



Theses and Dissertations

2012-07-11

A Content Analysis of Family Structure in Newbery Medal and Honor Books, 1930 – 2010

Shannon Marie Despain
Brigham Young University - Provo

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Despain, Shannon Marie, "A Content Analysis of Family Structure in Newbery Medal and Honor Books, 1930 – 2010" (2012). *Theses and Dissertations*. 3648.

<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/3648>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

A Content Analysis of Family Structure in Newbery Medal
and Honor Books, 1930 – 2010

Shannon M. Despain

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

Michael O. Tunnell, Chair
Timothy Morrison
Bradley Wilcox

Department of Teacher Education

Brigham Young University

August 2012

Copyright © 2012 Shannon M. Despain

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

A Content Analysis of Family Structure in Newbery Medal and Honor Books, 1930 – 2010

Shannon M. Despain
Department of Teacher Education
Master of Arts

Newbery books are a reliable representation of quality children's literature. They have not previously been formally evaluated by the family structures represented in the books. This content analysis considered 87 contemporary realistic fiction Newbery winner and Honor books since the 1930s that portray families in English-speaking, western settings. The family structures portrayed in these books were compared with the family structure categories of the decade in which each book is set. Percentage comparisons revealed that the 1930s, 1940s, and 1950s do not represent the actual family structures of their time period. After the Age of New Realism began in the mid 60s, the family structures in the books more closely matched the family structures of their decade, but several discrepancies remained.

Keywords: [family structure, children's literature, Newbery, U.S. Census, contemporary realistic fiction, traditional family]

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I express deep appreciation to my mother for her love and support. To my chair, Dr. Michael O. Tunnell, for the endless meetings, his guidance, wisdom, support, patience, and ability to allow me the range I need to stretch myself and make this thesis my own. Also, to my committee members, Dr. Timothy Morrison and Dr. Brad Wilcox for their flexibility, critiques, and support. And to Dr. Janet Young and my rock solid cohort.

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgements.....	iii
List of Tables.....	vii
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem.....	1
Statement of the Purpose.....	4
Research Questions in the Study.....	5
Limitations of the Study.....	5
Definition of Terms.....	6
Chapter 2: Review of Literature	7
Individual Identity.....	7
Stages of Development.....	7
Influence of Books.....	8
Role of Family Structure.....	11
Family Structure.....	11
Changes in Family Structure Over Time.....	11
Reflection of Families in Books.....	12
Teacher Responsibility to Students.....	14
Sources of Study.....	15
Newbery Award Books.....	15
U.S. Census.....	17
Chapter 3: Methodology	19
Changes in Census Categories Over time.....	19

Book Selection for Study.....	19
Categorization of Books by Family Structure.....	21
Analysis of Data.....	23
Chapter 4: Findings	24
Comparison of Family Structure Content in the Census and Books.....	24
1930s (1940 Census).....	24
1940s (1950 Census).....	25
1950s (1960 Census).....	27
1960s (1970 Census).....	29
1970s (1980 Census).....	31
1980s (1990 Census).....	33
1990s (2000 Census).....	35
2000s (2010 Census).....	36
Summary.....	37
Chapter 5: Discussion	39
Interpretation of Findings by Family Categories.....	39
Families.....	39
Interracial Couples.....	42
Same-sex Couples.....	43
Unmarried Partners.....	43
Children.....	44
Males and Females – Divorce.....	50
Summary.....	51

Recommendations.....	52
References.....	53
Appendix A.....	61
Appendix B.....	69

List of Tables

	Page
Table 1: Number of Qualifying Books by Decade Included in the Study.....	19
Table 2: A Comparison of the 1940 Census Family Structure Categories in the U.S. Population and Newbery Books.....	24
Table 3: A Comparison of the 1950 Census Family Structure Categories in the U.S. Population and Newbery Books.....	25
Table 4: A Comparison of the 1960 Census Family Structure Categories in the U.S. Population and Newbery Books.....	27
Table 5: A Comparison of the 1970 Census Family Structure Categories in the U.S. Population and Newbery Books.....	29
Table 6: A Comparison of the 1980 Census Family Structure Categories in the U.S. Population and Newbery Books.....	31
Table 7: A Comparison of the 1990 Census Family Structure Categories in the U.S. Population and Newbery Books.....	32
Table 8: A Comparison of the 2000 Census Family Structure Categories in the U.S. Population and Newbery Books.....	34
Table 9: A Comparison of the 2010 Census Family Structure Categories in the U.S. Population and Newbery Books.....	35

Chapter 1

Introduction

Statement of the Problem

The American family has undergone a radical transformation in the last 80 years. The size, quality, and diversity of this change can be illustrated by comparing census figures from 1940 and 2010. The categories used in 1940 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1940) to describe the families living among the approximately 132 million people in the country at the time show this change. There were only two basic divisions: "family" and "nonfamily" households. These divisions are further split into "married couples," "male householder," and "female householder."

By 2010, the U.S. Census described family structures in much different ways. The categories describing the family structures of the nearly 309 million residents included "married living with spouse," "married but separated," "widowed," "divorced," "living together but not married," etc. It also included "interracial couples," "size of family," "children under 18," "grandparents," and "adults living at home." In 1940, a woman could not be listed as head of household if she was married and her husband was present, but in 2010, a female may be so listed—a fact that highlights how much has changed in perception. Of course, more than perceptions have changed since 1940. As western society has become more tolerant of less traditional families, the more such families have proliferated, as indicated by the changes in census data collection. For instance, in the 1940 census, only three percent of adults were listed as divorced, as compared to 10 percent in 2010.

Children are affected by these changes in families. Students today come from a greater variety of family structures and therefore face many different experiences, struggles, triumphs, prejudices, and perceptions than their peers from the past. Still, a student's family today, as in the past, provides a developmental context that is important for forming a sense of identity (Bartoszuk & Pittman, 2010). It is during the intermediate and middle school grades that young adolescents form their identities. They shape them through exploration of conflict and resolution (Erikson, 1959) and other life experiences. Some of these experiences are lived. Other experiences are lived vicariously through the stories of others. Books containing these stories and experiences are important components of the formation of identity for children and young teens (Alvermann, 2001; Gillespie, et al., 1994; Smith-D'Arezzo & Moore-Thomas, 2009). Whether in books or in real life the family continues to be a vital part of any child's life experience (Bartoszuk & Pittman, 2010).

Because of the diverse families from which children come, teachers have a responsibility to be sensitive, aware, and accepting. They should help all students become aware and accepting of diverse family structures and help students see that their family structures are valid. Kinman and Henderson (1985) told us that children need to see lifestyles that are similar to their own in literature so they can feel validated and know they are not alone. They also can compare their family lives to those portrayed in books in order to better understand their own situations. For instance, if a child is in a family structure that puts him or her in danger, such as an incestuous or abusive relationship, that child can come to understand from literature that this is not an acceptable situation and find courage to seek help. Books, therefore, are a part of identity formation in students, helping them to

understand and make sense of their world (Bartoszuk & Pittman, 2010; Smith-D'Arezzo & Moore-Thomas, 2009). How students see themselves can be greatly influenced by books.

Since the 1960s and the rise of the Age of New Realism (see Definition of Terms), topics such as race (especially during the Civil Rights Movement), sexism and disabilities have been treated more openly (Casey, 2005; Rosen, 1971). People are more willing to discuss and explore non-traditional, controversial, and sensitive issues in western society, including diverse and unusual family structures. But has literature for children followed the same trend? Has literature led society to this openness? Why are some family structures still not discussed as frequently in children's books? Are the children's books of today more transparent concerning family issues than those from the 1940s and 50s? Have portrayals of family structures in more recent children's books reflected the diversity indicated by the changing census reports, thereby providing opportunities for individual children to read books that represent their own family situations?

What is read by a culture has a great impact on the society's beliefs and values (Nisse, 2008). According to Noll (1995), "work [produced by authors and illustrators in a culture] offers young readers a powerful means for developing personal understanding of the diversity and uniqueness of all people. It is crucial that those understandings be built upon a foundation of facts, not misinformation, distortions and stereotypes" (p. 40). Therefore, it is important to determine whether or not children's literature over the years has accurately reflected the range of family structures corresponding with societal realities, and especially whether or not that is the case today.

If children's books do not accurately represent family structures, children of each generation may be less likely to see their own family reflected in literature. This may

inhibit their chance to see families different from their own, thereby their understanding and learning from the diversity that surrounds them is diminished.

Statement of the Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine all contemporary realistic fiction books for children that have won either the Newbery Medal or Honor Award to determine how family structures in western English-speaking societies are represented compared with the family structures reported in the U.S. Census. Results can determine whether or not American children's books have, over time, reflected accurate views of family structures. Each year, the John Newbery Medal recognizes the most distinguished books in American literature for children. The award strongly influences parent and student book choices. Winners are among the most read of children's books. Since its inception in 1922, there have been 91 medal winners and 297 honor books.

Several studies have been done focusing on Newbery books and evaluating how they relate to societal issues and trends. Researchers have looked at gender (Agee, 1993), sexism (Kinman & Henderson, 1985), disabilities (Leininger et al., 2010), multicultural issues (Gillespie, et. al., 1994) and race (Nisse, 2008). There has not previously been an in-depth study on family structure in Newbery books.

Therefore, this study explained how Newbery books in each decade have reflected the family structures of their respective time periods. Because a more inclusive view of what makes up the family may help students feel that their family life is valid and acceptable, the information yielded by this study may prove useful in aiding young readers and their parents and teachers in selecting books about family life.

Research Questions in the Study

1. How have Newbery Medal and Honor books that are contemporary realistic fiction and set in English-speaking countries reflected the reality of family structures that existed during the decade in which they were written and set?
2. In which decades do the Newbery Medal and Honor books of contemporary realistic fiction best reflect the family structures in that decade in English-speaking countries?

Limitations of the Study

A few limitations to this study should be mentioned. First, the parameters for which Newbery books fit into the study were tightly controlled. Only books that were set within the decade of the publication date were included, in order to compare that decade's census data about family life to children's books written about that same time period. This was done in part to keep the study manageable.

Second, Newbery books may be an indicator but not necessarily representative of all children's books published in each decade. This is a trusted representation of children's books, but there is no way to remedy this because there is no way to represent all children's books.

Third, there was some difficulty in determining what constituted a match with the family structures of the time and the family structure portrayed in the book. The decision to label a family structure from a book as a family structure from the census required subjective judgment calls. Because of family structures changing and being intricately interwoven into the story, it would be impossible to employ another rater without that person reading each book, an unrealistic commitment to have asked of someone at this

time. Most of the family structures as shown in the literature were clear-cut. I have included my rationale for assigning family structures for specific books that include examples of excerpts from the books read to support the decisions made for each book in each decade. This should ensure readers that the placement of family structures from the books was not arbitrary.

Definition of Terms

The study uses the following terms repeatedly. It is important for readers to have a clear understanding of their meanings as used in this paper.

Traditional Family. A mother and father who are married, living together, and raising their children.

Valid Family Structure. A family structure defined in the census data of each decade.

Contemporary Realistic Fiction. A contemporary realistic fiction novel is set in the modern world and within the decade in which it was published. For example, if a book was published in 1965, its setting was also set sometime within the decade of the 1960s.

Conventional Reader. A conventional reader is someone who can read fluently (accurately, quickly, and with expression) and is able to comprehend what he or she reads.

Age of New Realism. The movement beginning in the mid 1960s when authors began to deal with previously taboo topics such as death and divorce.

Chapter 2

Review of Literature

The purpose of this study was to compare the family structures portrayed in Newbery Award books with those delineated in the U.S. Census reports, thereby determining whether or not children's literature gives an accurate reflection of American family life. Because the influence that both family structures (Bartoszuk & Pittman, 2010) and literary representations of those structures (Gillespie, *et al.*, 1994; Leininger, *et al.*, 2010; Long, 1978) have on the identities of children, these issues are included in the literature review. Also included is a look at a teacher's responsibility for helping students form their identities through literature and an examination of other studies that have utilized Newbery books.

Individual Identity

Students' identities play a role in how they function in the world and in their academic performance. This section will address stages in development, the ways identity is reflected in children's books, the role of content in books, and the extent to which students' identities are influenced by the structure of their families.

Stages in development. During intermediate and middle grades students begin to shape their identities and clarify how they will view the world. Identity is considered to be a social-psychological construct. Children are exploring to find out who they are and where they fit in, which includes exploring their roles in society. Explaining the work of Erikson, Umana-Taylor and her colleagues (2008) summed it up well:

Identity develops through an ongoing process of exploration and resolution of crises that continues through the lifespan (Cote & Levine, 1987). Social Identity theory

posits that one's identity involved a sense of belonging to a group and the affect that accompanies this sense of group membership (Tafjel, 1981).

Children's life experiences and background knowledge are key aspects to identity development, but Tafjel (1981) maintained that it is vital that children feel good about their experiences and what they have learned during the process.

According to Erikson's (1959) stages of identity, students in their early adolescent years are transitioning from "Industry vs. Inferiority" to "Identity vs. Identity Diffusion." The earlier stage is defined by the phrase "I am what I learn." What is learned comes from personal experiences in their environments (and families), and vicarious experiences found in books and other media. Students will work hard to learn something, but may feel inadequate and inferior if conflict in learning (Erikson's crisis that spurs development) is not resolved. Students at the later stage are trying to master experiences, while watching to see how others are mastering their experiences. They are strongly influenced by the perceptions others have of them. Similarly, they are looking for alternative sources of information about the world that they can use to inform their experiences.

Influence of books. Students learn about life in part from reading books. Books enable students to learn and experience many things independently. This is especially true once students focus less on learning to decode (phonics, concepts of print) and move on comprehending text (McGee & Richgels, 2008). As students learn how to read conventionally and think abstractly, books become a great source of information. Kinman and Henderson (1985) stated, "The written word is one of the most powerful ways to transmit ideas and information" (p. 885). Specifically, literature can be used to gain knowledge and experience in all aspects of life (Smith-D'Arezzo & Moore-Thomas, 2010).

