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Process Analysis Statement

The process of completing this undergraduate honors thesis was one of the most challenging endeavors I have ever pursued. What began as a simple desire to explore the diversity gap in children's literature quickly blossomed into a multi-part study that surprised even myself with the extent of its breadth and depth. Not only did I use many of the tools I had acquired from my psychology degree to create and run an experimental study, but I also tapped into skill sets that were previously foreign to me, such as intense photoediting and conducting demographic content analyses of books. The high levels of patience, determination and persistence required by this project helped me grow immensely as a person. On nights in which all of the work I still had looming in front of me seemed too much I really found within myself the ability to dig even deeper and push on. This was especially true when I found myself confronted with the daunting task of finding and logging the race of the main characters in the 380 book titles I had received from the public libraries. Overall, despite the challenges along the way I found myself falling in love with the process of research. For me this research was one of the many avenues through which I could explore racism, colorism and prejudice in our world today. I see my research, and other studies like it, as a way to unearth and bring to light some of the diversity issues we still have in our society today. I view the results of my research as an opportunity to raise awareness regarding these issues, after all it is only by honestly discussing the state of race and diversity in society that we can ever hope to grow.
An Analysis of the Presence of and Attitudes Towards Racial Minority Characters in Children’s Literature

Many researchers have investigated the role that basic cognitive processes play in the development of prejudiced and biased attitudes in individuals over time (Anzures et al., 2013; Bigler & Liben, 2007). This important area of study offers clues about the beginnings of these beliefs and these clues can suggest ways to inhibit the development of stereotypic beliefs. This research points to the importance of mechanisms beyond normal cognitive development that contribute to the development of racial attitudes, including parental racial attitudes and the media’s portrayal of racial minorities. One place children are first exposed to portrayals of individuals from different ethnic/racial backgrounds is in print media. Children’s books in particular can have a powerful impact on a child’s impressions of outgroup members, particularly by the way in which racial minority characters are portrayed. This is why the books parents select to show to their children and the characters in those books are such important pieces to consider when thinking about racial attitude development in children.

Racism, Colorism and Privilege

To understand the ways in which prejudiced beliefs can develop, it is first important to define racism and other related constructs. Racism, at its core, stems from the belief that some races or ethnicities are inferior to others, usually based upon certain stereotyped beliefs of group characteristics. Racism can be viewed as “a philosophy with two important components: a belief in the innate quality of interethnic differences and a belief in the superiority of one’s own race” (Kleinpennning & Hagendoorn, 1993, p. 22). Many people associate racism with the Jim Crow laws enacted in the post civil war United States and the actions of Ku Klux Klan members, such as lynchings, forgetting that racism can take on different and subtler forms in the society we live
in today. One such example of this transformed prejudiced can be seen in the concept known as modern racism. Scholars define the modern racist as someone who contends that racial discrimination is a thing of the past, believes that Blacks are making unfair demands of society, and believes that Blacks are gaining more status and attention than is actually deserved (McConahay, 1986). In addition to this, other more recent forms of racism identified by researchers include both aversive and symbolic racism. Aversive racism typically takes on the form of avoiding contact with ethnic/racial outgroups, while symbolic racism manifests as a mixture of negative feelings towards ethnic/racial outgroup members, especially Blacks, and a strong belief in American moral values, such as hard work (Kleinpenning & Hagendoom, 1993). Both of these types of racism are subtle and difficult to identify, making them frustrating, and potentially harmful to the self-esteem and well being of people of color (Sue et. al., 2007).

The flip side of this issue is that individuals who are identified as being White live with certain privileges that are denied to individuals in racial minority groups. Peggy McIntosh (1988) defined this privilege as “an invisible package of unearned assets which I can count on cashing in each day, but about which I am meant to remain oblivious” (para. 3). In practice, this privilege involves many everyday entitlements such as being able to move into a nice neighborhood without a realtor questioning if you would “fit in” there and being able to shop in any store without the threat of being monitored for having a darker skin tone. For many White individuals, racism is viewed as a problem that has already been solved and racial disparities are considered as being a nonexistent phenomenon. Many Whites, then, can avoid acknowledging racial oppression in favor of relying on their privilege (Frankenberg, 1993). However, educating White individuals about their privilege can make them more sensitive to and understanding of issues of racism (Boatright-Horowitz, Frazier, Harps-Logan & Crockett, 2013).
The line between an individual of color feeling the effects of either racism or privilege is not cut and dry, though. The concept of colorism ties the two above-mentioned areas together by highlighting the "allocation of privilege and disadvantage according to the lightness or darkness of one’s skin" (Landor et. al., 2013, p. 817). The importance of this concept lies in the fact that, within and across different racial groups, there can be very different levels of discrimination experienced depending upon the intensity of one’s skin color. For example, when slavery was still legal in the United States, lighter-skinned slaves were often given less strenuous work and instead enjoyed easier indoor domestic work that eventually enabled many of them to gain some level of education (Wirth & Goldhamer, 1944). In modern times, the effects of colorism are still prevalent. For example, research shows that dark-skinned Black men perceive worse treatment by Whites and higher levels of stereotype threat than their lighter-skinned counterparts (Uzogara, Lee, Abdou, & Jackson, 2014).

Other instances of withingroup effects, such as parents showing preferential treatment towards lighter-skinned offspring, have also been found. For example, an analysis of longitudinal data revealed that differing levels of quality of parenting and racial socialization were found within African American families based upon the intensity of the child’s skin tone (Landor et. al., 2013). Researchers used data collected from the Family and Community Health Study and coded the interviewee for skin tone as well as self-reports of racial discrimination, quality of parenting, and racial socialization. Results suggested that lighter-skinned Black daughters reported receiving higher quality parenting than did darker-skinned daughters. Black dark-skinned male adolescents, in contrast, reported higher quality parenting than their light-skinned counterparts and they reported higher levels of mistrust towards other racial/ethnic groups. Landor et. al., (2013) speculated that Black male adolescents receive higher quality parenting as
an "attempt [by the parents] to counter social inequality with additional parental investment," (p.823) given the greater levels of discrimination often experienced by darker skinned Black males.

