

Summer 7-2008

# The Face of Society


Roger D. Clark

*Rhode Island College*, [rclark@ric.edu](mailto:rclark@ric.edu)

Alex Nunes

*Rhode Island College*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.ric.edu/facultypublications>

 Part of the [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), [Gender and Sexuality Commons](#), and the [Race and Ethnicity Commons](#)

---

## Citation

Clark, R., & Nunes, A. (2008). The face of society: gender and race in introductory Sociology books revisited. *Teaching Sociology*, 36(3), 227-239. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0092055x0803600303>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons @ RIC. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ RIC. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@ric.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@ric.edu).

# Teaching Sociology

<http://tso.sagepub.com/>

---

## **The Face of Society : Gender and Race in Introductory Sociology Books Revisited**

Roger Clark and Alex Nunes  
*Teaching Sociology* 2008 36: 227  
DOI: 10.1177/0092055X0803600303

The online version of this article can be found at:  
<http://tso.sagepub.com/content/36/3/227>

---

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



American Sociological Association

**Additional services and information for *Teaching Sociology* can be found at:**

**Email Alerts:** <http://tso.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

**Subscriptions:** <http://tso.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

**Reprints:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

**Permissions:** <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

**Citations:** <http://tso.sagepub.com/content/36/3/227.refs.html>

## THE FACE OF SOCIETY: GENDER AND RACE IN INTRODUCTORY SOCIOLOGY BOOKS REVISITED\*

*We have updated Ferree and Hall's (1990) study of the way gender and race are constructed through pictures in introductory sociology textbooks. Ferree and Hall looked at 33 textbooks published between 1982 and 1988. We replicated their study by examining 3,085 illustrations in a sample of 27 textbooks, most of which were published between 2002 and 2006. We found important areas of progress in the presentation of both gender and race as well as significant areas of stasis. The face of society we found depicted in contemporary textbooks was distinctly less likely to be that of a white man, very prominent in the 1980s texts, and much more likely to be that of a minority woman. Thus, while only 34 percent of the pictures of identifiable individuals in the textbooks examined by Ferree and Hall were of women, almost 50 percent of such pictures were of women in the recent texts. Moreover, while the percentage of white men portrayed dropped from about 45 percent to 30 percent, the percentage of portrayals of minority women rose from about 11 percent to 22 percent. Another sign of progress has been the decreasing likelihood of textbooks to depict race and gender as being nonoverlapping categories: while women of color apparently "had" only race in the sample examined by Ferree and Hall, they "had" both gender and race in the sample we studied. Still, our examination of pictures as a whole as a unit of analysis found that blacks continue to be more likely than any other racial group to be depicted in the presence of other racial groups and, thus, to idealize the degree of social integration in American society. We also still see non-white women enjoying very little (in fact, no) visibility in sections devoted to theory, despite developments in feminist theory, generally, and multicultural feminist, specifically. In general, though, our analysis suggests that the various criticisms of introductory texts that have appeared in this forum and others can have an impact on the content of those texts and, by extension, the sociology we teach.*

---

**ROGER CLARK**

*Rhode Island College*

**ALEX NUNES**

*Rhode Island College*

THE INTRODUCTORY SOCIOLOGY COURSE is probably students' first exposure to the concepts and concerns of the discipline, and for many students, it is also their last. It is most likely taught with an introductory textbook, whose content is supposed to reflect the

concerns and interests of sociologists generally and, ideally, some realities of society itself. That introductory textbooks often fail to achieve either of these goals is undoubtedly less a function of the efforts of introductory textbook authors to achieve them than of the difficulty of keeping up with the many subdisciplines that constitute sociology (see, e.g., Hamilton and Form 2003, Schweingruber and Wohlstein 2005) and of striking a balance among many valued ends. One of the functions, then, of forums such as *Teaching Sociology* and other journals has become the provision of feedback to the authors, or at least the faculty users, of our

---

\*We would like to thank the Rhode Island College Faculty Research Committee for a grant that enabled this research. Please address all correspondence to Roger Clark at Rhode Island College, 600 Mount Pleasant Avenue, Providence, RI 02908; e-mail: rclark@ric.edu.

Editor's note: The reviewers were, in alphabetical order, Diane Gillespie and David Schweingruber.

introductory textbooks, and such feedback has been forthcoming. The purpose of this paper is to assess the degree to which one kind of feedback about introductory sociology textbooks, that of Ferree and Hall (1990) about textbooks' depiction of gender and race in society, is reflected in a new generation of such textbooks.