All students come to school with background knowledge that is their basis for viewing the world. Comprehension happens when readers use both the text and their background knowledge to construct meaning (Tarchi, 2010). Background knowledge can be built or activated to better understand something new (Fontichiaro, 2010). For example, a boy may have a puppy at home that has inexhaustible energy and often causes problems around the house. If that child reads a book about a girl who gets a new puppy and all the adventures and mishaps that go along with it, the student may connect the girl's experiences to his own and construct meaning from the printed page.

When students do not have sufficient background knowledge to understand a story, this can be built. For example, if the teacher is reading *The True Story of the Three Little Pigs* (Scieszka, 1989), and some students have never heard the original story of the three little pigs, they can be told or read that story. The new story will have more meaning, and they will be able to understand the humor in this fractured or reworked folktale.

Activating background knowledge is an important comprehension strategy that should be taught (Fontichiaro, 2010; Swanson, et. al., 2011; Tarchi, 2010). What students learn from life experiences and from books becomes their background knowledge and their background knowledge, reciprocally, aids in students' comprehension. In essence, they read to gain knowledge, and as they gain knowledge, they better comprehend what they read. Their background knowledge is part of who they are, and it helps shape their identity.

Books can play an important role in the formation of identity and a student's worldview (Bartoszuk & Pittman, 2010). Books are powerful; they have the power to change minds and hearts (Gillespie, et al., 1994). The books that students read can greatly impact how they view themselves. As students read, they have the opportunity to expand

their knowledge and world experiences vicariously (Smith-D'Arezzo & Moore-Thomas, 2009). These gained experiences will help them determine who they are and what kind of a person they want to become.

Reading is a social interaction between the author and the reader that provides a crucial way for students to explore their identities. Different texts may allow students to try on and evaluate identities (Alvermann, 2001). The identities they try on help them form their own. Similarly, students use books to understand the identities of others. Students act on cues from books they read and are heavily influenced by literature (Moje, et al., 2000).

Literature helps mold our own sense of what society is and what constitutes normality in our minds. Our books mirror our culture (Hilbun, Claes, & Griffiths, 2010). What is written in books generally reflects the values and ideals of society. In turn, what is read in books helps to shape the values and ideals of society. This occurs as early adolescent students become conventional readers and begin to develop their identities.

Intermediate and middle school students are at the stage where they simultaneously are becoming conventional readers and finding their identities. Identity is formed through social-psychological interactions (Erikson, 1959), and family is still the primary source of social interaction. Because there is also an important social interaction between reader and author (Bartoszuk & Pittman, 2010; Gillespie, et al., 1994; Smith-D'Arezzo & Moore-Thomas, 2009), the ways that families are represented in children's books may have an important influence on how young readers come to view themselves and others.

Beginning in the mid 1960s, topics that were previously not discussed in books, such as death, divorce, or children's discordance with parents, began to emerge. This became known as the Age of New Realism (see Definition of Terms). Two pioneer books of

this movement were *Where the Wild Things Are* (Sendak, 1963) and *Harriet the Spy* (Fitzhugh, 1964). These books showed children not in harmony with their parents and opened the doors for other writers to broach these previously taboo topics (Tunnell, et al., 2012).

Role of family structure. Family structure is an essential part of how students view the world. For early adolescents, it is still the main social institution on which they base their social identity (Bartoszuk & Pittman, 2010). Because family is, by its very nature, a social organization, it is the base of much of a person's social identity. Comparing their own family structures with the family structures of others can help some children make sense of life (Bartoszuk & Pittman, 2010).

Family Structure

Because family structure influences children's identity development, it would be important to know how families have changed over time. In addition, it would be of interest to know how those family structures were reflected in the children's literature of the time period.

Changes in family structure over time. Throughout history, family structures and the purpose of the family have changed dramatically. For instance, children are no longer seen as a mouth to feed or a helping hand as they were until the late 19th century; gender roles are less defined in regards to parenting; there has been a shift from traditional families as the norm to a growing number of non-traditional families (Bartoszuk & Pittman, 2010; Ferraro, 2008; Kinman & Henderson, 1985; Schmitt, 2001).

The decades since the 1940s have seen rapid changes in family structure. The traditional family, where a mother and father live together and raise their children, is no

longer the predominant family structure (Kinman & Henderson, 1985). The 1940 census did not even attempt to categorize or count a female head of household if she had a husband in the home, unlike today. Divorce rates were low and the majority of families were structured with the man as head of household, whether or not the wife was present or employed.

Contrast the 1940 U.S. Census with the 2010 U.S. Census. The categories today are not separated into male or female head of households. Only fifty percent of the households have the married spouse present in the home and divorce rates have increased. Ten percent of adults are divorced as compared to the three percent in 1940 (US Census Bureau, 1940 & 2010). This rate does not report the percentage of all married couples who were divorced, but the percentage of all adults (age 18 and up) who were divorced. In the later censuses more questions about the family structure were asked, more subcategories were added, including separated and married with spouse absent. The census questions have changed in relation to the demographics of the changing family structures.

It follows that because of changes in family structure in recent decades those changes have modified identity formation in the early adolescent years. The types of families students were a part of 70 years ago are different from the families many students have today. These altered family structures and the more exposure students have to them will shape identities in a different way (Bartoszuk & Henderson, 2010; Benson, 2009).

Reflection of families in books. In children's literature, students have a chance to see their own lifestyles and find either positive or negative images of it. They either can find acceptance and validation (Kinman & Henderson, 1985), or they can come to

understand that many of the things happening to them are not unique, and that others have also gone through and overcome similar difficulties.

Students who find literature that reflects their own family structures may find validation that their family situations are acceptable, thus positively impacting their self-images (Kinman & Henderson, 1985). Therefore, it is important that books have realistic elements so the experiences and thoughts of the protagonists are similar to readers (Kinman & Henderson, 1985). The choices and behaviors of the character could also have a positive influence on readers' developing identities. Leininger, et al., (2010) suggested that books may be used to change attitudes and behaviors in regards to a student's own lifestyle as well as those of others.

As students interact with peers who have different family structures from their own, literature may help them foster empathy and understanding for these divergent life situations (Leininger, et al., 2010). Although stories are not the same as personal contact with people, they can still "raise the consciousness level of children and deepen their understanding of cultures different from theirs" (Huck, et al., 1987, p. 501).

Positive portrayals of different family structures in literature may encourage acceptance and understanding in students (Leininger, et al, 2010). A study by Smith-D'Arezzo & Moore-Thomas (2010) showed that literature may help develop such understandings. Having students read books that portray students with disabilities in a positive light may engender a modicum of empathy.

Family structures and their related cultural expectations are key components of one's culture and lifestyle (Bartoszuk & Pittman, 2010). Typical classrooms include children with a wide range of family structures and home experiences. Students' familiarity

with their own families may cause them to assume most people have the same type of family. Through books and stories, they can learn that there are many types of families that function and can be acceptable in society.

By reading about others, students think about themselves and compare the family structures they encounter and the subsequent identities to themselves. “The term ‘identity’ expresses such a mutual relation in that it connotes both a persistent sameness within oneself (selfsameness) and a persistent sharing of some kind of essential character with others” (Erikson, 1959, p. 109).

Teacher Responsibility to Students in Choosing Books

Because books are such a powerful way to communicate and because books are a vital component of classroom learning, it is essential that teachers, especially those who teach early adolescents and upper elementary students, understand the role of literature in the formation of identities. Smith-D’Arezzo & Moore-Thomas (2010) stated that it is part of the job of a teacher to expose students to a wide variety of books that include characters from different backgrounds and cultures.

Teachers have a responsibility to become familiar with suitable books for their students (Gillespie, et. al., 1994). This also means that teachers need to find books with which students can identify. Students need access to books that will help them build a positive identity. Toward that goal, the teacher should expose students to literature that introduces a wide variety of family structures.

Bibliotherapy is a term often used in conjunction with problems associated with identity formation. It can be defined as any kind of emotional healing that results from the reading of stories (Jacobs & Tunnell, 2004). Bibliotherapy is an effective tool to use with

children and can have great benefits. However, bibliotherapy must never be prescriptive. A book can help a child wrestle and come to terms with a problem, but it is not necessarily a solution and should never be relied on as such. Many situations need trained professionals. Teachers can suggest books and make them available to students, but students should never be forced to read a book that may make them uncomfortable. There is no one perfect solution that can be portrayed through a book or character that will fit every reader's situation (Chatton, 1988).

Sources of Study

The sources of information for this study were the U.S. Census from 1940 – 2010 and Newbery Winner and Honor books. In order to justify my use of these sources, I looked at the book selection process in various studies. I also looked to other studies that were done that used Newbery books or U.S. Census data as sources of information.

Newbery Award books. Studies that used Newbery Award books included both the Newbery Medal winners and the Newbery Honor books. Parameters for utilizing the titles were then set to fit the particular study. For example, only books portraying a main or secondary character with one of the 13 disabilities according to IDEA (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act) were used in the Leininger study (Leininger, et. al., 2010).

The study on multicultural perspectives in Newbery books examined only those books with main or supporting characters that were minorities according to the classifications of the United States Department of Education (Gillespie, et. al., 1994). Agee's (1993) study looked specifically at only two Newbery books that portrayed women in leading roles in different cultural circumstances.

Following this pattern, this study used parameters for selecting books. For instance, only contemporary realistic fiction books set within the decade of their publication date were included, in order to compare that decade's census data about family life to children's books written about the same time period. The books also had to be Newbery Winner or Honor books as representatives of all children's books following the parameters from that decade.

It is a commonly accepted method in studies that analyze the content of children's books to use the winners of the Newbery Award. Examples of studies conducting a content analysis of Newbery Award and Honor books include one by Leininger, et al. (2010), who looked at how disabilities are portrayed in these award winners. The authors considered every Newbery book that had main or supporting characters with a disability and charted which disabilities were represented. They also looked at the portrayal of the disability, exemplary practices of the characters, and the characters' social interactions and relationships, including sibling relationships. The study found that "the representation of characters with disabilities was not proportionate to the current school population of children and adolescents with disabilities" (Leininger, et. al., 2010, p. 587). Among characters with disabilities, gender was accurately represented (71% of the characters in the books were male and 68% of students with disabilities are male), but race was not, with 76% of the characters with disabilities being white. Eighty-four percent of the characters were rated acceptable in the accurate portrayal of the disability, with higher ratings occurring in more recent years.

A study of Newbery books from a multicultural perspective was done in 1994 (Gillespie, et. al.). The ethnicities of the main and supporting characters in Newbery Award

and Honor winners were studied. Results showed that as of 1993, the characters were overwhelmingly white, with black characters as the second most represented. Seven percent of the main characters were black, along with 14% of the minor characters. Other ethnicities were represented less.

In 2008, Nisse wrote a paper on many aspects of society portrayed in Newbery books, including race. Overall, 72% of the protagonists in Newbery Medal winners were white and 28% were nonwhite. The percentages of nonwhites increased generally overtime.

Agee (1993) studied gender roles portrayed in Newbery books. She looked at two Newbery Award books and the mother and daughter relationships within them. She found that the two children's books showed the socialization of women in different ways, reflecting their differing cultures.

In 1985, a study was conducted that examined the issue of sexism in Newbery winners (Kinman & Henderson, 1985). Although this is not a recent study, it did show that from the years 1971-1984, women as main characters increased from a 1:3 ratio to a 2:3 ratio.

These studies establish a precedent for the use of Newbery books to examine how various cultural aspects are reflected in children's literature. Though a variety of those aspects have been studied, a content analysis of family structures in children's books has not been completed previously.

U.S. Census. The U.S. Census grants access to the demographic data about family structures in America that were needed for this study. The U.S. Census is a massive

undertaking by the federal government that is generally accepted as a reliable source of data about the population of America.

Many other studies have used census data in their research. For example, one such study used census data to track immigrant settlements in non-urban areas of the United States (Donato, et. al., 2007). Another study analyzed census data to determine if college graduates were more responsive to labor market opportunities internationally (Wozniak, 2010). Because of the legitimacy of census data as source material and other studies' use of such information, my use of census data in this research is justified.

Chapter 3

Methodology

This section describes in further detail the book selection process. It explains how the data were analyzed, comparing family structures represented in the Newbery books to the family structures reported in the census.

Changes in Census Categories Over Time

The census categories reporting family structures in the United States have changed throughout the last century. In the 1940s, the census had categories of only “family” households and “nonfamily” households with only “male and female” heads of household reported. Today there are many more categories, including a wider range of marital statuses, children under 18 living with family or nonfamily, interracial marriages, children living with grandparents, and adults living at home. In the 2000 census there was even an unofficial report of the number of married and non-married same-sex relationships.

Book Selection for Study

A book was included in this study if the story was set within the decade it was published. This means that if a story was about a family during World War II, it would have to have been published in the 1940s to be included. As an example, the book *Walk Two Moons* by Sharon Creech was published in 1994 and is about a little girl travelling from Ohio to Idaho in the 1990s. On the other hand, a book written in 1943 but set during the pre-Revolutionary War era, such as *Johnny Tremain* by Esther Forbes, would reflect the family structure of that historical time period and not that of the 1940s. I used this method for choosing books in order to determine whether or not authors have accurately reflected the reality of family structures when they wrote their contemporary realistic fiction novels.

Because the John Newbery Medal is an American award and the information about the family structure comes from the U.S. census, a book also had to be set in an English-speaking country in order to best represent the families of children in the United States. Although many families in America speak other languages, the cultures of their countries of origin may be different from America's general culture.

The Newbery Award was established in 1922 and is given to the most distinguished contribution to American literature for children published each year. There are 91 Medal winners and 297 Honor books to date. In the 1930s there are seven books that fit the criteria. In the 1940s, 8; 1950s, 9; and 9, 14, 12, 15, and 13 in the decades that follow for a total of 87 books (see Table 1).

