Picturing an Alternate Ending: Teaching Feminism and Social Change with *The Paper Bag Princess*

Abigail Feely
American River College

TEACHING THE SECOND-WAVE feminist movement presents a surprisingly challenging task. If you ask a college class to write down what comes to mind when they hear the word "feminism," students find themselves hard-pressed for an answer. Embarrassed, many admit all they could think of was "bra-burning." Many radical and incorrect images of feminism persist in the popular imagination. At the same time, ironically, feminism has become so ingrained into mainstream culture that many students don't recognize it. Gender Studies professor Pamela Aronson describes this as "a great ambiguity" where young women "embrace some aspects of feminism while rejecting others."[1] In addition to ambiguity, familiarity also poses a teaching challenge. For example, historian Stephen S. Mucher and history teacher Carrie E. Chobanian found that being familiar with 1960s fashion and music actually "inhibits students developing knowledge" about the counterculture, as students gravitated toward simplistic analyses of the movement.[2] The same phenomenon can be observed in student conceptions of feminist movements. Exaggerated stereotypes of feminists as well as familiarity with cultural feminism can hinder sophisticated analysis.

   In my history classes, Gloria Steinem's well-known 1963 exposé "I Was a Playboy Bunny" has consistently provided a popular springboard to discuss the second-wave feminist critique of female sexuality in

popular culture.[3] Students have reliably discerned the objectification and commodification of women in the Playboy enterprise and, by extension, in American popular culture. To my surprise, however, during the 2012 spring semester, two separate course sections arrived at an unexpected conclusion after studying the article. While generally amused by the Bunny protocol and the "stylish, faintly wiggly Bunny walk," merely the Bunnies' low pay rankled my students.[4] Minimal anger erupted concerning the sexual objectification of the playmates; rather, the classes determined that the real problem rested with the matter of pay and poor workplace conditions. In addition, for some students, the Bunnies exemplified sexual liberation. Bunnies simply did a job that was a matter of choice and an opportunity to profit from their sexuality (in popular terminology: "if you've got it, flaunt it"). These responses stopped me in my tracks. What had happened to produce this clear analytical shift in the minds of college students?

Today's traditional-age college students grew up in a cultural milieu distinctly different from that of their parents and teachers. The deregulation of television in the 1980s and the explosion of cable television and the Internet in the 1990s led to an environment of increasingly explicit sexual content and advertising. Media outlets competing for viewership continued to push the envelope regarding appropriate content.[5] Journalist Ariel Levy chronicled the effects of this change, noting that what was once fringe sexual behavior had became mainstream by 2005: appearing in a raunchy *Girls Gone Wild* video became a rite of passage, porn stars personified sexual liberation, and posing nude provided a way to assert female power. Levy questioned why this "woman-backed trash culture" has been deemed the "'new feminism' and not what it looks like: the old objectification."[6]

With a heavy dose of irony, Professor Susan J. Douglas noted that due to the institutional progress of second-wave feminism (which she terms "embedded feminism"), it is now "okay, even amusing, to resurrect sexist stereotypes of girls and women," a phenomenon she terms "enlightened sexism."[7] Expanding Levy's critique, Douglas spelled out the seduction of television's caricatures of women in power as well as consumer feminism billed as female empowerment. For example, a current proliferation of reality shows and makeover shows (of which many are popular with students) celebrate a narrow beauty ideal and depict competition trumping female solidarity. They provide an environment where "the worst clichés of gender indoctrination are resurrected."[8] In the same way that students defend Playboy Bunnies under the banner of "choice," some women legitimize breast implants and plastic surgery as a route to self-confidence, and justify exposing

themselves on television as a route to wealth and power. Girls "have gotten the message that part of being a modern woman is sort of playing with your sexuality," according to Diane E. Levin and Jean Kilbourne. However, "what they don't necessarily get is that you put on a Playboy bunny outfit and you're stepping into a history of objectification."[9] In light of this culture, it is no surprise that students' conceptions of feminism confound their teachers at times.

