

1979

Animal Stereotypes in Children's Picture Books

Jeanna L. Massman

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©1979 Jeanna L. Massman

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uni.edu/grp>

Offensive Materials Statement: Materials located in UNI ScholarWorks come from a broad range of sources and time periods. Some of these materials may contain offensive stereotypes, ideas, visuals, or language.

Animal Stereotypes in Children's Picture Books

Find Additional Related Research in UNI ScholarWorks

To find related research in UNI ScholarWorks, go to the collection of [School Library Studies Graduate Research Papers](#) written by students in the [Division of School Library Studies](#), Department of Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education, at the University of Northern Iowa.

ANIMAL STEREOTYPES IN CHILDREN'S PICTURE BOOKS

A Research Paper

Presented to the

Faculty of the Library Science Department

**In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirement for the Degree
Master of Arts**

Jeanna L. Massman

May 1979

Read and approved by

Leah Hiland

Mary Lou Mc Grew

Accepted by Department

Elizabeth Martin

Date

July 12, 1979

ANIMAL STEREOTYPES IN CHILDREN'S PICTURE BOOKS

This research was a content analysis concerned with the stereotyping of animals in children's literature. Five hypotheses were formulated on the topic. These hypotheses examined the relationship between type of characterization (animal as animal, animal as animal but talking, animal as human being) and stereotyping. The relationship between role of character (major or minor) and stereotyping and the degree of stereotyping and realism, in general, prevalent in children's picture books. The animals picked for analysis were bears, foxes, mice and rabbits. The total population of books was taken from five sources and a stratified random sample was drawn. A total of 129 books were analyzed.

The results of the analysis of data indicated that the number of characterizations which were labeled animal as human being was significantly less than was expected. Neither type of characterization or role of character was found to have a significant effect on stereotyping, however, significant differences were determined when degree of stereotyping and realism were analyzed. This led to a generalization that children's books have a tendency to be more stereotyped than realistic. A further generalization answers the major question inherent in the research: stereotyping of animals is evident in children's picture books.

CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	111
THE PROBLEM	1
Problem Statements	5
Hypothesis	6
Significance of Study	6
Limitations	7
Assumptions	8
Definitions	9
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	12
Animals in Children's Literature	12
Real and Stereotyped Characteristics of Animals	18
Content Analysis	22
METHODOLOGY	23
ANALYSIS OF DATA	36
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY	54
BIBLIOGRAPHY	58
APPENDIX	63

TABLES

Table	Page
1. Population and Samples of Animal Books Found Through Five Sources	25
2. Number of Characterizations In Each of the Three Types	37
3. Number of Characterizations in Each of the Four Rankings on the Stereotyping Continuum	40
4. Number of Characterizations in Each of the Four Rankings on the Realism Continuum	42
5. Degree of Stereotyping Among the Two Roles of Character	44
6. Degree of Realism Among the Two Roles of Character	45
7. Degree of Stereotyping Among the Three Types of Characterizations	46
8. Degree of Realism For the Three Types of Characterization	47
9. Number of Characterizations in Each of The Bear Characteristics	50
10. Number of Characterizations in Each of The Fox Characteristics	51
11. Number of Characterizations in Each of The Mice Characteristics	52
12. Number of Characterizations in Each of The Rabbit Characteristics	53

Chapter 1

THE PROBLEM

Most children, from the time they receive their first teddy bear, form a deep and often lasting attachment to animals. Children, especially those of a very young age, sometimes identify more easily with animal figures than they do with human figures.¹ However, since over half of the world's population is urban, the opportunity for most children to have direct contact with animals is somewhat limited.² Children's literature has helped children to overcome this limitation of their environment by helping them establish literary contact with numerous animals. In fact, writers of children's literature have capitalized on the natural affinity between animals and children and in doing so have greatly increased children's exposure to animal life. Picture books for the young are dominated by animal figures. Animals that have not appeared in children's picture books are difficult to find.³ Children never seem to tire of animal characters in their picture books, and adults are often unsuccessful in their attempts to get them to choose other types of books.⁴

¹Nancy A. Boyd and George Mandler, "Children's Responses to Human and Animal Stories and Pictures," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 19:367, 1955.

²May Hill Arbuthnot and Dorothy M. Broderick, Time for Stories of the Past and Present, (Chicago: Scott Foresman, 1968) p. 2.

³Bernard J. Lonsdale and Helen K. MacKintosh, Children Experience Literature, (New York: Random House, 1973) p. 96.

⁴Arbuthnot and Broderick, p. 2.

With the overwhelming popularity of fictional animal books, it seems justifiable to conclude that the stories children hear and read about animals may be a big factor in the attitudes and opinions they form about animals.⁵ Children do not always make the distinction between fact and fiction. They often accept the descriptions they read and see in story books as the real picture of the animal and the way he lives. As was previously mentioned, it is unlikely that the child will be able to compare the fictional account of the animal with actual observation of the animal's appearance and habits. Unfortunately, the author's portrayal is sometimes blatantly false and also the animal is many times judged good or bad without considering his actions in the context of his environment. Human values and standards can not be fairly applied to all the actions of non-human animals.⁶ Children may be led to accept the old clichés of the wily fox, timid mouse, and dirty rat if they are constantly reinforced in the books they read. They may also be encouraged to predict the actions of animals on the basis of the way they have always seen them act in stories. This can actually be dangerous to the child in the event of real physical contact with an animal. Part of the problem may be attributed to the types of characterization most often used by authors of children's literature.

Sutherland and Arbuthnot listed three main types of fictional animal books easily recognized in children's literature. The first

⁵William M. Bart, "A Hierarchy Among Attitudes Toward Animals," The Journal of Environmental Education, 3:3. Summer 1972.

⁶Jack Denton Soctt, "Animals: Facts and Fallacies," Reader's Digest, 112:160, May 1978.

⁷Thomas G. Aylesworth, "Personification is a Biological Problem," School Science and Math, 62:97, February 1962.

group consists of books where the animals are given many of the characteristics of human beings. These animals do not act as beasts at all. They talk, dress in clothes, walk on two legs and in general act just like people. The reader may even forget that they are animals instead of humans.⁸ Margery Fisher in her book Intent Upon Reading maintained that this type of animal story can only be successful if the author includes an essence of the real animal in his portrayal. The animal itself must be the starting point of the characterization, so that while the animal is humanized it remains true to its real animal nature.⁹ In the second group of animal stories, animals are portrayed as real animals with the exception that they are given the ability to think and speak. They are usually not concerned with human matters as are the animals in group one, but rather focus on their own particular experiences as animals of a certain species. The third way that an author includes animals in fiction for children is when he characterizes the animal entirely through outside observation. Man can only guess what the animal is thinking, saying, or feeling.¹⁰

In the first two types of animal stories described above, the animals are anthropomorphized (non-human things are given human traits) while in the latter group they usually are not. Children rarely have any difficulty in accepting animals with human traits and for the most part relate very well with them. Perhaps this close identification with anthropomorphized animals stems from a reluctance to separate the

⁸Zena Sutherland and May Hill Arbuthnot, Children and Books, (Chicago: Scott Foresman, 1977) p. 341.

⁹Margery Fisher, Intent Upon Reading: A Critical Appraisal of Modern Fiction For Children, (New York: Franklin Watts, 1961)

¹⁰Sutherland and Arbuthnot, p. 341.

animal world from the human world. Children usually are not surprised or skeptical when animals talk, drive cars or otherwise act human because they consider such actions natural for both man and animal.¹¹ The animals cease to be animals and become friends in fur or feathers.¹² Another fact of children's acceptance of anthropomorphism lies in the nature of young children. Child psychologists have found that children in pre-school through lower elementary school years show a high level of egocentrism and personalization. These children are also characterized by non-abstract thinking.¹³ Thus they tend to think of the actions of all things in relationship to how they or those around them act.¹⁴ Perhaps children also enjoy seeing humanized animals do what people cannot or dare not do.¹⁵ At any rate, in children's picture books anthropomorphism is both common and popular with the young readers of these books. The risks involved in giving animals human traits and personalities are once again related to the dilemma of applying human standards to non-human entities. Storybook animals, even those that fall in the third category of animals as animals without anthropomorphism, may be causing a severe injustice to their live counterparts if children

¹¹John Rowe Townsend, Written For Children: An Outline of English Children's Literature, (New York: Lothrop, Lee and Shepard, 1974) p. 89.

¹²May Lambertson Becker, First Adventures In Reading, (New York: Lippincott, 1936) p. 68.

¹³Belle D. Sharefkin and Hy Ruchlis, "Anthropomorphism in Lower Grades," Science and Children, 11:38, March, 1974.

¹⁴Leland Jacobs, "When Animals Talk," Instructor, 74:42, April, 1965.

¹⁵James Derby, "Anthropomorphism in Children's Literature or 'Mom, My Doll's Talking Again.'" Elementary English, 47:191, February, 1970.

force them to fit the patterns of behavior common in the animal stories they have read. The threat of possible misrepresentation suggests a need to examine children's literature from the standpoint of images given to animals. Defining animal stereotypes and their contrasting realistic descriptions seem necessary in forming a diagnosis on the condition of fictional animals in children's books. Role of character (major or minor) and type of characterization (animal as animal, animal as animal but talking and animal as human) are some factors which may relate to animal characterizations in children's literature and thus, need to be considered.

Problem Statements

1. How are animals (bears, foxes, mice and rabbits) most often characterized in children's picture books, -- as animals which behave as animals are expected to act, as animals which behave as animals except for the fact that they can talk or as animals which behave as human beings?
2. How frequently are the animals (bears, foxes, mice and rabbits) in children's fictional picture books highly stereotyped, moderately stereotyped, minimally stereotyped or not stereotyped?
3. How frequently are the animals (bears, foxes, mice and rabbits) in children's fictional picture books unrealistic, minimally realistic, moderately realistic or highly realistic?
4. What is the relationship between role of character and degree of stereotyping and degree of realism?
5. What is the relationship between type of characterization and degree of stereotyping and degree of realism?

Hypotheses

H₁--There will be no significant difference in the number of characterizations where animals behave as animals, where animals behave as animals but talking and where animals behave as human beings.

H₂--There will be no significant difference in the number of characterizations ranked "1" highly stereotyped, "2" moderately stereotyped, "3" minimally stereotyped and "4" not stereotyped on the stereotyping continuum.

H₃--There will be no significant difference in the number of characterizations ranked "1" unrealistic, "2" minimally realistic, "3" moderately realistic, and "4" highly realistic on the realism continuum.

H₄--There will be no significant difference in the mean score on the stereotyping continuum or the mean score on the realism continuum between the two roles of character--major or minor.

H₅--There will be no significant difference in the mean score on the stereotyping continuum or the mean score on the realism continuum among the three types of characterization--animals as animals, animals as animals but talking, and animals as human beings.

Significance of the Study

The relevance of a research project on animal stereotypes lies in the realization that the attitudes which children form toward animals are important. It was already noted that children's literature is a significant factor in the formation of these attitudes, thus, it is reasonable that we should have examined this literature to see what images it is presenting to children. Children grow up but too often their feelings toward animals do not mature. Adults readily accept the impressions of certain animals they learned when they were young.

Unless they are made to change their conceptions by direct contact with the animal or convincing contrary information, they go on believing that some animals are cuddly, gentle, and friendly all of the time while others are always vicious, deceitful, and bullying. Hunters feel far more justified in shooting an animal that they feel deserved to die because it was intrinsically bad. They go on judging by human, often fictional, standards and refuse to allow the animal its right to exist in a world of its own. Many animals on the endangered species list are not the most appealing to humans. In fact, some like the timber wolf may be labelled as a vicious predator by those who have failed to see the animal's true place in the balance of nature.¹⁶

This is not to say that anthropomorphism in animal stories should be completely eliminated but rather that children should be given factual information on animals to counteract any false notions. First, a measure of the extent and frequency of animal stereotypes is necessary before a strategy to combat the stereotypes can be conceived.