**Effects of Speaker's Race on Perception**

Blatant racist ideologies are not the only way in which racial minority individuals can be viewed by society as a whole. In some cases, an individual's perceived race can have subtler effects. For example, in a variety of situations, such as face-to-face communication, the perceived race of the speaker has been show to influence respondents' attitudes towards the speaker. Robinson (1996) conducted a study in which participants listened to an audiotape of a male speaking non-standard English and then evaluated the speaker and reported whether he was Black or White. Results showed that speakers of both races were viewed negatively as uneducated individuals that belonged to a low status group. The respondents who listened to the Black speaker, however, reported that the poor English was to be expected, whereas those who listened to the White speaker had no such expectation. This type of phenomenon has been extensively studied especially with regards to a White speaker and a non-White speaker presenting the same information. For example, Rasinkski and Czopp (2010) discovered that people responded more positively to a White speaker confronting racial bias than a Black speaker confronting bias in the exact same manner. In fact, the White speakers were rated as being more persuasive than the Black speaker, whereas the Black speakers were rated as being hypersensitive or even hostile. Other research shows that Black individuals are rated more negatively than White individuals when using the exact same strong argument for a topic (Shultz & Maddox, 2013).
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Racial Attitude Development in Children

Racial attitude development has deep roots that come from a number of different cognitive/developmental areas. Bigler and Liben (2007) developed the Developmental Intergroup Theory; to detail the ways in which prejudice can arise from normal cognitive developmental processes. Focusing on children specifically, the researchers established three main processes that can lead to the development of stereotyping and prejudice. This cognitive journey begins as children develop categorical rules to understand the world around them and ends with a highly evolved categorization system, culminating in stereotypical thoughts and beliefs about other people. The first component of this model explores how young children focus on perceptually salient attributes of a person, such as race or gender. Children then combine these salient attributes with how the person is labeled, such as Black or male, and with an approximate quantitative idea of how many people they have encountered with that same label. This combination of attributes leads to the child’s first perception of a new person. For example, when a White child encounters a Black person for the first time, the young child would notice that the individual has Black skin, is called “Black,” and is a member of a distinctly different group, as the child has encountered more White majority group members than Black minority group members up until this point. According to the model, the child will then further categorize this new and distinct person based on her or his environmental experiences with Blacks and other social stereotypes of that racial group. Finally, stereotypes and prejudices can develop from this process due to the fact that “children are likely to presume that visible markers of group membership denote other, unseen, inherent qualities” and are influenced by explicit and implicit statements that link racial groups to certain negative qualities (Bigler & Liben, 2007, p.165).
Other researchers have found that the developmental phenomenon, known as the other-race effect, can impact evaluations of ingroup and outgroup membership, which is important because these evaluations influence children’s social interactions. The other-race effect refers to the idea that infants, starting around the age of three months old, have better recognition memory for faces of their own race than faces of another race (Anzures et al., 2013). The effects of this are reversible in that repeated exposure to members of another race can lessen it, but it often still leads to later classifications of ingroup and outgroup membership that can change social partner preference. For example, research to date has found that children as young as three or four show no bias in terms of race when choosing a playmate, but by age five children tend to choose own-race playmates more than other-race playmates.

Children’s Literature and Development

The way in which events and individuals are represented in the media, including in books, can also have a profound impact on how children understand and relate to the world around them (Gusé-Moyer & Riddle, 2009). In many instances, a book can provide children with their first exposure to topics ranging from different cultural groups to other areas of the world, which is why accuracy of depiction is critical. The ways in which social groups are depicted in literature can reinforce or combat negative stereotypes through their character portrayal and storylines.

Overall effects on development. The cognitive changes that books can induce in a child’s mind have a substantial effect on their development (Conley, 2011). For example, when reading a book, a child begins to develop basic categories for people and objects. In addition to this, positive and negative associations with different groups of people can develop based upon how they are presented in the book. For example, books not depicting certain social groups, such
as a particular racial group, or depicting them in stereotyped or trivialized ways can send the message to a child that this particular group is not valued by society (Pescosolido, Graueuholz, & Milkie, 1997).

Young children especially are extremely susceptible to the messages around them, due to their stage of cognitive development. For example, according to Piaget’s (1936) Theory of Cognitive Development, children from ages two to seven are in the preoperational stage, and are able to focus on auditory and visual stimuli. However, they continue to engage in magical thinking, meaning that differentiating between fantasy and reality is not yet a fully developed skill. As a result, children at this stage would have trouble conceptualizing that the events and characters presented in a book are not necessarily real or accurate (Gusé-Moyer & Riddle, 2009). Children in this stage also have trouble making moral judgments, meaning that they view something as either good or bad with little room for variation in between. Thus, children will view a character as either the “good guy” or the “bad guy.”

**Importance of racial portrayal.** In light of the substantial effect that literature can have on a child’s development, it is easy to see why the ways in which racial minority characters are portrayed in books is important. Researchers have found that 75% of White parents never, or almost never, talk about race with their children (Kairys, 2016), which suggests that children’s first exposure to and subsequent attitude formations towards differing racial groups may come from books or other media. For example, a young White child who grows up in a predominantly White neighborhood may encounter books that depict Black men committing a crime. This depiction could lead to a child developing the stereotype that most or all Black men are criminals. On the other hand, exposure to positive representations of differing racial groups in literature can reinforce feelings of acceptance and foster global connections. In addition to this,
racially diverse children benefit from seeing positive and accurate racial portrayals in books because these types of portrayals have been shown to increase their levels of self-esteem and positive cultural identities (Conley, 2011).

**Diversity Issues in Children’s Literature**

Studies have shown that despite the increase in social awareness of racial issues, the actual number of books containing multicultural and racial themes has not changed very much since 1994 (Kairys, 2016). This is particularly troubling because the demographic reality in the United States is becoming more diverse (Pew Research Center, 2015). Issues of accurate representation of racial minority characters themselves also are raised. For example, in every category, except Latino, the majority of the books being published about a particular racial group are made by someone who is not a member of that group (Kairys, 2016).

**Racial presence.** The Cooperative Children’s Book Council logs data on the diversity content of children’s books every year for the trade books that have been published in the United States for that year (Horning, 2016). Of the 3,200 books received in 2015 from U.S. publishers, only 456, approximately 14%, were about a character from a racial minority group, including African Americans, American Indians, Asian Pacific American and Latino Americans. This is not due to a lack of human characters in the received stories; however, as an even more in-depth analysis of the books received by the same group in the year 2013 found that 78.3% of the collected books were about human beings, with 89.5% of those being about White people. Overall, in the 21 years since this analysis started, the number of books by and/or about racial minority individuals has only risen from 10% in 1994 to 14% in 2015.

**Racial portrayal.** The actual portrayal of racial minority characters in children’s literature is also a heavily researched topic (Chukhray, 2010). Of the scholars who have
examined the quality versus the quantity of racial minority characters in children’s books, the vast majority have analyzed books about African Americans. Results showed that African American portrayal in literature has morphed from the comical representation of this group in the 1940s to the stereotypical depictions evidenced in the 1990s. Today, one of the main issues critics point to in regards to the portrayal of African Americans is that illustrators are choosing to depict them with lighter skin tones, feeding into colorism ideals. In terms of further analysis on the quality of racial minority characters in children’s literature, other racial groups, such as Latino and Native American populations, have been examined as well. For example, Nilsson’s (2005) meta-analysis of Hispanic portrayal in children’s literature found that the majority of books depicted Mexican American families as living in low-income housing.

