



Dipartimento di Impresa e Management

Cattedra di Marketing

Is Gender Portrayal in Italian Television Advertisements dissimilar at different times of day (Daytime, Primetime and Weekend)?

RELATORE

PROF. Alberto Marcati

CANDIDATO Antonella Gugliersi

MATR. 168201

ANNO ACCADEMICO 2017 / 2018

.....

Table of contents

Abstract.....	4
Introduction	5
Chapter 1: Gender stereotypes.....	6
The history of stereotypes.....	6
Early studies	6
Authoritarian personality and prejudiced personality.....	7
The social cognition perspective and the new groups subject to stereotyping	8
Definition of stereotyping.....	9
Gender stereotypes	9
Eagly's social role model	15
Subtypes	16
Gender portrayals in advertisements	16
Gender stereotyping in advertising over the years.....	17
Degree of stereotyping and equality baseline	18
Does gender stereotyping in advertising affect the gender-related developments in society?	18
Roles of male and female characters during different day parts.....	19
Chapter 2: Gender portrayal results from other content analyses.....	21
Mode of presentation	21
Age	22
Basis credibility	23
Product type.....	23
Setting.....	24
Role.....	25
Argument.....	26
Reward type.....	26
Chapter 3 : Method and Results.....	28
Method.....	28
Categories	29
Results	31
Characters	32
Mode of presentation	33
Basis credibility of the central character.....	35
Role of central character.....	37
Age	39
Setting.....	41

Product type.....	43
Argument.....	45
Sex of the narrator	47
Rewards offered.....	48
Rewards reaped.....	50
Difference of means of odds-ratios in daytime, primetime and weekend	54
Chapter 4: Conclusion	55
Discussion.....	55
Limitations and future research	57
Final conclusions	58
References	59

Abstract

Dalla letteratura presente riguardo le rappresentazioni di genere emerge una tendenza a rappresentare gli esponenti di entrambi i generi in modo più conservativo e stereotipato, specialmente nelle pubblicità televisive. Questa tendenza può essere motivata dall'intento con cui le pubblicità nascono, ossia promuovere il brand cercando di far sentire il consumatore più a proprio agio con i personaggi protagonisti delle pubblicità, in modo da portarlo a credere al messaggio portato avanti da essi.

Diverse fasce orarie trasmettono programmi diversi, che raggiungono un target diverso della popolazione. Mentre la mattina gran parte delle pubblicità sono destinate a un target prettamente femminile che si occupa della casa e le pubblicità del fine settimana hanno come target gli uomini a casa dal lavoro, le pubblicità serali tendono a raggiungere anche le donne lavoratrici, nonché un pubblico più variegato.

L'obiettivo di questo studio è di indagare la presenza di differenze di stereotipizzazione di genere tra le pubblicità mandate in onda in diverse fasce orarie.

A tale scopo, sono state registrate e valutate 2028 pubblicità mandate in onda nelle fasce orarie giornaliera, serale e finesettimana. La valutazione è stata eseguita attraverso un sistema di codificazione ispirato a quello ideato da McArthur e Resko (1975), le cui categorie di valutazione sono: personaggi, personaggio principale, modo di presentazione, credibilità del personaggio principale, ruolo, età, ambientazione, tipo di prodotto, argomento della pubblicità, sesso del narratore e benefici offerti o rappresentati dal personaggio principale.

È stato preliminarmente cercato il grado di associazione tra il sesso femminile del personaggio principale e le variabili che ne esprimono la rappresentazione tipicamente stereotipata. È stata poi calcolata la differenza tra gli odds-ratio delle variabili di cui è stata misurata l'associazione nelle varie fasce orarie.

Le pubblicità considerate sono state 1971, poiché non è stato tenuto conto delle pubblicità senza un personaggio principale identificabile. La maggior parte di associazioni trovate è positiva, con solo una negativa e sei positive ma non statisticamente significative. Non è stata trovata alcuna differenza statisticamente significativa di stereotipizzazione tra le diverse fasce orarie.

Alla luce dei risultati, seppure sia stata trovata forte stereotipizzazione di genere per le diverse categorie, non è stata trovata differenza di rappresentazione di genere tra le diverse fasce orarie. Poiché i risultati trovati in questo studio contrastano quelli degli studi precedenti e poiché questo studio ha limitazioni metodologiche consistenti nell'aver avuto solo una persona addetta alla valutazione delle pubblicità, altri studi sono necessari in merito.

Introduction

While women and men's social role has changed in many western countries in the last few years, advertisements do not seem to portray this change: especially in television advertisements, it can be seen that men and women are depicted as having a more traditional role in society than their actual role nowadays. The existence of a gap between how society is and how it is portrayed in advertisements suggests that gender portrayals are stereotyped.

Stereotypes are a set of concepts pertaining to a social category (Vinacke 1957). In particular, gender stereotypes are beliefs that specific attributes differentiate women and men (Ashmore & Del Boca 1981): stereotypes are not necessarily negative judgments, but they can lead to oversimplified conceptions that do not usually represent a determinate social category. Research suggests that gender stereotypes have four different, independent components: trait descriptors (e.g. self-assertion, concern for others), physical characteristics (e.g. hair length, body height), role behaviors (e.g. leading, taking care of children), and occupational status (e.g. truck driver, elementary school teacher, housewife) (Deaux & Lewis 1984). Each component has a masculine and feminine version, which are significantly more strongly associated with males and females respectively (Knoll & Eisend 2011). Chapter one will concern what gender stereotypes are.

Gender stereotypes can also lead to judgments and expectations that restrict life opportunities for subjects of a social category, mostly women. It is usually the social role of women that is misrepresented: while the percentage of women employed in the non-agricultural sector in western countries is 48,43 of the total non-agricultural employment (The World Bank 2013), women portrayed as workers or as non-dependent characters in advertisements are usually much fewer than half of all the woman portrayed. Chapter two will present data collected by some of the most relevant studies in this field from many countries in different continents.

Avoiding stereotypes and achieving equal opportunities for both genders in different spheres of life is the main concern of gender policy and it has become accepted as a social objective in many societies. Therefore, the more the depiction of certain characteristics in advertising deviates from the objective of equality, the higher the degree of stereotyping across the components of role behavior and occupational status is (Eisend 2010).

The second part of the dissertation is composed of chapter three and four: chapter three will explain the method used in this study to categorize and analyze data from the recorded advertisements and it will present the results of the statistical analysis, while chapter four will discuss said results and compare them to the findings of a previous study about the difference among gender portrayals in television advertisements during different day parts.

Chapter 1: Gender stereotypes

The history of stereotypes

The word “stereotype” is the product of the union of two Greek words: *stereos*, which means “solid”, and *typos*, which means “the mark of a blow”, or more generally “a model”. A term such “solid model” can have at least two connotations: rigidity and duplication or sameness (Miller, 1982). Applied to people, then, stereotypes are rigid, stamping the same characteristics to all to whom they apply to.

The term “stereotype” was used as early as 1824 (Gordon, 1962; Rudmin, 1989) to refer to formalized behavior, and it was regularly used to refer to rigid, repetitive, often rhythmic behavior patterns by the first part of the 20th century (Schroeder, 1970). Despite the initial meaning, the term is most likely to be commonly used to refer to characteristics that we apply to others on the basis of their ethnic, national, or gender groups.

Early studies

Among the first people to use the word “stereotype”, there was journalist Walter Lippmann in the book *Public Opinion* (1922). In his book he discussed the concept of stereotypes, viewing them as general cognitive structures that are useful, since they account for errors and biases in our conceptions of the world. According to his book, having stereotypes is useful since “seeing all things freshly and in detail” is impossible, therefore generalities help us identify a trait which marks a well known type, and stereotypes that are already in our head “fill the rest of the picture”, avoiding us to waste time or opportunities in trying to know intimately other people (which is, according to him, impossible).

Most of Lippmann’s discussion presented errors of thinking and it was not specifically concerned with traits used to portray groups of people. The first empirical studies, despite still presenting errors of thinking, did concern trait attributions to groups of people, especially ethnic groups. The studies by Katz and Braly (1933, 1935) are most famous. In the first study, they asked Princeton university students to check traits they thought described ten racial and ethnic groups. The traits endorsed with a considerable consensus were considered stereotypic of the specific group to which they referred. Their second study found that the order of preferences for the ten groups that were rated was identical to the ranking of the average desirability of the traits associated to the groups, starting a long tradition of seeing stereotypes and prejudice as closely linked. Katz and Braly saw prejudice as attitudes toward labels or race names, and these attitudes were thought to reflect culturally derived stereotypes. Being cultural products, stereotypes helped to explain the effects of culture on prejudice and discrimination. For the following twenty years, studies continued to focus on these same aspects and, although there were offered various definitions for stereotypes, the accepted one was in terms of traits ascribed to various ethnic and racial groups. Since social scientists, who were trying to understand discrimination, looked for negative aspects of stereotyping, stereotypes, which were previously assumed to be reflections of the culture rather than of individual experiences with people from these groups, began to promote a negative evaluation that in turn justified discrimination.

Authoritarian personality and prejudiced personality

Stereotypes began to be considered as manifestations of a generally prejudiced attitude with the publication of “The Authoritarian Personality” (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunwik, Levinson & Sanford, 1950). Although they were still thought to predict discriminatory behavior, their source was believed as localized more in personality dynamics than in larger culture. Stereotypes were viewed less as pictures in the minds of people than as traits belonging to oversimplified categories, whose use was considered more likely to happen among people with prejudiced personalities.

The research began in the early forties of the 20th century in order to try to understand the roots of anti-Semitism in Nazi Germany. It showed that those who were prejudiced against Jews were also prejudiced against other groups, thus making anti-Semitism only one part of a more general ethnocentric way of thinking. Ethnocentric individuals showed a set of attitudes that was subsequently called the “authoritarian personality”.

Authoritarians tended to have antidemocratic tendencies, they liked clear authority structures, they had high allegiance to conservative values and were strongly opposed to behaviors that upset their sense of what was considered good and proper.

In the definition of this personality syndrome, stereotypes were considered reflections of deep-rooted hatred and prejudices. They were used to discriminate self from out-groups, making those groups homogenous and negative. They were held by authoritarians as a protection against having to think about individual difference among members of the hated groups.

In this research, the content of stereotypes came from projecting negative characteristic to others, therefore the content was considered inevitably negative. Stereotypes were not driven by experience, but they drove experience. Stereotyping was considered a general process and it was not restricted to specific groups.

“The Authoritarian Personality” polarized the discourse about prejudice and stereotyping for the social science community of the time, which subsequently focused mainly on that social group, despite the belief of the authors that not only authoritarians could be prejudiced. Moreover, it led to believe that stereotypes were inherently incorrect and derogatory generalizations about groups of people, that were not based on experience and were unaffected by empirical disconfirmation.

“The Nature of Prejudice” was published in 1954 by Gordon Allport and it introduced the “prejudiced personality”, which is diluted version of the authoritarian personality.

Allport discussed various cognitive factors involved in prejudice and stereotyping in his book: he particularly noted that placing things and people in categories is a part of our basic cognitive natures, since in categories we pour various traits, physical features, expectations and values, which are all characteristics of stereotypes.

According to Allport, the categorization and the use of categories are inevitable in our daily encounters with complex worlds, and it is also inevitable to avoid errors. He also noted that, although

everybody categorizes other people and uses stereotypes to some extent, prejudiced people and unprejudiced people think about their categories differently, with unprejudiced people being more likely to use what he calls “differentiated categories”, which allow for individual variation and exceptions.

By the early seventies, the study of stereotypes ceased to produce interesting research, but the review of ethnic stereotypes published by Brigham (1971a) paved the way to a more modern conception of stereotypes, by recognizing that they had been too narrowly defined, that they involved more than trait assignments to groups and that they were not necessarily disparaging cognitive results.

The social cognition perspective and the new groups subject to stereotyping

There have been two major changes in the stereotype research in the last few decades: first, emphasis shifted from studying the content of stereotypes to studying the cognitive processes of stereotyping (Hamilton, Stroessner & Driscoll, 1994); second, changes were made regarding the examination of which groups are specific targets of stereotyping.

As in the 1970s there was an extraordinary development in cognitive psychology, the latter was applied to the study of how we perceive, remember and think about people and social events. Cognitive psychology, and especially social cognition, emphasized the role of abstract knowledge structures (“theories”, “schemas”, etc.) in the processing of information about people. Stereotypes seemed related to these types of constructs and they could be defined as general theories or cognitive structures (Schneider, Hastorf & Ellsworth, 1979). Social cognition has come to dominate both social psychology in general and especially the study of stereotypes (Hamilton & Sherman, 1994; Jones, 1982; Schneider, 1996; Stangor & Lange, 1994; Stephan, 1985, 1989).

Since within social cognition stereotypes are considered simply generalizations, there are some advantages to defining stereotypes this way: because modern cognitive psychology has produced many insights about how generalization helps to process information, analyses on stereotypes can be based on the existing research on it and stereotypes could benefit from being seen in that way; moreover, stressing the continuities between the ordinary processes involved in generalizations and the processes involved in stereotyping, stereotypes tend to not be seen as products of corrupt minds or diseased culture.

There are also some problems with the social cognition approach: it does not place much emphasis on the content of stereotypes; the thought process is relatively free of context; finally, social cognition perspective does not investigate whether stereotypes are true or false, positive or negative, shared or individual, acquired from individual experience or from culture (Schneider, 2004).

The study of stereotyping focused traditionally on race, nationality and ethnic groups, but it was revitalized during the 1970s and the 1980s by a newfound interest in gender differences and in discrimination against women, mirroring an increasing cultural interest in sexism (Eberhardt & Fiske, 1996).

As categories of stereotypes, race, gender and age are considered to be prototypic stereotype magnets (Levin & Levin, 1982): they are categories that people usually do not choose, they have at least a genetic

component, they are culturally notable, they are not optional cognitive categories and membership to them is usually determined through the senses.

The rise of social cognition within social psychology and the increased interest of people in large discrimination issues – both racial and gender discrimination – resulted in a renewed interest in stereotyping.

Definition of stereotyping

According to Schneider, “stereotypes are qualities perceived to be associated with particular groups or categories of people” (Schneider, 2004).

This is a definition that captures the essential qualities of stereotypes, without limiting these features to be something specifically defined: they could be traits, physical features, roles, attitudes, beliefs, expected behaviors, and any other quality.

While earlier theorists of stereotypes tended to assume they had to be inaccurate, therefore considering inaccuracy and error as essential characteristics, modern theorists did not consider it a defining feature. That is the reason inaccuracy is not included in the definition, even if most of modern theorists would assume that stereotypes are actually inaccurate in important ways. Despite that, they choose not to include the inaccuracy of stereotypes in the definition in order to leave the accuracy question open to debate and to encourage the focus of the studies to be on the similarities between accurate and inaccurate generalizations about groups of people.

Gender stereotypes

In the last forty years, more research on stereotyping was directed towards gender than any other category. Catalyst to research this particular area was a paper by Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman and Broverman (1968), who let subjects link 122 traits to females and males. The 41 items that, according to at least 75% of men and 75% of women, belonged more to one gender than the other were considered sex-stereotypic traits. Of the chosen traits, 29 were masculine (i.e. being logical, self-confident, active, objective) and 12 were feminine (i.e. being quiet, talkative, kind, expressing tender feelings). Both male and female subjects showed high agreement as to which trait consider feminine and which masculine.