Limitations

This research study analyzed only four animals in regard to their images in children's fictional picture books. The four animals were the bear, the fox, the mouse and the rabbit. All types and varieties of these four animals were considered; the term "rabbit" included both hares and rabbits. All of these animals are types of wildlife. Two of the animals, bears and foxes, are mammalian predators and two, mice and rabbits, are mammalian prey. This is significant when looking at animals from a "balance of nature" point of view which many environmentalist enlist to combat stereotypes of animals. Also, these four

¹⁶Bart, p. 4

animals were chosen because while they are among the animals most often found in children's picture books, the majority of American children are less likely to have direct contact with them than say with cats and dogs which are also frequently used by the authors of picture books. Even in the case of mice and rabbits, where domesticated varieties can be found, it is far more rare for children to have them as a pet than for children to have a cat or a dog. It is even more unlikely that children would have the opportunity to observe the wild varieties of mice and rabbits. The same is true, of course, of bears and foxes which are seldom tamed. Children are dependent on media to help them form images and opinions of bears, foxes, mice and rabbits.

The type of media considered in this study was limited to children's fictional picture books. Both the text and illustrations of each book were analyzed. Other limitations related to the procedures used in this research can be found in the methodology section.

Assumptions

A basic assumption underlying this study is that some animals are stereotyped. Another assumption is that stereotyping affects the attitudes and opinions that children form regarding animals. The assumptions that stereotyping is not generally good literary practice and that books differ in the extent to which they use stereotyping were also inherent parts of this study. This research also assumed that the four animals chosen were a fair representation of the animal kingdom. Hypothesis four assumed that there was a relationship between role of character and degree of stereotyping. The assumption that all animal books fall into one of the three types discussed above was part of hypotheses one and five and hypothesis five went on to assume that there was a relationship between type of characterization and stereotyping.

Definitions

The population for this study was defined as picture books written in English for pre-school through third grade listed under the headings "Animal-Stories" or "Animal-Fiction," "Bear-Stories" or "Bear-Fiction," "Foxes-Stories" or "Foxes-Fiction," "Mice-Stories" or "Mice-Fiction," and "Rabbits-Stories" or "Rabbits-Fiction" in the eleventh edition of Elementary School Library Collection, the thirteenth edition of Children's Catalog (with 1977 and 1978 supplements), the youth collection at the University of Northern Iowa Library, the children's section of the Council Bluffs Public Library or the children's section of the Des Moines Public Library.

For the purposes of this study the term picture book included the pure picture book category and the picture-story book category discussed by Sutherland and Arbuthnot in the book Children and Books. The pure picture book is described as a book "with little or no text." A picture-story book is defined as a book "with structured, if minimal plot." The pictures, however, are such an integral part of the picture-story book that the story can sometimes be read from the pictures.¹⁷

The word stereotype was defined in Webster's New World Dictionary as a conventional or fixed notion or conception believed by a number of people. Often people, groups or ideas are stereotyped into a category that allows for no individuality or critical judgment. S. I. Hayakawa further defined a stereotype as "a substitute for observation and

¹⁷Sutherland and Arbuthnot, p. 62-63.

¹⁸David B. Guralnik, Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language, (New York: World, 1970) p. 1397.

and thought."¹⁹ The above definitions were applied to animals and used for this study.

Although a formal definition of the terms "major and minor characters" could not be found, for the purpose of this study major characters were defined as characters which appear frequently throughout the book, are involved in most of the action in the story, and are important to plot. If a major character were changed or left out of the story, the story itself would be significantly altered. Minor characters were, therefore, defined as those who make few appearances throughout the book, are only incidentally involved in the action and are unimportant to the plot. The story is not seriously affected if this type of character is changed or altered.

The three types of characterization are fairly self-explanatory, but for the purposes of this work they are briefly described as follows:

The actions of animals characterized as animals are objectively reported by an outside observer. The animals are not anthropomorphized in this type of characterization.

Animals as animals but talking are similar to the first group in nature but they are given the human attributes of thought and speech. Arbuthnot described this second type of characterization as "partly make believe and partly natural science."

Animals acting as prototypes of human beings have lost most of their animal traits and have taken on human personalities and manifestations.²⁰ For the purposes of this research the latter type of characterization included animal toys who have "come to life."

¹⁹S.I. Hayakawa, "Recognizing Stereotypes As Substitutes," English Journal, 38:155, April, 1949.

²⁰Arbuthnot and Broderick, p. 3.

The "essence of the true nature" of the animal was defined as an element in the characterization which makes the characterization unique to that particular animal. If another animal were substituted in the role the characterization would be seriously affected. In fact, the animal is the starting point of the characterization and the author builds around it.²¹

For use in the methodology of this study the stereotype for each of the four designated animals as well as his real characteristics must be defined. These definitions are operational and will be described in the methodology section.

²¹Fisher, p. 52.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In reviewing the literature for this research, a lack of material written specifically on animal stereotypes in children's literature was noted. Articles on animals in children's books could be found, however, and some of these had brief references to animal stereotyping. Portions of these articles which explained the role of the animal in children's literature, discussed stereotyping as a common occurrence in animal stories, or attempted to clarify the author's purpose in his characterization of some animals are included in this section. While not directly related to children's literature, information on animal stereotyping in general was also available. The sections of these articles which mentioned the animal stereotypes which can be found in children's books are part of this review. Articles written on anthropomorphism by both scientists and literary experts are included when anthropomorphism is related to animal stereotypes. An article on content analysis which applies to methodology of this research is part of this section.

Animals in Children's Literature

In an article entitled "The Animal Story: A Challenge in Technique," William H. Magee traced the development of the animal story. In this article, Magee's purpose was to illustrate the importance of realism in the animal story. He also used examples of children's literature to demonstrate trends in this area. His article was mainly limited to these examples but from them he tried to generalize to include all of children's literature. Magee found that a steady rise

in realistic animal stories can be documented from the ^{publication} ~~duplication~~ of Black Beauty in 1877. He supported the idea that the animal story at its highest point will be a psychological romance constructed within a framework of natural science. He makes no judgment as to the proximity of animal stories presently popular to this theoretical highest point. The work by Magee applies to this study in that it implies that realistic portrayals of animals should be a goal of children's literature. This study helps to assess the current status of picture books toward this goal.²²

Written in a similar vein yet much broader in scope is a book by Margaret Blount called Animal Land. Blount covered many facets of the characterization of animals in children's fiction. In one chapter entitled "Dressed Animals and Others," the author suggested that humanizing animals allowed the reader to forget the fear, pain and death which is a major part of most animals' lives. By keeping them somewhat animal-like the characters did not need to submit to human toil and trouble. Personified animals, according to Blount, seemed to have the "best of both worlds." Blount indicated that authors sometimes use familiar animal roles to create a sense of well-being in the reader's mind. This seemed to imply that certain stereotyped images are used to create attractive or sympathetic characters in a story. This concept applies to the present research because some of these types of images will be analyzed. Since this chapter deals exclusively with anthropomorphized animals, it also relates to the phase of the present

²²William H. Magee, "The Animal Story: A Challenge in Technique," Only Connect: Readings in Children's Literature, eds. Sheila Egoff, G.T. Stubbs and L.F. Ashley (New York: Oxford, 1969) pp. 221-232.

research which attempts to determine if the type of characterization is related to the degree of stereotyping.²³

Like Blount, May Hill Arbuthnot and Dorothy M. Broderick considered the animal story an important segment of children's literature. They talked about the average child's need to experience animals through literature because of the scarcity of opportunities for most children to experience them in real life. Arbuthnot also repeated her description of the three types of animal stories. These descriptions are an essential part of the present research. The authors also listed standards for judging animal stories, particularly those where the animal is characterized as an animal. One standard stated that the animal must remain true to his own species. This research is also concerned with this standard in that it attempts to determine the stereotypes and realistic characterizations in a sample of children's picture books. Finally, Arbuthnot and Broderick discussed the value of animal stories for children. In this section, they pointed out that it is important that children get a true picture of animals from the literature they read. Arbuthnot and Broderick wrote that children can only begin to really understand animals if the images they receive in literature are basically accurate. The present research hopes to reveal some stereotypes in literature which seriously threaten the understanding of young readers.²⁴

Juliet Kellogg Markowsky limited her discussion to the first two types of animal stories listed by Arbuthnot; those where the animal is

²³ Margaret Blount, Animal Land: The Creatures of Children's Fiction, (New York: Morrow, 1974) pp. 131-151.

²⁴ Arbuthnot and Broderick, pp. 2-5.

humanized. Markowsky's purpose in her opinion article was to list and discuss the major reasons for anthropomorphizing animals in children's literature. She attempted to explain why animals are sometimes given human images which are usually not entirely true to the animals' real description. The first reason for anthropomorphizing is to enable young readers to identify with animals. The second reason is for the sake of fantasy itself. A story that is pure make-believe often appeals to children. The third reason is for variety. An author can develop a greater number of characters if instead of drawing some characters in depth he can merely have the reader recall the commonly accepted attributes of some animals. The fourth reason is for humor. Children find enjoyment in caricatures of certain personality types. Markowsky implied that in writing quality literature the author should not limit his anthropomorphism to stereotypes but that he should use the stereotypes as a point of departure for individual characterization. This article was noteworthy because it not only pointed out various uses of anthropomorphism but related these uses to stereotypes of animals in children's literature. She maintained that anthropomorphism is a useful technique as long as the author is not tempted to limit his characterization to stereotypes. This is clearly related to the fundamentals of this study. Also, the section in which Markowsky pointed out that authors sometimes use stereotypes to avoid in-depth characterization applies to the fourth hypothesis of this study in that major characters who are usually more completely portrayed would be less likely to be stereotyped.²⁵

²⁵ Juliet Kellogg Markowsky, "Why Anthropomorphism In Children's Literature?" Elementary English, 52:460-466, April, 1975.

In a very short section of their book A New Look At Children's Literature, William Anderson and Patrick Groff agreed with Markowsky's opinion that animal stereotypes were often used as symbols to avoid more detailed descriptions. They stated that animals were used to exemplify certain human actions such as honesty, vanity, shrewdness and innocence. These characterizations usually begin with a resemblance between the natural attributes of the animal and the personality trait illustrated by the animal. The authors pointed out that the looks and habits of some animals seemed to suggest that the animal possessed some human qualities. This idea intimated that people have interpreted the actions of animals and have formed stereotypes around these human interpretations! Anderson and Groff's article hit on some key elements of the present research. The present research attempted to discover the popularity of such symbolic stereotypes.²⁶

Margery Fisher continued to analyze anthropomorphized animals in children's books. She alleged that inaccuracy, vulgarity and sentimentality are the three pitfalls of authors who create animal characters with human attributes. Fisher added that "silly" books about animals are corrupting influences for children. If the writer remained true to the real traits of the animal he wrote about, however, Fisher felt that anthropomorphizing animals could be a highly successful technique used by authors to capture the interest of ^{their} ~~his~~ readers. ✓

Fisher criticized animal stories where the animal was chosen arbitrarily without consideration of the animals' real nature. She went on to say that the real animal should always be the beginning of the description

²⁶ William Anderson and Patrick Groff, A New Look At Children's Literature , (Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1972) p. 28.

with the rest of the characterization built around it. This concept is being used in the present research to help determine the degree of stereotyping in stories where the animal is characterized as a human being. If no essence of the real animal exists in the text determining the extent of stereotyping will be impossible. Fisher's article is also important to this work in that, like Markowsky, she points out that anthropomorphism has a legitimate place in children's literature providing the author does not resort to inaccuracy and stereotyping in the characterization.²⁷

On the other hand, Mina Lewiton Simon argued that anthropomorphism may be doing the animals an injustice. She pointed out that animals should not be judged by human standards and should be considered in their own milieu. By continuing to characterize animals according to human stereotypes, Simon said we are halting the progress toward better understanding of nature. This statement hypothesized that stereotyping of animals was harmful to children. The present study attempts to ascertain how widespread stereotyping has become. If we are to accept Simon's hypothesis, a study such as this one would be necessary to evaluate how much injury has already been done. Simon seemed a bit radical in her conclusion in that she did not consider any of the virtues of anthropomorphism discussed by Markowsky and Fisher.²⁸

Along the same lines as the Simon article is one written by Deborah Shields Tully entitled "Nature Stories--Unrealistic Fiction." Tully also supported the theory that animals should not be judged or

²⁷Fisher, pp. 50-65.