**Pitfalls of multicultural books.** There are often issues besides stereotypical racial portrayal in children’s books that are classified as being diverse or multicultural. Researchers have noted that books classified as being racially diverse often contain misleading, inaccurate, or blatantly stereotypical character portrayals that turn these very popular books into a problematic phenomenon (Mendoza & Reese, 2001). For example, in *Arrow to the Sun*, a children’s book depicting a Pueblo Indian tale, the author included inauthentic depictions of art and used a kiva as a place for trial instead of ceremony, and so misrepresented Pueblo culture, practices and customs (Reese & Caldwell-Wood, 1997). The use of these books in specific settings, such as in the classroom, can in and of itself become problematic when it is assumed that any single book can accurately portray the experience of an entire racial group. As a result, children may not be exposed to racially diverse literature at all for fear that they will inadvertently be given a book that is inaccurate or offensive (Mendoza & Reese, 2001).
Present Studies

The first study examined the effects of race manipulation in a book on reader’s overall perceptions of the main character and the book. The first part of the study added to the existing literature that focuses on individual reactions to racial minority speakers. In particular, this study utilized three different versions of a children’s book in order to investigate the role of character race on overall attitudes towards the book. One version of the book contained only White characters, whereas the other two versions had either dark-skinned or light-skinned racial minority characters. After reading one of the books, participants provided demographic information and answered post-story survey questions to gauge effect of race and colorism on overall impressions of the book and the main character. I hypothesized that the book containing the White character would receive higher overall evaluations, such as being ascribed higher monetary value. In addition, I hypothesized that the lighter-skinned racial minority character would receive more positive ratings overall than the darker skinned racial minority character. I further hypothesized that individual’s scores on the Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions Scale would be related to their evaluations of the book.

The second study examined the presence of racial minority characters in children’s literature. Specifically, I conducted a demographic analysis of books checked out in local public libraries. I explored the type of books preferred by the public and the extent to which they are choosing to consume racially diverse literature. I hypothesized that the majority of the most frequently checked out books at each library branch would feature White main characters and/or animals.
Study One

Method

Participants

Ball State University Sample. 112 participants were recruited using the psychological science and marketing research pool; these participants received one research credit for completing in the study. The majority of participants were female (53.6%), nineteen years old (33%), spoke English as their first language (96.4%), and were European American (79.5%). In terms of class standing most participants were freshman or sophomores (33.9% each).

MTURK Sample. A sample of 160 parents were surveyed through Amazon’s MTURK program and were compensated $0.75 each, with funds allocated from a Ball State University Honors College Fellowship. The majority of participants were female (60.9%), were married (78.9%), had a Bachelor’s degree (35.4%), spoke English as their first language (90.7%), and were White (58.4%). Participant age ranged from 20 to 70, with the most common age being 29 (8.1%).

Materials. Three different versions of a children’s book were created to vary speaker race. One version of the book contained only White characters, whereas the other two versions of the book contain either dark-skinned or light-skinned racial minority characters (see Appendix E). The chosen book was one in the “younger reader” category, preschool to age seven, so that participants can read the work fairly quickly. Criteria for book selection included lack of specific racial indicators in the storyline and presence of a distinct and important main character. The selected book, “The Red Raincoat,” was obtained from the website freekidsbooks.org, and the book was downloaded and edited under the Creative Commons licensure (Kasturia & Tambawalla, 2016). The online photo editing software PicMonkey was used to alter the
characters skin colors, change the mother's hair, and adjust the name of the main character in the text.

**Demographic information.** Basic demographic information (see Appendix A) was collected from Ball State University participants to gather information on the diversity of individuals sampled. Questions included were gender, participant age, year in school, race/ethnicity and native language. Participant age was an exclusion/inclusion criteria, as those under 18 were not permitted to participant. Demographic information was collected from MTURK participants through a screening. Questions included were all of the abovementioned criteria in addition to current relationship status, number of children and highest level of educational attainment. Only participants over 18 years old who had at least one child were included.

**Evaluation of book.** Evaluation of the book was assessed with six items (see Appendix A): “How much would you pay for this book?” “What was the race of the child in this story?” “What was the gender of the child in this story?” “I liked this book,” “I would give this book to a child,” and “I would read this book to a child.” The first three items were answered using a fill-in-blank format, whereas the latter three items were rated on a 5-point scale from (1) Strongly Agree to (5) Strongly Disagree. Attitudes towards the book were gauged using an altered five-question, 7-point semantic differential (Osgood, Suci & Tannenbaum, 1957) (see Appendix B): “Please rate your overall emotional reactions to this book” (Good to Bad, Pleasant to Unpleasant, Wise to Foolish, Valuable to Useless, and Warm to Cold). In addition, participants were asked “have you seen or read this book before today?” If they respond “yes” their data was removed, as previous exposure to this book would alter the effects of the manipulation. In total, three participants' data sets was removed because they has seen the book before.
**Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS).** The adjectives chosen by participants to describe the main character were assessed by the PANAS (Watson, Clark & Tellegen, 1988) using 5-point scales (1 = Not at All to 5 = Extremely). Adjectives include interested, distressed, excited, upset, strong, guilty, sacred, hostile, enthusiastic, proud, irritable, alert, ashamed, inspired, nervous, determined, attentive, jittery, active and afraid (see Appendix C). Typically, this scale is used to assess an individual’s mood in general or for a given period of time. In this study, however, it was adapted to instead measure how an individual felt about the main character in the book. When initially developed, the scales items were found to be internally consistent, to demonstrate appropriate stability over time, and to be sensitive to mood fluctuations (Watson et al., 1988). The alpha reliabilities for internal consistency ranged from 0.86 to 0.90 for Positive Affect (PA) and ranged from 0.84 to 0.87 for Negative Affect (NA). Test-retest reliability for PA was 0.79 and was 0.81 for NA. Discriminant validity between NA scale and PA scales ranges from -0.12 to -0.23. The PANAS also has good convergent validity with other brief positive and negative affect measures, ranging from 0.76 to 0.92 (McAdams & Constantian, 1983; Stone, Hedges, Neale, & Satin, 1985; Warr, Barter, & Brownbridge, 1983; Watson et al., 1988).

**Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions Scale.** This 17-item scale assessed how motivated participants are to control and counter prejudiced reactions that they may experience (Dunton & Fazio, 1997) (see Appendix D). Items were rated on a 7-point scale ranging from (1) strongly agree to (7) strongly disagree. Higher scores on the scale overall indicated that the participant had greater motivation to control prejudice. Within the scale itself there are two subscales; one that measures individuals’ level of concern with acting prejudiced, both internally and externally, and another that measures their levels of avoidance of conflict and dispute. The
scale presents good ratings of reliability with an internal consistency ranging from 0.74 to 0.81 (Dunton & Fazio, 1997). Predictive validity regarding scores on the Modern Racism Scale have been found through the correlation between less prejudiced Modern Racism Scale scores and higher Motivation to Control Prejudice scores. In particular a main effect in terms of the Concern with Acting Prejudiced factor has been found, \( t(106) = 3.25, p < 0.002 \). “The more such concern individuals expressed, the lower (less prejudiced) their scores on the Modern Racism Scale” (Dunton & Fazio, 1997).

