Breaking Boundaries: Black Magazines Reconstructing Black Female Identity

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts at George Mason University

By

Anita N. DeLoach
Bachelor of Arts
Georgia State University, 2007

Director: Rutledge Dennis, Professor
Department of Sociology

Summer Semester 2009
George Mason University
Fairfax, VA

DEDICATION

I would like to dedicate this thesis to God, who gave me the determination and strength to complete this project. Without him, none of it would have been possible. I also want to dedicate this thesis to my husband, Brandon, for his unconditional love and support throughout this process. To my family, I love you all dearly and I am so blessed to have such a wonderful family. Lastly, to my closest friends whom allowed me to bounce ideas off of them and prayed for me every day.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to express my gratitude to Dr. Dennis Rutledge, Dr. Joseph Scimecca, and Dr. Gregory Guagnano, members of my committee, for their wonderful help and support during the writing of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

BREAKING BOUNDARIES: BLACK MAGAZINES RECONSTRUCTING BLACK
FEMALE IDENTITY

Anita N. DeLoach M.A.

George Mason University, 2009

Thesis Director: Dr. Rutledge Dennis

The mainstream media has aided black women's subordination by depicting black

women in limited and negative positions. In previous studies, the Mammy, Matriarch,

Welfare Queen, Strong Woman and Jezebel models have been identified as the most

commonly used stereotypical images of black women. Magazines such as *Ebony,*

Essence, and *Black Enterprise* have as one of their objectives the restoration of racial

pride, providing opportunities for black women to define themselves, presenting

unlimited job options and increasing unheralded expectations for black women. The

purpose of this study is to determine if contemporary popular black magazines reinforce

existing racial stereotypes or dispel them by presenting alternative images. The contents

of *Ebony, Essence* and *Black Enterprise,* were examined from 2000 to 2008 to investigate

the presence or absence of the Mammy, Matriarch, Welfare Queen, Strong Woman and

Jezebel images. A major finding of the study was that articles in *Essence* dispelled

approximately 29.5%, articles in *Black Enterprise* dispelled approximately 38.2% and articles in *Ebony* dispelled approximately 32.3% of the stereotypical images. Based on the total number of stereotypical images addressed in all of the magazines, the matriarch was dispelled at a higher percentage in both *Ebony* and *Black Enterprise*. In Essence, however, the strong woman stereotype was dispelled more than any of the other stereotypical images. Dispelling the stereotypes provides evidence that the magazines do in fact adhere to some of the basic principles of Black feminism which are voice, self-definition, and resisting oppression both in practices and in ideas that justify it.

CHAPTER 1

Historically, Black women have been, and still are, represented in mainstream

media by negative and damaging stereotypes like the Mammy, Matriarch, Welfare

Mother, Strong Woman and Jezebel. In *An Introduction To Studying The Media,* Tim

O'Sullivan, Brian Dutton and Phillip Rayner (1994, p.113) note, "the concept of

representation embodies the theme that the media construct meanings about the world-

they represent it." The media's importance as a source of information and ideas has

increased in recent years, and it often presents people, places, and issues to the public as

if they were truths or "real" social realities. It has the authority to shape perceptions of

the world, and for the purposes of this thesis, circulate images of Black femininity which

relate to the intersecting ideologies of race, class and gender. Simone Cottle, in *Ethnic*

Minorities in the Media (2000, p.2) further explains:

> the media occupy a key sight and perform a crucial role in the pubic
> representation of unequal social relations in the play of cultural power. It
> is in and through representations, for example, that members of the media
> audience are variously invited to construct a sense of who 'we' are in
> relation to who 'we' are not, whether as 'us' and 'them', 'insider' and
> 'outsider', 'colonizer' and 'colonized', 'citizen' and 'foreigner', 'normal'
> and 'deviant', 'friend' and 'foe, 'the west' and 'the rest'. By such means,
> the social interest mobilized across society are marked out from each
> other, differentiated and often rendered vulnerable to discrimination. At
> the same time, however, the media can also serve to affirm social and
> cultural diversity and, moreover, provide crucial spaces in an through

which imposed identities for the interests of others can be resisted, challenged, and changed.

Racism requires ideological justifications, and controlling images of Black women in the media participate in creating them. At the same time, Black women use these same sites within Black popular culture to resist racism, sexism, and class exploitation (Allen, 2001; Dates and Barlow, 1993). Just as the media creates and sustains negative images of individuals and groups, it is also important in the construction of a just society in that it affects employment, how individuals view one another, and how individuals and groups view themselves (Cottle, 2000; O'Sullivan, 1994).

Statement of the problem

Negative images of black women serve to support an oppressive patriarchal system that degrades and denigrates them according to race, class, and gender. Collins (2000), Dates and Barlow (1993), Lont (1995), Rooks (2004), Woodard and Mastin (2005) have all conducted studies examining negative images of black women in white mainstream and there findings confirm that the pejorative images do maintain an oppressive patriarchal system based on race, class, and gender. Patricia Hill Collins (2000, p.69) notes, "These controlling images [mammies, matriarchs, welfare queens, and hot mamas] are designed to make racism, sexism, poverty and other forms of social injustice appear to be natural, normal, inevitable parts of everyday life." In ideal theoretical terms, stereotyping is a means by which support is provided for one group's differential (often discriminatory) treatment of another (Rhinehart, 1963). Tim O'Sullivan et al. (1994, p.126-127) explains, "If black Africans could be represented as

uncivilized and savage in the 19th Century, then slavery and exploitation of blacks by their white rulers could be justified. In contemporary society, old people are frequently portrayed as physically and mentally infirmed, asexual and unable to adapt to social change. Such 'ageist' sentiments contribute to a lowering of the social status of the aged, including a lowering of their self-esteem". The same is also true for stereotypes about black women. If Black women are frequently portrayed as ignorant, lazy and promiscuous, then discriminatory practices against them based on racism and sexism can be justified (Lont, 1995; hooks, 1989). Such racist and sexist sentiments contribute to a lowering of the social status of Black women, including a lowering of their self-esteem. In addition to the aforementioned, the media's continuous treatment of black women as the objectified other, places women in boundaries inhibiting their potential and aiding in permeating their inferior position (Allen, 2001; Collins, 2000; Dates and Barlow, 1993, Kaiser, 1979; Kamalipour, 1998; Lemons, 1977; Lont, 1995; Rhodes, 1993).

Mainstream magazines in the United States, often ignore Black Americans, and fail to recognize their talents and experiences, as well as their concerns on certain issues (Allen, 2001; Collins, 2000; Dates and Barlow, 1993, Kaiser, 1979; Kamalipour, 1998; Lemons, 1977; Lont, 1995; Rhodes, 1993). The media is controlled by the white dominant population. Thus mainstream magazines such as *Vogue* and *Vanity Fair* (two of the most popular mainstream magazines based on revenue), which focus on topics related to human interest, politics, fashion, celebrities, sports, and entertainment, tend to highlight views which represent class and race values and views of the white dominant population (Allen, 2001; Collins, 2000; Dates and Barlow, 1993, Kaiser, 1979; Lemons,

1977; Lont, 1995). Mainstream magazines frequently reinforce stereotypical images as they portray women based upon the dominant societies notions of 'the perfect woman' (thin, beautiful, natural), women as sexual objects (seductive and typically naked), 'the homemaker' (dependant on a spouse for income and occupying private space while the man works in public space) (Collins, 2000; Kitch, 2001; Lemons, 1977; Lont, 1995). These portrayals do not reflect a view of women as equal partners in relationships, but as women trapped into subordinate positions in society (Collins 2000; Collins, 2004). More importantly, these magazines seldom feature minorities on their covers or in advertisements, nor do they address issues of importance to minorities in their content (Colfax and Sternburg, 1972; Lacey, 1996; Lont,1995; Humphrey and Schuman, 1984; Kassarjian, 1969; Kitch, 2001; Rhodes, 1993; Rooks, 2004). When minorities, blacks in particular, are featured, it is typically in the areas of sports and entertainment (Curry et al., 2002).

Significance of the study

As noted by their editors, *Ebony*, *Essence*, and *Black Enterprise* seek to increase black women's self-esteem and attempt to motivate them personally, professionally, and intellectually by providing articles that address issues which present positive role models and images of black women in leadership positions (*Black Enterprise*, Jan. 2000; Dates and Barlow, 1993; *Ebony*, Nov. 2005; *Essence*, May, 2002). The purpose of this study is

to examine roles and images of black women projected by the larger white society through the media, and to analyze the three black owned and controlled magazine to ascertain if their stories and advertisements support or disprove five models of black women which have permeated white media stereotypes.

The significance of this study arises from the assumption that negative stereotypes can have and have had, negative effects on black girls and women. Studies in self-esteem also note that negative images of a group are only important, on some level, if the group believes the negative images about them to be true. Dates and Barlow (1993), Collins (2000), hooks (2003), and Rooks (2004) explain that Black women accepted negative images of themselves by the white media, if they engaged in that media by reading and purchasing white mainstream magazines. The consequences of controlling Black images include damaged self-esteem and hindered employment opportunities (Allen, 2001; Collins, 2000; Collins, 2005; Culley, 1975; Entman and Rojecki, 2000; hooks, 2003; Lont, 1995; Rooks, 2004). Collins (2000), Dates and Barlow (1993), Lont (1995), Rooks (2004), and Woodard and Mastin (2005) based the development of the five models (mammy, matriarch, jezebel, strong woman, welfare mother) on concrete cases confirmed after studying the negative images of black women in white magazines. "So systematic had been the exclusion of positive Blacks from the White-controlled media that many people, including-sadly enough- a fair number of Blacks, had serious doubts about Blacks' ability to perform as well as their White counterparts" (*Ebony*, Nov. 2005). In *Rock My Soul: Black People and Self-Esteem*, psychologist Nathaniel Branden (hooks, 2003, xi-xii) states, "Self-esteem fully realized, is the experience that we are appropriate

to life and to the requirements of life… Self-esteem is confidence in our ability to think; confidence in our ability to cope with the basic challenges of life, and confidence in our right to be successful and happy; the feeling of being worthy, deserving, entitled to assert our needs and wants, achieve our values, and enjoy the fruits of our efforts." bell hooks (2003) continues on to explain that without self-esteem people begin to loose their sense of agency. They feel powerless. They feel they can only be victims. Victims in terms of white image makers portrayal of Black women, sexual abuse, prejudice, and discrimination (hooks, 2003).

Images from White mainstream rarely present Blacks in heroic roles (Allen, 2001; Collins, 2000; Entman and Rojecki, 2000; Rooks, 2004). Most of the time they are not portrayed seriously at all (Allen, 2001; Collins, 2000; Entman and Rojecki, 2000; Rooks, 2004). Moreover, white mainstream media shuns issues that Blacks consider important such as disparities in housing, education, and employment (Allen, 2001; Collins, 2000; Entman and Rojecki, 2000; Rooks, 2004). Unless their views echo those of the dominant white culture, Blacks rarely have an opportunity to be heard (Allen, 2001). Furthermore, many Blacks have charged the press with directing an inordinate amount of attention to racial conflict, crime, and negative news about Blacks, while avoiding favorable news (Allen, 2001). The majority press is still inclined to present Black women as the mammy, matriarch, strong woman, welfare mother, and jezebel which all characterize Black women as unattractive, unintelligent and unfeminine. The media's negative portrayal of Black women directly contributes to deep feelings of unworthiness and ugliness both inside and out (hooks, 2003). Richard Allen (2001, p.47) states, "The symbolic

interaction approach, originally conceived by Cooley (1902) and said by Gecas (1982) to

still function as the major influence on the concept of self, operates from the assumption

that one's concept of self is an ongoing product of social interaction with other people.

Under this thesis, what an individual incorporates as his or her own is based on

information about oneself received from others, that is, the 'looking glass self.'

Therefore, social interaction is the basis upon which an individual builds his or her self-

concepts. That is, the notion that people's feelings about themselves are informed by their

judgments of what others think about them, which in this case is learned from the media

representations. Allen (2001, p.28) further notes:

> Crocker and Major (1989) present and exciting and thought provoking
> literature review of the social psychology literature on the self-esteem.
> The focus on the definition of self-esteem in terms of generalized feelings
> of self-worth or self-acceptance (i.e. the definition proffered by
> Rosenberg, 1981, 1989), and included within the category of 'stigmatized'
> or 'oppressed' groups such as African Americans in the United States, the
> mentally challenged, homosexuals, the insane, and the physically
> unattractive. Within this conceptual scope, they reviewed three
> perspectives- reflected appraisals, self-fulfilling prophecies, and efficacy-
> based self-esteem- and identified several others- equity theory, social
> exchange theory, social comparison theory, and social identity theory- that
> were said to be in concert with the prediction that stigmatization has a
> negative effect on self-esteem. As African Americans are the most
> stigmatized group in the United States, it may be reasonably assumed that
> their self-esteem, defined as self-worth, would be particularly diminished.

Baldwin, Brown, and Hopkins studied the Black self-concept and self-hatred and their

findings confirm the media's negative effects of stigmatization of Blacks on self-esteem

(Allen, 2001, p. 56). Baldwin, Brown, and Hopkins emphasize:

> European-American racism and racists practices are construed to represent
> the African American community's social looking glass (i.e. their
> generalized significant others) reflecting derogatory images of blacks.