Another very important study was by Williams and Bennett (1975), where they asked university students to indicate which adjectives from a list of 300 were typically associated with either women or men. The method used was that of the “adjective checklist”, which involves presenting people with a long list of adjectives and asking them to identify the particular group to which the words apply (Katz & Braly, 1935). The students categorized over 90% (272) of adjectives as belonging to either women or men. There was considerable agreement among female and male students. This process produced 30 adjectives describing women and 33 adjective describing men. They were each assigned a classification of positive (+), negative (-

) or neutral (0), developed in a study by Gough and Heilbrun (1965). Tables 1 and 2 show the adjectives agreed upon by 75% of students of both sexes.

Table 1: Adjectives associated with women

Affected	–	Feminine	0	Prudish	–
Affectionate	+	Fickle	–	Rattlebrained	–
Appreciative	+	Flirtatious	0	Sensitive	0
Attractive	+	Frivolous	–	Sentimental	0
Charming	+	Fussy	–	Soft-hearted	0
Complaining	–	Gentle	+	Sophisticated	0
Dependent	0	High-strung	0	Submissive	0
Dreamy	0	Meek	0	Talkative	0
Emotional	0	Mild	0	Weak	–
Excitable	0	Nagging	–	Whiny	–

Source: Based on Williams and Bennett (1975) and Gough and Heilbrun (1965).
+ = positive; – = negative; 0 = neutral.

Table 2: Adjectives associated with men

Adventurous	+	Disorderly	–	Realistic	+
Aggressive	0	Dominant	0	Robust	0
Ambitious	+	Enterprising	+	Self-confident	0
Assertive	0	Forceful	0	Severe	0
Autocratic	0	Handsome	0	Stable	+
Boastful	–	Independent	+	Steady	0
Coarse	–	Jolly	0	Stern	0
Confident	+	Logical	+	Strong	0
Courageous	+	Loud	–	Tough	0
Cruel	0	Masculine	0	Unemotional	0
Daring	–	Rational	+	Unexcitable	0

Source: Based on Williams and Bennett (1975) and Gough and Heilbrun (1965).

Williams and Bennett's results are similar to those from other investigations of gender stereotypes (Ellis and Bentler, 1973; Komarovsky, 1950; Rosenkrantz et al., 1968; Williams & Best, 1982, 1990). Studies often found that raters ascribe higher value to adjectives attributed to males than to the ones attributed to females. This study confirms the trend: 15 adjectives in each list had a positive or negative evaluation, where the ones considered negative for women were ten and the positive ones were five, while the opposite was true for men, since the ones considered negative for men were five and the positive ones were ten.

According to these findings, the higher societal power of men is reflected in the meaning of the words used to describe the traits that are most associated with men, which seem to reflect the commonsense beliefs that women are viewed as inferior to men. The words shown in Table 1 and Table 2 reflect in fact the commonsense views of men and women, since it was commonsense that was used in order to make these judgments.

There was and there still is broad consensus on which traits “belong” to men and which to women, even among different cultures. It is particularly interesting that, according to a study by Cowan & Stewart (1977), people infer traits from gender but also which gender goes with a particular set of traits. Table 3 shows some traits that are usually perceived as to be gender-linked.

But most researchers found that, although there are clear differences between traits ascribed to women and traits ascribed to men, gender stereotypes are weakly held (De Lisi & Soundranayagam, 1990; Helgeson, 1994) and also traits that are traditionally associated with one gender are not excluded from being associated to the other.

Table 3: female and male stereotypic traits

Female traits	Male traits
Affectionate	Adventuresome
Dependent	Achievement-oriented
Emotional	Active
Friendly	Ambitious
Kind	Coarse
Mild	Independent
Pleasant	Loud
Prudish	Robust
Sensitive	Self-confident
Sentimental	Stable
Warm	Tough
Whiny	Unemotional

Note. Items from De Lisi and Soundranayagam (1990) and Williams and Bennett (1975).

Despite gender stereotypes being multifaceted and complex (Deaux & Kite, 1993), many authors have suggested that gender-linked traits could fall into broad categories. As men are perceived to have traits whose qualities tend to be of instrumentality and action and to believe more in values like freedom, accomplishment and self-respect than women, the category pertaining to them includes what are sometimes called “agentic” qualities. Contrary to that, women are perceived to be more concerned with relationships and more emotionally expressive, and to believe more in values like friendship, equality and happiness, therefore the category pertaining to them contains qualities defined as “communal” (Eagly, 1987; Di Dio, Saragovi, Koestner & Aubé, 1996).

Male traits are usually rated as more active, more strong or more potent, and it is a result found in many cultures (William & Best, 1990). Competence-related traits are also found as to be more frequently associated with males, and it is inferred that groups with higher status are usually seen as having also a higher competence, while groups such as females that are seen as relatively more warm than competent are treated in a paternalistic way. It should be noted that these features are associated with gender because of more general status and power relationships rather than cultural conditioning (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).

Despite the focus on process rather than content of stereotypes by modern theorists, gender seems to encompass an uncommonly high variety of features (Deaux & LaFrance, 1998; Twenge, 1999), which have been thoroughly examined by social scientists.

Physical features are considered prominent in differentiating genders. Males are usually perceived as larger, stronger, faster (Nakdimen, 1984); they are also expected to be more interested in sports, while women are expected to be more interested in the arts, such as dance and ballet. Not only the type of sports men and women participate in has been found different, but also the amount of sport participation (Csizma, Wittig & Scurr, 1988; Engel, 1994). Even children have stereotyped views of which types of physical activity boys or girls are more likely to enjoy (Pellett, 1994).

Science and math are still seen as masculine disciplines, while arts and the humanities are seen as more feminine (Andre, Whigham, Henderickson & Chambers, 1999; Whitehead, 1996).

Occupations remain gender-stereotyped; even in these days of increasing gender equality, it is unlikely to encounter male secretaries or female construction workers. The cultural stereotype is that men will generally make more money than women, and that women will be usually more involved with household and especially child-rearing responsibilities. Even the perfumes that people wear are gender-stereotyped (Sczesny & Stahlberg, 2002).

Even gender-related roles affect stereotypes (Ganong, Coleman & Mapes, 1990), i.e. married men and women are usually evaluated more positively than unmarried ones (Etaugh & Stern, 1984), or married women are considered to have better social skills than divorced women; employed mothers with small children are perceived as especially competent (Etaugh & Study, 1989), even though they are considered to have lost some of their communal traits (Bridges & Orza, 1993), while divorced mothers, stepmothers and unwed mother are usually evaluated negatively (Ganong & Coleman, 1995).

Covering appearance, interests, traits, behaviors, skills and abilities, it can be stated that gender stereotypes between men and women cover a lot of territory. Research suggests that gender stereotypes have four independent and different components: trait descriptors (self-assertion, concern for others), physical characteristics (hair length, body height), role behaviours (leading, taking care of children), and occupational status (truck driver, elementary school teacher, housewife) (Deaux & Lewis 1984). Each component has a masculine and feminine version, which are significantly more strongly associated with males and females respectively (Knoll & Eisend 2011). According to the 1984 study by Deaux and Lewis, people even perceive moderate correlations among relative femininity and masculinity across some of these areas (i.e. a male who likes ballet is commonly expected to have a more feminine job or to have a well-developed emotional side).

While for some time it was incorrectly suggested that that male traits are seen as more positive than female ones, since it was thought that it is good to be instrumental and assertive as well as nurturant and emotional, but that in the end the male traits are the ones perceived as more positive (Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson & Rosenkrantz, 1972; McKee & Sherriffs, 1957; Rosenkrantz et al., 1968; Wolff & Taylor, 1979), most recent studies find either no relationship between social desirability and gender-linked

traits (Ashmore & Tumia, 1980; Williams & Best, 1977); or even that female traits are more positive (e.g., Bergen & Williams, 1991; Eagly & Mladinic, 1989; Eagly, Mladinic, & Otto, 1991; Feingold, 1998; Langford & Mackinnon, 2000; Sankis et al., 1999) than the male counterparts. Despite the possibility for women to be liked more than men, they are still not as respected as they are: this difference may play a considerable role in the discrimination against women (Jackson, Esses & Burris, 2001).

It has to be noted that traits have different payoffs in different situations, therefore they rarely are evaluated singularly, without considering the situation they are placed in.

A study by Eagly and Karau (2002) found that women are disadvantaged in leadership situations in two ways: first, they are perceived to be lacking the agentic traits that are required for such positions, since it is actually males that are described as closer to being successful managers than females (Heilman, Block, Martell & Simon, 1989; Schein, 1973, 1975), more competent and potent; second, women sometimes pay a price in order to have agentic behaviors, because task-oriented female leaders are seen as effective, but also less agreeable, especially by people who have conservative sex roles attitudes (Forsyth, Heiney & Wright, 1997).

A study by Rudman (1998) went further, finding that women who used self-promotion tactics (something expected and valued in men) were often rated negatively; thus, female leaders may be caught in situations where, trying to perform agentic behaviors expected by the job and encouraged in males, they are seen as less warm, a negative perception that might outweigh the gains they may have by being agentic. At the same time, male homemakers are perceived more negatively than their female counterparts (Rosenwasser, Gonzales & Adams, 1985). Therefore the issue is not whether people value some traits more than others, but the extent to which some traits are seen to have “payoff”, but only for certain roles and in certain situations (Eagly, 1987).

Gender differs from many other social and cultural categories even for the nature of gender stereotypes, that tend to be descriptive, but also prescriptive (Burgess & Borgida, 1999; Eagly, 1987; Fiske & Stevens, 1993): women are thought to be more nurturant than men, but people also think it is their job to be so; men are competitive, but they are also expected to be so and they should also be emotionally strong. The prescriptive nature of gender stereotypes has historically made women suffer from discrimination, especially because men always tended to be the “default” category (or the traits found in a normal person), with women being considered the category departing from normality. However, women are also granted more freedom and flexibility in leaving their stereotypic roles than men: being a tomboy is considered permissible and even positive for girls, while showing more feminine interests is considered negative and less permissible for boys (Martin, 1990); women have entered occupations and roles that were traditionally considered for males, but the same has not happened for men. Despite continued discrimination against women regarding some occupations, women may feel they have more choices of careers than their male counterparts do.

Research has showed that both males and females see a bigger difference for males between male and female traits rather than for females, therefore males should be considered as more stereotyped than females (Hort, Fagot & Leinbach, 1990); it also showed that people tend to be more categorical, using “all” or “none”, while rating females than while rating males (Jackman & Senter, 1980), which would suggest that women are more stereotyped; there is no definite conclusion regarding which gender is actually more stereotyped.

Another issue is whether men and women are disapproved for behaving in a way seen as appropriate for the opposite sex. Many studies suggested that they both are disapproved for cross-gendered behavior (Costrich, Feinstein, Kidder, Marecek & Pascale, 1975; Fagot, 1978; Lindsey & Zakahi, 1996; Rojhan & Willemsen, 1994), but others found that generally males are disapproved more for female behavior than the reverse (Berndt & Heller, 1986; Carter & McCloskey, 1983-1984; Fagot, 1977; Lobel, Bempechat, Gewirtz, Shoken-Topaz & Bashe, 1993; Tilby & Kalin, 1980), except for feminists, who are disapproved more, since they are considered women who are actively seeking to blur traditional gender boundaries (Haddock & Zanna, 1994; Twenge & Zucker, 1999).

As previously noted, there is surprisingly good agreement on which traits characterize males and females from different cultures (Costa, Terracciano & McCrae, 2001), but there are also differences: U.S. gender stereotypes are correlated quite highly with Australian, English, Canadian and New Zealand ones and less highly with Pakistani, Japanese, Italian and French ones (Williams & Best, 1982, 1990). There is more agreement across cultures on stereotypes for males than for females. Table 4 gives some examples of some national differences in gender stereotypes, listing only the traits on which there was wider cultural disagreement.

Table 4: Percentages of people in various countries who think men have more of various traits

Trait	Brazil	France	Italy	Japan	Nigeria	Pakistan	United States
Blustery	76	93	97	88	43	8	44
Cheerful	25	47	51	31	20	68	9
Conscientious	60	29	57	49	65	43	31
Effeminate	35	61	82	39	9	8	38
Excitable	47	42	59	42	12	86	9
Friendly	36	75	53	73	28	53	28
Loyal	47	86	81	83	24	18	47
Nagging	72	81	52	34	17	73	2
Pessimistic	42	46	57	31	25	62	75
Poised	76	67	62	39	47	50	16
Prejudiced	39	29	46	34	23	64	77
Snobbish	36	58	77	63	22	91	18

Note. Large numbers represent male traits and low numbers female. Data from Williams and Best (1990).

Regarding female-male differences in stereotypes, males and females seem to have similar views on the content of gender stereotypes (Der-Karabetian & Smith, 1977; Jackman, 1994; Rosenkrantz et al., 1968; Williams & Best, 1977), even across cultures (Williams et al., 1979).

Research has found that males of all ages have stronger stereotypes of female than the contrary (Belk & Snell, 1986; Huston, 1985; Lewin & Tragos, 1987) and see more traits as gender related (Der-Karabetian & Smith, 1977).

Each gender tends to value itself more positively than the other gender (Etaugh, Levine & Mennella, 1984) and women tend to be more positive toward freedom and equality for women than men in matters such as traditional sex roles and egalitarianism (Gibbons, Stiles & Shkodriani, 1991; Haworth, Povey & Clift, 1986; Jackson, Hodge & Ingram, 1994; King & King, 1985, 1990).

It should be noted that even gender stereotypes change during time, available data in fact suggests that younger people have weaker gender stereotypes than older ones (Dambrot, Papp & Whitmore, 1984), although changes have not been dramatic (Spence & Buckner, 2000; Werner & LaRussa, 1985) and are probably connected to the level of how firmly men and women are stereotyped as opposed to the content of stereotypes.

Regarding the broad categories of males and females, it has been wondered for some time if there are distinctive stereotypes, or gender subtypes. Two arguments were made about them: Eagly's social role model and a second approach to stress subtypes.

Eagly's social role model

A study by Eagly (1987) suggested that stereotypes are really stereotypes about roles and not genders: according to her, men and women differ in behavior, but the differences reflect the differing roles men and women usually occupy in society (i.e. women probably behave in a more nurturing way than men, but they do because they are usually placed in positions, like occupations as nurse or teacher or motherhood, where such behaviors are expected; men are generally more aggressive and domineering than women because they are more likely to have jobs where such behaviors are encouraged). It has been found that both men and women behave in more agentic ways if they occupy a position that requires that sort of behavior (Moskowitz, Suh & Desaulniers, 1994).

Eagly argues that more is involved than social pressures to behave in a certain way in certain roles. Because men and women are, often from childhood, placed in different roles, they may develop different skills and abilities, have different expectations for their accomplishments and they might adopt differing beliefs about their own traits and behaviors in certain situations.

Four implications are related to Eagly's model. First, stereotypes may be built in large part on accurate observations on the differences between men and women, differences that are based more on men and women's roles than on their biological heritage (Eagly & Wood, 1999). Second, since stereotypes are about roles, if there were changes in the distribution of men and women in various roles or changes in the

behaviors we expect from people in different roles, that should have a direct impact on the stereotypes of males and females; supporting this there is evidence that women's assertiveness has risen in periods when their status increased (1931-1945, 1968-1993), and it decreased in the 1950s when they had lower status (Twenge, 2001). Third, the arguments about roles are not restricted to gender, in fact many social groups have different roles that affect their behaviors, therefore the perceptions that other have on them. Fourth, even if at some level we recognize differences among types of women and men, we might also let one subcategory stand for the whole category when we don't pay close attention (i.e. a study by Riedle from 1991 showed that ratings of mothers as a category were not distinguishable from ratings of mothers not working outside the home, but were dissimilar from ratings of working mothers, suggesting that when thinking of mothers, people usually only think about stay-at-home mothers).

