

Chapter 8: Analysis

Up until this point, I have provided evidence of linguistic minstrelsy in children's animated films over the past seventy years. In each chapter where I have discussed the films, I have tried to connect the representation of Blackness in animation to the sociopolitical environments in which those films were created. I have argued that these distortions of Blackness are damaging to children and have a lasting impact on the ways in which moviegoers (from all racial and ethnic backgrounds) perceive African Americans. In this chapter, I will discuss examples from the vast body of work that has been done on the impact that media has on children's developing concepts of race and racial dynamics. Much of this work comes from media experts and child psychologists who have expressed growing concern over the fact that media now infiltrates children's lives at every level. Critic Henry Giroux was the first of many scholars to raise concerns over the entertainment industry's growing role in the lives of children. He argues that "media culture has become a substantial, if not the primary educational force in regulating meanings, values, and tastes that set the norms, that offer up and legitimate particular subject positions—what it means to claim an identity as male, female, white, black, citizen, noncitizen"ⁱ There has been staunch resistance to these critiques by members of the entertainment industry (as well as the industries connected to film) who, like animator Floyd Norman protest that "overly sensitive people see racial or ethnic slights in every image." He further opines, "in their zeal to sanitize and pasteurize everything, they've taken all the fun out of cartoon making."ⁱⁱ While critics might take the fun out of making cartoons, the genre must be seriously and continually examined. As I have demonstrated in previous chapters, and as Lindvall and Fraser point out in their essay, "Darker Shades of Animation," cartoons "inhere the ability to reflect the spirit of an age to function as frozen or embalmed cultural artifacts that document the time and place from

which they are retrieved.ⁱⁱⁱ” Helaine Silverman concurs with, “as a quintessential form of American public culture, animated movies may be examined as a site where collective social understandings are created and in which the politics of signification are engaged^{iv}” Finally, Lindvall and Fraser caution further, “one must remember, the cartoon itself is a sort of graphic slang...mostly it lampoons, pokes fun at, entertains, makes silly, or acts like a deliberately vulgar rube...With its broad stereotypes, outrageous action and irreverent humor, the cartoon serves as an index of public attitudes about race. The dangers lie in its nature to (re)present a type, which to some willing and limited imaginations (like those of children) can become a stereotypical fact.^v”

In their ability to reflect our social ideologies, these films serve as a cultural mirror in which we can see our societal mores on display. James Snead argues that, “more than perhaps any other genre, animated cartoons encourage the rhetoric of harmlessness.” He continues, “the ‘winsomeness,’ ‘adorability,’ ‘charm’ and ‘cuteness’ of Disney’s cartoons refers in the first place to their content...but secondly, to the way in which the cartoon is to be taken. For even if the cartoon is violent, cruel, or deceitful,...it is not expected to have any extra-cinematic reference or effect...The cartoon is *ipso facto* innocuous, even if it is really not. From this standpoint, cartoons are taken to be pure entertainment.^{vi}” Bell, Haas, and Sells argue further that “Disney’s trademarked innocence operates on a systemic sanitation of violence, sexuality, and political struggle concomitant with an erasure or repression of difference.^{vii}” These films actually establish and reinforce racialized, gendered scenarios that directly link raced and gendered identities to lessons about character traits such as honesty, loyalty, trustworthiness, and the like. In doing so, they teach children biases about raced and gendered differences. The widely held belief that animated films are harmless entertainment (which they are, compared to other

offerings) makes animated film unpopular to critique, even when the assessment is valid. Blind defenses of animated film ignore the fact that the image on screen is intentional and that it is not just the rhetorical expression of individual imagination, but that it is also created within the context of corporate cultural hegemony. There is no such thing as an ideologically free animated film, especially when it has been created for profit. Roland Barthes pointed out that this is the “formidable underside” of cultural products, and cautioned that, “products of pleasure and fantasy do have ideological underpinnings behind them...they are rhetorical weapons, even in their naive form”^{viii} .