Of great concern for teachers is how to enable students to deconstruct retrograde sexual stereotypes masquerading as feminism. To use Susan J. Douglas' terms, how can students learn to discern between the mixed messages of "embedded feminism" and "enlightened sexism?" What teaching strategy can unlock the seeming familiarity and ambiguity of second-wave feminism? A historical look at late 20th-century American children's culture provides a unique way to explore the social change that accompanied legal and political victories of the feminist movement. In the span of one generation, popular media brought feminism to the mainstream. While historians have noted the role of television, movies, and mass media in reorienting gender roles, children's literature provides untapped and highly engaging primary source material for the classroom. If historian Joan Jacobs Brumberg is correct and "the ways in which a society manages its…girls [indicates] its fundamental values," then books created for girls in the late 20th century should demonstrate changing values. [10] Children's books published during and after the second-wave feminist movement provide unique clues into the gradual normalization of feminist rhetoric into the broader cultural context. Feminist children's books provided new narratives for the next generations of women to follow. The "story of these stories" provides an excellent springboard for instruction on feminism and social change.

The Paper Bag Princess and the Birth of a Feminist Picture Book

When a children's book both proves enduringly popular and finds its way into the heart of the academic discussion on gender roles, historians should pay attention. Robert Munsch's *The Paper Bag Princess* is such a book. As a primary source, it offers a tool to examine the journey of feminism into the mainstream. An international bestseller, *The Paper Bag Princess* has provided millions of young readers a feminist ending to the traditional princess tale. Traditionally, princesses in literature are defined by unparalleled beauty, passivity, and loyalty. Historian Iset Anuakan described traditional fairy tales as modeling "gender roles in which female characters are passive princesses waiting to be rescued, cared for and protected by men."[11] In contrast, Munsch's book stands

alone as an early and popular retelling of the princess story with an active and intelligent heroine. Readers meet Princess Elizabeth, who meets danger head-on and rises above vanity to imagine new possibilities for her life. She realizes what feminists have long hoped for, that women would become "independent, rational actors rather than decorative objects tied to the whims and fortunes of men."[12]

In the story, Elizabeth finds her castle and clothes burned, and her fiancé, Prince Ronald, carried off by a dragon. She resourcefully clothes herself with a paper bag, the only unburnt covering available. She then defeats the dragon not with strength, or even beauty, but by outwitting him. After Elizabeth saves Prince Ronald, he offers no gratitude, but instead responds harshly, "You are wearing a dirty old paper bag. Come back when you are dressed like a real princess."[13] Having confidently defeated the dragon single-handedly and realizing that she doesn't need to put up with this verbal abuse, she retorts, "Your clothes are really pretty and your hair is very neat. You look like a real prince, but you are a bum."[14] In the final illustration, Elizabeth leaps into the sunset of possibility wearing nothing but a paper bag.[15]

This striking story of the 1980 book originated in 1973. Storyteller Robert Munsch created the tale to entertain young children at Bay Area Childcare in Coos Bay, Oregon. Munsch told two stories each day, and he often changed the plots of stories each time. That year, he was "doing a bunch of dragon stories" with a prince always saving the princess. The director of the childcare center, his wife Ann, noticed that most of the women who brought their kids to day care were single moms. And most children did not have princely role models at home.[16] Ann asked, "Why can't the princess ever save the prince, Bob?"[17] He obliged. The revamped story with a female heroine proved popular not only with the kids, but with their single mothers who listened as well. It became "a story that the MOTHERS liked," explained Munsch, "and it stopped changing and became a story that was asked for again and again."[18] The story was retold for several years before he ever had the notion to write it down.[19]

Publishers Annick Press had never seen a story "that featured a spunky, quick-witted girl like Elizabeth."[20] They immediately spotted it as a revolutionary book. But critical response to the book was mixed. Some newspapers called the book "witty, vibrant, and original," while others proclaimed it as "a picture book of clichés" and "short lived."[21] The book proved to be anything but short-lived. Now in its sixty-second printing, *The Paper Bag Princess* has sold more than 3 million copies. It is published in more than a dozen languages, including Braille; it has inspired a musical, plays, a doll, and a cartoon DVD.[22] Its duration of

thirty years in print effectively enabled two generations of children to grow up under its influence. This is highly striking, given that there were few other broadly popular examples of this type of feminist narrative aimed at children in 1980.

The Paper Bag Princess
and Thirty Years of Gender Acceptance Studies

In addition to its general popularity, *The Paper Bag Princess* became fodder for academics studying gender role acceptance in children's books. Spanning thirty years, this academic discourse is historically important for several reasons. First, it documents increasing acceptance of feminism by quantifying changing views regarding a woman's proper place in society. Second, historians should view the academics who wrote these studies as contributors to the second-wave feminist movement as they intended to expose patriarchal structures in literature. Because of this, historians may consider the work of these academics as valuable primary sources that illustrate the scope of the movement and the ensuing social change.

