2.5	11	1
Beverages, alcoholic	34	3.8	16	1.9	-18	2
Beverages, non-alcoholic	19	2.1	30	3.6	11	1
Business to business	21	2.3	12	1.4	-9	-1
Charitable organizations	28	3.1	21	2.5	-7	-1
Children's products	37	4.1	45	5.4	8	1
Clothing, fashion	14	1.6	12	1.4	-2	0
Confectionery, snack food	24	2.7	17	2.0	-7	-1
Corporate image ads	13	1.4	3	0.4	-10	-1
Feminine hygiene	9	1.0	6	0.7	-3	0
Food producers organizations	11	1.2	19	2.3	8	1
Governments, federal and provincial	26	2.9	14	1.7	-12	-1
Health and beauty	94	10.4	90	10.7	-4	0
Home furnishings	61	6.8	32	3.8	-29	-3
Leisure, sports, newspapers	34	3.8	52	6.2	18	2
Lottaries	11	1.2	7	0.8	-4	0
Packaged goods, food	108	12.0	77	9.2	-31	-3
Packaged goods, non-food	49	5.4	68	8.1	19	3
Paid political ads	0	0.0	11	1.3	11	1
Pet food	14	1.6	0	0.0	-14	-2
Publicly regulated corporations	11	1.2	5	0.6	-6	-1
Real estate	4	0.4	3	0.4	-1	0
Retail outlets	117	13.0	126	15.0	9	2
Restaurants	32	3.6	38	4.5	6	1
Travel, tourism (non-government)	10	1.1	19	2.3	9	1
Other	13	1.4	5	0.6	-8	-1
Total	900	100	840	100		

Source: CRTC, 1990: 31

The three largest categories of advertised products in the 1988 product analysis were retail outlets, packaged non-food goods and packaged food goods, which together accounted for 32% of the products (Table 4.1).

The 1988 product findings revealed only slight differences from those reported in 1984. For example, the number of advertisements for packaged food items decreased 3% while packaged non-food items increased by 3% and the findings for the number of advertised retail outlets increased by 2% (Table 4.1). However, reporting in these studies, as noted earlier, was not always precise, and there are errors evident in the reporting of the 1988 product variable that complicate the interpretation and comparison of the product variable. The report showed that the 1988 data included 90 health and beauty advertisements, or 0.7%, which would indicate a substantial change from the first study (Table 4.1). However, close examination of the results indicates that 0.7% should have been reported as 10.7%. This change would also have corrected the column error, that mistakenly showed the 1988 % column adding to ± 100 rather than ± 90 (Table 4.1).

The "product and service" findings in the 1984 and 1988 studies are not readily comparable with the findings of other research since other research analyzes "gender" and the products and services, not products by themselves. Further, the bulk of the CRTC studies product and service categories are unique and are not comparable to the categorization of products in other studies. For example, Caron (1978) and Bretl and Cantor (1988), like previous studies and unlike the CRTC studies, reported on categories such as cleaning products, medication and household items.

Frequently in media and gender portrayal research, product and product representation are analyzed with gender. Unfortunately, the 1988 study like the 1984 study, captured product and service data, extraneous to analyses of gender-roles, missing the opportunity to conduct genuinely useful analyses. For example, analyses of gender in advertisements for

motor vehicle or household products are informative in determining how gender is portrayed, as well as yielding indicators for future research.

The 1988 study examined the "intended users" of the products and services category; this replaced the troublesome "product users" label attached to the user analysis in 1984. However, the newly labelled and operationalized variable lacked validity for gender analysis, as it reported that approximately 96% of products were for general use and 2% for use by non-humans, leaving only 2% of the advertised products and services available for examination with gender.

TABLE 4.2

***Intended Users of Products and Services
English Television Advertising***

Intended user	Number and Percent of Ads					
	1984		1988		Change, 84-88	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Females only	38	4.2	20	2.4	-18	-2
Males only	6	0.7	10	1.2	4	1
General use	841	93.4	810	96.4	-31	3
Non-human use, e.g., pet food	15	1.7	0	0	-15	-2
Total	900	100	840	100		

Note: The tests of partial association and the summary section are not shown here, as the categories in this table do not lend themselves to a meaningful test of gender differences.

Source: CRTC, 1990: 33

The 1988 study included a "general use" category of product users which replaced the 1984 category for products used by "both sexes" (Table 4.2). The "non-human" category of product users in the 1984 analysis was also examined in the 1988 study, but the 1988 analysis was not a replication of the 1984 analysis of product user (CRTC, 1990: 33).

A more efficient analysis of "product users" would examine the product in conjunction with the gender of known users of the product or with the gender of the advertisement's targeted user. Had the CRTC studies done this, their findings could be compared with those in the extensive literature available.

The operationalization of the "portrayal of consumers" variable was unique to the 1988 analysis. A variable definition included an example of a consumer, which portrayed teenagers playing on a beach in a soft drink advertisement; they were to be coded as consumers of the advertised soft drink (CRTC, 1990: 34). Any characters depicted purchasing, holding, drinking the soft drinks or even near the soft drink, would be included in the analysis as consumers because of their presence in the advertisement (CRTC, 1990: 34). The definition and example provided in the 1984 study was that of "family members who are driving to a restaurant, but not seen in the restaurant, who were coded as restaurant consumers in the advertisement" (CRTC, 1985: 22).

TABLE 4.3

***Consumers Portrayed in Ads
English Television Advertising***

Consumer	Number and Percent of Ads					
	1984		1988		Change, 84-88	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Women only	159	27	99	19	-60	-9
Men only	147	25	121	23	-26	-3
Children only	82	14	66	12	-16	-2
Women, men, children	175	30	246	46	71	16
Non-human characters, e.g., cartoons	16	3	2	<1	-14	-2
Total	579	100	534	100		

Note: The tests of partial association and the summary section are not shown here, as the categories in this table do not lend themselves to a meaningful test of gender differences.

Source: CRTC, 1990: 34

The findings of the "consumer" variable analysis indicate that the gender of a substantial number of children was not reported, nor were the classifications mutually exclusive with regard to gender (Table 4.3). And, once again, gender-neutral "non-humans" were included in the analysis (Table 4.3). The analysis, beyond reporting human (and non-human) representation and the possibility of non-humans being portrayed as consumers in the advertisements, did not report the gender of all the characters nor did it provide a credible definition of a consumer, and therefore provided little useful information.

The 1990 report compared the 1988 findings of the deficiently operationalized consumer variable with findings reported from the first study. For example, it was reported that 19% of the 1988 advertisements portrayed only females as consumers; this was less than the 27.4% reported in the 1984 study. The results do not lend themselves to valid comparison or replication, due to the difference in operationalization of the variable in the two studies. Other research into gender in advertising has not analyzed consumers as the CRTC studies did.

An analysis of the advertisements with gender and voice-overs revealed a vast majority of male characters with voice-over roles - 85% of 654 advertisements had male voices (CRTC, 1990: 35). Similarly, the 1984 study had reported 86% of the advertisements used males in voice-over roles (CRTC, 1985: 23). This change from 86% to 85% between 1984 and 1988 was not significant (CRTC, 1990: 35).

A second analysis of voice-overs, supplementary to the primary voice-over analysis, was based on the assumption of one voice-over per advertisement. This analysis reported 86% male voice-overs in the 1988 study, and 87% male voice-overs in the 1984 study. As noted by Dominick and

Rauch (1972) and by Courtney and Whipple (1974), when 87% of voice-overs were done by males, male characters were said to dominate voice-over roles. There was no change from 1972 to 1984; even in 1988, females were represented in only 13% of the voice-over roles.

The 1988 study's analysis of advertisements and value of products and voice-overs, reported male voices in 84% of the advertisements for products valued between "0 and \$1000," and in 100% of the advertisements for items valued at "more than \$1,000" (CRTC, 1990: 37). Reported differences between the 1984 and 1988 findings were slight, with only the number of females in the "\$10 to \$1,000" category showing any substantial increase.

The findings of product value and voice-overs, however, lack validity due to overlapping value classifications (CRTC, 1990: 37). The study reported two classifications for both \$10 and \$1,000 items. Since all the categories in the variable lack mutual exclusivity, the 1988 findings were lacking in validity and reliability, as were the 1984 findings of value and voice-over. The possibility of closely repeating or replicating the research and findings of either of the CRTC studies analyses of value and voice-over are highly unlikely.

The findings of the value and voice-over analysis were accompanied by notes on statistical significance. The notes did not caution that the findings, hence, the statistics, came from value classifications that were not mutually exclusive, and therefore lack reliability.

The study of advertisements portraying the preparation of food and beverages found that preparation activity is more frequent in advertisements with female characters (CRTC, 1990: 38, Table 8). The findings were that

52% of advertisements with food preparation had only female characters (CRTC, 1985: 25). A supplementary test that examined the advertisements with females or males and preparation found that in 64% of advertisements portraying food preparation the characters were female (CRTC, 1990: 38). Male characters were portrayed in food preparation activity in a minority of advertisements in both studies. Generally, the advertisements, like those criticized by the Task Force, portrayed food preparation as a female activity (CRTC, 1982: 6).

The opposite was found in an analysis of advertisements portraying "consumption of food and beverages," which reported that 65% of characters eating or drinking were male (CRTC, 1990: 39). Similar findings were reported in the 1984 study. The report of the 1984 consumption variable findings were jeopardized by an error in the supplementary test that indicated 37% of female and 73% of male characters were eating, when in fact only 63% of the characters eating were male, nor does 37% and 73% add to 100% (CRTC, 1990: 39). By itself, the error is negligible. As one in a series of errors, it adds to concerns of imprecision in the CRTC studies.

All On-camera Characters

The third section of the 1988 study included an analysis of all characters seen on-camera in the advertisements. The study examined eight categories of on-camera characters; four of them, including analyses of people with disabilities and visible minorities, are not reviewed here. The remaining four analyses: gender of all characters; gender of all characters and product type; gender and product value; and gender and revealing dress are reviewed in the following paragraphs.

The 1988 study reported that of the 2,760 on-camera characters, 59% characters were male (CRTC, 1990: 41). This was a 2% increase compared with the findings of a similar analysis of "sex of all characters" in the 1984 study, that found 57% of all on-camera characters were male. Previous studies reported that males were not as numerous as on-camera characters; for example, Caron (1978) found that 48% of characters were male and Gilly (1988) reported that 44% of the characters were male.

The increased male representation evidenced by the CRTC findings may be the result of a decrease in the female representation or it could be the result of the definition and operationalization of the variable. The 1988 study defined "all characters" as: all of the characters who appeared in advertisements, including all recognizable individuals, both minor and major characters, except "those in large groups who were not recorded" (CRTC, 1990: 41). Earlier in the 1988 report, however, the report stated that the 1988 data included 17 advertisements with more than nine male characters and eight advertisements with more than nine female characters, and that "in fact there was no upper limit on the number of characters coded in any advertisement" (CRTC, 1990: 10).

This raises two concerns. The first is obvious, were all the characters in each advertisement actually coded? That issue is not resolved by the contradictory information provided in the two different definitions and descriptions of the coding of characters (CRTC, 1990: 10, 41). The issue becomes more complex after reviewing item 33 in the coding guide which includes a category for "real animals, fantasy characters and people of unidentifiable sex," in the "sex" variable (cf. Appendix 2). The second concern has to do with the efficiency of counting all the heads, particularly

as the gender of the characters was not always captured. Specific problems emerging from the large "head count" are discussed as they are encountered.

The 1988 study's "characters by product category" variable closely resembled the 1984 category labelled "women and men in different product categories" (CRTC, 1990: 46). Equitable representation of gender was reported in only one product category, the "clothing and fashion" category, of the 1988 product analysis. The others, with the exception of three categories, were found to have a majority of male characters (Table 4.4). The three of the 20 categories of products and services that portrayed a majority of females were: "packaged goods, non-food," "food producer's organizations" and "health and beauty products" (Table 4.4).

The "health and beauty category," which had 55% male representation in the 1984 study, reported an 11% increase in female representation in the 1988 study. The remaining 16 categories of advertised products and services had a majority of male characters, with ten of the 16 reporting less female representation than in the 1984 study. Only 20 of the 28 product categories analyzed in the 1988 study were reported with the product and character findings (Table 4.4). The remaining product categories "had less than fifty characters in each category and were not reported," even as a matter of record (CRTC, 1990: 46).

Like the two "non-food" items in the 1984 version of the product analysis, automobile dealers appeared in two product categories in the 1988 analysis of product and gender (Table 4.4). Here, as was the case in the 1984 analyses, only percentages were provided with the product and service variable findings. The analysis of gender and "characters and product"

TABLE 4.4

Characters by Product Category
English Television Advertising

Type of ad	% 1984		% 1988		Base	
	F	M	F	M	1984	1988
Packaged goods, non-food	57	43	67	33	140	70
Food producers organizations	41	59	(60)	(40)	58	42
Health and beauty	45	55	56	44	266	223
Clothing, fashion	55	45	50	50	34	60
Retail outlets	47	53	48	52	372	437
Governments, federal and provincial	48	52	(47)	(53)	105	32
Packaged goods, food	42	58	41	59	386	153
<i>1988 average — 41 percent female</i>						
Children's products	47	53	40	60	135	168
Confectionery, snack food	46	54	40	60	90	67
Beverages, alcoholic	45	55	39	61	114	95
Restaurants	41	59	39	61	123	149
Beverages, non-alcoholic	41	59	37	63	51	132
Home furnishings	42	58	36	64	132	105
Leisure, sports, newspapers	38	62	36	64	139	220
Business to business	35	65	(32)	(68)	97	22
Charitable organizations	39	61	30	70	94	84
Automobile services, dealers	15	85	26	74	132	128
Banks, financial services, insurance	38	52	(25)	(75)	58	40
Automobile manufacturers, dealers	40	60	20	80	105	167
Paid political ads	-	-	18	82	-	77

Source: CRTC, 1990: 46

was, as illustrated in the preceding discussion, somewhat flawed by numerous small errors and omissions.

Analyses of gender with product type are informative indicators of gender portrayal, and indications here are, that females are still most associated with food, beauty and fashion. Male portrayals are still most associated with vehicles, banks, business and finances, and in the 1988 study, with politics--80% of political advertisements had male characters (Table 4.4).

The relationship between product type and gender portrays to an audience the type and value, and hence, the status of the products associ-

ated with gender. The gender of the character demonstrating or promoting the product, be it a toilet bowl cleaner or an automobile, conveys to the audience a message advising them what product is best, and by the gender association, which gender is best or which gender is perceived to have the most status (CRTC, 1982: 90). Similar associations are found between gender and the monetary value of the product.

The findings of the "value of products advertised by women and men in television advertising" indicated that female characters promote 42% of the products and tend to promote the least expensive products (Table 4.5). The lack of mutual exclusivity in the value categories (none of the six value categories were mutually exclusive), reduces reliability, as the analysis could not be replicated, and undermines the validity of the findings (Table 4.5).

The first of six value categories was for items valued at less than \$2, which according to the report, included free products and services (CRTC, 1990: 47). This was contradicted by the reported coding system that stated free products and services were coded separately from items valued under \$2 (Appendix 2). The reader cannot be sure where the free items were reported, further there is no way of determining where items valued at \$2, \$10, \$50, \$ 200 or \$1,000 were reported. There were two value categories where each of those items could have been reported, hence a \$10 item could have been included with the \$2 to \$10 category or with the \$10 to \$50 category (Table 4.5).

The overlapping of categories in the value variable was a replication of the same error in the 1984 study. The 1984 study, however, reported "free products and services" as a separate value category. The 1988 version of the value variable did not include, as had the 1984 study, a

TABLE 4.5

**Value of Products Advertised by Women and Men
English Television Advertising**

Price	1984		1988		% Change 84-88	
	F	M	F	M	F	M
Less than \$2 (Number)	212	270	192	251		
(Column percent)	26	27	26	25	0	.2
\$2 - \$10	382	431	298	325		
	47	43	40	32	-7	-11
\$10 - \$50	113	122	134	159		
	14	12	18	16	4	4
\$50 - \$200	14	38	22	44		
	2	4	3	4	1	1
\$200 - \$1000	30	58	36	51		
	4	6	5	5	1	-1
\$1000 and over	56	94	63	187		
	7	9	9	18	2	9
Total	807	1013	745	1017		

Summary

Significant gender difference, pooled 1984-1988 data
Significant change in gender difference, 1984-88

Yes
No

Tests of Partial Association

Effect	chi-square	df	p<.05
Price by gender by year	8.2	5	-
Price by gender	52.4	5	✓
Price by year	58.0	5	✓
Price	2068.7	5	✓

Source: CRTC, 1990: 47

category for "other;" without comment the "other" category just disappeared. The "no fixed cost" category, which raised some questions about the efficacy of the 1984 findings, was not reported in the 1990 report.

In sum, the findings of the value variable and the analyses that use the value variable findings, are of suspect reliability and validity. The findings reported with the value categories are compromised because the categories are not mutually exclusive. Similarly, comparisons of the findings of 1984 value items with the 1988 value items lack validity.

TABLE 4.6

Revealing Dress
English Television Advertising

Dress	1984		1988		% Change 84-88	
	F	M	F	M	F	M
Bathing suit (Number)	57	25	26	31		
(Percent of all members of gender)	5	2	2	2	-2	0
Underwear, sleep-wear	44	38	28	42		
	4	2	2	3	-1	0
Washing, grooming	37	33	25	20		
	3	2	2	1	-1	-1
Skin-tight clothes	18	3	2	0		
	1	<1	<1	-	-1	0
Base	1240	1636	1131	1629		

Source: CRTC, 1990: 49

Gender and Dress of On-camera Characters

An analysis of the gender of all characters and "revealing dress" reported that more male than female characters were portrayed dressed in bathing suits, underwear and sleep-wear (Table 4.6). The revealing dress variable also included a category for skin-tight clothing, which lacked appropriate operationalization, and was further complicated by the inclusion of a washing and grooming activity category (Table 4.6). Washing and grooming was described in the report as "a variety of dress styles which was to include washing and grooming activities, not usually performed in public" (CRTC, 1990: 49).

An analysis of washing and grooming activities is not compatible with an analysis of clothing styles. Revealing dress could have been more reliably categorized had it been separated from activity and included various categories of conventional, loose, tight and very tight, not revealing, some-

what revealing, and very revealing clothing. As it was reported, the variable and the findings do not lend themselves to replication or comparison.

Major Characters

The final section of the four-part 1988 study results reported on analyses of major characters. The study defined 926 characters with a speaking part and a role essential to the advertisement as major characters (CRTC, 1990: 51). The definition of a major character in 1988 was similar to the definition employed in 1984: that was "all characters with a speaking role". (CRTC, 1990: 51). The review here examines the analyses of major characters and gender with age, roles, marital status, child care activities, employment, occupations and dominant settings, and where possible compares the analyses with those of the 1984 study. The 1988 study found a smaller percentage of major characters than had the first study, where generally "only the characters with speaking roles were coded as major characters" (CRTC, 1985: 32). The 1988 findings indicated a less equitable representation of female and male "major characters" than reported in the 1984 study (CRTC, 1990: 51; CRTC, 1985: 32). Previous studies, as discussed in Chapter Two, reported finding a more equitable representation of gender than was found in the 1984 and 1988 CRTC studies.

The studies reviewed in Chapter Two defined and, in many cases, focused their entire analyses on a set of principal characters, major figures or product presenters. There is, however, a danger in defining major characters according to spoken lines and/or the centrality of their role in the advertisement. Specifically, the study may overlook the characters portrayed in decorative or sex object roles. The image of a character portrayed

as sex object was defined by one study as that of an attractive character who had little or nothing to say, was not central, or even essential to the advertisement and was usually in revealing or provocative clothing (Dominick and Rauch, 1972: 264). Studies that define and examine only the major or central characters as major players, or only characters with a substantial speaking role, will seldom capture the "sexual and decorative object" portrayals in the data.