Unlike traditional films created for adults, animated films serve both the purpose of reflecting as well as teaching, given the fact that they are largely directed toward an audience of children. Because they are largely considered to be innocent entertainment, parents often look to animated films to introduce children to social or developmental situations and to teach a variety of moral and ethical lessons. Children are shown a variety of familial relationships, gender roles, and conflicts between good and evil through animated characters and it is upon these characters and situations that they begin to build their own belief systems. Child expectations for a variety of behaviors and social roles are formed (in part) by watching animated films. While many parents think that children don't attend to subtle messages about race and gender in movies, the opposite is actually the case. In their work on the media's effect on children's conception of race, Greenberg and Mastro cite Badura's social cognitive theory which proposes that the mass media contribute to the construction of value systems and rules of conduct for society by providing models from which children can learn. Because mass mediated messages are pervasive in society, the child entertainment business plays a central role in the creation of role models and, subsequently, in the construction of social reality for children. As a result, interactions with

media models have the potential to generate and shift child beliefs and expectations about a number of social categories, including racial and ethnic groups. Based on their exposure to the possible role models presented in animated films, children may learn what they perceive to be normative behaviors for their own group. Through identifying with certain characters and their roles in animated films, children are also likely to develop their perceptions of members from other groups. If in-group media models are less available, as is more frequently the case with non-majority identified children, then less information is available to immature audiences to inform and guide perceptions and behaviors^{ix}. Black children are at a distinct disadvantage to their White peers when it comes to mapping their own identities to the characters they see in animated films since Black intended characters are so infrequent, and when they do appear, they are sidelined in narrow stereotypical roles. For example, in a study where they analyzed 101 top-grossing G-rated film over a 14-year period from 1990 to 2004, Kelly and Smith (2006) found that 86 percent of male characters were white, 5 percent were African American, 3 percent were Asian, 2 percent were Latino, and 1 percent were Native American. The researchers examined males separately due to their disproportionately high degree of gender representation—72% of speaking characters were male. Among these male models, minorities were nearly twice as likely (62 percent) than Whites (38 percent) to be physically aggressive or violent^x. This echoes the findings that were presented in chapters four through 6 of this volume and underscores the fact that children are relentlessly indoctrinated with mediated messages that Black men are violent and dangerous.

The potential for media content to influence intergroup comparisons is extremely likely, as these images may provide a comparative basis to maintain and enhance self-concept. In particular, research has found that exposure to media depictions of race and ethnicity plays a role

in such processes as stereotype acquisition and use^{xi}. The result is not only the reinforcement of ideologies in terms of gender roles and race, but also the shaping of children's ideas about racial and ethnic group characteristics, their understanding of treatment norms, and their perceptions about appropriate power relationships^{xii}. King et al use their insightful analysis of *Madagascar* as a clear example of the way in which children are taught to understand concepts as citizenship, belonging, and otherness through a nationalistic lens:

“Within a tale relating the adventures of cute and funny animals, the film weaves complicated stories about citizenship and subject positions juxtaposing the North (represented by New York City) and the South (represented by the Madagascar jungle). The fact that Alex, Gloria, Marty, and Melman feel uncomfortable in (and in fact are not able to recognize) the wild when they first arrive in Madagascar (Melman mistakes it for the San Diego zoo) tells us that as residents of the post-industrial North part of the globe, these animals are foreign to the South, a place in which they should feel at home, but they actually find uncivilized. But home for them is New York and its comforts, and they become tourists in their new place, consuming the culture and influencing the lives of those subjects who do belong to the jungle of Madagascar (specifically the lemurs who party constantly and the fossa who prey on the lemurs). This narrative of citizenship as (not) belonging, thus, becomes a teaching tool” by which the audience learns about how they and others are positioned in relation to their nation-state, regardless of the fact that the main characters teaching them those lessons are actually animals^{xiii}”

The same kinds of lessons are taught about race in these films, particularly through the use of language. As I have suggested in my analysis of the manipulation of AAE to influence audience

perceptions of Blackness in animated films, Giroux and others have pointed out the same in films like *Aladdin*, among others:

“racist ideology also appears in racially coded language and accents. For example, *Aladdin* portrays the “bad” Arabs with thick foreign accents while the Anglicized Jasmine and Aladdin speak in standard American English. A hint of the unconscious racism that informs this depiction is provided by Peter Schneider, president of feature animation at Disney, who points out that Aladdin was modeled after Tom Cruise.