In 1972, shortly before Munsch began telling his story, UC Davis sociologist Lenore Weitzman broke ground studying female and male characters in children's books. Weitzman examined Caldecott Medal-winning children's books from 1967-1971 and quantified the number and nature of female roles in the stories.[23] Female characters were noticeably absent from these stories. When present, they reinforced traditional roles. Female characters remained "insignificant…inconspicuous…passive… immobile," and "indoors."[24] As Weitzman began exposing patriarchal narratives in children's books, publishers and authors began rewriting them. The early 1970s saw the establishment of several alternative publishing companies. Feminists on Children's Media and the Women's Action Alliance worked to create pro-female literature for children.[25] Annick Press began work on publication of *The Paper Bag Princess* in the late 1970s.

In 1987, Sociologist J. Allen Williams revisited the topic of gender roles in children's books by examining Caldecott winners from the 1980s. This time, Williams found a greater parity in the number of presentations of male and female characters. The female characters, however, remained "colorless" and lacking in ambition. A near total conformity to traditional gender roles still remained.[26] Seven years after *The Paper Bag Princess* was published, there were still few popular books containing non-traditional roles for girls.

Building on Weitzman's work and a growing body of research, sociologist Bronwyn Davies examined feminist picture books in her

landmark 1989 work, *Frogs and Snails and Feminist Tales: Preschool Children and Gender.* Davies specifically documented preschoolers' reactions to *The Paper Bag Princess*. She noted that in the book, "a new kind of narrative is made possible" in regard to gender roles.[27] These new narratives were challenging to children. Many preschoolers in the study found the story confusing. Others "understood Princess Elizabeth 'as bad once she stepped out of her female place.'"[28] Davies' findings illustrate the 1980s as a time of changing gender roles in society. Davies found that children who had a mother working outside the home and who had a father who shared in the housework were able to grasp the feminist message of the story. They were able to "imagine women as active agents."[29] This is an important shift. Using Davies' study as evidence, acceptance of women in active roles was beginning to change by 1989. And, among all the books used in her study, *The Paper Bag Princess* was "by far the children's favorite story."[30]

In 1996, psychologist Stuart Oskamp examined Caldecott winners from 1986-1991 and determined that significant change had been made. Finally, award-winning books portrayed the same number of male and female characters. These female characters displayed "a wider variety of attributes and activities."[31] What had changed by 1996 for American girl readers? The "Girl Power" (sometimes "*Grrr*l Power") revolution had begun. Communications Studies scholar Sarah Banet-Weiser noted that the concepts of "girl" and "power," once thought to be completely absent from the world of children's popular culture, had become normalized within the discourses of consumer culture."[32] With the advent of the Riot Grrl Movement, girl heroines on Nickelodeon's *Clarissa Explains It All*, and the invasion of music and fashion icons the Spice Girls, the "war-whoop of 'Girl Power' celebrated ability over body."[33] By the end of the 1990s, popular culture seemed to have finally caught up to the message of *The Paper Bag Princess*.

Or did it? In 2011, *New York Times* bestselling-author Peggy Orenstein critiqued *The Paper Bag Princess* as a "typical 'feminist alternative' to the marry-the-prince ending." Orenstein, a feminist who frequently writes about girl culture, seems to relegate the story to the tired old feminist category in which men are portrayed as "simpletons" and traditional women's roles as "worthless."[34] This is where the book's history is instructive. Rather than tired, *The Paper Bag Princess* was simply one of the earliest and most groundbreaking examples of new narratives for girls to follow. Rather than wholesale anti-male sentiment, *The Paper Bag Princess* highlights unacceptable male behavior. According to Munsch, the moral of the story is: "there are a lot of bums out there and you don't want to marry one."[35]