Through African American's internalization of and/or identification with the (generalized) European American racist attitudes toward blacks, or through so-called objective comparison (housing, employment, income, etc.), blacks come to view themselves (cognitively and affectively) as whites view them" (Allen, 2001, p.57).

Acknowledging the controlling images of Blacks in the media and their position of inferiority in those contexts, it is clear that Blacks are inclined to internalize, early in life, negative beliefs about themselves and other Blacks. Low self-esteem leads to higher rates of unemployment, lower educational attainment, and other associated sociostructural elements (Allen, 2001; hooks, 2003). Branden (1994), Gaus et al. (1994), Jordan et al. (1990), Kenway (1990), Kingsbury et al. (1982), and Owens (1992) studies confirm the negative effects of low self-esteem previous stated. From what has been observed there needs to be a noticeable shift to a more positive self image for Blacks.

Ebony, *Essence*, and *Black Enterprise* have been created by Black image makers, who claim to expose and correct the omissions and distortions in the imagery fostered by whites (*Black Enterprise*, Jan. 2000; Dates and Barlow, 1993; *Ebony*, Nov. 2005; *Essence*, May, 2002). The magazines mission to dispel pejorative images and their influence on Black women make them important sites of resistance and as such should be examined to determine whether they are executing their mission.

CHAPTER 2

The ideas and assertions of black feminism help to propose Black women

magazines as liberating feminist texts (Hesse-Biber and Leavy, 2007) (which studies

women, allows women to define themselves, and works towards the elimination of all

forms of oppression, distinguish feminist research from non-feminists text). The use of

these texts should help to dispel stereotypical images of black women through

photographs and content. I will focus on the standpoint theory approach to black

feminism because I believe it to be the most applicable to cultural magazines such as

Ebony, *Essence*, and *Black Enterprise* and their goal of black image reconstruction.

Patricia Hill Collins (2000, p.22-39) identifies five distinguishing features of

black feminist thought: 1. Black feminist thought aims to empower African American

women within the context of social injustice sustained by intersecting oppressions of

race, class, gender, sexuality, and nation- The overarching purpose of U.S. Black feminist

thought is also to resist oppression both in practices and in the ideas that justify it; 2.

Tension linking experiences and ideas-On the one hand, all African-American women

face similar challenges that result from living in a society that historically and routinely

derogates women of African descent. Despite the fact that black women in the U.S. face

common challenges, this neither means that individual African-American women have all

had the same experiences nor that we agree on the significance of our varying

experiences; 3. Concerns the connections between U.S. Black women's experiences as a collectivity and any ensuing group knowledge or standpoint-One key reason that standpoints of oppressed groups are suppressed is that self-defined standpoints can stimulate resistance; 4. Stresses the essential contributions of African-American women intellectuals – Collins identifies four reasons black intellectuals are central to Black feminists thought- First, our experiences as African-American women provide us with a unique angle of vision concerning black womanhood unavailable to other groups, should we choose to embrace it. Second, Black women intellectuals both inside and outside the academy are less likely to walk away from Black women's struggles when the obstacles seem overwhelming or when the rewards for staying diminish. Third, Black women intellectuals from all walks of life must aggressively push the theme of self-definition because speaking for oneself and crafting one's own agenda is essential to empowerment. Fourth, Black women intellectuals are central in the production of Black feminist thought because we alone can foster the group autonomy that fosters effective coalitions with other groups; 5. Concerns the significance of change- The changing social conditions that confront African-American women stimulate the need for new Black feminist analysis of the common differences that characterizes U.S. black womanhood.

A central premise of standpoint theory is "the idea that all knowledge claims are historically and socially situated. While dominant modes of scientific inquiry posit a disembodied knower, feminist standpoint theories treat all knowledge as bounded by the cultural position, historical place, and biography of the knower" (Best, 2008, p.1). Another explanation offered by Abigail Brooks (Hesse-Biber and Leavy, 2007, p.55)

explains that "Feminist standpoint epistemology is a unique philosophy of knowledge building that challenges us to (1) see and understand the world through the eyes of and experiences of oppressed women and (2) apply the vision and knowledge of oppressed women to social activism and social change. The sociologist, Amy Best (2008, p.2) comments, "Feminist standpoint theorists see an implicit link between knowledge and emancipation. A central aim of standpoint theorists is to recover women's experiences and the subjugated knowledge of other oppressed groups, seeing this as critical to ending systems of oppression and developing a transformative consciousness for historically subordinated groups."

Standpoint theory, therefore, encompasses three elements:

- The connection between knowledge and practice

- Speaking from a position of direct experience (giving voice)

- Link between knowledge and social change

Best (2008, p.1) highlights the fact that "Standpoint epistemologies being in critique of the standards of objectivity and claims of universality that dominate in the natural and social sciences." She also explains that in challenging the "…absolute truth, standpoint theorists see only the possibility for partial and multiple truths that always begin with a situated and embodied knower" (2008, p.1).

Harding (Hesse-Biber and Leavy, 2007, p.71) as quoted in Brooks' "Feminist Standpoint Epistemology" explains, "Each oppressed group will have its own critical insights about nature and the larger social order in order to contribute to the collection of human knowledge. Because different groups are oppressed in different ways, each has the

possibility (not the certainty) of developing distinctive insights about systems of social

relations in general which their oppression is a feature." For the purposes of this study,

Black women's position in society as doubly oppressed- in terms of race and gender-

differentiates them from Black males and White men and women.

Theory and Black Women's Magazines

Ebony, *Essence*, and *Black Enterprise* adhere to the basic principles of Black

Feminism in the following ways: 1. They operate from the standpoint that Black

women's experiences are distinctly different from their Black male and White male and

female counterparts; 2. They view race, sex, and class are interlocking systems of

oppression; 3. They stress the importance of self-definition; 4. They stress the importance

of providing a voice to Black women; 5. They believe the goal of black image

reconstruction by Black women's magazines reveals the resistance to domination and

desire to provide a positive alternative. Because cultural and feminist text like Black

women's magazines expose interlocking systems of oppression, provide a voice to an

oppressed population, and self-definition to its members it is undeniably clear that these

magazines play a critical role in the empowerment of Black women.

Mainstream media uses, as it has always, stereotypical images of subordinate

groups particularly Black women (Collins, 1998; Culley and Bennett, 1975; Lont, 1995;

Morgan, 1995). These images include the mammy, matriarch, jezebel, welfare mother,

and strong black woman (which will be discussed in later chapters) help justify the social

practices that characterize the matrix of domination in the United States (Collins, 2000; Collins, 2005). Collins (2000, p.5) notes, "Black women's exclusion from positions of power within mainstream institutions has led to the elevation of elite White male ideas and interests and the corresponding suppression of Black women's ideas and interests in traditional scholarship. Moreover, this historical exclusion means that stereotypical images of Black women permeate popular culture and public policy." The images objectify Black women and aid in the patriarchal system of oppression. As a result, Black women are treated differently and many are denied jobs credentials and leadership positions (Chambers, 2008; Coleman, 2002; Russell, 1998). Contrary to the stereotypical images of Black women in mainstream media forced upon them by members of the dominant class, Black women's magazines give them a voice and allow them to define themselves. In a discussion about women's experiences as a map for social change, Brooks (Hesse-Biber and Leavy, 2007, p.61) states, "In fact, often the very process of enabling women to articulate their own experiences of oppression raises awareness, among women and others, about the particular difficulties diverse women face and inspires movement toward change." These magazines challenge the dominant conceptions about Black women, create a space where Black women can address issues and concerns of importance to them, and allow Black women the opportunity to paint a portrait of themselves that is positive and empowering to reflect the full range of their potential. It is in these magazines that Black women come together and share their stories. In doing so, they create a community in which they can begin to critically

examine society through the lens of their own experiences and challenge the stereotypes intended to keep them in subordinate positions.

CHAPTER 3

Images of Black women in the media, is a topic addressed by numerous scholars (Collins, 2000; Dates and Barlow, 1993; Lont, 1995; Rooks, 2004; Woodard and Mastin, 2005). However, scholarly research examining the portrayal of black women in magazines, specifically has received very little attention. Although understudied, White mainstream magazines too have participated in perpetuating demeaning racial stereotypes. This chapter will document the history of the rise of Black women's magazines and the changing images of black women from Antebellum to the present.

Numerous researchers point out that the Antebellum period created images of slaves and their masters (Collins, 2000; Dates and Barlow, 1993). Jannette Dates and William Barlow (1993, p.6) and others note, "These [slaves and their masters] initial representations were used to rationalize the enslavement of African people and to justify the institution of slavery in the South (also noted in Carroll, 2005; Collins, 2000). Slaves were depicted in the mass media (television, advertising, film, newspapers, and magazines) as inferior, dumb, childlike, obedient, comical (when depicted dancing), and contented with their lot (Dates and Barlow, 1993).

During postbellum popular culture, new black stereotypes emerged. The content Black slave image turned into the faithful servant: the female side of this stereotype

became the domestic mammy caricature (Dates and Barlow, 1993). In a discussion about controlling images and Black women's oppression, Patricia Hill Collins (2000, p.72) explains that the mammy image was "created to justify the economic exploitation of house slaves and sustained to explain Black women's long-standing restriction to domestic service, the mammy image represents the normative yardstick used to evaluate all Black women's behavior. By loving, nurturing, and caring for her White children and 'family' better than her own, the mammy symbolizes the dominant group's perception of the ideal Black female relationship to elite white male power." Collins comments on the justification of the mammy image reveals how black women are hindered from becoming white collar professionals by being treated as mammies. Collins (2000, p.73) further explains, "Employing Black women in mammified occupations supports the racial superiority of White employers encouraging middle-class White women in particular to identify more closely with the racial and class privilege afforded their fathers, husbands, and sons." If Black children internalize the mammy image, then they could come to believe that this position of inferiority is their assigned place in White power structures (Collins, 2000).

While the mammy typifies the Black mother figure in White homes, the matriarch symbolizes the mother figure in Black homes. The matriarch is another noted stereotype used by White mainstream media that negatively portrays black women. In a discussion of the matriarch Collins (2000, p.75) states:

> Introduced and widely circulated via a government report titled *The Negro Family: The Case for National Action*, the black matriarchy thesis argued that African American women who failed to fulfill their traditional 'womanly' duties at home contributed to social problems in Black civil

society (Moynihan, 1965) Spending too much time away from home, these working mothers ostensibly could not properly supervise their children and thus were a major contributing factor to the children's failure at school. As overly aggressive, unfeminine women, Black matriarchs allegedly emasculated their lovers and husbands. These men understandably, either deserted their partners or refused to marry the mothers of their children.

From this passage it is clear that the matriarch represents a bad mother who failed her children. This image was developed and applied to Black women who rejected the mammy and refused to be the content, submissive, hardworking servant. Segregation and discrimination forced single Black mothers to remain in domestic service positions. These were the only jobs available in large numbers, to black women in the 1940's, 50's and 60's. The matriarch image placed a burden of guilt on single Black mothers for trying to achieve a middle-class lifestyle for herself and family. Collins (2000, p.76) says:

Such a view [of Black women as matriarchs] diverts attention from political and economic inequalities that increasingly characterize global capitalism. It also suggests that anyone can rise from poverty if he or she only received good values at home. Inferior housing, underfunded schools, employment discrimination, and consumer racism all but disappear from Black women's lives. In this sanitized view of American society, those African Americans who remain poor cause their own victimization. In this context portraying African American women as matriarchs allows white men and women to blame Black women for their children's failures in school and with the law, as well as Black children's subsequent poverty.

The strong woman stereotype follows after the matriarch stereotype in that it labels Black women unfeminine and too strong. Collins (2000, p.77) explains, "Many U.S Black women who find themselves maintaining families by themselves often feel that they have done something wrong. If only they were not so strong, some reason, they might have found a male partner, or their sons would not have had so much trouble with the law." In this context, the image of the strong woman serves as a powerful symbol for

both White and Black women of what can go wrong if White patriarchal power is challenged. Collins (2000, p.78) says:

> For Black women workers in service occupations requiring long hours and/or substantial emotional labor, becoming the ideal mammy means precious time and energy spent away from husbands and children. But being employed when Black men have difficulty finding steady work exposes African American women to the charge that Black women emasculate Black men by failing to be submissive, dependent, 'feminine' women. This image ignores the gender-specific patterns of incorporation into the capitalist economy, where black men have greater difficulty finding work but make higher wages when they do work, and Black women find work with greater ease yet earn much less.

To summarize, Collins (2000, p.77) states, "Aggressive, assertive women are penalized- they are abandoned by their men, end up impoverished, and are stigmatized as being unfeminine." Once this image is internalized by Black women the result is….