**Procedure.**

**Ball State University Sample.** Participants first signed up for a time-slot through SONA and then clicked on the accompanying Qualtrics link to start the survey. Participants were then prompted to read the informed consent. They were then randomly presented with one of the three book conditions, at which point they clicked on a link to read the book and completed questions evaluating their response to it. They then completed the semantic differential scale, the altered PANAS scale, and the Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions Scale. Lastly, participants provided basic demographic information and then were redirected to a second Qualtrics survey to complete if they were receiving credit for taking this survey.

**MTURK Sample.** A screening system was set up through MTURK such that only participants who reported being a parent could see the study listed as an option to take. Participants first signed up to take the survey through MTURK and then followed the same above mentioned steps as the Ball State University sample. Lastly, participants provided basic demographic information and to a then were redirected to a page that presented them with a randomized code they could use to redeem $0.75 through MTURK.
Results

Preliminary Results. All data from participants who failed any of the reliability checks, including identifying the race and gender of the character or the question inserted into the MCPR scale, were removed; data from 26 MTRUK participants and 22 Ball State University undergraduate students were discarded. In total, data sets from 160 MTURK participants and 112 Ball State participants were left. See Table 1 and Table 3, respectively, for descriptive statistics across all dependent variables in both Ball State University and MTURK samples.

Hypotheses Testing

Ball State University Sample. A one-way Univariate Analysis of Variance was used to compare ratings across all of the dependent variables by book condition. Results indicated no significant effect across eight of the ten variables, indicating that most of my hypotheses were not supported (see Table 2). However, MCPR scores varied significantly across all three book conditions (see Table 2). Scores on Factor 1 (Concern with Acting Prejudiced) were higher in the dark-skinned book condition \( (M = 25.40) \) compared with the light-skinned book condition \( (M = 29) \) and the Whitebook condition \( (M = 27.80) \), \( F(2, 104) = 3.94, p < .05 \). Scores on Factor 2 (Restraint to Avoid Dispute) were marginally higher in the dark-skinned book condition \( (M = 18.71) \) compared with the light-skinned book condition \( (M = 20.6) \) and the White book condition \( (M = 20.6) \), \( F(2, 104) = 2.76, p = .07 \).

MTURK Sample. A Univariate Analysis of Variance was conducted on all of the dependent variables of interest in terms of the book condition to determine levels of significance. Results indicated no significant effect across all ten variables, indicating that my hypotheses were not supported (see Table 4).
Exploratory Analysis

**Ball State University Sample.** When scores on the two Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions factors (Factor 1: $F(2, 104) = 3.94, p < .05$, Factor 2: $F(2, 104) = 2.76, p = .07$) were entered as covariates, ratings on the Semantic Differential differed by condition. Ratings were more negative for the dark-skinned condition ($M=4.63$), compared with the light-skinned condition ($M=5.04$) and the white-skinned condition, ($M=5.10), F(2,99) = 3.09, p=0.05$ (see Figure 2). No other exploratory analyses that used Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reaction Scores as covariates were found to be significant.

**Study Two**

**Method**

**Materials.** Electronic records quantifying the number of times children’s books have been checked out in the past year were obtained from local public library branches. Books from the “younger readers” category were analyzed, as this study is focusing on the presence of diversity in books that children are first exposed to as they are learning to read. In addition, a record of the total circulation for particular younger reader books with diverse characters was obtained.

**Procedure.** Demographic character information was collected from 19 branches total in Indiana, 5 in the Elkhart County Public Library System and 14 in the Allen County Public Library system. In both library systems the younger reader selection was encompassed by two different book categories; as a result the top 10 books in each category were collected from each branch in terms of total number of checkouts. In Allen County, the two categories under consideration were Picture Books and Easy Readers. In Elkhart County, the two categories were J-Easy and J- Easy Reader. Random page presentation through Amazon’s book preview feature
was used to determine the main character of each story on the list. The main character(s) were then coded based upon their racial demographic information.

Specific racially diverse children’s books were chosen using the Association for Library Service to Children’s 2016 “Notable Children’s Books” list. Once all of the books in the “younger reader” category were examined for racial diversity, random selection of the diverse books was used to narrow the list down to 5 titles. The five titles were: “Princess and the Pony,” “Don’t Throw It to Mo,” “Last Stop on Markey Street,” “Mango, Abuela and Me,” and “Flop to the Top.” Circulation for the past year was obtained for each title and was recorded.

Results

Preliminary Results. In the Elkhart County Public Library system 100 total book titles were analyzed for racial diversity content. In the Allen County Public Library system 280 total book titles were analyzed for racial diversity content. Information on the five racially diverse Notable Children’s Books were also analyzed and it was found that copies of the book were present at all branches in both library systems.

Demographic Character Information. In Elkhart County, the majority of circulated books presented an animal as the main character, 78% (see Figure 2). However, the books that averaged the highest circulation, 28.31 total checkouts, were books with main characters that were White (see Figure 1). In Allen County the majority of circulated books presented an animal as the main character (69.53 %), and had books with animal main characters show the highest average circulation rates, 74.32 total checkouts (see Figures 3 and 4 respectively).

Diverse Books Checkout. Across both library systems, data was collected regarding the number of times specific racially diverse books were checked out at each branch. Within each library system, then, the average number of times a book was checked out was determined by
averaging the circulation rates collected from each branch. In Elkhart County, the racially diverse titles were circulated the following average number of times across all five branches: *The Princess and the Pony* – 5, *Don't Throw it To Mo* – 3, *Last Stop on Market Street* – 5, *Mango, Abuela and Me* – 1, *Flop to the Top* – 2. In Allen County the racially diverse titles were circulated the following average number of times across all fourteen branches: *The Princess and the Pony* – 13, *Don't Throw it To Mo* – 9, *Last Stop on Market Street* – 9, *Mango, Abuela and Me* – 5, *Flop to the Top* – 3.