²⁸Mina Lewiton Simon, "Crickets, Raccoons and Writers," School Library Journal, 12:32-33, May, 1965.

portrayed within the context of the human social order or experience. She explained that animals do not have to be humanized to be interesting to children. Like Simon, she felt that animals were frequently given false images in children's books. Tully further noted that animals do not have to be humanized in literature to be misrepresented. Books which are supposedly "realistic" as Magee defined the term can also contain some misconceptions. She specifically mentioned the vicious predator syndrome which related to some animals considered in this research. It is interesting that Tully went a step further than Simon in that she suggested methods of checking the accuracy of a book. A method similar to the ones she suggested are used in this study to define each animal's real traits.²⁹

Real and Stereotyped Characteristics of Animals

Austin Hughes discussed anthropomorphism from the viewpoint of the scientist or science teacher. His hypothesis was that anthropomorphism is never needed for a complete understanding of the behavior of a non-human species. He stated that over-emphasizing the aspects of an animal that are judged as unappealing by human standards might detract from the appreciation of serious study and description. Hughes believed that a logical extension of anthropomorphism would be the attempt to exterminate species which are unattractive to humans. Hughes was limited in the fact that his perspective is totally related to science.

²⁹Deborah Shields Tully, "Nature Stories--Unrealistic Fiction," Elementary English, 51:348-352, March, 1974.

He did not consider that anthropomorphism may have some value in literature as did Markowsky in her article. This related to this study because Hughes linked stereotyped images of animals to anthropomorphism. Since anthropomorphism is a common practice it may lead to predicting that stereotyping will also be widespread.³⁰

In response to the Hughes article, Belle D. Sharefkin and Hy Ruchlis wrote an article entitled "Anthropomorphism in the Lower Grades." This discussion took an opposite stand from the Hughes article. These authors tried to justify the use of animal stereotypes when they stated that stereotypes often help a writer communicate his ideas. Though the authors did not comment on the frequency of anthropomorphism and stereotyping of animals in literature, this piece is still significant to the present study in that it questions the relevancy of such research. The hypothesis of the Sharefkin and Ruchlis article was that consideration of an animal in human terms could help children comprehend the true nature of the animal. An underlying concept was that when authors described the animal within the realm of the child's experience the child would be more able to relate to the animal. Stereotyping of animals seemed to be considered an unavoidable and unimportant consequence. The Sharefkin and Ruchlis article did not consider any of the harmful effects which might occur when the child is unable to distinguish between the anthropomorphised animal and the real animal.³¹

³⁰ Austin Hughes, "Anthropomorphism, Teleology, Animism and Personification--Why They Should Be Avoided," Science And Children, 10:10-11, April, 1973.

³¹ Sharefkin and Ruchlis, pp. 37-40.

Another article seriously concerned with the effects of anthropomorphizing animals was written by Thomas B. Aylesworth. Aylesworth pointed out that children form opinions of animals at a very early age. In fact, Aylesworth believed children separate animals into two categories: good animals and bad animals. This division occurred shortly after they began to recognize the individual traits of different animals. This act of separating animals into desirable and undesirable categories stemmed from personification of the animal according to Aylesworth. The present research attempted to draw a connection between such stereotypes as good and bad, desirable and undesirable, with the type of characterization done on the animal. Aylesworth states that we are encouraging personification, and thus stereotyping, in our literature written for children. The present study will attempt to determine the accuracy of this statement. The author finally added that he did not arbitrarily condemn fantasy for children but rather he objected to the mixture of make-believe and fact so that the reader had difficulty distinguishing the truth.³²

Based on a premise similar to Aylesworth's "good and bad" animal concept, William W. Bart made an assessment of human attitudes toward animals. His purpose was to indicate a hierarchy among attitudes through an empirical study using a sample of college students at the University of Minnesota. Bart administered a questionnaire to his sample in which they were to indicate whether they liked or disliked a certain animal. His study was limited to college students and the animals included were limited to thirty well-known animals found in North America. Bart was able to construct a table and a graph which indicated the hierarchy

³²Aylesworth, pp. 97-98.

of attitudes toward animals for his population. The fact that many attitudes toward animals could possibly be traced directly to children's literature related this work to the present study. Also, the Bart research illustrated that many endangered species of animals are the least liked by people. He believed that this attitude may be, in part, a result of stereotyping.³³

Roger T. Johnson did a study on people's attitudes toward wolves which was very similar to the Bart study. The purpose of this study was to see if an increase of factual information had led people to change their attitudes toward wolves. The author also tried to determine differences in attitudes between men and women and between children and adults regarding the wolf. Johnson's sample was limited to 1,692 individuals who visited the University of Minnesota exhibit at the Minnesota State Fair of 1972. Each member of the sample was asked six questions related to wolves. They indicated their answers on a computer which was part of the exhibit. Johnson's conclusion was that children under ten years of age had the most negative attitude toward wolves. This study is of particular value to research on animal stereotyping because, like the Bart study, it established a relationship between children's literature and the attitudes that children have. Johnson went on to suggest that the wolf's image might be improved if accurate information was presented to children, and he indicated a present lack of such material.³⁴

Boyce Rensberger in a book The Cult of the Wild attempted to dispell many of the myths surrounding wildlife. He attempted to counteract false stereotypes of animals by presenting accurate scientific

³³Bart, pp. 4-6.

³⁴Roger T. Johnson, "On the Spoor of the 'Big Bad Wolf'", The Journal of Environmental Education, 6:37-39, Winter, 1974.

information. Like Johnson, he was concerned with people's attitudes toward wolves but he also included a number of other animals that he believed were misunderstood. He did not blame children's literature exclusively for this misunderstanding, but he did mention it as a factor in attitude formation. This book was specifically helpful in the present study because it contributed to the formation of some of the definitions or descriptions of the stereotypes of specific animals and also the lists of real characteristics. Rensberger drew some conclusions on the significance of the increase of accurate information available on animals to ecology and the conservation of wildlife.³⁵

Content Analysis

Tekla K. Bekkedal wrote an article in which she stated that content analysis is a sound approach to research on children's literature. Bekkedal stated that it is an objective, systematic and quantitative method of describing content. She further stated that little research had been done on content in children's books and that most of that done was relatively recent and limited in scope. Bekkedal provided a list of the topics of content analyses that are commonly done on children's books. Possible topics for further research were suggested in the conclusion of the article. The topic of the current research is never specifically mentioned, but a relationship can be traced to those present, for example cultural values. A need for such research is also implied in the discussion of the images presented in children's literature.³⁶

³⁵ Boyce Rensberger, The Cult of the Wild, (Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday, 1977) pp. 1-268.

³⁶ Tekla K. Bekkedal, "Content Analysis of Children's Books," Library Trends, 22:109-126, October, 1973.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

The method used for this study was a content analysis.

Only books designated as "easy," "picture," or those assigned a grade level of pre-school through third grade in at least one of the sources were considered in this study. Combinations of the grades in this range were included as long as they did not exceed one grade level above third. Only books that are written in the English language were considered in this study.

The number of books considered was also limited to those that can be found in the youth collection at the University of Northern Iowa Library in Cedar Falls, the Atlantic Carnegie Public Library in Atlantic, Iowa, the Council Bluffs Public Library in Council Bluffs, Iowa, or those obtained through inter-library loan. A time limit of six weeks was set to complete this research and books not obtained by the end of the six weeks were not considered.

In order for an animal to be chosen for analysis the number of book titles under the name of the animal in all of the sources described below had to equal 20 or more titles. The picture books included

in the population were limited to those found in the following selections aids and library card catalogs:

A. Children's Catalog 1976, (also 1977 and 1978 supplements)³⁷

Animals-Stories (Fiction in the 1977 and 1978 supplements)
 Bears-Stories (Fiction in the 1977 and 1978 supplements)
 Foxes-Stories (Fiction in the 1977 and 1978 supplements)
 Mice-Stories (Fiction in the 1977 and 1978 supplements)
 Rabbits-Stories (Fiction in the 1977 and 1978 supplements)

B. Elementary School Library Collection³⁸

Animals-Stories
 Bears-Stories
 Foxes-Stories
 Mice-Stories
 Rabbits-Stories

C. Youth Collection at the University of Northern Iowa

Animals-Fiction
 Bears-Fiction
 Foxes-Fiction
 Mice-Fiction
 Rabbits-Fiction

D. Children's Section, Council Bluffs (Iowa) Public Library

Animals-Stories
 Bears-Stories
 Foxes-Stories
 Mice-Stories
 Rabbits-Stories

E. Children's Section, Des Moines (Iowa) Public Library

Animals-Fiction
 Animals-Stories
 Bears-Fiction
 Bears-Stories
 Foxes-Fiction
 Foxes-Stories
 Mice-Fiction
 Mice-Stories
 Rabbits-Fiction
 Rabbits-Stories

³⁷ Barbara E. Dill, ed. Children's Catalog 1976, (New York: H. W. Wilson, 1976; 1977 and 1978 supplements).

³⁸ Phyllis Van Orden, ed. Elementary School Library Collection, (Williamsport, Penn., Bro-Dart, 1977).

Titles found under these headings were compiled to form one list and a random sample was taken from this list.³⁹ To insure the sample was representative a stratified sample was drawn. The total population equaled 497 books. This research considered approximately 25 percent of the number, of 133 books. A title was only used once, regardless of the fact that it appeared in more than one of the sources or under more than one of the subject headings. The stratified sampling technique yielded a range of 15 (Foxes - Stories) to 50 (Animal - Stories), from the animal categories. The number of books taken from each subject heading is listed in Table 1. The difference between the number in the sample and sample used is due to the fact^{that} four of the books were not available for analysis.

Table 1

Population and Samples of Animal Books Found Through Five Sources

Animal Categories	Population No.	% of Total Population	Sample No. Drawn	Sample No. Used
Animal - Stories	201	40%	50	38
Bears - Stories	97	19%	24	24
Foxes - Stories	23	5%	15	14
Mice - Stories	113	22%	28	28
Rabbits - Stories	63	13%	16	15
Total	497	100%	133	129

A major task of this research was the formation of a list of stereotyped characteristics and realistic characteristics for each animal.

³⁹ Herbert Arkin and Raymond R. Cotton, Tables for Statisticians, (New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1968) p. 158-161.