The welfare mother is also a controlling image of Black womanhood. In defining the welfare mother, Collins (2000, p.78) notes, "At its core the image of the welfare mother constitutes a class-specific, controlling image developed for poor, working-class Black women who make use of social welfare benefits to which they are entitled by law." This image provides an ideological justification for efforts to harness Black women's fertility to the needs of a changing political economy. The welfare mother is "portrayed as being content to sit around and collect welfare, shunning work, and passing on her bad values to her off spring" (Collins, 2000, p.79). In this context, the welfare mother is a social problem that will bring down the values of the country and continue the vicious cycle of poverty which translates from one generation to the next. Collins (2000, p.79-80) states:

The image of the welfare mother provides ideological justification for intersecting oppressions of race, gender, and class. African-Americans can be racially stereotyped as being lazy by blaming Black welfare mothers for failing to pass on the work ethic. Moreover, the welfare mother has no male authority figure to assist her. Typically portrayed as an unwed mother, she violates one cardinal tenet of White male-dominated ideology: She is a woman alone. As a result, her treatment reinforces the dominant gender ideology positing that a woman's true worth and financial security should occur through heterosexual marriage. Finally on average, in the post-World War II political economy, one of every three African American families have been officially classified as poor. With such high levels of Black poverty, welfare state policies supporting poor Black mothers and their children have become increasingly expensive. Creating the controlling image of the welfare mother and stigmatizing her as the cause of her own poverty and that of African-American communities shifts the angle of vision away from the structural sources of poverty and blames the victims themselves.

The jezebel is a racialized, gendered symbol of deviant female sexuality (Collins, 2000). Collins (2000, p.83) argues, "Because the jezebel, whore, or hoochie is constructed as a woman whose sexual appetites are at best inappropriate and, at worst, insatiable, it becomes a short step to image her as a 'freak'." She is easily identified by her sleazy clothes and takes on the man's role in being sexually assertive (Collins, 2000; Rooks, 2004). Rooks (2004, p.11) explains:

When African women were brought to the American colonies, as enslaved women working in the fields were given little more than rags with which to cover themselves. By the Victorian age, a period in which the sight of a white 'lady's' ankle was considered shocking, a woman with clothing whose rips and tears revealed much of her body simply scandalized. As a result, the image of women of African descent, over time, came to be closely associated with the lewd and oversexed. Such women were viewed as desiring to inflame passion, and that image was firmly entrenched within the Protestant imaginary and by, extension, within the cultural imagination of the United States as a whole.

Collins (2000, p.81) states, "Jezebel's function was to relegate all Black women to the category of sexually aggressive women, thus providing a powerful rationale for the widespread sexual assaults by White men typically reported by Black slave women." This image degraded Black women by reducing them to sexual objects whose only drive was to have as much sex as possible (Collins, 2000). Rooted in the historical jezebel, the contemporary jezebel portrays Black women and girls as overtly and willing promiscuous (Collins, 2000; Rooks, 2004). She not only tries to lure white men, but men of all races- particularly those with money (Collins, 2000).

Dates and Barlow (1993, p.16) argue, "White domination of mainstream culture inevitability gave rise to African American cultural resistance, splitting the black image." In other words, because whites have historically and consistently depicted Blacks as slaves, mammies, matriarchs, jezebels, welfare mothers, and strong woman, Blacks, in attempt to restore their racial pride and dignity, had to develop their own media outlets (Carroll, 2005; Coleman, 2002; Collins, 2000; Dates and Barlow, 1993; Rooks, 2005). In opposing the White perspective of Black women, Black makers presented positive images of themselves by creating cultural heroes and highlighting black accomplishments (Dates and Barlow, 1993; Rooks 2005). Dates and Barlow (1993, p.16) continue on to explain:

> African American images have been distorted and talent exploited, while on the other hand, African American have been systematically denied by those in power the opportunity to act as full participants in the media industries. What evolved were mass media [film, radio, advertising, news, magazines, and television] that favored black stereotypes created by whites over the more authentic and positive black characters created by black image makers. It is therefore understandable that, for the most part African Americans have been disappointed in many of the mass- media

products featuring their group as seen in mainstream America's popular culture, because so little of their own culture and values that differ from the mainstream has been given any exposure. Thus, whenever and wherever they could, African Americans tried to develop their own media products and their own means of distributing them.

According to Dates and Barlow (1993, p.371), "In the early 1800's newspapers were the primary vehicle of the black press (the term black press is used to include newspapers and magazines that are aimed at African American readers and speak to their issues), and their publication dominated the focus of the black press for more than a hundred years". Rooks (2005, p.6) comments, "The explosion of African American newspapers after the Civil War resulted from increases in African American literacy and mobility combined with a need for advocacy in the battle against segregation, disenfranchisement, and lynching. As a result, overwhelmingly, African American newspapers from that period functioned as organs of protest". The black press again interpreted the dynamics of Black involvement in society from a different perspective from that of the general press. The general press continuously pointed the finger at blacks depicting them as a social problem and blaming them for their own social condition (Dates and Barlow, 1993). On the contrary, Black newspapers would examine the structural forces effecting blacks social condition and explain the situation from this perspective (Dates and Barlow, 1993).

In the middle 1900's, however, other types of periodicals gained popularity with black audiences. Dates and Barlow (1993, p.371) point out:

Part of the reason for the increased role of black magazines at this time lay in the declining quality of reporting and commentary in black newspapers. In fact, at this juncture, many black newspapers had become scandal sheets with sensational, screaming headlines and offensive pictures. Moreover, there was limited coverage of events, frequent misprints,

outdated formats, smudgy ink, and a general perception that black
newspapers were either too radical or too conservative and were thus
failing to reflect true views of the black community. People were no
longer proud to take black newspapers home to share articles with their
families.

As a result of black newspapers embrace of entertainment, social, and crime news, their

readership began to drop and black magazines popularity increased (Dates and Barlow,

1993). As quoted in *Ladies Pages* (Rooks, 2004, p.17):

Daphne Brooks argued, African American migration and urbanization led
to a heightened rhetoric of 'newness' that held a particular resonance for
artists, journalists, and political leaders intent on displacing the distorted,
minstrel-inspired images of African Americans that persisted in
mainstream popular culture. She further notes that this new image came to
be described as the 'New Negro,' and African American cultural workers
called on the figure to displace the 'Sambo' and 'Mammy' images that
continued to occupy more than their share of space in the U.S. cultural
imagination and in the editorial content and advertising imagery of
mainstream periodicals like *Ladies' Home Journal* and the *Atlantic
Monthly*.

For Black women, slavery, sexual abuse, and the defense of their character and morals in

the face of the dominant, as well as Black male, sentiments formed the nineteenth- and

early twentieth-century political basis for the magazines they published.

Between publication of the *Colored American* in 1900 and *Negro Digest* in 1942,

approximately thirty-five magazines were published by and for Blacks across to country.

Dates and Barlow (1993, p.403) explain that "The publication of *Negro Digest* (known as

Black World after 1970*)* in Chicago was John H. Johnson's response to a need for a

periodical to summarize and condense articles and comments about blacks found in many

daily, weekly, or monthly mainstream publications." With the periodicals new name

came a new 1960's style of black nationalism. However, the change proved to be a failure and the magazine ceased publication in 1976 (Dates and Barlow, 1993).

Ebony

John H. Johnson's success with *Negro Digest* led him to publish *Ebony* magazine in November 1945. *Ebony,* Dates and Barlow (1993) point out, published editorials and encouraged black participation in the political process, while it prompted interracial understanding, and emphasized the positive aspects of race relations. "*Ebony*, Publisher Johnson said, 'was founded to project all dimensions of the Black personality in a world saturated with stereotypes. We wanted to give Blacks a new sense of somebodiness, a new sense of self-respect. We wanted to tell them who they were and what they could do. We believed then- and we believe now- that Blacks needed positive images to fulfill their potentialities" (*Ebony*, Nov. 2005, p.68). *Ebony* immediately captured the number one spot as the most widely circulated and most popular Black magazine, a position it has been able to maintain for sixty consecutive years (*Ebony*, Nov. 2005). In keeping with its mission, *Ebony* replaced the old damaging stereotypes with positive Black images by highlighting the achievements of Black men and women that had heretofore been ignored by the general press (*Ebony*, Nov. 2005). "With articles and dramatic photos, the new publication showed how undaunted Black individuals were able to triumph over poverty and racial barriers and succeed in building viable careers in education, business, sports, the military, entertainment and the arts"(*Ebony*, Nov. 2005, p.68). This magazine emphasizes equality for all people and stresses the importance of education. "While

monitoring the ongoing saga of Black progress, the magazine also put its resources to

work to show its readers that Blacks had a history to be proud of and that even during

slavery, there were Black men and women whose heroic deeds helped in the freedom

struggle and paved the way for future generations of Blacks" (*Ebony*, Nov. 2005, p.68).

Ebony's circulation has risen from its original press run of 25,000 to 1,800,000 and its

readership has grown from 125,000 per issue to more than 12.5 million per issue (*Ebony*,

Nov. 2008). As a result, *Ebony* reaches more Black men, more Black women and more

Black professionals than any other magazine, Black or White (*Ebony*, Nov. 2008).

Publisher Johnson died August 8, 2005, therefore his daughter, Linda Johnson Rice is

now the company's president and CEO *(Ebony*, Nov. 2005). It is also important to note

that between 1945 and the 1980's, Johnson publishing company also published, or bought

out and published, *Jet, Tan, True Confessions, Hue, Ebony International, Ebony Jr., and*

Copper Romance (Dates and Barlow, 1993).

Other Magazines

The following passage is a detailed list of black magazines published from the

1940's to the 1980's as documented by Dates and Barlow (1993, p.404-405):

> Other popular magazines of the forties included *The Negro* (St. Louis, Missouri, 1943); *Pulse* (Washington, D.C., 1943); *Headlines and Pictures* (Detroit, 1944); *Negro Story* (Chicago, 1944); *Southwestern Journal* (Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 1944); and *The African* (New York, 1945). Between the 1945 publication of *Ebony* and the 1951 publication of *Jet* magazine, eight magazines began publications that targeted African American audiences. They included such titles as *Our World* (New York, 1946); *Septia* (Fort Worth, Texas, 1947); and *Harlem Quarterly* (New York, 1949). *Jet* filled the need for a pocket-sized magazine that summarized the week's biggest 'Negro' news in a well-organized, easy-to-

read format. The magazine included a few in-depth news stories and items spreading across areas that focused on business, education, religion, health, medicine, journalism, politics, labor, poverty, and crime. Between the 1951 publication of *Jet* magazine and the year 1970, eight popular magazines began publication, including *The Liberator* (New York, 1961), *Freedomways* (New York, 1961); *Harvard Journal of Afro-American Affairs* (1965-1971), and *Black Theater* (1968-72). The latter two magazines started and then ceased publication in response to the sociocultural forces of the civil rights era. *Freedomways* thrived throughout the 1980's. The year 1970 was a significant one in the history of the black press in the area of consumer magazine publication. In that year alone, thirteen consumer magazines were published. Some were short-lived; they included *Black Academy Review* (Buffalo, New York, 1970-74); *Black Business Digest* (Philadelphia, 1970-73); *Black Creation* (New York, 1970-75); and *Black World* (1970-76). Among those that continued to thrive through the 1980's were *Black Collegian* (New Orleans), *Black Sports* (New York), and the two largest new publications, *Essence* (New York) and *Black Enterprise* (New York).

Essence

Essence: The Magazine for Today's Black Woman, a privately owned periodical, enjoyed phenomenal success from the beginning. The publication was the product of Earl Lewis, a banker, Cecil Hollingsworth, Jonathan Blount, an advertising salesman, and Clarence Smith, an insurance salesman, who had been inspired by a Wall Street brokerage firm's invitation to discuss ideas for black business ventures (Dates and Barlow, 1993; Rooks, 2004). These five men formed a business concern named the Hollingsworth Group, and then created a magazine that promised Black women that it "speak in your name and in your voice" (Rooks, 2004, p.143). "After making sure readers knew that publishers intended to present information 'from a black perspective- that will necessarily include the full spectrum of Black women,' the publishers statement ends by saying its aim will be to 'delight and to celebrate the beauty, pride, strength, and

uniqueness of all Black women."(Rooks, 2004, p.143). According to Dates and Barlow (1993, p.405), "Blount and Smith formed a partnership with a printing expert and a financial planner. The partners then sold their proposal for a black woman's magazine to financial backers on Wall Street and engaged an experienced and talented editorial and journalistic team." Rooks (2004, p.144) notes, "Jonathan Blount and Cecil Hollingsworth, left the company within the first few years because of differing views over its direction, as had a fifth member in 1969, a year before the magazine was published." *Essence* was founded in May of 1970 and since then its success lies in its editorial policies, fashion pages, homemaking advice and political content. *Essence* is an influential women's magazine that focuses on Black women's concerns including, but not limited to health, domestic violence, sexual harassment and the significance of both race and gender in the U.S. Rooks (2004, p.141) notes, "Indeed, a Publishers Weekly story on March 5, 2001 titled, "African Americans Spent $356 Million on Books in 2000," credits *Essence* with an ability to reach upwards of 72 percent of African American book buyers." The magazine is and has always been edited by Black women, and its readership is overwhelmingly Black and female (one-third of the contemporary readership is male) (Rooks, 2004). *Essence* praises the accomplishments of Black women in various careers (many of which are male-dominated fields) and interviews popular Black women celebrities. Two of the founders decided to sell forty-nine percent of the publication to Time Warner Communications in 2000, and the other fifty-one percent was taken over in 2005 (*Essence*, 2005).

Black Enterprise

In 1968, Earl G. Graves, Sr. set out to create the ultimate source of wealth

creation, the premier business, investing, and wealth-building resource for Blacks. Dates

and Barlow (1993, p.406) state, "*Black Enterprise* from inception, focused on the

economic viability of African Americans as an integral part of the nation's economic

structure." Though Earl Graves Sr. was the power behind the development and growth of

the publication, the many participants in the concept-planning strategies for Black

Enterprise included Whitney Young, Jr., then director of the National Urban League, and

representatives from the National Association of Marketing Developers, the National

Business League, the Congress of Racial Equality, and others (Dates and Barlow, 1993).