Racially coded language is also evident in *The Lion King*, as members of the royal family speak with posh British accents while Shenzi and Banzai, the despicable hyena storm troopers, speak through the voices of Whoopi Goldberg and Cheech Marin in racially coded accents that take on the nuances of the discourses of decidedly urban black and Latino youth. The use of racially coded language in Disney films occurs in an early version of *The Three Little Pigs*, *Song of the South*, and *The Jungle Book*. Astonishingly, these films produce a host of representations and codes which teach children that cultural differences are deviant, inferior, ignorant, and a threat to be overcome.^{xiv}”

As socializing agents for children, Lugo-Lugo and Bloodsworth-Lugo point to what they consider to be a recent shift in the characterization of race in animated films so that ethnicity is repositioned within race, with important consequences. They write, “there is an ethnicization of race in more recent animated films for children, suggesting that children are not only being taught “crude” racial categories but more intricate ways of conceiving “race” in relation to ethnic markers.” (Like language (my addition)) “While it might be argued that there are positive aspects to such portrayals (for instance they complicate race by not homogenizing racial categories such as “black” and “white”), we would argue that the real purpose of the ethnization of race – in a

film like *Shark Tale*—is to differentiate characters in no-so-positive ways.^{xv} Their example in *Shark Tale* outlines the difference between ethnicized Blacknesses with Oscar positioned as a Black American and Ernie and Bernie as Black Jamaicans. The suggestion of different ethnicities within race is signified not only by each group member's appearance, but even more clearly by the use of vernacular forms associated with each ethnicity. Hollywood may claim to reflect what it perceives to be public attitudes in its portrayal of foreign or minority characters by translating those intuitive perceptions. Nevertheless, be it dimwitted earnestness or ethnic insensitivity, the images of Blacks on the animated screen contributed to an evolving mass popular folklore that propagated indiscriminating racist attitudes, essentially placing a mediated image of a 'foreign people,' even a tribal people, before a xenophobic public eye^{xvi}. 121-122

While the work that has been done in the area of media's impact on children's racial ideologies is compelling, much of it is theoretical. So the question remains—in real time, what do children learn about race from animated films? What do they know or predict (if anything) about animated characters with “Black” voices? How are these voices supporting stereotypes about African Americans? Of particular interest to me is the inclusion of violence, sexual content, and comedy and ignorance (or in the very least, naiveté) in the dialogue that is particular to these characters.

The Study

To investigate for myself what children understand about certain characterizations through voicing, I conducted a series of film watching studies with small groups of children. I chose thirty minutes of footage from some of the most popular children's animated films that prominently feature Black-voiced characters. The films were *The Lion King*, *Over the Hedge*, *Madagascar*, and *Mulan*. I selected films which were well-known to all of the participants so

that they would be able to attend more closely to the sounds of the characters' speech than to the storyline. While the children were shown about 30 minutes of film at a time, we used half hour segments that included the longest scenes featuring AAE. The film segments we focused on are as follows:

- 1) *The Lion King* (Shenzi, Banzai, and Ed/ Whoopi Goldberg, Cheech Marin, and Jim Cummings as the hyenas)

Scene 1: The hyenas make their first appearance in the elephant graveyard, where they menace Simba, Zazu, and Nala. After they are chased by the hyenas, Mufasa arrives and rescues the cubs so that the hyenas in this clip are shown to be at turns first violent, then cowardly. While the hyenas' violence is presented as opportunistic victimization of the weak and innocent, (e.g., at one point, Simba tells them to "pick on someone your own size") Mufasa's violence is interpreted as necessary and heroic. Their use of AAE and Latino English is juxtaposed with Zazu' British English and Mufasa and the cubs' unmarked mainstream American English. The scene involves a chase and is backgrounded by gloom (grey clouds and mist) which transitions to red (fire) as the potential for violence intensifies. The predominant images of the hyenas are of flashing teeth and angry eyes, accompanied by dramatic music.

Scene 2: This scene begins with the hyenas alone but they are joined by Scar halfway through. At the outset, the two male hyenas, Banzai and Ed are fighting and then are reprimanded by Shenzi. The three go on to complain about lions and the fact that in the animal hierarchy, lions unfairly have the most powerful position and hyenas the least. When Scar joins them, he breaks into song where he repeatedly references the hyenas' stupidity and ultimately convinces them to participate in the assassination of Mufasa. AAE and Latino are once again

placed in comparison to British English (Scar's dialect) and the scenes are painted in dark, threatening colors.