**Discussion**

Prior research has demonstrated that there are numerous diversity issues in the realm of children’s literature, including an overall lack of racial representation in addition to cultural misrepresentations (Horning, 2016). In 2015, the rate of children’s books in the United States that were about racial minority characters was still only 14%. Of the scholars who have examined the quality versus the quantity of racial minority characters in children’s books, the vast majority have analyzed books African Americans (Chukhray, 2010). Results showed that African American portrayal in literature has morphed from the comical representation of this group in the 1940s to the stereotypical depictions evidenced in the 1990s. Today, one of the main issues critics point to in regards to the portrayal of African Americans is that illustrators are choosing to depict them with lighter skin tones, feeding into colorism ideals. Colorism is the concept that within and across different racial groups, there can be very different levels of treatment, prejudice, and discrimination experienced depending upon the intensity of one’s skin color (Landor et. al., 2014)

The purpose of the first study was to examine the effects of race manipulation in a book on readers’ overall perceptions of the main character and the book, adding to existing literature
that focuses on individual’s reactions to racial minority speakers. In a variety of situations, whether it be when reading a book or during face-to-face communication, the perceived race of the speaker has been show to influence respondents’ attitudes towards the speaker. For example, research shows that Black individuals are rated more negatively than White individuals when using the exact same strong argument for a topic (Shultz & Maddox, 2013). The second study examined the presence of racial minority characters in children’s literature. Specifically, I conducted a demographic analysis of books checked out in local public libraries to explore the type of books preferred by the public and the extent to which they are choosing to consume racially diverse literature.

Of the hypotheses tested in the first study, only the Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions scores differed significantly, and this was true only for the Ball State sample. Thus, participants reported similar levels of approval and reactions towards the books regardless of the character’s race. Exploratory analyses that controlled for MCPR scores found that individuals had the highest average positive reaction overall to the book with White characters when compared to the light-skinned and dark-skinned book. These significant differences indicate that Motivation to Control Prejudice scores may mediate participants’ attitudes towards the different books. This potential implication aligns with much of the literature that shows how racism and prejudice has become less overt and subtler over time (Kleinpenning & Hagendooom, 1993). In particular, this hidden prejudice closely aligns with new conceptions of racism in the field of psychology, such as aversive and symbolic racism. Both of these types of racism are subtle and difficult to identify, making them frustrating, and potentially harmful to the self-esteem and well-being of people of color (Sue et. al., 2007)
My hypothesis for the second study was supported, in that the majority of books checked out at all of the library branches contained animals or White humans as main characters. This finding implies that consumers are still primarily choosing literature that is not racially diverse, whether because of a lack of available literature or a bias toward majority group fiction. Practically speaking, then, many children may not be exposed to racially diverse literature, which has further implications for their cognitive development. The cognitive changes that books can induce in a child's mind have a substantial effect on their development (Conley, 2011). For example, positive and negative associations with different groups of people can develop based upon how they are presented in the book. In particular, the way in which racial groups are depicted in literature can reinforce or combat negative stereotypes though their character portrayal and storylines (Gusé-Moyer & Riddle, 2009).

Limitations

The Ball State sample was composed of primarily students taking an Introductory Psychology course at a university. As such, racial biases may be less present or less expressed in this particular population due to increased levels of education or contact with racial minorities. Research has shown that higher levels of contact with members of minority groups leads to lower levels of prejudice overall (Raabe & Beelmann, 2011; Tropp & Prenovost, 2010). This may be the result of simply learning to control the expression of prejudice over time or an actual decrease in prejudiced ideologies due to intergroup contact.

The MTURK sample was composed of respondents who are incentivized to take a large number of surveys in order to be financially compensated. This became apparent when examining the data, as some response sets would have identical answers for each question in a given measure. For example, on a five question 7-point Semantic Differential scale, some
participants chose value 7 for each question. As such, some participants that passed all reliability checks may have hurried through other parts of the survey, without concern for responding accurately.

In addition, both aforementioned samples are not generalizable to society as whole. In terms of the Ball State University sample in particular, the participants are disproportionately likely to be Western, Educated, Industrialized, Rich, and Democratic or WEIRD, a term coined by researchers Henrich, Heine, and Norenzayan (2010). This disproportionality leads to a lack of generalizability because the sample can no longer be representative of the diversity present in our world’s populations (Arnett, 2008).

In addition, there is a basic social desirability bias inherent in asking individuals to rate a children’s book. When taking a survey, many participants want to present a favorable image of themselves. Typically, this can involve ‘faking good’ by choosing survey responses that conform to socially accepted values or self-deception, when participants actually believe what they are reporting (King & Brunner, 2000; Huang, Liao, & Chang, 1998). In the case of this study, many participants may have been reluctant to ascribe any negative comments or reactions to any of the books, simply due to the fact that children’s literature is viewed positively by society overall.

Finally, it is possible that people simply liked the book. The main topic of the book was neutral and centered around a young boy getting a new raincoat and wanting to wear it. Thus, ratings may not have been affected by attitudes toward racially diverse books or by colorism. If the book had contained a culturally-specific storyline or a more controversial topic, such as the experience of racism, participants may have responded very differently and their ratings may have been affected by the protagonist’s skin color. Previous research on the effect of speaker race on perception has found that racially minority individuals are viewed less positively than
RACIAL MINORITY CHARACTERS

White individuals when speaking on the same controversial topic. For example, Rasinkski and Czopp (2010) discovered that people responded more positively to a White speaker confronting racial bias than a Black speaker confronting bias in the exact same manner. In fact, the White speakers were rated as being more persuasive than the Black speaker, whereas the Black speakers were rated as being hypersensitive or even hostile. A similar effect could appear when reading about a racially minority that is confronting controversial topics.

Future Research

Future research should survey a wider range of populations in order to see what differences could be found between reactions to the books based upon variables such as age, educational level and other factors. Expanding the population in this way would help results have higher levels of generalizability. In particular, it would be very interesting to include children themselves as a studied population. An experiment could be constructed similar to that of the Clark and Clark's (1947) doll experiment, such that the children are presented with three copies of a book to choose from with all factors remaining the same except for the race of the main character. More than likely, one can imagine that children would choose the book with the White character when asked which book they would like to read. Future research could also expand the present study by choosing from a wide range of book topics and by including female women of color as main characters.