Since 1970, *Black Enterprise* has provided essential business information and advice to

professionals, corporate executives, entrepreneurs, and decision makers. Every month,

Black Enterprise magazine provides 4.3 million readers with information on

entrepreneurship, careers, and financial management (Wadium, 2008). The magazine

emphasizes business, job opportunities, and career options. It positioned itself as a source

for practical answers and culled information on trends that effect opportunities for

minorities, particularly Blacks (Dates and Barlow, 1993). Though *Black Enterprise* has a

business orientation, it also highlights for Blacks those political and social forces which

had effects on or were impacted by economic factors. A multimedia company, *Black*

Enterprise also produces radio and television programming, business and lifestyle events,

web content, and digital media (Wadium, 2008). *Black Enterprise* is the definitive source

of information for and about Black business markets and leaders, and the authority on

Black news and trends. The magazine has a paid circulation of 525,000 (*Black Enterprise*, Oct. 2008). As a leading proponent of Black entrepreneurship and political and social awareness in the black community, *Black Enterprise* also documents the progress made by Blacks, and other culturally diverse groups. In January 2006, Earl Graves Sr. named his eldest son Earl Graves Jr., the company's new executive chief officer (*Black Enterprise*, Jan. 2006).

CHAPTER 4

The method used for this research was based on a study entitled, "Black

Womanhood: "Essence" and its Treatment of Stereotypical Images of Black Women" by

Jennifer Bailey Woodard and Teresa Mastin (2005). Woodard and Mastin completed a

content analysis of the featured articles in *Essence* from 1976-1977 and 1996-1998 using

a random sample and coding for the following stereotypical images: the mammy, the

matriarch, jezebel, and welfare mother. The study concluded that of the 80 articles

examined, well-known individuals were featured in most of the articles. More

specifically, there were 20 profiles of successful women and seven profiles of successful

men. A quarter of the articles dealt with relationships (e.g. between men and women,

women and women, men and men etc.). Racial discrimination by White people against

Black people was the third largest topical category covered, and work-related and health

related articles were the fourth and fifth categories most often covered. An article

dispelled a stereotype if it used the language of the stereotype or identified the stereotype

and then proceeded to put forth an alternate image. As stated in Woodard and Mastin

(2005, p.270):

> For example, an article that contains a major presence of the matriarch
> stereotype and dispels it is "The Extraordinary Faith of Pauli Murray"
> (Scarupa, 1977). In this profile, Murray is celebrated as being the nation's
> first Black woman Episcopal priest, and with startling regularity she has
> been 'first,' 'only,' or 'before her time': the only woman in her class at

> Howard Law School; the only woman in the distinguished New York Law firm of Paul, Weiss, Rifkin, Wharton and Garrison… She was talking about non-violence and feminism before most people knew what the words meant, and her *Proud Shoes*, the story of her ancestors, preceded *Roots* by 20 years (Scarupa, 1977, p.91). Murray has a strong sense of family and community, but has no desire for children. She is an independent kind leader. This article was coded as dispelling the matriarch stereotype because of the language it used and the celebratory tone that invites Black women to share in Murray's first and even become trailblazers themselves.

The authors dispelled approximately 96% of the 1970's and 92% of the 1990's stereotypical references made in articles about the examined stereotypes. The 1970's articles included two references, or 4.6% of total references, to the mammy stereotype and 12 references or 27.3% of total references to the welfare mother stereotype. In comparison, 1990's articles included eight references or 12.7% of total references to the mammy stereotype and 15 references, or 23.8% of the total references to the welfare mother stereotype. However, based on the total number of stereotypical references, the welfare mother stereotype was referenced and dispelled at a higher percentage, 27.3% during the 1970's than during the 1990's, 23.8%. During the 1970's the matriarch stereotype was dispelled most often, 54.8% of total stereotypical occurrences. The jezebel was dispelled third most often, 11.9% of total occurrences. The welfare mother was addressed more than twice as often as the jezebel stereotype, 28.6% of total occurrences.

During the 1990's, the jezebel with 32.8% of total occurrences, was dispelled most often, followed by the matriarch stereotype, 27.6% of total occurrences. The welfare mother was referenced almost as often as the matriarch stereotype, 25.9% of total occurrences. Also during the 1990's the jezebel was dispelled more often, 32.8% of total occurrences, than during the 1970's, 11.9% of 1970's occurrences. However, the

matriarch was dispelled more often during the 1970's than during the 1990's. In fact, of the 1970 articles examined, 54.8% of all references dispelled the matriarch stereotype. By comparison, only 27.6% of the 1990's articles references addressed the matriarch stereotype. In the end, Woodard and Mastin (2005) declare that Essence is a feminist text that strongly supports the feminist principles of self-definition and the connection of everyday life experiences to consciousness.

Woodard and Mastin conduct a good study and have a compelling argument, however, the study omits the strong woman stereotype and neglects to mention what type of "New Black Woman" is being portrayed. By comparison, the important distinctions between this study and Woodard and Mastin's include:

1. The strong woman stereotype (discussed in greater detail later in the paper).

2. A depiction of the "New Black Woman" that Black women magazines are reinforcing to overcome negative stereotypes.

3. A comparison of Essence, Ebony (the first African American magazine), and Black Enterprise (a magazine not specifically geared for Black women only but still has feminist principles).

4. The information gathered can be used to determine whether or not there has been a shift in topical categories overtime (includes shift in topics from Woodard and Mastin's content analyses as well as topical shifts in Ebony and Black Enterprise from 2000-2008).

The data used for this research was gathered from an analysis of *Ebony*, *Essence*, and *Black Enterprise* from 2000-2008, a total of 324 magazines. Throughout this period,

each article was examined for the presence of the identified stereotypes (mammy, matriarch, welfare mother, strong women, and jezebel) and contradictory images of these stereotypes. The images and articles distinguish it from other women's magazines in its focus on issues and topics of concern to Black women. Therefore, it is in these images and articles that negative stereotypes of Black women will either be reinforced or dispelled.

An article was marked as supporting the stereotype if it used the language of the stereotype without attempting to put forth an alternate image. On the contrary, an article was marked as dispelling the stereotype if it used or portrayed the image of the stereotype and then attempts to put forth an alternate image. The information was coded into categories, tallied, and then translated into percentages. The entire article was coded for each stereotype. Thus it is possible that an article contained all four stereotypes, but it may only mention two in passing while validating them while overwhelmingly focusing on two other stereotypes and dispelling them.

The first image is that of the mammy. As the mammy Black women are characterized as a loyal domestic servant to Whites. Woodard and Mastin (2005, p.271) notes, "She loves, takes care of, and provides for her white family over her own." Collins (1990, p.71) says that this image was "created to justify the economic exploitation of house slaves and sustained to explain Black women's long-standing restriction to domestic service; the mammy image represents the normative yardstick used to evaluate all Black women's behavior." The next image is that of the matriarch. Woodard and Mastin (2005, p.271) state, "She represents the image of the Black women as a mother

within the Black home. This mother, too, works outside of the home and her children suffer for it." Collins explains (1990:74, 2005:271-272) how the matriarch image is central to interlocking systems of race, gender, and class oppressions as she states:

> Portraying African American women as matriarchs allows the dominant group to blame Black women for the success or failure of Black children. Assuming that Black poverty is passed on intergenerationally via value transmission in families, an elite white male standpoint suggests that Black children lack the attention and care allegedly lavished on White, middle-class children and that this deficiency retards Black children's achievement. Such a view diverts attention from the political and economic inequality affecting Black mothers and children and suggests that anyone can rise from poverty if he or she only received good values at home.

The third image is that of the jezebel, which represents negative portrayals of Black women as a "bitch or whore" (Woodard and Mastin, 2005, p. 272). This image of the Black woman cares for nothing but her own sexual satisfaction. The fourth image is that of the welfare mother. Collins (1990, p.76-77) explains, "that in this image [welfare mother] Black mothers are breeding animals who have no desire to work, but are content to live off of the state, which positions Black women as a costly threat to political and economic stability and heterosexual marriage because she is a woman living alone with her children." This image places the blame of poverty on the shoulders of the Black mother and shifts the angle of vision from structural sources of poverty and blames the victims themselves. This image is attached to the poor or working class. Woodard and Mastin (2005) claim that this image also justifies the dominant society's efforts to restrict the fertility of Black women. The fifth images is that if the strong woman. The strong black woman is characterized as rude, overbearing, hard and undesirable women who

drive others, especially men, away. This image often referred to as the "too strong Black woman" reinforces the weak man, strong woman mentality that continues to divide the Black community. These women have "inappropriate" female strength, they are not appropriately submissive, they are bad mothers who raise children without men, and are considered educated bitches who act like men. Collins (2005, p.205) adds, "The depiction of Black women as tireless workers, both in paid labor market and the unpaid reproductive labor of the family reinforces views of African American women as the strong Black woman, As one of the few positive images of used to describe Black femininity, the valorization of women's strength in African American communities makes it difficult for Black women to reject exploitative work and simple walk away from responsibility, especially from their families."

Additionally, each of the articles was coded into categories including health (which was further broken down into general, diet/exercise, breast cancer, HIV/AIDS, diabetes, and obesity), relationships (male to female), finances, family, education, spotlight (which has to categories interviews with celebrities and careers which highlight black women's accomplishments in male dominated fields), and history. As with the stereotypes an article could be counted in multiple categories, if it applied. This information is important in that it reveals not only the magazines area of focus, but also how much emphasis is placed on each topic. With this information, the following questions can be answered: What category received the most attention? Has the focus areas shifted over time? How much of a particular magazine is dedicated to workplace discrimination? What is being omitted? etc.

CHAPTER 5

In this section I will provide the key findings from the data analyses. Looking at

Figure 1, I can see that *Essence* dispelled approximately 29.5%, *Black Enterprise*

dispelled approximately 38.2% and *Ebony* dispelled approximately 32.3% of the 2000-

2008 stereotypical references made in articles about the examined stereotypes. Based on

the total number of stereotypical references, the matriarch was dispelled at a higher

percentage in both *Ebony* and *Black Enterprise*. In Essence, the strong woman stereotype

was dispelled more than the matriarch. Figure 1 present those findings. None of the

magazines referenced any of the stereotypes without attempting to put forth an alternative

image.

The language of the mammy, welfare mother, and jezebel were not referenced in

any of the magazines. However, in *Ebony* and *Essence* numerous references were made

to the "appropriate" way to dress, which was always conservative. Both of these

magazines warned readers against multiple sex partners for personal value and safety

reasons.

In highlighting Black women celebrities, figure 2 indicates that *Ebony* totaled

55.3%, *Essence* 58.7%, and *Black Enterprise* 14.5%. *Ebony* provided profiles of

successful black women in male dominated positions 44.7%, *Essence* and *Black*

Enterprise totaled 41.3% and 85.5% respectively. In terms of discrimination articles,

Ebony dedicated 36.5%, *Essence* dedicated 30.2% and *Black Enterprise* dedicated 33.2%.

Figure 2 also present those findings.

As noted in Figure 2 the topical categories for each magazine rank as the

following:

Ebony

1. Relationships
2. Health
3. Finances
4. Discrimination
5. Spotlight
6. Education
7. History
8. Family

Essence

1. Family
2. History
3. Relationships
4. Health
5. Spotlight
6. Discrimination
7. Education
8. Finances

Black Enterprise

1. Finances
2. Education
3. Discrimination
4. Spotlight
5. Family
6. Health
7. History
8. Relationships

Figure 1

		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	SUM	%	SUM	%
DISPELLED STEREOTYPES 2000-2008														
EBONY	Matriarch	24	26	26	24	18	25	24	21	25	213	82.2		
	Strong Woman	5	7	5	4	5	3	5	8	4	46	17.8	259	32.3
ESSENCE	Matriarch	13	9	15	11	10	7	17	14	15	111	47		
	Strong Woman	6	13	13	16	14	13	20	13	17	125	53	236	29.5
B.E.	Matriarch	30	43	34	33	33	31	31	36	35	306	100		
	Strong Woman	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	306	38.2
											SUM	**801**	**100**	

		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	SUM	%	SUM	%
INTERVIEWS AND CAREERS 2000-2008														
EBONY	Interviews	35	33	33	33	35	32	35	34	34	304	55.3		
	Careers	28	28	32	24	23	31	28	31	21	246	44.7	550	33.3
ESSENCE	Interviews	33	23	28	26	39	42	47	44	49	331	58.7		
	Careers	22	22	29	28	28	26	26	25	27	233	41.3	564	34.2
B.E.	Interviews	8	10	7	6	4	12	12	10	9	78	14.5		
	Careers	48	51	46	47	56	55	42	48	66	459	85.5	537	32.5
											SUM	**1651**	**100**	

Figure 2

DISCRIMINATION 2000-2008											
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	SUM	%
EBONY	16	12	12	11	15	13	16	20	7	122	36.5
ESSENCE	10	4	7	10	4	7	10	34	15	101	30.2
B.E.	13	12	14	11	18	10	10	10	13	111	33.2
									SUM	334	100