Ferree and Hall, of course, have not provided the only feedback to authors and publishers of introductory sociology texts. The year before Ferree and Hall's piece appeared in 1990, Mathisen (1989) opined that introductory texts should stop treating "common sense" negatively. Ferree and Hall's piece seemed to inspire a wave of articles focusing on groups that were omitted or whose presentation was in some other way inappropriate: Najafizadeh and Menerick (1992) observed that texts paid little attention to Third World education; Marquez (1994) noted that textbooks offered a distorted image of "Hispanic" women; Stone (1996) observed that racial and ethnic minorities tend to be ghettoized and marginalized in texts; and Taub and Fanflik (2000) criticized textbooks for their limited information about disability. There were critiques that asserted that introductory textbooks provided inadequate approaches to inequality or stratification: Lucal (1994) found that the majority of introductory texts offered distributional, rather than relational, approaches to social stratification and therefore did not promote a consciousness of oppression and privilege; Ferree and Hall (1996) showed that texts segregated their discussions of race, class, and gender, rather than showing them as interactive in stratification processes; Hall (2000) argued that poverty information is too concentrated in discussions of class and not enough a part of discussions of race and gender; and Hamilton and Form (2003) asserted that the categories of race, ethnicity, and religion used by the texts oversimplify social reality. Even more recently there have been articles that seem even more radical in their critiques of introductory texts. Best and Schweingruber (2003), for instance,

claimed that many of the concepts introduced in texts are rarely used by practicing sociologists themselves. Nolan (2003) suggested that by using exaggeration, distortion, and simple untruths about social phenomena, texts run the risk of engendering distrust and cynicism in students. Keith and Ender (2004a, 2004b) and Schweingruber (2004) debated whether sociology as a discipline has a "core" and whether this core, such as it is, is adequately reflected in our introductory texts. Wagenaar (2004) argued that certain topics covered by current texts are not seen as important by teaching sociologists, and Schweingruber and Wohlstein (2005) argue that textbook authors fail to keep up with all the fields they cover, particularly noting that introductory texts promote crowd myths that experts in collective behavior have debunked. The criticisms vary in the degree to which they may be easily and happily dealt with by authors and publishers of introductory sociology texts. It is, after all, one thing to commit to mainstreaming racial and ethnic minorities throughout a text (Stone 1996) and another to commit to demonstrating how sociology lacks the status of a science (Keith and Ender 2004a).

But do authors and publishers respond to published criticisms as they rework older introductory textbooks and prepare new ones, even when the problems addressed are amenable to change? There is some evidence that authors read such criticisms (see Macionis's [1989] response to Elaine Hall's [1988] insistence upon the inclusion and handling of gender.) We replicate Ferree and Hall's (1990) study based upon the examination of 33 introductory textbooks published between 1982 and 1988, using 27 textbooks published between 2002 and 2006 to ascertain the degree to which their critique of the visual presentation of gender and race has been addressed by a new generation of textbooks.

#### METHOD

We have replicated Ferree and Hall's

(1990) efforts by looking at three levels of visual portrayal in sociology textbooks: the depiction of individuals, the social composition of images as a whole, and the placement of pictures within a sociological topic area. The first level focused on the number of individuals in a picture, provided the individuals were brought sufficiently to the foreground to make their race- and gender-identities clear and salient to readers. In this, like Ferree and Hall, we were simply trying to discern which race and gender categories were given a presence in the textbook. The second level focused on the implicit social relationships among members in the race and gender categories. At this level, we were no longer asking only whether there were black women, for instance, but whether black women were given “frames of their own” rather than frames shared with others. The third level examined the degree to which pictures of certain race or gender categories were ghettoized into certain topical areas. Did one find, for instance, an overrepresentation of women in sections on gender or an underrepresentation of blacks in sections on theory?

We examined the pictorial presentation of race and gender in the 3,085 illustrations (photographs, cartoons, drawings) in 27 introductory sociology textbooks published in the United States between 2002 and 2006. We solicited all college-level textbooks listed in WorldCat under the topics of “sociology” and “sociological” and examined the most recent versions available to us. (See the Appendix for a list of the books we studied.) In most cases, the most recent version of the text was the most recent available to us. In only two cases (Eitzen and Baca Zinn 2007; Tischler 1999) did we use a book that fell outside the 2002-2006 target period. In the case of Eitzen and Baca Zinn, the 2007 edition was the one we received when we asked the publisher for an earlier edition, and it made sense to include the most recent edition in our sample. In the case of Tischler, the 1999 edition was the

most recent one we could obtain through interlibrary loan, despite our knowledge that more recent editions existed. We used this version on the assumption that it would make our sample more representative of the universe of “current” introductory sociology textbooks than if we did not use it. We believe that the inclusion of this text creates a sample that is slightly conservative in its estimates of the (positive) change that has occurred in sociology texts since the 1980s. Four of our 27 texts (Harvell 2005; Kunz and Stuart 2005; Russell 2005; Sharrock and Martin 2003) had either only one or two (usually cover) pictures with humans and therefore did not contribute much to the variation described below (where, again, individuals and pictures, not books themselves, were units of analysis).

The 27 textbooks we examined included 4,899 pictures. Like Ferree and Hall, we coded each picture as containing one of the following: no people, collectivities, or identifiable individuals. (Unless otherwise noted, our coding was consistent with theirs.) Like them, we coded each of the (3,085) pictures that contained identifiable individuals for the number of males and females, the number of whites, blacks, Asians, Hispanics, Native Americans, Middle Easterners, and people of “other” (usually “mixed”) races.