The stereotyped characteristics were based on the views of animals expressed in fables and folklore and were further embellished by the common or widely known image of the animals. The viewpoints of various experts on the subject of animals in folklore and children's literature were also utilized in the formation of the definitions of each animal's stereotype. Some stereotypes are factual. However, this research was mainly concerned with false stereotypes. Therefore, any stereotype characteristic which is wholly or partially false was included as part of the definition of the stereotype. The real scientific descriptions were drawn primarily from non-fiction books written for children on each of the four animals. All of the children's non-fiction books used were listed in either Children's Catalog or Elementary School Library Collection. Statements from adult non-fiction sources on wildlife were included when they added significant information to the definition. The words representing key characteristics are listed at the end of each definition. These words were used to construct a form for analysis of each book in compiling data for this study.

Bears

Stereotyped Characteristics. For the most part bears are thought to be cuddly, cute and harmless.⁴⁰ Winnie the Pooh is a good example of this sort of characterization. The cuddly bear is a natural laugh provoker and is often cast in humorous situations.⁴¹ Like the well known Smokey Bear, bears are often portrayed as friendly and helpful.⁴²

⁴⁰Roger A. Caras, Dangerous to Man: A Definitive Story of Wildlife's Reputed Dangers, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964) p. 42.

⁴¹Lonsdale and MacKintosh, p. 92.

⁴²Lily Dorothea Glenn, "A Study of the Animal and Its Role in the Modern Fairy Tale," (Master's Thesis, University of Washington, 1954) p.8.

High intelligence is usually not evident in the depiction, however, the bear may be quaintly clever and mischievous.⁴³ Aesop's bear in the "Bear and the Beehive" fits the description of clever and mischievous when he steals honey from the bees.⁴⁴ The bear in the old Eskimo legend "Kunikdjuaq" added another dimension to the bear stereotype in that he is not only very helpful but also exceedingly loyal to the old woman who raised him and saved his life.⁴⁵ Bears are most characterized in fiction as:

1. cuddly and cute
2. harmless
3. humorous
4. friendly
5. helpful
6. clever
7. mischievous
8. loyal

Real Characteristics. Scientists are trying to warn people that bears are not as cute and harmless as they may appear. When provoked the bear can use his deadly claws with devastating effects.⁴⁶ In fact, the bear is the most dangerous meat-eating animal in North America.⁴⁷ Bears are quite large, sometimes weighing three quarters of a ton and may be as much as nine feet tall when standing upright. The eyesight of a bear is often poor but their good hearing and keen sense of smell help

⁴³Caras, p. 42.

⁴⁴Aesopus, The Fables of Aesopus, (New York: Paddington Press, 1975) p. 159.

⁴⁵Maria Leach, The Rainbow Book of American Folktales and Legends, (New York: World, 1958) p. 275-276.

⁴⁶Dorothy E. Shuttlesworth, Animals That Frighten People--Fact Versus Myth, (New York: Dutton, 1973) p. 30.

⁴⁷Rensberger, p. 164.

them overcome this deficiency. Bears most often walk upright at a slow pace yet they can demonstrate amazing bursts of speed.⁴⁸ Most of a bear's waking hours are spent looking for food to satisfy their truly horrendous appetite.⁴⁹ In locations where the winter is very cold, bears sleep during the cold period in a cave or den. This sleep is not true hibernation because the bear's body temperature, breathing and heart beat do not undergo significant change.⁵⁰ Despite their somewhat volatile nature bears are rather timid around humans and usually do not seek contact unless threatened or tempted with food.⁵¹ In reality, the bear is:

1. ferocious
2. dangerous
3. huge in size
4. poor in eyesight
5. keen in sense of smell
6. slow, but capable of bursts of speed
7. insatiable in appetite
8. timorous toward humans
9. restful during cold weather

Foxes

Stereotyped Characteristics. Foxes abound in folklore and fables and almost without exception they are portrayed as cunning and sly.⁵² Stories of how they trick other animals and even each other are

⁴⁸Robert McClung, The Mighty Bears, (New York: Random House, 1967) p. 6-7.

⁴⁹Sally Carrighar, Wild Heritage, (Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1965) p. 75-76.

⁵⁰George R. Mason, The Bear Family, (New York: Morrow, 1960) p. 13-15.

⁵¹Maurice Burton, ed. The World Encyclopedia of Animals, (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1972) p. 65.

⁵²Blount, p. 24.

numerous. For example, in the fable called "The Fox Without a Tail," a fox who has lost his tail in a trap tries to convince his friends to cut off their tails. He expounds on the disadvantages of tails. A wise old fox foils his plan by calling attention to his missing tail.⁵³ In this instance, besides being clever and sly they are also depicted as deceitful and boastful. Foxes are also known for their viciousness in folklore. The well-known tale of the "Gingerbread Man" is an example of this. In this story the fox lures the Gingerbread Man to the tip of his nose and then swallows him in two gulps.⁵⁴ In most stories the fox attempts to find the easy way to complete a task whether it be finding food to eat or planting a crop as was the situation in the folktale from Argentina entitled "The Lazy Fox." In this story, he tries to trick an armadillo into tending his farm.⁵⁵ The fox is most often characterized as:

1. cunning or clever
2. sly and deceitful
3. wise
4. conceited
5. vicious
6. lazy

Real Characteristics. Foxes have a high degree of mental alertness and a capacity to adapt to their surroundings but they are "clever" or "wise" in that sense only.⁵⁶ To say that they possess the ability or

⁵³ Aesop, Aesop, Five Centuries of Illustrated Fables, (Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1964, p. 64.

⁵⁴ Bonnie Rutherford and Bill Rutherford, illus., The Gingerbread Man, (Racine, Wisconsin: Golden, 1964).

⁵⁵ Genevieve Barlow, Latin American Tales, (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966) p. 23.

⁵⁶ Edward W. Nelson, Wild Animals of North America, (Washington, D.C.: National Geographic Society, 1918) p. 444.

the ingenuity purposely to devise and execute a plan would be erroneous. They have a keen sense of survival and this is what leads them to attack and kill animals smaller than themselves. Foxes have sharp senses of smell, eyesight and hearing. Most of a fox's hunting is done at night and he usually only prowls a mile or two in that time. Most foxes are competent climbers and are swift runners.⁵⁷ Foxes usually lead a solitary life and do not enjoy close neighbors.⁵⁸ Foxes are important to the balance of nature in that they help control the numbers of rodents and other small animals.⁵⁹ Real foxes are described as:

1. adaptable to surroundings
2. mentally alert
3. keen in sense of smell, sight, and hearing
4. nocturnal in hunting habits
5. competent in climbing
6. swift or speedy
7. of value to the balance of nature

Mice

Stereotyped Characteristics. Mice have been very popular with storytellers through the ages. They are usually portrayed as beautiful, timid creatures with surprisingly courageous natures. Mice are supposedly clean and neat, perhaps even fastidious housekeepers. Resourcefulness is also one of the virtues attributed to fictional mice.⁶⁰ Mice are often associated with the role of the underdog;

⁵⁷ Charles L. Ripper, Foxes and Wolves, (New York: Morrow, 1961) p. 6-20.

⁵⁸ Burton, p. 154.

⁵⁹ Thomas B. Allen, Vanishing Wildlife of North America, (Washington, D.C.: National Geographic Society, 1974) p. 117.

⁶⁰ Blount, pp. 144-154.

symbols of the weak and downtrodden of the world.⁶¹ Many stories, including a North American Indian legend entitled "Coyote and the Mice," show mice out-maneuvering and overcoming their much larger predators. In this story, mice not only trick the coyote into hanging in a bag from a tree to avoid a hailstorm, but they also almost cause his death as they pelt him with stones to teach him a lesson.⁶² Most often, however, mice are shown as friendly and helpful. An example of the helpful mouse who also exhibits a high degree of loyalty is the mouse who saves the lion in Aesop's famous fable.⁶³ Mice usually possess nimble wits and intelligent minds in stories and legends. They also seem overwhelmingly patient with the dangerous life they lead.⁶⁴

Stereotyped mice most often are:

1. beautiful or attractive
2. timid
3. neat and clean
4. resourceful
5. weak and downtrodden
6. friendly
7. helpful
8. intelligent
9. patient

Real Characteristics. Experts believe that mice are really rather bold. They use speed rather than shyness as their defense.⁶⁵

⁶¹ Alvin Silverstein and Virginia B. Silverstein, Rats and Mice: Friends and Foes of Man, (New York: Lothrop, Lee and Shepart, 1968) p. 16.

⁶² Gail Robinson and Douglas Hill, ed. Coyote the Trickster--Legends of the North American Indians, (New York: Crane Russack, 1975) pp. 53-59.

⁶³ Joseph Jacobs, ed. The Fables of Aesop, (New York: Macmillan, 1964) p. 21.

⁶⁴ Blount, p. 164.

⁶⁵ Blount, p. 161.

Also, far from being neat and clean, the mouse is known for contamination of food and the spread of disease. Man must consider mice as deadly enemies rather than friends.⁶⁶ Man has inadvertently transported mice wherever he has gone and they have shown themselves to be amazingly adaptable. The fact that mice will eat almost everything has helped them adapt.⁶⁷ While mice are fairly intelligent, it is unlikely that they outwit their predators. Their high reproduction rate seems to have helped them avoid extinction.⁶⁸ Mice are very agile and have a good sense of balance. When hunting insects or smaller rodents or defending their homes, mice can be quite ferocious. It is doubtful that this could be termed "courageous," however.⁶⁹ The real mouse appears to be:

1. unclean and disease carrying
2. adaptable
3. nonselective in eating habits
4. highly reproductive
5. agile
6. ferocious

Rabbits

Stereotyped Characteristics. Rabbits are most often characterized as speedy, timid and persecuted in literature. They are also cute and cuddly.⁷⁰ Many rabbits, especially mother rabbits, are wise and kind.⁷¹

⁶⁶Osmond P. Breland, Animal Life and Lore, (New York: Harper and Row, 1963) p. 52.

⁶⁷Silverstein, Rats and Mice, p. 129-130.

⁶⁸Lilo Hess, Mouse and Company, (New York: Scribner, 1972), p. 20.

⁶⁹Dorothy E. Shuttlesworth, The Story of Rodents, (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1971) pp. 13-24.

⁷⁰Dennis A. Flanagan, "To Each Generation Its Own Rabbits," Wilson Library Bulletin, 49:153, October, 1974.

⁷¹Lillah Farmer, "Rabbits in Children's Books," Language Arts, 53:527, May 1976.

In literature, rabbits appear to lead innocent, uncomplicated lives. They seem totally helpless, peaceful, though sometimes slightly careless.⁷² Though almost always cheerful, at times the rabbit also appears to be conceited. This is the case in Aesop's "Hare and the Tortoise." Nevertheless, in this fable the boastful hare is outdone by the tortoise.⁷³ The hare's loss of a seemingly simple race also demonstrates a lack of intelligence. On the other hand the rabbit may appear cunning and tricky. Brer Rabbit in the famous Uncle Remus stories seems to almost always "out fox" Brer Fox. An example of this is the famous "Tar Baby" legend. In this tale the rabbit tricks the fox into throwing him into the briarpatch where he subsequently escapes. In the Korean folktale, "The Rabbit That Rode On a Tortoise," the rabbit displays a great amount of curiosity as well as cunning. In this story the rabbit fools not only the tortoise but the Dragon King as well into believing he has the ability to take his vital organs out of his body.⁷⁵ Rabbits are most often stereotyped as:

1. cuddly and cute
2. timid
3. speedy
4. innocent and uncomplicated
5. helpless
6. peaceful
7. not overly intelligent
8. careless
9. cunning
10. curious

⁷²R.M. Lockley, The Private Life of a Rabbit, (New York: Macmillan, 1964) p. II.

⁷³Aesopus, p. 70.

⁷⁴Joel Chandler Harris, Uncle Remus: His Songs and Sayings, (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1921) p. 7.