FAMILY 2000-2008											
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	SUM	%
EBONY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ESSENCE	1	0	5	4	5	2	5	18	3	43	74.1
B.E.	2	3	0	0	2	1	2	3	2	15	25.9
									SUM	58	100

EDUCATION 2000-2008											
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	SUM	%
EBONY	25	30	27	28	22	27	25	28	29	241	31.9
ESSENCE	14	9	16	19	12	20	18	29	29	166	22
B.E.	36	49	39	38	35	36	34	38	43	348	46.1
									SUM	755	100

HISTORY 2000-2008											
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	SUM	%
EBONY	6	5	5	7	2	6	6	3	5	45	22.3
ESSENCE	11	7	13	11	7	9	19	24	32	133	65.8
B.E.	4	2	3	4	3	3	3	1	1	24	11.9
									SUM	202	100

HEALTH 2000-2008											
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	SUM	%
EBONY	68	57	68	80	70	71	68	60	58	600	51.4
ESSENCE	45	52	42	54	53	54	56	89	35	424	36.3
B.E.	18	22	19	15	19	16	12	11	11	143	12.3
									SUM	1167	100

RELATIONSHIPS 2000-2008											
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	SUM	%
EBONY	34	31	34	38	32	31	34	44	41	319	56
ESSENCE	28	21	21	35	25	28	22	14	18	212	37.2
B.E.	3	5	4	5	3	3	3	5	8	39	6.8
									SUM	570	100

FINANCES 2000-2008											
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	TOTAL	%
EBONY	73	31	25	31	25	23	73	27	35	343	36.7
ESSENCE	14	15	14	13	13	16	11	8	10	114	12.2
B.E.	53	52	49	52	53	44	51	64	59	477	51.1
									SUM	934	100

The "New Black Woman"

(Note: The "New Black Woman" image is a model that emerged from my interpretation of the content in *Ebony*, *Essence* and *Black Enterprise*)

The "New Black Woman" that is praised in *Ebony*, *Essence* and *Black Enterprise* is one that is highly educated, works, and has money and power. She is independent but yet has a viable support system (sisterhood, family, etc.) who can provide advice and aid them in times of need. The "New Black Woman" is depicted as beautiful, strong, intelligent, and self-reliant agents of their own-desire. The magazines highlight Black women in positions of influence and power that will help problem areas- economic gap between white and black counterparts, healthcare, childcare, and affordable housing- gain greater attention. The magazines typically complete this task in the spotlight sections of the magazines which include interviews with well-known celebrities and recognition of Black women's accomplishments in various fields that are not well-know. The magazines highlight women breaking male-dominated barriers as well as helping others in the community. Individuals including but not limited to Desiree Rogers (president of social networking at Allstate Financial, responsible for creating a system where regular people can discuss retirement options and finances with experts and other Allstate customers), Angela Guy (new general manager and senior vice president of *SoftSheen Carson*- the perm and hair-product company), Capt. Christina Hopper (the first Black woman to fly a fighter jet in a combat mission during a major war), Denise Kaiger (corporate vice president of global communications and talent relations for Reebok International Ltd, making her the highest ranking African-American at Reebok, and the first woman to hold

such a position in the corporation), and Beverley Sibblies (senior vice president and chief accounting officer for Household International, Inc. She is responsible for all accounting activities for the company, including financial planning, management reporting, accounting controls, accounting policy research, external reporting and financial information systems) represent the "New Black Woman" image. These women represent the average working Black women dealing with jobs, children, and spouses. The magazines praise the accomplishments of these and many more while simultaneously exposing the diversity in talent and ability of the Black population.

The Matriarch and Strong Woman

(Note: The following is a discussion of the matriarch and strong woman the only stereotypes addressed in *Ebony*, *Essence*, and *Black Enterprise*)

The majority of Black women must work in order to maintain a middle-class lifestyle however they do not have to sacrifice their career over family or vice versa. In other words, these mothers can do-it-all meaning they can have multiple roles- employee, wife, and mother and be successful in each area, while simultaneously hurdling the triple barriers of race, class, and gender.

Many of the articles mention role reversal in which the traditional societal roles that distinguish men as providers and women as nurturers are switched. It is important to note that tasks should not be gender specific but parties should work together for the benefit of the child. In this model the relationship is a partnership and both parties are equal with dual responsibilities. For example, in "10 Tips that Work for Working

Mothers" (*Ebony*, March 2005, p.115) the article gives an account of a national sampling of successful career moms and parenting experts which indicate that there are ten tips to surviving and thriving as a working mom-and the golden rule is to always strive to keep your work life, home life, and private life separate but equal. The article works to dispel the matriarch stereotype. The children do not suffer from the mother being away from home because in everything she does she remembers that her children come first. The time that the mothers do have to spend with their children, they use to build close-knit relationships and instill family values. Ultimately, if working moms follow these ten tips then none of their split roles will suffer and she can do-it-all.

However, many question the validity of these gender specific roles when gaps in education, coupled with adverse employment and incarceration rates, have resulted in Black women out numbering Black men on college campuses and consequently out-earning them in corporate America-which leads to the Strong Woman stereotype. To challenge this stereotype one must uncouple strength from notions of sexual dominance and exploitation which the magazines do. In the following article, as in many of the other articles that dispel the strong woman stereotype, the editors are sure to point out that being strong doesn't mean enduring abuse or injustice and they encourage Black women to speak out against these wrong doings.

The findings of the study support the idea that *Ebony*, *Essence*, and *Black Enterprise* are feminist text. Dispelling the stereotypes provides evidence that the magazines do in fact adhere to some of the basic principles of Black feminism in the following ways:

1. They operate from the standpoint that Black women's experiences are distinctly different from their Black male and White male and female counterparts;

2. They view race, sex, and class are interlocking systems of oppression;

3. They stress the importance of self-definition;

4. They stress the importance of providing a voice to Black women;

5. They believe the goal of black image reconstruction by Black women's magazines reveals the resistance to domination and desire to provide a positive alternative.

Because cultural and feminist text like Black women's magazines expose interlocking systems of oppression, provide a voice to an oppressed population, and self-definition to its members it is undeniably clear that these magazines play a critical role in the empowerment of Black women.

CHAPTER 6

This final chapter is divided into the following two sections: conclusions; and recommendations.

Conclusions

Major findings from the previous chapter include the following:

- Essence dispelled approximately 29.5%, *Black Enterprise* dispelled approximately 38.2% and *Ebony* dispelled approximately 32.3% of the 2000-2008 stereotypical references made in articles about the examined stereotypes.

- Based on the total number of stereotypical references, the matriarch was dispelled at a higher percentage in both *Ebony* and *Black Enterprise*.

- In Essence, the strong woman stereotype was dispelled more than the matriarch.

- None of the magazines referenced any of the stereotypes without attempting to put forth an alternative image.

- The language of the mammy, welfare mother, and jezebel were not referenced in any of the magazines.

Ebony, Essence, and *Black Enterprise* appear to be aware of the matriarch and strong woman stereotypes and the need to dispel them. Perhaps the lack of reference to the mammy, welfare mother, and jezebel is due to the fact that these magazines are

targeted to Black middle-class women. These women have a wider variety of occupations available to them and are no longer forced to spend more time cleaning others' homes or tending to others' children more than their own in order to survive. Likewise, if these women are working, they are not depending on the state and are capable are providing for their own families.

The findings of the study support the idea that *Ebony*, *Essence*, and *Black Enterprise* are feminist text. Dispelling the stereotypes provides evidence that the magazines do in fact adhere to some of the basic principles of Black feminism in the following ways:

1. They operate from the standpoint that Black women's experiences are distinctly different from their Black male and White male and female counterparts;

2. They view race, sex, and class are interlocking systems of oppression;

3. They stress the importance of self-definition;

4. They stress the importance of providing a voice to Black women;

5. They believe the goal of black image reconstruction by Black women's magazines reveals the resistance to domination and desire to provide a positive alternative. Because cultural and feminist text like Black women's magazines expose interlocking systems of oppression, provide a voice to an oppressed population, and self-definition to its members it is undeniably clear that these magazines play a critical role in the empowerment of Black women.

The magazines provide a cultural space for community building among Black women and it is a space in which damaging and denigrating images are absent. *Ebony, Essence,* and *Black Enterprise* provide images of Blacks so important in molding both self-esteem and opinion. The magazines instill a sense of community and a feeling of self-worth. They provide a platform for Black women, young and old, to speak their hearts-sharing trials and triumphs in their journeys to reclaiming positive self-images. *Ebony, Essence,* and *Black Enterprise* allow women to find work as journalists, printers, writers, and editors; to define personal, as well as group, identities; to create a sense of unity by establishing a communication network among women in different regions; to present and comment about world and local events from a Black female perspective; and to highlight achievement often overlooked and ignored by the dominant or Black male press. They instill a sense of cultural pride that reinforces values of independence, education, and hard-work. The magazines are tools for the individual woman, family members and friends to promote healthy and healing dialogue that will empower and set the stage for Black women to set their own standards. Rooks (2004, p.6) says it best as she states, "Black women's magazines importance lies in their asking us to think more deeply about, or, in some instances, rethink what we are sure we know about Black women, and to draw attention to the split image of Black women produced by both white and black media makers." If magazines like *Ebony*, *Essence*, and *Black Enterprise* continue to design more progressive Black conceptions that reject economic inequalities, sexism and racism then perhaps we can hope for a future full of unprecedented job opportunities and a society where Black women can advance as equals.

Recommendations

In spite of Black women's magazine's efforts to present positive images of Black women, mainstream media continues to present Black women in stereotypical terms (Allen, 2001; Collins, 2000; Collins, 2005). Therefore, unless a deliberate effort is made to educate the general public, Black women will continue to be portrayed as the controlling images of the mammy, matriarch, strong woman, welfare mother, and jezebel and their self-esteem will suffer for it. If education is to be effective, such efforts must involve all producers of mass communication- not just black image makers. Black girls and women must be encouraged to discuss their portrayal in the media- these discussions would be more fruitful if mediated by a person knowledgeable in the history of black representation in the mass media. This education might be accomplished via the school system in mass communication, race and ethnicity, and institutions and inequality classes and/or through family settings. Briefly addressing the subject could encourage Black girls and women to discuss the subject between themselves and others and perhaps influence one another to be more cautious of harmful stereotypes and refrain from participating in their perpetuation.

There are very few magazines targeted directly toward Black women that uplift the individual and highlight their values. Studies of these Black women magazines are extremely rare. There is a great need for further quantitative and qualitative studies of *Ebony, Essence,* and *Black Enterprise* from the perspective of readers, writers, and advertisers. For example, current studies that examine the effects of both positive and negative images of Black women in the media on Black girls and women would give

more insight into the issues of self-esteem, educational attainment, and employment. Black girls in middle-school and high-school, as well as women in the workforce of various ages could be interviewed or surveyed to determine how often they view, purchase, or discuss Black women's magazines? Do they believe the images portrayed in these magazines are majority positive or negative? Etc. The repeating the same questions for White mainstream magazines. The list of possible studies is endless. This study is a step to begin research that examines Black image makers use of the media to resist damaging and controlling images of Black women. This is important information for educators, writers, editors, producers, and the entire black community.

Table 1

EBONY 2000	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL	%
HEALTH														
DIET/EXERCISE	1	0	2	2	3	4	2	1	2	2	2	3	24	35.3%
BREAST CANCER	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	7	10.3%
HIV/AIDS	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	1	10	14.7%
DIABETES	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2.9%
OBESITY	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.5%
GENERAL	5	1	1	1	3	2	1	1	1	3	4	1	24	35.3%
													68%	**100.0%**
DISCRIMINATION														
MEDIA	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	12.5%
VIOLENCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	12.5%
WORKPLACE	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	5	31.3%
JUSTICE SYSTEM	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	12.5%
ECONOMIC DISPARITY	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	5	31.3%
													16	**100.0%**
RELATIONSHIPS	2	3	3	3	2	6	2	4	1	2	3	3	**34**	
FINANCES	1	0	5	2	2	1	3	0	4	2	2	1	**73**	
FAMILY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	
DISPELLED STEREOTYPES														
MATRIARCH	2	3	2	1	2	3	2	3	3	0	1	2	24	82.8%
MAMMY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
STRONG WOMAN	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	17.2%
WELFARE MOTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
JEZEBEL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
													29	**100.0%**
EDUCATION	3	2	3	1	1	2	3	3	1	2	2	2	**25**	
SPOTLIGHT														
INTERVIEWS	17	7	2	3	4	6	1	2	4	1	2	2	35	55.6%
CAREERS	2	3	2	4	2	2	3	1	3	3	2	1	28	44.4%
													63	**100.0%**
HISTORY	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**6**	