Most importantly, Orenstein's critique highlights the exact challenge of teaching feminism to students born and raised in the Girl Power of the 1990s. Some students may similarly dismiss the book and, consequently, second-wave feminism as tired and anti-male. So, what is it *exactly* about our current culture that makes the brand of feminism offered in *The Paper Bag Princess* seem anti-male and unattractive decades later? It must be noted that in Orenstein's very personal book, *Cinderella Ate My Daughter: Dispatches from the Front Lines of the New Girlie-Girl Culture*, she turns to *The Paper Bag Princess* in her search for alternative children's stories to read to her own daughter. She hunts for role models to combat the materialistic and highly sexualized consumer culture that surrounds girls today. As Orenstein, Levy, and Douglas argue, consumer culture has effectively labeled second-wave feminism as a dead and unnecessary movement. Quite simply, in recent years, the Girl Power movement became separated from its feminist core. The media has consistently worked to "attack, ignore, trivialize the political substance of the movement, decapitate the look or style of the movement from its substance, and use this new style to marginalize the movement and to create new stuff to sell."[36] No wonder students are confused about feminism.

Using *The Paper Bag Princess* in the Classroom

The Paper Bag Princess provides an effective way to begin a discussion on feminism and social change in the college classroom. The story can be read to a class in ten minutes, quickly enabling a discussion. The first time I presented the book, my class was transfixed. They listened. They clapped. They loved the heroine, Elizabeth. Some students read this book as a child, while others read it to their own kids, but this activity provided their first opportunity to consider it a historical primary source. A re-reading of the book as a college student helps them to analyze the values that they were taught as children. This enables them to think critically about social change that was at work in their own lives. Today's traditional college students were born in the 1990s and grew up in the Girl Power culture. These students may not find this book particularly ground-breaking precisely because the cultural shift had already been made (the challenge of recognizing "embedded feminism"). Classes with students from multiple generations can provide a spectrum of responses to how children's culture formed their upbringing and values. More often than not, college classes include immigrant students who didn't grow up with American popular children's culture. Also, many students still wrestle with the proper place of women in society today. The simplicity

of children's books helps students from a variety of perspectives move from a place of ambiguity to a clearer understanding of the second-wave agenda. A discussion of the history of the book and the accompanying academic research allows students to move from familiarity to a place of deeper analysis.

Alongside standard histories of the legislative victories of the feminist movement, the history of *The Paper Bag Princess* can be used to illustrate feminism becoming part of mainstream culture. To begin this discussion, students should first be prodded to consider the distinctions between institutional, legislative change and the process of broader change in social consciousness. American women's rights advocates have always understood the need to change public opinion as well as to change laws and institutions. In the agenda set forth in the 1848 Declaration of Rights and Sentiments, early women's advocates desired to "enlist…the press in our behalf" *alongside* the petitioning of legislatures.[37] While it is perhaps easier for students to track legislative successes in favor of women, changing public opinion through the press and the media was no less important to feminists' ultimate goal. Once this is established, students can appreciate children's media like *The Paper Bag Princess* as a significant part of this social change. How are new role models and narratives created? How do you raise a generation to believe in equality? *The Paper Bag Princess* provides an effective way to begin to wrestle with these historical questions.

A variety of discussion topics can follow a reading of the story. In an effort to train students to think historically, two main concepts can be explored: a) historical feminists' goals represented in the tale, and b) the process of social change in favor of feminism in the late 20th century.

Several of historical feminists' goals for American girls are represented though the victories of the main character. In her widely given and popular 1880s speech, "Our Girls," Elizabeth Cady Stanton admonished girls and young women to realize their full potential. "God has given you minds, dear girls," she exhorted, "as well as bodies."[38] This exhortation is in many ways central to the message of *The Paper Bag Princess* as the hero models confidence and a sharp mind. Elizabeth's refusal to accept Prince Ronald's disparaging remarks can be seen as an unintended nod to Stanton's 1848 Declaration of Rights and Sentiments. Stanton wrote that men had "endeavored…to destroy…confidence in [a woman's] own powers, to lessen her self-respect, and to make her willing to lead a dependent and abject life."[39] By considering Stanton's 19th-century views in relation to the story, students can appreciate the long trajectory of social change that took place between Stanton's time and today to make feminism a central component of American culture. While discussing

the 19th century, many students note an important historical connection between children's books and the irony of Republican Motherhood. While a basis for denying women's political equality, the tenets of Republican Motherhood included the education of children. In this vein, women of any decade had the power to teach the next generation new feminist values—and then wait for the revolution to come.