We coded pictures as a whole for the type of racial, ethnic and gender diversity depicted. We coded for whether members of a particular group were shown alone or with members of other groups. We were interested in the degree to which integration and segregation by race and gender was depicted.

Again, we coded each picture according to whether its image was set in the United States or elsewhere and whether it fell into any of 26 substantive subfields of sociology (e.g., gender, family, methods, etc.). We mention Ferree and Hall’s (sometimes referred to as “the earlier study’s” and “the 1980s study’s”) findings to provide context for our own.

## FINDINGS

### *Number of Individuals*

In our sample of 27 introductory sociological textbooks, there were 3,085 pictures containing a total of 6,598 coded individuals. In Ferree and Hall's study of 33 textbooks there were 3,948 pictures containing 15,721 coded individuals. We found a number of pictures comparable to that of Ferree and Hall, given that our sample was smaller by six books. However, we coded a smaller number of individuals within those pictures, possibly because we coded only recognizable individuals in the foreground of a picture and never more than seven or eight of those. We assumed that individuals in the background of pictures, beyond the first seven or eight individuals in the foreground, were not likely to affect reader perception of the social world created by the author(s).

The percentages of males and females in our sample, in contrast to those of the 1980s sample, were similar to real population parameters. As suggested by Table 1 (in which all percentages are rounded to the nearest full percent), women and girls accounted for 50 percent (really 49.6 percent) of all individuals in our textbooks, as compared to 36 percent of all individuals in the 1980s textbooks. Moreover, women and men were represented fairly evenly in each racial group in our 2002-2006 sample of textbooks. Women accounted for 47 percent of whites, 47 percent of blacks, 56 percent of Hispanics, and 56 percent of Asians. The 1980s study reported much less female inclusion by race; in their textbooks, women accounted for 36 percent of whites, 36 percent of blacks, 33 percent of Hispanics and 40 percent of Asians.

Some races were overrepresented and others underrepresented when compared to population parameters. Blacks, who made up 12.3 percent of the U.S. population in 2000 according to the U.S. census (U.S. Bureau of the Census), were 18.2 percent of all individuals in pictures set in the United States in 2002-2006 textbooks. Whites made up about three quarters of the American

population in 2000 but were only 66 percent of all individuals set in the United States in our textbooks. Hispanics were also underrepresented, making up 6.3 percent of individuals in our textbook, despite being 12.5 percent of the U.S. population in 2000. In Ferree and Hall's study, whites were 79 percent of the individuals, blacks 14 percent, and other nonwhites 8 percent. At the time blacks made up 12 percent and other nonwhites 8 percent of the U.S. population. Pictures of blacks are overrepresented even more in today's textbooks than they were in the 1980s sample, which helps explain why the representation of whites has declined, and this may reflect an appropriate concern for problems associated with race on the part of textbook authors. Still, it appears that authors have not yet found ways to adequately depict (and perhaps talk about?) the boom in America's Latino population.

Of all the individuals depicted in our textbooks white men accounted for 30 percent, white women 27 percent, minority men 20 percent and minority women 22 percent. In the 1980s sample, 45 percent of the individuals portrayed in the texts were white men, 26 percent were white women, 19 percent were minority men and 11 percent were minority women. This is another indication that females and minorities have gained greater inclusion in sociology textbooks since the 1980s. In particular, minority women are about twice as visible in the 2000s texts as they were in the 1980s texts.

### *Segregation and Integration in Picture Composition*

Following Ferree and Hall, we next examined the picture as the unit of analysis. Sixty-three percent of the pictures we examined had codeable individuals, as compared to 73 percent in Ferree and Hall's sample. This difference, again, probably in large part reflects our tougher standard for counting individuals as codeable—that is, that they not be incidental to the picture, appearing only in the background of whatever is clearly the focus of the image. Consequently, we expected that the percentage of

**Table 1. Comparison of the Gender, Race, and Geographic Locale of All Individuals Portrayed in U.S. Introductory Textbooks: 1982-1988 (Ferree and Hall) Sample and 2002-2006 Sample**

	Total	
	All Individuals 1982-1988 (N=15,721) Percent	All Individuals 2002-2006 (N=6,598) Percent
Men and Boys	64	50
White	45	30
Minority	19	20
Women and girls	36	50
White	26	27
Minority	11	22

Gender by Race		
Whites	100	100
Men and boys	64	53
Women and girls	34	47
Blacks	100	100
Men and boys	64	53
Women and girls	36	47
Hispanics	100	100
Men and boys	67	44
Women and girls	33	56
Asians	100	100
Men and boys	60	44
Women and girls	40	56