⁷⁵Frances Carpenter, Tales of a Korean Grandmother, (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1974) p. 125.

Real Characteristics. In real life the rabbit is tough, brave, and resourceful.⁷⁶ While rabbits are seemingly unaggressive they are fierce competitors and adapt well to new situations.⁷⁷ Their mental prowess is seldom debated yet it is noteworthy that they have a very sophisticated communication system and in some cases they demonstrate a rather complex social order.⁷⁸ Nothing indicates that they are overly cunning. Rabbits have a keen sense of sight, smell and hearing.⁷⁹ This sensual acuity may make him appear skittish. All of the sources consulted agree that the rabbit can move very quickly. He is not a long distance runner, however, for his bursts of speed are relatively short lived. Cleanliness seems to be very important to the rabbit and he seems to enjoy being around other rabbits. The rabbit in real life appears to be:

1. tough
2. brave
3. resourceful
4. aggressive and competitive
5. sophisticated in social order
6. keen in sight, hearing and smell
7. speedy but for only short distances
8. clean
9. socialable *S.*

The characterization in both text and illustrations was studied to discover its agreement or disagreement with the list of stereotyped characteristics and with the list of realistic characteristics. If a stereotyped characteristic or a realistic characteristic appeared

⁷⁶Flanagan, p. 152.

⁷⁷Terry A. Vaughn, Mammalogy, (Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders Company, 1972) p. 146.

⁷⁸Lockley, pp. 48-50.

⁷⁹Alvin Silverstein and Virginia Silverstein, Rabbits--All About Them, (New York: Lothrop, Lee and Shepard, 1973) p. 98.

in either the text or illustrations the decision was made that the characterization included that characteristic.

When more than one characterization of the same kind of animal was present in the book the total picture of the animal was considered. If any of the stereotyped or real characteristics appeared as a part of any characterization it was noted that the animal as a whole had this characteristic.

All of the data was compiled on duplicated forms which designated the animal, listed his real and stereotyped characteristics and recorded the other pertinent information for each book. The information was transferred to cards and a file kept according to animal, type of characterization, role of the character, and title of book. This system was designed to allow easy access for the final analysis of data.

Chapter 4

ANALYSIS OF DATA

In the analysis of data, only picture books which contained one or more bears, foxes, mice or rabbits were included. If one of the four animals appeared in a book it had to be sufficiently characterized so that stereotyping could be judged, or it was not used in the data analysis. In the case of picture books where the designated animal was characterized as a human being, an essence of the true nature of the animal had to be included in order to judge stereotyping in the text of the book.

Each book included in the sample was analyzed in terms of the characterization of any of the four animals which appeared in the book. Both the text and illustrations in the books were studied. If the animal was sufficiently characterized, it was analyzed to determine three factors: type of characterization, role of character, and degree of stereotyping/realism.

First, the animal was analyzed to determine type of characterization. The text and illustrations were both studied and each was judged to be one of four types -- (1) animal as animal, (2) animal as animal but talking, (3) animal as human being with the essence of the real animal, and (4) animal as human being with no essence of the real animal. A final decision was made based on the text and illustrations. If the type of characterization in the text varied from that in the illustrations, the variance was resolved by using the most unrealistic type. The ranking will run as follows: (1) animal as animal (most realistic characterization), (2) animal as animal but talking, (3) animal

as human being with an essence of the real animal, and (4) animal as human being with no essence of the real animal (most unrealistic). If the animal's characterization was judged to be (4) animal as human being with no essence of the real animal, the characterization was not analyzed to determine stereotyping. If more than one type of characterization for the same animal species occurred in the book, each was analyzed separately, otherwise the animal as a whole was considered regardless of the number of individual characterizations of the same kind of animal.

To test hypothesis one, "there will be no significant difference in the number of characterizations where animals behave as animals but talking and where animals behave as human beings," the total number of books for each of the three types of characterization were determined. Rankings of animal as human being with no essence of the real animal and animal as human being with an essence of the real animal were added together and considered one type of characterization.

Table 2

Number of Characterizations in Each of the Three Types

Characterization Types	Bears	Foxes	Mice	Rabbits	Total
Animal as animal	13	11	8	13	45
Animal as animal but talking	6	7	6	9	28
Animal as human being	21	13	23	17	74
Total	40	31	37	39	147

chi square = 22.082

degree of freedom = 2

Table 2 shows that 45 characterizations were categorized as animal as animal, 28 were categorized as animal as animal but talking and 74 were categorized as animal as human being. The total number of characterizations was 147. The expected result was that each of the three types of characterization would have an equal portion of the total number of characterizations or 49 characterizations. The expected number was compared to the observed number by use of the chi square test.

A significant difference at the .01 level was found between the expected and the observed number of characterizations. The value of chi square (22.082) was considerably larger than the value given for the .01 level from the chi square distribution table.⁸⁰ Hypothesis one was, thus, rejected.

Upon examination of the number of characterizations falling within each of the three types some obvious facts relating to the rejection of this hypothesis can be noted. A conclusion might be reached from this random sample that the animals found in children's picture books most often are of the animal as human being type. Another point of interest was that of the 74 animal as human characterizations, 22 were designated as animal as human with no essence of the real animal, while 52 were termed animal as human with an essence. While significant difference was not determined on these figures, it may be noted that in this sample more of the animal as human characterizations did include the essence of the real animal than those that

⁸⁰Clinton I. Chase, Elementary Statistical Procedures, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976) P. 257.

did not. Authors may prefer the animal as human characterization for a variety of reasons, many of which were discussed earlier in this paper and if a tendency can be predicted from this sample authors more often inject an essence of the true nature of the animal than not. The number of characterizations that were found to be animal as animal but talking was considerably less than the expected result so it might be concluded that when authors give animals the human trait of speech they often go a few steps further to total humanization. A characterization which is truly animal as animal but talking may be difficult to maintain without slipping into the category of animal as human. The characterization of animal as animal seemed to be neither popular or unpopular with authors of children's books since the number of observed characterizations was very near the expected number.

Secondly, each of the four animals' characterizations in the books was analyzed to discover degree of stereotyping and degree of realism. The continuum given below was used to rank the degree of stereotyping and realism for each characterization.

Stereotyping Continuum

- | | |
|---------------------------|---|
| 1. Highly stereotyped | 3/4 or more of the characteristics on the list are found in the book. |
| 2. Moderately stereotyped | 1/2 or more of the characteristics on the list are found in the book. |
| 3. Minimally stereotyped | 1/4 or more of the characteristics on the list are found in the book. |
| 4. Not stereotyped | None of the characteristics on the list are found in the book. |

Realism Continuum

- | | |
|----------------|--|
| 1. Unrealistic | None of the characteristics on the list are found in the book. |
|----------------|--|

- | | |
|-------------------------|---|
| 2. Minimally realistic | 1/4 or more of the characteristics on the list are found in the book. |
| 3. Moderately realistic | 1/2 or more of the characteristics on the list are found in the book. |
| 4. Highly realistic | 3/4 or more of the characteristics on the list are found in the book. |

To test hypothesis two, "there will be no significant difference in the number of characterizations ranked "1" highly stereotyped, "2" moderately stereotyped, "3" minimally stereotyped and "4" not stereotyped on the stereotyping continuum," the number of books with each of the four rankings on the stereotyping continuum was totaled.

Table 3
Number of Characterizations in Each of the Four Rankings
on the Stereotyping Continuum

Rankings of Stereotyping	Bears	Foxes	Mice	Rabbits	Total
Highly	14	3	11	4	32
Moderately	6	6	8	8	28
Minimally	11	13	15	20	59
Not	3	3	0	0	6
Total	34	25	34	32	125

chi square = 45.4

degree of freedom = 3

The observed results were that 32 were highly stereotyped, 28 were moderately stereotyped, 59 were minimally stereotyped and 6 were not stereotyped. A total of 125 characterizations were judged for degree of stereotyping. The expected result was that each ranking of the continuum would have an equal portion of the 125 characterizations or that each would have 31.25 characterizations. The expected number was compared to the observed number by use of the chi square test.

A significant difference at the .01 level was found between the observed and expected number of characterizations. Hypothesis two was rejected.

Based on examination of the characterizations in the four rankings, some general statements can be made. The number of characterizations that ranked highly or moderately stereotyped were very close to the expected number. More characterizations were ranked minimally stereotyped than was expected. Many fewer characterizations ranked not stereotyped than was expected. A conclusion can be made based on this research that most of the animal characterizations in children's picture books are at least minimally stereotyped. In fact, characterizations with minimal stereotyping seemed to be the most readily found. Characterizations that were not stereotyped at all were rare in this research leading to a tentative conclusion that they are rare in children's picture books in general.

To test hypothesis three, "there will be no significant difference in the number of characterizations ranked "1" unrealistic, "2" minimally realistic, "3" moderately realistic, and "4" highly realistic on the realism continuum," the number of books with each of the four rankings on the realism continuum were totaled. The observed results were that out of a total of 125 characterizations, 15 were unrealistic, 93 were minimally realistic, 11 were moderately realistic and 6 were highly realistic. The expected result was that each of the four rankings would have an equal portion of the 125 characterizations or 31.25 characterizations. The expected number was compared to the observed number by use of the chi square test. Data analyzed is given in Table 4.

Table 4
Number of Characterizations in Each of the
Four Rankings on the Realism Continuum

Ranks of Realism	Bears	Foxes	Mice	Rabbits	Total
Unrealistic	7	3	4	1	15
Minimally	22	18	24	29	93
Moderately	4	2	5	0	11
Highly	1	2	1	2	6
Total	34	25	34	32	125

chi square = 188.856

degree of freedom = 3

A significant difference at the .01 level was found between the observed and the expected number of characterizations. The hypothesis three was rejected.

Based on an examination of the data used to test hypothesis three, an obvious observation stands out. The expected rankings varied considerably ~~different~~ from the observed rankings. In the rankings of unrealistic, moderately realistic and highly realistic, the number of characterizations was much less than the expected number. In the ranking of minimally realistic the observed number was much greater than the expected number. From this research the conclusion could be formed that most of the characterizations of animals in children's picture books are minimally realistic. Authors seem reluctant to portray animals as highly realistic and they are somewhat more inclined to abandon realism all together. A possible explanation for this large portion of minimally realistic characterizations is that

the common image of the animal often includes realistic traits. From the analysis of hypothesis three, it may also be suggested that the realistic portion of an animal's most common or frequently observed image is counter-balanced by the inclusion of stereotyped characteristics.

The last factor in this analysis, role of character, was noted and the animal was labeled either a major or minor character according to the definitions of these terms provided in the definition section. In the instance where more than one of a certain animal was found in a book, the animal as a whole was analyzed for role of character. If all of that kind of animal were removed or if one or more were significantly altered would the story be significantly changed? A yes to this question indicated a major characterization; a no to this question indicated a minor characterization.

To test hypothesis four, "there will be no significant difference in the mean score on the stereotyping continuum or the mean score on the realism continuum between the two roles of character--major or minor," the books analyzed were divided into two groups: those where the animal was a major character and those where the animal was a minor character. The data were grouped to determine the mean score of stereotyping for each of the two groups. Books that were tabulated in category "one" on the continuum were assigned a score of one, and so forth, through the four ranks of the continuum. The scores were compared using an analysis of variance or "F" test.⁸¹ Table 5 shows the data analyzed.

⁸¹Chase, p. 249-256.

Table 5
Degree of Stereotyping Among The
Two Roles of Character

Roles of Character	Ranks of Stereotyping				Total
	Highly 1	Moderately 2	Minimally 3	Not 4	
Major	32	26	23	0	81
Minor	0	2	36	6	44
Total	32	28	59	6	125

$$F = 1.77 \quad df = \text{sag}^2 = 1 \quad \text{swg}^2 = 123$$

The F ratio for the degree of stereotyping of major and minor characters was less than the ^{.05} ~~five percent~~ value of F. Thus, the stereotyping part of hypothesis four was accepted because no significant difference was found.