Table 1

Number of Qualifying Books by Decade Included in the Study

Decade	Newbery Medal Winners	Newbery Honor Winners	Total
1930s	1	6	7
1940s	0	8	8
1950s	3	6	9
1960s	3	6	9
1970s	5	9	14
1980s	2	10	12
1990s	6	9	15
2000s	2	11	13
Total	22	65	87

All of the selected books are fiction because biographies are typically historical and informational books do not typically represent family life with the same emotional power as fiction. However, as noted earlier, not all fiction qualified. For instance, stories with animals as main characters were not included. Fantasies based on ancient or imaginary

cultures were also not included. Only books categorized as contemporary realistic fiction at the time of publication were analyzed in this study.

The parameters for book selection were as follows: 1) The book had to be a Newbery Medal or Honor winner; 2) The book had to be a contemporary realistic fiction (see definition of terms); 3) The book must have been set in an English-speaking country. All Newbery Medal and Honor winners that fit these parameters were analyzed. Though the award was first presented in 1922, books from the 1920s were not included because no books from that decade qualified.

Categorization of Books by Family Structure

Families in the Newbery books were categorized by family structure using the U.S. Census from the decade in which the book was written. For example, the 2000 census was used for books published from 1990 to 1999. The U.S. Census data for each decade was used to show what the reality of family structures was at that point in time. Books published during the decade covered by a census report were evaluated using the definitions of family structures included in the census data. For instance, if a book was written in 1954, the census data from 1960 were compared to the family structure represented in the book. This demonstrated if the Newbery books accurately reflected the family structures of the time.

The census data included four main categories beginning with the 1960 Census: “families,” “children,” “males,” and “females.” When calculating the percentages from both the census data from each decade and the information from the books, I used one of these four categories as the denominator when calculating percentages. For example, when determining what percentage of children live with a divorced mother only in the 1960

Census, I calculated 1,210,000 (the number of children under 18 living with a divorced mother only) divided by 63,727,000 (the total number of children under 18).

As I read the books, I marked and highlighted passages that helped reveal what sort of family structure existed in the story. If a family structure was not shown in enough detail to be able to categorize it, then a book otherwise fitting the parameters was not used. Because of family structures changing and being intricately interwoven into the story, it was impossible to employ another rater without that person reading each book, a time commitment no one was able to provide. Most of the family structures as shown in the literature were clear-cut. I have included in the discussion section examples of excerpts from the books read and the family structure that I put it under for that decade. This should demonstrate to readers that the assignment of family structures from the books was not arbitrary (see Appendix B).

There were some books that did not specify the marital status or family dynamics. If it was alluded to or could be inferred, I included this in my data. An example of this is from *Everything on a Waffle* by Polly Horvath (2001) when Primrose was describing her uncle who took her in when her parents went missing.

The town council must try to summon my next of kin, Mr. Jack Dion, because . . . he was the only kin they could find any reference to and no one else was volunteering to take me in. . . . One time my mother had mentioned Uncle Jack, her brother, to me, she had said he was a drifter. . . . He was in the navy now, stationed all the way across the country in Halifax, Nova Scotia. (pp. 15-16)

From this passage, I inferred that “Uncle Jack” was a man that had never been married because when he came to take care of Primrose he brought no family with him.

If there was no way of knowing the status of an individual, I did not include it in my data. In the book *Honk the Moose* by Phil Stong, no references to the mother of one of the main characters was included; however, the author did not mention him not having one either. The mother simply was not mentioned. Only his dad was mentioned in passing. In this case I did not know if he had a mother, if she was absent, if the parents were divorced, or if they were still married. The book provided insufficient information to make an inference, so that character's family structure was left out of the data.

Analysis of Data

I analyzed the U.S. Census data records on family structures for every decade from 1940 to 2010. I charted the census questions about family structure (see Appendix A). When I read the qualifying books from that decade, I made a record of which family structure was represented in each book. When all analyses of the books were finished, I compared the number of families that fit a certain family structure in the Newbery books to the actual number of families that fit that profile in each decade according to the U.S. Census. Then the statistics for each decade were compared to see which family structures were accurately represented in its Newbery winners. For example, if two males out of 24 total males (8%) in the books of the 1970s fit under the category of divorced males, then this percentage was compared with the actual percentage of divorced males according to the 1980 U.S. Census data.

Chapter 4

Findings

The following pages report the results of my data analysis. A discussion will follow in Chapter 5 as to what the data imply in relation to the research questions. It is important to understand that in categorizing the families depicted in the qualifying books I did not include families or individuals in the data if there was not enough information to at least infer the family structure (see Chapter 3).

Comparison of Family Structure Content in the Census and Books

While reading the books that qualified for the study and collecting data from them, many interesting congruencies and glaring discrepancies between the census and the books were revealed, indicating how society is reflected in our children's books and how the books may affect our society. For instance, the 1940 census has few family categories, showing that many family structures that certainly existed were not recognized. Likewise, the books in earlier decades did not adequately reflect the realities of the family structures of their times, such as households split by divorce and households with one householder (see Appendix A). I have reported the most telling comparisons by decade for reading ease.

1930s (1940 Census). The 1940 Census had fewer categories pertaining to families than any other decade and the predominant category was "family household, married couple," which is a traditional family. However, the seven qualifying books in the 1930s overrepresented the traditional family. According to the census, 76% of family households had married couples, but 82% of the books contained families with married couples. Married males and married females were also overrepresented. The census showed 61% of both genders were married, but the books showed that 90% of females are married and

82% of males. Although only 2% of females and 1% of males were divorced according to the 1940 census, there was no mention of divorce in any of the qualifying books. (See Table 2 for an overview of the 1940 Census and the corresponding Newbery books.)

Table 2

A Comparison of the 1940 Census Family Structure Categories in the U.S. Population and Newbery Books

1940 Census Family Structure Categories	U.S. Population	Newbery Books
Married couples	76%	82%
Married female	61%	82%
Never married female	26%	5%
Widowed female	12%	-
Divorced female	2%	-
Married male	61%	82%
Never married male	33%	9%
Widowed male	4%	5%
Divorced male	1%	-

The only category other than the traditional family that surfaced in the books was “spouses” that were “widowed.” Twelve percent of women were widows in the 1930s, but the books did not include any woman who was a widow. Only 4% of males were widowed according to the census. One widower appeared in the books, which accounted for 5% of the males (n=22). “Marriage separation” was not a category on the census at this time, nor was it mentioned in the books. Adult males and females in the books who had never been married were extremely underrepresented. Twenty-six percent of females had never been married in the 1930s compared to 5% of females in the books. Similarly, the census data showed 33% of males had never been married, but the books showed only 9%.

1940s (1950 Census). Seventy-eight percent of families were categorized as married couples in the 1950 census compared with 71% of the families in the eight qualifying books. Surprisingly, the married couples were slightly underrepresented in the

books. There were many more male and female heads of household that were not married in the books than in the census data: 14% compared to 3% of females and 36% compared to 8% of males. In the 1950 Census fewer than 1% of families had a father only, but in the books it was 7%. Three percent of families had only a mother according to the census, but the books had 21%. Both widows and widowers were overrepresented in the books. Only 12% of women and 4% of men actually were widowed, but the books showed 33% of women and 17% of men. (See Table 3 for an overview of the 1950 Census and the corresponding Newbery books.)

Table 3

A Comparison of the 1950 Census Family Structure Categories in the U.S. Population and Newbery Books

1950 Census Family Structure Categories	U.S. Population	Newbery Books
Married couples	78%	71%
Family household – Male householder	3%	14%
Family household – Female householder	8%	36%
Families with own children under 18 – Married couples	43%	50%
Families with own children under 18 – Mother only	3%	21%
Families with own children under 18 – Father only	<1%	7%
Widowed female	12%	33%
Widowed male	4%	17%
Divorced female	2%	-
Divorced male	2%	-
Never married female	20%	8%
Never married male	26%	8%

New categories appeared in the 1950 census such as families with “children under the age of 18 living with married parents,” “a father only,” or “a mother only.” The percentage of married couples with children under 18 was similar in the census data (43%) and the books (50%). Children under 18 living with a mother or father only are overrepresented in the books. Mother-only families included 21% of families in the books,

but only 3% in the census. Seven percent of families in the books have only a father, but the census showed fewer than 1%. Though the percentages of divorced couples in the census was 2% for both males and females, divorce was not mentioned in any of the books.

1950s (1960 Census). Beginning in the 1950s the census categories broadened and included many different types of families that had not appeared before. This census listed families according to the children. Children were categorized by whom they lived with: Some lived with “married parents,” others with “only a mother” who was either “divorced,” “widowed,” or “never married.” Some children lived with only a father who fell into one of the same marital status categories. The number of people in a household was also reported. Unmarried Partners were never counted before this decade, even though they surely existed. The 1950 census included the new categories of “children living with non-relatives” and “adults living at home.” The books reflected these changes as well. No divorce appeared in the books although the divorce rate had risen slightly to 3% in females and 2% in males. There was also no evidence of any unmarried partners in the books and very few unmarried partners were reported in the census data (0.4% with children and 0.5% without children).

The census reported that fewer than 1% of children fell into the category of “children living with non-relatives,” but the books portrayed 10% of the children of that decade in the same category. The 10% figure was derived from a single book, *The Family Under the Bridge* by Natalie Savage Carlson (1958), wherein three children live with their widowed mother and a homeless single man.

A surprising 48% of families in the nine qualifying books had married couples compared with 74% from the 1950 Census. However, 8% of the actual population and 8%

of the families in the books had a female head of household when there was no married couple, an exact match. The male householders, on the other hand, were overrepresented in the books, 28% to 2% in the census. Families with their own children under 18 that had married couples was 44% in the census, while the book representation was 40%. The percentages of families with children under 18 with a mother only were exactly the same in both the census and the books (4%), but families with a father only were overrepresented (0.5% compared with 4%). (See Table 4 for an overview of the 1960 Census and the corresponding Newbery books.)

Table 4

A Comparison of the 1960 Census Family Structure Categories in the U.S. Population and Newbery Books

1960 Census Family Structure Categories	U.S. Population	Newbery Books
Married couples	74%	48%
Family households – Male householder	2%	28%
Family households – Female householder	8%	8%
Families with own children under 18 - Married couples	44%	40%
Families with own children under 18 – Mother only	4%	4%
Families with own children under 18 – Father only	0.5%	4%
Children under 18 living with other relatives	3%	3%
Children under 18 living with nonrelatives	<0.1%	10%
Children under 18 living with widowed mother only	2%	10%
Unmarried partners with children under 15	0.4%	-
Unmarried partners without children under 15	0.5%	-
Divorced female	3%	-
Never married male	25%	4%
Divorced male	2%	-
18-24 living at home male	6%	9%
18-24 living at home female	4%	-

The new categories of “children under 18” and whom they live with produced more divergent data. Children living with other relatives or nonrelatives were overrepresented. Children living with nonrelatives made up 10% of families in books compared with fewer

than 1% in the census, but children living with other relatives made up 3% of families in both the census and the books. In the books, 10% of all the children lived with a widowed mother. Only 2% of children in the 1950s actually lived with a widowed mother. A father-only family surfaced in only one book, *Ginger Pye* by Eleanor Estes (1951), which did not state where the mother was or why she was not in the picture.

The percentages of households with one, two, three, four, or seven or more persons were similar across the board between the census data and the book information. There were no five or six-person households represented in the books (see Appendix A). Never-married males were underrepresented in books (25% in the census to 4% in the books) probably because the books often failed to mention whether a male was married or not. There was one book that mentioned young men between the ages of 18 and 24 living at home. This accounted for 9% of males in the books, but the census data showed that 6% of males in that age group were living at home.

1960s (1970 Census). As in the 1950s, families with married couples were underrepresented in the 1960s books. The census data showed 71% of households with married couples, but only 54% appeared in the books. Male and female householders were overrepresented in the books (8% in books, 2% in the census for males and 17% in books, 9% in the census for females). There were three children living with only the mother derived from one books of the 1960s, *The Egypt Game* by Zilpha Keatley Snyder (1967). There was one family where the father was married but had an absent spouse (comprising 2% of the households in the books). The census reported fewer than 1% of families were led by a married father, spouse absent.

In the 1960s divorce was finally represented in the books. Divorce had risen to 4% among females and 3% among males. The only book with divorce (5% in books) was *It's Like This Cat* by Emily Neville (1963), and the divorced father was a minor character. (See Table 5 for an overview of the 1970 Census and the corresponding Newbery books.)

Table 5

A Comparison of the 1970 Census Family Structure Categories in the U.S. Population and Newbery Books

1970 Census Family Structure Categories	U.S. Population	Newbery Books
Married couples	71%	54%
Family households – Male householder	2%	8%
Family households –Female householder	9%	17%
Families with own children under 18 – Father only	<0.1%	4%
Grandchildren living with grandparents and both parents	<0.1%	33%
Unmarried partners with children under 15	0.3%	-
Unmarried partners without children under 15	0.5%	4%
Married female	61%	72%
Never married female	22%	-
Divorced female	4%	-
Married male	66%	68%
Never married male	29%	11%
Divorced male	3%	5%
Grandchildren living with grandparents only	1%	2%
Families with own children under 18 – Mother only	5%	4%

Married females were overrepresented in the nine qualifying books (72%) while only 61% of the adult females in the 1960s were married. The percentages of married men, however, were nearly the same (66% in the census and 67% in the books). The never-married males were underrepresented (29% in the census compared with 11% in the books), and the never-married females were not represented at all in the books. Unmarried partners were represented in one book, also *The Egypt Game* by Zilpha Keatley Snyder (1967).