	Racial Distribution of Individuals Located in United States			
	1980	Census Percent	2000	Census Percent
Non-Hispanic whites	79	80	66	69
Non-Hispanic blacks	14	12	18	12
Hispanics			6	13
Other nonwhites	8	8	10	6

pictures that included codeable males and females would be smaller in our sample than in the 1980s sample of pictures. That was, in fact, the case. Significantly, though, and as Table 2 shows, the comparative invisibility of males in our sample is much greater than the comparative invisibility of females: 57 percent of our pictures with codeable individuals were of men or boys, as compared to 81 percent of the earlier

pictures contained women or girls, as compared to 56 percent of the 1980s sample. And while Ferree and Hall found that more than twice as many pictures of individuals contained exclusively men than contained exclusively women (44 percent to 19 percent), we found that men were only about a third more likely, in the recent sample, to appear without women than women were to appear without men (34 percent to 27 percent). Thus, while in the 1980s sample, 54

percent of pictures that showed men included only men and only 33 percent of pictures that showed women had only women in them, in the current sample, 59 percent of pictures with men showed only men and fully 54 percent of pictures with women showed only women.

To the extent that exclusive portrayal suggests greater sociological significance, men's pictorial dominance declined not only overall, but also by race. Thus, while Ferree and Hall found more than twice as many pictures containing whites showed only white men compared to only white women (39 percent to 16 percent), we found that the difference was only about half again as much (37 percent to 25 percent), and while

they found more than twice as many pictures of other racial groups showed only men compared to only women (33 percent to 16 percent), we found that the difference was only about 2 percent (29 percent to 27 percent).

But while women were much more likely to have a "frame of their own" in our sample than in the sample from the 1980s, Black people were only slightly more likely to have one. In the 1980s sample, only 53 percent of pictures containing blacks contained only blacks, while 85 percent of pictures of whites and 81 percent of pictures of other racial or ethnic groups were exclusive portraits. In our sample the percentages were very similar: 55 percent of pictures

**Table 2. Overall Portrayal and Exclusive Portrayal of Gender and Race Groups for Pictures and Individuals: 1982-1988 (Ferree and Hall) Sample and 2002-2006 Sample**

	Pictures with Individuals 1982-1988 (N=3,948)		Pictures with Individuals 2002-2006 (N=1,814)	
	A* Percent	B* Percent	A Percent	B Percent
Contains any men	81	100	57	100
Only men	44	54	34	59
Contains any women	56	100	50	100
Only women	19	33	27	54
Contains any whites		100		100
Only whites		85		83
Only white men		39		37
Only white women		16		25
Contains any other racial ethnic groups (including blacks)		100		100
Only other men		28		29
Only other women		14		27
Contains any blacks		100		100
Only blacks		53		55
Contains any other racial ethnic groups (excluding blacks)		100		100
Only others		81		79
Contains any blacks in United States		100		100
Only blacks in United States		44		51
Contains any other racial ethnic groups (excluding blacks) in United States		100		100
Only others in United States		67		70

\*Column A = overall portrayal and exclusive portrayal as percentage of all pictures with people; column B = exclusive portrayal as percentage of overall portrayal.



with blacks were exclusively of blacks, 83 percent of pictures of whites were exclusively of whites, and 79 percent of pictures of other races or ethnic groups were exclusives. For U.S. settings, the 1980s study found that blacks were less likely than other minorities to have pictures of their own, giving an unrealistic impression, Ferree and Hall asserted, that blacks were more integrated into American society than others. Thus, while blacks in pictures from the U.S. appeared exclusively in 44 percent of pictures with blacks, other ethnic minorities appeared that way 67 percent of the time. Our sample was slightly more "realistic" in this respect: In our pictures set in the United States blacks appeared alone in 54 percent of the pictures that had blacks, while other ethnic minorities appeared that way 70 percent of the time.

#### *Stereotypes and Substantive Contexts*

We also followed Ferree and Hall to a third

level of analysis, examining the textbook topics of gender and race, as well as the association of race and gender groups with specific institutional topics (e.g., politics, the economy, etc.). We examined, as they did, only those pictures set in the United States, inasmuch as the meaning of race varies across cultures and most pictures (81 percent in the 1980s sample; 78 percent in ours) were set in the United States.

Like Ferree and Hall, we considered a race or gender category over- or underrepresented when the percentage of race or gender pictures in a certain topic area differed by 10 percentage points or more from the number of pictures devoted to that group in all U.S.-based pictures. Thus, as indicated at the bottom of Table 3, 62 percent of the pictures that contained individuals in the United States in our sample contained any women. This was up from 58 percent in the earlier sample. So a topic was overly associated with women if women

**Table 3. Gender and Race Composition of Pictures with Individuals Set in the United States by Placement with Selected Sociological Topics: 1982-1988 (Ferree and Hall) Sample and 2002-2006 Sample**