Table 2

EBONY 2001	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL	%
HEALTH														
DIET/EXERCISE	3	3	1	3	0	4	0	2	4	3	4	1	28	48.3%
BREAST CANCER	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	5.2%
HIV/AIDS	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	10	17.2%
DIABETES	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	8.6%
OBESITY	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	5.2%
GENERAL	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	9	15.5%
													58	**100.0%**
DISCRIMINATION														
MEDIA	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	28.6%
VIOLENCE	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	14.3%
WORKPLACE	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	14.3%
JUSTICE SYSTEM	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	14.3%
ECONOMIC DISPARITY	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	28.6%
													7	**100.1%**
RELATIONSHIPS	1	3	4	4	5	2	0	2	4	5	6	5	**41**	
FINANCES	2	2	3	4	5	0	0	4	5	4	2	4	**35**	
FAMILY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	
DISPELLED STEREOTYPES														
MATRIARCH	2	3	2	2	2	2	0	2	3	3	2	2	25	86.2%
MAMMY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
STRONG WOMAN	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	13.8%
WELFARE MOTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
JEZEBEL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
													29	**100.0%**
EDUCATION	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	1	2	29	
SPOTLIGHT														
INTERVIEWS	1	3	4	5	3	3	0	1	0	4	5	5	34	61.8%
CAREERS	1	3	2	2	3	2	1	1	1	3	1	1	21	38.2%
													55	**100.0%**
HISTORY	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**5**	

Table 3

EBONY 2002	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL	%
HEALTH														
DIET/EXERCISE	1	2	4	2	3	1	2	0	2	2	2	3	24	35.3%
BREAST CANCER	1	0	0	1	0		0	1	0	1	2	1	7	10.3%
HIV/AIDS	0	2	0	1	0	0	2	0	3	0	1	0	9	13.2%
DIABETES	3	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	7	10.3%
OBESITY	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	4.4%
GENERAL	2	1	1	1	1	3	2	1	1	3	1	1	18	26.5%
													68	100.0%
DISCRIMINATION														
MEDIA	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8.3%
VIOLENCE	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	16.7%
WORKPLACE	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	3	25.0%
JUSTICE SYSTEM	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8.3%
ECONOMIC DISPARITY	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0 5	41.7%
													12	100.0%
RELATIONSHIPS	3	4	5	2	2	3	2	3	3	2	2	3	34	
FINANCES	3	2	2	1	1	3	4	2	1	1	2	3	25	
FAMILY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
DISPELLED STEREOTYPES														
MATRIARCH	3	2	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	1	1	26	83.9%
MAMMY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
STRONG WOMAN	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	5	16.1%
WELFARE MOTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
JEZEBEL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0.0%
													31	100.0%
EDUCATION	3	3	3	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	3	3	27	
SPOTLIGHT														
INTERVIEWS	4	3	3	2	3	5	1	2	2	3	3	2	33	50.8%
CAREERS	3	2	2	3	3	3	4	3	2	2	2	3	32	49.2%
													65	100.0%
HISTORY	0	3	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	

Table 4

EBONY 2003	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL	%
HEALTH														
DIET/EXERCISE	4	2	2	2	3	4	1	2	3	1	1	3	28	35.0%
BREAST CANCER	0	3	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	8	10.0%
HIV/AIDS	2	0	2	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	10	12.5%
DIABETES	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	6	7.5%
OBESITY	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	3.8%
GENERAL	2	3	4	3	1	1	2	1	1	3	2	2	25	31.3%
													80	**100.0%**
DISCRIMINATION														
MEDIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	9.1%
VIOLENCE	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	18.2%
WORKPLACE	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	5	45.5%
JUSTICE SYSTEM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
ECONOMIC DISPARITY	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	27.3%
													11	**100.1%**
RELATIONSHIPS	4	4	3	2	2	3	2	4	5	3	3	3	**38**	
FINANCES	4	2	2	1	3	2	2	5	3	2	2	3	**31**	
FAMILY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	
DISPELLED STEREOTYPES														
MATRIARCH	3	3	1	2	1	2	2	3	1	2	2	2	24	85.7%
MAMMY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0	0.0%
STRONG WOMAN	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	14.3%
WELFARE MOTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
JEZEBEL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
													28	**100.0%**
EDUCATION	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	**28**	
SPOTLIGHT														
INTERVIEWS	4	2	3	2	7	1	1	2	4	3	2	2	33	57.9%
CAREERS	3	1	1	2	1	4	3	3	2	2	1	1	24	42.1%
													57	**100.0%**
HISTORY	0	2	0	1	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	**7**	

Table 5

EBONY 2004	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL	%
HEALTH														
DIET/EXERCISE	3	1	2	2	3	4	1	3	3	1	2	1	26	37.7%
BREAST CANCER	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	6	7.3%
HIV/AIDS	1	0	0	3	1	2	3	1	0	1	0	1	13	18.8%
DIABETES	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	5.8%
OBESITY	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	2.9%
GENERAL	2	3	1	1	1	2	1	2	2	2	1	1	19	27.5%
													70	100.0%
DISCRIMINATION														
MEDIA	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	13.3%
VIOLENCE	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	20.0%
WORKPLACE	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	6	40.0%
JUSTICE SYSTEM	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6.7%
ECONOMIC DISPARITY	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	3	20.0%
													15	100.0%
RELATIONSHIPS	4	2	2	3	2	3	2	4	1	5	2	2	32	
FINANCES	2	0	3	2	2	4	2	1	3	1	1	4	25	
FAMILY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
DISPELLED STEREOTYPES														
MATRIARCH	3	1	0	2	0	2	0	3	2	3	0	2	18	78.3%
MAMMY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
STRONG WOMAN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
WELFARE MOTHER	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	5	21.7%
JEZEBEL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
													23	100.0%
EDUCATION	2	2	1	3	1	2	3	3	1	1	1	2	22	
SPOTLIGHT														
INTERVIEWS	2	2	3	3	1	3	4	2	2	4	2	7	35	60.3%
CAREERS	1	2	1	4	2	1	2	3	3	1	2	1	23	39.7%
													58	100.0%
HISTORY	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	

Table 6

EBONY 2005	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL	%
HEALTH														
DIET/EXERCISE	2	1	1	2	2	3	4	3	1	1	2	4	26	36.6%
BREAST CANCER	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	5	7.0%
HIV/AIDS	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	9	12.7%
DIABETES	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	0	7	9.9%
OBESITY	0	0	0	0	1	1		0	0	0	0	0	2	2.8%
GENERAL	4	2	2	1	1	1	1	3	3	2	1	1	22	31.0%
													71	**100.0%**
DISCRIMINATION														
MEDIA	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	23.1%
VIOLENCE	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	15.3%
WORKPLACE	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	4	30.8%
JUSTICE SYSTEM	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7.7%
ECONOMIC DISPARITY	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	23.1%
													13	**100.0%**
RELATIONSHIPS	4	2	1	3	2	2	2	3	5	3	2	2	**31**	
FINANCES	4	1	2	2	1	3	2	2	1	3	1	1	**23**	
FAMILY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	
DISPELLED STEREOTYPES														
MATRIARCH	3	2	2	2	3	2	3	1	1	2	2	2	25	89.3%
MAMMY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
STRONG WOMAN	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	10.7%
WELFARE MOTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
JEZEBEL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
													28	**100.0%**
EDUCATION	2	4	3	3	2	2	1	3	1	2	2	2	**27**	
SPOTLIGHT														
INTERVIEWS	7	3	3	2	1	1	4	2	2	3	2	2	32	50.8%
CAREERS	2	3	1	3	2	2	3	5	3	2	2	3	31	49.2%
													63	**100.0%**
HISTORY	0	2	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	**6**	

Table 7

EBONY 2006	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL	%
HEALTH														
DIET/EXERCISE	1	0	2	2	3	4	2	1	2	2	2	3	24	35.3%
BREAST CANCER	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	7	10.3%
HIV/AIDS	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	1	10	14.7%
DIABETES	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2.9%
OBESITY	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.5%
GENERAL	5	1	1	1	3	2	1	1	1	3	4	1	24	35.3%
													68	**100.0%**
DISCRIMINATION														
MEDIA	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	12.5%
VIOLENCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	12.5%
WORKPLACE	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	5	31.3%
JUSTICE SYSTEM	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	12.5%
ECONOMIC DISPARITY	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	5	31.3%
													16	**100.0%**
RELATIONSHIPS	2	3	3	3	2	6	2	4	1	2	3	3	**34**	
FINANCES	1	0	5	2	2	1	3	0	4	2	2	1	**73**	
FAMILY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
DISPELLED STEREOTYPES														
MATRIARCH	2	3	2	1	2	3	2	3	3	0	1	2	24	82.8%
MAMMY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
STRONG WOMAN	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	5	17.2%
WELFARE MOTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
JEZEBEL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
													29	**100.0%**
EDUCATION	3	2	3	1	1	2	3	3	1	2	2	2	**25**	
SPOTLIGHT														
INTERVIEWS	17	7	2	3	4	6	1	2	4	1	2	2	35	55.6%
CAREERS	2	3	2	4	2	2	3	1	3	3	2	1	28	44.4%
													63	**100.0%**
HISTORY	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**6**	

Table 8

EBONY 2007	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL	%
HEALTH														
DIET/EXERCISE	4	3	2	2	3	1	2	1	2	1	0	1	22	36.7%
BREAST CANCER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	0	1	7	11.7%
HIV/AIDS	2	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	2	9	15.0%
DIABETES	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	4	6.7%
OBESITY	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1.7%
GENERAL	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	3	2	17	28.3%
													60	**100.1%**
DISCRIMINATION														
MEDIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	10.0%
VIOLENCE	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	6	30.0%
WORKPLACE	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5	25.0%
JUSTICE SYSTEM	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	4	20.0%
ECONOMIC DISPARITY	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	3	15.0%
													20	**100.0%**
RELATIONSHIPS	3	3	3	4	2	1	6	2	3	6	8	3	**44**	
FINANCES	2	0	1	3	0	2	4	1	3	6	3	2	**27**	
FAMILY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	
DISPELLED STEREOTYPES														
MATRIARCH	1	1	1	2	3	2	1	0	2	3	1	2	21	72.4%
MAMMY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
STRONG WOMAN	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	1	1	8	27.6%
WELFARE MOTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
JEZEBEL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
													29	**100.0%**
EDUCATION	3	1	2	2	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	3	28	
SPOTLIGHT														
INTERVIEWS	2	0	2	2	1	4	2	1	6	4	3	7	34	52.3%
CAREERS	3	2	2	1	3	2	3	1	5	3	3	3	31	47.7%
													65	**100.0%**
HISTORY	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**3**	

Table 9

EBONY 2008	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL	%
HEALTH														
DIET/EXERCISE	3	3	1	3	0	4	0	2	4	3	4	1	28	48.3%
BREAST CANCER	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	5.2%
HIV/AIDS	0	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	10	17.2%
DIABETES	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	8.6%
OBESITY	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	5.2%
GENERAL	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	9	15.5%
													58	**100.0%**
DISCRIMINATION														
MEDIA	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	28.6%
VIOLENCE	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	14.3%
WORKPLACE	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	14.3%
JUSTICE SYSTEM	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	14.3%
ECONOMIC DISPARITY	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	28.6%
													7	**100.1%**
RELATIONSHIPS	1	3	4	4	5	2	0	2	4	5	6	5	**41**	
FINANCES	2	2	3	4	5	0	0	4	5	4	2	4	**35**	
FAMILY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	
DISPELLED STEREOTYPES														
MATRIARCH	2	3	2	2	2	2	0	2	3	3	2	2	25	86.2%
MAMMY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
STRONG WOMAN	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	13.8%
WELFARE MOTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
JEZEBEL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
													29	**100.0%**
EDUCATION	3	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	3	1	2	29	
SPOTLIGHT														
INTERVIEWS	1	3	4	5	3	3	0	1	0	4	5	5	34	61.8%
CAREERS	1	3	2	2	3	2	1	1	1	3	1	1	21	38.2%
													55	**100.0%**
HISTORY	1	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**5**	

Table 10

ESSENCE 2000	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL	%
HEALTH														
DIET/EXERCISE	0	1	1	0	1	2	2	1	1	3	1	1	14	31.1%
BREAST CANCER	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	4	8.9%
HIV/AIDS	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4.4%
DIABETES	0	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	8	17.8%
OBESITY	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	8.9%
GENERAL	2	0	1	1	1	1	4	1	0	0	1	1	13	28.9%
													45	**100.0%**
DISCRIMINATION														
MEDIA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10.0%
VIOLENCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	10.0%
WORKPLACE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	20.0%
JUSTICE SYSTEM	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	30.0%
ECONOMIC DISPARITY	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	3	30.0%
													10	**100.0%**
RELATIONSHIPS	2	7	4	1	3	1	3	2	2	1	0	2	**28**	
FINANCES	2	1	0	1	0	1	1	2	3	1	1	1	**14**	
FAMILY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	**1**	
DISPELLED STEREOTYPES														
MATRIARCH	0	0	1	1	2	1	1	3	3	0	0	1	13	68.4%
MAMMY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
STRONG WOMAN	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	6	31.6%
WELFARE MOTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
JEZEBEL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
													19	**100.0%**
EDUCATION	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	2	2	4	1	0	**14**	
SPOTLIGHT														
INTERVIEWS	1	3	4	1	0	2	0	3	6	5	4	4	33	60.0%
CAREERS	4	3	4	1	0	3	0	1	1	1	2	2	22	40.0%
													55	**100.0%**
HISTORY	0	3	1	0	0	2	2	1	1	1	0	0	**11**	