Subtypes

Another approach consists in stressing subtypes of males and females, dividing the world in smaller and smaller categories and asking whether the behaviors belonging to the categories and subcategories we divide people in are naturally assigned and, if so, if they influence what we think about gender.

Various studies have examined gender subtypes. One of the most cited, by Clifton, McGrath and Wick (1976), asked subjects to check traits that described housewives, Playboy models, club women, career women and female athletes. Some traits were used to describe two or more subtypes, but most of them were seen as characteristic of only one subtype. A study by England (1992) asked subjects to check traits describing businessmen, macho males and family man, and men in general were rated differently across a number of personality traits, but there was still a high degree of similarity across the categories for some traits and expected behaviors for some roles, therefore suggesting that subjects might not strongly differentiate males for expected behavior. These studies show that people have stereotypes of various gender subtypes, but they also suggest that there is some commonality of trait assignment across subtypes, as well as other traits differentiating the types.

It has been wondered if the subtypes are meaningful for people, since the fact that people can generate them and associate different features with them does not guarantee that they are actively used. There are some studies (i.e. Deaux, Winton, Crowley & Lewis, 1985) that suggest that gender subtypes might not be especially relevant, but other research tends to suggest that they are. For example, Green and Ashmore (1998) asked people to describe the pictures in their heads when thinking about four male and four female subtypes. A content analysis revealed considerable consensus on the images, a result suggesting some degree of salience.

Gender portrayals in advertisements

Commercials are designed to have a persuasive impact and they contribute to cultural norms (Pollay, 1986). The process of cultural norming is achieved through repetitive television images, which reinforce

cultural messages that as a result become accepted as mainstream thought (Gerbner, 1999; Gerbner & Gross, 1976; Signorelli & Morgan, 1996).

Television is a powerful socializing agent (Barner, 1999; Bretl & Cantor, 1988; Signorelli, 1989) and it is especially influential regarding the matter of gender identity: according to Barner, “One of the most obvious and important characteristics of television actors is their gender, and one of the most important lessons that children learn from TV is how gender fits into society”.

Advertisers want viewers to connect with the characters depicted in commercials, in order to let them believe they can trust them and emulate them on where to shop, how to live, what to buy (Ganahl, Prinsen & Netzley, 2003). To do so, marketers react to gender-related developments in society and use existing values to promote their brand instead of trying to alter these values through advertisements (Eisend, 2010).

Gender portrayals in advertising that deviate from gender-related values in society can have negative effects on consumers, who could disbelieve a portrayal of central figures that do not represent the values of society and reject the message, which could negatively impact their purchase decisions (Kilbourne, 1986; Lundstrom & Sciglimpaglia, 1977). Some consumers may be offended by inappropriate gender roles and publicly criticize the commercial or organize movements against the advertiser (Eisend, 2010).

These are some of the reasons gender portrayals in advertisements tend to be more conservative and traditional. But how women are cast as characters in commercials can create or reinforce unwanted stereotypes. Courtney and Whipple (1983) found that young women were depicted as rewards for men’s use of certain products. They also found this to be true for commercials advertising products used primarily by women, which implied that “the ultimate benefit of product usage was to give men pleasure”.

In order to try and resolve this problem, the European Parliament issued a resolution on gender stereotyping in the media and asked member countries to take action to avoid stereotypical depictions of women and men on television (European Parliament, 2008).

Gender stereotyping in advertising over the years

Since gender stereotyping is still used in advertising, critics argue that advertising does not reflect the momentous advancement of the gender equality movement in many societies. There are two conclusions; pessimistic and optimistic.

Pessimistic studies highlight that women are still portrayed in a negative, stereotypical way, and that stereotyping is even becoming worse (i.e., Ganahl et al., in a 2003 study, found that commercials perpetuate traditional stereotypes despite significant changes in the roles of women in the US; Milner and Higgs, investigating gender stereotyping in Australian TV advertisements in a 2004 study, compared the results with previous studies from 1980s and 1990s and concluded that the portrayal of women in Australian advertising was actually becoming more stereotypical, with their depictions becoming even more distant from the reality of the living experience of women).

Optimistic studies suggest that women are gaining ground on their male counterparts, they are becoming equal to men and they are breaking out of negative stereotyping, with role portrayals in commercials that are more representative of contemporary women (i.e., Wolin detected in a 2003 study that, despite the presence of both decreasing and increasing gender bias, the tendency was going towards decreasing stereotyping; Furnham and Mak found in a 1999 study that stereotyping was declining in Europe, but not in Asia and Africa).

Degree of stereotyping and equality baseline

Gender equality serves as a basis for comparison to understand the degree of stereotyping in advertisements regarding factors influenced by social environment such as occupational status and role behavior.

It can be also used for some biological gender-related differences, such as age. An unbiased depiction of age of women and men in advertising would represent all the age groups mirroring the age distribution in society. But the average age of characters in advertising is usually less than the average in society, so there is already a biased depiction of both genders.

In order to observe whether the portrayal of women is more or less biased than that of men, age equality of central characters can be assumed as a standard of comparison, with the deviation from equality providing a relative measure of stereotyping that shows how much more stereotyping occurs for each gender (Knoll, Eisend & Steinhagen, 2011).

The more the portrayal of certain characteristics in advertisements deviates from the objective of equality, the higher is the degree of stereotyping in regard to the components of role behavior, occupational status and age.

Even the type of product advertised could indicate the degree of stereotyping: in this case, the equality baseline is the assumption that the number of female and male decision-makers is equal. Assumption that not only is a socially accepted goal, but is also confirmed by the data on the changing roles of women regarding the products they choose to buy (i.e., more than 50% of buyers of new cars, products traditionally associated with men, are female, according to a study by Candler from 1991).

Does gender stereotyping in advertising affect the gender-related developments in society?

The relationship between gender stereotyping in advertising and gender-related values (norms, perceptions, behavioral patterns) in society sparked a debate about advertising's consequences for a long time. The two opposing positions are also called "mirror" and "mold" arguments.

The "mirror" argument states that advertising reflects values that already exist in society (Holbrook, 1987): gender roles in advertising therefore reflect cultural expectations towards gender. Despite advertising systematically under-represents several aspects in life while making other aspects more important, changes in the content of advertisements are more likely to correspond to changes in society than the reverse. According to this argument, advertisers adapt the images they portray to the ones that are more widely

accepted, in order to use existing values in a society to promote their brands (Holbrook, 1987). This position is usually supported by the fact that the impact of advertising on a society, whose system of values is influenced by many factors, is very small.

The “mold” argument hypothesizes that advertising is able to mold and shape the values of its target audience (Pollay, 1986, 1987): gender roles in advertising create, shape and reinforce gender-stereotypical beliefs and values in a society (Ganahl et al., 2003b). According to this argument, changes in attitudes and behavior can depend on the exposure of the audience to media and advertising, since people learn from media.

The “mold” argument is supported by cultivation theory, which states that television has long-term effects on viewers that are small, gradual, indirect, but also cumulative and significant. According to cultivation studies, repeated TV viewing can cultivate the perceptions and beliefs of viewers, thus letting them believe in the world presented in television rather than the real world (Gerbner, Gross, Morgan & Shanahan 2002).

Television watching has been shown to contribute to the learning of gender-stereotypic perceptions among children (McGhee & Frueh, 1980), but these findings are to be considered with caution, because cultivation studies have only demonstrated short-term changes in attitudes and beliefs, they do not provide conclusive proof that exposure to television advertisements produces long-term change in the beliefs and values of a society on an aggregate level. Both views still lack empirical investigations.

Roles of male and female characters during different day parts

A 1992 study by Craig investigated gender stereotypes in different day parts. Since the objective of advertisers is to make commercials pleasurable to the target audience, advertisements are usually made in a way that reinforce the image of gender that is most comfortable for said target audience.

This study found that in daytime commercials, whose target audience was mainly women homemakers, the focus was on the traditional stereotypical images associated with the figure of the American housewife. When men are portrayed as central characters in daytime commercials, they usually appear in a position of authority and patriarchal dominance, they are seen in advertisements for the categories “food” or “body”, reinforcing the stereotypical image that the primary role of the housewife is satisfying the needs of the male.

Weekend commercials were different both in content and style. Since the audience is composed mainly of men, products were usually associated with life away from home and settings were outside the home. The images reinforced in weekend ads stress stereotypes of masculinity, such as competitiveness, aggressiveness, independence and the importance of physical strength and ruggedness. If women were portrayed in weekend advertisements, they were oftentimes with men and they were seldom portrayed as the central character. Their roles were usually submissive to men.

Since the primetime audience is more diverse than the daytime or weekend one and a big part of the target audience consists of working women – who do not watch television during the day because of their work and are believed to be less willing to accept heavily stereotyped gender portrayals – advertisements during this day part depicted women more likely to be in a position of authority and in a setting away from home than daytime ones. Men were more likely to be portrayed with dependent roles and in a home setting than weekend ones. Primetime commercials represented a more balanced portrayal of gender than both the other day parts.

Chapter 2: Gender portrayal results from other content analyses

Content analyses on gender portrayals in television advertisements have been a focus in social studies for more than forty years, encompassing studies on TV commercials broadcasted in different countries and continents.

This chapter aims to present the results found by some of the most cited or recent studies, most of them using the same coding categories used in my study.

The most recent content analysis was made by Verhellen, Dens and Pelsmacker in 2016. It analyzed advertisements from two periods, period one (2002-2003) and period two (2009-2010), and made four hypotheses regarding gender portrayals: the first one is about how women are represented significantly more frequently in a parental or housekeeping role and less frequently in a professional or expert role than men; the second regards how men are represented significantly more frequently as actively involved with the advertised product than women; the third is about how frequently are women represented as sexual objects compared to men; and the fourth inquires if women are significantly more represented with health, beauty and domestic products and less frequently with leisure and technological products than men.

This study found that women were proportionally more depicted in parental roles than men in both periods, but the findings of period two were statistically significant, the ones from period one were not. It also found that women were more frequently represented in a household role than men in both periods, and the findings were statistically significant; it showed that men were not represented more frequently in a professional expert role than women in both periods and that the findings were not statistically significant.

Regarding hypotheses two and three, Verhellen et al. found that men were not significantly more frequently represented in an active role than women in both periods and that women seemed even more often depicted in active roles than men; they found that women were significantly more often portrayed as sexual objects than men in both periods.

Hypothesis four tried to associate health, body and domestic products more frequently to women than men, and leisure and technological products less frequently to women than man, and the study found that women advertised in fact more often health, body and domestic products, while men advertised more often technological and leisure products; regarding leisure products, men were advertising them only slightly more often than women in both periods.

Mode of presentation

Craig (1992) found that in US commercials the primary visual characters were females (daytime 60%, primetime 48, weekend 20%). A study by Bretl and Cantor (1988) showed that 91% of narrator (voice-over) were males.

Manstead and McCulloch (1981) found that, in UK commercials, males were more likely to be voice-overs (67.2%) while females were more likely to be presented visually (92.4%). A study by Furnham and Voli (1989) on Italian television advertisements found that 70% of males were voice-overs and 78.8% of females were presented visually; Furnham, Babitzkow and Uguccioni (1999) found that in Denmark and France more advertisements had mostly visual central figures, but males were more likely to be presented as voice-overs (40.2% in Denmark, 42.9% in France) than females, while females were more likely to be presented visually (78.1% in Denmark, 57.1% in France). A study by Neto and Pinto (1998) found that, in Portugal television advertisements, only 10% of the voice-over were done by women while 90% of voice-overs were done by males.

Mazzella, Durkin, Cerini and Buralli (1992) found that females were more likely to be depicted visually (86%) than males (52%), and males were more likely to do voice-overs (48%) than females (14%) in Australian TV advertisements.

In a study by Furnham, Mak and Tanidjojo (1999), women were more likely to be depicted visually (75.4%) and males were more likely to act as voice-overs (67.1%) in Hong Kong television advertisements, while in Indonesia female central figures were often presented visually (66%) and males were more likely to do voice-overs (52.3%).

Age

Furnham and Skae (1997) found that most central figures were middle-aged, but women were still more likely to be younger (28.1%) than men (5.7%), while male central figures were more likely to be middle-aged (88.6%) than females (71.9%). In a study by Furnham, Babitzkow and Uguccioni (1999), females were more likely to be young (63.3%) while males were more likely to be middle-aged (49.4%) in French television advertisements and 59.4% females were young while 57.5% males were middle-aged in Danish TV advertisements; more old males (11.5%) were shown compared to old females (7.8%) on Danish television. Neto and Pinto (1998) found that 56% females were coded as young compared to 13.7% males; 81.9% males were coded as middle-aged and 40% females were coded as middle-aged.

Mazzella, Durkin, Cerini and Buralli (1992) found that more females were portrayed as younger (62%), while most males were portrayed as middle-aged (51%).

In a study by Furnham, Mak and Tanidjojo (1999), females were more likely to be portrayed as young (56.9% in Hong Kong, 74.1% in Indonesia), while males were more likely to be portrayed as middle-aged (77.1% in Hong Kong, 61.5% in Indonesia).

A study by Knoll and Eisend (2011) found that women were more likely to be 35 years old or younger four times (public channel) and seven times (private channel) more than men in German TV advertisements.

Basis credibility

McArthur and Resko (1975) found that, in US television commercials, 84% of females were depicted as product users, while only 30% of males were depicted as such; 70% were depicted as authority and only 14% of females were depicted as authority. In a subsequent study by Bretl and Cantor (1988), the number of females presented as product users were lower (74%) than McArthur and Resko's findings, but still higher than males, while males were still more likely to depict authoritative figures (44%) than females (26%).

Manstead and McCulloch (1981) found that 81.2% females were portrayed as product user, and only 22.4% males were portrayed as such in UK television advertisements; males depicted as authority were the majority (77.7%) and only 14.8% women were authoritative figures. Subsequently, Furnham and Skae (1997) found that most advertisements had authoritative central figures and both genders were equally depicted as authority (83.5% of males and 84.6% of women).

Furnham and Voli (1989) found that, in Italian TV advertisements, 69.7% women were depicted as product users, while 77.6% men were portrayed as authority. A study by Furnham, Babitzkow and Ugucioni (1999) found that most figures were product users (more than 60% of both genders) in Denmark and France, but females (79.7% in Denmark and 86.7% in France) were still more likely to be depicted as product users than males, and males were more likely to be authority (37.9% in Denmark, 33.3% in France). In Portugal television advertisements, Neto and Pinto (1998) found that 77.5% males were depicted as authorities, while only 29% females were depicted as such.

Mazzella, Durkin, Cerini and Buralli (1992) found that females were more significantly depicted as product users (68%) and males were more likely to be portrayed as authorities (68%) in Australian TV advertisements.

In a study by Furnham, Mak and Tanidjojo (1999), women were found to be depicted more often as product users (78.5%) and men were more likely to be portrayed as authoritative figures (76.4%) in Hong Kong television advertisements; in Indonesian TV commercials, 57.4% females were portrayed as product users, while 73.8% males were depicted as authority.

Knoll and Eisend (2011) found that women were more likely to be depicted as product users 4.7 times (public channel) and more than 5 times (private channel) than men in German TV advertisements.