In the 1970 census, I found one important category that was not present in previous decades: "Grandchildren living with grandparents." Previously there had been books with children living with their grandparents (*Misty of Chincoteague* by Marguerite Henry [1947], ... *And Now Miguel* by Joseph Krungold [1953]), but the census data did not recognize this family structure. Only two books portrayed children living with grandparents in the 1960s (*The Noonday Friends* by Mary Stolz [1965] and *The Egypt Game* by Zilpha Keatley Snyder [1967]). In *The Noonday Friends*, the children lived with both the parents and the grandparents (33% in the books, <1% in the census). The main character, April, lives with her grandmother in *The Egypt Game* (2% in books, 1% in the census).

1970s (1980 Census). Fifty-one percent of the families in the 14 qualifying books of the 1970s were headed by married couples, while 61% was the actual percentage for the decade according to the census. In this decade, children living with nonfamily householders (children in foster care families or children taken in briefly by other families) finally appeared in a qualifying book, *The Great Gilly Hopkins* by Katherine Paterson (1978). Gilly is a foster child living with Mrs. Trotter.

More divorce was represented in the books in the 1970s than before. Divorce rates rose to 7% among females and 5% among males according to the 1980 census. The percentages of divorce in the books were actually higher, although only slightly (10% of females and 9% of males). Divorced mothers appeared in *The Westing Game* by Ellen Raskin (1978) and *The Headless Cupid* by Zilpha Keatley Snyder (1971), and there was one divorced man, also in *The Westing Game*.

Widowed parents were overrepresented in the books. Eleven percent of children living with only a father had a deceased mother in the books, compared with 0.3% in the census data. Widowed mothers accounted for 3% of mother-only families compared with 2% in the census. In this decade, a category for “females between 18 and 24 living at home” appeared for the first time, and the census reported 7% of females fell into this category (9% in the books). (See Table 6 for an overview of the 1980 Census and the corresponding Newbery books.)

Table 6

A Comparison of the 1980 Census Family Structure Categories in the U.S. Population and Newbery Books

1980 Census Family Structure Categories	U.S. Population	Newbery Books
Married couples	61%	51%
Children under 18 living with widowed mother only	2%	3%
Children under 18 living with widowed father	0.3%	11%
Black husband, white wife	0.2%	-
White husband, black wife	<0.1%	-
White and other race	0.6%	3%
Black and other race	<0.1 %	-
Divorced female	7%	10%
Divorced male	5%	9%
18-24 living at home female	7%	9%
18-24 living at home male	9%	4%

A category added to this decade’s census that indicates major societal changes was that of “interracial couples.” Interestingly, the subcategories for this were limited to “black husband, white wife”; “white husband, black wife”; “white and other race”; or “black and other race.” In the 1970s the number of interracial couples reported in the census was miniscule (fewer than 1% in all interracial categories out of all families). White and other race couples had the highest percentage of interracial marriages and accounted for 0.6% of all families in the 1970s. The books did not reflect this societal shift. The only mention of

interracial marriage was in *Julie of the Wolves* by Jean Craighead George (1972). Julie’s mother was white and her father was native Alaskan. In fact, this was the only mixed-race couple mentioned in all the books of the study.

1980s (1990 Census). The 1990 census showed no new categories for classifying families. However, I did find a rise in divorce rates in the census data as well as in the books. Divorce previously was not represented at all in the books. In the 1980s, it was overrepresented significantly. Nine percent of females and 7% of males were divorced in the 1980s, according to the census. The books showed 18% of females and 26% of males to be divorced. Six out of the 12 qualifying books in this decade included divorced adults. This was a dramatic shift in the census data and the data from the books as compared to the ‘40s and ‘50s. (See Table 7 for an overview of the 1990 Census and the corresponding Newbery books.)

Table 7

A Comparison of the 1990 Census Family Structure Categories in the U.S. Population and Newbery Books

1990 Census Family Structure Categories	U.S. Population	Newbery Books
Married couples	56%	48%
Families with own children under 18 – Married couples	26%	42%
Children under 18 living with married mother, spouse absent	5%	8%
Grandchildren living with grandparents only	1%	13%
Divorced female	9%	18%
Divorced male	7%	26%
Children living with other relatives	2%	16%
Children living with nonrelatives	<0.1%	3%
Grandchildren living with grandparents and both parents	0.7%	8%

Married couples were still underrepresented in the books in the 1980s, but the percentages were closer together. Married couples made up 56% of family households in the 1990 census but 48% in the books.

A large and fairly consistent discrepancy in the data each decade was the percentage of married couple families with their own children under the age of 18. It was the same in the 1990 census, with only 26% of the families with children being led by married couples, but the books showed 42%.

This decade had a rise in married mothers whose spouse is absent in the books but a drop in the census data. The books did overrepresent this family structure. Eight percent of families in the books fell into this category, but only 5% of families in the census data. This was not even a category until the 1960 census and at that time there was no representation of this category in the qualifying books. In the 1980s, three children in Walter Dean Myers' *Scorpions* (1988) lived with their mother. Though their parents were still married, their father had been gone for years and came around only once in a while.

Grandchildren living with grandparents became more prevalent in the census data as well as the books in the 1980s, although all subcategories under this heading were underrepresented in the books. There was no instance of grandchildren living with only a father and the grandparents in the books, but grandchildren living with both parents and grandparents, the mother only and grandparents, or only the grandparents are represented in several books. In *Dacey's Song* by Cynthia Voigt (1982) the four Tillerman children find their grandmother after their mother disappeared and lived with her. Tony, one of the main characters in *Scorpions* by Walter Dean Myers (1988), lived with his grandmother as well.

1990s (2000 Census). The representation of married couples in the books of the 1990s very closely matched the data from the 2000 census. Married couple families made up 53% of families in the census and 50% of families in the 15 qualifying books. (See Table 8 for an overview of the 2000 Census and the corresponding Newbery books.)

Table 8

A Comparison of the 2000 Census Family Structure Categories in the U.S. Population and Newbery Books

2000 Census Family Structure Categories	U.S. Population	Newbery Books
Married couples	53%	50%
Married couples, stay-at-home mother with children under 15	5%	20%
Married couples, stay-at-home father with children under 15	<0.1%	-
Divorced female	10%	11%
Divorced male	8%	10%
Grandchildren living with grandparents only	2%	2%
Grandchildren living with grandparents and both parents	0.7%	5%

One category that was unofficially reported was included after the 2000 census surfaced. This was the category of “same-sex” couples. There were four subcategories: “Male-male relationships” and if they reported being “married” and “female-female” relationships and if they reported being “married.” No subcategories specified if children lived with these couples or not. None of the books that qualified for the study included any kind of same-sex relationship.

Another new category in the 2000 census was “stay-at-home mothers” and “stay-at-home fathers.” In the 1976 the Newbery Honor book, *Ramona and Her Father* by Beverly Cleary, Ramona’s father lost his job and was a stay-at-home dad for a time. The 1980 census did not have a category for this, though Cleary’s book would have qualified for it. In

the 1990s, there were no “stay-at-home fathers” represented in the books but there was an overrepresentation of “stay-at-home mothers” (5% in the census, 20% in the books).

In the 1990s percentages of divorced males and females in the books more closely matched the census data. Divorced females made up 10% in the census and 11% in the books. Divorced males were 8% in the census and 10% in the books.

2000s (2010 Census). Married couples portrayed in the 13 qualifying books from the 2000s closely matched the percentage of married couples reported in the 2010 census. The percentages were 50% in the census and 56% in the books. The data shifted back to a slight overrepresentation in the books. (See Table 9 for an overview of the 2010 Census and the corresponding Newbery books.)

Table 9

A Comparison of the 2010 Census Family Structure Categories in the U.S. Population and Newbery Books

2010 Census Family Structure Categories	U.S. Population	Newbery Books
Married couples	50%	56%
Married couple, stay-at-home mother with children under 15	4%	7%
Married couple, stay-at-home father with children under 15	0.1%	2%
Never married female	27%	3%
Divorced female	11%	14%
Never married male	34%	3%
Divorced male	8%	9%

Many of the books had more than one family represented, and different families had different family structures. In the 2000s, *Olive’s Ocean* by Kevin Henkes (2003), *Rules* by Cynthia Lord (2006), *The Higher Power of Lucky* by Susan Patron (2006), *Hoot* by Carl Hiaasen (2002), *Pictures of Hollis Woods* by Patricia Reilly Giff (2002), and *Getting Nearer to*

Baby by Aubrey Coulobmbis (1999) all had married couples, as well as other family structures represented. These families included divorced parents; parents with spouses absent; and children living with nonrelatives (foster children), other relatives, or grandparents; and stepfamilies.

By the 2000s divorce had increased from 2% among females in the 1940 census to 11% among females in the 2010 census. In the 2000s, 14% of the females in the books were divorced and 9% of the males were divorced, compared with 8% of males in the census data.

Stay-at-home mothers were overrepresented in the 2000s (4% in the census, 7% in the books), but there was one stay-at-home father in *Olive's Ocean* by Kevin Henkes (2003) where the father “worked” from home pretending to write a book. This was an overrepresentation (2% in the books, 0.1% in the census).

The category of “never-married males” has increased little since the 1940 census and was still little represented in 2010. This was often due to the fact that many males living alone are not given a specific marital status in the books. Both never-married males (34% in the census, 3% in the books) and females (27% in the census, 3% in the books) were greatly underrepresented in the books.

Summary

The major trends in all decades were that married couples were underrepresented in books and male householders (mostly unmarried men living alone) were overrepresented. There was also an increase in divorce rates every census year and a dramatic jump in the portrayal of divorce in the books as the decades progressed.

The family structures that were consistently dealt with in the books as the decades progressed were children of married couples, divorced or widowed parents, parents with a spouse absent, adults living alone, and children living with grandparents. There were few, if any, portrayals of same-sex or interracial couples or younger adults still living at home.

One category that was impossible to compare with census data was Stepfamilies. The census never included this category. I did run across some stepfamilies in the books, such as in Zilpha Keatley Snyder's *The Headless Cupid* (1971) and *Blue Willow* by Doris Gates (1940). However, the census data simply reported these couples as families with married parents rather than specifying whether or not they were stepfamilies.

Chapter 5

Discussion

The Newbery winner and Honor books that qualified for this study had more close matches with census data than anticipated. However, more of the matches occurred in the later decades as society began to accept the realities of family structures. Even in these decades there were some major discrepancies.

Interpretation of Findings by Family Categories

The following discussion interprets the findings, separated into three main headings: families, children, and males and females. These interpretations include why certain family structures were not represented as well in earlier decades and why there was a change. This chapter also examines possible reasons that there was overrepresentation in later decades.

Families. In the 1930s families with married couples were overrepresented in the books. Since the 1940s, the books have underrepresented the percentage of married couples as reported in the census data. However, a drop in marriage percentages in both the census and the books and a rise in the divorce rate occurred in each successive decade. Therefore, the books have reflected the changing family structures and acceptance of family structures in the United States. Married couples were again slightly overrepresented in books in the 2000s. In the 1950s a surprising 48% of families in the books had married couples compared with 74% from the census. This is likely due to the high number of males in the qualifying books of that decade living alone. Three of the eight qualifying books in the 1950s included men who lived alone and were main or secondary characters: *Kildee House* by Rutherford Montgomery (1949), *Family Under the Bridge* by Natalie Savage

Carlson (1958), and *The Light at Tern Rock* by Julia L. Sauer (1951). The number of male characters living alone skewed the data away from married couples and raised the percentage of male householders in most decades. I had expected married couples to be overrepresented in books, at least in the 1930s-1960s, because the census categories and data from the books indicate that society had not accepted families that had strayed from the traditional family configuration. However, I did see evidence of this lack of acceptance in the absence of divorced individuals in the books of the early decades.

A large and fairly consistent discrepancy in the percentage of married-couple families with their own children under the age of 18 occurred in each decade. In the 1990 census, only 26% of the families with children were led by married couples, but the books showed 42%. This may be due to the fact Newbery books are written for children and so generally have children as the main characters. Therefore, families with children naturally would be more common in children's books, thus overrepresenting the actual number of "Married-couple Families" with children in the 1980s and in other decades as well. Another likely reason for this overrepresentation was the ever-rising divorce rate, coupled with the fact that not every married couple has children under the age of 18.

Beginning with the 1960 census, census categories broadened to include many family structures that had not appeared before. This may be due to the Age of New Realism. Tunnell, et al. (2012) explained what ushered in the Age of New Realism in children's books: "Long-standing taboos imposed on authors and illustrators began to break down as the social revolution of the 1960s began to boil. Few books before this time dealt with topics like death, divorce, alcoholism, and child abuse" (p. 49). The new family structures

appearing in the census may be because of society's growing acknowledgement of the diverse families that existed.

There may have been some overrepresentation of certain changes from the traditional family structure because society was and is trying to highlight the acceptance and acknowledgement of these family structures. This may be another reason we saw a more dramatic underrepresentation of married-couple families after the Age of New Realism began.

Divorce appeared in the books in the 1960s with *It's Like This, Cat* by Emily Neville (1963). It was overrepresented in the books since the 1970s among both males and females for the remaining decades.

As soon as the category of "grandchildren" appeared in the 1970 Census, "children living with grandparents" and "both parents" showed up in the books. This category and, beginning in the 1970s (1980 Census), children living with grandparents only were consistently overrepresented in the subsequent decades.

Except for children living with other relatives not being represented in books in the 1960s, children living with other relatives and children living with nonrelatives remained overrepresented in the books as soon as they appeared as categories in the 1960 Census (1950s).

Although some family structures were continuously overrepresented in the books, some family structures appeared more frequently in the books in the 1970s-1990s. This may be because the novelty of the Age of New Realism finally allowed these taboo topics to be broached, but as the novelty wore off, the drive to portray these different family structures lessened.