Next, students should be encouraged to consider *The Paper Bag Princess* in the context of the second-wave feminist movement. Introducing the history of the book as well the decades of progress demonstrated in gender role acceptance studies can open up a discussion on how a new generation was raised with second-wave values. These studies should be discussed in light of the larger aims of the second-wave feminist movement, which began chipping away at patriarchy at all levels, including children's books.

It is important to note that this feminist crusade on behalf of girl readers is often left out of traditional second-wave histories. Historians have evaluated movies, television shows, newspaper articles, and magazines for their roles in either perpetuating or challenging gender stereotypes.[40] For example, historian Ruth Rosen discussed "first woman narratives" that appeared in newspapers in the 1970s announcing local women moving into non-traditional jobs. Rosen asserted these stories allowed "millions of women readers" to "imagine themselves in new occupations and professions."[41] Due to mass media's culpability in perpetuating patriarchy, second-wave feminists set out to produce alternative possibilities for women in popular culture. But where were the "first girl" stories? In what ways could young girls envision themselves in new occupations and possibilities? Children's books like *The Paper Bag Princess* clearly provide an important clue. By illustrating this omission of children's history in traditional textbooks, students are exposed to the practice of history and how historians continually analyze new frameworks, sources, and voices from the past. This might lead to a discussion on future opportunities for history research. For example, what stories were African-American children reading in the 1970s and 1980s? How did the core message of Civil Rights equality disseminate to the next generation? Was it through legislation or the fact that millions of children grew up watching a multi-cultural cast on *Sesame Street* and *Barney*?

One student remarked that *The Paper Bag Princess* ended with possibility: it was an "alternate ending."[42] Princess Elizabeth and the girls who grew up with her story experienced the alternate ending that feminists desired for their girls and worked for at great cost. In many ways, they have realized Elizabeth Cady Stanton's goal that "every girl should be something in and of herself, have an individual aim and purpose

in life."[43] More than a bunch of "bra-burners," and more than a tired, unnecessary movement, second-wave feminism changed the course of American girls' lives and continues to call out to us today. Using *The Paper Bag Princess* book in the classroom will help students identify and appreciate this opportunity.

Notes

1.   Pamela Aronson, "Feminists or 'Post-feminists'?: Young Women's Attitudes toward Feminism and Gender Relations," *Gender and Society* 17, no. 6 (December 2003): 904, 918.

2.   Stephen S. Mucher and Carrie E. Chobanian, "The Challenges of Overcoming Pop Culture Images of the Sixties," *OAH Magazine of History* 20, no. 5 (October 2006): 40.

3.   Originally written for *Show* Magazine, and published with a postscript in Steinem's collection of essays, Gloria Steinem, *Outrageous Acts and Everyday Rebellions* (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1995), 32-75.

4.   Steinem, 62. History 330: Women in American History courses at American River College, Sacramento, CA.

5.   For an excellent discussion of depictions of women in the media, see Jennifer Siebel Newsom's documentary *Miss Representation* (New York: Virgil Films and Entertainment, 2011). See also <http://www.missrepresentation.org>.

6.   Ariel Levy, *Female Chauvinist Pigs: Women and the Rise of Raunch Culture* (New York: Free Press, 2005), 44, 81.

7.   Susan J. Douglas, *The Rise of Enlightened Sexism: How Pop Culture Took Us from Girl Power to Girls Gone Wild* (New York: St. Martin's Griffin, 2010), 9.

8.   Jennifer Maher, as quoted in Douglas, 198.

9.   Diane E. Levin and Jean Kilbourne, *So Sexy, So Soon: The New Sexualized Childhood and What Parents Can Do to Protect Their Kids* (New York: Ballantine Books, 2008), 155.

10.   Joan Jacobs Brumberg, *The Body Project: An Intimate History of American Girls* (New York: Random House, 1997), 201.

11.   Iset Anuakan, "Princess Literature and the Miss America Pageant," in *There She Is, Miss America: The Politics of Sex, Beauty, and Race in America's Most Famous Pageant*, ed. Elwood Watson and Darcy Martin (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 116.

12.   Brumberg, xxxii.

13.   Robert Munsch, *The Paper Bag Princess* (New York: Annick Press, 2010), 22.

14.   Ibid., 24.

15.   In the original oral story, Princess Elizabeth punched Prince Ronald in the nose, but that plot line was removed when the book was published in 1980. Robert Munsch, Letter to Author, 6 March 2012.