Table 11

ESSENCE 2001	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL	%
HEALTH														
DIET/EXERCISE	0	2	1	2	2	1	4	1	0	2	0	2	17	32.7%
BREAST CANCER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	3.8%
HIV/AIDS	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	5.8%
DIABETES	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	1	7	13.5%
OBESITY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1.9%
GENERAL	1	2	3	1	1	1	4	1	1	3	2	2	22	42.3%
													52	**100.0%**
DISCRIMINATION														
MEDIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
VIOLENCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
WORKPLACE	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	75.0%
JUSTICE SYSTEM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
ECONOMIC DISPARITY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	25.0%
													4	**100.0%**
RELATIONSHIPS	0	2	2	2	0	2	2	3	2	1	2	3	**21**	
FINANCES	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	1	1	**15**	
FAMILY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	
DISPELLED STEREOTYPES														
MATRIARCH	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	1	2	1	0	1	9	41.0%
MAMMY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
STRONG WOMAN	0	1	1	3	1	1	0	1	1	3	0	1	13	59.0%
WELFARE MOTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
JEZEBEL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
													22	**100.0%**
EDUCATION	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	1	1	1	**9**	
SPOTLIGHT														
INTERVIEWS	1	1	3	2	1	1	3	1	3	3	4	0	23	51.00%
CAREERS	4	2	2	1	3	0	2	1	3	1	1	2	22	49.00%
													45	**100.0%**
HISTORY	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	**7**	

ESSENCE 2002	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL	%
HEALTH														
DIET/EXERCISE	2	0	3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	15	35.7%
BREAST CANCER	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	7.1%
HIV/AIDS	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	1	1	0	6	14.3%
DIABETES	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	11.9%
OBESITY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2.4%
GENERAL	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	28.6%
													42	**100.0%**
DISCRIMINATION														
MEDIA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	14.3%
VIOLENCE	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	14.3%
WORKPLACE	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	4	57.1%
JUSTICE SYSTEM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
ECONOMIC DISPARITY	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14.3%
													7	**100.0%**
RELATIONSHIPS	2	4	2	2	1	2	1	1	3	2	1	0	**21**	
FINANCES	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	3	1	0	1	**14**	
FAMILY	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	**5**	
DISPELLED STEREOTYPES														
MATRIARCH	1	1	1	1	2	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	15	53.6%
MAMMY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
STRONG WOMAN	1	1	2	1	3	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	13	46.4%
WELFARE MOTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
JEZEBEL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
													28	**100.0%**
	3													
EDUCATION	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	0	0	16	
SPOTLIGHT														
INTERVIEWS	3	0	4	1	3	1	3	4	3	1	2	3	28	49.1%
CAREERS	2	1	5	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	2	2	29	50.9%
													57	**100.0%**
HISTORY	1	5	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	**13**	

Table 13

ESSENCE 2003	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL	%
HEALTH														
DIET/EXERCISE	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	3	1	1	14	25.9%
BREAST CANCER	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	5.6%
HIV/AIDS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3.7%
DIABETES	0	1	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	13.0%
OBESITY	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	4	7.4%
GENERAL	1	1	3	1	3	1	5	2	1	2	3	1	24	44.4%
													54	**100.0%**
DISCRIMINATION														
MEDIA	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	20.0%
VIOLENCE	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	30.0%
WORKPLACE	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	4	40.0%
JUSTICE SYSTEM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
ECONOMIC DISPARITY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	10.0%
													10	**100.0%**
RELATIONSHIPS	2	6	3	2	6	2	5	1	2	3	1	2	**35**	
FINANCES	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	**13**	
FAMILY	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	**4**	
DISPELLED STEREOTYPES														
MATRIARCH	0	0	2	1	2	1	1	0	1	0	1	2	11	40.7%
MAMMY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
STRONG WOMAN	0	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	16	59.3%
WELFARE MOTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
JEZEBEL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
													27	**100.0%**
EDUCATION	1	0	0	2	4	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	**19**	
SPOTLIGHT														
INTERVIEWS	0	0	2	2	3	3	2	3	2	2	3	4	26	48.1%
CAREERS	4	3	3	1	2	1	2	3	3	2	2	2	28	51.9%
													54	**100.0%**
HISTORY	0	2	1	1	0	3	1	0	1	0	1	1	**11**	

Table 14

ESSENCE 2004	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL	%
HEALTH														
DIET/EXERCISE	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	5	18	34.0%
BREAST CANCER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1.9%
HIV/AIDS	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	7.5%
DIABETES	0	0	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	7	13.2%
OBESITY	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	3	5.7%
GENERAL	2	1	3	1	1	1	3	1	1	4	1	1	20	37.7%
													53	**100.0%**
DISCRIMINATION														
MEDIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
VIOLENCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
WORKPLACE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	3	75.0%
JUSTICE SYSTEM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
ECONOMIC DISPARITY	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25.0%
													4	**100.0%**
RELATIONSHIPS	1	5	3	3	1	3	3	2	0	1	1	2	**25**	
FINANCES	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	**13**	
FAMILY	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	**5**	
DISPELLED STEREOTYPES														
MATRIARCH	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	2	1	1	10	41.7%
MAMMY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
STRONG WOMAN	1	1	1	1	3	1	0	1	1	2	1	1	14	58.3%
WELFARE MOTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
JEZEBEL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
													24	**100.0%**
EDUCATION	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	2	2	2	0	0	**12**	
SPOTLIGHT														
INTERVIEWS	4	1	5	4	5	4	2	2	3	4	4	1	39	58.2%
CAREERS	2	3	3	1	4	2	1	4	3	2	1	2	28	41.8%
													67	**100.0%**
HISTORY	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	**7**	

Table 15

ESSENCE 2005	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL	%
HEALTH														
DIET/EXERCISE	1	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	17	31.5%
BREAST CANCER	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	3.7%
HIV/AIDS	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	3.7%
DIABETES	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	9.3%
OBESITY	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	4	7.4%
GENERAL	1	2	2	2	1	3	2	1	2	5	1	2	24	44.4%
													54	**100.0%**
DISCRIMINATION														
MEDIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	28.6%
VIOLENCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
WORKPLACE	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	57.1%
JUSTICE SYSTEM	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	14.3%
ECONOMIC DISPARITY		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
													7	**100.0%**
RELATIONSHIPS	0	4	2	4	2	4	2	1	2	2	2	3	**28**	
FINANCES	2	1	3	1	1	2	1	0	2	1	1	1	**16**	
FAMILY	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	**2**	
DISPELLED STEREOTYPES														
MATRIARCH	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	2	0	7	35.0%
MAMMY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
STRONG WOMAN	0	1	0	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	2	0	13	65.0%
WELFARE MOTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
JEZEBEL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
													20	**100.0%**
EDUCATION	0	2	0	1	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	**20**	
SPOTLIGHT														
INTERVIEWS	3	1	6	2	3	2	2	3	7	2	5	6	42	61.8%
CAREERS	2	1	4	3	3	4	3	1	2	1	1	1	26	38.2%
													68	**100.0%**
HISTORY	0	1	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	1	**9**	

Table 16

ESSENCE 2006	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL	%
HEALTH														
DIET/EXERCISE	1	2	1	2	2	1	3	1	1	1	1	1	17	30.4%
BREAST CANCER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	3	5.4%
HIV/AIDS	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	4	7.1%
DIABETES	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	6	10.7%
OBESITY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
GENERAL	3	1	1	3	2	1	5	1	1	4	2	2	26	46.4%
													56	**100.0%**
DISCRIMINATION														
MEDIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	20.0%
VIOLENCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	10.0%
WORKPLACE	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	30.0%
JUSTICE SYSTEM	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	20.0%
ECONOMIC DISPARITY	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20.0%
													10	**100.0%**
RELATIONSHIPS	1	6	3	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	0	**22**	
FINANCES	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	**11**	
FAMILY	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	**5**	
DISPELLED STEREOTYPES														
MATRIARCH	1	1	1	1	3	0	0	2	2	2	2	2	17	45.90%
MAMMY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
STRONG WOMAN	1	1	1	1	4	2	2	2	0	2	2	2	20	54.10%
WELFARE MOTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
JEZEBEL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
													37	**100.0%**
EDUCATION	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	**18**	
SPOTLIGHT														
INTERVIEWS	2	3	9	4	3	2	1	5	6	4	2	6	47	64.4%
CAREERS	3	3	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	1	2	1	26	35.6%
													73	**100.0%**
HISTORY	2	5	1	1	0	1	0	1	5	0	3	0	**19**	

Table 17

ESSENCE 2007	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL	%
HEALTH														
DIET/EXERCISE	5	1	3	2	4	1	5	1	0	4	2	2	30	33.70%
BREAST CANCER	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	3	3.40%
HIV/AIDS	0	2	0	4	0	1	0	0	0	3	1	0	11	12.40%
DIABETES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
OBESITY	3	6	0	5	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	18	20.20%
GENERAL	1	2	1	3	6	1	3	1	2	4	2	1	27	30.30%
													89	**100.00%**
DISCRIMINATION														
MEDIA	2	3	1	0	1	0	5	2	0	0	1	0	15	44.10%
VIOLENCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
WORKPLACE	4	1	0	3	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	12	35.30%
JUSTICE SYSTEM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
ECONOMIC DISPARITY		0	0	5	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	20.60%
													34	**100.00%**
RELATIONSHIPS	2	3	1	4	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	**14**	
FINANCES	0	1	0	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	2	**8**	
FAMILY	3	0	5	0	3	0	1	1	0	4	1	0	**18**	
DISPELLED STEREOTYPES														
MATRIARCH	2	0	2	0	0	2	0	2	2	2	2	0	14	51.90%
MAMMY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
STRONG WOMAN	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	2	2	1	2	2	13	48.10%
WELFARE MOTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
JEZEBEL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
													27	**100.00%**
EDUCATION	3	2	2	1	3	3	1	2	3	3	3	3	**29**	
SPOTLIGHT														
INTERVIEWS	5	4	5	2	4	3	1	6	2	2	8	2	44	63.80%
CAREERS	1	2	3	3	1	1	2	1	3	3	1	4	25	36.20%
													69	**100.00%**
HISTORY	3	2	1	3	1	2	1	3	2	1	3	2	**24**	

Table 18

ESSENCE 2008	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL	%
HEALTH														
DIET/EXERCISE	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	2	1	2	15	42.9%
BREAST CANCER	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	8.6%
HIV/AIDS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2.9%
DIABETES	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.7%
OBESITY	0	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	11.4%
GENERAL	1	2	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	3	0	0	10	28.6%
													35	**100.1%**
DISCRIMINATION														
MEDIA	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	20.0%
VIOLENCE	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	4	26.7%
WORKPLACE	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	13.3%
JUSTICE SYSTEM	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	13.3%
ECONOMIC DISPARITY		1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	26.7%
													15	**100.0%**
RELATIONSHIPS	3	2	2	0	2	1	0	3	0	2	1	2	**18**	
FINANCES	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	**10**	
FAMILY	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	**3**	
DISPELLED STEREOTYPES														
MATRIARCH	1	2	0	0	3	2	0	1	1	1	2	2	15	46.9%
MAMMY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
STRONG WOMAN	1	2			2	2	3	1	1	1	2	2	17	53.1%
WELFARE MOTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
JEZEBEL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
													32	**100.0%**
EDUCATION	3	2	3	2	0	0	3	3	3	3	3	4	**29**	
SPOTLIGHT														
INTERVIEWS	3	4	5	3	5	7	3	5	4	3	2	5	49	64.5%
CAREERS	4	3	2	3	2	4	2	1	1	1	1	3	27	35.5%
													76	**100.0%**
HISTORY	1	2	5	1	3	4	3	1	1	2	5	4	**32**	

Table 19

B.E. 2000	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL	%
HEALTH														
DIET/EXERCISE	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	2	8	44.4%
BREAST CANCER	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.6%
HIV/AIDS	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	22.2%
DIABETES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
OBESITY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
GENERAL	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	5	27.8%
													18	**100.0%**
DISCRIMINATION														
MEDIA	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7.7%
VIOLENCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
WORKPLACE		3	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	1	8	61.5%
JUSTICE SYSTEM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
ECONOMIC DISPARITY	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	30.8%
													13	**100.0%**
RELATIONSHIPS	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	**3**	
FINANCES	5	4	6	3	3	5	4	7	4	4	3	5	**53**	
FAMILY	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	**2**	
DISPELLED STEREOTYPES														
MATRIARCH	2	1	2	2	3	3	4	2	3	2	2	4	30	100.0%
MAMMY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
STRONG WOMAN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
WELFARE MOTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
JEZEBEL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
													30	**100.0%**
EDUCATION	3	2	3	3	4	4	2	3	3	3	4	2	36	
SPOTLIGHT														
INTERVIEWS	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	8	14.3%
CAREERS	4	3	3	6	7	4	3	3	4	3	4	4	48	85.7%
													56	**100.0%**
HISTORY	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**4**	

Table 20

B.E. 2001	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL	%
HEALTH														
DIET/EXERCISE	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	8	36.4%
BREAST CANCER	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	13.6%
HIV/AIDS	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	18.2%
DIABETES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
OBESITY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
GENERAL	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	2	7	31.8%
													22	100.0%
DISCRIMINATION														
MEDIA	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8.3%
VIOLENCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
WORKPLACE	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	5	41.7%
JUSTICE SYSTEM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
ECONOMIC DISPARITY	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	6	50.0%
													12	100.0%
RELATIONSHIPS	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	5	
FINANCES	7	4	3	3	4	5	4	3	3	5	6	5	52	
FAMILY	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	
DISPELLED STEREOTYPES														
MATRIARCH	5	4	4	3	2	4	4	5	3	3	4	2	43	100.0%
MAMMY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
STRONG WOMAN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
WELFARE MOTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
JEZEBEL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
													43	100.0%
EDUCATION	6	5	5	3	2	5	5	5	4	3	4	2	49	
SPOTLIGHT														
INTERVIEWS	1	1	0	2	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	10	16.4%
CAREERS	7	5	6	4	3	4	7	3	3	4	3	2	51	83.6%
													61	100.0%
HISTORY	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	