The analysis of gender of major characters and age reported that in three of the seven age categories, male characters were in the majority (CRTC, 1990: 52). Females were, for the most part, excluded from the age categories 36 to 50 years and 51 to 65 years. Of the characters aged 36 to 50 years, 88% were male, and in the 51 to 65 year of age category, 86% were male (CRTC, 1990:53). Males were also the majority of characters in the under 12 years of age, and the over 65 years of age categories. In the age categories 12 to 18 years and 26 to 35 years, females were reported to be approximately 53% and 47% respectively, very close to the gender composition in the general population. Similar to the findings of the 1984 study and other previously reported studies, female characters were the majority only in the 12 to 25 years of age category (CRTC, 1990: 52).

The trend in television advertising, at least since 1972, has been to portray young females to the exclusion of female children and females over 35 years of age. The 1988 study findings demonstrate that this trend persists and that the representation of 12 to 25 year old females may in fact be increasing, while representation of older females is decreasing (CRTC, 1990: 52).

Generally, the 1988 study findings, like the 1984 findings, indicate that males of all ages still have a preferred status that may even be increasing in comparison with female characters of almost all ages, in television advertising. The findings support the Task Force's criticism that television advertising portrayals are biased toward young females (CRTC, 1982).

The analyses of major characters included an analysis of gender and seven categories of "character's roles." The five roles discussed here and illustrated in Table 4.7 were consumer, expert, salesperson, celebrity and other (CRTC, 1990: 56).

TABLE 4.7

Roles Depicted in Ads
Major Characters in English Television Advertising

Role	1984		1988		% Change 84-88	
	F	M	F	M	F	M
Consumer (Number)	321	347	266	314		
(Column percent)	77	59	78	54	1	-5
Expert	2	18	1	10		
	<1	3	<1	2	0	-1
Salesperson	26	94	20	96		
	6	16	6	16	0	1
Celebrity	15	64	26	97		
	8	11	8	17	-1	6
Other	34	69	28	68		
	8	12	8	12	0	0
Total	418	592	341	585		

Summary

Significant gender difference, pooled 1984-1988 data	Yes
Significant reduction in gender difference, 1984-88	No

Tests of Partial Association

Effect	chi-square	df	p<.05
Role by gender by year	3.9	4	-
Role by gender	105.9	4	✓
Role by year	7.3	4	-
Role	2019.1	4	✓

Source: CRTC, 1990: 56 (Table 5)

The analysis of "consumer's roles" of major characters should not be confused with the "portrayal of consumers in advertisements," examined earlier. The majority, 54%, of the "major characters in consumer roles,"

were portrayed by males; this was a slight increase over the 1984 findings. Consumers were defined in a way peculiar to the CRTC studies, and included 70% of all major characters. Any major characters that were in close proximity to, seen with, or on the way to the advertised product or service were coded as consumers.

The role analysis reported that those not portrayed as consumers were portrayed either as "experts," 91% of whom were male, "salespeople," of whom 73% were male, or "celebrities," of whom 68% were male. The 1988 findings of gender and role portrayal were almost identical to those reported by the 1984 study (CRTC, 1990: 56). The findings also supported the findings of the studies reviewed in Chapter Two: that males characterized as experts, salespeople and authorities significantly outnumber female characters in those roles.

The 1988 study analyzed gender of major characters with marital status (CRTC, 1990: 57). Prudently, the 1984 (CRTC) study had not reported findings for gender and marital status. The marital status of characters in television advertising is a most difficult if not impossible operationalization; for example, in most advertisements the marital status of the characters is not discernable. The operationalization and coding of marital status requires such complex operationalization and produces so little information that it is best avoided, particularly if it cannot be implemented without extraordinary care and precision (Downing, 1974). The 1988 study found less than 11% of major characters were portrayed as married; the number of females and males characterized as married were almost equal (CRTC, 1990: 57). To the researchers' credit, they did not report additional

categories of marital status since attempts to do this, as Downing (1974) commented, in other studies have been, at best, problematic.

The study examined the representation of gender and the participation of major characters in "household maintenance," finding that the rate of female participation in tasks around the house was more than twice that of male participation (CRTC, 1990: 60). It is not apparent how the study operationalized household maintenance, as neither the report nor the coding guide defined or listed household maintenance and tasks performed around the house (CRTC, 1990: 48, Appendix 2).

The analysis of major characters and "child care activities" found that twice as many females as males were portrayed in child care activity. The definitions of child care included activities carried on without any children present. For example, doing laundry or shopping for clothing for an absent child, interaction with children or just being seen with children, were deemed representative of child care (CRTC, 1990: 59, 121).

Of the 926 characters designated as major characters, 97 were children under 12 years of age and 47 were young people between 12 and 18 years of age, some of whom could be deemed to be children (CRTC, 1990: 52). The definition of major characters combined with the operationalization of child care activities supposedly allowed for the inclusion of cases "of children caring for children." The study did not report controlling for, or the results of this phenomenon; however, only 48 characters were found to be portrayed in child care roles (CRTC, 1990: 59). Indications are that the child care variable was not well operationalized in 1984 or 1988, as it yielded little reliable information for comparisons.

The 1990 report published revised data on 1984 household maintenance and family roles, reporting them as though they had been distinct variables, which they were not in 1984 (CRTC, 1985: 59). Reporting the findings from data that were analyzed by revision, four or five years after the study was originally published, is not usual practice. Further, to publish the revised findings in a different context than it was in five years previously, without explaining the changes, is poor practice and certainly not in keeping with research norms.

The study examined gender and "all people who appear to have a paying job even though the nature of the employment is unknown," and reported that 347 of the 926 major characters were portrayed in paid employment roles (CRTC, 1990: 61). Male characters were three times more likely than females to be portrayed in paid employment roles. The study found 77% of those employed were male and only 23% were female (CRTC, 1990: 61). Both Bretl and Cantor (1988) and Gilly (1988) found a higher percentage of female major characters employed; however, Lovdal (1989) reported findings almost identical to those reported by the CRTC (1990). The employment findings in the 1984 (CRTC) study were almost identical, where it was reported that 24% of employed major characters were female (CRTC, 1985: 37).

The finding that amongst major characters portrayed in occupational roles, 78% were male, paralleled the findings of the employment variable. The study reported the gender of characters in six occupational roles, which were reduced to five by combining unskilled labour and skilled tradespeople into a new category called "trades." A majority of characters portrayed in

professions, management, sales, business, trades, office work and creative occupations were male (CRTC, 1990: 62).

The findings of the occupation and gender analysis cannot be compared with 1984 findings because the categories used were not the same. Similarly the findings cannot be closely compared with other research since the operationalization of occupational role was unique to the CRTC studies. Generally speaking, other research has consistently reported similar misrepresentations of gender in all occupational roles portrayed by television advertising.

Employment and occupational roles have long been an issue of concern in gender portrayal studies (Head, 1952; DeFleur, 1964; Dominick and Rauch, 1972). Since the inception of television, the rate of male participation in the "televised labour force" has been higher than in reality. Television advertising portrays more employed males in higher status occupations than they would have in real life. Conversely, females have appeared underemployed in number and those who have been portrayed as employed have been over-represented in occupations related to serving and nurturing. The representation of gender in employment and occupational portrayals came within the mandate and concerns of the CRTC studies. The findings, from all sources, indicated that females and males are still misrepresented in occupational portrayals. Females in particular are still portrayed in the stereotyped employment patterns detailed in Chapter Two.

An analysis of the characters' "dominant setting" in the advertisements found the most prevalent and persistent setting for the majority of females is still the home; only 25% of females were portrayed in employment settings (CRTC, 1990: 63). Male characters were represented in a

variety of settings; the majority were seen in employment or work settings (CRTC, 1990: 63). Of the major characters found in "home settings," 53% were female and 31% were male (CRTC, 1990: 63).

The "dominant setting" variable in the 1988 study was comparable with the "primary setting" variable reported in the 1984 study and resulted in similar findings (CRTC, 1985: 39). The studies reviewed in Chapter Two reported findings similar to those of the CRTC studies, with the preponderance of female characters seen in home settings. The CRTC study, unfortunately, did not analyze, as most studies have done, the occupational settings which can often confirm employment role findings. The Task Force had expressed concern about this issue, with their observation that women were overly-represented in traditional settings and should be seen represented in all occupations (CRTC, 1982: 30). This observation was neither confirmed nor denied by the 1988 analysis of settings.

The remaining variables relating to major characters in the last section of the report were not included in the preceding review. Those variables included: urban and rural settings, ethnicity, race and participation in leisure, presence in vehicles, support for others, friendship, romantic involvement, violence and camera portrayal of characters' bodies. Some, such as ethnicity, race, presence in vehicles and urban and rural settings, were not essential to the objectives of the study. Others, such as camera portrayal of bodies, violence, friendship and romantic involvement, resulted in little data, and in some cases no portrayals. These were not deemed relevant to this examination other than as exemplars of inadequate selection and definition of categories.

A small change in a positive direction was indicated by the findings of the analyses of gender and occupations that revealed a slight increase since the 1984 study, in the number of females in "professional occupational" portrayals. Government advertisements, as in the 1984 study, showed almost equal representation, with 47% females and 53% males in this category (CRTC, 1990: 44). The tendency to use young females to the exclusion of older female characters only slightly declined in 1988. In sum, the analyses reflected the persistent stereotyping and disproportionate representation reported in both the 1984 study and in other research, with the exception of a slight increase in the number of females in advertisements for higher value products. The domination of males in voice-over roles was also found to have persisted with males doing 87-88% of the voice-overs in the CRTC studies. Overall, the findings indicated that little change had occurred in gender portrayal in television advertising since the 1984 study was conducted, or since the CRTC was first advised to take action to eliminate sex-role stereotyping (CRTC, 1982: 1).

One way in which the 1988 study was problematic was that it purported to be a "replication" of the 1984 study, a study as we have shown, with some serious flaws. One of the most serious problems in the study was the lack of mutually exclusive categories, particularly in the analyses using value data. The product and service category was also found lacking discrete category categories. This problem was apparent in the 1984 study and was repeated in the 1988 study. Many categories in the 1984 study, as indicated in Chapter Three, were inadequately defined or did not meet the objectives of the research. They were, for the most part, replicated in the 1988 study.

Some of the categories in the 1988 study were operationalized differently than in the first study. In some cases the categories were changed only slightly; for example, in 1988 the variable "intended user" replaced the 1984 "product user" variable. The 1990 report also listed 22 variables whose 1984 categories were combined to create new categories for the 1988 study (CRTC, 1990: 23). This limited the capacity of the latter study as a comparative exercise.

The report of the 1988 study contained, as did the report of the 1984 study, many small errors and omissions. For example, a previously mentioned error reported that 37% of females and 73% of males consuming food and beverages totalled 100% (CRTC, 1990: 39). The health and beauty products, in the product variable, were reported as 0.7% of the total advertised products when they were actually 10.7% (CRTC, 1990: 31). A third error involved the two categories for automobile dealers in the product variable (CRTC, 1990: 46). These errors indicate a lack of concern with precision and raise questions about the levels of validity and the reliability of the research. This leads to one having very limited confidence in the research and its findings, since precision, validity and reliability are essentials in content analysis research.

The 1988 study, as discussed earlier in this chapter, made changes in the sampling method, redefined major characters, re-analyzed the 1984 data, produced and published data from the revised analysis which differed from the 1984 data and used different statistical methods than in the first study. The calculations of the data were almost exclusively reported as column totals and percentages (CRTC, 1990). Hence, in cases where readers wish to know the proportion of females to males, they are required

to do further calculations themselves; publishing the row percentages would have increased the usefulness of the report. These conditions limit the usefulness of the studies for examining changes over time and for comparison with other research.

The findings of the 1988 study were not published on their own. The 1984 and 1988 findings were accompanied by results of statistical tests done on the combined revised data and were published as one report (CRTC, 1990). There is not a stand-alone report of the 1988 study nor did the combined publication present the 1984 findings as they were reported in the 1985 report. Rather, in the majority of instances, only the revised and reanalysed findings of the 1984 study were published in the 1990 report. Perhaps the CRTC, or someone else, did not want the 1984 data reported in 1985, to be available side by side with the 1988 findings.

In brief, the 1988 study was not, as promised, a replication of the 1984 "benchmark" study; rather, the 1988 work was comparable with a revision of the deficient "benchmark" study. Since the 1984 study was, in many instances flawed, a direct replication should not have been attempted in the first place. The 1990 report's promised comparison of 1984 and 1988 findings was, in many respects, a comparison of findings from the 1988 study with the revisionist version of the 1984 study findings.

Thus, the implicit value of the CRTC studies for assessing the portrayal of gender in television advertising is not as effective as the original study mandate had hoped. The studies, in comparison with existing research, were not as reliable as might be expected, nor were they as comparable to existing social science as they might have been. Since the studies failed for the most part to meet the research objectives, the CRTC's efforts

to obtain its own benchmark study and a study to measure change over time have to be considered, at best, somewhat ineffective.

A number of factors contributed to the ineffectiveness of the research. First was the CRTC's limitation that prohibited study of the stereotypes in gender portrayal and directed the studies to research only "sex-role portrayals" and presence of gender (CRTC, 1985: 4). These directives could have reduced the study to a mere head count of female and male appearances. Further, the CRTC stated that producers, television stations and networks were not to be identified. This meant, for example, that if the CBC advertising had an equitable representation of gender, this would be lost in the data if a private network was broadcasting advertising that contained more numerous inequitable representations and vice versa.

Other shortcomings in the studies were due to an apparent lack on the part of the CRTC to closely monitor the research. Examples of these were: the reluctance of the researchers and the CRTC to draw on easily available studies in gender portrayal; the acceptance of questionable levels of reliability and validity in the research; and, most of all, the choice of ill-defined, non-exhaustive and non-exclusive categories. Content analysis stands or falls on its categories, since categories "represent the elements of the investigators' theory" (Holsti, 1969).

The 1988 CRTC content analysis of gender portrayal in television advertising has been examined in this chapter. The examination considered the methodology, findings, and the shortcomings of the 1988 study. The examination included some comparisons of the 1988 study with the 1984 study, and occasional comparisons with findings in other research. The examination reaffirmed the conclusion noted in Chapter Three that, despite

the findings of previous research and the concerns voiced by the Task Force “that sex-role stereotyping, particularly of women was a problem of inequality and injustice” (CRTC, 1982: 3). Few if any changes have occurred since the CRTC was directed to take action toward its elimination. Chapter Five will further examine the research problems in both the 1984 and 1988 studies. That will be followed by a brief discussion of the regulatory role of the CRTC and the role of the industry groups in the research initiatives, and the current position of the CRTC in eliminating gender stereotyping.

CHAPTER FIVE

In this chapter, following on the review of the 1988 CRTC study of gender portrayal in Chapter Four, the research problems in the 1988 study will be examined and discussed. The problems discovered in the 1988 study, one of the objectives of which was to measure changes over time, will be brought together for examination and discussion with the problems of the 1984 benchmark study, reviewed in Chapter Three. Further, this chapter will examine the supervisory role of the CRTC in the research initiatives, as well as the role played by others such as the Task Force and industry groups. The chapter will conclude with a discussion of the CRTC's responsibility in eliminating or encouraging the elimination of gender stereotypes and inequitable representation of gender in the broadcast media it regulates.

The 1984 content analysis, reviewed in Chapter Three, was commissioned by the CRTC after two years of industry self-regulation of gender portrayal guidelines. That study, according to Erin Research:

measured patterns of representation and patterns of behaviour and reported only on things that could be counted and clearly defined, so that any person trained in a specific coding system would come up with the same observations (Adjusting the Image, 1987: 26).

Few patterns of behaviour were to be found in the 1984 study report (CRTC, 1985). Much of what was reported of the patterns of representation had not been clearly defined, and much of what had been counted had not been precisely reported or well operationalized. The studies, in both 1984 and 1988, suggest that the CRTC's research team may have lacked

experience and/or may have misinterpreted the research questions and the standard approaches to content analysis. This, however, does not explain the apparent lack of monitoring of the research by the CRTC and why they accepted and published the problematic research with deficient categorization and findings in the two studies. The research and findings neither fulfilled the Task Force's mandate nor provided the information requested by the CRTC (CRTC, 1985). If any one aspect of the study was most deficient and least reliable, it was the system of categorization.

An effective system of categorization is essential to all quantitative analysis: "no content analysis can be better than its categories, for the system of categories is, in essence the conceptual scheme" (Budd ", 1967: 39). Normally in content analysis, the categories are variables or the discrete components of variables; the categories are not mere labels, but are carefully defined compartments into which the data are gathered for analysis. A research scheme requires that the categories come directly from research questions, ensuring that the research measures what it is intended to measure. Further, according to Budd (1967: 39-41), the categories must meet the following criteria: they must be appropriate, they must be exhaustive, and it is most critical that both the categories and the divisions within the categories be mutually exclusive.

The categorization systems of the studies reviewed in Chapter Two met, for the most part, the criteria above and appeared to have very well-defined categories. The system of categorization employed in the 1984 and 1988 CRTC studies, however, in many instances failed to meet the basic criteria required for reliable content analysis. These failures are illustrated in the following discussion which re-examines the product and service, product

users, consumers and value variables reviewed in Chapters Three and Four, and in particular, further addresses the problems with non-exhaustive and non-exclusive categories.

Interest in examining advertised products with the gender of the characters portrayed in the television advertising was prompted by the persistent over-representation of females in the on-camera promotion of personal cleaning products, bathroom and other cleaning products. Paralleling that criticism was the complaint that male representations dominated the promotion of automobiles, financial services and business services (Dominick and Rauch, 1972; Courtney and Whipple, 1974).

These observations, also noted in McLuhan's (1951) description of females in television advertising, who are portrayed as characters who must disinfect not only themselves but the spaces surrounding them, provoked the research questions used as early as 1972 by Dominick and Rauch (and others) in the study of gender portrayal in television advertising (1972). The persistent criticisms of female portrayals in advertising were a factor in their categorization of the products and service variable into six very specific categories. Dominick and Rauch (1972) found that in categories for personal hygiene (soaps, shampoos, deodorants, et cetera) product advertisements, females were seven times more likely to appear than not appear. Categories for cleaning and personal hygiene products as discrete variables, however, were not included in the CRTC's analyses.

Similar analyses revealed that less than 25% of advertisements for bathroom and kitchen products were promoted by male characters, while an exceptional majority of the characters promoting cars and trucks, and a smaller majority of those promoting products such as motor oils and gaso-

lines were males (Dominick and Rauch, 1972: 261). The categories of cars, trucks and other motor vehicles, and the findings that males did most of the promoting of these products, came directly from the research questions, one of which was, for example, are females or males over-represented in the advertising of vehicles. Courtney and Whipple (1974) and Klassen (1977) both analyzed and reported on eight product and service categories, Knill and Pesch (1981) used nine categories and Craig (1990) employed seven product categories.

The illustrations here, as well as the studies reviewed in Chapter Two, most often analyzed and reported findings of ten or less exclusive and well defined product categories. The data produced were, in the majority of cases, significant and useful in assessing gender portrayal. More importantly, a schema can be observed, emerging from the original complaints of gender portrayal, to the research objective, to the research questions and finally to the variable categories and the research findings.

The 27 categories of the product and service variable in both CRTC studies originated with a classification list of product and service advertisements which was used by the advertising industry award festival (CRTC, 1985: 4). The festival categories were market-related categories used for advertising industry competition and were not all that adaptable for use in research, and as implied by the use of the advertising industry list, the report shows that the categories did not follow from the research questions.

One of the results of ill-defined and numerous categories was the "fractionation" of the variable (Budd, 1967: 50) with few of the product and service items even suitable to being collapsed or recoded into other variables. Budd (1967) warned in a discussion of the "fractionation of catego-

ries," that one of the results of this phenomenon was that the use of too many categories would render the statistical tests inconclusive. The CRTC report stated, in reference to the 1984 product and service categories, that there were too few people in many of the groups, hence the study reported only the findings of 18 of the 27 product and service categories (CRTC, 1985: 29). The research should have used only the categories required to address the research objective, which was to give the CRTC "factual information on sex-role portrayal" (CRTC, 1985: 4).