2) *Over the Hedge* (Wanda Sykes as Stella and Omid Djalli as Tiberius/Tiger,)

Scene 1: The animals awake from hibernation and Stella releases "something she's been holding in all winter" (spray that has been repurposed in this film as flatulence). Here, and repeated over the course of the movie, the skunk's defense mechanism is interpreted as farting so that Stella is continually cast as uncouth. The use of AAE in her "fart" scenes reinforces racialized stereotypes that African Americans are crass, and the immature comedy of bodily fixated humor also situates Blacks as unsophisticated.

Scene 2: Stella meets Tiger, the spoiled house cat, for the first time and that leads to an altercation between the two. Tiger (officially Prince Tiberius Mahmood Shabazz but nicknamed "Tiger" by Stella because she claims his given name is too difficult for her to pronounce) is a Persian cat and is voiced by a British Iranian actor. This voicing again juxtaposes AAE with a prestige dialect, heightening what is to be understood by the audience as a clash of low- and high-born cultures. When Tiger insults her, Stella angrily responds. As was the case with the hyenas, a Black intended character is shown exhibiting the potential for imminent violence with (what will seem to audiences) quick and irrational anger.

Madagascar (Marty/Chris Rock)

Scene 1: Marty's birthday party is a scene that occurs early in the film and the event serves as the catalyst for the friends' adventure to Madagascar. The zoo animals are all assembled to celebrate Marty's tenth birthday and when he blows out the candles on his cake, he wishes that he could go to the wild, upsetting his friends. At first, when asked, Marty is reluctant to reveal what he wished for, citing the possibility of bad luck. When he finally admits his wish to his

friends, they react dramatically and then try to talk him out of wanting to go to the wild. The exchange in this scene attempts to establish Marty as irrational—he's superstitious and then needs to be reasoned with because of what his friends see as his perverse desire to go to the wild.

Scene 2: The crates containing the animals have fallen off of the boat and they arrive in Madagascar. Each animal emerges on the beach for their reunion which turns sour when Alex angrily blames Marty for their banishment from New York. While the other animals are struggling with their new reality, Marty enters the scene joyously surfing on porpoises and is clearly thrilled to be in "the wild." As Alex runs toward Marty and the zebra realizes that their reunion won't be a happy one, Marty tries to retreat and says "Sugar Honey Iced Tea," although it is probably lost on children, adults no doubt recognize the clever way of avoiding cursing (SHIT).

3) *Mulan* (Mushu/Eddie Murphy)

Scene 1: Mushu is introduced when he is awakened by Mulan's ancestors and is sent to rouse the Great Stone Dragon intended to rescue Mulan. Mushu accidentally destroys the Great Stone Dragon and then decides to save Mulan himself for his own redemption with the ancestors. Mushu is reactive and erratic in his opening scenes and it is revealed that he is in disfavor with the more senior (and human) ancestors and as such, has been demoted. He is established as low status here and the audience is shown that, because of his personality, he is unreliable, irrational, and incapable of handling responsibility.

Scene 2: Mushu meets Mulan for the first time and claims to be sent by her ancestors to help her. His entry invokes Black preaching style (and lampoons it) as he first appears larger than life as a shadow on a mountain. He is surrounded by smoke and fire and proclaims himself to be "the guardian of lost souls. The powerful, the pleasurable, the indestructible Mushu." From the outset

he is revealed to the audience as overconfident in his role and his abilities, and that, although he does not acknowledge it, he is out of his depth. His character is instilled with the overblown, stylized bravado that is associated with stereotypes of Black performers and athletes, made all the more prominent by Eddie Murphy's use of the linguistic cadences employed by Black preachers.

Participants

The first groups in the study were made up of children between the ages of five and nine, all of whom were enrolled in a summer camp in a small town in south central Pennsylvania. The camp schedule permitted half-hour film viewings in the afternoons, so my research assistants (one of whom was a counselor at the camp) and I were given permission to show our segments at different times throughout the summer. The children were accustomed to watching 30 minutes of cartoons after lunch so our study was not a departure from their usual routine. The focus groups were made up of 8-10 children from varying racial backgrounds but did not include the same children every time. Due to camp enrollments and summer vacations, membership fluctuated. Over the course of the summer, our team was able to include 24 different campers in the 5-9 age group. There were 8 African American children and 16 European American kids. After the children watched each film clip, they were asked the following questions: which character is the funny one and why? Which character do you like best? Which characters are different? How can you tell? Who is the hero? Who is/are the bad guys? To connect the voicing of the animated characters (interpreted in the absence of physical cues regarding race) to human races, I then showed the children pictures of people (European American and African American) and asked, which one of these people do you think might sound most like X character (e.g., Marty, in

Madagascar or Mushu from *Mulan*)? This was intended to test whether young children actually think of these voices as “Black” or “White.”