Although this study didn't find any apparent differences due to colorism, this doesn't mean that racism is a thing of the past. Exploratory analyses indicate that some individuals may have been controlling their levels of prejudice when taking this survey, aligning with the literature that shows how racism has simply become subtler and more covert over time. Additionally, very minimal levels of racial diversity have been found in the top circulated books
in public libraries, indicating that many individuals are choosing to consume books about animals and white individuals at a much higher rate than racially diverse books. This is important in light of the known possible effects that literature can have on a child’s development. Future research in this area can help raise awareness for the importance of more racial diversity in children’s literature, while also exposing the more subtle ways that racism appears in our society today.
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### Table 1

**Descriptive Statistics of Dependent Variables by Book Condition in Ball State University Sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Dark-Skinned Book</th>
<th>Light-Skinned Book</th>
<th>White Book</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic Differential Score</td>
<td>4.67 (1.25)</td>
<td>5.01 (1.08)</td>
<td>4.92 (1.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative PANAS</td>
<td>1.59 (0.41)</td>
<td>1.47 (0.46)</td>
<td>1.45 (0.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive PANAS</td>
<td>3.17 (0.79)</td>
<td>2.82 (1.04)</td>
<td>2.90 (1.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCPR- Factor 1</td>
<td>25.40 (5.17)</td>
<td>29.00 (5.66)</td>
<td>27.80 (5.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCPR- Factor 2</td>
<td>18.71 (3.81)</td>
<td>20.60 (3.13)</td>
<td>20.60 (4.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I would buy this book&quot;</td>
<td>1.49 (0.51)</td>
<td>1.51 (0.51)</td>
<td>1.42 (0.50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;This book is worth ___ dollars&quot;</td>
<td>6.39 (3.65)</td>
<td>5.24 (3.08)</td>
<td>6.05 (2.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I liked this book&quot;</td>
<td>2.60 (0.88)</td>
<td>2.64 (0.81)</td>
<td>2.58 (0.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I would give this book to a child&quot;</td>
<td>2.17 (0.95)</td>
<td>2.18 (0.89)</td>
<td>2.24 (1.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would read this book to a child&quot;</td>
<td>2.09 (0.95)</td>
<td>2.31 (0.89)</td>
<td>2.13 (1.02)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

Univariate Analysis of Variance by Book Condition for Dependent Variables in Ball State University Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semantic Differential Score</td>
<td>(2, 109)</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative PANAS</td>
<td>(2, 109)</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive PANAS</td>
<td>(2, 109)</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCPR- Factor 1</td>
<td>(2, 104)</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>0.02**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCPR- Factor 2</td>
<td>(2, 104)</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I would buy this book&quot;</td>
<td>(2, 109)</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;This book is worth __ dollars&quot;</td>
<td>(2, 56)</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I liked this book&quot;</td>
<td>(2, 109)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I would give this book to a child&quot;</td>
<td>(2, 109)</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would read this book to a child&quot;</td>
<td>(2, 109)</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. ** Significant at p < 0.05 level, * Marginally Significant p < 0.10
### Table 3

**Descriptive Statistics of Dependent Variables by Book Condition in MTURK Sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>Dark-Skinned Book</th>
<th>Light-Skinned Book</th>
<th>White Book</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic Differential Score</td>
<td>5.83 (0.93)</td>
<td>5.80 (1.17)</td>
<td>5.96 (0.90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative PANAS</td>
<td>1.28 (0.41)</td>
<td>1.46 (0.65)</td>
<td>1.37 (0.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive PANAS</td>
<td>3.29 (0.86)</td>
<td>3.46 (1.00)</td>
<td>3.52 (0.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCPR- Factor 1</td>
<td>31.31 (6.80)</td>
<td>31.83 (6.66)</td>
<td>31.76 (5.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCPR- Factor 2</td>
<td>13.42 (2.97)</td>
<td>13.64 (2.76)</td>
<td>13.61 (3.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I would buy this book&quot;</td>
<td>1.29 (0.46)</td>
<td>1.17 (0.38)</td>
<td>1.26 (0.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;This book is worth ____ dollars&quot;</td>
<td>6.53 (4.40)</td>
<td>6.26 (3.55)</td>
<td>6.67 (4.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I liked this book&quot;</td>
<td>1.77 (0.70)</td>
<td>2.00 (0.92)</td>
<td>1.70 (0.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I would give this book to a child&quot;</td>
<td>1.60 (0.60)</td>
<td>1.79 (0.93)</td>
<td>1.58 (0.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would read this book to a child&quot;</td>
<td>1.65 (0.60)</td>
<td>1.72 (0.88)</td>
<td>1.56 (0.64)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 3. Descriptive statistics of sample number, means and standard deviation for all measured dependent variables in terms of the book condition assigned to the participants. This table is from the MTURK sample.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semantic Differential Score</td>
<td>(2, 157)</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative PANAS</td>
<td>(2, 157)</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive PANAS</td>
<td>(2, 157)</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCPR- Factor 1</td>
<td>(2, 156)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCPR- Factor 2</td>
<td>(2, 156)</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I would buy this book&quot;</td>
<td>(2, 156)</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;This book is worth ____ dollars&quot;</td>
<td>(2, 156)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I liked this book&quot;</td>
<td>(2, 157)</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I would give this book to a child&quot;</td>
<td>(2, 157)</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would read this book to a child&quot;</td>
<td>(2, 156)</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. ** Significant at p < 0.05 level, * Marginally Significant p < 0.10

Table 4. An ANOVA was run on all dependent variables in the study in terms of the book condition assigned to participants. An asterisk notes dependent variables that had a significant difference across conditions. This table is comprised of MTURK data.
Figures

**Average Circulation Rate in Terms of Character's Racial Diversity- Elkhart County Public Libraries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Character(s) Racial Demographic</th>
<th>Average Number of Times Circulated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Human</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Human &amp; White</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Non-White</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Human &amp; Non-White</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1.* This figure depicts circulation information regarding the top 10 books circulated in the J- Easy Reader and J- Easy categories in the Elkhart Public Library System. Of the top circulated books, this graph depicts the average number of times that the books were checked out in terms of the race of the main character in the book. The two columns without bars represent the fact that no books in those categories made it into the top ten lists.
Racial Demographics of Top Circulated Books at Elkhart County Public Libraries

Legend

- = Non-Human Character
- = White Character
- = Non-Human & White
- = White & Non-White

Figure 2. This figure depicts circulation information regarding the top 10 books circulated in the J-Easy Reader and J-Easy categories in the Elkhart Public Library System. Of all of the top 10 books, this graph represents the percentage that have a main character of a particular racial demographic.
Figure 3. This figure depicts circulation information regarding the top 10 books circulated in the Easy Reader and Picture Book categories in the Allen County Public Library System. Of the top circulated books, this graph depicts the average number of times that the books were checked out in terms of the race of the main character in the book.
Figure 4. This figure depicts circulation information regarding the top 10 books circulated in the Easy Reader and Picture Book categories in the Allen County Public Library System. Of all of the top 10 books, this graph represents the percentage that have a main character of a particular racial demographic.
Demographic Questions

1. What is your gender?
   a. Male
   b. Female
   c. Other
   d. Prefer not to answer

2. What is your age?
   a. Drop box; type in age

3. What is your class standing?
   a. Freshman
   b. Sophomore
   c. Junior
   d. Senior
   e. Other

4. What is your race? Check all that apply.
   a. Caucasian/White/American European
   b. Black/African American
   c. Hispanic/Latino/Latina
   d. Asian/Pacific Islander
   e. Native/Indigenous American
   f. Multiracial
   g. Other

5. Is English your first language?
   a. Yes
   b. If not, please specify _______

Survey Questions

Have you seen or read this book before today?