Generally, the CRTC studies findings cannot be compared with the findings of other research. Decima Research, contracted by the CRTC to examine the two studies, also noted the analysis of the product variable was limited due to a lack of gender analysis (Decima, 1990).¹ This is unfortunate, since a very basic test of a study's validity is achieved through comparison with similar research. For example, the percentage of female characters in advertisements for cleaning products or the incidence of male characters portrayed in family roles found in one study can be compared with those in subsequent research; if they are not found to be similar, the research question is why. This "why" frequently leads to further research, and the results also provide an opportunity to note changes, or the lack of them over time. These comparisons are not possible with the CRTC studies, in part, as described in the preceding discussion of the product variable, because of the unique and apparent deficiencies in their operationalization.

The shortcomings in the operationalization of the variables in the CRTC (1984-88) studies is well illustrated by the definition for a variable

¹ In the latter part of April, 1995, a series of requests made to the CRTC, under the provisions of the Access to Information Act, resulted in the acquisition of a two volume critique of the CRTC/Erin research prepared for the CRTC by Decima Research Inc.

entitled "consumers." Consumers have been defined in many other studies as those characters who were portrayed "consuming," as in eating, drinking or immediately using something. Alternatively, consumers have been defined as the characters actually making a purchase, arranging for a purchase or contracting a service. Those consumer categories are further complicated by a third interpretation that originated with complaints that male characters are always portrayed in advertisements as authorities or experts who talk bathroom and kitchen products while females (as consumers) are the only ones actually buying and using them. Some studies have analyzed the promoters and the consumers from that context. Hence, the difficulty of distinguishing between consumers, users and promoters is problematic and like all categorization generally, a research challenge. However, reliable definitions of consumers have evolved and have been used in a multitude of media research.

The CRTC (1985, 1990) reports include a multiplicity of consumer definitions. In the text, tables and coding materials, the reports indicate that consumers were defined as consumers in different ways on a number of occasions. According to the 1985 report, characters who might use a product are consumers; characters who are thought to use the product are consumers; and almost all characters seen in an advertisement for the products, are consumers (CRTC, 1985: 35, 76, 85). Those who are implied consumers, as well as those who are actually seen using the product, with the exception of sales people, experts or celebrity endorsers, are all deemed to be consumers (CRTC, 1985: 22; CRTC, 1990: 34). A further instruction for "item 17" in the coding method, however, reminded coders that, only

those actually seen using the product, were to be coded as consumers (cf. Appendix 1).

A further problem with the consumer variable, in addition to those previously discussed, is that the categories were not precisely defined or mutually exclusive; hence, the probability of replicability is negligible. The findings were that 76% of the characters were consumers; however, this included the "non-human characters" and children, whose gender was not reported (see Chapter Four, Table 4.3). Subsequently, even the reported equity of gender among "consumers" is suspect since it appears that every incidence of gender was not reported. It appears, therefore, that there was not a specific research question for the consumer variable that would have provided for a clear and consistent definition of a "consumer." The lack of well-defined and consistent coding instructions for coding consumers (cf. Appendix 2), and the inclusion of the genderless children and non-humans resulted in invalid findings which were of little value in "assisting the CRTC to make informed assessments" about gender portrayals in advertising (CRTC, 1985: 4).

One inexplicable aspect of the CRTC studies where the research pushed the boundaries of responsible research, was their use of non-exclusive variable categories. The first principle of categorization in social science methodology is that "categories must be mutually exclusive," any coded item must fall unequivocally into one category and no more (Zito, 1975: 32). This failing is rarely observed in the existing body of research studies primarily because only quality research is usually published. These studies are an exception in that they were published by the CRTC (CRTC,

1985; 1990). It is unlikely that these studies would have survived the scrutiny required for reporting in peer-reviewed professional publications.

The 1984 and 1988 studies' most obvious infraction of the rule of mutually exclusive categories was seen in the monetary value analyses (CRTC, 1990: 37, 47; CRTC, 1985: 18, 24, 30). All of the analyses using data describing monetary value employed overlapping value categories. One of these, an analysis of "value of products and services," reported in the 1984 study, analyzed 10 categories of value of the advertised products and services (cf. Table 3.1: p. 78). Only one of the 10 value categories, the category for products and services estimated to be worth more than \$20,000, was a discrete category. There were two or even more categories into which each of the other 897 items in the data could have been coded. Two additional analyses in the 1984 study, "higher and lower cost products and voice-overs" and "characters promoting higher and lower cost products" also used the same non-exclusive value categories albeit with a smaller number of items (CRTC, 1985: 24, 30).

The 1988 study included two analyses related to monetary values. They were, "gender, voice-over and value of product" and "value of products advertised by women and men," neither of which used mutually exclusive categories (CRTC, 1990: 37, 47). The "value of products advertised by women and men" variable reported six value groups, only one of which, the group of products valued at less than \$2, was a discrete category. In view of the problems found in the value analyses, the validity and reliability of the findings and related variables are suspect and of limited value.

The acquisition of the sample is a critical and essential component of content analysis. If the sample is not drawn correctly it can render the rest

of the research questionable, and possibly, invalidate the findings. The CRTC content analysis sample in both 1984 and 1988 was drawn from taped recordings of 21 consecutive station days of programming. The sample included an equal number of advertisements from CBC stations, CTV stations and independent stations (CRTC, 1985: 9). Approximately the same number of advertisements was drawn from each of 21 days of broadcast tape (CRTC, 1985: 9). Hence, the sample could be said to have been drawn systematically, and though adequate for some purposes, a more randomized sampling methodology would have resulted in a more rigorous sample.

An even more serious flaw in sampling resulted from the purposive duplicating of advertisements. A few duplications in a sample of hundreds of advertisements would not be unexpected or deleterious. The concern here, from a statistical perspective, is that the inclusion of a large number of duplicates in the sample circumscribes the criteria for a random distribution. The more duplications in the sample, the less likely that any one particular non-duplicated advertisement is likely to appear in the sample. This wreaks havoc with the notion that any and all advertisements have an equal probability of inclusion in the sample.

A primary assumption of quantitative analysis is that the findings be testable. Therefore one of the requirements of the sample is that it be a random sample, since much of statistical testing demands this random sampling distribution. Analyses and testing of data containing items that appear more than once require tests of multiple measure, otherwise the statistical findings are likely to be invalid. If the systematic and uncontrolled duplication of items in a sample were viable, content research could be done

more easily and less expensively. For example, a sample of 300 items could be multiplied by any number to acquire a larger sized sample, and any one item would be duplicated the same number of times.

Of equal concern in examining the duplication of advertisements is the social significance of their inclusion, that being the influence or effects of repeatedly viewing the same advertisements. The CRTC report alluded to this in their statement that the duplicates were included because "it would be misleading to treat high frequency advertisements, in the same way as low-frequency advertisements" (CRTC, 1990, 21). There are ways to deal effectively with both the sociological concerns and the statistical demands.

One recent study (1994), for example, dealt with both the concern for the social impact of frequently repeated advertisements and the need for statistical constraints. The study drew a sample from six hours of broadcasting each day for five days, producing 550 advertisements (Signorielli, McLeod and Healy, 1994: 91). The elimination of the duplicated advertisements reduced the sample from 550 to 119 individual advertisements. The researchers, considering it was more likely that the images of the repeated advertisements would be more influential, weighted the duplicated advertisements and ran their tests again. The results of the analyses of the weighted sample and unweighted sample, however, yielded somewhat similar findings (Signorielli, 1994: 100). It can be estimated that if the rate of repetition of advertisements in the CRTC sample were, for example, only half the rate encountered by the Signorielli study, the 1984 CRTC sample would have been comprised of less than 400 individual advertisements. The relevance of citing the Signorielli study here is to illustrate one approach to resolving the issues related to the duplication of repeated

advertisements. The most obvious ways of managing duplications in a sample are, as discussed: eliminating them and losing the opportunity to assess the sociological implications of the repetitions; including the duplications and controlling for them, by, for example weighting as Signorielli (1994) did; or allowing duplications in the sample, accounting for and reporting them.

The CRTC studies did none of the above in the management of duplicate advertisements in the sample. It appears that the CRTC was negligent in its monitoring of the sampling since they did not report how many duplicate advertisements were repeated how many times. Nor were the duplicates excluded from the sample, or included and controlled for, or weighted.

As discussed in this thesis, many dimensions of the CRTC studies were unique and unlike the research approaches of other studies. This was due, in part, to the lack of reference to existing research, as the CRTC studies did not include a comprehensive review of previous study into gender portrayal in the broadcast media. Nor was there a *post facto* comparison of the studies' findings with those in the existing body of literature.

Undoubtedly, the CRTC's monitoring of the studies and subsequent research would have been approached differently, had this review been conducted. The strength of content analysis is in its comparisons across media and time, as the comparisons provide tested definitions, uncover defective or troublesome categories, and provide better definitions, categories and new research directions (Butler and Paisley, 1980).

The CRTC's desired "benchmark study" and a study to "measure changes over time" would have been more useful had those responsible for the studies made themselves fully conversant with the vast research litera-

ture available in the public domain on gender portrayals in the broadcast media. Many of the problems in the 1988 study were replications or extensions of errors made in the 1984 study. Had the existing studies been reviewed, if only after the 1984 study, it could have contributed to the validity, the reliability and, therefore, the usefulness of the 1988 study.

The CRTC (1984, 1988) content analysis studies produced a collection of descriptive statistics to describe the gender portrayals in the examined advertisements. Data of this type can indicate the representation or the misrepresentation of gender, and unreasonable or inequitable distributions of gender in television advertising. For example, in study after study, voice-over roles have been observed by a straightforward coding and counting of the female and male voices. The studies found, as did the CRTC studies, that in advertisements with voice-overs, females are excluded since 85% to 95% of the advertisements employ male voices. Though the voice-over discrimination may require regulation it does not require, at this time, further research.

What was required was a study that attempted to measure the demeaning and trivializing portrayals of gender and sex-role stereotyping as recommended by the CRTC Task Force on Sex-role Stereotyping (CRTC, 1982). This type of study would have had to operationalize more complex concepts that would yield explanatory or interpretive statistics. The CRTC studies, for example, could have captured data concerning only the one or two characters who were on-camera the longest time, and who were expected by the advertiser to have the most influence on the audience. These characters could have been examined in combination with analyses of social roles, product type, product value and gender.

Similarly, if on-camera roles with and without speaking had been coded and examined in relation to social role, type of clothing and gender, it could have provided information about the portrayal of characters as decorative or sexual objects in advertisements. Analyses of the mode of dress or settings, by themselves, even if conducted with careful precision, lack utility in that they are not sufficiently informative. The faulty analyses of the "revealing dress" variable in these studies, more thoroughly discussed here, in the previous chapters (Three and Four) and in the Decima (1990) report for the CRTC, best evidences the overall ineptness of the CRTC studies in this area.

More rigorous and explanatory research could examine stereotypes and produce data which could either support or refute a complaint such as, "only male characters are seen using and promoting automobiles and business products." The CRTC studies did not conduct research into the advertising accompanying children's programming, Saturday morning television advertising, portrayals in Canadian-produced advertising, the portrayals of older females or research into the advertisers' use of young females as attention-getting sexual lures. Future studies of gender portrayal in advertising should examine the CRTC omissions, particularly the advertising accompanying children's programming, in addition to examining gender and spoken dialogue, gender and product type and daypart. Carefully conducted, those analyses could provide indications of what gender portrayal regulation is required.

The lack of explanatory analyses in the two CRTC studies, discussed in the preceding paragraphs, was another of the studies' shortcomings. The government had requested explanatory information for use in policy devel-

opment, but what the research delivered were two reports heavy with variables and findings of questionable descriptive value, and in some instances, statistical data of limited use. The studies were to provide an up-to-date, factual and informative assessment (CRTC, 1985) of gender portrayal and “sex-role stereotyping” (CRTC, 1982: 1) as it was referred to in 1979 by Jeanne Sauvé, the Minister of Communication and later, by her successor David MacDonald who discussed the problem of “sex stereotyping in the media” (CRTC, 1982: 1). These studies failed to fulfil their mandate.

Gender portrayal in the media was and is biased against females. This fact, along with the media’s perpetuation of negative female stereotypes, had attracted government attention and policy endeavour. A 1979 initiative taken up by Communications Minister Jeanne Sauvé that saw the formation of the CRTC Task Force on Sex-Role Stereotyping addressed these concerns. That initiative gave recognition to the problem by defining it and placing it on the political agenda. The CRTC Task Force report, Images of Women reiterated that sex-role stereotyping was a problem of inequality and injustice rather than one of “bad taste” (CRTC, 1982: 3). Further, the Task Force stated that “the most blatant example of misrepresentation in portrayals could be seen in television advertising,” which if not portraying women in subservient employment portrayed them as “sexual objects,” and the Task Force would give consideration to “both television advertising and programming, in that order” (CRTC, 1982: 3).

The regulatory role of the CRTC was, according to the 1979 directive of the Minister of Communications, “to take steps to encourage the elimination of sex-role stereotyping from the media regulated by the CRTC” (CRTC,

1982: 1). The Task Force, which was put in place by the CRTC in response to that directive, recommended that the CRTC monitor and assess gender portrayals over a period of two years (CRTC, 1982: 65). The 1984 content analysis was as close a response to the monitoring recommendation as was made by the CRTC. The results were reported in 1985 and reviewed in a CRTC report, Sex Role Stereotyping In The Broadcast Media (CRTC, 1986a).

The report (CRTC, 1986a) reviewed a portion of the findings noted by the CRTC in 1985 and also contained a review of the sex-role stereotyping concerns reported in 1982 by the Task Force. Among the concerns that "the Commission undertook to monitor and assess," was that broadcasting should present women engaged in a wide variety of activities: as authorities, experts, as intelligent, as decision-makers, and as characters capable of making significant contributions to society (CRTC, 1986a: 65). Further, broadcasting should not portray women as attention-getting sexual stimuli or as otherwise irrelevant objects, as subservient to men, as dependent on men and/or as neurotic characters compulsive about cleanliness (CRTC, 1982: 32, 35). These concerns, among others, were restated in the 1986 report (1986a). Neither the discussion of these particular concerns or the report in general included any explanation of why the CRTC had neglected to have the commissioned research inquire into those specific issues (listed above).

The issues and concerns demonstrated in the statements by Ministers Sauvé and MacDonald were specific to sex-role or gender-role stereotyping. The Task Force repeatedly expressed its queries and concerns in terms of sex-role stereotyping, negative stereotypes and stereotyped images (CRTC, 1982: 29-35). The CRTC had a regulatory responsibility to investigate,

assess and develop policy regarding "sex stereotyping in the media." However, the CRTC, in its research mandate given to the research team to examine sex-roles, the acceptance of the research, and publishing of the findings, indicated that it did not completely fulfil its responsibility in the research phase, to examine and assess stereotyping in the broadcast media.

According to the CRTC, the study gathered "descriptive data about the portrayal of sex roles in Canadian Broadcast media" (CRTC, 1985: 4). The CRTC research report on the television advertising component of the study stated that "stereotype is a limited term usually carrying negative connotation and that the CRTC study investigated at a 'higher level' of portrayal which produced factual information on sex-role portrayal and did not report on sexual stereotypes" (CRTC, 1985: 4). The report further elaborated that "the research was based on Canadian Association of Broadcasters (CAB) and Canadian Advertisers Foundation (CAF was formerly the AAB) guidelines on sex-role portrayal and that the method of analysis was designed to reflect those (CAB and AAB) guidelines" (CRTC, 1985: 5). The use of industry guidelines was stated somewhat differently in the 1990 report: "the variables used in the research were derived from the CAB and AAB guidelines" (CRTC, 1990: 6).

An argument could be made that in keeping with the ministerial directives and its own Task Force recommendations, the CRTC was required to examine "stereotypes." A further argument could be that in keeping with standard research practice, the CRTC should have ensured that research variables came from research questions, complaints and other studies versus being rooted in industry guidelines. Simply put, however, the CRTC was to examine the insidious gender stereotypes that degraded or trivialized

females (MacDonald, 1979: 3). The CRTC's failure to investigate "stereotypes" in its broadest sense is unfortunate because the findings would have contributed immeasurably to the formulation of gender portrayal regulation.

Images of Women (CRTC, 1982), the CRTC Task Force's report, recommended specific actions including the assessment and monitoring of gender portrayals to preclude the development and implementation of policy that had been requested by the Minister. The report also described how the CRTC Task Force on Sexual Stereotyping, the Task Force Report and the formation of the CRTC Internal Committee on Sex role Stereotyping, met, at least, the first and minimal requirements of the Minister of Communication's mandate.

Thirty years of media research existed to indicate to the CRTC that the television industry lacked the will to produce, distribute and broadcast reasonable gender portrayals. One would not necessarily expect those same players to make the best possible contributions to the formulation of policy that would likely impinge on their ability to decide for themselves what images and stereotypes should be promulgated. It is possible that the intention of these players was positive and transcended their vested interests; however, it is equally possible that industry members opposed to CRTC regulation of gender portrayal might not cooperate with processes intended to further regulate advertisers or broadcasters. It is a matter of record that the industry (CAB) strongly opposed and lobbied against regulation and failed to comply with CRTC attempts at mandatory regulation (Trimble, 1990).

The industry (CAB and CAF) representatives, however, were enthusiastic in their promotion of industry "self regulation" of gender portrayal. In 1984 they assisted the CRTC by developing guidelines on sex-role portrayal that were, as mentioned, used by the CRTC in the 1984 and 1988 studies. Since the CRTC was reluctant to use guidelines from existing research, and knowing that the industry had limited concerns with gender portrayal and opposed regulation, it would have been prudent on the part of the CRTC research supervisors to develop their own research guidelines. In the 1985 report of the first study, the CRTC stated:

The research is based on CAB and AAB guidelines on sex-role portrayal. The method of analysis was designed to fairly and accurately reflect the spirit of the CAB and AAB guidelines (CRTC, 1985: 5).

The CRTC had a regulatory responsibility to assess and monitor sex stereotyping in the media and had been directed to do so by the Minister of Communication. Hence, the CRTC and Canadians might have been better served had the CRTC research "reflected the spirit and concern" of the Minister's directive. The shifting of even part of that responsibility to the industry under investigation was an error on the part of the CRTC. Similarly, the CRTC was responsible for the supervision of the content analyses which failed to measure what the research was intended to measure. The CRTC had a regulatory and fiscal responsibility to ensure that the research and the researchers were monitored in carrying out essential research. The CRTC seems not to have done this.

This thesis has questioned if, and to what extent, the CRTC fulfilled its responsibility with regard to the Government's directive to stop, or at least, encourage "the elimination of sex stereotyping in the broadcast media"

(CRTC, 1982: 1). The CRTC had a further responsibility, a social responsibility, to develop the firmest possible policy to ensure reasonable gender portrayals in the media.²

The CRTC was mandated and positioned to provide Canadian society with a gender-portrayal broadcast regulation that is representative of an organized, enlightened and equitable society. The window of opportunity opened in 1979 by the federal Cabinet directive to the CRTC is now closed, and with its closing, the best and last chance in this century to shape a more reasonable and equitable portrayal of gender in the broadcast media is probably lost. The lost opportunity raises grave concerns that if the CRTC did not effectively supervise the relatively straightforward issue of gender stereotyping regulation in advertising, it seems poorly positioned to deal with the more complex regulatory challenges on the policy agenda such as convergence, violence and even privacy.

² The responsibilities, including the social responsibility of the CRTC is embedded in the Statutes of Canada 38-39 (1991). It is stated that the CRTC is to effectively ensure and maintain and enhance the culture of Canada and to assist in safeguarding and strengthening the social and economic fabric of Canada and through broadcasting to reflect attitudes, opinions, values which serve the needs of women, men and children (Canada, 1991: Statutes 38-39: (c, d, i; iii))

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aaron, Dorothy. 1975. *About Face: Towards A Positive Image of Women In Advertising*. Toronto: Ontario Status of Women.

Alliance of Canadian Television and Radio Artists (ACTRA). 1986. *Gender Portrayal in CTV Network News and Information Programming*. Prepared by Erin Research. Toronto: ACTRA.