A second set of film-watching sessions included older children between the ages of 10 and 13. There were fewer of these children and they were recruited through my own children’s personal relationships and included children of my own acquaintances. There were 9 kids in total who represented this age level, and the group again was predominately White (2 were African American, one was Latino). With those children, I asked some of the same questions (about which were their favorite characters, for example) but I also asked more pointed questions about ethnicity, such as: do you think some of these characters are supposed to be Black? How can you tell? Do you think that they sound like Black people you know? Do you think those (Black intended) characters are funnier than the others? Why, what makes them funny? Do you think if they had different voices that they would still be funny? Do you think some of the characters are smarter or more honest than the others? Why? By asking these types of questions, I intended to test my argument that these characters are designed to conform of racial and ethnic stereotypes already in place, and that they also encourage ongoing ethnic stereotyping in children. I used children between ages 10 and 13 because I believe that by that age, they are sophisticated enough to understand the nuances of ethnic voicing but still are unlikely to connect the voices to actors with whom they might be familiar.

Our findings were as follows:

Children between 5 and 9

Question	<i>Lion King</i>	<i>Over the Hedge</i>	<i>Madagascar</i>	<i>Mulan</i>
Which character is the funny one?	Zazu Ed	Stella Hammy	Marty King Julien	Mushu

			Penguins	
Which character do you like best	Simba Zazu Mufasa	Hammy Heather Stella	Marty Alex King Julien	Mulan Mushu
Which characters are different?	The hyenas Zazu Scar	Stella Tiger	King Julien Marty Melman	Mushu The Huns
Who is the hero?	Mufasa Simba	Vern RJ	Alex	Li Shang Mulan
Who is/are the bad guys?	hyenas Scar	The exterminator people RJ	People fossa	Huns Shan Yu Mushu

Most of the children identified one of the Black intended characters as the funny one first, and then had a runner-up. This was not the case with Whoopi Goldberg's character in *The Lion King* however. While Shenzi does have comedic moments, apparently those were outweighed by her villainous ones. The children between 5 and 9 also chose the "Black" characters among their favorites (except for Shenzi again) and identified some of them as "different" as well. Some of the other "different" characters that the children pointed out also used nonstandard dialects, including British English (Zazu, Scar, and Tiger), Jewish English (Melman), and whatever it is that Ali G is doing when he voices King Julien. They referenced these accents in their answers. Of King Julien, they commented that he "talks funny," "doesn't talk like us," is "maybe from a

different country,” and “I don’t think he’s from here because of the way he talks.” The children had similar reactions to Scar, with the addition of “he sounds mean because of the way he talks” and “he sounds famous.” Zazu, King Julien, and Marty were also determined to be different because of their actions. Children who said that they thought that the Huns were different did so because of their looks—in *Mulan*, the Huns are drawn in a way that is strikingly different from the other characters (their skin is also darker) and the children picked up on this. Heroes were consistently (and predictably) the protagonists of the films and the villains were those that were clearly delineated as well. Two children said that they thought Mushu (while their favorite character) was also “bad” because “he got Mulan into trouble.” Interestingly, in two of the films where people are in opposition with animals, it was the humans who were identified first as “bad guys.” When we asked follow-up questions about why our participants liked particular characters, there were a cluster of common answers. The first was that the favorite characters were silly; they sounded funny, said funny things, or performed funny actions. The second reason given for liking a character reflected connections between the character’s identity and the child’s own. For example, our answers on *Mulan* were along gendered lines—the girls said they liked Mulan because she is a girl. The same was true with Heather, a relatively small part of a teenaged girl voiced by Avril Lavigne in *Over the Hedge*. I suspect that a similar pattern emerged (in part) for Simba whose voice as a cub was provided by Jonathan Taylor Thomas when he was 13; it is likely that the children heard themselves reflected in that voice. All of the African American children who participated in the study selected Black intended characters as favorites and said that they liked those characters for some reasons that revealed racial affinity. Responses included “She sounds like my mom, but ‘cept she’s funny” for Stella and “I think she’s pretty” from an African American girl and a rejoinder from her friend, “She looks like my