“Married mothers whose spouse is absent” appeared as a category with the 1960 Census (1950s), but did not appear in qualifying books until the 1970s (1980 Census). One book portrays a family led by a married mother whose spouse was absent in the 1970s: *The Planet of Junior Brown* by Virginia Hamilton (1971) where Junior lived with his drug addict mother and his father worked in another state and wouldn’t come home. In the 1980s, there was a rise in the percentage of families with a married mother whose spouse is absent appearing in the books from 5% in the ‘70s to 8%. *Scorpions* by Walter Dean Myers (1988) includes another example of this family structure (“Jamal could hardly remember when his father had lived with them,” p. 87). There is no mention of a divorce causing the absence of Jamal’s father. However, the fact that more people were getting divorces by this decade may well have been the reason. In any case, the books finally began showing this family structure.

Unmarried couples are only represented in the 1970s and 1980s. A child living with a mother who was never married only appears in 1993 with *Crazy Lady!* by Jane Leslie Conly (1993). This was the only book that specified that the mother had never married.

Interracial couples. Interracial couples surely existed before the 1930s. However, it was not a category in the census count until the 1980 Census. The percentages of interracial couples rose slightly each decade, especially among white individuals married to someone of a race other than white or black. The books did not reflect this at all. There was one interracial marriage in *Julie of the Wolves* by Jean Craighead George (1972): Julie’s mother was white and her father was an Eskimo. Otherwise, there was no other mention of interracial couples in the qualifying books. This is not because characters of various races

do not appear in the stories, because they most certainly do. For whatever reason, Newbery winners and Honor books do not include interracial couples.

This is surprising because other new family categories are represented in the later qualifying books. Is it because our society has been and still is uncomfortable with racially mixed marriages? And will this change in the Newbery books of the future? Such a change would certainly be beneficial to children from interracial families who seek confirmation concerning the legitimacy of their own family structure.

Same-sex couples. Same-sex couples did not appear as a census category until the 2000 census. The new millennium saw gay marriage become a political and constitutional issue in the United States, and society was clearly becoming more accepting of homosexual couples. Same-sex couples made up a small percentage of the population in the 2000 Census, gay couples being more prevalent than lesbian couples. Still, none of the qualifying books represented same-sex couples, not even as secondary or periphery characters.

There may be several reasons for this. Perhaps the Newbery committee members were not ready to accept books with same-sex couples for children. Maybe authors have not felt comfortable reflecting this family structure in their stories since it is a more controversial subject in recent decades than race or divorce. As more general acceptance of same-sex couples increases, this census category will likely be represented in Newbery books over the next couple of decades.

Unmarried partners. The census category of “unmarried partners with or without children under 15” showed up as early as the 1960 census (1950s). This family structure surfaced in a qualifying book in the 1960s in *The Egypt Game* by Zilpha Keatley Snyder (1967). The main character, April, lived with her grandmother. Her mother, Dorothea, was

an actress who wasn't willing to take care of her daughter. The mother lived with her boyfriend, Nick. They sent her postcards sporadically, and these postcards were the only involvement they had in the story. Although Dorothea had a child under 15, Dorothea and Nick were placed under the category of "unmarried couples without children under 15" since April lives with her grandmother.

The other book with an unmarried couple was *After the Rain* by Norma Fox Mazer (1987) from the 1980s. The main character's brother lived across the country with his girlfriend. The main character, Rachel, wrote letters to her brother, but he did not respond until the end of the story. At their grandfather's funeral, he finally visited the family, making his only appearance. No other book in the study included unmarried partners.

Unmarried couples made up fewer than 1% of all families when the category first surfaced, reaching 4% by the 2000s (growing at a rate of about one percent each decade). The two decades that include unmarried partners in the qualifying books overrepresented that family structure simply because of the small number of books that qualified (15 books in the 1970s and 12 books in the 1980s) compared with the actual number of families in the prospective decades. Unmarried couples with children under age 15 represented a smaller percentage of families than unmarried couples without children under age 15. Most of the time, if a couple has children, they were likely married at some point. Surprisingly, this family structure appeared only in the 1970s and 1980s and not again after. This may be due to the novelty of the Age of New Realism that finally allowed the topic to be discussed.

Children. "Children" did not emerge as a category until the 1960 Census with 11 subcategories, such as "children living with married parents," "children living with

nonrelatives,” or “children living with widowed father,” depending on whom the children lived with. “Grandchildren” also appeared as a new category in the 1960 Census. Although Grandparents fell under the “living with other relatives” category, the census also classified “grandchildren living with both grandparents and parents,” “grandchildren living with grandparents and mother only,” “grandchildren living with grandparents and father only,” and “grandchildren living with grandparents only” as categories separate from the ones mentioned previously.

The category of “children living with married parents” included the highest percentage of children in the census data of all categories, as well as the books through all the decades. Children living with a mother only appeared much more frequently than children living with a father only. Several books included children living with only their mother. Some examples include *Dear Mr. Henshaw* by Beverly Cleary (1983), *The Witches of Worm* by Zilpha Keatley Snyder (1972), *The Middle Moffat* and *Rufus M.* both by Eleanor Estes (1942 & 1943), *Pancakes-Paris* by Claire Hutchet Bishop (1947), *What Jamie Saw* by Carolyn Coman (1995), *Afternoon of the Elves* by Janet Taylor Lisle (1989), *Crazy Lady* by Jane Leslie Conly (1993), *Yolanda’s Genius* by Carol Fenner (1995), *Getting Nearer to Baby* by Audrey Couloumbis (1999), and *Joey Pigza Loses Control* by Jack Gantos (2000).

Children who lived with only a father, both in the census data and the books, were most often living with a widowed father. *Walk Two Moons* by Sharon Creech (1994), *The View From Saturday* by E. L. Konigsburg (1996), *Crazy Lady* by Jane Leslie Conly (1993), *Julie of the Wolves* by Jean Craighead George (1972), and *The Headless Cupid* by Zilpha Keatley Snyder (1971) all include widowed fathers. Some books that include children living with only a father, but the father is not widowed, are *Maniac Magee* by Jerry Spinelli

(1990), *Dogsong* by Gary Paulsen (1985), and *A Solitary Blue* by Cynthia Voigt (1983). Until the 1970s, child custody battles were largely unheard of. Probably because divorce was not as common or acceptable and for many it was a cause of shame. After the 1970s and the Age of New Realism, child custody battles greatly increased. Most states consider the parents' desires, as well as what the child wants (usually for children over the age of 12) (Wolf, 2012). Many children are naturally more attached to the mother, many mothers naturally wish to have custody of the children over the fathers, and many fathers do not wish to take the children away from their mothers. Judges also generally tend to award custody to the mothers over the fathers. It seems society still accepts the role of the mother as nurturer and caregiver for children. These may be reasons that children are more often living with a mother only rather than a father only and why the father only families are more commonly seen when the father is widowed in the both the census and the books of all decades. As discussed later, children living with grandparents only most often lived with only the grandmother. This may be more evidence that women are still considered the nurturers.

Children living with other relatives, such as aunts and uncles, grandparents, or siblings, made up only a small percentage of children in the census data of the earlier decades. The percentage grew through the decades. This category appears in the books as frequently as it occurs in the census data. It appeared in *The Avion my Uncle Flew* by Cyrus Fisher (1946), before the census had a category for it. The main character, Johnny, lived with his uncle in France for a summer.

Children also lived with grandparents in books before the 1960s, as mentioned earlier. Children living with other relatives in the 1950s made up 3% of children for both

the census and the books. It did not surface in the books in the 1960s, and then in the 1970s it was overrepresented (3% census, 19% books) and was overrepresented in all subsequent decades as well. The reasons children live with their grandparents in the books changes over time. In the earlier decades, children living with grandparents was considered an acceptable family structure according to society if there was a legitimate reason for the parents to be gone, as in *Misty of Chincoteague* by Marguerite Henry (1947). The children live with their grandparents because the mother and father are living in China for business. In later decades the reasons become more varied and controversial such as parents who are absent or unable to care for their children.

Children living with nonrelatives were slightly overrepresented in the books in all decades, but more so in the 2000s. In the earlier decades, such as in *The Family Under the Bridge* by Natalie Savage Carlson (1958), the family lived with a non-relative and a mother. In *The Loner* by Ester Wier (1963), the main character, who is nameless through most of the book, is an orphan and drifts from place to place trying to survive, living with whoever will take him in for a time. He finally settled with one family permanently, but no one he lived with was ever his blood relatives or even adoptive parents. *Pictures of Hollis Woods* by Patricia Reilly Giff (2002) and *The Great Gilly Hopkins* by Katherine Paterson (1978) both portrayed foster children as the main characters. In earlier decades, foster children was considered a taboo subject because it was shameful for parents to be unable to care for their children. The reasons for the rise in children living with nonrelatives in both the census and the books are discussed later.

In some decades, children living with a father only were represented very infrequently or not at all. Single fathers were never represented as often as single mothers

were in the books. There are also more single mothers than single fathers according to census data of various decades. Widowed mothers and fathers appeared sporadically. Divorced mothers or married mothers with an absent spouse only appeared in later decades. In the books, instances of children living with a widowed mother were overrepresented. This may be because the books did not represent divorce, separation, or never-married couples in this decade. *Ginger Pye* by Eleanor Estes (1951) is the only book that represents a father only family. It did not specify where the mother was nor why she was not in the picture, only saying, “He (Wally) and his pop—he hasn’t any mother—were going to join a vaudeville show” (1951, p. 274). Wally was portrayed originally as a mean boy in the neighborhood despite the two main characters’ efforts to befriend him. He ends up being the villain of the story, stealing the children’s dog. Perhaps children who did not come from traditional families were portrayed as having less value in the earlier decades whereas later on, after the 1960s, children from the nontraditional families are frequently the main protagonists. Were children from nontraditional families treated differently before society began to accept and even embrace these other family structures?

“Grandchildren” appeared as a category for the first time in the 1970 census. No doubt children had been living with their grandparents before this time. Children might live with grandparents because their parents are unable to take care of them, their parents have passed away, or they live with both their parents and grandparents because the family is not doing well economically or the grandparent needs to be taken care of.

A small percentage of the population of children of the 1960s lived with their grandparents. Most lived with grandparents only or grandparents and mother only. In each decade the percentages increased slightly. This may be due to parents in later decades not

being able or willing to take care of their children, as shown in *Dacey's Song* by Cynthia Voigt (1982). The Tillerman children lived with their mentally ill mother until she abandoned them in their car in the mall parking lot with no explanation. The children traveled on their own to their grandmother's house and lived with her. In *The Great Gilly Hopkins* by Katherine Paterson (1978), Gilly's mother did not want to take care of her child and turned her over to the state. Gilly went to different foster homes until her grandmother learned she existed and took Gilly to live with her.

In *Scorpions* by Walter Dean Myers (1988), Tony lived with his grandmother. The story did not reveal where his parents were, but from lines in the book, the reader can infer that his father didn't want to take care of him. "You get a letter from your dad?" "Uh-uh. He's too busy. Abuela said it doesn't make any difference, because your grandmother is suppose to take care of you" (p. 33).

In recent decades there began to be a rise in child abandonment due to poverty, mental illness, drug abuse, or unwanted pregnancies (Edwards, 2010). Poverty is the number one cause. Parents may believe that their children will be better off with someone who can better provide for their needs. Mental illness and drug abuse warp the judgment of the parents so they do not understand the effects of their choice on the abandoned child. Women who find themselves pregnant often feel a deep fear, especially if the mother is a teen, which may drive her to abandon her child.

In the 1990s and 2000s we see fewer representations in the books of grandchildren living with their grandparents, but they still appear. In *Surviving the Applewhites* by Stephanie S. Tolan, Jake's parents are in prison for growing marijuana so he is sent to live

with his grandfather. In *The Higher Power of Lucky* by Susan Patron a character named Miles lives with his grandmother because “Miles’ mother was in jail” (p. 73).

Males and Females – divorce. Divorce was delineated in the census in part by males and females. This category has been in the census since at least 1940, the earliest one of this study. The books did not represent divorce of any kind until the 1960s at the beginning of the Age of New Realism with *It’s Like This Cat* by Emily Neville (1963). The divorced father was a minor character. Divorce was not the focus of the story by any means, but just mentioned in passing: “He (Tom) has people out in the Midwest somewhere—a father and a stepmother” (Neville, 1963, p. 60).

By the 1970s, divorce was slightly overrepresented in the books. Three books included characters that were divorced. *The Westing Game* by Ellen Raskin (1978) and *The Headless Cupid* (1971) and *The Witches of Worm* (1972) by Zilpha Keatley Snyder portrayed at least secondary characters who were divorced who played a part in the story.

There were many more books representing divorce in the 1980s. The 1980s also began to depict children experiencing the divorce of their parents and how they deal with this challenge. It became acceptable for divorce to be an issue or problem in the books rather than just mentioned. An example is found in *Hatchet* by Gary Paulsen: “The thinking started. Always it started with a single word. Divorce. . . . In the summer Brian would live with his father. In the school year with his mother” (pp. 2, 6). *Dear Mr. Henshaw* by Beverly Cleary (1983) and *A Solitary Blue* by Cynthia Voigt (1988) are also books where the main characters struggle with accepting the divorce of their parents.

Data from the 1990s show that the divorce rates in the census and divorce depicted in the books were a close match indicate, It appears that society was becoming more

accepting of the realities of divorce and showing these realities to children through literature.

By the 2000s divorce had increased considerably since the 1930s. Once the Age of New Realism dawned in the 1960s, a qualifying book reflected this shift with much more accuracy. Of course, divorce is still prevalent today, but at least children have quality books to choose from that may help them cope with the problem.

Summary

I found that the books of the 1930s, 40s, and 50s did not represent the actual family structures counted in the census. Through subsequent decades, the categories in the census broadened, indicating that society better accepted, or at least acknowledged, a variety of family structures. At the same time, the Newbery books began to more closely match the census data. By the 2000s, the books better reflected the diverse family structures of the time. Yet, there are still some discrepancies in the data, such as no representations of same-sex couples, and very little representation of interracial couples or children living with a married father, spouse absent.