Topic	Pictures of Individuals in the United States that Contain							
	White Men Only		Any Women		Any Non-Whites		Any Non-White Women	
	80s%	00s%	80s%	00s%	80s%	00s%	80s%	00s%
Gender	19	11	77	84	17	33	12	34
Race	10	5	54	61	76	89	39	63
Theory	40	49	51	30	17	21	7	0
Methods	39	28	52	57	25	39	10	32
Sexuality	10	10	90	84	14	26	10	19
Age	23	21	74	72	16	23	17	16
Family	8	10	91	87	28	37	24	34
Education	11	18	79	72	52	54	34	44
Health	37	16	61	79	16	29	11	23
Population	24	22	66	72	37	38	27	31
Politics	55	45	36	39	17	32	6	17
Technology and Sports	41	50	39	42	25	25	5	17
Total Percentages	31	25	58	62	29	31	15	31

were in 72 percent of its pictures or more; it was underassociated with women if 52 percent or fewer of its pictures contained women. Importantly, all of our baseline percentages differed significantly from those representing Ferree and Hall's sample and all suggested substantially less focus in the 2002-2006 sample on white men than in the 1982-1988 sample and substantially more focus on previously more marginalized groups (women, nonwhites, and particularly nonwhite women). Thus, while fully 31 percent of the 3,158 pictures containing individuals shown in the United States in Ferree and Hall's sample contained *only* white men, only 25 percent of the comparable 2,351 pictures in our sample did so. Fifty-eight percent of their pictures contained *any* women, while 62 percent of ours did; 29 percent of their pictures contained at least one member of a nonwhite race, while 38 percent of ours did; and only 15 percent of theirs contained a female member of a nonwhite racial category, while fully 31 percent (or more than twice as many) of ours did. Ferree and Hall did not report on the percentage of pictures that had any men in them. We found that 69 percent of our pictures depicted at least one man (as compared to the 62 percent that depicted at least one woman).

The much greater presence of nonwhite women in the 2000s sample was reflected in changes that occurred in sections that focus on gender too. These sections were not only the domain of pictures with women in the 1980s sample, but more particularly of white women. Seventy-seven percent of their pictures illustrating gender had women, but only 12 percent contained nonwhite women. Gender sections of our texts were also overly associated with women (84 percent of their pictures contained women), but they also contained about three times as many pictures of nonwhite women (34 percent showed women of color) as gender sections in the 1980s texts. Moreover, while only 26 percent of the pictures in the 1982-1988 sample that showed any women showed women of color, 51 percent of the

pictures in the 2002-2006 sample that showed any women showed women of color. And, while only 16 percent of pictures of women in the gender sections in the 1980s sample included at least one woman of color, fully 41 percent of such pictures in the later sample did so. Another interesting change since the 1980s is the degree to which men became a less significant presence in sections devoted to gender. While in the 1980s group of texts about 20 percent of pictures with people in gender sections exclusively portrayed males, that percentage was about halved in our sample (11 percent). Moreover, while Ferree and Hall reported that there were half again as many pictures devoted to white men exclusively as there were pictures that contained *any* women of color, there were more than three times as many pictures that contained women of color (60) in our gender sections than pictures that had white men exclusively (19). In fact, more pictures were of women of color exclusively (21) than of white men exclusively (19). So while, as Ferree and Hall pointed out, in the 1980s texts, gender seemed most frequently embodied by white women, often embodied by white men, and rarely embodied by women of color, in the more recent texts, gender seemed most frequently embodied by white women, frequently embodied by women of color, and less frequently embodied by white men.

Not surprisingly, perhaps, the subject of race is even more dominated by nonwhites today than it was in the 1980s. In the 1980s sample, 76 percent of the pictures in sections devoted to race contained some nonwhites; today, the proportion is 89 percent. Then, 39 percent contained nonwhite women; today, 63 percent contain them. In the 1980s, there were more than three times as many pictures of women of color in the section on race than there were in the section on gender (84 compared to 23), but in the recent sample the difference was much smaller (101 compared to 60), suggesting that women of color are now less defined by their race and more by their gender than they were 20 years ago. The fraction of

pictures in the current sample containing white men (5 percent) was half the already small fraction (10 percent) it was in the 80s sample, suggesting that white men have even less "race" than they did in the 1980s sample.

There are also some notable changes in sociology's presentation of itself through sections on sociological theory and methods in the recent texts. At least one of these changes was distressing. Pictures in the theory sections of the 2000s texts underrepresented nonwhite women to a considerably greater degree (0 percent of these had any nonwhite women, compared to the 31 percent of all pictures that did so) than did pictures in the theory sections of the 1980s texts (where 7 percent had any nonwhite women, when 15 percent of all pictures in those texts did so). Thus, while white men, including C. Wright Mills and George Herbert Mead, made occasional appearances and white women (notably Jane Addams) and nonwhite men (notably W.E.B. DuBois) made even more frequent appearances in theory sections, we found no women of color used even in illustrations of theories, much less in pictures of theorists themselves.

In the methods sections of the current texts, there was no substantial overrepresentation or underrepresentation of any group examined here: white men, women, nonwhites or nonwhite women. But partly because nonwhite women were so much more present in the 2000s texts than they were in the 1980s texts (31 percent as compared to 15 percent overall), they were more than three times as present in the current methods sections as they were in methods sections of the 1980s texts (they appeared in 32 percent of that section's pictures this time, as compared to 10 percent in the 1980s).