Alliance of Canadian Television and Radio Artists (ACTRA). 1984. *Gender Portrayal in Canadian Television*. Toronto: ACTRA.

Alreck, Pamela, Robert Settle and Michael Belch. 1982. "Who Responds To "Gendered" Ads, and How?" *Journal of Advertising Research*, 22(2), 25-31.

Amundsen, Kirsten. 1977. *New Look at The Silenced Majority*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Aronoff, Craig E. 1974. "Prime Time: Sex Roles and Aging on Television." *Journal of Communication*, 24(4), 86-87.

Ashmore, R. D. and F. Del Boco. 1981. "Conceptual Approaches to Stereotypes and Stereotyping." In D. L. Hamilton (Ed.), *Cognitive Process in Stereotyping and Intergroup Behaviour* (pp. 1-36). Hillsdale: Erlbaum.

Atkin, David. 1991. "The Evolution of Television Series Addressing Single Women: 1966-1990." *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 35(4), 517-523.

Atkin, David, Jay Moorman and Carolyn A. Lin. 1991. "Ready For Prime Time: Network Series Devoted to Working Women in The 1980s." *Sex-Roles*, 25(11-12), 677-685.

Atwood, R. A., S. B. Zahn and G. Webber. 1986. "Perceptions of The Traits of Women on Television." *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 30(1), 95-101.

Baehr, H. 1980. "The "Liberated Women" in Television Drama." *Women's Studies International Quarterly*, 3, 29-39.

- Baehr, H. and G. Dyer. 1987. *Boxed In: Women and Television*. New York: Pandora Press.
- Bagdikian, Ben. 1989. "The Lords of The Global Village." *The Nation*, 12(June), 805-820.
- Ball-Rokeach, Sandra J. and Muriel Cantor. 1988. *Media Audience and Social Structure*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Bandura, A. 1986. *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. 1977. *Social Learning Theory*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. and R. Walters. 1963. *Social Learning and Personality Development*. New York: Holt.
- Barcus, Earle. 1983. *Images of Life on Children's Television: Sex Roles, Minorities and Families*. New York: Praeger.
- Bardwick, Judith and Suzanne Schumann. 1967. "Portrait of American Men and Women in TV Commercials." *Psychology*, 4(4) 18-23.
- Barker, David. 1988. "It's Been Real: Forms of Television Representation." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 88(5) 42-56.
- Barnouw, Erik. 1990. *Tube of Plenty: The Evolution of American Television* (Rev. 2nd ed.). New York: Oxford Press.
- Barthel, Diane L. 1988. *Putting On Appearances: Gender and Advertising*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Basow, Susan. 1984. *Sex-Role Stereotypes: Traditions and Alternatives*. Monterey: Brooks and Cole.
- Bell, L. (Ed.). 1983. *Visions of Women*. Clifton: Humana Press.
- Berelson, B. 1952. *Content Analysis in Communications Research*. New York: Free Press.
- Bernstein, Sidney. 1977. "How Research Finds The Obvious." *Advertising Age*, 22(August), 16.

- Betz, Anne. 1991. *From Cover-Girl to Co-host: Images of Women on CBC Prime-time Public Affairs Television 1960-1983*. Unpublished M.A. Research Essay. Ottawa: Carleton University.
- Beu, Ann H. 1974. "Doctor, Lawyer, Household Drudge." *Journal of Communication*, 24(2), 142-145.
- Bird, Caroline. 1971. "What's Television Doing For 51% of Americans?" *TV Guide*, (Feb. 27) 5-8.
- Bloch, Susan. 1985. "The Business of Friendly Persuasion." *Duke Magazine*, 71(4), 12-15.
- Bretl, Daniel J. and Joanne Cantor. 1988. "The Portrayal of Men and Women in US Television Commercials: A Recent Content Analysis and Trends Over 15 Years." *Sex-Roles*, 18(9/10), 595-609.
- Brown, Mary Ellen. 1992. *Television and Women's Culture: Politics of The Popular*. London: Sage.
- Brown, M. E. and M. Miller. 1982. "Mass Media and Sex-Typing: Research Perspectives and Policy Implications." *International Journal of Women's Studies*, 5(3), 265-276.
- Brownlee, Mary Elizabeth. 1978. *Analysis of The Portrayal of Women in Selected Television Commercials*. Unpublished M.A. Research Essay, Ottawa: Carleton University.
- Buchanan, William and Hadley Cantril. 1954. "National Stereotypes." In Wilbur Schramm (Ed.), *The Process and Effects of Mass Communication* (pp. 313-328). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Budd, Richard, Robert Thorpe and Lewis Donohew. 1967. *Content Analysis of Communications*. New York: MacMillan.
- Buerkel-Rothfuss, N. L. and S. Mayes. 1981. "Soap Opera Viewing: The Cultivation Effect." *Journal of Communication*, 31(3), 108-115.
- Busby, Linda. 1975. "Sex-role Research in the Mass Media." *Journal of Communication*, 25(4), 107-131.
- Busby, Linda. 1974. "Defining The Sex-Role Standard in Commercial Network Television Programs Directed Toward Children." *Journalism Quarterly*, 51(4), 690-696.

- Butler, Matilda and William Paisley. 1980. *Women and The Mass Media*. New York: Human Sciences Press.
- Butsch, Richard. 1992. "Class and Gender in Four Decades of Television Situation Comedy: Plus ca Change." *Critical Studies In Mass Communication*, 9(4), 387-399.
- Butsch, Richard and Lynda Glennon. 1983. "Social Class: Frequency Trends in Domestic Situation Comedy, 1946-1978." *Journal of Broadcasting*, 27(1), 77-81.
- Bystydienski, J. and N. Rose. 1973. *Women's Image in Television Advertisements*. Unpublished manuscript. Montreal: McGill University.
- Caballero, Marjorie and Paul Soloman. 1984. "A Longitudinal View of Women's Role Portrayal in Television Advertising." *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 12(4), 93-108.
- Canada, Royal Commission on The Status of Women (RCSW) . 1970. *Towards Equality For Women, Report of the Royal Commission on The Status of Women in Canada*. Ottawa: Status of Women.
- Canada, Statistics Canada. 1992. *Labour Force Studies* [Catalogue 71.001]. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.
- Canada, Statistics Canada. 1989. *Annual Television Viewing in Canada: Culture Statistics*. Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.
- Canada. 1991. *Broadcasting Act. Revised Statutes of Canada (C-22)*: Ottawa: Minister of Supply and Services.
- Canadian Advertising Foundation. 1988. *Report to the Advertising Industry of Initiatives re: Sex-role Stereotyping Guidelines*. Toronto: Canadian Advertising Foundation.
- Canadian Association of Broadcasters. 1987. *Response to CRTC PN 1987-90*. Ottawa: CAB.
- Cantor, Muriel. 1991. "From Molly Greenberg to Bill Cosby: The American Family On Television." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 22(2), 201-216.

- Cantor, Muriel. 1991. *Prime-time Television: Content and Control* (2nd ed.). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Cantor, Muriel. 1990. "Prime-Time Fathers: A Study in Continuity and Change." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 7(2), pp. 275-285.
- Cantor, Muriel. 1987. "Women in Popular Fiction." In B. Hess and M. Ferree (Eds.), *Analyzing Gender* (pp. 190-214). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Cantor, Muriel. 1986. *Media, Audience and Social Structure*. Paper delivered to 1984 American Sociological Association Conference. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Cantor, Muriel. 1979. "Our Days and Our Nights on TV." *Journal of Communication* 29(3), 66-74.
- Cantor, Muriel. 1978. "Where Are The Women In Public Broadcasting?" in G. Tuchman, A. Daniels and J. Benet (Eds.). *Hearth and Home: Images of Women in the Mass Media*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cantor, Muriel. 1977. "Women and Public Broadcasting." *Journal of Communication*, 27(1), 14-19.
- Cantor, Muriel and Joel Cantor. 1992. "The Age of Advertising." In Muriel Cantor and Joel Cantor, *Prime-Time Television: Content and Control* (pp. 11-14, 2nd ed.). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Carney, T. F. 1972. *Content Analysis: A Technique For Systematic Inference from Communications*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.
- Caron, Margaret. 1978. *Sex Stereotyping in Canadian Television*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Department of Psychology. Saskatchewan: University of Regina.
- Cassata, Mary. 1985. *Television: A Guide to the Literature*. Pheonix: Oryx Press.
- Cassata, Mary and Thomas Skill. 1983. *Life on Daytime Television: Tuning-in American Serial Drama*. Norwood: Ablex.

- CBC. 1992. *Social Trends On CBC Prime Time Television 1977-1992*. Ottawa: CBC.
- CBC. 1991. *Revised CBC Guidelines on Sex-Role Portrayal*. Ottawa: CBC.
- CBC. 1990. *The Portrayal of Social Roles on CBC Television: 1977-1990*. Ottawa: CBC.
- CBC. 1988. *Trends in the Portrayal of People on CBC Television: 1977-1987*. Ottawa: CBC.
- CBC. 1986. *Portrayal of Women in Programming: Submission to the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission*. Ottawa: CBC.
- CBC. 1984. *The Image of Women in News, Public Affairs and Information Programming on CBC Prime Time Television [Content analysis conducted by George Spears and Kasia Seydegart for CBC]*. Ottawa: CBC.
- CBC. 1982. *The Presence, Role and Image of Women in Prime Time on the English Television Network of the CBC [Report of Content Analysis done by Spears, Torrance and Seydegart]*. Ottawa: CBC.
- Ceulemans, Meike and Guido Fauconnier. 1979. *The Image, Role and Social Conditions of Women: A Collection and Analysis of Research Materials, Report No 84*. Paris: UNESCO Press.
- Cirksena, Katherine and Matilda Butler. 1978. *Sex Bias in Advertisements: Are We Making Progress?* San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.
- Collins, Richard. 1990. *Television: Policy and Culture*. London: Unwin Press.
- Comstock, George. A. 1991. *Television and The American Child*. San Diego: Academic.
- Comstock, George A. 1978. *Television and Human Behaviour*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Courtney, Alice E. 1983. *Sex Stereotyping in Advertising*. Lexington: Lexington Books.

- Courtney, Alice E. and Thomas W. Whipple. 1978. *Canadian Perspectives on Sex Stereotyping in Advertising*. Ottawa. Advisory Council on the Status of Women.
- Courtney, Alice E. and Thomas W. Whipple. 1974. "Women in TV Commercials." *Journal of Communication*, 24(2), 110-118.
- Craig, Stephen R. 1992. "The Effect of Television Day Part on Gender Portrayals in Television Commercials: a Content Analysis." *Sex-Roles*, 26(5/6), 197-211.
- Craig, Stephen R. 1992. "Women as Home Caregivers: Gender Portrayal in OTC Commercials." *Journal of Drug Education*, 22(4), 301-312.
- Craig, Steve. 1992. *Men, Masculinity and The Media*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Creedon, Pamela J. (Ed.) 1993. *Women In Mass Communication: Challenging Gender Values* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park: Sage.
- CRTC. 1994. *CRTC Public Notice 1994-37: Revisions to Restrictions on Amount of Advertising*. Ottawa: CRTC.
- CRTC. 1992. *CRTC Public Notice 1992-58: 1992 Policy on Gender Portrayal*. Ottawa: CRTC.
- CRTC. 1991. *CRTC Public Notice 1991-109: Revised CBC Guidelines on Sex-Role Portrayal*. Ottawa: CRTC.
- CRTC. 1990. *The Portrayal of Gender in Canadian Television Advertising: 1984-1988*. Ottawa: CRTC.
- CRTC. 1990a. *CRTC Public Notice 1990-99: Industry Guidelines for Sex-Role Portrayal*. Ottawa: CRTC.
- CRTC. 1990b. *CRTC Public Notice 1990-114: Review of the Policy on Sex-Role Stereotyping*. Ottawa: CRTC.
- CRTC. 1989. *CRTC Public Notice 1989-27: Overview Local Television for the 1990s*. Ottawa: CRTC.
- CRTC. 1988. *CRTC Circular Number 350: Infomercial Guidelines*. Ottawa: CRTC.

- CRTC. 1987. *CRTC Public Notice 1987-205: CAB Report On Gender-Portrayals*. Ottawa: CRTC.
- CRTC. 1986. *Equality, Stereotyping and Women in Broadcasting: Report of The Task Force on Broadcasting*. Ottawa: CRTC.
- CRTC. 1986a. *CRTC Public Notice 1986-351: Sex-Role Stereotyping in The Broadcast Media: A Report on Industry Self-Regulation*. Ottawa.
- CRTC. 1986b. *Sex-Role Stereotyping in The Broadcast Media: CRTC Policy Statement*. Ottawa: CRTC, Dec. 22.
- CRTC. 1986c. *Transcripts of Proceedings: Public Hearing on Sex-Role Stereotyping in the Broadcast Media*. Ottawa: CRTC, April 28.
- CRTC. 1986d. *CRTC Public Notice 1986-351: Policy on Sex-Role Stereotyping in the Broadcast Media*. Ottawa: CRTC.
- CRTC. 1986e. *CRTC Public Notice 1986-247: Broadcast Advertising of Alcoholic Beverages and Food and Drugs*. Ottawa: CRTC.
- CRTC. 1985. *The Portrayal of Sex-Roles in Canadian Television Advertising*. Ottawa: CRTC.
- CRTC. 1982. *Images of Women: Report of the Task Force on Sex-Role Stereotyping in the Broadcast Media*. Ottawa: CRTC.
- CRTC. 1982a. *CRTC Public Notice 82-126. Report of the Task Force on Sex-Role Stereotyping in the Broadcast Media*. Ottawa: CRTC.
- Culley, James D. and Rex Bennett. 1976. "Selling Women, Selling Blacks." *Journal of Communication*, 26(4), 160-178.
- Curran, James. 1981. "The Impact of Advertising on British Mass Media." *Media, Culture and Society*, 3, 43-69.
- Davis, Donald M. 1990. "Portrayals of Women in Prime-Time Network Television: Some Demographic Characteristics." *Sex-Roles*, 23(5/6), 325-332.
- Davison-Leong, Janis. 1990. *Interest Groups and Canadian Broadcasting Regulation: An Examination of MediaWatch*. Unpublished M. A. Thesis. Calgary: University of Calgary.

- Decima Research Inc. 1990. *Women and Change: Main Findings From Erin's The Portrayal of Gender Roles*. (Prepared for CRTC, may be obtained via ATIP request to CRTC), 2 Volumes. Toronto: Decima.
- DeFleur, Melvin. 1964. "Occupational Roles as Portrayed on Television." *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 28(Spring), 57-74.
- Derevensky, Jeffrey and Carolyn Klein. 1992. "Children and Television." In Helen Holmes and David Taras (Eds.) *Seeing Ourselves: Media Power and Policy in Canada* (pp. 287-308). Toronto: Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich.
- Doern, Bruce G. and Richard Phidd. 1992. *Canadian Public Policy; Ideas, Structure, Process* (2nd Ed). Scarborough: Nelson.
- Dominick, Joseph R. 1979. "The Portrayal of Women in Prime Time: 1953-1977." *Sex-Roles*, 5(4), 405-411.
- Dominick, Joseph R. and Gail Rauch. 1972. "The Image of Women in Network TV Commercials." *Journal of Broadcasting*, 16(3), 259-265.
- Dominick, Joseph R. and M. Pearce. 1976. "Trends in Network Prime-time Programming 1953-1977." *Journal of Communication*, 26(1), 70-80.
- Dow, Bonnie Jean. 1990. *Woman's Place on Television: A Feminist Critical Study of Situation Comedy*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Downing, Mildred. 1974. "Heroine of the Daytime Serial." *Journal of Communication*, 24(2), 130-137.
- Downs, A. Chris. 1981. "Sex-Role Stereotyping on Prime-time Television." *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, (138), 253-258.
- Durkin, K. and P. Akhtar. 1982. *Preconditions on Sex-Role Equity: Children's Responses to Television*. Paper presented at the International Symposium on Socio-moral Education, University of Fribourg, Switzerland, August 29 - September 3.
- Durkin, Kevin. 1984. "Children's Accounts of Sex-role Stereotypes in Television." *Communication Research*, 11(3), 341-362.
- Durkin, Kevin. 1985a. "Television and Sex-Role Acquisition 1: Content." *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 24(2), 101-113.

- Durkin, Kevin. 1985b. "Television and Sex-Role Acquisition 2: Effects." *British Journal of Social Psychology* 24(3), 211-222.
- Edgar, Patricia and Hilary McPhee. 1974. *Media She*. Melbourne, Australia: Heinemann Press.
- Ellis, David. 1979. *Evolution of The Canadian Broadcasting System*. Ottawa: Supply and Services [Department of Communications].
- Ellis, Donald and Blake Armstrong. 1989. "Class, Gender and Code on Prime-Time Television." *Communication Quarterly*, 37(3), 157-169.
- Ewen, Stuart and E. Ewen. 1982. *Channels of Desire: Mass Images and The Shaping of American Consciousness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Ferguson, Marjorie. 1990. "Images of Power and the Feminist Fallacy." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 7(2), 215-230.
- Ferrante, Carol L., A. M. Haynes and S. M. Kingsley. 1988. "Image of Women in Television Advertising." *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 32(2), 233-237.
- Fiske, J. and J. Hartley. 1978. *Reading Television*. London, England: Methuen.
- Foss, K. A. and S. K. Foss. 1983. "The Status of Research on Women and Communication." *Communication Quarterly*, 31, 195-204.
- Freuh, Terry and Paul E. McGhee. 1975. "Traditional Sex-role Development and Amount of Time Spent Watching Television." *Developmental Psychology*, 11(1), 109.
- Friedman, Leslie. 1977. "Media Socialization and Sex Roles," In *Sex-Role Stereotyping in the Mass Media* (pp. 1-34). New York: Garland.
- Fuller, Colleen. 1992. "Our Pale Male Media." *The Canadian Forum*, LXXI(809, May), 5-7.
- Furnham, Adrian and Nadine Bitar. 1993. "The Stereotyped Portrayal of Men and Women in British Television Advertisements." *Sex-Roles*, 29(3/4), 297-310.

- Furnham, Adrian and Virginia Voli. 1989. "Gender Stereotypes in Italian Television Advertisements." *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 33(2), 175-185.
- Gallagher, M. 1981. *Unequal Opportunities: The Case of Women and the Media*. Paris: UNESCO Press.
- Gans, H. J. 1993. "Reopening the Black-box: Toward A Limited Effects Theory." *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 29-35.
- Geiger, Seth. 1993. "Revealing The Black Box: Information Processing and Media Effects." *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 42-50.
- Geis, Florence. L., Virginia Brown, J. Jennings and N. Porter. 1984. "Television Commercials as Achievement Scripts For Women." *Sex-Roles*, 10(April), 513-525.
- Geraghty, Christine. 1991. *Women and Soap Opera: A Study of Prime Time Soaps*. Oxford, UK: Polity Press.
- Gerbner, George. 1990. "Advancing on the Path of Righteousness: Maybe" In N. Signorielli and M. Morgan (Eds.), *Cultivation Analysis: New Directions in Media Effects Research* (pp. 249-262). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Gerbner, George. 1972. "Communication and Social Environment." In *Communication, A Scientific American Book* (pp. 114-120). San Francisco: W. H. Freeman.
- Gerbner, George and L. Gross. 1986. "Living With Television: The Dynamics of The Cultivation Process." In J. Bryant and D. Zillman (Eds.), *Perspectives on Media Effects*. Hillsdale: Erlbaum.
- Gerbner, George and L. Gross. 1976a. "The Scary World of TV's Heaviest Viewer." *Psychology Today* 9: 41-45.
- Gerbner, George and L. Gross. 1976b. "Living With Television." *Journal of Communication*, 26(2), 173-199.
- Gerbner, George and N. Signorielli. 1982. "The World According to Television." *American Demographics*, (October) 15-17.