In the 2000s a major theme of most of the qualifying books was children finding themselves and how they fit into their families. For some, their families were changing in structure, as in *Pictures of Hollis Woods* by Patricia Reilly Giff (2002), wherein Hollis was sent to different foster homes and finally was adopted by a family with a mother, father, brother, and new baby sister joining them later. *Joey Pigza Loses Control* by Jack Gantos (2000) and *Hope was Here* by Joan Bauer (2000) are other books portraying changing family structures.

In some cases characters had to accept how their families really were, as in *Because of Winn-Dixie* when India Opal worked through her mom having abandoned the family and how it affected not only her, but her father as well. In every qualifying book in the 2000s, one of the main themes of the book is family, yet not one family was stable and traditional.

Recommendations

In hindsight, I would have included fantasies that have a realistic setting in my study. This would have broadened the books that qualified, further validating the study. Some examples of books that would have qualified as fantasies with realistic settings are *Charlotte's Web* by E. B. White (1952), *A Cricket in Times Square* by George Selden (1960), and *When You Reach Me* by Rebecca Stead (2009).

As I conducted this study, several ideas arose for studies that could enhance and expand upon this one. To verify the findings in this study, a study with a much larger and deeper scope could be conducted with several readers participating. *All* contemporary realistic fiction novels for a certain decade could be analyzed for the family structure and compared to the census data. This was too large an undertaking for just one person.

Another study could be conducted comparing the family structure in books written in the 1960s about the 1960s with books written in the 2000s or another later decade about the 1960s. Books of the 2000s may better represent the families of the 1960s than books actually written in that decade.

A companion study to this one could look at the affect these books have on students with similar family structures who may be struggling at home. Do struggling students seek these books or avoid them? How important is it for children to have a book to read with which they can relate? Does it help or hinder their processes of coping with family trials?

References

- Agee, J. M. (1993). Mothers and daughters: Gender-role socialization in two Newbery Award books. *Children's Literature in Education, 24*, 165-173.
- Alvermann, D. E. (2001). Effective literacy instruction for adolescents. *Literacy Research Association*. <http://www.nrconline.org/>
- Bartoszuk, K., & Pittman, J. F. (2010). Does family structure matter? A domain-specific examination of identity exploration and commitment. *Youth and Society, 42*, 155-170.
- Benson, J. E. (2009). Adolescent family context and adult identity formation. *Journal of Family Issues, 30*, 1265-1286.
- Casey, J. (2005). History of Disability. <http://www.dublincil.org/archive/nag/historyofdisability.htm>
- Chatton, B. (1988). Apply with caution: Bibliotherapy in the library. *Journal of Youth Services in Libraries, 1*, 334-338.
- Donato, K. M., Tolbert, C. M. II, Nucci, A., & Kawano, Y. (2007). Recent immigrant settlement in the nonmetropolitan United States: Evidence from internal census data. *Rural Sociology, 72*, 537-559).
- Edwards, C. (2010, June 8). Reasons for child abandonment. *Livestrong.com*. Retrieved from <http://www.livestrong.com/article/143509-reasons-child-abandonment/>
- Erikson, E. H. (1959). *Identity and the life cycle*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton.
- Fontichiaro, K. (2010). Nudging toward inquiry: Awakening and building upon prior knowledge. *School Library Monthly, XXVII*(1).
- Gillespie, C. S., Powell, J. L., Clements, N. E., & Swearingen, R. A. (1994). A look at the Newbery Medal books from a multicultural perspective. *The Reading Teacher, 48*, 40-49.
- Hilbun, J., Claes, J., & Giffiths, P. (2010, September). Commonalities in content of international children's books awards: What does this tell us about children, culture and reading interests across the globe? *International Association of School Librarianship*. Paper presented at the School Library Association of Queensland and the International Association of School Librarianship Conference incorporating the International Forum on Research in School Librarianship.

- Jacobs, J. S., & Tunnell, M. O. (2004). *Children's literature, briefly: (3rd ed.)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Kinman, J. R. & Henderson, D. L. (1985). An analysis of sexism in Newbery Medal Award books from 1977 to 1984. *The Reading Teacher*, 38, 885-889.
- Leininger, M., Dyches, T. T., Prater, M. A., & Heath, M. A. (2010). Newbery Award Winning Books 1975-2009: How do they portray disabilities? *Education and Training in Autism and Developmental Disabilities*, 45, 583-595.
- McGee, L. M. & Richgels, D. J. (2008). *Literacy's beginnings: Supporting young readers and writers*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Moje, E. B., Young, J. P., Readence, J. E., & Moore, D. W. (2000). Reinventing adolescent literacy for new times: Perennial and millennial issues. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 43, 400-410.
- Nisse, A. (2008). *Do you see what I see?: Portrayals of diversity in Newbery medal-winning children's literature* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Provo, UT: Brigham Young University.
- Noll, E. (1995) Accuracy and authenticity in American Indian children's literature: The social responsibility of authors and illustrators. *The New Advocate*, 8, 29-43.
- Rosen, R. (1971). Sexism in history or, writing women's history is a tricky business. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 33, 541-544.
- Smith-D'Arezzo, W. M. & Moore-Thomas, C. (2010). Children's perceptions of peers with disabilities. *Teaching Exceptional Children Plus*, 6(3), 1-16.
- Swanson, E., Edmonds, M. S., Hairrell, A., Vaughn, S., Simmons, D. C. (2011). Applying a cohesive set of comprehension strategies to content-area instruction. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 46, 266-272.
- Tanti, C., Stukas, A. A., Haloran, M. J., & Foddy, M. (2011). Social identity change: Shifts in social identity during adolescence. *Journal of Adolescence*, 34, 555-567.
- Tarchi, C. (2010). Reading comprehension of informative texts in secondary school: A focus on direct and indirect effects of reader's prior knowledge. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 20, 415-420.
- Tunnell, M. O., Jacobs, J. S., Young, T. A., & Bryan, G. (2012). *Children's literature, briefly: (5th ed.)*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.

- Umana-Taylor, A. J., Vargas-Chanes, D., Garcia, C. D., & Gonzales-Backen, M. (2008). A longitudinal examination of Latino adolescents' ethnic identity, coping with discrimination, and self-esteem. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 28*, 16-50.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (2010). *Children under 18 years living with father only, by marital status of father: 1960 to present*. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (2010). *Children under 18 years living with mother only, by marital status of mother: 1960 to present*. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (2010). *Families, by presence of own children: 1950 to present*. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (2010). *Grandchildren under age 18 living in the home of their grandparents: 1970 to present*. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1940). *Households by size: 1960 to present*. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (2010). *Households by type: 1940 to present*. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (2010). *Interracial married couples: 1980 to 2002*. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (2010). *Living arrangements of children under 18 years old: 1960 to present*. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (2010). *Marital status of the population 15 years old and over, by sex, race and Hispanic origin: 1950 to present*. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (2010). *Numbers of same-sex couple households by editing status: Census 2000 short form*. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (2010). *Parents and children in stay-at-home parent family groups 1994 to present*. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (2010). *Unmarried partners of the opposite sex/1, by presence of children/2: 1960 to present*. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. (2010). *Young adults living at home: 1960 to present*. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Wolf, J. A. (2012). Child Custody Laws in the United States. *About.com: Single Parents*. Retrieved from http://singleparents.about.com/od/legalissues/a/custody_laws.htm

Wozniak, A. (2010). Are college graduates more responsive to distant labor market opportunities? *The Journal of Human Resources*, 45, 944-970.

Children's Book References

Allee, M. H. (1931). *Jane's island*. New York, NY: The Junior Literary Guild.

Atwater, F. & Atwater R. (1938). *Mr. Popper's penguins*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.

Avi. (1991). *Nothing but the truth*. New York, NY: Scholastic.

Bauer, J. (2000). *Hope was here*. New York, NY: Penguin.

Bauer, M. D. (1986). *On my honor*. New York, NY: Dell.

Bianco, M. (1936). *Winterbound*. New York, NY: Viking.

Bishop, C. H. (1947). *Pancakes-Paris*. New York, NY: Viking.

Brooks, B. (1992). *What hearts*. New York, NY: Harper Trophy.

Byars, B. (1970). *The summer of the swans*. New York, NY: Puffin.

Carlson, N. S. (1958). *The family under the bridge*. New York, NY: Harper & Row

Cleary, B. (1983). *Dear Mr. Henshaw*. New York, NY: Scholastic.

Cleary, B. (1975). *Ramona and her father*. New York, NY: Dell.

Cleary, B. (1981). *Ramona Quimby, age 8*. New York, NY: Dell.

Coman, C. (1995). *What Jamie saw*. New York, NY: Puffin.

Conly, J. L. (1993). *Crazy lady!* New York, NY: Harper Trophy.

Coulombis, A. (1999). *Getting near to baby*. New York, NY: Scholastic.

Creech, S. (2000). *The wanderer*. New York, NY: Harper Trophy.

Creech, S. (1994). *Walk two moons*. New York, NY: Scholastic.

Dalglish, A. (1952). *The bears on Hemlock Mountain*. New York, NY: Aladdin.

Dejong, M. (1953). *Shadrach*. New York, NY: Harper Trophy.

DiCamillo, K. (2000). *Because of Winn-Dixie*. Cambridge, MA: Candlewick Press.

Enright, E. (1957). *Gone-away lake*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt.

Enright, E. (1938). *Thimble summer*. New York, NY: Henry Holt.

Estes, E. (1951). *Ginger Pye*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt.

Estes, E. (1943). *Rufus M.* Orlando, FL: Harcourt.

Estes, E. (1944). *The hundred dresses*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt.

Estes, E. (1942). *The middle Moffat*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt.

Fenner, C. (1995). *Yolanda's genius*. New York, NY: Aladdin.

Fisher, C. (1946). *The avion my uncle flew*. New York, NY: Scholastic.

Fitzhugh, L. (1964). *Harriet the spy*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Forbes, E. (1943). *Johnny Tremain*. New York, NY: Houghton.

Gantos, J. (2000). *Joey Pigza loses control*. New York, NY: Harper Trophy.

Gates, D. (1940). *Blue willow*. New York, NY: Viking.

George, J. C. (1972). *Julie of the wolves*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

George, J. C. (1959). *My side of the mountain*. New York, NY: Penguin.

Giff, P. R. (2002). *Pictures of Hollis Woods*. New York, NY: Scholastic.

Greene, B. (1974). *Phillip Hall likes me. I reckon maybe*. New York, NY: Puffin.

Hamilton, V. (1974). *M.C. Higgins, the great*. New York, NY: Scholastic.

Hamilton, V. (1971). *The planet of Junior Brown*. New York, NY: Collier Books.

Henkes, K. (2003). *Olive's ocean*. New York, NY: Harper Trophy.

Henry, M. (1947). *Misty of Chincoteague*. New York, NY: Rand McNally.

Hiaasen, C. (2002). *Hoot*. New York, NY: Yearling.

Horvath, P. (2001). *Everything on a waffle*. New York, NY: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.

Jukes, M. (1984). *Like Jake and me*. New York, NY: Random House.

Konigsburg, E. L. (1967). *From the mixed-up files of Mrs. Basil E. Frankweiler*. New York, NY: Aladdin.

Konigsburg, E. L. (1967). *Jennifer, Hecate, Macbeth, William McKinley, and me, Elizabeth*. New York, NY: Aladdin.

Konigsburg, E. L. (1996). *The view from Saturday*. New York, NY: Aladdin.

Krumgold, J. (1953). *...And now Miguel*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Krumgold, J. (1959). *Onion John*. New York, NY: Harper Trophy.

L'Engle, M. (1980). *A ring of endless light*. New York, NY: Dell.

Lisle, J. T. (1989). *Afternoon of the elves*. New York, NY: Apple Paperbacks.

Lord, C. (2006). *Rules*. New York, NY: Scholastic.

Mathis, S. B. (1975). *The hundred penny box*. New York, NY: Scholastic.

Mazer, N. F. (1987). *After the rain*. New York, NY: Avon.

Means, F. C. (1945). *The moved-outers*. New York, NY: Houghton Mifflin.

Miles, Miska. (1971). *Annie and the old one*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.

Montgomery, R. (1949). *Kildee house*. New York, NY: Walker.

Myers, W. D. (1988). *Scorpions*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Myers, W. D. (1992). *Somewhere in the darkness*. New York, NY: Scholastic.

Naylor, P. R. (2000). *Shiloh*. New York, NY: Aladdin.

Neville, E. (1963). *It's like this, cat*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Paterson, K. (1977). *Bridge to Terabithia*. New York, NY: The Trumpet Club.

Paterson, K. (1978). *The great Gilly Hopkins*. New York, NY: Harper Trophy.

Patron, S. (2006). *The higher power of Lucky*. New York, NY: Aladdin.

Paulsen, G. (1985). *Dogsong*. New York, NY: Aladdin.

Paulsen, G. (1987). *Hatchet*. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Paulsen, G. (1989). *The winter room*. New York, NY: Scholastic.

Perkins, L. R. (2005). *Criss cross*. New York, NY: Harper Trophy.

Raskin, E. (1974). *Figgs & phantoms*. New York, NY: Scholastic.

Raskin, E. (1978). *The Westing game*. New York, NY: Avon.

Robinson, M. L. (1937). *Bright Island*. New York, NY: Random House.

Rylant, C. (1986). *A fine white dust*. New York, NY: Aladdin.

Rylant, C. (1992). *Missing May*. New York, NY: Scholastic.

Sachar, L. (1998). *Holes*. New York, NY: Scholastic.

Sauer, J. L. (1951). *The light at Tern Rock*. New York, NY: Puffin.

Schmidt, S. L. (1933). *New land*. New York, NY: Robert M. McBride & Company.

Selden, G. (1960). *A cricket in Times Square*. New York, NY: Yearling.