grandma,” in reference to Gloria. In the second part of the study, when the children were shown pictures of people (European American and African American) and asked, “Which one of these people do you think might sound most like X character?” they all consistently chose pictures of people of the same races as the actors who voiced the characters. They connected voicing to race without fail which means that they definitely are learning lessons about race from characters in animated films, even (or maybe especially) when those characters are not humans.

Children between 10 and 13

The responses of the children between the ages of 10 and 13 patterned similarly to those of the younger participants.

Question	<i>Lion King</i>	<i>Over the Hedge</i>	<i>Madagascar</i>	<i>Mulan</i>
Which character is the funny one?	Zazu Ed Shenzi	Stella Hammy	Marty King Julien Penguins	Mushu Cri-Kee
Which character do you like best	Simba Mufasa	Hammy Stella	Marty King Julien	Mulan Mushu
Which characters are different?	Zazu Scar	Stella Tiger	King Julien Melman	Mushu The Huns/ Shan Yu
Who is the hero?	Mufasa Simba	Vern RJ All the animals	Alex	Mulan Li Shang
Who is/are the bad guys?	hyenas Scar	The exterminator RJ	People fossa	Huns/ Shan Yu Chi Fu

Like the younger children, the older participants preferred the characters they found to be funny, which often meant the Black intended roles. They gave the same sorts of answers regarding favorite characters as well and for the characters who were the heroes and villains. This group was asked more specific questions regarding what they could tell about race and voicing. To the questions “do you think some of these characters are supposed to be Black? And how can you tell?” they answered in the affirmative. The participants pointed linguistic features, broadly defined, that they associated with AAE like “they use slang” and “they sound southern.” The children also identified particular lexical items and tried to replicate certain sound features, such as liquid vocalizations and the realization of *th* as *d*. They also said that yes, the Black intended characters sound, in general like some of the Black people they knew, but only gave exemplars that matched who were funny, such as a popular class clown who they all knew. Three of the older participants also recognized Chris Rock’s voice and guessed that the other Black intended voices were those of comedic actors. The participants agreed that the Black intended characters (with the exception of Whoopi Goldberg) are funnier than the others (with the exception of Hammy and King Julien), and that the reason they’re funny is because of the roles that they play in the films. Why, what makes them funny? Do you think if they had different voices that they would still be funny? Some of the participants reported that the amusement lay in the physical actions of the comedic characters (such as King Julien’s) and others said that the lines certain characters spoke is what made them funny. They pointed to Mushu’s introduction to Mulan, the fact that he constantly referenced her horse as a cow, to Marty’s crack-a-lackin’ catch phrase, and to Stella’s angry rant to Tiger that included “I did not get all prepped and preened to have some overfed pompous puffball to tell me he’s too good for me. I got makeup on my butt, dude!” They said that the characters would probably not be as funny if they had different voices, and

that part of the humor was not just in the lines, but in their delivery. A few of the participants delivered movie lines with flat intonation to prove this point. Finally, when they were asked “Do you think some of the characters are smarter or more honest than the others?” they were less forthcoming with negative reactions. They blanketed the villains with dishonesty in general because of villainous misdeeds. Scar was dishonest and smart, the hyenas were neither smart nor honest, and RJ was smart but not honest since he is the character who put the other animals in jeopardy in *Over the Hedge*, but he also devised the plan to get them out of trouble. The participants otherwise referred to the positive traits of the heroes: Mufasa must be smart and honest because he is good and kind and is the king of the jungle who protects the circle of life. According to the children in the study, Mulan shares those characteristics because she saves China. Even though Mulan deceived the army and her parents, the participants agreed that she did it in good faith; therefore, she was ultimately honest. None of the Black intended characters were identified immediately as smart or honest. When I asked specifically if the children considered Stella, Marty, and Mushu to be smart, they said no, they did not think that those characters were really intelligent, but perhaps that they were “street smart.” They attempted to define the difference and relied on racialized stereotypes about the kind of Black intelligence that characterizes the trickster: thinking quickly on one’s feet, snappy comebacks, seizing on and exploiting opportunities, and the ability to be linguistically dexterous or evasive.