Based on the analysis of data involved in testing this segment of hypothesis four some conclusions were drawn. Role of character does not seem to have a significant effect on stereotyping. An examination of the number of books falling into each of the stereotyping ranks seems to indicate that minor characters are more often minimally or not stereotyped than major characters. On the other hand, major characters seemed to be ranked highly or moderately stereotyped more frequently than minor characters. These differences did not prove to be significant, however.

To test the second part of hypothesis four, the mean score of realism was determined for books where the animal was a major character and books where the animal was a minor character. The

procedure used was similar to that used to compare the mean scores of stereotyping. Data used to test this segment of hypothesis four is given below.

Table 6
Degree of Realism Among the Two Roles of Character

Roles of Character	Unrealistic	Minimally	Moderately	Highly	Total
Major	7	61	10	6	84
Minor	8	32	1	0	41
Total	15	93	11	6	125

$$F = .09$$

$$df = \text{sag}^2 = 1$$

$$\text{swg}^2 = 123$$

The F ratio of the degree of realism for the two roles of character was less than the .05 value of F. Thus, the second part of hypothesis four was accepted because no significant difference was determined.

A conclusion drawn from the analysis of data for this segment of hypothesis four was that the role of character does not have a significant influence on degree of realism. Upon examination of the actual number of characterizations within each ranking for major and minor characters it would seem that this conclusion holds true. Both major and minor roles of character had the greatest number of characterizations ranked minimally realistic. The number of characterizations in the other three rankings were also very similar.

To test hypothesis five, "there will be no significant difference in the mean score on the stereotyping or the mean score on the realism continuum among the three types of characterization--animals as animals,

animals as animals but talking, and animals as human beings," the books were divided into three groups: those where the animal appears as an animal, as an animal but talking, and as animal with an essence of the real animal. Since degree of stereotyping or degree of realism cannot be judged in the characterization of animal as human being with no essence of the real animal, it was omitted in testing this hypothesis.

A procedure similar to the one used to tabulate the scores in hypothesis four was used to test this hypothesis. The score of stereotyping was compared using an "F" test or analysis of variance to determine significant difference. The data used to test this hypothesis is given in Table 7.

Table 7

Degree of Stereotyping Among the Three Types of Characterizations

Type of Characterizations	Highly	Moderately	Minimally	Not	Total
Animal as animal	2	8	30	5	45
Animal as animal but talking	5	7	15	1	28
Animal as human being	25	13	14	0	52
Total	32	28	59	6	125

$$F = 1.05$$

$$df = \text{sag}^2 = 2$$

$$\text{swg}^2 = 122$$

The F ratio of the degree of stereotyping for the three types of characterization was less than the .05 value on the F table. No significant difference was determined in the stereotyping segment and hypothesis five was accepted.

A logical conclusion from this analysis was that the type of characterization does not have a significant effect on degree of

stereotyping. Based on an examination of the numbers of characterizations in each ranking for each type of characterization the following observations may be made. The category of animal as human had a higher number of characterizations that ranked "highly stereotyped" than the other two types of characterizations. Conversely, it had less characterizations that ranked "not stereotyped" on the continuum. The animal as animal characterization had the highest sum of the scores of the three types which indicated that type of characterization may have been the least stereotyped in this analysis. Most of the characterizations which were designated animal as animal but talking fell into the minimally stereotyped ranking.

The scores of realism of the three types of characterizations were also compared using the "F" test in a procedure similar to the one described above. Data used in this analysis is given in Table 8.

Table 8

Degree of Realism for the Three Types of Characterizations

Type of Characterization	Unrealistic	Minimally	Moderately	Not	Total
Animal as animal	4	34	4	3	45
Animal as animal but talking	3	23	2	0	28
Animal as human being	8	36	5	3	52
Total	15	93	11	6	125

$$F = .01$$

$$df = sag^2 = 2$$

$$swg^2 = 122$$

The F ratio of the degree of realism for the three types of characterization was less than the value of F at the .05 level. Thus,

no significant difference was determined and the realism segment of hypothesis five was accepted.

Based on an examination of the data in this analysis some general statements may be made. The total number of scores in each ranking were similar for each of the three types of characterizations. This seemed to indicate that the type of characterization does not affect the degree of realism in a major way. All three types of characterizations had the highest number of cases fall in the minimally realistic ranking. Each type of characterization had the fewest number of cases in the highly realistic ranking. Once again the conclusion could be drawn that since most of the characterizations in each of the three fell into the same ranking of minimally realistic, the type of characterization was not a major influence on the degree of realism.

Some data which was not initially analyzed in this research but which might be of interest to future study will be given in this section. From the data compiled in tables 9 - 12 some observations can be made. For example, in the case of bears it is noteworthy that in the text of the stories 20 books portrayed this animal as friendly while only seven books portrayed them as ferocious. Since evidence shows that bears are ~~bears are~~ indeed ferocious a serious misconception might be diagnosed. Some characteristics were more often detected in the illustrations of the bear books while others occurred more frequently in the text. Cute and cuddly, humorous, and huge in size were some characteristics that seemed to appear much more often in the illustrations than in the text. When a bear was friendly, loyal and insatiable in appetite, it most frequently occurred in the text of the book.

Some observations on the nature of fox characterizations can be made after examining the data on Table 10. The fact that foxes

are of value to the balance of nature was only evident in one of the books analyzed while foxes were characterized as vicious in the text of 12 books and in the illustrations of five books. This seems to indicate that the foxes in the children's books analyzed were more likely to be vicious predators with little consideration of how they fit in the scheme of nature. The fox characteristics on a whole seemed to be more readily observed in the text of the books than in the illustrations. Competency in climbing was the only characteristic that appeared more often in the illustrations than in the text.

After interpreting the data on Table 11, mice appeared to be more frequently characterized as neat and clean than unclean and disease carrying. Since research shows that mice are actually unclean and disease carrying a serious deviation from fact seems evident in the children's books analyzed. Mice were portrayed as beautiful or attractive, neat and clean and agile many times in the illustrations, however, very few of the other characteristics were evident in the illustrations. This might indicate that some real and stereotyped characteristics of mice are more visual than others.

From the data in Table 12, rabbits seemed to be portrayed more often as cuddly and cute than as tough or brave. Experts on rabbit behavior have written that in reality rabbits are more likely to be tough and brave than cuddly and cute. This might suggest that the authors of the books in this study fictionalized rabbits to such an extent that the rabbits really did not closely resemble their real counterparts. Once again at least one of the characteristics appeared to be more visual than others since it appeared very frequently in the illustrations and others appeared very rarely. It was a common occurrence for the rabbit to appear cute and cuddly but that was the only characteristic that had a high total number of characterizations.

Table 9

Number of Characterizations in Each of the Bear Characteristics

Characteristic	Number of Characterizations with Characteristic in Text	Number of Characterizations With Characteristic in Illustration
STEREOTYPED		
Cute and cuddly	7	22
Harmless	10	14
Humorous	12	19
Friendly	20	0
Helpful	15	2
Clever	14	3
Mischievous	7	5
Loyal	12	3
REAL		
Ferocious	7	11
Dangerous	8	5
Huge in Size	4	18
Poor in Eyesight	3	2
Keen in sense of smell	4	1
Slow, but capable of bursts of speed	8	3
Insatiable appetite	16	6
Timorous toward humans	3	1
Restful in cold weather	8	3

Total Number of Bear Characterizations = 40

Table 10

Number of Characterizations in Each of the Fox Characteristics

Characteristic	Number of Characterizations With Characteristic in Text	Number of Characterizations With Characteristic in Illustration
STEREOTYPED		
Cunning or clever	11	1
Sly and deceitful	9	3
Wise	5	0
Conceited	4	0
Vicious	12	5
Lazy	4	1
REAL		
Adaptable to surroundings	4	0
Mentally alert	16	2
Keen sense of smell, hearing and eyesight	9	1
Nocturnal in hunting habits	6	2
Competent in climbing	3	4
Swift or speedy	9	5
Of value to balance of nature	1	0

Total Number of Fox Characterizations = 31

Table 11

Number of Characterizations in Each of the Mice Characteristics

Characteristic	Number of Characterizations With Characteristic in Text	Number of Characterizations With Characteristic in Illustrations
STEREOTYPED		
Beautiful or attractive	7	28
Timid	14	5
Neat and clean	11	10
Resourceful	22	3
Weak and downtrodden	17	1
Friendly	24	3
Helpful	19	2
Intelligent	15	3
Patient	17	1
REAL		
Unclean and disease carrying	1	0
Adaptable	13	0
Unselective in eating habits	5	0
Highly reproductive	5	0
Agile	23	11
Ferocious	2	0

Total Number of Mice Characterizations = 37

Table 12

Number of Characterizations in Each of the Rabbit Characteristics

Characteristic	Number of Characterizations With Characteristic in Text	Number of Characterizations With Characteristic in Illustrations
STEREOTYPED		
Cuddly and Cute	7	29
Timid	12	4
Speedy	16	8
Innocent and uncomplicated	11	5
Helpless	15	2
Peaceful	6	0
Careless	10	0
Not overly intelligent	10	0
Cunning	1	0
Curious	10	0
REAL		
Tough	1	0
Brave	6	1
Resourceful	10	1
Aggressive and competitive	3	0
Sophisticated in social order	5	0
Keen in sight, hearing and smell	15	0
Speedy but only for short distances	15	5
Clean	6	4
<u>Socialable</u> <i>AP</i>	21	3

Total Number of Rabbit Characterizations = 39

Chapter 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

This research was undertaken to explore the topic of stereotyping of animals in children's fictional picture books. The animals selected for analysis were bears, foxes, mice and rabbits. These four animals were frequently used by authors as characters in their children's books. The hypotheses which provided direction for the research considered the relationship between type of characterization and degree of stereotyping and realism, the relationship between role of character and degree of stereotyping and realism, and the frequency of stereotyping and realism in general. The types of characterization were defined as animal as animal, animal as animal but talking, animal as human with and without the essence of the real animal. These definitions were based on the writing of May Hill Arbuthnot on the topic of animal stories. Role of character refers to major or minor characterizations or the general importance of the character in the story. The review of the literature revealed that while critics of children's literature and animal conservationists had assumed that connections between children's literature and stereotyping of animals existed no one had done research on precisely that topic.

The total population of books to be analyzed was taken from appropriate headings in Children's Catalog and Elementary School Library Collections. The card catalogs of three large libraries were also used to compile the total population. A stratified random sample was drawn and a total of 129 books were analyzed. Each book was examined to determine if one of the four designated animals appeared.

The role of character and type of characterization of the animal and whether or not the characterization displayed any of the stereotyped or realistic characteristics. Degree of stereotyping and realism was determined after the initial analysis. Data from the research was compiled on duplicated forms. The analysis of data to test the five hypotheses was conducted using appropriate statistical methods to determine significant difference.

At this point a brief summary of the conclusions reached in the analysis of data will indicate the outcome of this research. A significant difference was determined in the number of characterizations among the three categories. The number of books which were designated animal as human was significantly more than expected. The number of books designated animal as animal but talking was significantly less than was expected. The type of characterization did not have a significant effect on stereotyping, however. Role of the character also was determined to have an insignificant effect on stereotyping. As a result of this research role of the character and type of characterization may be eliminated from the list of possible factors which strongly influence stereotyping in children's literature.