- Gerbner, George and Signorielli N. 1979. *Women and Minorities in Television Drama, 1969-1978* [Research Report prepared in collaboration with Screen Actors Guild, AFL-CIO, The Annenberg School of Communications]. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Gerbner, George., L. Gross, M. Morgan and N. Signorielli. 1980. "Aging with Television: Images on Television Drama and Conceptions of Social Reality." *Journal of Communication*, 30(1), 37-47.
- Gerbner, George., L. Gross, M. Morgan and N. Signorielli. 1981. "Scientists on the TV Screen." *Society*, 18(4), 41-44.
- Gilly, Mary C. 1988. "Sex Roles in Advertising: A Comparison of Television Advertisements in Australia, Mexico and The United States." *Journal of Marketing*, 52(April), 75-85.
- Gitlin, Todd. 1983. *Inside Prime Time*. New York: Pantheon.
- Goff, David H., Lynda Dysart Goff and Sara Kay Lehrer. 1980. "Sex-Role Portrayals of Selected Female Characters." *Journal of Broadcasting*, 24(4), 467-478.
- Goffman, Erving. 1979. *Gender Advertisements*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Goldman, Robert, Deborah Heath and Sharon Smith. 1991. "Commodity Feminism." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 8(3), 333-351.
- Greenberg, Bradley and C. Atkin. 1980. *Life On Television: Content Analyses of U. S. TV Drama*. Norwood: Ablex.
- Greer, Germaine. 1971. *The Female Eunuch*. London: Paladin.
- Grills, Lee. 1980. "The Portrayal of Women on CTV." *Status of Women News*, (6)9. Toronto: Ontario Advisory Council on the Status of Women.
- Gross, Larry. 1974. "The Real World of Television." *Today's Education*, 63(1), 86.
- Gunter, Barrie. 1994. "Effects of A TV Drama Series Upon Public Impressions About Psychiatrists." *Psychological Reports*, 74 (1), 163-178.

- Gunter, Barrie. 1990. *Children and Television: The One Eyed Monster?* London: Routledge.
- Gunter, Barrie. 1986. *Television and Sex Role Stereotyping*. London: John Libbey.
- Gunter, Barrie and M. Wober. 1983. "Television Viewing and Public Perceptions of Hazards to Life." *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 3, 325-335.
- Hall, C. C. I. 1994. "Women and Body-isms in Television Beer Commercials." *Sex-Roles*, 32(5/6), 329-337.
- Halpern S. and B. Ethier. 1977. *The Portrayal of Women and Men in Canadian and U.S. Television Commercials*. Unpublished manuscript, University of British Columbia, (T. M. Williams) Department of Psychology.
- Harris, Peter R. and Jonathan Stobart. 1986. "Sex-Role Stereotyping in British Television Advertisements at Different Times of The Day: An Extension and Refinement of Manstead and McCulloch." *British Journal of Social Psychology* 25(2), 155-164.
- Haskell, Deborah. 1979. "The Depiction of Women in Leading Roles in Prime Time Television." *Journal of Broadcasting*, 23(2), 191-196.
- Hawkins R. and Suzanne Pingree. 1982. "Television's Influence on Social Reality." in D. Pearl, L. Bouthilet and J. Lazar (Eds.) *Television and Behaviour: Ten Years of Scientific Progress*. Rockville: U.S. National Institute of Mental Health.
- Head, Sydney W. 1954. "Content Analysis of Television Drama Programs." *Quarterly of Film, Radio and Television*, 9, 175-194.
- Henderson L., C. Atkin and B. Greenberg. 1980. "Sex Differences in Giving Orders, Making Plans and Needing Support on Television." In B. S. Greenberg (Ed.), *Life on Television: Content Analyses of U.S. TV Drama* (pp. 49-64, 3rd. ed.). Norwood: Ablex.
- Hennessee, J. A. and J. Nicholson. 1972. "NOW Says: TV Commercials Insult Women." *New York Times Magazine* (May 28), 12, 13, 48-51.

- Hiemstra, Roger, Maureen Goodman, Mary Ann Middlemiss and Richard Vosco. 1983. "How Older Persons Are Portrayed in Television Advertising," *Educational Gerontology*, 9, 111-122.
- Himmelweit, H. T. 1958. *Television and the Child: An Empirical Study of the Effect of Television on the Young*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Holsti, Ole. 1969. "Aspects of Inference from Content Data" In George Gerbner, George, Ole Holsti, Klaus Krippendorff, William Paisley and Philip Stone (Eds.), *The Analysis of Communication Content*. New York: John Wiley.
- Honey, M. 1984. *Creating Rosie the Riveter: Class, Gender and Propaganda During World War II*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Howell, Sharon. 1990. *Reflections of Ourselves: The Mass Media and the Women's Movement, 1963 to the Present*. New York: Peter Lang Press.
- Hull, C. L. 1943. *Principles of Behavior*. New York: Appleton.
- Innis, Harold. 1951. *The Bias of Communication*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Isber, Caroline and Muriel Cantor. 1975. *Report of The Task Force on Women In Public Broadcasting*. Washington: Corporation for Public Broadcasting.
- Janus, Noreen. 1981. "Advertising and The Mass Media: Transnational Link Between Production and Consumption." *Media Culture and Society*, 3(1), 13-23.
- Janus, Noreen. 1977. "Research on Sex-Roles in the Mass Media: Toward a Critical Approach." *Insurgent Sociologist*, 7(3), 19-32.
- Jeffres, Leo. 1986. *Mass Media: Processes and Effects*. Prospect Heights: Waveland Press.
- Jennings-Walstedt, Joyce, F. Geis and V. Brown. 1980. "Influence of Television Commercials on Women's Self-confidence and Independent Judgement." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38(2), 203-210.

- Jhally, Sut. 1994. *Commercial Culture, Collective Values and the Future of the Species* [paper delivered at the CRITICAL Symposium, October 28]. University of Ottawa: Ottawa.
- Jhally, Sut, William Leiss and Stephen Kline. 1985. "Magic in The Marketplace." *Canadian Journal of Political and Social Theory*, 9(3), 1-22.
- Johnson, Samuel. 1759. "Essay." *The Idler*, 40(20, January). England.
- Kalisch, Philip, and Beatrice Kalisch. 1984. "Sex-Role Stereotyping of Nurses and Physicians on Prime-Time Television: A Dichotomy of Occupational Portrayals." *Sex-Roles*, 10(7/8) 533-553.
- Katzman, Natan. 1972. "Television Soap Operas: What's Been Going On Anyway?" *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36(2), 200-212.
- Kessler-Harris, A. 1981. *Women Have Always Worked*. Old Westbury: Feminist Press.
- Kilbourne, Jean. 1994. *Deadly Persuasion: Advertising and Addiction* [paper delivered at the CRITICAL Symposium, October 26] Ottawa: University of Ottawa.
- Kilbourne, Jean. 1989. "Beauty: and The Beast of Advertising " *Media and Values*, (Winter) 8-10.
- Kilbourne, William E. 1990. "Female Stereotyping in Advertising: An Experiment on Male- Female Perceptions of Leadership." *Journalism Quarterly* 67(1), 25-31.
- Kimball, M. 1986. "Television and Sex-role Attitudes." In T. M. Williams (Ed.), *The Impact of Television*. London: Academic Press.
- King, Linda. 1987. *Broadcasting Policy for Canadian Women*. Paper presented at Adjusting the Image Conference on Broadcasting Policy Ottawa: MediaWatch.
- King, Mae C. 1973. "The Politics of Sexual Stereotypes." *Black Scholar*, March/April, 12-23.
- Klassen, M. L. 1993. "Men and Women - Images of Their Relationships in Magazine Advertisements." *Journal of Advertising Research*, 33(2), 30-39.

- Klassen, Rita. 1977. *A Content Analysis of Women's Roles in Television Advertisements in Ontario*. Unpublished undergraduate thesis. Guelph: University of Guelph.
- Kline, Stephen and William Leiss. 1992. "The Ravelled Sleeve: Advertising Policy in Canada." In Helen Holmes and David Taras (Eds.), *Seeing Ourselves: Media Power and Policy in Canada* (pp. 119-134). Toronto: Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich.
- Knill, B. J., M. Pesch, G. Pursey, P. Gilpin and R. M. Perloff. 1981. "Still Typecast After All These Years? Sex Role Portrayals in Television Advertising." *International Journal of Women's Studies*, 4(5), 497-506.
- Kolbe, Richard and Carl Langefeld. 1993. "Appraising Gender Role Portrayals in TV Commercials." *Sex-Roles*, 28(7/8), 393-417.
- Komisar, Lucy. 1971. "The Image of Women in Advertising." In C. Gornick and B. Moran (Eds.), *Women in Sexist Society*. New York: Basic Books.
- Krippendorff, Klaus. 1980. *Content Analysis: An Introduction to its Methodology*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Lazier-Smith, Linda. 1993. "A New "Genderation" of Images to Women." In Pamela J. Creedon (Ed.), *Women In Mass Communication: Challenging Gender Values* (pp. 247-261, 2nd ed.). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Lazier-Smith, Linda and A. G. Kendrick. 1993. "Women in Advertisements: Sizing up the Images, Roles and Functions." In Pamela Creedon (Ed.), *Women in Mass Communication: Challenging Gender Values* (pp. 199-219, 2nd ed.). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Leiss, William, Stephen Kline and Sut Jhally. 1990. *Social Communication in Advertising: Persons, Products and Images of Well-Being*. Scarborough: Nelson.
- Lemon, Judith. 1978. "Dominant or Dominated? Women on Prime-Time Television." In Gaye Tuchman, Arlene Kaplan Daniels and J. Benet (Eds.), *Hearth and Home: Images of Women in The Mass Media* (pp. 51-67). New York: Oxford University Press.

- Lemon, Judith. 1977. "Women and Blacks on Prime-Time Television." *Journal of Communication*, 27(4), 70-79.
- Levine, Joan. 1975. "Ads Ignore Real Women: Use Stereotypes." *Advertising Age*, 46(26), 86.
- Li, Peter. 1981. *Social Research Methods*. Toronto: Butterworths.
- Liebert, Robert, Joyce Sprafkin and Emily Davidson. 1988. *The Early Window: Effects of Television on Children and Youth* (3rd edition). Elmsford: Pergamon.
- Lippmann, Walter. 1965. *Public Opinion*. New York: MacMillan (1922).
- Livingstone, Sonia and Gloria Green. 1986. "Television Advertisements and the Portrayal of Gender." *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 25(2), 149-154.
- Long, Michele L. and Rita J. Simon. 1974. "The Roles and Statuses of Women on Children and Family TV Programs." *Journalism Quarterly*, 51(2), 107-110.
- Lovdal, Lynn T. 1989. "Sex Role Messages in Television Commercials: An Update." *Sex-Roles*, 21(11/12), 715-724.
- Lull, James. 1988. *World Families Watch Television*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Lull, James, Catherine Hanson and Michael Marx. 1977. "Recognition of Female Stereotypes in TV Commercials." *Journalism Quarterly*, 54(2), 153-157.
- MacBeth Williams, Tannis. 1986. *The Impact of Television: A Natural Experiment in Three Communities*. Orlando: Academic Press.
- MacBeth Williams, Tannis, M. Zabrack and L. Joy. 1977. "A Content Analysis of Entertainment Television Programming." In *Report of the Ontario Royal Commission on Violence In The Communications Industry, Volume III*. Toronto: Ontario.
- MacBeth Williams, Tannis, D. Baron, S. Phillips, L. Travis and D. Jackson. 1986a. "The Portrayal of Sex Roles On Canadian and U. S. Television." *Sex-Roles Within Massmedia Newsletter* (December) 16-18.

- MacDonald, Lynn. 1981. "The Silenced Majority: Women and Canadian Broadcasting." *Status of Women News*, (Spring) 6.
- Malloch, Kati. 1973. *Pit and Pedestal: A Horror Story, Women In the Canadian Media*. Montreal: McGill University Press.
- Mamay, Patricia and Richard Simpson. 1981. "Three Female Roles in Television Commercials." *Sex-Roles*, 7(12), 1223-1232.
- Manes, Audrey and Paula Melnyk. 1974. "Televised Models of Female Achievement." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 4(4), 365-374.
- Mannes, Marya. 1970. "Should Women Only be Seen and Not Heard?" In Barry G. Cole (Ed.), *Television* [reprinted from TV Guide] (pp. 276-280). New York: The Free Press.
- Manstead, A. S. R. and Caroline McCulloch. 1981. "Sex-Role Stereotyping in British Television Advertisements." *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 20(3), 171-180.
- Marecek, J., J. Piliavin, E. Fitzsimmons, C. Krogh, E. Leader and B. Trudell. 1978. "Women as TV Experts: The Voice of Authority?" *Journal of Communication*, 28(1), 159-168.
- Mattelart, M. 1982. "Women and The Cultural Industries." *Media, Culture and Society*, 4, 133-151.
- Mayes, Sandra L. and K. Valentine. 1979. "Sex Role Stereotyping in Saturday Morning Cartoon Shows." *Journal of Broadcasting*, 23(1), 41-50.
- Mazzella, Carmela, K. Durkin, E. Cerini, and Paul Buralli. 1992. "Sex Role Stereotyping in Australian Television Advertisements." *Sex-Roles*, 26(7/8), 1992.
- McArthur Zebrowitz, L. and S. V. Eisen. 1976. "Television and Sex-Role Stereotyping." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 6(4), 329-351.
- McArthur, Leslie and Beth Resko. 1975. "The Portrayal of Men and Women in American Television Commercials." *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 97(2), 209-220.
- McGhee, Paul E. and Terry Freuh. 1980. "Television Viewing and The Learning of Sex-role Stereotypes." *Sex-Roles*, 6(2), 179-188.

- McLuhan, Marshall H.. 1951. *The Mechanical Bride, Folklore of Industrial Man*. New York, New York: Vanguard Press.
- McNeil, Jean. 1975a. "Imagery of Women in TV Drama: Some Procedural and Interpretive Issues." *Journal of Broadcasting*, 19(3), 283-288.
- McNeil, Jean. 1975b. "Feminism, Femininity and the Television Series: A Content Analysis." *Journal of Broadcasting*, 19(3), 259-271.
- McNeil, Jean. 1975c. "Whose Values?" *Journal of Broadcasting*, 19(3), 295-296.
- MediaWatch. 1984. *Sex Role Stereotyping: A Content Analysis of Radio and Television Programs and Advertisements*. Toronto: MediaWatch.
- Meehan, D. M. 1983. *Ladies of the Evening: Women Characters of Prime Time Television*. Metuchen: Scarecrow Press.
- Meehan, Eileen R. 1993. "Heads of Household and Ladies of the House: Gender, Genre, and Broadcast Ratings, 1929-1990." In William Solomon and Robert McChesney (Eds.), *Ruthless Criticism* (pp. 204-221). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Meyrowitz, Joshua. 1992. "Television: The Shared Arena." In Helen Holmes and David Taras (Eds.), *Seeing Ourselves: Media Power and Policy in Canada*. Toronto: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Meyrowitz, Joshua. 1985. *No Sense of Place: The Impact of Electronic Media on Social Behaviour*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Miller, M. C. 1986. "Deride and Conquer." In T. Gitlin (Ed.), *Watching Television*. New York: Pantheon.
- Miller, Mark and Byron Reeves. 1976. "Dramatic TV Content and Children's Sex-Role Stereotypes." *Journal of Broadcasting*, 20(1), 35-49.
- Miller, Roger. 1991. "Selling Mrs. Consumer: Advertising and the Creation of Suburban Socio-Spatial Relations." *Antipode*, 23(3), 203-306.
- Mills, C. Wright. 1962. "The Mass Society." In Eric and Mary Josephson (Eds.) *Man Alone*. New York: Dell.

- Mills, Kay. 1988. *From The Women's Pages to The Front Pages*. New York: Dodd and Mead.
- Moen, Phyllis. 1993. *Women's Two Roles: A Contemporary Dilemma*. New York: Auburn House.
- Moore, Marvin L. 1992. "The Family as Portrayed on Prime-Time Television, 1947-1990: Structure and Characteristics." *Sex-Roles*, 26(1/2), 41-61.
- Moore, T. E. and L. Cadeau. 1985. "The Representation of Women, the Elderly, and Minorities in Canadian Television Commercials." *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 17(3), 215-225.
- Morgan, M. 1984. "Heavy Television Viewing and Perceived Quality of Life." *Journalism Quarterly*, 61(3), 499-504, 740.
- Morgan, Nicole. 1988. *The Equality Game*. Ottawa: Canadian Advisory Council on The Status of Women.
- Morrison, Nancy. 1989. *The Portrayal of Women in Television Advertisements*. Unpublished M. A. Thesis. Pittsburgh: Point Park College.
- Murdock, Graham. 1982. "Large Corporations and the Control of the Communications Industries." In Michael Gurevitch, Tony Bennett, James Curran and Janet Wollacott (Eds.), *Culture, Society, and the Media* (pp. 118-150). London: Methuen.
- Myers, Philip and Frank Biocca. 1992. "The Elastic Body Image: The Effect of Television Advertising and Programming on Body Image Distortions in Young Women." *Journal of Communication*, 42(3), 108-133.
- National Institute of Mental Health. *Report of the Surgeon General's Scientific Advisory Committee on Television and Social Behavior*. Rockville: NIH.
- Niculescu, Nancy. 1991. *A Burkean Analysis of The Depiction of Women in Television Commercials*. Unpublished Ed. D Thesis. New Brunswick: Rutgers State University.
- Nochimson, Martha. 1992. *No End To Her: Soap Opera and The Female Subject*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Northcott, Herbert, John Seggar and James A. Hinton. 1975. "Trends in TV Portrayal of Blacks and Women." *Journalism Quarterly*, 52(4), 741-744.
- Nova Scotia Human Rights Commission. 1979. *Women and Advertising*. Halifax: Nova Scotia Human Rights Commission.
- NOW (National Capital Chapter, National Organization for Women). 1972. *Women in The Wasteland Fight Back: A Report on The Image of Women Portrayed in TV Programming*, [in consultation with Muriel Cantor of the American University]. Washington: National Organization for Women.
- NOW (New York Chapter, National Organization for Women). 1972. See Hennessee and Nicholson, 1972.
- O'Barr, William M. 1984. *Language and Power*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- O'Donnell, W. J. and K. J. O'Donnell. 1978. "Update: Sex Role Messages in TV Commercials." *Journal of Communication*, 28(1), 56-158.
- O'Kelly, Charlotte. 1974. "Sexism in Children's Television." *Journalism Quarterly*, 52(4), 722-724.
- O'Kelly, Charlotte and Linda E. Bloomquist. 1976. "Women and Blacks on Television," *Journal of Communication*, 26(4), 179-184.
- Ogles, R. M. 1987. "Cultivation Analysis: Theory, Methodology and Current Research on Television-influenced Constructions of Social Reality." *Mass Communications Review*, 14, 43-53.
- Ontario Educational Communications Authority. 1990. *Societal Diversity in TV Ontario Programming*. [by Erin Research]. Toronto.
- Osborn, Suzanne. 1988. *Gender Depictions in Television Advertisements*. Memphis: Osborn.
- Parkinson, Laura. 1987. *Women and the Media: The Broken Promise of Equality*. Vancouver: MediaWatch.
- Peck, Jeff. 1979. Children's Television Advertising: An Analysis. *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, 14(1), 64-76.

- Peevers, Barbara Hollands. 1979. "Androgyny on the TV Screen? An Analysis of Sex-Role Portrayal." *Sex-Roles*, 5(6), 797-809.
- Perloff, Richard. 1986. "Social Effects of The Media." In Leo W. Jeffres (Ed.), *Mass Media: Processes and Effects* (pp. 201-246). Prospect Heights: Waveland Press.
- Perse, Elizabeth, Douglas Ferguson and Douglas McLeod. 1994. "Cultivation in the Newer Media Environment." *Communication Research*, 21(1), 105-123.
- Pingree, Suzanne, Robert Hawkins, Matilda Butler, and William Paisley. 1976. "A Scale For Sexism." *Journal of Communication*, 26(4), 193-200.
- Pivnick, L. and S. Craig. 1993. "Men, Masculinity and the Media." *American Journal of Sociology*, 98(6), 1468-1470.
- Pollack, G. 1977. "What's Wrong With Images of Women." *Screen Education*, 24(1), 25-33.
- Pool, Ithiel de Sola. 1983. *Technologies of Freedom*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Porter, Judith. 1988. "Children's gender-role stereotypes: A Sociological Investigation of Psychological Models." *Sociological Forum*, 3, 184-210.
- Posner, Judith. 1989. "Where's Mom?" *Media and Values*, 6-7(Winter).
- Postman, Neil. 1985. *Amusing Ourselves To Death: Public Discourse in the Age of Show Business*. New York: Viking.
- Potter, W. J. 1993. "Cultivation Theory and Research: A Conceptual Critique." *Human Communication Research*, 19(4), 564-601.
- Pribram, D. 1988. *Female Spectators: Looking at Film and Television*. New York: Verso.
- Probyn, Elspeth. 1989. "TV's Local: The Exigency of Gender in Media Research." *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 14(September), 29-41.