Sendak, M. (1963). *Where the wild things are*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Snyder, Z. K. (1967). *The Egypt Game*. New York, NY: Bantam Doubleday Dell.

Snyder, Z. K. (1971). *The headless cupid*. New York, NY: Bantam Doubleday Dell.

Snyder, Z. K. (1972). *The witches of worm*. New York, NY: Bantam Doubleday Dell.

Sorensen, V. (1956). *Miracles on Maple Hill*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt.

Spinelli, J. (1990). *Maniac Magee*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown.

Spinelli, J. (1997). *The wringer*. New York, NY: Harper Trophy.

Stead, R. (2009). *When you reach me*. New York, NY: Random House.

Stong, Phil. (1935). *Honk the moose*. Duluth, MN: Trellis Publishing.

Stolz, M. (1965). *The noonday friends*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Tolan, S. S. (2002). *Surviving the Applewhites*. New York, NY: Scholastic.

Voigt, C. (1983). *A solitary blue*. New York, NY: Aladdin.

Voigt, C. (1982). *Dacey's song*. New York, NY: Aladdin.

Weik, M. H. (1966). *The jazz man*. New York, NY: Aladdin.

White, E.B. (1952). *Charlotte's web*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Wier, E. (1963). *The loner*. New York, NY: Scholastic.

Appendix A

Comparison of Census Family Structure Categories for U.S. Population and Newbery Books, 1940 - 2010

1940 Census Family Structure Categories	U.S. Population	Newbery Books	Jane's Island	Thimble Summer	Mr. Popper's Penguins	Bright Island	New Land	Winter Bound	Honk the Moose	Book Totals		
Family Households - Married Couples	76%	82%	1	2	1	5	4	3	2	18		
Family Households - Male Householder other family	4%	9%	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2		
Family Households - Female Householder other family	10%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Nonfamily Households - Male Householder	5%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Nonfamily Households - Female Householder	5%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Married Female	61%	90%	1	2	1	5	4	3	2	18		
Never married female	26%	5%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		
Widowed female	12%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Divorced female	2%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Married Male	61%	82%	1	2	1	5	4	3	2	18		
Never married male	33%	9%	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2		
Widowed male	4%	5%	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1		
Divorced male	1%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1950 Census Family Structure Categories	U.S. Population	Newbery Books	Misty of Chincoteague	Blue Willow	Pancakes-Paris	The Hundred Dresses	The Avion my Uncle Flew	The Moved-Outers	Rufus M.	The Middle Moffat	Book Totals	
Family Households - Married Couples	78%	71%	3	3	0	0	1	2	0	1	10	
Family Households - Male Householder	3%	14%	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	
Family Households - Female Householder	8%	36%	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	1	5	
Nonfamily Households - Male Householder	4%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Nonfamily Households - Female Householder	7%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Families with own children under 18 - Married Couples	43%	50%	1	2	0	0	1	2	0	1	7	
Families with own children under 18 - Mother Only	3%	21%	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	
Families with own children under 18 - Father Only	<1%	7%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Married Female	66%	75%	2	3	0	0	1	2	0	1	9	
Never married female	20%	8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	
Widowed female	12%	33%	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	4	
Divorced female	2%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Married Male	68%	83%	3	3	0	0	1	2	0	1	10	
Never married male	26%	8%	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Widowed male	4%	17%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	
Divorced male	2%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
1960 Census Family Structure Categories	U.S. Population	Newbery Books	Ginger Pye	Family Under the Bridge	Kildee House	Gone-Away Lake	on Hemlock Mt.	Lights at Tern Rock	...And Now Miguel	Miracles on Maple Hill	Shadrach	Book Totals
Family Households - Married Couples	74%	48%	2	0	2	2	1	0	1	2	2	12
Family Households - Male Householder	2%	24%	1	1	1	0	0	1	3	0	0	7
Family Households - Female Householder	8%	8%	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
Nonfamily Households - Male Householder	5%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nonfamily Households - Female Householder	4%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Families with own children under 18 - Married Couples	44%	40%	2	0	2	2	1	0	1	1	1	10
Families with own children under 18 - Mother Only	4%	4%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Families with own children under 18 - Father Only	<1%	4%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Children under 18 living with other relatives	3%	3%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Children under 18 living with non-relatives	<1%	10%	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Children under 18 living with divorced mother only	2%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Children under 18 living with married mother, spouse absent	4%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Children under 18 living with widowed mother only	2%	10%	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Children under 18 living with mother never married	0.30%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Children under 18 living with divorced father only	0.20%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Children under 18 living with married father, spouse absent	0.50%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Children under 18 living with widowed father only	0.30%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Children under 18 living with father never married	<0.1%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Children under 18 living with two parents	88%	77%	3	0	8	3	1	0	5	2	2	24
1 person household	13%	24%	0	1	1	2	0	1	0	1	0	6
2 persons household	28%	16%	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	4
3 persons household	0	16%	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	4
4 persons household	18%	20%	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	5
5 persons household	12%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6 persons household	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7 or more persons household	5%	8%	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Unmarried partners with children under 15	0.40%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unmarried partners without children under 15	0.50%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Married Female	66%	75%	2	0	2	2	1	0	1	2	2	12
Never married female	19%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Widowed female	12%	19%	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	3
Divorced female	3%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Married Male	69%	57%	2	0	2	2	1	0	1	3	2	13
Never married male	25%	4%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Widowed male	4%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Divorced male	2%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18-24 living at home male	6%	9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
18-24 living at home female	4%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24-34 living at home male	2%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24-34 living at home female	1%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1970 Census Family Structure Categories	U.S. Population	Newbery Books	From the Mixed Up Files	Onion John	Jennifer, Hecate...	It's Like This, Cat	My Side of the Mountain	The Noonday Friends	The Jazz Man	The Loner	The Egypt Game	Book Totals
Family Households - Married Couples	71%	54%	1	1	2	3	1	2	1	1	1	13
Family Households - Male Householder	2%	8%	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Family Households - Female Householder	9%	17%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4
Nonfamily Households - Male Householder	6%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nonfamily Households - Female Householder	12%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Families with own children under 18 - Married Couples	40%	50%	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	12
Families with own children under 18 - Mother Only	5%	4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

Families with own children under 18 - Father Only	<1%	4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1						
Children under 18 living with other relatives	2%	2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1						
Children under 18 living with non-relatives	<1%	2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1						
Children under 18 living with divorced mother only	3%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
Children under 18 living with married mother, spouse absent	5%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
Children under 18 living with widowed mother only	2%	7%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3						
Children under 18 living with mother never married	1%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
Children under 18 living with divorced father only	<1%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
Children under 18 living with married father, spouse absent	<1%	2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1						
Children under 18 living with widowed father only	<1%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
Children under 18 living with father never married	<0.1%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						
Children under 18 living with two parents	85%	71%	4	1	2	2	9	11	1	0	2	32							
1 person household	17%	38%	1	1	0	0	2	0	1	3	1	9							
2 persons household	29%	17%	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	4							
3 persons household	117%	25%	0	1	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	6							
4 persons household	16%	8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2							
5 persons household	10%	4%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1							
6 persons household	6%	4%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1							
7 or more persons household	5%	13%	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	3							
Grandchildren living with grandparents and both parents	<1%	33%	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	7	0	15							
Grandchildren living with grandparents and mother only	1%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
Grandchildren living with grandparents and father only	0.10%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
Grandchildren living with grandparents only	1%	2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1							
Unmarried partners with children under 15	0.30%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
Unmarried partners without children under 15	0.50%	4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1							
Married Female	61%	72%	1	1	2	3	1	2	1	1	1	13							
Never married female	22%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
Widowed female	12%	11%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2							
Divorced female	4%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
Married Male	66%	68%	1	1	2	3	1	2	1	1	1	13							
Never married male	29%	11%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2							
Widowed male	3%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
Divorced male	3%	5%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1							
18-24 living at home male	8%	11%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2							
18-24 living at home female	6%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
24-34 living at home male	2%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
24-34 living at home female	1%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0							
1980 Census Family Structure Categories	U.S. Population	Newbery Books	The Westing Game	Bridge to Terabithia	Great Gilly Hopkins	Ramona and her Father	Julie of the Wolves	Summer of the Swans	Hundred Penny Box	M.C. Higgins	Figgs and Phantoms	Phillip Hall Lake Me	The Witches of Worm	The Headless Cupid	Planet of Junior Brown	Annie and the Old One	Book Totals		
Family Households - Married Couples	61%	51%	3	2	0	1	1	0	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	18	
Family Households - Male Householder	2%	14%	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	

Family Households - Female Householder	11%	29%	3	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	8
Nonfamily Households - Male Householder	11%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nonfamily Households - Female Householder	15%	3%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Families with own children under 18 - Married Couples	31%	49%	2	2	0	1	1	0	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	17
Families with own children under 18 - Mother Only	7%	6%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2
Families with own children under 18 - Father Only	1%	6%	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Children under 18 living with other relatives	3%	20%	0	0	1	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7
Children under 18 living with non-relatives	<1%	6%	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Children under 18 living with divorced mother only	8%	6%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Children under 18 living with married mother, spouse absent	6%	3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Children under 18 living with widowed mother only	2%	3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Children under 18 living with mother never married	3%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Children under 18 living with divorced father only	1%	3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Children under 18 living with married father, spouse absent	0.50%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Children under 18 living with widowed father only	0.30%	11%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	4
Children under 18 living with father never married	0.10%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Children under 18 living with two parents	77%	91%	3	6	0	2	1	0	1	5	2	5	1	5	0	1	32
1 person household	29%	26%	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	9
2 persons household	31%	14%	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	5
3 persons household	17%	17%	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
4 persons household	16%	17%	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6
5 persons household	8%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6 persons household	3%	9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	3
7 or more persons household	2%	9%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3
Grandchildren living with grandparents and both parents	0.50%	6%	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
Grandchildren living with grandparents and mother only	1%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grandchildren living with grandparents and father only	0.10%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grandchildren living with grandparents only	2%	3%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Unmarried partners with children under 15	0.50%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unmarried partners without children under 15	1%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Black husband, white wife	0.20%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
White husband, black wife	<0.1%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
White and other race	0.60%	3%	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Black and other race	<0.1%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Married Female	59%	66%	3	2	0	1	2	0	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	19
Never married female	22%	10%	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Widowed female	12%	17%	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5
Divorced female	7%	10%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	3
Married Male	63%	78%	3	2	0	1	1	0	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	18
Never married male	30%	13%	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Widowed male	2%	22%	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	5

Divorced male	5%	9%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	
18-24 living at home male	9%	4%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
18-24 living at home female	7%	9%	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
24-34 living at home male	2%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
24-34 living at home female	1%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
1990 Census Family Structure Categories	U.S. Population	Newbery Books	On My Honor	Ramona Quimby, Age 8	Scorpions	A Fine White Dust	Hatchet	After the Rain	Like Jake and Me	Dear Mr. Henshaw	A Solitary Blue	Dacey's Song	Dog Song	A Ring of Endless Light	Book Totals				
Family Households - Married Couples	56%	48%	2	1	1	1	0	4	1	0	1	1	1	2	15				
Family Households - Male Householder	9%	16%	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	1	5				
Family Households - Female Householder	12%	29%	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	3	1	0	1	9				
Nonfamily Households - Male Householder	12%	9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1				
Nonfamily Households - Female Householder	17%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Families with own children under 18 - Married Couples	26%	42%	2	1	0	1	0	4	1	0	1	1	0	2	13				
Families with own children under 18 - Mother Only	7%	10%	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3				
Families with own children under 18 - Father Only	1%	10%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	3				
Children under 18 living with other relatives	2%	16%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	6				
Children under 18 living with non-relatives	<1%	9%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1				
Children under 18 living with divorced mother only	8%	5%	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2				
Children under 18 living with married mother, spouse absent	5%	8%	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3				
Children under 18 living with widowed mother only	2%	5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2				
Children under 18 living with mother never married	7%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Children under 18 living with divorced father only	2%	5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2				
Children under 18 living with married father, spouse absent	0.50%	5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2				
Children under 18 living with widowed father only	0.20%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Children under 18 living with father never married	0.70%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Children under 18 living with two parents	73%	58%	6	2	0	1	0	7	1	0	1	1	0	3	22				
1 person household	25%	13%	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	4				
2 persons household	32%	32%	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	1	1	1	2	1	10				
3 persons household	17%	19%	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	6				
4 persons household	15%	19%	1	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	6				
5 persons household	7%	6%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2				
6 persons household	2%	6%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2				
7 or more persons household	1%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
parents	0.70%	8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3				
Grandchildren living with grandparents and mother only	2%	3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1				
Grandchildren living with grandparents and father only	0.30%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Grandchildren living with grandparents only	1%	13%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	5				
Unmarried partners with children under 15	1%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Unmarried partners without children under 15	2%	9%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1				
Black husband, white wife	0.20%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
White husband, black wife	<0.1%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
White and other race	0.80%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				