A. Yes
B. No

Fill in the Blank Questions

1. How much money would you pay for this book?
   a. I would pay $____ for this book
   b. I would not buy this book

2. What was the race of the child in this story?
   __________
3. What was the gender of the child in this story?

Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following:
(These will be formatted as Likert scale questions in Qualtrics)

4. I liked this book
   a. Strongly Agree
   b. Agree
   c. Neutral
   d. Disagree
   e. Strongly Disagree

5. I would give this book to a child
   a. Strongly Agree
   b. Agree
   c. Neutral
   d. Disagree
   e. Strongly Disagree

6. I would read this book to a child
   a. Strongly Agree
   b. Agree
   c. Neutral
   d. Disagree
   e. Strongly Disagree
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7. Please rate your overall emotional reactions to this book (Semantic Differential Question)

Good _______x______x_x_x_x_x_x_x_x_x_x____Bad
Pleasant  _______x______x______x__x____Unpleasant
Wise _______x______x______x______x____Foolish
Valuable _______x______x______x______x____Useless
Warm _______x______x______x______x_______Cold
Appendix C

8. Please indicate to what extent you feel that the following adjectives describe the main character:

1- Not at All, 2- A little, 3- Moderately, 4- Quite a Bit, 5- Extremely

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1. Interested</th>
<th></th>
<th>11. Irritable</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Distressed</td>
<td></td>
<td>12. Alert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Excited</td>
<td></td>
<td>13. Ashamed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Strong</td>
<td></td>
<td>15. Nervous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Scared</td>
<td></td>
<td>17. Attentive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Hostile</td>
<td></td>
<td>18. Jittery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Enthusiastic</td>
<td></td>
<td>19. Active</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Motivation to Control Prejudiced Reactions Scale
(Dunton & Fazio, 1997)

Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

1. In today's society it is important that one not be perceived as prejudiced in any manner
   a. Strongly Agree
   b. Agree
   c. Neutral
   d. Disagree
   e. Strongly Disagree

2. I always express my thoughts and feelings, regardless of how controversial they might be.
   a. Strongly Agree
   b. Agree
   c. Neutral
   d. Disagree
   e. Strongly Disagree

3. I get angry with myself when I have a thought or feeling that might be considered prejudiced.
   a. Strongly Agree
   b. Agree
   c. Neutral
   d. Disagree
   e. Strongly Disagree

4. If I were participating in a class discussion and a Black student expressed an opinion with which I disagreed, I would be hesitant to express my own viewpoint.
   a. Strongly Agree
   b. Agree
   c. Neutral
   d. Disagree
   e. Strongly Disagree

5. Going through life worrying about whether you might offend someone is just more trouble than it's worth.
   a. Strongly Agree
   b. Agree
   c. Neutral
   d. Disagree
   e. Strongly Disagree

6. It's important to me that other people not think I'm prejudiced.
   a. Strongly Agree
   b. Agree
   c. Neutral
   d. Disagree
7. I feel it’s important to behave according to society’s standards.
   a. Strongly Agree
   b. Agree
   c. Neutral
   d. Disagree
   e. Strongly Disagree

8. I’m careful not to offend my friends, but I don’t worry about offending people I don’t know or don’t like.
   a. Strongly Agree
   b. Agree
   c. Neutral
   d. Disagree
   e. Strongly Disagree

9. I think that it is important to speak one’s mind rather than worry about offending someone.
   a. Strongly Agree
   b. Agree
   c. Neutral
   d. Disagree
   e. Strongly Disagree

10. It’s never acceptable to express one’s prejudice
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Neutral
    d. Disagree
    e. Strongly Disagree

11. If you are reading this question, choose Strongly Disagree
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Neutral
    d. Disagree
    e. Strongly Disagree

12. I feel guilty when I have a negative thought or feeling about a Black person.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Neutral
    d. Disagree
    e. Strongly Disagree

13. When speaking to a Black person, it’s important to me that he/she not think I’m prejudiced.
    a. Strongly Agree
    b. Agree
    c. Neutral
    d. Disagree
    e. Strongly Disagree
14. It bothers me a great deal when I think I’ve offended someone, so I’m always careful to consider other people’s feelings.
   a. Strongly Agree
   b. Agree
   c. Neutral
   d. Disagree
   e. Strongly Disagree

15. If I have a prejudiced thought or feeling, I keep it to myself.
   a. Strongly Agree
   b. Agree
   c. Neutral
   d. Disagree
   e. Strongly Disagree

16. I would never tell jokes that might offend others.
   a. Strongly Agree
   b. Agree
   c. Neutral
   d. Disagree
   e. Strongly Disagree

17. I’m not afraid to tell others what I think, even when I know they disagree with me.
   a. Strongly Agree
   b. Agree
   c. Neutral
   d. Disagree
   e. Strongly Disagree

18. If someone who made me uncomfortable sat next to me on a bus, I would not hesitate to move to another seat.
   a. Strongly Agree
   b. Agree
   c. Neutral
   d. Disagree
   e. Strongly Disagree
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Edited versions of *The Red Raincoat* (Kasturia & Tambawalla, 2016)

Monday was bright and sunny. "Will it rain today, Mom?" asked John.

"No, John, not today. If you wear your raincoat, you will look quite funny!" said Mom.

Wednesday was hot. "Mom, WHY doesn’t it rain?" asked John.

"Son, I think it will rain very soon. Maybe even before it is noon," said Mom.

Friday was cloudy. "Mom, will it rain today?" asked John loudly.

"It might, my dear. There are some dark clouds low down in the sky," said Mom.

On Sunday, John’s parents got him a red raincoat. "Mom, may I wear it now?" asked John.

"No, my dear, the rains are near, but just now the sky is clear," said Mom.

On Tuesday, the sky was blue. "Mom, WHEN will my wish come true?" asked John.

"Not today, my dear, there is just one white cloud in the sky!" said Mom.

On Thursday John went on a picnic. "Mom, what if it rains? Shall I take the raincoat with me?" asked John.

"No my dear, it will not rain today. The little white clouds are too high in the sky," said Mom.

Saturday began with a bang! Badaboom!

"Mom, is that thunder I hear? Will it rain very soon?" asked John.
And then at last, it started raining!

"Oh, it's raining, it's raining," sang Manu, running out.

"But John," called Mom, running after him, "you forgot your raincoat!"

Skin tones of the other two versions of the book:
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Ball State SONA Consent Document

College of Sciences and Humanities
Department of Psychological Science
Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306-0520
Phone (765) 285-1690

Study Title
Rating Children’s Literature

Study Purpose and Rationale
The purpose of this research project is to examine the how people view main characters in
children’s literature.

Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria
To be eligible to participate in this study, you must be at least 18 years old, be able to respond to
questions in English, be able to view a digital copy of a book, and be a citizen of the United
States.