- Pyke, S. W. and J. C. Stewart. 1974. "This Column is About Women: Women and Television." *Ontario Psychologist*, 6(5), 66-69.
- Rak, D. and L. McMullen. 1987. "Sex-Role Stereotyping in Television Commercials: A Verbal Response Mode and Content Analysis." *Canadian Journal Of Behaviourial Science*, 19, 25-39.
- Rakow, Lana F. 1989. "A Bridge to the Future: Re-Visioning Gender in Communication." In Pamela Creedon (Ed.), *Women in Mass Communication* (pp. 299-312). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Rakow, Lana F. 1986. "Rethinking Gender Research in Communication." *Journal of Communication*, 36(4), 11-24.
- Reep, Diana and Faye Dambrot. 1989. "Effects of Frequent Television Viewing on Stereotypes: Drip, Drip or Drench?" *Journalism Quarterly*, 66(3), 542-550.
- Reinhard, J. C. 1980. "The 52-percent Minority." In J. C. McNeil (Ed.), *Trumpets to Change* (pp. 169-246). Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Riffe, Daniel. 1993. "Game Time, Soap Time and Prime-Time TV Ads: Treatment of Women in TV Ads." *Journalism Quarterly*, 70(2), 437-446.
- Riffe, Daniel. 1993. "Sins of Omission and Commission in Mass Communication Quantitative Research." *Journalism Quarterly*, 70(1), 126-132.
- Riffe, Daniel, K. Saxton Goldson and Yang-Chou. 1989. "Females and Minorities in Television Ads in 1987 Children's Programs." *Journalism Quarterly*, 66(2), 129-136.
- Robinson, Gertrude Joch. 1992. "Women and the Media in Canada: A Progress Report." In Helen Holmes and David Taras (Eds.), *Seeing Ourselves: Media Power and Policy in Canada*. Toronto: Harcourt, Brace and Jovanovich.
- Robinson, Gertrude Joch. 1989. "Broadcast Regulation and Sex Role Stereotyping: In Canada and the United States." *Gender and Mass Media Newsletter*, (November) 14-17.
- Rosengren, Karl. 1981. *Advances in Content Analysis*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

- Rubin, A. 1986. "Uses, Gratifications and Media Effects Research." In J. Bryant and D. Zillman (Eds.), *Perspectives on Mass Media Effects* (pp. 281-302). Hillsdale: Erlbaum.
- Ruble, Thomas, Renae Cohen and Diane Ruble. 1984. "Sex Stereotypes." *American Behavioral Scientist*, 27(3), 339-356.
- Salter, Liora. 1986. *Issues In Broadcasting* [Report to the Caplan-Sauvageau Task Force on Broadcasting]. Ottawa. Department of Communications.
- Sanderson, Samantha and Rose Potvin. 1987. *Adjusting the Image: Report of a Conference on Women and Canadian Broadcasting*. Toronto: MediaWatch.
- Sarantakos, Catherine E. 1990. *Identity and Expectations: A Feminist Analysis of Gender Role in Children's Television Programs*. Unpublished M. A. Thesis. Kansas City: Missouri State University.
- Scheibe, Cyndy. 1979. "Sex Roles in TV Commercials." *Journal of Advertising Research*, 119(1), 23-27.
- Schiller, D. 1993. "Back To the Future-Prospects for Study of Communication as a Social Force." *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 117-124.
- Schneider, Kenneth C. and Sharon Barich Schneider. 1979. "Trends In Sex Roles in Television Commercials." *Journal of Marketing*, 43(3), 79-84.
- Schramm, Wilbur and William E. Porter. 1982. *Men, Women, Messages and Media: Understanding Human Communication*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Screen Actors Guild. 1974a. *The Relative Roles of Men and Women in Television Commercials*. New York: Screen Actors Guild.
- Screen Actors Guild. 1974b. *The Use of Women and Minorities in Prime-Time TV*. Hollywood: Screen Actors Guild.
- Seger, Linda. 1989. "How to Evaluate Media Images of Women." *Media and Values*, (Winter) 21-30.

- Seggar, John F. 1977. "Television's Portrayal of Minorities and Women 1971-1975." *Journal of Broadcasting*, 21(4), 435-446.
- Seggar, John F. 1975a. "Imagery of Women in Television Drama: 1974." *Journal of Broadcasting*, 19(3), 273-282.
- Seggar, John F. 1975b. "Imagery of Women on Television: Feminist, Fair Maiden or Maid?" *Journal of Broadcasting*, 19(3), 289-294.
- Seggar, John F. 1975c. "Imagery Reflected Through TV's Cracked Mirror." *Journal of Broadcasting*, 19(3), 297-299.
- Seggar, John F. and Penny Wheeler. 1973. "World of Work on TV: Ethnic and Sex Representation in TV Drama." *Journal of Broadcasting*, 17(2), 201-214.
- Seggar, John F. Jeffrey Hafen and Helena Hannonen-Gladden. 1981. "Television's Portrayal of Minorities and Women in Drama and Comedy Drama 1971-1980." *Journal of Broadcasting*, 25(3), 277-288.
- Seiter, Ellen. 1993. *Sold Separately: Children and Parents in Consumer Culture*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Seiter, Ellen. 1986. "Stereotypes and the Media: A Re-evaluation." *Journal of Communication*, 36(2), 14-27.
- Shoemaker, Pamela J. and Stephen D. Reese. 1991. *Mediating the Message: Theories of Influences on Mass Media Content*. New York: Longman.
- Shrum, L. J., and Thomas C. O'Guinn. 1993. "Processes and Effects in the Construction of Social Reality." *Communication Research*, 20(3), 436-471.
- Signorielli, Nancy. 1989. "Television and Conceptions About Sex Roles: Maintaining Conventionality and the Status Quo." *Sex-Roles*, 21(5/6), 341-360.
- Signorielli, Nancy. 1989. "Children, Television and Gender Roles." *Journal of Adolescent Health Care*, 11(1), 50-58.
- Signorielli, Nancy. 1985. *Role Portrayal and Stereotyping on Television: An Annotated Bibliography*. Westport: Greenwood Press.

- Signorielli, Nancy. 1982. "Marital Status in Television Drama: A Case of Reduced Options." *Journal of Broadcasting*, 26(2), 585-597.
- Signorielli, Nancy. 1978. "The Image of The Elderly in Prime-time Network Television Drama." *Generations*, (Fall), 8-11.
- Signorielli, Nancy, and M. Morgan (Eds.). 1990. *Cultivation Analysis: New Directions In Media Effects Research*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Signorielli, Nancy, Douglas McLeod and Elaine Healy. 1994. "Gender Stereotypes in MTV Commercials: The Beat Goes On." *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 38(1), 91-101.
- Silverstein, Arthur Jay and Rebecca Silverstein. 1974. "The Portrayal of Women in Television Advertising." *U. S. Federal Communications Bar Journal*, 27(1), 71-98.
- Singer, Benjamin D. 1991. "Advertising: A Sociocultural Force." In Benjamin D. Singer (Ed.), *Communications in Canadian Society* (pp. 100-113, 3rd ed.). Scarborough: Nelson.
- Singer, J. L., and D. G. Singer. 1983. "Psychologists Look at Television: Cognitive, Developmental, Personality, and Social Policy Implications." *American Psychologist*, 38(7), 826-834.
- Skill, Thomas and J. D. Robinson. 1994. "Four Decades of Families on Television: A Demographic Profile, 1950-1989." *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 38(4), pp. 449-464.
- Skinner, B. F. 1953. *Science and Human Behavior*. New York: MacMillan.
- Smith, Anthony. 1978. *The Politics of Information: Problems of Policy in Modern Media*. London: MacMillan Press.
- Smith, L. J. 1994. "A Content Analysis of Gender Difference in Children's Advertising." *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 38(3), 323-327.
- Smythe, Dallas. 1981. *Dependency Road: Communications, Capitalism, Consciousness, and Canada*. Norwood: Ablex.
- Smythe, Dallas. 1954. "Reality as Presented by Television." *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 18(Summer), 143-156.

- Spears, G. and K. Seydegart. 1990. *Societal Diversity in TVOntario Programming*. Toronto: OECA.
- Spears, G., N. Torrance and K. Seydegart. 1982. *The Presence, Role and Image of Women on The English Television Network of the CBC, Part I: Content Analysis* [for PEAC Developments - Report to the Office of The co-ordinator, Portrayal of Women]. Ottawa: Canadian Broadcasting Corporation.
- Spence, K. W. 1956. *Behaviour Theory and Conditioning*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Spicer, Keith. 1994. *Broadcasters Who Listen* [an address delivered to the Annual Convention of the Canadian Association of Broadcasters, Winnipeg, November 7]. Ottawa: CRTC.
- Spigel, Lynn. 1992. *Make Room for Television: Television and the Family Ideal in Postwar America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Spigel, Lynn. 1989. "The Domestic Economy of Television Viewing in Postwar America." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 6(4), 337-354.
- Steeves, H. Leslie. 1989. "Gender and Mass Communication in a Global Context." In Pamela Creedon (Ed.), *Women in Mass Communication* (pp. 83-111). Newbury Park: Sage.
- Steeves, H. Leslie. 1987. "Feminist Theories and Media Studies." *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 4(2), 95-135.
- Steeves, H. Leslie and Marilyn Crafton Smith. 1987. "Class and Gender in Prime-Time Television Entertainment: Observations From a Socialist Feminist Perspective." *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 11(1), 43-63.
- Sternglanz, S. H. and L. Serbin. 1974. "Sex-Role Stereotyping in Children's Television Programs." *Developmental Psychology*, 10(5), 710-715.
- Strainchamps, Ethel Reed. 1974. *Rooms With No View*. New York: Harper.

3 of/de 3

PM-1 3 1/2" x 4" PHOTOGRAPHIC MICROCOPY TARGET
NBS 1010a ANSI/ISO #2 EQUIVALENT

PRECISIONSM RESOLUTION TARGETS

- Streenland, S. 1985. *Prime Time Kids: An Analysis of Children and Families on Television*. Washington: National Commission on Working Women.
- Streicher, Helen. 1974. "The Girls in the Cartoons." *Journal of Communication*, 24(2), 125-129.
- Tamborini, R., D. Zillman and J. Bryant. 1984. "Fear and Victimization: Exposure to Television and Perceptions of Crime and Fear." In R. N. Bostrom (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook*, 8, 492-513.
- Tan, Alexis S. 1981. *Mass Communication Theories and Research*. Columbus: Grid Press.
- Tan, Alexis S. 1979. "TV Beauty Ads and Role Expectations of Adolescent Female Viewers." *Journalism Quarterly*, 56(1), 283-288.
- Taylor, E. 1989. *Prime Time Families: Television Culture in Postwar America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Tedesco, Nancy. 1974. "Patterns in Prime Time " *Journal of Communication*, 24(2), 119-124.
- Tichi, Cecelia. 1991. *Electronic Hearth: Creating an American Television Culture*. New York: Oxford University.
- Toronto Women's Media Committee (TWMC). 1974. *Content Analysis of Women in Canadian Television Commercials* [in consultation with A. Courtney and T. Whipple of York University]. Toronto: TWMC.
- Toronto Women In Film and Television (TWIFT). 1991. *Changing Focus: The Future For Women in The Canadian Film and Television Industry*. Toronto: Canada.
- Toronto Women in Film and Television (TWIFT). 1990. *A Statistical Profile of Women in the Canadian Film and Television Industry* [Prepared by Peat, Marwick, Stevenson and Kellogg for TWIFT]. Toronto: TWIFT.
- Trimble, Linda. 1990a. *Coming Soon to a Station Near You: The Process and Impact of the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunication Commission's Involvement in Sex-Role Stereotyping*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. Kingston: Queen's University.

- Trimble, Linda. 1990b. "Coming Soon to a Station Near You?: The CRTC Policy on Sex-Role Stereotyping." *Canadian Public Policy*, 16(3), 326-338.
- Tuchman, Gaye. 1993. "Realism and Romance: The Study of Media Effects." *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 36-41.
- Tuchman, Gaye. 1979. "Women's Depiction by the Mass Media." *Signs*, 4(3), 528-542.
- Tuchman, Gaye. 1978. "The Symbolic Annihilation of Women by The Mass Media." In Gaye Tuchman, Arlene Kaplan Daniels and James Benet (Eds.), *Hearth and Home: Images of Women in the Mass Media*. New York: Oxford.
- Turow, Joseph. 1974. "Advising and Ordering: Daytime, Prime Time." *Journal of Communication*, 24(2), 138-141.
- United Nations. 1980. *Women in the Media*. Malta: Interprint (UNESCO).
- United States Commission on Civil Rights. 1985. *Window Dressing on The Set: An Update*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- United States Commission on Civil Rights. 1977. *Window Dressing On The Set: Women and Minorities in Television*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Vande Berg, Leah R. and Diane Streckfuss. 1992. "Prime-Time Television's Portrayal of Women and the World of Work: A Demographic Profile." *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 36(2), 195-208.
- Verna, Mary Ellen. 1975. "The Female Image in Children's TV Commercials." *Journal of Broadcasting*, 19(3), 301-309.
- Vernon, Joetta, A. Williams, T. Phillips and J. Wilson. 1990. "Media Stereotyping: A Comparison of the Way Elderly Women and Men Are Portrayed on Prime-Time Television." *Journal of Women and Aging*, 2(4), 55-68.
- Vest, David. 1992. "Prime-Time Pilots: A Content Analysis of Changes in Gender Representation." *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 36(2), 25-41.

- Vickers, Jill. 1894. *Taking Sex Into Account: The Policy Consequences of Sexist Research* (Ed.) Ottawa: Carleton University Press.
- Warren, Denise. 1978. "Commercial Liberation." *Journal of Communication*, 28(4), 169-173.
- Weber, Robert Philip. 1990. *Basic Content Analysis*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Weigman O., M. Kuttscheuter and B. Baarda. 1992. "A Longitudinal Study of the Effects of Television Viewing on Aggressive and Prosocial Behaviours." *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 31, 147-164
- Werner, Anita. 1975. "The Effects of Television on Children and Adolescents: A Case of Sex and Class Socialization." *Journal of Communication*, 25(4), 45-50.
- Wernick, A. 1988. "Promotional Culture." *Canadian Journal of Social and Political Theory*, 12(1/2), 180-210.
- Whipple, Thomas. 1986. "Female Role Portrayals." *Journal of Advertising*, 14(3), 4-8.
- Whipple, T. W. and A. E. Courtney. 1980. "How to Portray Women in TV Commercials." *Journal of Advertising Research*, 20(2), 53-59
- Williams, F., R. Larose and F. Frost. 1981. *Children, Television and Sex role Stereotyping*. New York: Praeger
- Winick, C., L. G. Williamson, S. Chusmir and M. Winick. 1973. *Children's Television Commercials: A Content Analysis*. New York: Praeger
- Woollacott, Janet. 1982. "Messages and Meanings." In Michael Gurevitch, Tony Bennett, James Curran and Janet Woollacott (Eds.), *Culture, Society, and the Media* (pp. 91-111). London: Methuen
- Women on Words and Images. 1975. *Channelling Children: Sex Stereotyping on Prime Time TV*. Princeton: Women on Words and Images.
- Wormley, Wallace. 1974. "Images of Women in Media Advertising." *Cablelines*, 11(11), 4-5.

- Wroblewski, Roberta, and A. Huston. 1987. "Televised Occupational Stereotypes and Their Effects on Early Adolescents." *Journal of Early Adolescents*, 7(3), 283-297.
- Young McFarlane, Constance. 1994. "Measuring Student Attitudes Toward Science and Scientists." In Audrey Wipper (Ed.) *The Sociology of Work: The Sociology of Work in Canada, Papers in Honour of Oswald Hall*. (pp. 184-205, revised edition). Ottawa: Carleton University Press.
- YWCA, Sexism in Advertising Committee. 1978. *Sexism in Advertising: Report of the Montreal YMCA Sexism in Advertising Committee*. Montreal: YMCA.
- Zebrowitz-McArthur. see McArthur-Zebrowitz.
- Zito, George V. 1975. *Methodology and Meanings: Varieties of Sociological Inquiry*. New York: Praeger.

APPENDIX I

Coding System, Coding Guide and Codebook for Television
Advertising: From the CRTC's 1985 Study "The Portrayal of
Sex-Roles in Canadian Television Advertising"

Source: CRTC, 1985: 75-92

CODING SYSTEM FOR TELEVISION ADVERTISING

A COMMERCIAL ELEMENTS

- 1 NETWORK/STATION
- 1 CBC
 - 2
 - 3 CTV
 - 4
 - 5 Global
 - 6 English Independents
 - 7 Radio-Canada
 - 8 TVA

2-7 LOCATION OF BROADCAST

- 1 Vancouver
- 2 Edmonton
- 3 Winnipeg
- 4 Toronto
- 5 Hamilton
- 6 Ottawa/Hull
- 7 Montréal
- 8 Québec
- 9 Sherbrooke
- 10 Trois-Rivières
- 11 Halifax

4-5 TYPE OF COMMERCIAL BY PRODUCT

- 1 Automobile manufacturers
- 2 Auto supplies and services, dealers
- 3 Banks, insurance, finance, & trust companies
- 4 Beverages, alcoholic
- 5 Beverages, non-alcoholic
- 6 Business equipment, services, business-to-business
- 7 Charitable & educational orgs
- 8 Children's products
- 9 Clothing & accessories, fashion
- 10 Confectionery, snack food
- 11 Corporate ads: these do not advertise specific products or services
- 12 Feminine hygiene products
- 13 Food producers' & agricult., e.g., pork, milk, eggs
- 14 Governments: fed., prov., municipal
- 15 Health & beauty
- 16 Home furnishings, appliances, entertainment
- 17 Leisure, sports, hobbies
- 18 Lotteries
- 19 Packaged goods, food
- 20 Packaged goods, non-food
- 21 Pet food
- 22 Paid political announcements
- 23 Publicly regulated utilities & corps, e.g., Bell, Hydro
- 24 Real estate
- 25 Retail outlets, chains
- 26 Restaurants, take-out
- 27 Station/program promotions
- 28 Travel/tourism (other than government)
- 29 Other

6 DAY OF WEEK

- 1 Monday
- 2 Tuesday
- 3 Wednesday
- 4 Thursday
- 5 Friday
- 6 Saturday
- 7 Sunday