Product type

McArthur and Resko (1975) found that females were more likely to advertise domestic products (76.1%) than males (56.5%). Bretl and Cantor (1988) showed that females were more likely to advertise domestic products (86%) than males (66%), while males were more often to be shown advertising products that are not used at home (17%) than females (6%).

Furnham and Skae (1997) found that women were more likely to be portrayed advertising body products (35.45%) than men (10.5%); men were more likely to advertise food products (43.9%) and cars/sports products (7%) than women (2.1%) in UK TV advertisements. A study by Furnham and Voli (1989) found that women were more likely to be shown with body products (50%) than men (30.8%), while men were more likely to advertise food products (30.8%) than females (18.1%) and they were more likely to advertise cars/sports (27.1%) products than females (18.1%). Furnham, Babitzkow and Ugucioni (1999) found that women were more likely to be shown advertising body (24.5%) and home products (20.4%) as oppose to men (2.3% body products, 6.9% home products) in French television advertisements; men were more likely to advertise food products (35.6%) and cars/sports products (55.2%). Neto and Pinto (1998) found that only 7.8% males advertised body products compared to 30% females, while only 5% females advertised cars/sports product compared to 20.6% males; females advertised food products (33%) more often than males (22.5%).

A study by Mazzella, Durkin, Cerini and Buralli (1992) found that females were more likely to advertise food products (42%) compared with males (28%) and body products (17%) compare to males (10%) in Australian TV advertisements; males were more likely to advertise cars/sports products (28%) than females (19%).

Furnham, Mak and Tanidjojo (1999) found that females were more likely to advertise body (35.4%) and home products (15.4%) than males (20.7% body products, 9.3% home products) in Hong Kong television advertisements; males were more likely to advertise food products (30.7%) than females (27.7%). In Indonesian TV advertisements, females were more likely to advertise body products (59.3%) than males (32.3%), more home products (11.2% females, 7.7% females) and more food products (20.4% females, 16.9% males); males were more likely to advertise cars/sports products (15.4%) than females (0%).

According to Knoll and Eisend (2011), women were more likely to be advertising domestic products two times (public channel) and seven times (private channel) more than men in German TV advertisements.

Setting

Bretl and Cantor (1988) found that males were more often presented outdoors (53%), while females were more often presented at home (61%) in US television advertisements.

In a study by Manstead and McCulloch (1981), females were more likely to be portrayed at home (38%) than males (7.3%), while males tended to be portrayed in all locations but home (83.6%) more often than females (52.2%), and these findings were not very dissimilar from the findings of Furnham and Skae in 1997. Furnham and Voli (1989) found that females in Italian advertisements were depicted more often at home (34.8%) than males (22.4%), while males were more often showed in professional settings (18.7%) than females (15.1%). A study by Furnham, Babitzkow and Ugucioni (1999) found no significant

difference in portrayals of central figures in different locations. Neto and Pinto (1998) found that more females were portrayed at home (35%) compared to males (12.7%) and more males were portrayed in occupational settings (37.7%) than females (22%).

In a study by Mwangi (1996), females were consistently depicted at home (79.4%) compared to men (20.6%) in Kenyan tv advertisements. A study by Furnham, Mak and Tanidjojo (1999) found that women were more often portrayed at home (36.9%) than men (21.4%), while men were more likely to be portrayed in occupational settings (9.3%) than women (6.2%) in Hong Kong television advertisements; in Indonesian TV advertisements, women were more likely to be portrayed at home (48.1%) than men (10.8%), while men were more likely associated with leisure settings (83.1%) than women (48.1%).

A study by Knoll and Eisend (2011) found that women were seven times (public channel) and two times (private channel) more likely to be portrayed in a home setting than men in German TV advertisements.

Role

Bretl and Cantor (1988) found that women were more likely to have a dependent role (53%) compared to men (27%), while men were more often depicted as having a professional role (21%) compared to women (11%).

In a study by Manstead and McCulloch (1981), 89.9% males had autonomous roles, while 74.1% females were depicted as dependent in UK television advertisements. In a subsequent study by Furnham and Skae (1997) the majority of central figures were categorized as interviewer/narrator, but women were still more likely to have dependent roles (13.5%) compared to men (0%), while men tended to be interviewers/narrators (80.3%) more than women (60.4%); more women were depicted as professionals (26.1%) than men (19.7%). Furnham and Voli (1989) found that 66.7% females had dependent roles and males were more likely to have professional roles (48.6%), while men were more likely to be narrators (25.2%) compare to women (10.6%) in Italian television advertisements. Furnham, Babitzkow and Uguccioni (1999) found that sex-role stereotyping was stronger in France than in Denmark: 63.3% women had dependent roles and 57.5% men were depicted as professionals in French TV advertisements, while 82.8% women had dependent roles compared to 66.7% men who had dependent roles in Danish television advertisements. In a study by Neto and Pinto (1998), 60.3% males were portrayed as interviewer/narrator compared to 16% females, while 50% females were portrayed as having dependent roles compared to 6.4% males in Portuguese TV advertisements.

Mazzella, Durkin, Cerini and Buralli (1992) found that both genders were more likely to be represented as autonomous figures, but men were still more likely than women to have autonomous roles

(85%) and women were more likely than men to have dependent roles (44%) in Australian television advertisements.

In a study by Furnham, Mak and Tanidjojo (1999), women were portrayed as having dependent roles (55.4%) more often than men (19.3%) in Hong Kong television advertisements, while men were more likely to be depicted as interviewer/narrator (65.7%) than women (18.5%). In Indonesian TV advertisements, women were more likely to be portrayed in dependent roles (16.7%) than men (0%), while men were more often portrayed as interviewer/narrator (84.6%) than women (1.5%).

Knoll and Eisend (2011) found that women were four times (public channel) and 1.4 times (private channel) more likely to be portrayed in a dependent role than men in German TV advertisements.

Argument

McArthur and Resko (1975) found that females were more likely to make no argument in US television advertisements, and Bretl and Cantor (1988) found no differences between females and males regarding the type of arguments they made.

In a study by Manstead and McCulloch (1981), females were more likely to make no argument (63.4%) than males (19.8%), and males were more likely to make both scientific and non-scientific arguments than females. Furnham and Voli (1989) found that females were more likely to make no arguments (53%), while males were more likely to make factual arguments (43.9) than females (25.8%) in Italian TV advertisements. A study by Furnham, Babitzkow and Uguccione (1999) found that French commercials had more females giving opinion (23.5%) than males (10.3%) and more males giving factual arguments (13.8%) than females (5.1%). Neto and Pinto (1998) found that 23.5% males presented factual arguments, while only 11% females did such thing; they also found that 44% females and 22.5% males provided no argument.

Mazzella, Durkin, Cerini and Buralli (1992) found that most central figures tended to give opinions on Australian TV commercials, but males were more often associated with factual arguments (19%) than female (5%), and females were more likely to make no argument (29%) than males (13%).

Furnham, Mak and Tanidjojo (1999) found that more females gave opinion (74.1%) and more males gave factual arguments (52.3%) in Indonesian television advertisements.

Reward type

Manstead and McCulloch (1981) found that males were more often associated with rewards that were practical (74%) and females were more often associated with rewards aimed at self-enhancement (40.2%). Furnham and Skae (1997) found that, in UK TV advertisements, females were more likely to be associated with self-enhancing rewards (24%) than males (12.7%), but males were more frequently portrayed with

pleasurable rewards (44.7%) than females (19.7%); women were more often shown with practical rewards (56.3%) than men (42.6%).

Furnham and Voli (1989) found that females were more often portrayed with social approved rewards (36.4%) than males (15.9%) and females were more frequently portrayed with practical rewards (24.2%) than males (21.5%) in Italian television advertisements; men were more likely to be associated with self-enhancement rewards (28.9%) compared to women (24.2%) and men were also more likely shown with pleasurable rewards (16.8%) than women (4.5%). A study by Furnham, Babitzkow and Ugucioni (1999) found that in Danish TV advertisements males were more often portrayed with pleasurable rewards (50.6%), while females were more frequently associated with self-enhancement rewards (42.2%). Neto and Pinto (1998) found that 10.3% males and 37% females gave self-enhancement as a reward, while 50% males and 30% females provided a pleasure or another reward as explanation for the product advertised.

Mazzella, Durkin, Cerini and Buralli (1992) found that females were more often shown with socially approved (26%) or self-enhancing rewards (18%) than males (14% in both categories); males were more likely to give practical rewards (51%) than females (30%).

A study by Furnham, Mak and Tanidjojo (1999) found that females were more likely to be portrayed with self-enhancement rewards (60%), males (17.1%) were more likely than females (12.3) to be shown with practical rewards and pleasurable rewards (26.4% males; 20% females) in Hong Kong TV advertisements. In Indonesian television advertisements, women were more likely to be associated with self-enhancing rewards (59.3%), while men were more likely to be associated with pleasurable rewards (67.7%).

Chapter 3 : Method and Results

Method

The aim of this study is to understand whether the representation of genders is stereotypical in Italian television advertisements and if there are variations of representation in different day parts. In order to investigate the stereotyping of genders, comparisons were made with the sex of the central character and every variable. What was especially important was seeing if characteristics generally associated with one gender were usually portrayed in advertisements as relating to that particular gender (i. e., from previous studies we know that the mode of presentation of females is usually visual, therefore the relation between a female central character and the mode of presentation visual is analysed). To understand how gender representation might vary during different day parts, the same one-on-one analysis was made for every day part, in order to find a link between the TV audience of a specific day part and how genders are portrayed in that particular day part.

Advertisements were recorded during the month of November 2016. From November 1st to November 15th, advertisements broadcasted on the Italian public television channel Rai 2 were recorded, while from November 16th to November 30th, advertisements broadcasted on the Italian commercial television channel Italia 1 were recorded.

In order to examine gender differences during different parts of day, advertisements on the television channel Rai 2 were recorded everyday for two hours during Daytime (from 11.30 to 13.00 and from 14 to 15), and for two-and-a-half hours during Primetime (from 19.30 to 22.00). During the weekend, advertisements were recorded for five hours during the day (from 11.00 to 16.00) and for two-and-a-half hours at night (from 19.30 to 22.00). Daytime, Primetime and Weekend time slots were chosen because their audience is relatively stable demographically; considering the type of programs broadcasted, Daytime viewers are usually home-staying women or older people, Primetime viewers tend to be more diversified, while during the weekend a high percentage of viewers is male (Craig 1992). Advertisements broadcasted on the television channel Italia 1 were recorded everyday for two hours during Daytime (from 11.30 to 12.30 and from 15.00 to 16.00) and for another two hours during Primetime (from 20.00 to 22.00); during the weekend, advertisements were recorded for two-and-a-half hours during the day (from 11.00 to 13.30) and for two hours at night (from 20.00 to 22.00).

The choice to record fewer hours of television programs and advertisements on the television channel Italia 1 than the ones recorded on the television channel Rai 2 was made because of the disproportionately higher number and frequency of advertisements broadcasted on the former than the ones broadcasted on the latter.

2028 advertisements, of which 686 had been broadcasted on the Italian public television channel Rai 2 and 1342 had been broadcasted on the Italian commercial television channel Italia 1, were recorded and analysed by only one person, using coding categories based on the ones proven effective by the studies of Bretl & Cantor (1988), Craig (1992), McArthur & Resko (1975), Eisend (2010) and Furnham & Mak (1999). Being important for the study to compare the sex of the central character with the other variables, when the character was considered unclear, the advertisement wasn't included in the calculations; there are 57 advertisements whose central character is coded as "unclear", therefore the coded advertisements actually analysed are 1971. If one advertisement didn't perfectly fit a specific category, the category closer to the one advertised was chosen (i.e. "Lines" pads were considered a "home product", specifically medications; "Just Eat" website, since it sells food, was considered a "home product" too, specifically foodstuffs).

Categories

Characters

In order to get an overall view of the genders of the characters present in the advertisement, each commercial was classified considering the apparent age and gender of all the characters that have appeared in it (Craig, 1992). The categories were: "all male adult"; "all female adult"; "all adult, mixed gender"; "male adults with children or teens (no women)"; "female adults with children or teens (no men)"; "mixture of age and genders". People who seemed under the age of 18 were considered children or teens.

Central character

A character was considered the central one if he/she had the greatest amount of on-screen time. If two characters were tied on this measure, the one with the longest speaking time is considered the primary one (Bretl & Cantor, 1988). The categories were: "male"; "female"; "unclear". "Unclear" was used when coding advertisements with many characters whose on-screen time was similar and not one of them seemed to talk more than the others.

Mode of presentation

The central character could be the one who is seen the most or the one who talks the most about the product. The mode of presentation is the type of appearance for the primary character appearing in the commercial (Eisend, 2010). The categories were: "visual"; "voice-over".

Bases for the credibility (of the primary character)

The reasons viewers would trust what the central character is saying about the product being advertised could be because the central character is a "product user", which means he/she is primarily depicted as a user of the product being advertised, or an "authority" regarding the product being advertised, meaning he/she knows all the facts about said product (McArthur & Resko, 1975). The subcategories of the

“product user” category are: “personal experience”, where the product user showed in the advertisement is a real life person; “celebrity”, where the product user or the person advertising the product is a real life famous person; “apparent personal experience”, where the product user is an actor made to appear as he/she has used the product. The subcategories of “authority” category are: “expert”, where the person advertising the product is a real life person with a high degree of skill or knowledge in the product area”; “apparent expert”, where the person advertising the product is an actor made to appear as an expert; “company representative”, where the person advertising the product is a real life person from within the company of the advertised product (Craig, 1992).

Role (of the primary character)

The role of the primary character is the everyday role he/she is appeared to have in the advertisement. The categories are “dependent/relative to others” and “autonomous/independent from others”. The subcategories of “dependent/relative to others” are: “parent”; “spouse”; “homemaker”; “boy-/girlfriend”; “sex-object”; “decorative”. The subcategories of “autonomous/independent from others” are: “professional”; “worker”; “celebrity”; “interviewer/narrator” (Eisend, 2010).

Age (of the primary character)

The age of the primary character is the age the central character is appeared to have in the commercial. The categories are: “young”; “middle-aged”; “old”. Characters are considered “young” when they appear to be 35 years old or younger, “middle-aged” when they appear to be older than 35 years old but younger than 65 years old and “old” when they appear to be older than 65 years old (Furnham & Mak, 1999).

Setting

The setting of the commercial refers to the location in which the characters are depicted. The categories are “home settings” and “away settings”. The subcategories of “home settings” are: “kitchen”; “bathroom”; “other room in the house”; “outdoor at home”. The subcategories of “away settings” are: “restaurants/bars”; “business”; “school”; “outdoor away from home” (Craig, 1992).

Product Type

Product type refers to the type of product being advertised. The categories are “home products”, which refers to products used mainly at home and “away products”, which refers to products used in places other than home. The subcategories of “home products” are: “foodstuffs”; “body care”; “household items”; “pet-related items”; “toys”; “medications”. The subcategories of “away products” are: “travel”; “bank/money”; “restaurants”; “cars”; “other” (Eisend, 2010).

Argument

Argument refers to the type of argument given on behalf of the product by the primary character. The argument can be “scientific” or “non-scientific”. Arguments are “scientific” if they contained or purported to contain factual evidence concerning the product; they are “non-scientific” if they consist only of opinion or testimonials in favour of the product (McArthur & Resko, 1975).

Sex of the narrator (if present)

The sex of the narrator refers to the sex of the narrator both in advertisements where the primary character is visual but there is a narrator and where the narrator is the primary character. The categories are: “male”; “female” (Bretl & Cantor, 1988).