Women are not just overrepresented in the sections on gender in the current texts. They also exceed their level of general visibility (in 62 percent of all pictures in those texts) in sections on sexuality (where they appear in 84 percent of the pictures), age (where they appear in 72 percent of the pic-

tures), family (87 percent of the pictures), education (72 percent), health (79 percent), and population (72 percent). They were also overrepresented in sections on sexuality, age, family and education in the 1980s sample, according to Ferree and Hall, but not in health and population. Men are not just underrepresented in sections on gender (where only 44 percent of the pictures contained any men, compared to 69 percent in the whole texts), but also in sections on sexuality (where the percentage of pictures that contained any men is 42 percent) and collective behavior (where it is 52 percent). Nonwhites and nonwhite women are not just overrepresented in the sections on race, but also in sections on education (where nonwhites and nonwhite women appeared in 54 percent and 49 percent of the pictures, respectively). Ferree and Hall found this kind of overrepresentation in education for both nonwhites and nonwhite women in the 1980s texts as well.

Looking at specific institutions more generally, we found in the 2000s texts, as Ferree and Hall did in the 1980s texts, that white men were disproportionately depicted in politics. Thus, white men appeared alone in 45 percent of the pictures in sections on politics (as compared to 25 percent in all of the pictures in the 2000s texts). Moreover, 92 percent of all pictures in sections on politics showed *any* men, as compared to 69 percent of all pictures in all sections. Politics, then, still seems to be an area associated with men in current sociology texts. Interestingly, while women and nonwhites were underrepresented in sections on politics in the 1980s textbooks, only women (and not nonwhite women) were underrepresented in those sections in the 2000s texts, with only 39 percent of the pictures in those sections containing *any* women.

White men, and men generally, were much more overrepresented in sections on technology and sports, where white men only were the focus of 50 percent of the pictures in the 2000s sample, and where *any* men appeared in 83 percent of the pictures, than they were in the 1980s sample. The

androcentric approach to these topics is particularly curious given women's increased visibility in college sports since Title IX was passed in 1972, but even since the middle 1980s, when the approach to these areas was less androcentric. Nonwhites and nonwhite women were underrepresented in sections on technology and sports, indicating that the awareness of integration in American schools that is evident in the education sections is not on display in sections on technology and sports.

### CONCLUSIONS

The comparison of sociology texts published from 2002 to 2006 with those published between 1982 and 1988 yields about as many striking differences as similarities. The current texts are much more gender balanced than the texts studied by Ferree and Hall (1990). Almost 50 percent of the pictures of identifiable individuals were of women in the recent texts, while only 34 percent of such pictures were of women in the 1980s texts. Moreover, the increase in gender balance is almost completely due to decreases in the visibility of white men and increases in the visibility of minority women: while the percentage of individuals portrayed who were white men dropped from about 45 percent to 30 percent, the percentage that were minority women rose from about 11 percent to 22 percent.

The face of society, as depicted in introductory sociology textbooks, has become distinctly less masculine, more like that of a minority woman, by other measures as well. While the ratio of pictures that contained only white men to those that contained only white women dropped by nearly 80 percent between the 1980s and the 2000s, the ratio of pictures that contained only minority men to those that contained only minority women dropped by roughly 95 percent.

Another substantial difference between the 1980s texts and the current group is in the degree to which the section on gender focuses on women of color. Ferree and Hall

could fairly say that "the invisibility of women of color in the discussion of gender underlines the extent to which women and minorities are conceived of as nonoverlapping categories" (1990:529). This is no longer the case in introductory sociology textbooks. In fact, in the current sample, women of color actually were more frequently seen in chapters on gender than white men, and now appeared in 41 percent of all pictures with any women, as opposed to only 16 percent of all such pictures in the 1980s sample.

This is not to say that women of color became less visible in the sections on race in the current sample. In fact, they were just over half again as visible in sections on race as they were in the earlier sample, pushing white men into such a marginal position in chapters on race that one is tempted to say that they (white men) were depicted as being even more "raceless" than they were in the earlier sample (where they were already fairly raceless).

The similarities between the 2000s sample and the 1980s sample are suggestive of ways in which other blinders persist for textbook writers and their publishers. One of these similarities is that blacks continue to be much more likely than any other racial group to be depicted in the presence of members of other racial groups. The implicit degree of social integration enjoyed by blacks is undoubtedly more idealized than real. Nonwhite women are much more evident today in sections on sociological methods than they were in the 1980s, but they are even less evident than they were in sections devoted to theory, despite all of their evident contributions to feminist theory (e.g., Anzaldúa 1999; Collins 1990, 1998; Espiritu 1997; hooks 1984, 1989; Spivak 1988; Trinh 1989). And it is not just that there are no pictures of multicultural feminists in theory sections; there is scarcely any mention of multicultural feminist theory there either.