7 TIME

- 1 6 am - Noon
- 2 Noon - 4 pm
- 3 4 pm - 7 pm
- 4 7 pm - 11 pm
- 5 11 pm - end

- 8 LENGTH OF COMMERCIAL
- 1 15 seconds
 - 2 16-30 "
 - 3 31-60 "
 - 4 more than 60 "
- 9 GEOGRAPHICAL SETTING
- 0 No information
 - 1 Canada
 - 2 Canada and other country
 - 3 USA
 - 4 Europe, including Britain
 - 5 Third world
 - 6 Other country
- 10 DOMINANT SETTING
- 0 No information
 - 1 Home/domestic
 - 2 Paid work environment
 - 3 School
 - 4 Other indoor setting, incl point of sale
 - 5 Street
 - 6 Other outdoor setting, incl point of sale
 - 7 Indoors and outdoors equally
 - 8 Other, e.g., outer space
- 11 HUMAN PRESENCE
- 0 No information
 - 1 Children only 0 - 12 years
 - 2 Adolescents only 13 - 18 years
 - 3 Adults only
 - 4 Children & adolescents
 - 5 Children & adults
 - 6 Adolescents & adults
 - 7 Children, adolescents, & adults
- 12 NON-HUMAN PRESENCE
- 0 No information
 - 1 Cartoon characters, puppets, fantasy creatures
 - 2 Live animals
 - 3 Both
- 13 PRICE OF PRODUCT OR SERVICE
- 0 No consumer product or service advertised, or, cost varies with use of service, e.g., telephone
 - 1 Free service
 - 2 \$0 - \$2
 - 3 \$2 - \$10
 - 4 \$10 - \$50
 - 5 \$50 - \$200
 - 6 \$200 - \$1,000
 - 7 \$1,000 - \$5,000
 - 8 \$5,000 - \$20,000
 - 9 More than \$20,000
- 14 MOOD OR TONE
- 0 Does not contain humour
 - 1 Contains humour
- 15 APPARENT DISTRIBUTION OF PRODUCT OR SERVICE
- 0 No information
 - 1 Local/regional
 - 2 National
- 16 USER OF PRODUCT OR SERVICE
- 0 No information
 - 1 Product or service for general use
 - 2 Exclusively female product
 - 3 Exclusively male product
 - 4 Non-human user, e.g., pet food
- 17 DEPICTION OF CONSUMER IN AD
- 0 No information
 - 1 Children, including teens
 - 2 Women
 - 3 Men
 - 4 Women and men
 - 5 Women and children
 - 6 Men and children
 - 7 Women, men, and children
 - 8 Non-human consumers only
- 18 NO. OF MAJOR FEMALE CHARACTERS
- 0 None
 - 1 One
 - 2 Two
 - etc
 - 9 Nine or more
- 19 NO. OF MAJOR MALE CHARACTERS
- 0 None
 - 1 One, etc

- 20 NO OF MINOR FEMALE CHARACTERS
0 None
1 One, etc
- 21 NO OF MINOR MALE CHARACTERS
0 None
1 One, etc
- 22 NO NON-WHITE FEMALES
0 None
1 One, etc
- 23 NO NON-WHITE MALES
0 None
1 One, etc
- 24 CANADIAN MINORITY REPRESENTATION
0 No information
1 French representation included
2 Native representation included
3 Other ethnic representation included
4 1 & 2
5 2 & 3
6 1 & 3
7 1 & 2 & 3
- 25 PRESENCE OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES
0 No information
1 Persons with physical disability present
2 Persons with psychological or emotional disability
3 Persons with developmental handicaps
4 Combination of above
- 26 SPOTLIGHT ON CHANGING SEX ROLES
0 No information
1 Explicit mention of changing sex roles or non-traditional roles (describe)
- 27 VOICEOVER
0 No information
1 Female
2 Male
3 Both
4 Voice is unclear, unidentifiable sex
- 28 JINGLE, SONG OR MUSIC
0 No information
1 Instrumental only
2 Female singers
3 Male singers
4 Both F & M singers
5 Voices unclear, unidentifiable sex
- 29 USE OF NON-INCLUSIVE LANGUAGE (LIST)
0 No information
1 Man/boy words; phrases that assume all in group are male
2 Woman/girl words; phrases that assume all in group are female
3 Both
- 30 USE OF SEXUALLY OFFENSIVE OR PATRONIZING LANGUAGE (LIST)
0 No information
1 Occurs
- 31 NO. FEMALES IN SWIM SUITS/ EQUIVALENT
0 None
1 One, etc
- 32 NO. MALES IN SWIM SUITS/ EQUIVALENT
0 None
1 One, etc
- 33 NO FEMALES IN SLEEPWEAR, UNDERWEAR
0 None
1 One, etc
- 34 NO MALES IN SLEEPWEAR, UNDERWEAR
0 None
1 One, etc
- 35 NO. FEMALES IN SKINTIGHT CLOTHES
0 None
1 One, etc
- 36 NO MALES IN SKITIGHT CLOTHES
0 None
1 One, etc
- 37 NO FEMALES SEEN WASHING, GROOMING
0 None
1 One, etc
- 38 NO. MALES SEEN WASHING, GROOMING
0 None
1 One, etc

39 PERSONS SEEN PREPARING OR SERVING
FOOD OR DRINK

- 0 None
- 1 Women
- 2 Girls, including teens
- 3 Both women and girls
- 4 Men
- 5 Boys, including teens
- 6 Both men and boys
- 7 Women and men
- 8 Girls and boys
- 9 Other combination

40 PERSONS SEEN EATING OR DRINKING

- 0 None
- 1 Women
- 2 Girls, including teens
- 3 Both women and girls
- 4 Men
- 5 Boys, including teens
- 6 Both men and boys
- 7 Women and men
- 8 Girls and boys
- 9 Other combination

CODE REMAINING VARIABLES FOR MAJOR CHARACTERS ONLY

B. DEMOGRAPHICS

- 41 SEX
- 1 Female person
 - 2 Male person
 - 3 Person unidentifiable sex
 - 4 Female fantasy character
 - 5 Male fantasy character
 - 6 Fantasy character: unidentifiable sex
 - 7 Real animals
- 42 APPARENT AGE
- 0 No information
 - 1 Child
 - 2 12 - 18
 - 3 19 - 25
 - 4 26 - 35
 - 5 36 - 50
 - 6 51 - 65
 - 7 66 +
- 43 APPARENT RACE
- 0 No information
 - 1 White
 - 2 Black
 - 3 Oriental
 - 4 Indo-Pakistani
 - 5 Native North American
 - 6 Other
- 44 APPARENT ETHNICITY/NATIONALITY
- 0 No information
 - 1 English Canadian
 - 2 French Canadian
 - 3 Native Canadian
 - 4 Canadian of European background
 - 5 Canadian of non-European background
 - 6 American (US)
 - 7 British
 - 8 French
 - 9 Other
- 45 APPARENT SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS
- 0 No information
 - 1 Poor income, clothing, lifestyle
 - 2 Middle income, clothing, lifestyle
 - 3 Affluent income, clothing, lifestyle
- 46 ROLE IN COMMERCIAL
- 0 No information
 - 1 Expert
 - 2 Star or high profile figure
 - 3 Consumer or customer
 - 4 Salesperson
 - 5 Interviewer
 - 6 Other

C. FAMILY AND DOMESTIC ROLE

- 47 MARITAL OR LIVING ARRANGEMENT
- 0 No information
 - 1 Child: too young for marriage
 - 2 Single
 - 3 Married
 - 4 Living with lover
 - 5 Divorced/separated
 - 6 Widowed
- 48 PRESENCE IN FAMILY SETTING
- 0 No information
 - 1 No family
 - 2 Has family, not seen with family members
 - 3 Seen with other family members
- 49 INTERACTION WITH CHILDREN
- 0 No information
 - 1 Seen with kids, does not interact
 - 2 Interacts with children in home
 - 3 Interacts with children away from home
 - 4 Both
- 50 CHILD CARE ROLE
- 0 No information
 - 1 Children present: does not perform child care functions
 - 2 Children present: performs child care functions
 - 3 Children absent: performs child care functions
- 51 PARTICIPATION IN DOMESTIC TASKS
- 0 No information
 - 1 Appears in domestic setting, but performs no related tasks
 - 2 Performs tasks traditional for sex
 - 3 Performs non-traditional tasks
 - 4 Performs domestic-related tasks, but outside domestic setting

D INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

52 ROMANTIC INVOLVEMENT

- 0 No information
- 1 No relationship
- 2 Actively seeks partner
- 3 Is actively pursued by other
- 4 Both 2 & 3

53 PRESENCE OF SAME-SEX FRIENDS (Platonic)

- 0 No information
- 1 Has one or more same-sex friends

54 PRESENCE OF OPPOSITE-SEX FRIENDS (Platonic)

- 0 No information
- 1 Has one or more opposite-sex friends

E WORK ENVIRONMENT

55-56 PRIMARY OCCUPATION

- 0 No information
- 1 Child
- 2 Student
- 3 Homemaker
- 4 Manager, executive person at the top
- 5 Professional, e.g., lawyer, doctor, teacher
- 6 Politician
- 7 Middle manager, supervisor
- 8 Office, clerical worker, salesperson
- 9 Small business operator
- 10 Skilled tradesperson
- 11 Unskilled labourer
- 12 Law enforcement, military
- 13 Artist, creative person
- 14 Retired
- 15 Unemployed and looking for work
- 16 Other

57 PAID EMPLOYMENT

- 0 No information
- 1 Employed in traditional role for sex
- 2 Employed in non-traditional role for sex

58 SUPERVISOR

- 0 No information
- 1 Is supervisor, e.g., CEO, self-employed
- 2 Female supervisor
- 3 Male supervisor
- 4 Both female and male supervisors

59 STAFF

- 0 No information
- 1 No one
- 2 Female staff
- 3 Male staff
- 4 Both

F SETTING AND ACTIVITIES

- 60 DOMINANT SETTING
 0 No information
 1 Home/domestic
 2 Paid work environment
 3 Retail outlet, point of sale
 4 Other indoor setting
 5 Other outdoor setting
 6 Studio or stage
 7 Automobile
- 61 URBAN RURAL SETTING
 0 No information
 1 Urban only
 2 Rural only
 3 Both
- 62 INTERESTS AND ACTIVITIES
 0 No information
 1 Seen doing indoor sports/hobbies
 2 Seen doing outdoor sports/hobbies
 3 Both of the above
- 63 VEHICLES CARS, TRUCKS, PLANES, BOATS
 0 No information
 1 Drives vehicle
 2 Passenger in vehicle
 3 Both

G PERSONALITY, BEHAVIOUR

- 64 PROVIDES CONCRETE HELP, EMOTIONAL OR PRACTICAL
 0 No information
 1 Supports female(s)
 2 Supports male(s)
 3 Supports both
- 65 VERBAL ABUSE, HUMILIATION
 0 No information
 1 Abuses female(s)
 2 Abuses male(s)
 3 Abuses both

66 ACTS OF PHYSICAL VIOLENCE

- 0 No information
 1 Commits violence against women
 2 Commits violence against men
 3 Commits violence against both

67 THREAT OF PHYSICAL VIOLENCE

- 0 No information
 1 Commits against women
 2 Commits against men
 3 Commits against both

68 VICTIMIZATION

- 0 No information
 1 Victim of physical violence
 2 Victim of threat/intimidation/abuse
 3 Victim of both

H BODY ASPECTS FILMED

69 TORSO, NO HEAD

- 0 No
 1 Yes

70 LEGS ONLY

- 0 No
 1 Yes

71 "REAR" VIEW

- 0 No
 1 Yes

CODING GUIDE FOR TELEVISION ADVERTISING

A. THE COMMERCIAL AS A WHOLE

1-3 Network and Location of Broadcast

Consult CRTC cassette

4-5 Type of Commercial by Product (Categories are arranged alphabetically)

1. Automobile manufacturers e.g., General Motors, Ford, Toyota

2. Auto supplies and services, dealers includes Sam's Car Sales, muffler and transmission repair companies, car stereos, etc. Oil company ads are included when they are promoting their own brands of gasoline or oil. Oil companies are not included when they portray the company's oil exploration efforts or good corporate citizenship: code these under "Corporate Image" ads, number 11.

3. Banks, insurance, finance and trust companies Service provided is money or credit. Also includes VISA, American Express, etc.

5. Beverages, non-alcoholic e.g., soft drinks, fruit juice, mineral water, etc.

6. Business equipment and services, business to business Products and services advertised here are not consumer products in the usual sense. Examples are data transmission services, large computers, courier and delivery services.

7. Charitable and educational organizations Medical foundations account for a large portion of this group -- Heart Foundation, Kidney Foundation, etc. Other examples are United Way, Unitarian Service Committee, Oxfam, Construction Safety Association, etc. Some ads in this group receive government funding. For example, a current Ontario Mental Health Association ad acknowledges this by displaying the Government of Ontario logo at the end of the ad. The ad, however, appears to have been made by the Mental Health Association and promotes the Association rather than the Government. It is therefore considered a Charitable Foundation ad.

11. Corporate image ads Includes ads which do not advertise a specific product or service, but rather promote the image of a company. MacMillan-Bloedel and Dofasco often advertise in this way. Occasionally oil companies do: an oil company ad that describes the company's exploration efforts and good corporate citizenship without actually pitching its own brand of gasoline is coded here.

14. Government All government sponsored advertising goes here, even if it could conceivably be placed in another category. For example, a government health-promotion ad is Government, not Health. But note that crown corporations are not considered as government. Petrocan is an oil company, Canada Post is a publicly regulated utility, etc.

15 Health & beauty e.g., aspirin, shampoo, lipstick, toothpaste, vitamins, etc. But not feminine hygiene products

16 Home furnishings, appliances, entertainment includes ads made by manufacturers of items that are permanent fixtures in a house, i.e., not portable. A stereo set comes in this category, but a Walkman is "Leisure, sports, hobbies". This category also includes VCRs, refrigerators, washing machines, furniture, furnaces, insulation, etc.

Note the distinction between manufacturer and retailer. An ad for RCA televisions goes here if the manufacturing company made the ad. If, however, the television is shown in an Eaton's ad, "Come to Eatons and buy this RCA television", code the ad under retail outlets.

17 Leisure, sports, hobbies includes boats, skates, newspapers, cameras, film, etc. But children's games go under number 7 -- Children's products.

19 Packaged Goods: Food includes products which are kept on the shelf, e.g., dried, frozen, or canned goods, food that is wrapped. Does not include candy, gum, these are number 10 -- Confectionery, snack food.

20 Packaged goods: non-food includes cleaning products, paper products, items generally found on the shelf at the supermarket or drug store. But do not include items under Health & beauty, Pet food, Children's products, etc.

22 Paid political announcements includes any item by a candidate for political office or member of a political party, whether in government or not.

23 Publicly regulated utilities e.g., gas companies, Hydro, telephone companies. Not that there are many publicly regulated companies that are not utilities and therefore do not fall into this category, Air Canada, for example, is Travel and Tourism.

24 Real estate Century 21, etc.

25 Retail outlets includes national chains, e.g., The Bay, Sears, Eatons, etc. and local retail outlets, e.g., Fred's Clothing Store Edmonton. Services are also included, e.g., hairstyling salons.

26 Restaurants, takeout Most are fast food, e.g., MacDonalds, Harveys. Some local ads are for individual restaurants.

27 Station or program promotions include "new season" ads, preview clips from coming programs, as well as ads that plug the station or network without mentioning specific programs.

28 Travel, tourism Airlines, hotels, busses including municipal transit companies, etc. Do not include government tourism ads, these go under Government.

6-7 Day of Week & Time ad is shown

Consult CRTC tape.

8 Length of Commercial

Time the commercial, if in doubt

10 Dominant Setting

In cases where the ad has a plot or story line, pick the setting where the major characters spend the most time. If two or more settings are equally important, code the one where the resolution of the plot occurs.

13 Price of Product or Service

It is generally easy to establish a price range for a product. However, the price of some products can vary with different options that the consumer chooses. A camera may cost under \$200.00, but the cost of optional lenses shown for it can boost the price well over \$200.00. In these cases, code the lower cost for the basic product.

If the cost of the service or product advertised varies with use, e.g., British Airways or Bell Telephone, code 0. Restaurants, chain stores, and other retail outlets are also coded 0, since they sell products of different prices.

15 Apparent Distribution of Product or Service

Local ads include those made by individual retail outlets, restaurants, etc. Regional ads include provincial governments, utilities, and associations.

Most brand name products are nationally distributed.

16 User of Product

The purpose of this variable is to identify products that are exclusively for either male or female use. The vast majority of products are used by both sexes. Tide detergent is not exclusively a women's product, even though the ad may make it seem so. Uniflo oil is not exclusively a men's product.

Exclusively female products include lipstick, women's clothes, feminine hygiene products, women's razors, etc. Do not include shampoo, even if the ad appears to be directed at women, e.g., Veronika Principal selling Jhirmack.

Exclusively male products include men's clothing, men's razors.

17 Depiction of Consumer in Ad

In order to be considered as a consumer of the product or service advertised, the character must be actually using the product in some way. If a woman is washing dishes with Sunlight detergent and a man is drying them, only the woman is coded as a consumer.

If a woman serves her husband and children Maple Leaf Wieners for lunch, all are considered consumers: the woman has prepared the product, and the man and children eat it.

Some ads show people who may potentially use the product or service, but who are not seen to do so. A telephone company ad shows a woman and child walking by the sea, they are never seen using the telephone and so are not coded as users of the service.

A battery ad shows grandfather taking a picture of a young toddler while grandmother and another child watch. The grandfather is the only consumer to be coded in this ad.

Verbal cues may be sufficient to code a consumer, even though there is no visual evidence. Victor Kiam is a consumer in the Remington shaver ads because he says he uses the product -- he is not seen shaving.

18-19 Major Characters

An individual is a major character if the ad is centred on that individual, her/his opinion, role, life-style or needs. A major character is necessary to the logic or purpose of the plot or story of the ad, e.g., Carling and John Bassett for C Plus, Peter Ustinov for American Express, the woman in Oil of Olay. A major character often, but not always, speaks to the camera. The ad would collapse if the major characters were not there.

20-21 Minor Character

Minor characters are not portrayed as individuals with individual personalities or characteristics. A minor character can be removed from the ad without the ad losing its integral logic or point. Persons in groups are usually minor characters, e.g., the people shopping in The Brick Warehouse ads, crowds of singers in Coke commercials, dancers in a CloseUp toothpaste ad, a group of young people drinking beer in a Labatts ad.

22-23 Non-white characters

Include both major and minor characters.

24 Canadian Minority Representation

A character is assumed to be mainstream Canadian (i.e., Anglo-Canadian for English language ads) if she/he speaks unaccented English, dresses in mainstream clothes, and is not explicitly presented as a non-Anglo character. There must be a discernable accent or definite designation to code a minority.

A minority code can be made on the basis of (1) accent, (2) costume or dress, (3) statements that the character makes or that other characters make about him/her.

27 Voiceover

Voices of persons not seen are generally voiceovers.

Not all unseen voices are voiceovers. A voiceover does not participate directly in the action on screen. Example: Two characters have a conversation. One is heard but not seen because he/she is in the next room. Both are coded as characters, not as one character and one voiceover.

29 Use of Non-inclusive Language

Language that assumes male sex: Includes words such as businessman, policeman, mankind, phrases such as "the doctor...he" when no specific doctor is referred to.

Language that assumes female sex: Stewardess, actress, etc., phrases such as "the consumer...she".

30 Offensive or Patronizing Language

This is restricted to language that is offensive in terms of sex-roles or sex-related expressions. Terms such as "little old lady", "chick", and "bitch" are examples. Use of "girl" instead of "woman" is another example. "I'll have one of the girls do it".

31-32 Bathing Suit or Equivalent

Includes bathing suits and clothing that expose the body to approximately the same degree, e.g., halter top and short shorts.

33-34 Sleepwear, underwear

Includes underwear, pyjamas, and other clothes usually worn in privacy. A character seen in bed covered with a sheet is coded as sleepwear, even though the actual clothing cannot be seen. A character in bed who is nude and not covered by a sheet is coded as nude.

35-36 Skintight clothes outside athletic or dance settings

An example is Loni Anderson in a skintight dress at the office. Code exercise tights, leotards, etc. when they are worn outside the following settings: gymnastics or similar sports, exercise setting, ballet or modern dance.

37-38 Washing, grooming

Acts done in privacy. Does not include swimming. Includes bathing, showering, dressing, etc. Putting on a tie is coded here if the character is filmed in the privacy of his bathroom, but not if he is filmed walking down a busy street.

39 Persons Seen Preparing or Serving Food or Drink

Code only those persons actually involved in the preparation or serving. Do not include bystanders or persons watching the preparation. This variable is coded for all types of setting: in the home, in restaurants, etc. The preparation/serving may be part of the person's paid job, or it may not.

40 Persons Seen Eating or Drinking

Code only those persons who are actually in possession of food or drink. Do not include onlookers or bystanders. If persons are seated at a dinner table and have food on their plates, they can be coded, even if they are not seen to eat it.