Rewards offered or reaped by the primary character

The rewards were considered “offered” if they were offered by authoritative figures; they were considered “reaped” if it was the product-using primary characters that proposed them. The categories are: “social enhancement”; “self enhancement”; “practical rewards”; “others”. Rewards that offer or reap “social enhancement” are: “opposite sex approval”; “family approval”; “friend approval”; “social advancement”; “career advancement”; “other”. Rewards that offer or reap “self enhancement” are: “psychological improvement”; “attractiveness”; “cleanliness”; “health”; “other”. Rewards that offer or reap “practical rewards” are: “saving money” and “saving time” (McArthur & Resko, 1975).

Statistical analysis

The software used for the statistical analysis are IBM SPSS Statistics (v. 20) and Microsoft Office Excel (2007).

The association between the dependent variable “central character” female and every other independent variable (except for “characters” and “sex of the narrator”) was investigated. The variables were made dichotomic, presented in cross-tabs and the odds-ratio was used as index of association, in order to provide a measure of the degree of stereotyping.

To test whether the categories of the variables differ between women and men, chi-square tests were applied for all day parts.

In order to verify the existence of a different range of stereotyping among the different day parts, the difference of means of the odd-ratios was calculated using t-test.

Results

Over-all, television advertisements present genders still in stereotyped roles.

Despite some atypical results regarding the basis credibility of the central character, where both men and women were consistently represented as authority, the setting, where both men and women were more

likely to be portrayed as away from home, and the products advertised, where it was both men and women more likely to advertise home products, most variables presented results highlighting gender stereotyping.

Women were still depicted as young, more consistently than men, who were majorly depicted as middle-aged or old; women were still depicted as having dependent roles a lot more than men.

Despite both sexes being slightly more usually presented as voice-over, women were still more likely to be presented visually, just as it was found by previous studies.

Even if non-scientific arguments were had more frequently than scientific ones, men were still a lot more likely to have scientific arguments than women.

Lastly, in line with previous studies, women were more likely both to offer and reap self enhancing rewards, while men were more likely to offer and reap social enhancing and practical rewards.

Characters

A descriptive analysis of this variable was made based on its non-dichotomic nature because of the variable's relevance for understanding the overall context.

Daytime

The highest percentage of characters being portrayed belong to the "All adult, mixed gender" category, followed by the "Mixture of ages and genders" category. The lowest percentage of characters being portrayed belong to the "Female adults with children or teens (no men)" category (Table 5).

Table 5: Characters

	Frequency	Percentage
All male adult	131	19.8
All female adult	90	13.6
All adult, mixed gender	247	37.3
Valid Male adults with children or teens (no women)	33	5.0
Female adults with children or teens (no men)	27	4.1
Mixture of ages and genders	134	20.2
Total	662	100.0

Primetime

The highest percentage of characters being portrayed belong to the "All adult, mixed gender" category, followed by the "All male adult" category. The lowest percentage of characters being portrayed belong to the "Female adults with children or teens (no men)" category (Table 6).

Table 6: Characters

	Frequency	Percentage
All male adult	169	22.4
All female adult	100	13.3
All adult, mixed gender	295	39.2
Valid Male adults with children or teens (no women)	22	2.9
Female adults with children or teens (no men)	12	1.6
Mixture of ages and genders	155	20.6
Total	753	100.0

Weekend

The highest percentage of characters being portrayed belong to the “All adult, mixed gender” category, followed by the “Mixture of ages and genders” category. The lowest percentage of characters being portrayed belong to the “Male adults with children or teens (no men)” category (Table 7).

Table 7: Characters

	Frequency	Percentage
All male adult	148	24.1
All female adult	60	9.8
All adult, mixed gender	210	34.3
Valid Male adults with children or teens (no women)	14	2.3
Female adults with children or teens (no men)	19	3.1
Mixture of ages and genders	162	26.4
Total	613	100.0

Mode of presentation

Voice-over was the preferred mode of presentation for both genders (57% of women, 66% of men). Despite that, women were still more likely (43%) to be portrayed visually than men (34%).

Daytime

Despite females, as males, being mainly represented as voice-over (59% women, 63% men), they were still more represented as visual than men (41% vs 37%).

Women were more likely to be in the group visual and men were more likely in the group voice-over, but this difference is not statistically significant ($\chi^2=0.84$, $df=1$, $p > 0,05$) (Table 8). There is a positive association between the mode of presentation visual and the central character female but it is not statistically significant (OR=1.16; CI 95% 0.84 – 1.61) (Table 9).

Table 8: Crosstab Mode of presentation * Central Character

		Central character		Total
		Male	Female	
Mode of presentation	Visual	146	104	250
	Voice-over	248	152	400
Total		394	256	650

Table 9: Odds-ratio

	Value	CI 95%	
		Lower	Upper
Odds-ratio Mode of presentation (Visual / Voice-over)	1.16	0.84	1.61

Primetime

Females were equally represented as visual and voice-over (50% vs 50%), while males were more often portrayed as voice-over (64%) than visual (36%).

Women were equally likely to be in the group visual and in the group voice-over and men were more likely to be in the group voice-over ($\chi^2=13.28$, $df=1$, $p < 0,001$) (Table 10). The odds that more women are in the group visual are more than one time the odds for men (OR=1.77; CI 95% 1.30 – 2.42) (Table 11).

Table 10: Crosstab Mode of presentation * Central Character

		Central character		Total
		Male	Female	
Mode of presentation	Visual	170	126	296
	Voice-over	304	127	431
Total		474	253	727

Table 11: Odds-ratio

	Value	CI 95%	
		Lower	Upper

Odds-ratio presentation (Visual / Voice-over)	Mode of	1.77	1.30	2.42
--	---------	------	------	------

Weekend

Both females and males were mostly portrayed as voice-over (63% women, 70% men), but females were more likely (37%) to be presented visually than males (30%).

Women were more likely to be in the group voice-over and men were more likely in the group voice-over, but this difference is not statistically significant ($\chi^2=3.03$, $df=1$, $p > 0,05$) (Table 12). There is a positive association between the mode of presentation visual and the central character female but it is not statistically significant (OR=1.37; CI 95% 0.96 – 1.97) (Table 13).

Table 12: Crosstab Mode of presentation * Central Character

		Central character		Total
		Male	Female	
Mode of presentation	Visual	117	74	191
	Voice-over	276	127	403
Total		393	201	594

Table 13: Odds-ratio

	Value	CI 95%	
		Lower	Upper
Odds-ratio presentation (Visual / Voice-over)	1.37	0.96	1.97

Basis credibility of the central character

Men and women were both more likely to be portrayed as authority (52% of women, 66% of men), but women were more likely to be portrayed as product user (48%) than men (34%).

Daytime

Both females and males were more likely to be represented as authority (53% women, 65% men), but more females (47%) than males (35%) were represented as product users.

Women were slightly more likely to be in the group authority and men were more likely to be in the group authority ($\chi^2=7.76$, $df=1$, $p < 0,01$) (Table 14). The odds that more women are in the group product user are more than one time the odds for men (OR=1.57; CI 95% 1.14 – 2.17) (Table 15).

Table 14: Crosstab Basis credibility * Central character

		Central character		Total
		Male	Female	
Basis credibility	Product user	140	119	259
	Authority	254	137	391
Total		394	256	650

Table 15: Odds-ratio

	Value	CI 95%	
		Lower	Upper
Odds-ratio basis credibility (product user / authority)	1.57	1.14	2.17

Primetime

Females were more likely to be presented as product users (53%) and males were more likely to be presented as authority (63%). More females than males were depicted as product users (29% men) and more males than females were depicted as authority (47% women).

Women were more likely to be in the group product user and men were more likely to be in the group authority ($\chi^2=17.85$, $df=1$, $p < 0,001$) (Table 16). The odds that more women are in the group product user are more than one time the odds for men (OR=1.94; CI 95% 1.42 – 2.65) (Table 17).

Table 16: Crosstab Basis credibility * Central character

		Central character		Total
		Male	Female	
Basis credibility	Product user	174	134	308
	Authority	300	119	419
Total		474	253	727

Table 17: Odds-ratio

	Value	CI 95%	
		Lower	Upper
Odds-ratio basis credibility (product user / authority)	1.94	1.42	2.65

Weekend

Both females and males were mainly depicted as authority (57% women, 71% men), but more females were still presented as product users than males (43% women, 29% men).

Women were more likely to be in the group authority and men were more likely to be in the group authority ($\chi^2=11.65$, $df=1$, $p < 0,001$) (Table 18). The odds that more women are in the group product user are more than one time the odds for male (OR=1.85; CI 95% 1.30 – 2.62) (Table 19).

Table 18: Crosstab Basis credibility * Central character

		Central character		Total
		Male	Female	
Basis credibilità	Product user	115	87	202
	Authority	278	114	392
Total		393	201	594

Table 19: Odds-ratio

	Value	CI 95%	
		Lower	Upper
Odds-ratio basis credibility (product user / authority)	1.85	1.30	2.62

Role of central character

Central characters of both genders were majorly portrayed as autonomous (88% of women, 97% of men), but women were a lot more likely to be portrayed as dependent than men (12% vs 3%).

Daytime

Both females and males were depicted as having autonomous roles (87% females, 96% males), but females were way more likely to have dependent roles (13% females, 4% males).

Women were more likely to be in the group autonomous and men were more likely to be in the group autonomous ($\chi^2=20.17$, $df=1$, $p < 0,001$) (Table 20). The odds that more women are in the group dependent are more than four times the odds for men (OR= 4.02; CI 95% 2.11 – 7.69) (Table 21).

Table 20: Crosstab Role of Central Character * Central character

		Central character		Total
		Male	Female	
Role of central character	Dependent	14	33	47
	Autonomous	380	223	603
Total		394	256	650

Table 21: Odds-ratio

	Value	CI 95%	
		Lower	Upper
Odds-ratio role of central character (dependent / autonomous)	4.02	2.11	7.69

Primetime

Both females and males were more likely to be depicted as having autonomous roles (88% women, 97% men), but females were much more likely to be depicted as having dependent roles than males (12% vs 3%).

Women were more likely to be in the group autonomous and men were more likely to be in the group autonomous ($\chi^2=22.96$, $df=1$, $p < 0,001$) (Table 22). The odds that more women are in the group dependent are more than four times the odds for men (OR= 4.59; CI 95% 2.34 – 9.01) (Table 23).

Table 22: Crosstab Role of Central Character * Central character

	Central character		Total
	Male	Female	
Role of Dependent central character	13	29	42
Autonomous	460	224	684
Total	473	253	726

Table 23: Odds-ratio

	Value	CI 95%	
		Lower	Upper
Odds-ratio role of central character (dependent / autonomous)	4.59	2.34	9.01

Weekend

Both females and males were more likely to be depicted as having autonomous roles (88% women, 97% men), but females were much more likely to be depicted as having dependent roles than males (12% vs 3%).

Women were more likely to be in the group autonomous and men were more likely to be in the group autonomous ($\chi^2=18.51$, $df=1$, $p < 0,001$) (Table 24). The odds that more women are in the group dependent are more than four times the odds for men (OR= 4.15; CI 95% 2.07 – 8.33) (Table 25).

Table 24: Crosstab Role of Central Character * Central character

	Central character		Total
	Male	Female	
Role of Dependent central character	13	25	38
Autonomous	380	176	556
Total	393	201	594

Table 25: Odds-ratio

	Value	CI 95%	
		Lower	Upper
Odds-ratio role of central character (dependent / autonomous)	4.15	2.07	8.33

Age

Women were almost as likely to be portrayed as young (64%) as men were as likely to be portrayed as middle-aged or old (67%).

Daytime

Females were more likely to be young (68%) than males (33%). Males were more likely to be middle-aged or old (67%) than females (32%).

Women were more likely to be in the group under 35 years and men were more likely in the group of 35 and older ($\chi^2=79.78$, $df=1$, $p < 0,001$) (Table 26). The odds that women are younger are more than four times the odds for men (OR=4.47; CI 95% 3.19 – 6.25) (Table 27).

Table 26: Crosstab Age of Central Character * Central Character

	Central character		Total
	Male	Female	
Age of central Young	128	175	303
Middle-aged/Old	265	81	346
Total	393	256	649

Table 27: Odds-ratio

	Value	CI 95%	
		Lower	Upper
Odds-ratio Age of central character (young / middle-aged/old)	4.47	3.19	6.25

Primetime

Females were more likely to be depicted as young (63%) than males (35%), while males were more likely to be depicted as middle-aged or old (65%) than females (37%).

Women were more likely to be in the group under 35 years and men were more likely in the group of 35 and older ($\chi^2=51.63$, $df=1$, $p < 0,001$) (Table 28). The odds that women are younger are more than three times the odds for men (OR=3.14; CI 95% 2.29 – 4.31) (Table 29).

Table 28: Crosstab Age of Central Character * Central Character

	Central character		Total
	Male	Female	
Age of central Young	167	160	327
character Middle-aged/Old	305	93	398
Total	472	253	725

Table 29: Odds-ratio

	Value	CI 95%	
		Lower	Upper
Odds-ratio Age of central character (young / middle-aged/old)	3.14	2.29	4.31

Weekend

Females were more likely to be depicted as young (59%) than males (32%), while males were more likely to be depicted as middle-aged or old (68%) than females (41%).

Women were more likely to be in the group under 35 years and men were more likely to be in the group of 35 and older ($\chi^2=41.24$, $df=1$, $p < 0,001$) (Table 30). The odds that women are younger are more than three times the odds for men (OR=3.12; CI 95% 2.19 – 4.42) (Table 31).

Table 30: Crosstab Age of Central Character * Central Character

	Central character		Total
	Male	Female	
Age of central Young character	125	119	244
Middle-aged/Old	268	82	350
Total	393	201	594

Table 31: Odds-ratio

	Value	CI 95%	
		Lower	Upper
Odds-ratio Age of central character (young / middle-aged/old)	3.12	2.19	4.42

Setting

The setting for both men and women was away from home (60% of women, 67% of men), but women were more likely to be portrayed at home (40%) than men (33%).

Daytime

Both females and males were more likely to be depicted as away from home (60% women, 67% men), but more females were still depicted as at home (40%) than men (33%).

Women were more likely to be in the group setting away and men were more likely to be in the group setting away ($\chi^2=4.07$, $df=1$, $p < 0,05$) (Table 32). The odds that women are in the setting home are more than one time the odds for male (OR=1.40; CI 95% 1.01 – 1.94) (Table 33).

Table 32: Crosstab Age * Central Character

	Central character		Total
	Male	Female	
Setting Home	128	103	231
Away	266	153	419
Total	394	256	650

Table 33: Odds-ratio

	Value	CI 95%	
		Lower	Upper

Rapporto odd per Setting (Home / Away)	1.40	1.01	1.94
---	------	------	------

Primetime

Both females and males were more likely to be depicted as away from home (63% women, 67% men), but more females were still depicted as at home (37%) than men (33%).

Women were more likely to be in the group away and men were more likely in the group away, but this difference is not statistically significant ($\chi^2=0.86$, $df=1$, $p > 0,05$) (Table 34). There is a positive association between the setting home and the central character female but it is not statistically significant (OR=1.16; CI 95% 0.85 – 1.60) (Table 35).

Table 34: Crosstab Age * Central Character

		Central character		Total
		Male	Female	
Setting	Home	158	93	251
	Away	316	160	476
Total		474	253	727

Table 35: Odds-ratio

	Value	CI 95%	
		Lower	Upper
Odds-ratio Setting (Home / Away)	1.16	0.85	1.60

Weekend

Both females and males were more likely to be depicted as away from home (55% women, 68% men), but more females were still depicted as at home (45%) than men (32%).