Participation Procedures and Duration
If you are willing to participate in this study, you will first read a short ten-page children’s book
and then respond to a series of questions about the book. Afterwards, a short psychological
inventory will be completed and you will provide demographic information All of these tasks
will be completed online. This study will last approximately 30-45 min.

Risks or Discomforts
This study involves no more than minimal risk. Should any part of the study cause you
discomfort you may choose to withdraw from the study overall. You may also choose not to
answer any of the questions.

Compensation and Reimbursement
Participants who complete the study through the SONA research pool will receive 1 research
participation credit.

Data Confidentiality or Anonymity
All responses will be recorded anonymously. All data will be maintained so that no identifying
information will appear in any publication or presentation of the data.

Storage of Data
All collected data will be stored on a password-protected computer and kept private.
Only the principal investigator and the faculty supervisors will have access to the data. Data will
be kept indefinitely for possible use in replication studies and other further research in this field.
Benefits
There are no perceived benefits for participating in this study.

If you experience any discomfort as a result of participating in this study, potential resources for addressing this experience include:

Ball State University Counseling Center Located in Lucina Hall, room 320; phone 765-285-1736 Free and confidential services for BSU students

Voluntary Participation
Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you are free to withdraw your permission at any point, without penalty or prejudice from the investigator. If you withdraw from the study, any information you have provided will be destroyed. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to email the principal investigator at any point

IRB Contact Information
For questions regarding your rights as a research subject, contact the following: Office of Research Integrity, Ball State University, Muncie, IN 47306, (765) 285-5070, irb@bsu.edu.

Researcher Contact Information
Please feel free to contact the principal investigator and/or faculty supervisor with any questions or concerns. Contact information is listed below.

Principal Investigator:
Mikaela Pieri, Undergraduate Student
Psychological Science
Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306
Email: mapieri@bsu.edu

Faculty Supervisor:
Dr. Mary Kite
Psychological Science
Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306
Telephone: 765-285-819
Email: mkite@bsu.edu

Faculty Supervisor:
Dr. Thomas Holtgraves
Psychological Science
Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306
Telephone: (765) 285-1716
Email: otoholtgrav@bsu.edu
MTURK Consent Document

College of Sciences and Humanities
Department of Psychological Science
Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306-0520
Phone (765) 285-1690

Study Title
Rating Children’s Literature

Study Purpose and Rationale
The purpose of this research project is to examine the how people view main characters in children’s literature.

Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria
To be eligible to participate in this study, you must be at least 18 years old, be able to respond to questions in English, be able to view a digital copy of a book, and be a parent.

Participation Procedures and Duration
If you are willing to participate in this study, you will first read a short ten-page children’s book and then respond to a series of questions about the book. Afterwards, a short psychological inventory will be completed and you will provide demographic information. All of these tasks will be completed online. This study will last approximately 30 min.

Risks or Discomforts
This study involves no more than minimal risk. Should any part of the study cause you discomfort you may choose to withdraw from the study overall. You may also choose not to answer any of the questions.

Compensation and Reimbursement
Participants who complete the study through MTURK will receive $0.75 after entering the code upon completion of the survey.

Data Confidentiality or Anonymity
All responses will be recorded anonymously. All data will be maintained so that no identifying information will appear in any publication or presentation of the data.

Storage of Data
All collected data will be stored on a password-protected computer and kept private. Only the principal investigator and the faculty supervisors will have access to the data. Data will be kept indefinitely for possible use in replication studies and other further research in this field.

Benefits
There are no perceived benefits for participating in this study.
Voluntary Participation
Your participation in this study is completely voluntary and you are free to withdraw your permission at any point, without penalty or prejudice from the investigator. If you withdraw from the study, any information you have provided will be destroyed. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to email the principal investigator at any point.

IRB Contact Information
For questions regarding your rights as a research subject, contact the following: Office of Research Integrity, Ball State University, Muncie, IN 47306, (765) 285-5070, irb@bsu.edu.

Researcher Contact Information
Please feel free to contact the principal investigator and/or faculty supervisor with any questions or concerns. Contact information is listed below.

Principal Investigator:
Mikaela Pieri, Undergraduate Student
Psychological Science
Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306
Email: mapieri@bsu.edu

Faculty Supervisor:
Dr. Mary Kite
Psychological Science
Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306
Telephone: 765-285-819
Email: mkite@bsu.edu

Faculty Supervisor:
Dr. Thomas Holtgraves
Psychological Science
Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306
Telephone: (765) 285-1716
Email: oot0holtgrav@bsu.edu
The Institutional Review Board reviewed your protocol on December 14, 2016 and has determined the procedures you have proposed are appropriate for exemption under the federal regulations. As such, there will be no further review of your protocol, and you are cleared to proceed with the procedures outlined in your protocol. As an exempt study, there is no requirement for continuing review. Your protocol will remain on file with the IRB as a matter of record.

**Exempt Categories:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category 1: Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal education practices, such as (i) research on regular and special education instructional strategies, or (ii) research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X Category 2: Research involving the use of educational test (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Category 3:** Research involving the use of educational test (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior that is not exempt under category 2, if: (i) the human subjects are elected or appointed officials or candidates for public office; or (ii) Federal statute(s) require(s) without exception that the confidentiality of the personally identifiable information will be maintained throughout the research and thereafter.

**Category 4:** Research involving the collection of study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.

**Category 5:** Research and demonstration projects which are conducted by or subject to the approval of Department or agency heads, and which are designed to study, evaluate or otherwise examine: (i) public benefit or service programs; (ii) procedures for obtaining benefits or services under those programs; (iii) possible changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under these programs.

**Category 6:** Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies, (i) if wholesome foods without additives are consumed or (ii) if a food is consumed which contains a food ingredient at or below the level and for a use found to be safe, by the Food and Drug Administration or approved by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Food Safety and Inspection Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

**Editorial Notes:**

1. N/A

While your project does not require continuing review, it is the responsibility of the P.I. (and, if applicable, faculty supervisor) to inform the IRB if the procedures presented in this protocol are to be modified or if problems related to human research participants arise in connection with this project. **Any procedural modifications must be evaluated by the IRB before being implemented, as some modifications may change the review status of this project.** Please contact (ORI Staff) if you are unsure whether your proposed modification requires review or have any questions. Proposed modifications should be addressed in writing and submitted electronically to the IRB (http://www.bsu.edu/irb) for review. Please reference the above IRB protocol number in any communication to the IRB regarding this project.

**Reminder:** Even though your study is exempt from the relevant federal regulations of the Common Rule (45 CFR 46, subpart A), you and your research team are not exempt from ethical research practices and should therefore employ all protections for your participants and their data which are appropriate to your project.
Bryan Byers, PhD/Chair
Institutional Review Board

Christopher Mangelli, JD, MS, MEd, CIP/Director
Office of Research Integrity