We wondered whether what Ferree and Hall called "the prevalence of staged equality in some sectors . . . and not in others"

(1990:529) persisted in such a way as to suggest that blacks in the United States have “equal chances” but not “equal outcomes.” We did find, as they did in the 1980s texts, that blacks are overrepresented in sections on education in current texts but underrepresented in sections on politics (even while their underrepresentation in sections on the economy no longer persists). But when we examined pictures in current education sections more closely, we found that all of the overrepresentation of blacks reflected efforts to illustrate special problems in education, such as historic patterns of school segregation. These pictures do not give an impression that blacks have had “equal chances.”

One of the limitations of both the current study and Ferree and Hall’s (1990) is that they both assume that the authors and publishers of introductory textbooks would like to reflect society in the images they use. Given the recent debate over whether textbooks accurately reflect the discipline of sociology itself (e.g., Best and Schweingruber 2003; Hamilton and Form 2003; Nolan 2003; Schweingruber and Wohlstein 2005), it may seem odd to expect them to reflect the demographic and sociological realities of society as a whole. And even if they did, would we really prefer that the society so reflected be American society or some more or less global one? Another limitation of our study, and of the study it replicates, is that it treats the total population of introductory texts as a unit of analysis, failing to examine how images are actually and differentially used in different introductory texts.

Nonetheless, we surmise that the reimagining of society advocated by feminists and in particular by Ferree and Hall has led to some significant and useful changes in the picture of society presented in our introductory textbooks since the 1980s. Society as literally depicted in these texts is much less white and male, much more nonwhite and female. Women of color are now embraced in both our sections on race and gender.

To the extent that the current texts embody change advocated by Ferree and Hall

(1990), critics of the various ways in which introductory textbooks are misleading and misinforming students (e.g., by paying too little attention to Third World education, offering distorted images of “Hispanic” women, supplying too limited information about disability or ghettoizing racial and ethnic minorities) may take heart. When those criticisms make sense to authors and publishers and when they can be dealt with reasonably easily, they may have some, if not all, of their desired effects on the texts and perhaps even the texts’ audiences.

#### Appendix. Sample of 2002-2006 Introductory Sociology Textbooks

- Brinkerhoff, David B., Lynn K. White, Suzanne T. Ortega, and Rose Weitz. 2004. *Essentials of Sociology*. East Rutherford, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Brym, Robert J. and John Lie. 2006. *Sociology: Your Compass for a New World*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Curry, Timothy J., Robert M. Jibou, and Kent P. Schwirian. 2004. *Sociology for the Twenty-First Century*. East Rutherford, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Eitzen, D. Stanley and Maxine Baca Zinn. 2007. *In Conflict and Order: Understanding Society*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Ferrante, Joan. 2005. *Sociology: A Global Perspective*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Giddens, Anthony. 2005. *Introduction to Sociology*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Harvell, Calvin Daronne. 2005. *Sociology: The Orientation*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- Henslin, James M. 2006. *Sociology: A Down-to-Earth Approach, Core Concepts*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon Inc.
- Kendall, Diana. 2006. *Sociology in Our Times*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Kornblum, William. 2004. *Sociology in a Changing World*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Kunz, Jennifer and Claudia Stuart. 2005. *Sociology: The New Millennium*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
- Lindsey, Linda L. and Stephen Beach. 2003. *Sociology*. East Rutherford, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Macionis, John J. 2005. *Sociology*. East Rutherford, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Neubeck, Kenneth J. and Davita Silfen Glasberg. 2004. *Sociology: Diversity, Conflict, and Change: A Critical Approach*. Burr Ridge, IL: McGraw-Hill Humanities, Social Sciences &