A significant difference was determined in the number of characterizations within the four rankings of stereotyping. A significant difference was also determined in the number of characterizations within each of the four rankings of realism. While most of the characterizations were ranked minimally stereotyped and minimally realistic, more characterizations were found to be highly stereotyped than highly realistic. More characterizations were marked unrealistic than not stereotyped. An indication of a tendency toward more stereotyping and less realism might be observed. A generalization might be

made in answer to the major question inherent in this research: stereotyping of animals is evident in children's picture books. This seems to ~~prove~~ ^{agree with} William W. Bart's assumption that some animals are given false stereotyped images in children's literature. Further study is indicated to test his theory that children's literature is instrumental in children's attitude formation toward animals.⁸²

The data in this research or data from a similar study could be used to analyze individual animals in regard to their type of characterization, role of character and degree of stereotyping or realism. The popularity of certain animals in children's picture books could also be studied to determine the animals which appear most often in children's picture books. The realistic or stereotyped images of animals could also be analyzed in children's non-fiction books and in fictional animal books for older children as a continuation of the present research. Also, as was suggested in the preceding paragraph as a continuation of the present research, the opinions of actual children on bears, foxes, mice and rabbits could be surveyed. A connection between attitude formation and children's literature might be graphically illustrated when the results of the suggested research polling children's opinions and the present research on stereotyping were compared. As was evident from the review of the literature, critical analyses of the images of animals found in books for children are relatively scarce but a growing interest in the welfare of animal is also evident. Future research may continue to probe the link between literature and the formation of attitudes toward animals.

⁸²Bart, pp. 4-6.

The data given in Tables 9 - 12 could be analyzed to determine if there is a significant difference in the number of characterizations which display each of the various characteristics of bears, foxes, mice and rabbits.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Periodicals

- Aylesworth, Thomas G. "Personification Is a Biological Problem." School Science and Math, 62:97-8. February, 1962.
- Bart, William. "A Hierarchy Among Attitudes Toward Animals." The Journal of Environmental Education, 3:4-6. Summer, 1972.
- Bekkedal, Tekla K. "Content Analysis of Children's Books." Library Trends, 22:109-26. October, 1973.
- Boyd, Nancy A. and George Mandler. "Children's Responses to Human and Animal Stories and Pictures." Journal of Consulting Psychology, 19:367-371. 1955.
- Burnford, Sheila. "Animals All The Way." Canadian Library, 19:30-33. July, 1962.
- Byrne, Barbara. "Cats In Literature." Elementary English, 51:955-58. October, 1974.
- Collins, Michael A.J. "Questionnaires and Changing Student's Attitudes To Animals." Journal of Environmental Education, 8:37-40. 1976.
- _____. "Student Attitudes Towards Animals." American Biology Teacher, 38:491-93. November, 1976.
- Derby, James. "Anthropomorphism in Children's Literature or 'Mom, My Doll's Talking Again.'" Elementary English, 47:190-2. February, 1970.
- Farmer, Lillah. "Rabbits in Children's Books." Language Arts, 53:527-30. May, 1976.
- Flanagan, Dennis. "To Each Generation Its Own Rabbits." Wilson Library Bulletin, 4:152-6. October, 1974.
- Garvey, Leone. "What Is Children's Literature?" Elementary English, 41:475-83. May, 1964.
- Gordon, Anitra. "Animals and Adolescents." Elementary English, 49:460-65. March, 1972.
- Hayakawa, S.I. "Recognizing Stereotypes As Substitutes For Thought." English Journal, 38:155-6. April, 1949.
- Hughes, Austin. "Anthropomorphism, Teleology, Animism, and Personification-- Why They Should Be Avoided." Science and Children, 10:10-11. April, 1973.

- Jacobs, Lee. "When Animals Talk." Instructor, 74:42, 81, April, 1965.
- Johnson, Roger T. "On the Spoor of the 'Big Bad Wolf.'" The Journal of Environmental Education, 6:37-9. Winter, 1974.
- Lancelyn, Roger. "Sing Ho! For the Life of A Bear." Junior Bookshelf, 25:202-4. October, 1961.
- Langton, Jane. "A Weak Place In the Cloth: A Study of Fantasy For Children." Hornbook, 49:433-41. October, 1973. Part 2, Hornbook, 49:570-78. December 1973.
- Lawrence, Joseph. "Animals and 'Dressed Animals.'" Junior Bookshelf, 2:289-294. December, 1967.
- Markowsky, Juliet Kellogg. "Why Anthropomorphism In Children's Literature." Elementary English, 52:460-6. April, 1975.
- McCann, Donna Rae. "Well Of Fantasy, 1865-1965." Wilson Library Bulletin, 40:334-43. December, 1965.
- Overton, Jacqueline. "What Makes An Animal Book?" Publisher's Weekly, 122:665-70. August 27, 1932.
- Scott, Jack Denton. "Animals: Facts and Fallacies." Reader's Digest, 112:160-3. May, 1978.
- Sharefkin, Belle D. and Hy Ruchlis. "Anthropomorphism In the Lower Grades." Science and Children, 11:37-40. March, 1974.
- Simon, Mina Lewiton. "Crickets, Raccoons, and Writers." School Library Journal, 12:32-3. May, 1965.
- Smith, Dora V. "The Children's Literature Heritage." Elementary English, 41:715-727. November, 1964.
- Tully, Deborah Shields. "Nature Stories--Unrealistic Fiction." Elementary English, 51:348-52. March, 1974.
- White, Mary Lou. "A Structural Description of Picture Storybooks." Elementary English, 52:495-98. April, 1975.
- Yawkey, Thomas D. and Margaret L. Yawkey. "An Analysis of Picture Books." Language Arts, 53:545-48. May, 1976.

Books

- Aesopus. Aesop's Fables. New York: Franklin Watts, 1968.
- _____. The Fables of Aesops. New York: Paddington Press, 1975.

- _____. Aesop, Five Centuries of Illustrated Fables, Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1964.
- Allen, Thomas B. Vanishing Wildlife of North America. Washington, D.C.: National Geographic Society, 1974.
- Anderson, William and Patrick Groff. A New Look At Children's Literature. Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1972.
- Arbuthnot, May Hill and Dorothy M. Broderick. Time For Stories of Past and Present. Chicago: Scott Foresman, 1968.
- Arkin, Herbert and Raymond R. Cotton. Tables for Statisticians. New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc., 1968.
- Barlow, Genevieve. Latin American Tales. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.
- Becker, May Lambertson. First Adventures in Reading. New York: Lippincott, 1936.
- Belting, Natalia M. The Long-Tailed Bear and Other Indian Legends. Eau Claire, Wisconsin: Hale, 1961.
- Blount, Margaret. Animal Land: The Creatures of Children's Fiction. New York: Morrow, 1974.
- Brady, Irene. Wild Mouse. New York: Scribner, 1976.
- Breland, Osmond P. Animal Life and Lore. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.
- Burkett, John and Molly Burkett. Foxes Three. New York: Lippincott, 1975.
- Burton, Maurice, ed. The World Encyclopedia of Animals. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1972.
- Caras, Roger A. Dangerous To Man. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.
- Carpenter, Frances. Tales Of A Korean Grandmother. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1947.
- Carrighar, Sally. One Day At Teton Marsh. New York: Knopf, 1947.
- _____. Wild Heritage. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1965.
- Chase, Clinton I. Elementary Statistical Procedures. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.
- Cullinah, Bernice E. Literature and Young Children. National Council of Teachers of English, 1977.
- Devoe, Alan. Our Animal Neighbors. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1953.

- Dill, Barbara E. Children's Catalog. New York: H.W. Wilson, 1976; 1977 and 1978 Supplements.
- Egoff, Sheila, G.T. Stuggs and L.F. Ashley, eds. Only Connect: Readings In Children's Literature. New York: Oxford, 1969.
- Fisher, Margery. Intent Upon Reading: An Appraisal Of Modern Fiction For Children. New York: Franklin Watts, 1961.
- Freschet, Bernice. Grizzly Bear. New York: Scribner, 1975.
- Georgiou, Constantine. Children and Their Literature. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1969.
- Grosvenor, Melville Bell, ed. Wild Animals of North America. Washington, D.C.: National Geographic Society, 1960.
- Guralnik, David B. Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language. New York: World, 1970.
- Harris, Joel Chandler. Uncle Remus: His Songs and Sayings. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1921.
- Hess, Lilo. Mouse and Company. New York: Scribner, 1970.
- Jacobs, Joseph, ed. The Fables of Aesop. New York: Macmillan, 1964.
- Leach, Maria. The Rainbow Book of American Folktales and Legends. New York: World, 1958.
- Lickteig, Mary J. An Introduction To Children's Literature. New York: Merrill, 1975.
- Lockley, R.M. The Private Life Of A Rabbit. New York: Macmillan, 1964.
- Lonsdale, Bernard J. and Helen K. MacKintosh. Children Experience Literature. New York: Random House, 1973.
- Mason, George F. The Bear Family. New York: Morrow, 1960.
- McClung, Robert. The Mighty Bears. New York: Random House, 1967.
- Nelson, Edward W. Wild Animals of North America. Washington, D.C.: National Geographic Society, 1918.
- Rensberger, Boyce. The Cult Of The Wild. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1977.
- Ripper, Charles L. Foxes and Wolves. New York: Morrow, 1961.
- Robinson, Gail and Douglas Hill. Coyote the Trickster: Legends of North American Indians. New York: Crane Russack, 1975.

- Rudolph, Marguerita, ed. The Magic Egg and Other Folk Stories of Rumania. Boston: Little, Brown, 1971.
- Rutherford, Bonnie and Bill Rutherford, illus. The Gingerbread Man. Racine, Wisconsin: Golden, 1963.
- Shuttlesworth, Dorothy E. Animals That Frighten People--Fact Versus Myth. New York: Dutton, 1973.
- _____. The Story of Rodents. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1971.
- Silverstein, Alvin and Virginia Silverstein. Animal Invaders--The Story Of Imported Wildlife. New York: Atheneum, 1974.
- _____. Rabbits--All About Them. New York: Lothrop, Lee and Shepard, 1973.
- _____. Rats and Mice: Friends and Foes Of Man. New York: Lothrop, Lee, and Shepard, 1968.
- Sutherland, Zena and May Hill Arbuthnot. Children And Books. Chicago: Scott Foresman, 1977.
- Townsend, John Rowe. Written For Children: An Outline Of English Children's Literature. New York: Lothrop, Lee and Shepard, 1974.
- Trost, Lucille. Biography Of A Cottontail. New York: Putnam, 1971.
- Van Orden, Phyllis. Elementary School Library Collections. Williamsport, Pennsylvania: Bro-Dart, 1977.
- Vaughn, Terry A. Mamalogy. Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders Company, 1972.

UNPUBLISHED SOURCES

- Glenn, Lily Dorothea. "A Study Of The Animal And It's Role In Modern Fairy Tale." Master's Thesis, University of Washington, 1954.