As other studies have shown, and as I have foreshadowed in earlier chapters, these children do, in fact, reveal that they are attuned to race and racialized scenarios in animated film. The numbers included in the study reported on here are too small to generalize to all children, but these results do support what has been argued throughout this book and elsewhere. I am often told by adults that they saw most of the films I mention in my analysis as children and they did

not see the characters as any race, just as cartoon roles. They insist that they did not grow up knowing or thinking about the racialized scenarios or the imbalance of power along racial lines, or the constant sidelining of Black characters who were consistently cast as either buffoons or henchmen in these films. I respond that they've helped me make my point: these films are insidious in that they indoctrinate immature, uncritical minds at such a subliminal level that children grow up completely unaware of their effect and continue the cycle with children of their own.

ⁱ Giroux, Henry (1992) p 2-3

ⁱⁱ Norman, Floyd. (2007) "Now in full color: A cartoonish take on Black History"
http://jimhillmedia.com/columnists1/b/floyd_norman/archive/2007/02/20/now-in-full-color-a-cartoonish-take-on-black-history.aspx?PageIndex=2. Retrieved 1/30/2018

ⁱⁱⁱ Lindvall, T. and Fraser, B. (1998). "Darker shades of animation: African American Images in the Warner Bros. Cartoon." In *Reading the Rabbit: Explorations in Warner Bros. Animation*. (Kevin Sandler ed.)

^{iv} Silverman, Helaine. 2002. Groovin' to ancient Peru: A critical analysis of Disney's *The Emperor's New Groove*. *Journal of Social Archeology* 2 (3): 298-322, (299)

^v Lindvall, T. and Fraser, B. (1998). "Darker shades of animation: African American Images in the Warner Bros. Cartoon." In *Reading the Rabbit: Explorations in Warner Bros. Animation*. (Kevin Sandler ed.) (123)

^{vi} Snead, James. (1994). "Trimming Uncle Remus' Tales" in *White Screens, Black Images: Hollywood from the Dark Side*. Colin MacCabe and Cornell West, eds. New York.: Routledge.

^{vii} Bell, Elizabeth, Lynda Haas, and Laura Sells, eds. 1995. *From mouse to mermaid: The politics of film, gender, and culture*. Bloomington: Indianan University Press. (1995, 7):

^{viii} Barthes, Roland. 1975. *The Pleasure of the Text*. Macmillan. (39)

^{ix} Greenberg, Bradley and Dana Mastro. 2008. "Children, Race, Ethnicity and Media." In *The Handbook of Children, Media, and Development*. Sandra Calvert and Barbara Wilson (eds.) Blackwell. (75)

Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory of mass communication. *Media Psychology*, 3, 265-99.

^x Quoted in Greenberg and Mastro (84)

^{xi} (Mastro, Behm-Morawitz and Ortiz 2007) quoted in Greenberg and Mastro (78) Mastro, D., Behm-Morawitz, E., & Ortiz, M. (2007). The cultivation of race-based social perceptions of Latinos: A mental models approach. *Media Psychology*. 9, 1-19.

^{xii} (Harwood & Roy 2005; Mastro & Kopacz 2007) quoted in Green berg and Mastro 2007 (78)

^{xiii} (35)

King, C. Richard, Carmen Lug-Lugo, Mary Bloodsworth-Lugo. 2010. *Animating Difference: race, gender, and sexuality in contemporary films for children*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield, Inc.

^{xiv} Giroux, Henry A. (2004) Are Disney Movies Good for you Kids” in *Kinderculture: The corporate construction of childhood*. Shirley Steinberg and Joe Kincheloe (eds.) Westview Press. (175)

^{xv} Lugo-Lugo, C. and Bloodsworth-Lugo, M. (2009).”Look out New World, Here we Come”?: Race, racialization and Sexuality in Four Children’s Animated Films from Disney, Pixar, and DreamWorks.” *Culture Studies ⇔ Ctitical Methodologies*.

^{xvi} Lindvall, T. and Fraser, B. (1998).”Darker shades of animation: African American Images in the Warner Bros. Cartoon.” In *Reading the Rabbit: Explorations in Warner Bros. Animation*. (Kevin Sandler ed.) (121-22)