In one ad, a man and a woman pick up an order at fast food restaurant -- the man takes the package and the woman simply watches. Code the man, since he has food in his possession, but not the woman. In a barbecue setting, one person may be actually eating a hamburger while others are not. Code only the person eating, even though the others appear to be participating in the barbecue.

B. DEMOGRAPHICS

44 Apparent Ethnicity

A character is assumed to be English Canadian if she/he speaks unaccented English, dresses in mainstream clothes, and is not explicitly presented as a non-Anglo character. There must be a discernable accent or definite designation to code another ethnicity.

A minority code can be made on the basis of (1) accent, (2) costume or dress, (3) statements that the character makes or that are made about him/her.

A character is assumed to be English Canadian if speaking English. An American must have an accent or be identified as such by title, obvious geographic location, e.g., Empire State Building, or verbal reference to location.

45 Apparent Socio-Economic Status

1 Poor income: Individuals are seen to be in impoverished conditions, having inadequate housing or clothing.

2 Middle income: Characters appear to live a moderate or average life-style with a house, car, enough income to support vacations, hobbies, etc.

3 Affluent income: Individuals are high income when they have expensive or high-style clothing, luxurious life-style, unusual big ticket hobbies such as yachting, travel by private plane, etc.

46 Role in Commercial

1 Expert: The individual appears on camera because of special knowledge or expertise, e.g., scientists, doctors, lawyers.

2 Star or high profile figure: e.g., Bill Cosby for Jello, Olympic diver for Canon camera, Peter Ustinov for American Express.

3 Consumer or customer: The character need not necessarily use the product in the ad. If a beer ad features a skier, for example, she/he is coded as the customer even though no beer is actually consumed. Note that "potential" consumers are coded here, even though they are not coded in variable 17, "Depiction of Consumer in Ad".

4 Salesperson: May be fictional, as in dramatizations of retail scenes, or real, as in an ad for a used car dealership.

5 Interviewer: Person shown interviewing Ms X about the whiteness of her wash, interviewers in consumer comparison ads such as the Pepsi Challenge, etc. The unseen voices in the Anacin ads are interviewers, (not voiceovers), because they participate in the action of the ad.

C. FAMILY AND DOMESTIC ROLE

47 Marital or Living Arrangement

Often this is difficult to determine because of the short time-frame of the ad. When in doubt, code 0 - unknown. In a scene showing a woman, a man, and two children eating dinner, code the man and women as married. In a scene showing a woman and a man eating dinner, code them as no information in the absence of any other information. The couple in the Spumante Bambino ads, for example, are coded as 'no information' on this variable.

48 Presence in Family Setting

Family includes the character's extended family. A spouse is counted as family, as are children, parents, grandparents, aunts, uncles, etc. Do not code characters who appear in the context of families other than their own.

49 Interaction with children

Interaction with any children is counted, whether they are the character's own or not. Children include teenagers who live with their parents.

50 Child Care Role

Performs child care functions, e.g., holding a child, making food for child, helping with a child's problem. Code "3" if person takes a direct interest in child care when children are not present, e.g., parent shopping for kids' things.

Code this variable for all major characters, including children. In a scene with several children playing and none are taking responsibility for the others, a major child character would be coded 1 -- Children present, does not perform child care functions.

51 Participation In Domestic Tasks

An individual participates in domestic tasks if she/he performs tasks needed by, or of value to, the family unit, e.g., fixing the roof, doing the washing, helping with the income tax. Traditional tasks for a woman include cooking, cleaning house, washing dishes, serving food, changing diapers, etc. Traditional tasks for a man include cutting lawn, washing car, fixing plumbing, washing or drying dishes.

Note that some tasks, such as doing dishes, are traditionally done by both sexes. However a woman doing plumbing is coded non-traditional, as is a man cleaning the oven.

D. INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

52 Romantic Involvement

A character seeks romantic involvement only outside her/his marital or co-habitational relationship. A character must show a genuine interest in entering a romantic relationship, a man who pursues a woman only for her money would not be coded here. The relationship need not be permanent to be coded here -- a character who is interested in another for a one night stand is coded. A character who is coded as being pursued by another may or may not be interested in that person.

53 Presence of same-sex platonic friends

Members of one's family are not coded as friends.

54 Presence of opposite-sex platonic friends

Do not include romantic involvement as friendship. Members of the character's family are not coded as friends.

E. WORK ENVIRONMENT

49 Supervisor

A character reports to, consults with, gets advice from, is paid by a supervisor.

G. SETTING AND ACTIVITIES

60 Dominant Setting

In cases where the story/plot advances through several settings, pick the setting where the major character is seen most often. If no single setting is most important, pick the one where the resolution of the plot occurs.

61 Urban / Rural Setting

This is usually obvious, but occasionally there is no information. Some episodes of "Upstairs, Downstairs", for example, are staged entirely indoors, with no hint as to whether the house is in the city or country.

62 Leisure Activities

Includes a wide range of activities, but they must be outside the character's paid work. Fishing, for example, can be a leisure activity for some and work for others. Do not include drinking.

63 Vehicles

Includes all vehicles or conveyances that have a non-human source of power, e.g., car, snowmobile, plane, glider, motorbike, balloon, stage coach. Does not include bicycles and horses, these are coded as outdoor sports/hobbies, variable 62.

C. PERSONALITY, BEHAVIOUR

64 Provides Concrete Help, Emotional or Practical

The character must identify another's problem or need for help and act on it. By encouragement, praise, consolation, commiseration or help provided for a specific problem, e.g., Laverne helps Shirley fight off an aggressive employer. Must see individual providing help in the program.

Code this only when a genuine problem or difficulty exists. A man drying the dishes while a woman washes them is not providing help in the sense of this variable, because doing dishes does not present a genuine problem or difficulty.

A woman who is distressed over hard water spots on her crystal does, however receive concrete help when her friend arrives with Product X, just in time to shine the stemware before the big dinner party.

65 Verbal Abuse, Humiliation

Abuse includes denegrating, insulting remarks often presented in a comedy situation, eg., Fred Flintstone, Don Rickles and Joan Rivers each use "putdowns" in comedy. Do not include sex-related terms and phrases, these are coded under variable 30, Sexually Offensive or Patronizing Language.

66 Acts of Physical Violence

Includes life threatening situations, abuse of person or possessions. The act must be sufficient to cause physical pain or damage to be coded "violent".

68 Threat of Physical Violence

The threat of any act which, if performed, would cause physical pain or damage.

69 Victimization

Victim of either actual or threatened physical violence.

II. BODY ASPECTS ON FILM

Code disembodied pieces of anatomy, e.g., camera focuses on legs or bust or posterior and follows it as person moves across set. As in drama and news systems.

APPENDIX II

Coding System for Television Advertising: From the CRTC's 1988 Study "The Portrayal of Gender in Canadian Television Advertising"

Source: CRTC, 1990: 118-123

TELEVISION ADVERTISING Coding System

CONTEXT

1 AD ID NUMBER

4 NETWORK/STATION

- 1 CBC National
- 2
- 3 CTV National
- 4
- 5 Global
- 6 Independents
- 7 Radio-Canada
- 8 TVA
- 9 Quatre Saisons

5 LOCATION OF BROADCAST

- 1 Vancouver
- 2 Edmonton
- 3 Winnipeg
- 4 Toronto
- 5 Hamilton
- 6 Ottawa/Hull
- 7 Montreal
- 8 Quebec
- 9 Sherbrooke
- 10 Trois-Rivieres
- 11 Halifax

7 TYPE OF COMMERCIAL

- 1 Automobile manufacturers
- 2 Auto supplies and services, dealers
- 3 Banks, insurance, finance, & trust companies
- 4 Beverages, alcoholic
- 5 Beverages, non-alcoholic
- 6 Business equipment, services, business-to-business
- 7 Charitable & educational orgs
- 8 Children's products
- 9 Clothing & accessories, fashion
- 10 Confectionery, snack food
- 11 Corporate ads these do not advertise specific products or services
- 12 Feminine hygiene products
- 13 Food producers' & agricult, assoc, e.g. pork, milk, eggs
- 14 Governments fed, prov, municipal
- 15 Health & beauty
- 16 Home furnishings, appliances, entertainment
- 17 Leisure, sports, hobbies
- 18 Lotteries
- 19 Packaged goods, food
- 20 Packaged goods non-food
- 21 Pet food
- 22 Paid political announcements
- 23 Publicly regulated utilities & corps, e.g. Bell, Hydro
- 24 Real estate
- 25 Retail outlets, chains
- 26 Restaurants, take-out
- 27 Station/program promotions
- 28 Travel/tourism (other than government)
- 29 Other

9 DAY OF WEEK

- 1 Monday
- 2 Tuesday
- 3 Wednesday
- 4 Thursday
- 5 Friday
- 6 Saturday
- 7 Sunday

10 TIME

Code time on 24-hour clock, e.g. 1530 is 3 30 pm. Code 1500, *not* 15 00 — no colon!

AD AS A WHOLE**14 LENGTH OF AD**

- 1 15 seconds
- 2 30 seconds
- 3 60 seconds
- 4 more than 60 seconds

15 GEOGRAPHICAL SETTING

- 0 No information
- 1 Canada
- 2 Canada and other country
- 3 USA
- 4 Europe, including Britain
- 5 Third world
- 6 Other country

16 DOMINANT SETTING

- 0 No information
- 1 Home/domestic
- 2 Paid work environment
- 3 School
- 4 Other indoor setting, incl point of sale
- 5 Street
- 6 Other outdoor setting, incl point of sale
- 7 Indoors and outdoors equally
- 8 Other, e.g., outer space

17 HUMAN PRESENCE

- 0 No information
- 1 Children only: 0 - 12 years
- 2 Adolescents only: 13 - 18 years
- 3 Adults only
- 4 Children & adolescents
- 5 Children & adults
- 6 Adolescents & adults
- 7 Children, adolescents, & adults

18 NON-HUMAN PRESENCE

- 0 No information
- 1 Cartoon characters, puppets, fantasy creatures
- 2 Live animals
- 3 Both

19 PRICE OF PRODUCT OR SERVICE

- 0 No consumer product or service advertised, or, cost varies with use of service, e.g., telephone, airlines
- 1 Free service or product
- 2 Less than \$ 2
- 3 \$ 2 - \$10.
- 4 \$ 10 - \$ 50
- 5 \$ 50 - \$ 200
- 6 \$ 200 - \$ 1,000
- 7 \$ 1,000 - \$ 5,000
- 8 \$ 5,000. - \$ 20,000
- 9 More than \$ 20,000

20 MOOD OR TONE

- 0 Does not contain humour
- 1 Contains humour

21 APPARENT DISTRIBUTION OF PRODUCT OR SERVICE

- 0 No information
- 1 Local/regional
- 2 National

22 USER OF PRODUCT OR SERVICE

- 0 No information
- 1 Product or service for general use
- 2 Exclusively female product
- 3 Exclusively male product
- 4 Non-human user, e.g., pet food

23 CONSUMERS IN AD

- 0 None
- 1 Children, including teens
- 2 Women
- 3 Men
- 4 Women and men
- 5 Women and children
- 6 Men and children
- 7 Women, men, and children
- 8 Non-human consumers only

24 MINORITIES IN AD

- 0 None
- 1 Francophone / anglophone minority
- 2 Native Canadians
- 3 Other ethnic people
- 4 1 & 2
- 5 2 & 3
- 6 1 & 3
- 7 1, 2, and 3

25 PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES IN AD

- 0 None
- 1 Physical disability
- 2 Psychological or emotional disability
- 3 Developmental handicap
- 4 Combination of 1, 2, and 3

26 SPOTLIGHT ON CHANGING SEX ROLES

- 0 No information
- 1 Explicit mention of changing sex roles or non-traditional roles (describe)

27 VOICEOVER

- 0 No information
- 1 Female
- 2 Male
- 3 Both
- 4 Voice is unclear, unidentifiable sex

28 JINGLE, SONG OR MUSIC

- 0 No information
- 1 Instrumental only
- 2 Female singers
- 3 Male singers
- 4 Both F & M singers
- 5 Voices unclear, unidentifiable sex

29 USE OF NON-INCLUSIVE LANGUAGE (LIST)

- 1 No information
- 2 Man/boy words, phrases that assume all in group are male
- 3 Woman/girl words, phrases that assume all in group are female
- 4 Both

30 USE OF SEXUALLY OFFENSIVE OR PATRONIZING LANGUAGE (LIST)

- 0 No information
- 1 Occurs

31 PERSONS SEEN PREPARING OR SERVING FOOD OR DRINK

- 0 None
- 1 Women
- 2 Girls, including teens
- 3 Both women and girls
- 4 Men
- 5 Boys, including teens
- 6 Both men and boys
- 7 Women and men
- 8 Girls and boys
- 9 Other combination

32 PERSONS SEEN EATING OR DRINKING

- 0 None
- 1 Women
- 2 Girls, including teens
- 3 Both women and girls
- 4 Men
- 5 Boys, including teens
- 6 Both men and boys
- 7 Women and men
- 8 Girls and boys
- 9 Other combination

CHARACTERS IN AD**33 SEX**

- 1 Female person
- 2 Male person
- 3 Person, unidentifiable sex
- 4 Female fantasy character
- 5 Male fantasy character
- 6 Fantasy character, unidentifiable sex
- 7 Real animals

34 IMPORTANCE

- 1 Major character
- 2 Minor character
- 3 Non-speaking role: use to code dress, camera angles, disability.

35 ROLE IN COMMERCIAL

- 1 No information
- 2 Expert
- 3 Star or high profile figure
- 4 Consumer or customer
- 5 Salesperson
- 6 Interviewer
- 7 Other

36 APPARENT AGE

- 0 No information
- 1 Child
- 2 12 - 18
- 3 19 - 25
- 4 26 - 35
- 5 36 - 50
- 6 51 - 65
- 7 66 +

37 APPARENT ETHNICITY/NATIONALITY

- 0 No information
- 1 English Canadian
- 2 French Canadian
- 3 Native Canadian
- 4 Canadian of European background
- 5 Canadian of non-European background
- 6 American (US)
- 7 British
- 8 French
- 9 Other

38 APPARENT RACE

- 0 No information
- 1 White
- 2 Black
- 3 Oriental
- 4 Indo-Pakistani
- 5 Native North American
- 6 Other

39 DISABILITY

- 0 None
- 1 Physical disability
- 2 Psychological disability
- 3 Developmental handicap
- 4 More than one disability

40 APPARENT SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

- 0 No information
- 1 Poor income, clothing, lifestyle
- 2 Middle income, clothing, lifestyle
- 3 Affluent income, clothing, lifestyle

41 PRIMARY OCCUPATION

- 0 No information
- 1 Child
- 2 Student
- 3 Homemaker
- 4 Manager, executive person at the top
- 5 Professional, e.g., lawyer, doctor, teacher
- 6 Politician
- 7 Middle manager, supervisor
- 8 Office, clerical worker, salesperson
- 9 Small business operator
- 10 Skilled tradesperson
- 11 Unskilled labourer
- 12 Law enforcement, military
- 13 Artist, creative person
- 14 Retired
- 15 Unemployed and looking for work
- 16 Other, incl. athletes

43 PAID EMPLOYMENT

- 0 No information
- 1 Employed in traditional role for sex
- 2 Employed in non traditional role for sex

FAMILY AND DOMESTIC ROLE**44 MARITAL OR LIVING ARRANGEMENT**

- 0 No information
- 1 Child too young for marriage
- 2 Single
- 3 Married
- 4 Living with lover
- 5 Divorced/separated
- 6 Widowed

45 PRESENCE IN FAMILY SETTING

- 0 No information
- 1 No family
- 2 Has family, not seen with family members
- 3 Seen with other family members

46 INTERACTION WITH CHILDREN

- 0 No information
- 1 Seen with kids, does not interact
- 2 Interacts with children in home
- 3 Interacts with children away from home
- 4 Both

47 CHILD CARE ROLE

- ☐ No information
- ☐ 1 Children present does not perform child care functions
- ☐ 2 Children present performs child care functions
- ☐ 3 Children absent performs child care functions

48 PARTICIPATION IN DOMESTIC TASKS

- ☐ No information
- ☐ 1 Appears in domestic setting, but performs no related tasks
- ☐ 2 Performs tasks traditional for sex
- ☐ 3 Performs non-traditional tasks
- ☐ 4 Performs domestic-related tasks, but outside domestic setting

INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS**49 ROMANTIC INVOLVEMENT**

- ☐ No information
- ☐ No relationship
- ☐ 2 Actively seeks partner
- ☐ 3 Is actively pursued by other
- ☐ 4 Both 2 & 3

50 PRESENCE OF SAME-SEX FRIENDS (Platonic)

- ☐ No information
- ☐ 1 Has one or more same-sex friends

51 PRESENCE OF OPPOSITE-SEX FRIENDS (Platonic)

- ☐ No information
- ☐ 1 Has one or more opposite-sex friends

WORK ENVIRONMENT**52 SUPERVISOR**

- ☐ No information
- ☐ 1 Is supervisor, e.g., CEO, self-employed
- ☐ 2 Female supervisor
- ☐ 3 Male supervisor
- ☐ 4 Both female and male supervisors

53 STAFF

- ☐ No information
- ☐ No one
- ☐ 2 Female staff
- ☐ 3 Male staff
- ☐ 4 Both

SETTING AND ACTIVITIES**54 DOMINANT SETTING**

- ☐ No information
- ☐ 1 Home/domestic
- ☐ 2 Paid work environment
- ☐ 3 Retail outlet, point of sale
- ☐ 4 Other indoor setting
- ☐ 5 Other outdoor setting
- ☐ 6 Studio or stage
- ☐ 7 Automobile, boat, plane

55 URBAN RURAL SETTING

- ☐ No information
- ☐ 1 Urban only
- ☐ 2 Rural only
- ☐ 3 Both

56 INTERESTS AND ACTIVITIES

- ☐ No information
- ☐ 1 Seen doing indoor sports/hobbies
- ☐ 2 Seen doing outdoor sports/hobbies
- ☐ 3 Both of the above

57 VEHICLES CARS, TRUCKS, PLANES, BOATS

- ☐ No information
- ☐ 1 Drives vehicle
- ☐ 2 Passenger in vehicle
- ☐ 3 Both

58 PREPARES OR SERVES FOOD OR DRINK

- ☐ No
- ☐ 1 Yes

59 CONSUMES FOOD OR DRINK

- ☐ No
- ☐ 1 Yes

PERSONALITY, BEHAVIOUR**60 PROVIDES CONCRETE HELP, EMOTIONAL OR PRACTICAL**

- 0 No information
- 1 Supports female(s)
- 2 Supports male(s)
- 3 Supports both

61 VERBAL ABUSE, HUMILIATION

- 0 No information
- 1 Abuses female(s)
- 2 Abuses male(s)
- 3 Abuses both

62 ACTS OF PHYSICAL VIOLENCE

- 0 No information
- 1 Commits violence against women
- 2 Commits violence against men
- 3 Commits violence against both

63 THREAT OF PHYSICAL VIOLENCE

- 0 No information
- 1 Commits against women
- 2 Commits against men
- 3 Commits against both

64 VICTIMIZATION

- 0 No information
- 1 Victim of physical violence
- 2 Victim of threat of physical violence
- 3 Victim of both

BODY ASPECTS FILMED**65 TORSO, NO HEAD**

- 0 No
- 1 Yes

66 LEGS ONLY

- 0 No
- 1 Yes

67 "REAR" VIEW

- 0 No
- 1 Yes

68 BATHING SUIT OR EQUIVALENT

- 0 No
- 1 Yes

69 SLEEPWEAR, UNDERWEAR

- 0 No
- 1 Yes

70 SKIN TIGHT CLOTHES (except gym clothes, exercise clothes in appropriate setting)

- 0 No
- 1 Yes

71 WASHING, GROOMING

- 0 No
- 1 Yes

72 NUDE

- 0 No
- 1 Yes

END

1 9 - 1 1 - 9 6

FIN