Women were more likely to be in the group setting away and men were more likely to be in the group setting away ($\chi^2=10.42$, $df=1$, $p < 0,01$) (Table 36). The odds that women are in the setting home are more than one time the odds for male (OR=1.77; CI 95% 1.25 – 2.55) (Table 37).

Table 36: Crosstab Age * Central Character

		Central character		Total
		Male	Female	
Setting	Home	125	91	216

Away	268	110	378
Total	393	201	594

Table 37: Odds-ratio

	Value	CI 95%	
		Lower	Upper
Odds-ratio Setting (Home / Away)	1.77	1.25	2.55

Product type

Men and women were both more likely to advertise products used at home (65% of women, 64% of men) and men were slightly more likely to advertise products used away from home (36%) than women (35%).

Daytime

Both females and males were more likely to advertise home products (67% women, 70% men), but more females were more likely to advertise away products (33%) than males (30%).

Women were more likely to be in the group home product and men were more likely to be in the group home product ($\chi^2=0.89$, $df=1$, $p > 0,05$) (Table 38). There is a negative association between the product type home and the central character female but it is not statistically significant (OR=0.85; CI 95% 0.61 – 1.19) (Table 39).

Table 38: Crosstab Product type * Central character

		Central_character		Total
		Male	Female	
Product Type	Home	277	171	448
	Away	117	85	202
Total		394	256	650

Table 39: Odds-ratio

	Valore	Intervallo di confidenza 95%	
		Inferiore	Superiore
Odds-ratio Product type (Product type home / Product type away)	0.85	0.61	1.19

Primetime

Both females and males were more likely to advertise home products (63% women, 60% men), but more males were slightly more likely to advertise away products (40%) than females (37%).

Women were more likely to be in the group home product and men were more likely to be in the group away product ($\chi^2=0.44$, $df=1$, $p > 0,05$) (Table 40). There is a positive association between the group home and the central character female but it is not statistically significant (OR=1.11; CI 95% 0.81 – 1.52) (Table 41).

Table 40: Crosstab Product type * Central character

		Central character		Total
		Male	Female	
Product type	Home	286	159	445
	Away	188	94	282
Total		474	253	727

Table 41: Odds-ratio

	Value	CI 95%	
		Lower	Upper
Odds-ratio Product Type (Product type home / Product type away)	1.11	0.81	1.52

Weekend

Both females and males were more likely to advertise home products (62% women, 67% men), but more females were more likely to advertise away products (38%) than males (33%).

Women were more likely to be in the group home product and men were more likely to be in the group away home product ($\chi^2=1.34$, $df=1$, $p > 0,05$) (Table 42). There is a positive association between the group home and the central character female but it is not statistically significant (OR=1.23; CI 95% 0.86 – 1.76) (Table 43).

Table 42: Crosstab Product type * Central character

		Central character		Total
		Male	Female	
Product Type	Home	243	134	377
	Away	150	67	217
Total		393	201	594

Table 43: Odds-ratio

	Value	CI 95%	
		Lower	Upper
Odds-ratio Product Type (Product type home / Product type away)	1.23	0.86	1.76

Argument

The majority of arguments made by men and women were non-scientific (84% o women, 57% of men), but men were a lot more likely to give scientific arguments (43%) than women (16%).

Daytime

Both females and males were more likely to give non-scientific arguments (86% women, 60% men), but more males were more likely to give scientific arguments (40%) than females (14%).

Women were more likely to be in the group argument non-scientific and men were more likely to be in the group argument non-scientific ($\chi^2=50.25$, $df=1$, $p < 0,001$) (Table 44). The odds that more women are in the group argument non-scientific are more than four times the odds for men (OR=4.14; CI 95% 2.75 – 6.23) (Table 45).

Table 44: Crosstab Argument * Central character

		Central character		Total
		Male	Female	
Argument	Scientific	156	35	191
	Non-scientific	238	221	459
Total		394	256	650

Table 45: Odds-ratio

	Value	CI 95%	
		Lower	Upper
Odds ratio Argument (Scientific / Non-scientific)	4.14	2.75	6.23

Primetime

Both females and males were more likely to give non-scientific arguments (83% women, 52% men), but more males were more likely to give scientific arguments (48%) than females (17%).

Women were more likely to be in the group argument non-scientific and men were more likely to be in the group argument non-scientific ($\chi^2=66.62$, $df=1$, $p < 0,001$) (Table 46). The odds that more women are in the group argument non-scientific are more than four times the odds for men (OR=4.45; CI 95% 3.06 – 6.47) (Table 47).

Table 46: Crosstab Argument * Central character

		Central character		Total
		Male	Female	
Argument	Scientific	226	43	269
	Non-scientific	248	210	458
Total		474	253	727

Table 47: Odds-ratio

	Value	CI 95%	
		Lower	Upper
Odds-ratio Argument (Scientific / Non-scientific)	4.45	3.06	6.47

Weekend

Both females and males were more likely to give non-scientific arguments (59% women, 81% men), but more males were more likely to give scientific arguments (41%) than males (19%).

Women were more likely to be in the group argument non-scientific and men were more likely to be in the group argument non-scientific ($\chi^2=28.28$, $df=1$, $p < 0,001$) (Table 48). The odds that more women are in the group argument non-scientific are more than two times the odds for men (OR=2.91; CI 95% 1.95 – 4.36) (Table 49).

Table 48: Crosstab Argument * Central character

		Central character		Total
		Male	Female	
Argument	Scientific	162	39	201
	Non-scientific	231	162	393
Total		393	201	594

Table 49: Odds-ratio

	Value	CI 95%	
		Lower	Upper

Odds-ratio (Scientific / Non-scientific)	Argument	2.91	1.95	4.36
---	----------	------	------	------

Sex of the narrator

A descriptive analysis of this variable was made because of the variable's relevance for understanding the overall context. It was not necessary to know the degree of association between the sex of the narrator and the sex of the central character.

Daytime

Narrators were for 52.3% males. There were 34.9% female narrators, and only the 12.8% of advertisements did not have a narrator (Table 50).

Table 50: Sex of the narrator

	Frequency	Percentage
Valid		
None	85	12.8
Male	346	52.3
Female	231	34.9
Total	662	100.0

Primetime

Narrators were for 55.9% males. There were 29.0% female narrators, and only the 15.1% of advertisements did not have a narrator (Table 51).

Table 51: Sex of the narrator

	Frequency	Percentage
Valid		
None	114	15.1
Male	421	55.9
Female	218	29.0
Total	753	100.0

Weekend

Narrators were for 60.4% males. There were 30.3% female narrators, and only the 9.3% of advertisements did not have a narrator (Table 52).

Table 52: Sex of the Narrator

	Frequency	Percentage
Valid		
None	57	9.3
Male	370	60.4
Female	186	30.3
Total	613	100.0

Rewards offered

The rewards offered were mainly self-enhancing, for both men (53%) and women (67%). Although more men (47%) than women (33%) were still more likely than give social enhancement or practical rewards.

Daytime

Both females and males were more likely to offer self enhancing rewards (54% women, 60% men), while females were more likely to offer social enhancing or practical rewards (46%) than males (40%).

Women were more likely to be in the group self enhancement and men were more likely to be in the group self enhancement ($\chi^2=1.72$, $df=1$, $p > 0,05$) (Table 53). There is a positive association between the group self enhancement and the central character female but it is not statistically significant (OR=1.31; CI 95% 0.87 – 1.96) (Table 54).

Table 53: Crosstab Rewards offered * Central character

		Central character		Total
		Male	Female	
Rewards offered	Self Enhancement	139	94	233
	Social Enhancement/Practical Rewards	120	62	182
	Total	259	156	415

Table 54: Odds-ratio

	Value	CI 95%	
		Lower	Upper
Odds-ratio Rewards Offered (Self Enhancement / Social Enhancement/Practical Rewards)	1.31	0.87	1.96

Primetime

Females were equally likely to offer self enhancing and social enhancing rewards (50% and 50%), while males were more likely to offer self enhancing rewards (70%) than social enhancing or practical rewards (30%).

Women were more likely to be in the group self enhancement and men were equally likely to be in the group self enhancement or social enhancement/practical rewards ($\chi^2=15.41$, $df=1$, $p < 0,001$) (Table 55). The odds that more women are in the group self enhancement are more than two times the odds for men (OR=2.31; CI 95% 1.52 – 3.53) (Table 56).

Table 55: Crosstab Rewards offered * Central character

		Central character		Total
		Male	Female	
Reward sOffered	Self Enhancement	158	99	257
	Social Enhancement/Practical Rewards	155	42	197
Total		313	141	454

Table 56: Odds-ratio

	Value	CI 95%	
		Lower	Upper
Odds-ratio Rewards Offered (Self Enhancement / Social Enhancement/Practical Rewards)	2.31	1.52	3.53

Weekend

Both females and males were more likely to offer self enhancing rewards (55% women, 71% men), while females were more likely to offer social enhancing or practical rewards (45%) than males (29%).

Women were more likely to be in the group self enhancement and men were more likely to be in the group self enhancement ($\chi^2=10.22$, $df=1$, $p < 0,01$) (Table 57). The odds that more women are in the group self enhancement are more than two times the odds for men (OR=2.06; CI 95% 1.32 – 3.22) (Table 58).

Table 57: Crosstab Rewards offered * Central character

		Central character		Total
		Male	Female	
Rewards Offered	Self Enhancement	157	92	249
	Social Enhancement/Practical Rewards	130	37	167

Total	287	129	416
-------	-----	-----	-----

Table 58: Odds-ratio

	Value	CI 95%	
		Lower	Upper
Odds-ratio Rewards Offered (Self Enhancement / Social Enhancement/Practical Rewards)	2.06	1.32	3.22

Rewards reaped

Self enhancing rewards were more likely to be reaped by women (69%) than men (45%), while social enhancing and practical rewards were more likely to be reaped by men (55%) than women (31%).

Daytime

Self enhancing rewards were more likely to be reaped by females (68%) than males (48%), while social enhancing or practical rewards were more likely to be reaped by males (52%) than females (32%).

Women were more likely to be in the group self enhancement and men were more likely to be in the group social enhancement/practical rewards ($\chi^2=9.22$, $df=1$, $p < 0,01$) (Table 59). The odds that more women are in the group self enhancement are more than two times the odds for men (OR=2.29; CI 95% 1.34 – 3.92) (Table 60).

Table 59: Crosstab Rewards Reaped * Central character

		Central character		Total
		Male	Female	
Rewards Reaped	Self Enhancement	65	68	133
	Social Enhancement/Practical Rewards	70	32	102
Total		135	100	235

Table 60: Odds-ratio

	Value	CI 95%	
		Lower	Upper

Odds-ratio Rewards Reaped (Self Enhancement / Social Enhancement/Practical Rewards)	2.29	1.34	3.92
--	------	------	------

Primetime

Self enhancing rewards were more likely to be reaped by females (70%) than males (36%), while social enhancing or practical rewards were more likely to be reaped by males (64%) than females (30%).

Women were more likely to be in the group self enhancement and men were more likely to be in the group social enhancement/practical rewards ($\chi^2=32.11$, $df=1$, $p < 0,001$) (Table 61). The odds that more women are in the group self enhancement are more than four times the odds for men (OR=4.26; CI 95% 2.55 – 7.14) (Table 62).

Table 61: Crosstab Rewards Reaped * Central character

		Central character		Total
		Male	Female	
Rewards Reaped	Self Enhancement	58	80	138
	Social Enhancement/Practical Rewards	105	34	139
	Total	163	114	277

Table 62: Odds-ratio

	Value	CI 95%	
		Lower	Upper
Odds-ratio Rewards Reaped (Self Enhancement / Social Enhancement/Practical Rewards)	4.26	2.55	7.14

Weekend

Self enhancing rewards were more likely to be reaped by both females (70%) and males (55%), while social enhancing or practical rewards were more likely to be reaped by males (45%) than females (30%).

Women were more likely to be in the group self enhancement and men were more likely to be in the group self enhancement ($\chi^2=3.90$, $df=1$, $p < 0,05$) (Table 63). The odds that more women are in the group self enhancement are more than one time the odds for men (OR=1.88; CI 95% 1.00 – 3.53) (Table 64).

Table 63: Crosstab Rewards Reaped * Central character

		Central character		Total
		Male	Female	
Rewards Reaped	Self Enhancement	58	50	108
	Social Enhancement/Practical Rewards	48	22	70
	Total	106	72	178

Table 64: Odds-ratio

	Value	CI 95%	
		Lower	Upper
Odd-ratio Rewards Reaped (Self Enhancement / Social Enhancement/Practical Rewards)	1.88	1.00	3.53

Figure 1: Characteristic of women and men in advertisements as portrayed in different parts of day on two Italian television channel, one public and one private

Variables	Daytime				Primetime				Weekend			
	Female	Male	χ^2	o ^a	Female	Male	χ^2	o ^a	Female	Male	χ^2	o ^a
	%	%			%	%			%	%		
	(n=256)	(n=394)			(n=253)	(n=474)			(n=201)	(n=393)		
Mode of presentation												
Visual	41	37	0.84*	1.16	50	36	13.28**	1.77	37	30	3.03*	1.37
Voice-over	59	63			50	64			63	70		
Basis credibility												
Product user	47	35	7.76***	1.57	53	37	17.85**	1.94	43	29	11.65**	1.85
Authority	53	65			47	63			57	71		
Role of the central character												
Dependent	13	4	20.17**	4.02	12	3	22.96**	4.59	12	3	18.51**	4.15
Autonomous	87	96			88	97			88	97		
Age												
Young	68	33	79.78**	4.47	63	35	51.63**	3.14	59	32	41.24**	3.12
Middle-aged/Old	32	67			37	65			41	68		
Setting												
Home	40	33	4.07****	1.40	37	33	0.86*	1.16	45	32	10.42***	1.77
Away	60	67			63	67			55	68		
Product Type												
Home	67	70	0.89*	0.85	63	60	0.44*	1.11	62	67	1.34*	1.23
Away	33	30			37	40			38	33		
Argument												
Scientific	14	40	50.25**	4.14	17	48	66.62**	4.45	41	19	28.28**	2.91
Non-scientific	86	60			83	52			59	81		
Rewards offered ^b												
Self enhancement	54	60	1.72*	1.31	50	70	15.41***	2.31	55	71	10.22***	2.06
Social enhancement / Practical rewards	46	40			50	30			45	29		
Rewards reaped ^b												
Self enhancement	68	48	9.22***	2.29	70	36	32.11**	4.26	70	55	3.90****	1.88
Social enhancement / Practical rewards	32	52			30	64			30	45		

* p > 0.05 ; ** p < 0.001 ; *** p < 0.01 ; **** p < 0.05

^a = odds-ratio

^b = in order to consider the subcategories “self enhancement” and “social enhancement/practical rewards”, the categories “rewards offered” and “rewards reaped” had to be separated, therefore for those categories n=156; n=141; n=129 (rewards offered, women). n=259; n=313; n=287 (rewards offered, men). n=100; n=114; n=72 (rewards reaped, women). n=135; n=163; n=106 (rewards reaped, men).