- World Languages.
- Newman, David M. 2006. *Sociology: Exploring the Architecture of Everyday Life*. Newbury Park, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Russell, James W. 2005. *Societies and Social Life: An Introduction to Sociology*. Cornwall-on-Hudson, NY: Sloan Publishing.
- Schaefer, Richard T. 2003. *Sociology: A Brief Introduction*. Columbus, OH: Glencoe/McGraw-Hill.
- Scott, Barbara Marliene and Mary Ann Schwartz. 2004. *Making Sense of the Social World*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Sharrock, Wes, John Hughes and Peter Martin. 2003. *Understanding Modern Sociology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Shepard, Jon M. 2002. *Sociology*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Stark, Rodney. 2006. *Sociology*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Sullivan, Thomas J. 2006. *Sociology: Concepts and Applications in a Diverse World*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Taylor, Howard F. and Margaret L. Andersen. 2005. *Sociology: Understanding a Diverse Society*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Thio, Alex B. 2006. *Society: Myths and Realities, an Introduction to Sociology*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Thompson, William E. and Joseph V. Hickey. 2004. *Society in Focus: An Introduction to Sociology*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Tishler, Henry L. 1999. *Introduction to Sociology*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Tweedell, Cynthia Benn, ed. 2003. *Sociology: A Christian Approach for Changing the World*. Marion, IN: Triangle Publishing.
- Espiritu, Yen Le. 1997. *Asian American Women and Men*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Ferree, Myra Marx and Elaine J. Hall. 1990. "Visual Images of American Society: Gender and Race in Introductory Sociology Textbooks." *Gender & Society* 4(4):500-33.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1996. "Rethinking Stratification from a Feminist Perspective: Gender, Race, and Class in Mainstream Textbooks." *American Sociological Review* 61(3):929-50.
- Hall, Elaine J. 1988. "One Week for Women? The Structure of Inclusion of Gender Issues in Introductory Textbooks." *Teaching Sociology* 16(4):431-42.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2000. "Packaging Poverty as an Intersection of Class, Race, and Gender in Introductory Textbooks, 1982 to 1994." *Teaching Sociology* 28(4):299-315.
- Hamilton, Richard F. and William H. Form. 2003. "Categorical Usages and Complex Realities: Race, Ethnicity, and Religion in the United States." *Social Forces*: 81(3):693-714.
- hooks, bell. 1984. *Feminist Theory: From Margin to Center*. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1989. *Talking Back: Thinking Feminist, Talking Black*. Boston, MA: South End Press.
- Keith, Bruce and Morten G. Ender. 2004a. "The Sociological Core: Conceptual Patterns and Idiosyncrasies in the Structure and Content of Introductory Sociology Textbooks, 1940-2000." *Teaching Sociology* 32(1):19-36.
- Keith, Bruce and Morten Ender. 2004b. "Search Not for the Core in the Knowledge Frontier: A Reply to Schweingruber." *Teaching Sociology* 33(1):90-4.
- Lucal, Betsy. 1994. "Class Stratification in Introductory Textbooks: Relational or Distributional Models?" *Teaching Sociology* 2(2):139-50.
- Macionis, John J. 1989. "Response to Hall's Article on Gender Issues in Introductory Texts." *Teaching Sociology* 17(3):421.
- Marquez, Stephanie Amedeo. 1994. "Distorting the Image of 'Hispanic' Women in Sociology: Problematic Strategies of Presentation in the Introductory Text." *Teaching Sociology* 22(3):231-6.
- Mathisen, James A. 1989. "A Further Look at 'Common Sense' in Introductory Sociology." *Teaching Sociology* 17(3):307-15.
- Najafizadeh, Mehrangiz and Lewis A. Menerick. 1992. "Sociology of Education or Sociology of Ethnocentrism? The Portrayal of Education in U.S. Introductory Sociology Textbooks." *Teaching Sociology* 20(3):215-21.

## REFERENCES

- Anzuldúa, Gloria. 1999. *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. San Francisco, CA: Spinners/Aunt Lute.
- Best, Joel and David Schweingruber. 2003. "First Words: Do Sociologists Actually Use the Terms in Introductory Textbooks' Glossaries?" *The American Sociologist* 34(3):97-106.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 1990. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. Boston, MA: Unwin Hyman.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1998. *Fighting Words: Black Women and the Search for Justice*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Eitzen, D. Stanley and Maxine Baca Zinn. 2007. *In Conflict and Order: Understanding Society*. Boston, MA: Pearson.

- Nolan, Patrick D. 2003. "Questioning Textbook Truth: Suicide Rates and the Hawthorne Effect." *The American Sociologist* 34(2):107-16.
- Schweingruber, David. 2004. "Looking for the Core in the Wrong Place." *Teaching Sociology* 33(1):81-9.
- Schweingruber, David and Ronald T. Wohlstein. 2005. "The Madding Crowd Goes to School: Myths about Crowds in Introductory Sociology Textbooks." *Teaching Sociology* 33(2):136-53.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. 1988. *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics*. New York and London, UK: Routledge.
- Stone, Pamela. 1996. "Ghettoized and Marginalized: The Coverage of Racial and Ethnic Groups in Introductory Sociology Texts." *Teaching Sociology* 24(4):356-63.
- Taub, Diane E. and Patricia L. Fanflik. 2000. "The Inclusion of Disability in Introductory Sociology Textbooks." *Teaching Sociology* 28(1):12-23.
- Tischler, Henry L. 1999. *Introduction to Sociology*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Trinh, T. Minh-ha. 1989. *Woman, Native, Other: Writing Postcoloniality and Feminism*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. 2000. American FactFinder. Retrieved August 28, 2007 (<http://factfinder.census.gov>).
- Wagenaar, Theodore C. 2004. "Is There a Core in Sociology? Results from a Survey?" *Teaching Sociology* 32(1):1-18.
- Roger Clark** is professor of sociology at Rhode Island College, where his specialties are the sociology of gender and research methods. His *How It's Done: An Invitation to Social Research*, with Emily Stier Adler, is published by Thomson and is in its third edition.
- Alex Nunes** received his BA in 2007 from Rhode Island College, where he won the Lauris B. Whitman Award as the outstanding graduate in sociology, and his MS in journalism from Columbia University in 2008. He now works as a general assignment reporter at the Glens Falls (NY) Post Star.