16.   "While I was busy being a sexist," Munsch discloses, "the head of the [child

care] center came and said, 'Have you noticed that NONE of the mothers had husbands and that princes were a totally ABSENT species among the loggers who inhabited the town?" Ibid.

17.   Robert Munsch and Michael Martchenko, *The Paper Bag Princess 25th Anniversary Edition: The Story Behind the Story*, developed by the editors at Annick Press with Sarah Dann (Buffalo, NY: Annick Press, 2005), 12.

18.   Robert Munsch, Letter to Author, 6 March 2012.

19.   Munsch and Martchenko, 12.

20.   Ibid., 6.

21.   Ibid., 50.

22.   Ibid., 52-57.

23.   The Randolph Caldecott Medal has been awarded every year since 1937 by the American Library Association to recognize the most distinguished American Children's picture book published in the previous year. See <http://www.ala.org/alsc/awardsgrants/bookmedia/caldecottmedal/aboutcaldecott/aboutcaldecott>.

24.   Leonore J. Weitzman et al., "Sex-Role Socialization in Picture Books," *American Journal of Sociology* 77, no. 6 (May 1972): 1131-1132.

25.   J. Allen Williams, Jr. et al., "Sex Role Socialization in Picture Books: An Update," *Social Science Quarterly* 68, no. 1 (March 1987): 149.

26.   Williams, 154-155.

27.   Bronwyn Davies. *Frogs and Snails and Feminist Tales: Preschool Children and Gender* (Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 2003), 48.

28.   Angela E. Hubler, "Beyond the Image: Adolescent Girls, Reading, and Social Reality," *National Women's Studies Association Journal* 12, no. 1 (Spring 2000): 84.

29.   Davies, 66.

30.   Ibid., 62.

31.   The 1996 study reports, "human female characters have become increasingly visible, with close to equal numerical representation and a wider variety of attributes and activities" among the female characters. Stuart Oskamp, Karen Kaufman, Lianna Atchison Wolterbeek, "Gender Role Portrayals in Preschool Picture Books," *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality* 11, no. 5 (December 1996): 27.

32.   Banet-Weiser discusses popular television shows *Clarissa Explains it All*, *As Told By Ginger*, and *Nick News* to determine whether 1990s radical girl power messages disrupt or entrench conventional gender relations. Sarah Banet-Weiser, "Girls Rule!: Gender, Feminism, and Nickelodeon," *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 21, no. 2 (June 2004): 119.

33.   Peggy Orenstein, *Cinderella Ate My Daughter: Dispatches from the Front Lines of the New Girlie-Girl Culture* (New York: HarperCollins, 2011), 7. For a discussion of Riot Grrl, see Douglas, 43-47.

34.   Orenstein, 101.

35.   Munsch and Martchenko, 51.

36.   Douglas, 45.

37.   Elizabeth Cady Stanton, "Seneca Falls Declaration of Sentiments and Resolutions" (1848), published in *History of Woman Suffrage*, ed. Susan B. Anthony, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and Matilda Joslyn Gage (Rochester, NY: S. B. Anthony, 1889).

38.   Elizabeth Cady Stanton, "Our Girls" speech, c. 1880, in *The Selected Papers of Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony, Volume III: National Protection for National Citizens, 1873 to 1880*, ed. Ann D. Gordon (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers, 2003). Available at Voices of Democracy, The U.S. Oratory Project, <http://voicesofdemocracy.umd.edu/stanton-our-girls-speech-text/>.

39.   Stanton, "Declaration of Sentiments and Resolutions."

40.   All roads begin with Betty Friedan's critique of women's magazines in *The Feminine Mystique* (1963). For a discussion of television, movies, and "first woman" narratives in 1970s newspapers, see Ruth Rosen, *The World Split Open: How the Modern Women's Movement Changed America* (New York: Penguin, 2000), 308-320. For a discussion of teenage girls and gender role construction, see Kelley Massoni, "Modeling Work: Occupational Messages in *Seventeen* Magazine," *Gender and Society* 18, no. 1 (February 2004): 47-63.

41.   Ibid., 308.

42.   Community College student Maggie Moore, in class discussion at History 330: Women in American History at American River College, Sacramento, CA, 6 May 2011.

43.   Stanton, "Our Girls."