Black and other race	<0.1%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Married Female	57%	68%	2	1	1	1	0	4	1	0	1	1	1	2	15				
Never married female	29%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Widowed female	11%	18%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	4				
Divorced female	9%	18%	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	4				
Married Male	61%	65%	2	1	1	1	0	4	1	0	1	1	1	2	15				
Never married male	30%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Widowed male	9%	9%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2				
Divorced male	7%	26%	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	6				
18-24 living at home male	8%	13%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3				
18-24 living at home female	6%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
24-34 living at home male	9%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
24-34 living at home female	2%	5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1				
2000 Census Family Structure Categories	U.S. Population	Newbery Books	Holes	Wringer	The View from Saturday	The Winter Room	What Jamie Saw	Yolanda's Genius	Walk Two Moons	Missing May	Crazy Lady	Afternoon of the Elves	What Hearts	Nothing but the Truth	Maniac Magee	Shiloh	Somewhere in the Darkness	Book Totals	
Family Households - Married Couples	59%	50%	1	3	2	1	0	0	2	2	0	2	1	1	3	2	0	20	
Family Households - Male Householder	4%	18%	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	7	
Family Households - Female Householder	12%	28%	1	0	2	0	1	2	0	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	11	
Nonfamily Households - Male Householder	14%	3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	
Nonfamily Households - Female Householder	17%	3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	
Families with own children under 18 - Married Couples	24%	43%	1	3	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	1	2	2	0	17	
Families with own children under 18 - Mother Only	7%	15%	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	
Families with own children under 18 - Father Only	2%	13%	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	5	
Married Couple, stay-at-home mother with children under 15	5%	20%	1	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	8	
Married Couple, stay-at-home father with children under 15	<0.1%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Children under 18 living with other relatives	3%	10%	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	
Children under 18 living with non-relatives	1%	4%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	
Male-male unmarried couples	57%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Male-male married couples	42%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Female-female unmarried couples	57%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Female-female married couples	43%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Children under 18 living with divorced mother only	8%	8%	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	
Children under 18 living with married mother, spouse absent	4%	2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Children under 18 living with widowed mother only	1%	4%	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
Children under 18 living with mother never married	9%	2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Children under 18 living with divorced father only	2%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Children under 18 living with married father, spouse absent	0.80%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Children under 18 living with widowed father only	0.20%	16%	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	
Children under 18 living with father never married	1%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Children under 18 living with two parents	69%	65%	1	3	4	2	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	1	13	4	0	32	

1 person household	26%	15%	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	6
2 persons household	33%	33%	1	0	2	0	0	0	3	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	2	13
3 persons household	16%	33%	1	3	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	13
4 persons household	15%	10%	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4
5 persons household	7%	8%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3
6 persons household	2%	8%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3
7 or more persons household	1%	3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Grandchildren living with grandparents and both parents	0.70%	5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	10
Grandchildren living with grandparents and mother only	2%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grandchildren living with grandparents and father only	0.30%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grandchildren living with grandparents only	2%	2%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Unmarried partners with children under 15	2%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unmarried partners without children under 15	3%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Black husband, white wife	0.20%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
White husband, black wife	<0.1%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
White and other race	1%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Black and other race	<0.1%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Married Female	55%	71%	1	3	2	1	0	0	2	2	0	2	1	1	3	2	0	20
Never married female	25%	11%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
Widowed female	10%	11%	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Divorced female	10%	11%	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Married Male	58%	65%	1	3	2	1	0	0	2	2	0	2	1	1	3	2	0	20
Never married male	31%	3%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Widowed male	3%	23%	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	7
Divorced male	8%	10%	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	3
18-24 living at home male	7%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18-24 living at home female	6%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24-34 living at home male	2%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24-34 living at home female	1%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2010 Census Family Structure Categories	U.S. Population	Newbery Books	Surviving Applewhittes	Getting Near to Baby	Everything on a Waffle	The Wanderer	Pictures of Hollis Woods	Hoot	Higher Power of Lucky	Rules	Criss Cross	Olive's Ocean	Because of Winn-Dixie	Joey Pigza	Hope was Here	Book Totals		
Family Households - Married Couples	50%	56%	2	2	2	3	1	3	1	3	3	2	0	0	1	23		
Family Households - Male Householder	5%	15%	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	6		
Family Households - Female Householder	13%	27%	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	2	2	1	2	11		
Nonfamily Households - Male Householder	16%	2%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1		
Nonfamily Households - Female Householder	17%	5%	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2		
Families with own children under 18 - Married Couples	21%	46%	1	1	1	3	1	3	1	3	3	2	0	0	0	19		
Families with own children under 18 - Mother Only	7%	12%	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	5		
Families with own children under 18 - Father Only	2%	5%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2		
Married Couple, stay-at-home mother with children under 15	4%	7%	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3		
Married Couple, stay-at-home father with children under 15	0.10%	2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1		

Children under 18 living with other relatives	3%	13%	1	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	6
Children under 18 living with non-relatives	1%	9%	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
Children under 18 living with divorced mother only absent	7%	6%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	3
Children under 18 living with widowed mother only	5%	6%	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Children under 18 living with mother never married	1%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Children under 18 living with divorced father only	10%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Children under 18 living with married father, spouse absent	2%	2%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Children under 18 living with widowed father only	0.70%	2%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Children under 18 living with father never married	0.20%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Children under 18 living with two parents	1%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1 person household	69%	81%	4	5	1	3	2	6	1	2	5	8	0	0	38
2 persons household	27%	15%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	6
3 persons household	34%	39%	2	1	2	0	1	1	2	1	0	1	1	2	16
4 persons household	16%	34%	0	1	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	14
5 persons household	14%	12%	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	5
6 persons household	6%	7%	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3
7 or more persons household	2%	2%	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
parents	1%	7%	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3
Grandchildren living with grandparents and mother only	1%	9%	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Grandchildren living with grandparents and father only	3%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grandchildren living with grandparents only	0.30%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Unmarried partners with children under 15	2%	4%	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Unmarried partners without children under 15	2%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Married Female	4%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Never married female	52%	65%	2	3	2	3	1	3	1	3	3	2	0	0	24
Widowed female	27%	3%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Divorced female	9%	5%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Married Male	11%	14%	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	5
Never married male	55%	72%	2	3	2	3	1	3	1	1	3	2	1	0	23
Widowed male	34%	3%	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Divorced male	3%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18-24 living at home male	8%	9%	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	3
18-24 living at home female	7%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24-34 living at home male	6%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24-34 living at home female	3%		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Appendix B

Location of Evidence of Family Structure in Newbery Books

Author and Title	Page Numbers
Allee, M. H. (1931). <i>Jane's island</i>	1, 3, 6, 10
Atwater, F. & Atwater R. (1938). <i>Mr. Popper's penguins</i>	5
Avi. (1991). <i>Nothing but the truth</i>	3, 5, 8, 27
Bauer, J. (2000). <i>Hope was here</i>	5, 6, 9, 102, 148, 155, 169, 171
Bauer, M. D. (1986). <i>On my honor</i>	2, 3, 10, 77
Bianco, M. (1936). <i>Winterbound</i>	5, 6
Bishop, C. H. (1947). <i>Pancakes-Paris</i>	7, 10
Brooks, B. (1992). <i>What hearts</i>	10, 13
Byars, B. (1970). <i>The summer of the swans</i>	9, 13, 20, 81, 86
Carlson, N. S. (1958). <i>The family under the bridge</i>	1, 8, 11, 12, 49, 51, 54
Cleary, B. (1983). <i>Dear Mr. Henshaw</i>	16
Cleary, B. (1975). <i>Ramona and her father</i>	12, 15
Cleary, B. (1981). <i>Ramona Quimby, age 8</i>	11
Coman, C. (1995). <i>What Jamie saw</i>	7, 8, 47
Conly, J. L. (1993). <i>Crazy lady!</i>	3, 7, 13, 32, 168
Couloumbis, A. (1999). <i>Getting near to baby</i>	1, 3, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 15, 28, 37, 40, 48, 57, 62, 135
Creech, S. (2000). <i>The wanderer</i>	3, 5, 14, 16, 28, 82, 231, 249
Creech, S. (1994). <i>Walk two moons</i>	2, 6, 8, 10, 19, 149, 175, 185, 248, 272, 274
Dalgliesh, A. (1952). <i>The bears on Hemlock Mountain</i>	1, 4, 10
Dejong, M. (1953). <i>Shadrach</i>	1, 5, 7, 8, 37
DiCamillo, K. (2000). <i>Because of Winn-Dixie</i>	7, 13, 14, 22, 41, 64, 129
Enright, E. (1957). <i>Gone-away lake</i>	1, 2, 47, 48
Enright, E. (1938). <i>Thimble summer</i>	4, 6, 8
Estes, E. (1951). <i>Ginger Pye</i>	6, 9, 274
Estes, E. (1943). <i>Rufus M.</i>	2
Estes, E. (1944). <i>The hundred dresses</i>	5, 9, 10
Estes, E. (1942). <i>The middle Moffat</i>	1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 13, 43, 47, 53, 56, 71, 74, 85, 86
Fenner, C. (1995). <i>Yolanda's genius</i>	1, 39, 46, 78, 82
Fisher, C. (1946). <i>The avion my uncle flew</i>	1, 144
Gantos, J. (2000). <i>Joey Pigza loses control</i>	3, 17
Gates, D. (1940). <i>Blue willow</i>	14, 16, 19, 23
George, J. C. (1972). <i>Julie of the wolves</i>	7, 10, 12, 75, 83

George, J. C. (1959). <i>My side of the mountain</i>	8
Giff, P. R. (2002). <i>Pictures of Hollis Woods</i>	1, 6, 166
Greene, B. (1974). <i>Phillip Hall likes me. I reckon maybe</i>	3, 4, 11, 14, 54, 100, 101
Hamilton, V. (1974). <i>M.C. Higgins, the great</i>	21, 22, 212, 214, 216
Hamilton, V. (1971). <i>The planet of Junior Brown</i>	1, 3, 18, 23, 25, 27, 40, 51, 64
Henkes, K. (2003). <i>Olive's ocean</i>	1, 7, 21, 24, 32, 33, 36, 48, 51, 213
Henry, M. (1947). <i>Misty of Chincoteague</i>	21, 29, 111
Hiaasen, C. (2002). <i>Hoot</i>	27, 38, 76, 81, 114
Horvath, P. (2001). <i>Everything on a waffle</i>	9, 15, 18, 130, 172
Jukes, M. (1984). <i>Like Jake and me</i>	1, 4, 20
Konigsburg, E. L. (1967). <i>From the mixed-up files of Mrs. Basil E. Frankweiler</i>	5, 7
Konigsburg, E. L. (1967). <i>Jennifer, Hecate, Macbeth, William McKinley, and me, Elizabeth</i>	25, 33, 56, 92
Konigsburg, E. L. (1996). <i>The view from Saturday</i>	5, 8, 13, 25, 61, 63, 67, 84
Krumgold, J. (1953). <i>...And now Miguel</i>	1, 3, 4, 23, 27, 28
Krumgold, J. (1959). <i>Onion John</i>	3, 7
L'Engle, M. (1980). <i>A ring of endless light</i>	8, 12, 22, 46
Lisle, J. T. (1989). <i>Afternoon of the elves</i>	4, 44
Lord, C. (2006). <i>Rules</i>	1, 3, 8, 34, 45, 63, 92
Mathis, S. B. (1975). <i>The hundred penny box</i>	10
Mazer, N. F. (1987). <i>After the rain</i>	2, 15, 16, 30, 38, 124
Means, F. C. (1945). <i>The moved-outers</i>	3, 6, 19
Miles, Miska. (1971). <i>Annie and the old one</i>	6, 10, 15
Montgomery, R. (1949). <i>Kildee house</i>	1, 4, 23, 26, 89
Myers, W. D. (1988). <i>Scorpions</i>	3, 6, 9, 33, 86, 87
Myers, W. D. (1992). <i>Somewhere in the darkness</i>	1, 5, 7, 19, 21
Naylor, P. R. (2000). <i>Shiloh</i>	1, 2, 56
Neville, E. (1963). <i>It's like this, cat</i>	1, 3, 60, 128, 131
Paterson, K. (1977). <i>Bridge to Terabithia</i>	2, 7, 32
Paterson, K. (1978). <i>The great Gilly Hopkins</i>	1, 4, 9, 11, 107, 118, 119
Patron, S. (2006). <i>The higher power of Lucky</i>	4, 13, 15, 23, 72
Paulsen, G. (1985). <i>Dogsong</i>	5
Paulsen, G. (1987). <i>Hatchet</i>	2, 6
Paulsen, G. (1989). <i>The winter room</i>	8, 10

Perkins, L. R. (2005). <i>Criss cross</i>	1, 6, 60, 65
Raskin, E. (1974). <i>Figgs & phantoms</i>	4, 9, 27, 34
Raskin, E. (1978). <i>The Westing game</i>	102, 103, 106, 109, 115, 118, 123, 126, 127, 154
Robinson, M. L. (1937). <i>Bright Island</i>	12, 18
Rylant, C. (1986). <i>A fine white dust</i>	4, 5
Rylant, C. (1992). <i>Missing May</i>	4, 9, 60
Sachar, L. (1998). <i>Holes</i>	5, 6, 9
Sauer, J. L. (1951). <i>The light at Tern Rock</i>	12, 13, 16
Schmidt, S. L. (1933). <i>New land</i>	3, 4, 11, 15
Snyder, Z. K. (1967). <i>The Egypt Game</i>	11, 13, 59
Snyder, Z. K. (1971). <i>The headless cupid</i>	3, 4, 6, 51
Snyder, Z. K. (1972). <i>The witches of worm</i>	3, 13, 43
Sorensen, V. (1956). <i>Miracles on Maple Hill</i>	1, 2, 5, 7, 15, 130, 152
Spinelli, J. (1990). <i>Maniac Magee</i>	5, 21, 41, 42, 44, 84, 108, 110, 128, 132
Spinelli, J. (1997). <i>The wringer</i>	5, 24, 42, 115
Stong, Phil. (1935). <i>Honk the moose</i>	7, 11, 17, 22, 45, 56
Stolz, M. (1965). <i>The noonday friends</i>	3, 4, 11, 12, 65
Tolan, S. S. (2002). <i>Surviving the Applewhites</i>	2, 9-13, 17
Voigt, C. (1983). <i>A solitary blue</i>	3, 4, 26, 36, 40, 42, 49, 50, 54, 56, 80
Voigt, C. (1982). <i>Dacey's song</i>	2, 8, 11, 20, 43, 67, 254, 322
Weik, M. H. (1966). <i>The jazz man</i>	3, 4, 10, 14, 17, 22, 25, 29, 40
Wier, E. (1963). <i>The loner</i>	2, 6, 9, 11, 14, 18, 23, 31, 32, 34, 37, 39