APPENDIX

Animal: Bears

Title and author of book:

1. Role of Character: (Check answer)

Major character _____

Minor character _____

2. Type of Characterization: (Check answers)

	Text	Illustrations	Decision
Animal as animal	_____	_____	_____
Animal as animal but talking	_____	_____	_____
Animal as human with an essence of the real animal	_____	_____	_____
Animal as human with no essence of the real animal	_____	_____	_____

3. Stereotyped Characteristics: (Check answers)

	Text	Illustrations	Decision
Cuddly and Cute	_____	_____	_____
Harmless	_____	_____	_____
Humorous	_____	_____	_____
Friendly	_____	_____	_____
Helpful	_____	_____	_____
Clever	_____	_____	_____
Mischievous	_____	_____	_____
Loyal	_____	_____	_____

Real Characteristics: (Check answers)

	Text	Illustrations	Decision
Ferocious	_____	_____	_____
Dangerous	_____	_____	_____
Huge in size	_____	_____	_____
Poor in eyesight	_____	_____	_____
Keen in sense of smell	_____	_____	_____
Slow but capable of bursts of speed	_____	_____	_____
Insatiable in appetite	_____	_____	_____
Timorous toward humans	_____	_____	_____
Restful during cold weather	_____	_____	_____

Degree of Stereotyping:

1. Highly stereotyped _____
2. Moderately stereotyped _____
3. Minimally stereotyped _____
4. Not stereotyped _____

Degree of Realism:

1. Unrealistic _____
2. Minimally realistic _____
3. Moderately realistic _____
4. Highly realistic _____

Animal: Foxes

Title and author of book:

1. Role of Character: (Check answer)

Major character _____

Minor character _____

2. Type of Characterization: (Check answers)

	Text	Illustrations	Decision
Animal as animal	_____	_____	_____
Animal as animal but talking	_____	_____	_____
Animal as human with an essence of the real animal	_____	_____	_____
Animal as human with no essence of the real animal	_____	_____	_____

3. Stereotyped Characteristics: (Check answers)

	Text	Illustrations	Decision
Cunning or clever	_____	_____	_____
Sly and deceitful	_____	_____	_____
Wise	_____	_____	_____
Conceited	_____	_____	_____
Vicious	_____	_____	_____
Lazy	_____	_____	_____

Real Characteristics: (Check answers)

	Text	Illustrations	Decision
Adaptable to surroundings	_____	_____	_____
Mentally alert	_____	_____	_____
Keen in sense of smell, hearing and eyesight	_____	_____	_____
Nocturnal in hunting habits	_____	_____	_____
Competent in climbing	_____	_____	_____
Swift or speedy	_____	_____	_____
Of value to the balance of nature	_____	_____	_____

Degree of Stereotyping:

1. Highly stereotyped _____
2. Moderately stereotyped _____
3. Minimally stereotyped _____
4. Not stereotyped _____

Degree of Realism:

1. Unrealistic _____
2. Minimally realistic _____
3. Moderately realistic _____
4. Highly realistic _____

Animal: Mice

Title and author of book:

1. Role of Character: (Check answer)

Major character _____

Minor character _____

2. Type of Characterization: (Check answers)

	Text	Illustrations	Decision
Animal as animal	_____	_____	_____
Animal as animal but talking	_____	_____	_____
Animal as human with an essence of the real animal	_____	_____	_____
Animal as human with no essence of the real animal	_____	_____	_____

3. Stereotyped Characteristics: (Check answers)

	Text	Illustrations	Decision
Beautiful or attractive	_____	_____	_____
Timid	_____	_____	_____
Neat and clean	_____	_____	_____
Resourceful	_____	_____	_____
Weak and downtrodden	_____	_____	_____
Friendly	_____	_____	_____
Helpful	_____	_____	_____
Intelligent	_____	_____	_____
Patient	_____	_____	_____

Real Characteristics: (Check answers)

	Text	Illustrations	Decision
Unclean and disease carrying	_____	_____	_____
Adaptable	_____	_____	_____
Nonselective in eating habits	_____	_____	_____
Highly reproductive	_____	_____	_____
Agile	_____	_____	_____
Ferocious	_____	_____	_____

Degree of Stereotyping:

1. Highly stereotyped _____
2. Moderately stereotyped _____
3. Minimally stereotyped _____
4. Not stereotyped _____

Degree of Realism:

1. Unrealistic _____
2. Minimally realistic _____
3. Moderately realistic _____
4. Highly realistic _____

Animal: Rabbits

Title and author of book:

1. Role of Character: (Check answer)

Major character _____

Minor character _____

2. Type of Characterization: (Check answers)

	Text	Illustrations	Decision
Animal as animal	_____	_____	_____
Animal as animal but talking	_____	_____	_____
Animal as human with an essence of the real animal	_____	_____	_____
Animal as human with no essence of the real animal	_____	_____	_____

3. Stereotyped Characteristics: (Check answers)

	Text	Illustrations	Decision
Cuddly and Cute	_____	_____	_____
Timid	_____	_____	_____
Speedy	_____	_____	_____
Innocent and uncomplicated	_____	_____	_____
Helpless	_____	_____	_____
Peaceful	_____	_____	_____
Careless	_____	_____	_____
Not overly intelligent	_____	_____	_____
Cunning	_____	_____	_____
Curious	_____	_____	_____

Real Characteristics: (Check answers)

	Text	Illustrations	Decision
Tough	_____	_____	_____
Brave	_____	_____	_____
Resourceful	_____	_____	_____
Aggressive and competitive	_____	_____	_____
Sophisticated in social order	_____	_____	_____
Keen in sight, hearing and smell	_____	_____	_____
Speedy for short distances	_____	_____	_____
Clean	_____	_____	_____
Sociable	_____	_____	_____

Degree of Stereotyping:

1. Highly stereotyped _____
2. Moderately stereotyped _____
3. Minimally stereotyped _____
4. Not stereotyped _____

Degree of Realism:

1. Unrealistic _____
2. Minimally realistic _____
3. Moderately realistic _____
4. Highly realistic _____

Books used in research of animal stereotypes in children's literature:

Anatole and the Cat- Eve Titus
Anatole and the Poodle- Eve Titus
Anatole and the Robot- Eve Titus
Anatole and the Thirty Thieves- Eve Titus
And My Mean Old Mother will be Sorry, Blackboard Bear- Martha Alexander
Animal Frolic- Toba Sojo
Another Day- Marie Hall Ets
Ask Mr. Bear- Marjorie Flack
Baby Bears- E. Charushin
The Bad Bear- Rudolf Neumann
Barnaby- William Vandivert
Bear Circus- William Pene Dubois
Bear Mouse- Berniece Freschet
Bear Party- William Pene Dubois
The Bear's Bicycle- Emilie Warren McLeod
The Bear's Water Picnic- John Yeoman
Becky and the Bear- Dorothy Van Woerkom
Big Bad Bear- Zula Todd
The Biggest Bear- Lynd Ward
The Bike Lesson- Stan and Jan Berenstain
Bumblebee's Secret- Miriam Schlein
The Bunny School- Ida Delage
The Bunny Who Found Easter- Charlotte Zolotow
Buzzy Bear's Winter Party- Dorothy Marino
The Church Mouse- Graham Oakley
Cock-A-Doodle-Do- Juliet Kepes
Come and Have Fun- Edith Tacher Hurd
Deep in the Forest- Brinton Turkle
Edith and Mr. Bear- Dare Wright
Elephant in a Well- Marie Hall Ets
Emily's Voyage- Emma Smith
Five Little Foxes and the Snow- Tony Johnston
The Fox and the Fire- Miska Miles
Fox Eyes- Margaret Wise Brown
The Golden Footprints- Taro Yashima & Hatoju Muku
Goodnight Painted Pony- John McInnes
Gordon Goes Camping- Julie Brinckloe
Great Big Mystery Book- Richard Scarry
The Great Rebellion- Mary Stolz
Green and Something Else- Gunilla Norris
Grouchy Uncle Otto- Alice Bach
Happy Lion and the Bear- Louise Fatio
The Hare's Race- Hans Baumann
Harry- Blanche Dorsky
Henny Penny- William Stobbs
How to Read a Rabbit- Jean Fritz
Huge Harold- Bill Peet
I Like Animals- Dahlov Ipcar
I Love My Anteater With an A- Dahlov Ipcar
I Sure am Glad to See You, Blackboard Bear- Martha Alexander

Johnny Crow's Garden- L. Leslie Brooke
 Johnny Crow's New Garden- L. Leslie Brooke
 Johnny Crow's Party- L. Leslie Brooke
 The Lion and the Bird's Nest- Eriko Kishida
 Listen, Listen- Ylla
 Little Bear's Christmas- Janice
 Little Bear's Sunday Breakfast- Janice
 Little Fox Goes to the End of the World- Ann Tompert
 Little Lost Bear- Inez Hogan
 Little People of the Night- Laura Bannon
 Mare's Egg- Judy Varga
 Martin's Mice- Sister Mary Marguerite
 Mary, the Mouse Champion- Ellie Simmons
 Miffy at the Zoo- Dick Bruna
 Mr. Gumpy's Motor Car- John Burningham
 Mr. Gumpy's Outing- John Burningham
 Mr. Snow Bunting's Secret- Robert Quackenbush
 Mr. T.W. Anthony Woo- Marie Hall Ets
 Mix-Ups & Fiz-Ups- Evelyn Weiss
 The Monster Behind Black Rock- Judy Varga
 Moose, Goose and Little Nobody- Ellen Raskin
 A Moose is not a Mouse- Harold Berson
 Morris's Disappearing Bag- Rosemary Wells
 The Mouse and the Elephant- Barbara Walker and Naki Tezel
 Mouse Cafe- Patricia Coombs
 Mousekin's ABC- Edna Miller
 Mousekin Finds a Friend- Edna Miller
 Muffie Mouse and the Busy Birthday- Joan Lowery Nixon
 Mushroom in the Rain- Mirra Ginsburg
 Noisy Nora- Rosemary Wells
 Noodle- Munro Leaf
 Norman the Doorman- Don Freeman
 Not this Bear- Bernice Myers
 Off to Bed- Maud and Miska Petersham
 Old One Eye Meets His Match- Roy Doty
 One Fine Day- Nonny Hogrogian
 Oscar Otter- Nathaniel Benchley
 Papa's Lemonade & Other Stories- Eve Rice
 Parker Pig, Esquire- Tomie De Paola
 Pete Pack Rat- Robert Quackenbush
 Pig and the Blue Flag- Carla Stevens
 The Rabbit- John Burningham
 The Rabbit Story- Alvin Tresselt
 Red Fox and the Hungry Tiger- Paul Anderson
 Roger and the Fox- Lavinia R. Davis
 Runaway Bunny- Margaret Wise Brown
 Sam and Emma- Donald Nelsen
 The School Mouse- Dorothy Joan Harris
 The Schoolroom Bunny- Janet Konkle
 Seven Little Rabbits- John Becker
 Sidney- Susan Jeschke
 Slip! Slop! Gobble!- Jeanne B. Hardendorff
 Small Rabbit- Miska Miles
 The Snow on Bear's Nose- Jennifer Bartoli

The Story of Miss Moppet- Beatrix Potter
Sugar Mouse Cake- Gene Zion
The Tale of Benjamin Bunny- Beatrix Potter
The Tale of Johnny Townmouse- Beatrix Potter
The Tale of Mrs. Tittlemouse- Beatrix Potter
The Tale of Mr. Tod- Beatrix Potter
Three Aesop Fox Fables- Paul Galdone
Three Friends- Robert Kraus
The Three Visitors- Marjorie Hopkins
Tim Mouse and the Major- Judy Brook
Timothy and Madam Mouse- Jane Thayer
Tom Fox and the Apple Pie- Clyde Watson
Too Many Rabbits- Peggy Parish
Town Mouse and the Country Mouse- Paul Galdone
Trix and Vix- Mary and Conrad Buff
Trust Reba- Joseph Low
Twenty Two Bears- Claire Huchet Bishop
Twirlup on the Moon- Laura Bannon
Two Hundred Rabbits- Lonzo Anderson & Adrienne Adams
Two Strikes, Four Eyes- Ned Delaney
Veronica's Smile- Roger Duvoisin
Walter the Wolf- Marjorie Weinman Sharmat
Which Horse is William- Karla Kuskin
Which is the Best Place?- Mirra Ginsburg