Difference of means of odds-ratios in daytime, primetime and weekend

The difference between the means of primetime odd-ratios and daytime odd-ratios is 0.391, but it is not statistically significant (t-test p-value = 0.568). The difference between the means of daytime odd-ratios and weekend odd-ratios is 0.097, but it is not statistically significant (t-test p-value = 0.869). The difference between the means of primetime odd-ratios and weekend odd-ratios is 0.488, but it is not statistically significant (t-test p-value = 0.400).

Table 65: Tab of the odd-ratios of the different day parts, with their mean and standard deviation

	Odd-ratios daytime	Odd-ratios primetime	Odd-ratios weekend
Mode of presentation	1.16	1.77	1.37
Basis credibility	1.57	1.94	1.85
Role of central character	4.02	4.59	4.15
Age	4.47	3.14	3.12
Setting	1.40	1.16	1.77
Product type	0.85	1.11	1.23
Argument	4.14	4.45	2.91
Rewards offered	1.31	2.31	2.06
Rewards reaped	2.29	4.26	1.88
Mean	2.36	2.75	2.26
Standard deviation	1.45	1.32	0.8

Chapter 4: Conclusion

Discussion

Content analysis on advertisements by different types of private and public television channels can offer a representative portrayal of how women and men are perceived in advertising. Despite the progress towards gender equality in western societies, in fact, men and women's portrayals don't seem to reflect it. Most recent studies, like the one on Belgian advertisements by Verhellen, Dans and Pelsmacker (2016) or the one on German television advertisements by Eisend (2011), found results in line with previous research (Babitzkow & Ugucioni, 2000; Furnham & Voli, 1989; McArthur & Resko, 1975; Neto & Pinto, 1998), noting that advertisers still use stereotypical gender role portrayals in order to convey their messages.

Stereotyping varies in different day parts because the targets of advertisements change during the day (Craig, 1992): non-working women are the target for daytime adverts, men are the target for weekend adverts, while the viewers of primetime advertisements are usually a more homogenous group of men and working women. The most recent study on the difference in stereotyping in different day parts (Craig, 1992) found that there were differences in how genders were portrayed, with daytime and weekend parts portraying men and women in a more conservative and traditional way and the primetime part portraying them in a more progressive way.

On the contrary, this study found no difference in gender portrayals among different day parts. Despite still finding a stereotyped portrayal of society in advertisements, most variables presented similar degrees of stereotyping regardless of the day part during which the advertisements were broadcast.

There were a few exceptions. During primetime advertisements, instead of females being more presented than males visually, they were equally presented as voice-over and visually, while males were more often stereotypically presented as voice-over. Contrary to how females usually offer self-enhancing rewards in advertisements during primetime and weekend, during daytime they offer more social enhancing or practical rewards than males. Advertisements broadcast during weekend portrayed more females than males as advertising products used away from home, while in the other day parts males advertised more often than females products used away from home.

The results of this study show that, despite men and women being both majorly associated with the not stereotypical variable, there were still more women than men associated with the stereotypical variables. It is the case for the categories of "mode of presentation", "basis for credibility", "role of central character", "setting", "product" and "rewards offered". The only categories where men and women were associated with the stereotypical variable were the "age" category, where women were more likely to be portrayed as young (64%) and men were more likely to be portrayed as middle-aged or old (67%), and the "rewards reaped" category, where self-enhancing rewards were reaped mostly by women and social enhancing and practical

rewards were reaped mostly by men. Therefore, it can be stated that the results are in line with previous research.

The associations between the category female (of the variable central character) and the categories linked to a more conservative gender representation were all positive, except for the variable “product type”, where men advertising home products were slightly more than their female counterparts.

While the majority of associations were positive and statistically significant, some of them without statistical significance were found for the variables “mode of presentation” visual (daytime and weekend parts), “setting” home (primetime part), “product type” home (primetime and weekend parts) and “rewards offered” self enhancement (primetime part).

The highest degree of stereotyping was found analyzing the variables “role of central character”, “age” and “argument”. With the highest odds-ratio found within the variable “role of central character” in the primetime part, the odds that women were portrayed as dependent during this day part were more than four-and-a-half times the odds of men.

It was chosen to compare the findings of this study to the findings of a content analysis made by Craig in 1992, since they both investigate the differences of gender portrayals in television advertisements among the different day parts. Only some of the categories used by this study can be compared with the categories of the other study, due to the lack of some of them in the latter.

While both studies had more all adult males than all adult females in the category “characters” and the highest percentage of males was found during the weekend while the lowest was found during the daytime, this study found that the gap between the all adult males and all adult females was wider. Far less all adult women were found during weekend compared to primetime and daytime and all adult males were consistently more than the females, in all the day parts.

Whereas the content analysis from 1992 found that the autonomous role of the central character belonged mostly to male adults during daytime and primetime, and that during weekend men and women were portrayed in equal proportion in the two categories, in this study it can be seen that a vast majority of central characters of both genders were portrayed as having autonomous roles, but women were four times more likely to have a dependent role compared to men.

In the other study home products were advertised mostly by males during daytime, while in primetime and weekend both genders advertised home products in equal proportion. This study found that at least 60% of both men and women were central characters advertising home products in all day parts.

The primary setting of advertisements was a home setting during daytime and an away from home setting during primetime and weekend according to the findings of the content analysis by Craig, while this

study found that the home setting was the most prominent one for both males and females (60% to 70%) in all the day parts.

The findings of both studies regarding the sex of the narrator show that a high majority of narrators are male, in all the day parts. The highest number of male narrators are found during the weekend and the lowest during daytime in both studies. This study shows that the number of female narrators increased consistently (47.7% during daytime, 54.1% during primetime and 48.6% during weekend).

The findings of this study highlighted that gender role portrayals are still stereotyped, and a study by Stankiewicz and Rosselli (2008) found that sexual objectification of women actually increased in media images. According to them, it was a response to female independence imagery, justified by the fears men have about female empowerment, that lead advertisers to the choice of depicting something that does not correspond to social reality but that appeases those fears.

Despite the mirror argument being favoured by the most recent study on gender role portrayal (Eisend, 2011), Verhellen, Dans and Pelsmacker (2016) question this theory because, if advertisements mirrored society, then gender role portrayals would be less stereotyped and they would evolve with the changing values and norms in society.

Moreover, the perception of costumers or potential costumers appears different from the perception of advertisers. Van Hellemont and Van Den Bulck (2013) found that the degree of tolerance of advertising professionals towards a more stereotyped representation of the genders is higher than the one of consumers.

If advertisements were to portray men and women as fitting in specific outdated gender roles not accepted by the consumers, who are on the receptive end of the communication, it could lead to consumers not getting the message the advertisement wanted to send.

Resorting to a less stereotyped representation of gender roles could benefit both western societies and the companies advertising for the people belonging to them.

Limitations and future research

The main limitation of this study consist in the low number of people watching the recorded advertisements, since only one person analyzed them.

Another limitation is the very low number of existing studies regarding the investigation of difference in gender portrayals in different day parts.

Future research is needed in order to better understand the state of gender stereotyping in the different day parts both regarding the coding categories broadly and its subcategories specifically. It would be interesting to search for association among subcategories of the most used coding categories and it could

be useful to increase the number of gender portrayal analysis of television advertisements of different European countries, in order to find differences in stereotyping but also to compare stereotyping among different cultures.

Furthermore, considering that the majority of studies were made in the 1970s, 1980s, 1990s and 2000s, with only a few studies being published after 2010, it would be interesting and socially relevant to investigate if and how gender portrayal is stereotyped even with societal progress and in a period when women are more well-represented in categories and careers more historically associated with men.

Final conclusions

This study found high degrees of gender stereotyping in many categories, but no statistically significant difference in stereotyping among the different day parts. In light of the methodological limitations of this study and its conflicting results with previous studies, further research is needed on this matter.

References

- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday/Anchor.
- Ashmore, R.D. & Del Boca, F. K. (1981). Conceptual approaches to stereotypes and stereotyping. In Hamilton, D. L. (ed.) *Cognitive Processes in Stereotyping and Intergroup behavior*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 1-35.
- Ashmore, R. D., & Tumia, M. (1980). Sex stereotypes and implicit personality theory: I. A personality description approach to the assessment of sex stereotypes. *Sex Roles*, 6, 501–518.
- Barner, M. R. (1999). Sex-role stereotyping in FCC-mandated children's educational television. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media*, 43, 551–564.
- Belk, S. S., & Snell, W. E., Jr. (1986). Beliefs about women: Components and correlates. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 12, 403–413.
- Bergen, D. J., & Williams, J. E. (1991). Sex stereotypes in the United States revisited: 1972–1988. *Sex Roles*, 24, 413–423.
- Berndt, T. J., & Heller, K. A. (1986). Gender stereotypes and social inferences: A developmental study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 889–898.
- Bretl, D. J. & Cantor J. (1988). The Portrayal of Men and Women in U.S. Television Commercials: A Recent Content Analysis and Trend Over 15 Years. *Sex Roles*, Vol. 18, Nos 9/10.
- Bridges, J. S., & Orza, A. M. (1993). Effects of maternal employment-childrearing pattern on college students' perceptions of a mother and her child. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 17, 103–117.
- Brigham, J. C. (1971a). Ethnic stereotypes. *Psychological Bulletin*, 76, 15–33.
- Broverman, I. K., Vogel, S. R., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., & Rosenkrantz, P. S. (1972). Sexrole stereotypes: A current appraisal. *Journal of Social Issues*, 28(2), 59–78.
- Burgess, D., & Borgida, E. (1999). Who women are, who women should be: Descriptive and prescriptive gender stereotyping in sex discrimination. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 5, 665–692.
- Candler, J. (1991). Woman car buyer—Don't call her a Niche anymore. *Advertising Age*, January 21, 28.
- Carter, D. B., & McCloskey, L. A. (1983–1984). Peers and the maintenance of sex-typed behavior: The development of children's conceptions of cross-gender behavior in their peers. *Social Cognition*, 2, 294–314.
- Costa, P., Jr., Terracciano, A., & McCrae, R. R. (2001). Gender differences in personality traits across cultures: Robust and surprising findings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, 322–331.
- Costrich, N., Feinstein, J., Kidder, L., Marecek, J., & Pascale, L. (1975). When stereotypes hurt: Three studies of penalties for sex-role reversals. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 11, 520–530.
- Courtney, A. E., & Whipple, T. W. (1983). *Sex stereotyping in advertising*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Cowan M. L. & Stewart B.J. (1977). *A methodological study of sex stereotypes*. Sex Roles, Springer.

- Craig, R. S. (1992). The Effect of Television Day Part on Gender Portrayals in Television Commercials: A Content Analysis. *Sex Roles*, Vol. 26, Nos. 5/6.
- Csizma, K. A., Wittig, A. F., & Schurr, K. T. (1988). Sport stereotypes and gender. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 10, 62–74.
- Dambrot, F. H., Papp, M. E., & Whitmore, C. (1984). The sex-role attitudes of three generations of women. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 10, 469–473.
- Deaux, K., & Kite, M. E. (1993). Gender stereotypes. In F. Denmark & M. Paludi (Eds.), *Psychology of women: A handbook of issues and theories* (pp. 107–139). New York: Greenwood Press.
- Deaux, K., & LaFrance, M. (1998). Gender. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed., Vol. 1, pp. 788–827). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Deaux, K. & Lewis, L. L. (1984) Structure of gender stereotypes: interrelationships among components and gender label. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46(5), pp. 991 – 1004.
- Deaux, K., Winton, W., Crowley, M, & Lewis, L. L. (1985). Level of categorization and content of gender stereotypes. *Social Cognition*, 3, 145–167.
- De Lisi, R., & Soundranayagam, L. (1990). The conceptual structure of sex role stereotypes in college students. *Sex Roles*, 23, 593–611.
- Der-Karabetian, A., & Smith, A.J. (1977). Sex-role stereotyping in the United States. Is it changing? *Sex Roles*, 3, 193–198.
- Di Dio, L., Saragovi, C., Koestner, R., & Aube, J. (1996). Linking personal values to gender. *Sex Roles*, 34, 621–636.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review*, 109, 573–598.
- Eagly, A. H., & Mladinic, A. (1989). Gender stereotypes and attitudes toward women and men. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 15, 543–558.
- Eagly, A. H., Mladinic, A., & Otto, S. (1991). Are women evaluated more favorably than men?: An analysis of attitudes, beliefs, and emotions. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 15, 203–216.
- Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (1999). The origins of sex differences in human behavior: Evolved dispositions versus social roles. *American Psychologist*, 54, 408–423.
- Eberhardt, J. L., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). Motivating individuals to change: What is a target to do? In C. N. Macrae, C. Stangor, & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *Stereotypes and stereotyping* (pp. 369–415). New York: Guilford Press.
- Eisend, M. (2010). A Meta-Analysis of Gender Roles in Advertising. *J. of the Acad. Mark. Sci.*
- Ellis, L. J. and Bentler, P. M. (1973). Traditional sex-determined role standards and sex stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 25: 28–34.

- Engel, A. (1994). Sex roles and gender stereotyping in young women's participation in sport. *Feminism and Psychology*, 4, 439–448.
- England, E. M. (1992). College student gender stereotypes: Expectations about the behavior of male subcategory members. *Sex Roles*, 26, 699–716.
- Etaugh, C., Levine, D., & Mennella, A. (1984). Development of sex biases in children: 40 years later. *Sex Roles*, 10, 913–924.
- Etaugh, C., & Stern, J. (1984). Person-perception: Effects of sex, marital status, and sex-typing occupation. *Sex Roles*, 11, 413–424.
- Etaugh, C., & Study, G. G. (1989). Perceptions of mothers: Effects of employment status, marital status, and age of child. *Sex Roles*, 20, 59–70.
- European Parliament. (2008). Report on how marketing and advertising affect equality between women and men. Retrieved January 16, 2018 from <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?type=REPORT&reference=A6-2008-0199&language=EN&mode=XML>
- Fagot, B. I. (1977). Consequences of moderate cross gender behavior in preschool children. *Child Development*, 48, 902–907.
- Fagot, B. I. (1978). The influence of sex of child on parental reaction to toddler children. *Child Development*, 49, 459–465.
- Feingold, A. (1998). Gender stereotyping for sociability, dominance, character, and mental health: A meta-analysis of findings from the bogus stranger paradigm. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*, 124, 253–270.
- Fiske, S. T., & Stevens, L. E. (1993). What's so special about sex?: Gender stereotyping and discrimination. In S. Oskamp & M. Costanzo (Eds.), *Gender issues in contemporary society* (pp. 173–196). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Forsyth, D. R., Heiney, M. M., & Wright, S. S. (1997). Biases in appraisals of women leaders. *Group Dynamics*, 1, 98–103.
- Furnham, A. & Mak, T. (1999). Sex-role Stereotyping in Television Commercials: A Review and A Comparison of Fourteen Studies Done on Five Continents Over 25 Years. *Sex Roles*, Vol. 41, Nos 5/6.
- Furnham, A., & Skae, E. (1997) . Portrayals of men and women in British television advertisements. *European Psychologist*, 2, 14± 51.
- Furnham, A., & Voli, V. (1989) . Gender stereotyping in Italian television advertisements. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electric Media*, 33, 175± 185.
- Furnham, A., Mak, T., & Tanidjojo, L. (1998) . An Asian perspective on the portrayal of men and women in television advertisements: Studies from Hong Kong and Indonesian television. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, in press.

- Furnham, A., Babitzkow, M., & Ugucioni, S. (1999) . Gender stereotyping in television advertisements: A comparative study of French and Danish television. *Genetic, Social and General Psychology Monography*, in press.
- Ganahl, D. J., Prinsen, T. J., & Netzley, S. B. (2003b). A content analysis of prime time commercials: a contextual framework of gender representation. *Sex Roles*, 49, 545–551.
- Ganong, L. H., & Coleman, M. (1995). The content of mother stereotypes. *Sex Roles*, 32, 495–512.
- Ganong, L. H., Coleman, M., & Mapes, D. (1990). A meta-analytic review of family structure stereotypes. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 52, 287–297.
- Gerbner, G. (1999). The stories we tell. *Peace Review*, 11, 9–15.
- Gerbner, G., & Gross, L. (1976, April). The scary world of TV's heavy viewer. *Psychology Today*, pp. 41–45, 89.
- Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Morgan, M., Signorielli, N., & Shanahan, J. (2002). Growing up with television: Cultivation processes. In J. Bryant & D. Zillmann (Eds.), *Media effects: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 43–67). Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gibbons, J. L., Stiles, D. A., & Shkodriani, G. M. (1991). Adolescents' attitudes toward family and gender roles: An international comparison. *Sex Roles*, 25, 625–643.
- Gordon, R. (1962). *Stereotypy of imagery and belief as an ego defense*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Gough, H. G. and Heilbrun, A. B. (1965). *Adjective Checklist Manual*. Palo Alton, CA: Consulting Psychologists' Press.
- Green, R. J., & Ashmore, R. D. (1998). Taking and developing pictures in the head: Assessing the physical stereotypes of eight gender types. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 28, 1609–1636.
- Haddock, G., & Zanna, M. P. (1994). Preferring “housewives” to “feminists”: Categorization and the favorability of attitudes toward women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 18, 25–52.
- Hamilton, D. L., & Sherman, J. W. (1994). Stereotypes. In R. S. Wyer, Jr., & T. K. Srull (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Cognition* (2nd ed., pp. 59–82). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hamilton, D. L., Stroessner, S. J., & Driscoll, D. M. (1994). Social cognition and the study of stereotyping. In P. G. Devine, D. L. Hamilton, & T. M. Ostrom (Eds.), *Social cognition: Impact on social psychology* (pp. 291–321). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Haworth, G., Povey, R., & Clift, S. (1986). The Attitudes towards Women Scale (AWS-B): A comparison of women in engineering and traditional occupations with male engineers. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 25, 329–334.
- Heilman, M. E., Block, C. J., Martell, R. F., & Simon, M. C. (1989). Has anything changed?: Current characterizations of men, women, and managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 935–942.
- Helgeson, V. S. (1994). Prototypes and dimensions of masculinity and femininity. *Sex Roles*, 30, 653–682.

- Holbrook, M. B. (1987). Mirror, mirror, on the wall, what's unfair in the reflections on advertising? *Journal of Marketing*, 51, 95–103.
- Hort, B. E., Fagot, B. I., & Leinbach, M. D. (1990). Are people's notions of maleness more stereotypically framed than their notions of femaleness? *Sex Roles*, 23, 197–212.
- Huston, A. (1985). The development of sex-typing: Themes from recent research. *Developmental Review*, 5, 1–17.
- Jackman, M. R. (1994). *The velvet glove: Paternalism and conflict in gender, class, and race relations*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Jackman, M. R., & Senter, M. S. (1980). Images of social groups: Categorical or qualified? *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 44, 341–362.
- Jackson, L. M., Esses, V. M., & Burris, C. T. (2001). Contemporary sexism and discrimination: The importance of respect for men and women. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 48–61.
- Jackson, L. A., Hodge, C. N., & Ingram, J. M. (1994). Gender and self-concept: A reexamination of stereotypic differences and the role of gender attitudes. *Sex Roles*, 30, 615–630.
- Jones, R. A. (1982). Perceiving other people: Stereotyping as a process of social cognition. In A. G. Miller (Ed.), *In the eye of the beholder: Contemporary issues in stereotyping* (pp. 41–91). New York: Praeger.
- Katz, D., & Braly, K. (1933). Racial stereotypes in one hundred college students. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 28, 280–290.
- Katz, D., & Braly, K. (1935). Racial prejudice and racial stereotypes. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 30, 175–193.
- Kilbourne, W. E. (1986). An exploratory study of the effect of sex role stereotyping on attitudes towards magazine advertisements. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 14, 43–46.
- King, L. A., & King, D. W. (1985). Sex-role egalitarianism: Biographical and personality correlates. *Psychological Reports*, 57, 787–792.
- King, L. A., & King, D. W. (1990). Abbreviated measures of sex role egalitarian attitudes. *Sex Roles*, 23, 659–673.
- Komarovsky, M. (1950). Functional analyses of sex roles. *American Sociological Review*, 15: 508–16.
- Knoll, S. & Eisend, M. and Steinhagen J. (2011). Gender roles in advertising. Measuring and comparing gender stereotyping on public and private TV channels in Germany. *Int. Journal of Advertising*, 30(5), pp. 867-888.
- Langford, T., & Mackinnon, N. J. (2000). The affective bases for the gendering of traits: Comparing the United States and Canada. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 63, 34–48.
- Levin, J., & Levin, W. (1982). *The functions of discrimination and prejudice*. New York: Harper & Row.

- Lewin, M., & Tragos, L. M. (1987). Has the feminist movement influenced adolescent sex role attitudes?: A reassessment after a quarter century. *Sex Roles, 16*, 125–135.
- Lindsey, A. E., & Zakahi, W. R. (1996). Women who tell and men who ask: Perceptions of men and women departing from gender stereotypes during initial interaction. *Sex Roles, 34*, 767–786.
- Lippmann, W. (1922). *Public opinion*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.
- Lobel, T. E., Bempechat, J., Gewirtz, J. C., Shoken-Topaz, T., & Bashe, E. (1993). The role of gender-related information and self-endorsement of traits in preadolescents' inferences and judgments. *Child Development, 64*, 1285–1294.
- Lundstrom, W. J., & Sciglimpaglia, D. (1977). Sex role portrayals in advertising. *Journal of Marketing, 41*, 72–29.
- Manstead, A. S. R., & McCulloch, C. (1981). Sex-role stereotyping in British television advertisements. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 20*, 171± 180.
- Martin, C. L. (1990). Attitudes and expectations about children with nontraditional and traditional gender roles. *Sex Roles, 22*, 151–165.
- Mazzella, C., Durkin, K., Cerini, E., & Buralli, P. (1992). Sex role stereotyping in Australian television advertisements. *Sex Roles, 26*, 243± 259.
- McArthur, L. Z. & Resko, B. G. (1975). The Portrayal of Men and Women in American Television Commercials. *J. of Social Psychology*.
- McGhee, P. E., & Frueh, T. (1980). Television viewing and the learning of sex-role stereotypes. *Sex Roles, 6*, 179–188.
- McKee, J. P., & Sheriffs, A. C. (1957). The differential evaluation of males and females. *Journal of Personality, 25*, 356–371.
- Miller, A. G. (1982). Historical and contemporary perspectives on stereotyping. In A. G. Miller (Ed.), *In the eye of the beholder: Contemporary issues in stereotyping* (pp. 1–40). New York: Praeger.
- Milner, L.M. & Higgs, B. (2004) Gender sex-role portrayals in international television advertising over time: the Australian experience. *Journal of Current Issues and Research in Advertising, 26*(2), pp. 81–95.
- Moskowitz, D. S., Suh, E. J., & Desaulniers, J. (1994). Situational influences on gender differences in agency and communion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66*, 753–761.
- Mwangi, M. (1996). Gender roles portrayed in Kenyan television commercials. *Sex Roles, 34*, 205± 214.
- Nakdimen, K. A. (1984). The physiognomic basis of sexual stereotyping. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 141*, 499–503.
- Neto, F., & Pinto, I. (1998). Gender stereotypes in Portuguese television advertisements. *Sex Roles, 39*, 153 ± 164.

- Pellett, T. L. (1994). Children's stereotypical perceptions of physical activities: A K-12 analysis. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 79, 1128-1130.
- Pollay, R.W. (1986) The distorted mirror: reflections on the unintended consequences of advertising. *Journal of Marketing*, 50(2), pp. 18-38.
- Pollay, R. W. (1987). On the value of reflections on the values in "The Distorted Mirror". *Journal of Marketing*, 51, 104-109.
- Riedle, J. E. (1991). Exploring the subcategories of stereotypes: Not all mothers are the same. *Sex Roles*, 24, 711-723.
- Rojahn, K., & Willemsen, T. M. (1994). The evaluation of effectiveness and likability of gender-role congruent and gender-role incongruent leaders. *Sex Roles*, 30, 109-119.
- Rosenkrantz, P., Vogel, S. R., Bee, H., Broverman, I. K., & Broverman, D. M. (1968). Sex-role stereotypes and self-concepts in college students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 32, 287-295.
- Rosenwasser, S. M., Gonzales, M. H., & Adams, V. (1985). Perception of a housewife: The effects of sex, economic productivity, and subject background variables. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 9, 258-264.
- Rudman, L. A. (1998). Self-promotion as a risk factor for women: The costs and benefits of counterstereotypical impression management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 629-645.
- Rudmin, F. W. (1989). The pleasure of serendipity in historical research: On finding "stereotype" in Morier's (1924) *Hajji Baba*. *Cross-Cultural Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 8-11.
- Sankis, L. M., Corbitt, E. M., & Widiger, T. A. (1999). Gender bias in the English language? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 1289-1295.
- Schein, V. E. (1973). The relationship between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57, 95-100.
- Schein, V. E. (1975). Relationships between sex role stereotypes and requisite management characteristics among female managers. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60, 340-344.
- Schneider, D. J. (1996). Modern stereotype research: Unfinished business. In C. N. Macrae, C. Stangor, & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *Stereotypes and stereotyping* (pp. 419-453). New York: Guilford Press.
- Schneider, D. J. (2004) *The Psychology of Stereotyping*. New York: Guilford Press
- Schneider, D. J., Hastorf, A. H., & Ellsworth, P. C. (1979). *Person perception* (2nd ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Schroeder, S. R. (1970). Usage of stereotypy as a descriptive term. *Psychological Record*, 20, 337-342.
- Sczesny, S., & Stahlberg, D. (2002). The influence of gender-stereotyped perfumes on leadership attribution. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 32, 815-828.

- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of hierarchy and oppression*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Signorelli, N. (1989). Television and conceptions about sex roles: Maintaining conventionality and the status quo. *Sex Roles*, 21, 341–360.
- Signorelli, N. & Morgan, M. (1996). Cultivation analysis: Research and practice. In M. B. Salwen & D. W. Stacks (Eds.), *An integrated approach to communication theory and research* (pp. 111–126). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Spence, J. T., & Buckner, C. E. (2000). Instrumental and expressive traits, trait stereotypes, and sexist attitudes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 24, 55–62.
- Stangor, C., & Lange, J. E. (1994). Mental representations of social groups: Advances in understanding stereotypes and stereotyping. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 26, pp. 357–416). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Stephan, W. G. (1985). Intergroup relations. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (3rd ed., Vol. 2, pp. 599–658). New York: Random House.
- Stephan, W. G. (1989). A cognitive approach to stereotyping. In D. Bar-Tal, C. F. Graumann, A. W. Kruglanski, & W. Stroebe (Eds.), *Stereotyping and prejudice: Changing conceptions* (pp. 37–57). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Tilby, P. J., & Kalin, R. (1980). Effects of sex-role deviant lifestyles in otherwise normal persons on the perception of maladjustment. *Sex Roles*, 6, 581–592.
- Twenge, J. M. (1999). Mapping gender: The multifactorial approach and the organization of genderrelated attributes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 23, 485–502.
- Twenge, J. M. (2001). Changes in women's assertiveness in response to status and roles: A crosstemporal meta-analysis, 1931–1993. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81, 133–145.
- Twenge, J. M., & Zucker, A. N. (1999). What is a feminist?: Evaluations and stereotypes in closed and open-ended responses. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 23, 591–605.
- Van Hellemon, C., & Van Den Bulck, H. (2013). Impacts of Advertisements that are Unfriendly to Women and Men. *International Journal of Advertising* 31 (3): 165–197.
- Verhellen Y., Dens N. & Pelsmacker P. (2016). A longitudinal content analysis of gender role portrayal in Belgian television advertising. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 2016. Vol. 22, No. 2, 170–188
- Vinacke, W. E. (1957) Stereotypes as social concepts. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 46(6), pp. 229 – 243.
- Werner, P. D., & LaRussa, G. W. (1985). Persistence and change in sex-role stereotypes. *Sex Roles*, 12, 1089–1100.
- Whitehead, J. M. (1996). Sex stereotypes, gender identity and subject choice at A-level. *Educational Research*, 38, 147–160.

Williams, J. E., & Bennett, S. M. (1975). The definition of sex stereotypes via the Adjective Check List. *Sex Roles, 1*, 327–337.

Williams, J. E., & Best, D. L. (1977). Sex stereotypes and trait favorability on the Adjective Check List. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 37*, 101–110.

Williams, J. E. & Best, D. L. (1982). *Measuring Sex Stereotypes: A Thirty-Nation Study* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Williams, J. E. & Best, D. L. (1990). *Measuring Sex Stereotypes: A Multination Study* (rev. edn). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Wolff, L., & Taylor, S. E. (1979). Sex, sex-role identification, and awareness of sex-role stereotypes. *Journal of Personality, 47*, 177–184.

Wolin, L.D. (2003) Gender issues in advertising – an oversight of research: 1970–2002. *Journal of Advertising Research, 43*(1), pp. 111–129.

Appendix 1

Coding

CHARACTERS

- “all male adult”
- “all female adult”
- “all adult, mixed gender”
- “male adults with children or teens (no women)”
- “female adults with children or teens (no men)”
- “mixture of ages and genders”

CENTRAL CHARACTER

- “male”
- “female”
- “unclear”

MODE OF PRESENTATION

- “visual”
- “voice-over”

BASIS FOR THE CREDIBILITY (OF THE PRIMARY CHARACTER)

- “Product user”
 - Personal experience
 - Celebrity
 - Apparent personal experience
- “Authority”
 - Expert
 - Apparent expert
 - Company representative

ROLE (OF THE PRIMARY CHARACTER)

- “Dependent/Relative to others”:
 - parent
 - spouse
 - homemaker
 - boy-/girlfriend
 - sex-object
 - decorative
- “Autonomous/Independent from others”:
 - professional
 - worker
 - celebrity
 - interviewer/narrator

AGE (OF THE PRIMARY CHARACTER)

- “Young”
- “Middle-aged”
- “Old

SETTING

- “Home settings”: - kitchen
 - bathroom
 - other room in the house
 - outdoor at home
- “Away settings”: - restaurants/bars
 - business
 - school
 - outdoors away from home

PRODUCT TYPE

- “Home products”:
 - foodstuffs
 - body care
 - household items
 - pet-related items
 - toys
 - medications
- “Away products”:
 - travel
 - banks/money
 - restaurants
 - cars
 - other

ARGUMENT

- “Scientific”
- “Non-scientific”

SEX OF THE NARRATOR (if present)²

- “Male”
- “Female”

REWARDS OFFERED OR REAPED BY THE PRIMARY CHARACTER

- “Social enhancement”: - opposite sex approval
 - family approval
 - friend’s approval
 - social advancement
 - career advancement
 - other
- “Self enhancement”: - psychological improvement
 - attractiveness
 - cleanliness
 - health
 - other
- “Practical rewards”: - saving time
 - saving money
- “Other”

The first categories are preceded by the symbol “•”, while the second ones are preceded by the symbol “-”.