Table 21

B.E. 2002	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL	%
HEALTH														
DIET/EXERCISE	2	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	8	42.1%
BREAST CANCER	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.3%
HIV/AIDS	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	21.0%
DIABETES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
OBESITY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
GENERAL	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	6	31.6%
													19	**100.0%**
DISCRIMINATION														
MEDIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
VIOLENCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
WORKPLACE	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	7	50.0%
JUSTICE SYSTEM		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
ECONOMIC DISPARITY	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	7	50.0%
													14	**100.0%**
RELATIONSHIPS	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	**4**	
FINANCES	6	5	3	3	4	5	6	4	3	3	3	4	**49**	
FAMILY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	
DISPELLED STEREOTYPES														
MATRIARCH	3	2	2	2	3	3	4	2	3	4	3	3	34	100.0%
MAMMY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
STRONG WOMAN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
WELFARE MOTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
JEZEBEL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
													34	**100.0%**
EDUCATION	3	4	2	3	3	4	3	4	3	3	3	4	39	
SPOTLIGHT														
INTERVIEWS	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	7	13.2%
CAREERS	4	5	4	7	3	3	4	5	3	3	3	2	46	86.8%
													53	**100.0%**
HISTORY	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**3**	

Table 22

B.E. 2003	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL	%
HEALTH														
DIET/EXERCISE	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	33.3%
BREAST CANCER	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6.7%
HIV/AIDS	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	3	20.0%
DIABETES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
OBESITY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
GENERAL	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	40.0%
													15	**100.0%**
DISCRIMINATION														
MEDIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
VIOLENCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
WORKPLACE	1		1	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	6	54.5%
JUSTICE SYSTEM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
ECONOMIC DISPARITY	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	5	45.5%
													11	**100.0%**
RELATIONSHIPS	0	3	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	**5**	
FINANCES	5	6	4	3	6	4	6	4	4	3	3	4	**52**	
FAMILY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**	
DISPELLED STEREOTYPES														
MATRIARCH	2	3	3	4	4	2	3	3	2	2	3	2	33	100.0%
MAMMY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
STRONG WOMAN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
WELFARE MOTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
JEZEBEL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
													33	**100.0%**
EDUCATION	4	3	3	3	3	4	2	3	4	4	2	3	38	
SPOTLIGHT														
INTERVIEWS	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	6	11.3%
CAREERS	5	4	4	3	3	4	5	4	4	4	3	4	47	88.7%
													53	**100.0%**
HISTORY	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**4**	

Table 23

B.E. 2004	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL	%
HEALTH														
DIET/EXERCISE	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	6	31.6%
BREAST CANCER	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10.5%
HIV/AIDS	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	3	15.8%
DIABETES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
OBESITY		0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.3%
GENERAL	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	7	36.8%
													19	**100.0%**
DISCRIMINATION														
MEDIA	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5.6%
VIOLENCE	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	11.1%
WORKPLACE	0	2	1	0	2	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	9	50.0%
JUSTICE SYSTEM	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	6	33.3%
ECONOMIC DISPARITY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
													18	**100.0%**
RELATIONSHIPS	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	**3**	
FINANCES	3	6	4	6	3	6	5	4	4	6	3	3	**53**	
FAMILY	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**2**	
DISPELLED STEREOTYPES														
MATRIARCH	2	3	4	2	3	3	2	2	3	4	3	2	33	100.0%
MAMMY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
STRONG WOMAN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
WELFARE MOTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
JEZEBEL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
													33	**100.0%**
EDUCATION	2	3	4	2	4	3	3	2	3	3	3	3	35	
SPOTLIGHT														
INTERVIEWS	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	4	6.7%
CAREERS	2	7	4	8	7	7	2	6	3	4	3	3	56	93.3%
													60	**100.0%**
HISTORY	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**3**	

Table 24

B.E. 2005	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL	%
HEALTH														
DIET/EXERCISE	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	5	31.3%
BREAST CANCER	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	12.5%
HIV/AIDS	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	18.8%
DIABETES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
OBESITY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
GENERAL	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	6	37.5%
													16	**100.1%**
DISCRIMINATION														
MEDIA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10.0%
VIOLENCE	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	6	60.0%
WORKPLACE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
JUSTICE SYSTEM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
ECONOMIC DISPARITY	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	30.0%
													10	**100.0%**
RELATIONSHIPS	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**3**	
FINANCES	4	4	6	3	5	4	3	4	3	3	3	2	**44**	
FAMILY	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**1**	
DISPELLED STEREOTYPES														
MATRIARCH	3	4	3	2	2	2	3	2	3	3	2	2	31	100.0%
MAMMY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
STRONG WOMAN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
WELFARE MOTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
JEZEBEL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
													31	**100.0%**
EDUCATION	4	4	3	3	3	4	2	3	3	2	2	3	**36**	
SPOTLIGHT														
INTERVIEWS	2	2	0	1	2	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	12	17.9%
CAREERS	3	4	3	6	4	4	4	6	4	6	6	5	55	82.1%
													67	**100.0%**
HISTORY	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	**3**	

Table 25

B.E. 2006	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL	%
HEALTH														
DIET/EXERCISE	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	4	33.3%
BREAST CANCER	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	16.7%
HIV/AIDS	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	16.7%
DIABETES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
OBESITY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
GENERAL	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	4	33.3%
													12	**100.0%**
DISCRIMINATION														
MEDIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	10.0%
VIOLENCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
WORKPLACE	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	6	60.0%
JUSTICE SYSTEM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
ECONOMIC DISPARITY	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	30.0%
													10	**100.0%**
RELATIONSHIPS	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	**3**	
FINANCES	4	7	5	5	4	2	3	3	4	3	6	5	**51**	
FAMILY	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	**2**	
DISPELLED STEREOTYPES														
MATRIARCH	2	3	2	2	3	4	2	2	3	2	2	4	31	100.0%
MAMMY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
STRONG WOMAN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
WELFARE MOTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
JEZEBEL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
													31	**100.0%**
EDUCATION	3	4	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	3	4	3	**34**	
SPOTLIGHT														
INTERVIEWS	1	1	1		1	1	2	1	0	2	1	1	12	22.2%
CAREERS	3	3	2	2	4	5	4	4	3	3	2	7	42	77.8%
													54	**100.0%**
HISTORY	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**3**	

Table 26

B.E. 2007	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL	%
HEALTH														
DIET/EXERCISE	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	27.3%
BREAST CANCER	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	18.2%
HIV/AIDS	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	9.1%
DIABETES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
OBESITY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
GENERAL	2	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	45.5%
													11	100.1%
DISCRIMINATION														
MEDIA	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10.0%
VIOLENCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
WORKPLACE	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	60.0%
JUSTICE SYSTEM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
ECONOMIC DISPARITY	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	3	10.0%
													10	80.0%
RELATIONSHIPS	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	
FINANCES	7	5	5	6	4	7	4	6	5	5	4	6	64	
FAMILY	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	
DISPELLED STEREOTYPES														
MATRIARCH	2	2	3	4	3	5	3	3	3	2	3	3	36	100.0%
MAMMY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
STRONG WOMAN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
WELFARE MOTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
JEZEBEL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
													36	100.0%
EDUCATION	4	3	3	3	4	5	3	3	2	2	3	3	38	
SPOTLIGHT														
INTERVIEWS	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	2	1	10	17.2%
CAREERS	4	5	3	4	3	5	7	3	3	2	2	7	48	82.8%
													58	100.0%
HISTORY	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	

Table 27

B.E. 2008	JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEPT	OCT	NOV	DEC	TOTAL	%
HEALTH														
DIET/EXERCISE	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	18.2%
BREAST CANCER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2	18.2%
HIV/AIDS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	9.1%
DIABETES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
OBESITY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
GENERAL	0	1	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	54.5%
													11	**100.0%**
DISCRIMINATION														
MEDIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	7.7%
VIOLENCE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
WORKPLACE	0	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	8	61.5%
JUSTICE SYSTEM	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
ECONOMIC DISPARITY	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	30.8%
													13	**100.0%**
RELATIONSHIPS	0	2	1	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	**8**	
FINANCES	3	7	2	7	3	4	5	6	5	5	6	6	**59**	
FAMILY	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	**2**	
DISPELLED STEREOTYPES														
MATRIARCH	2	2	5	5	2	3	2	4	2	3	3	2	35	100.0%
MAMMY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
STRONG WOMAN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
WELFARE MOTHER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
JEZEBEL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%
													35	**100.0%**
EDUCATION	3	5	4	3	3	4 3	3	4	2	4	4	4	43	
SPOTLIGHT														
INTERVIEWS	0	1	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	2	1	9	12.0%
CAREERS	7	7	7	7	5	4	4	7	4	3	5	6	66	88.0%
													75	**100.0%**
HISTORY	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**1**	

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Allen, Richard. 2001. *The Concept of Self: A Study of Black Identity and Self-Esteem*. Detriot, MI: Wayne State University Press.

Best, Amy. 2008. "Standpoint Theory." *Encyclopedia of Social Problems*. Ed. Vincent Parillo. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Black Enterprise. 2000. 30 (1-12).

Black Enterprise. 2001. 31 (1-12).

Black Enterprise. 2002. 32 (1-12).

Black Enterprise. 2003. 33 (1-12).

Black Enterprise. 2004. 34 (1-12).

Black Enterprise. 2005. 35 (1-12).

Black Enterprise. 2006. 36 (1-12).

Black Enterprise. 2007. 37 (1-12).

Black Enterprise. 2008. 38 (1-12).

Branden, Nathaniel. 1994. *The Six Pillars of Self-Esteem*. New York: NY: Bantam Books.

Carroll, Anne. 2005. *Word, Image, and the New Negro*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press

Chambers, Jason. 2008. *Madison Avenue and the Color Line: African Americans in the Advertising Industry*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Colfax, David and Susan Frankel Sternburg. 1972. "The Perpetuation of Racial Stereotypes: Blacks in Mass Circulation Magazine Advertisements." *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36 (1), 8-18.

Collins, Patricia. 2005. *Black Sexual Politics: African Americans, Gender, and the New Racism*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Collins, Patricia. 2000. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Collins, Patricia. 1998. *Fighting Words: Black Women and the Search for Justice*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Cottle, Simon. 2000. *Ethnic Minorities in the Media*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.

Culley, James and Rex Bennett. 1975. *The Use of Stereotypes in Mass Media Advertising: Blacks in Magazines, Newspapers, and Television Ads*. Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press.

Curry, Timothy and Paula Arriagada, et al. 2002. "Images of Sport in Popular Nonsport Magazines: Power and Performance versus Pleasure and Participation." *Sociological Perspectives*, 45 (4), 397-413.

Dates, Jannette and William Barlow. 1993. *Split Image: African Americans in the Mass Media*. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press.

Ebony. 2000. 55 (1-12).

Ebony. 2001. 56 (1-12).

Ebony. 2002. 57 (1-12).

Ebony. 2001. 58 (1-12).

Ebony. 2004. 59 (1-12).

Ebony. 2005. 60 (1-12).

Ebony. 2006. 61 (1-12).

Ebony. 2007. 62 (1-12).

Ebony. 2008. 63 (1-12).

Entman, and Robert and Andrew Rojecki. 2000. *The Black Image in the White Mind: Media and Race in America*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Essence. 2000. 31 (1-12).

Essence. 2001. 32 (1-12).

Essence. 2002. 33 (1-12).

Essence. 2003. 34 (1-12).

Essence. 2004. 35 (1-12).

Essence. 2005. 36 (1-12).

Essence. 2006. 37 (1-12).

Essence. 2007. 38 (1-12).

Essence. 2008. 39 (1-12).

Gaus, V., Wood, J. V., Beech, M. G., Taylor, K. L., & Michela, J. L. 1994. "Strategies of social comparison among people with low self-esteem: Self-protection and self-enhancement." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67,* 713-731.

Hesse-Biber, Sharlene and Patricia Lina Leavy. 2007. *Feminist Research Practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

hooks, bell. 2003. *Rock My Soul: Black People and Self-Esteem*. New York, NY: Atria Books.

hooks, bell. 1989. *Talking Back*. Boston, MA: South End Press.

Humprey, Ronald and Howard Schuman. 1984. "The Portrayal of Blacks in Magazine Advertisements: 1950-1982." *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, 48 (3), 551-563.

Jordan, L. K., & Kelly, K. R. 1990. "Effects of academic achievement and gender on academic and social self-concept: A replication study." *Journal of Counseling and Development, 69,* 173- 177.

Kaiser, Kathy. 1979. "The New Women's Magazines: It's the Same Old Story." *Frontier's: A Journal of Women's Studies*, 4 (1), 14-17.

Kamalipour, Yahya and Theresa Carilli. 1998. *Cultural Diversity and the U.S. Media*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Kassarjian, Harold. 1969. "The Negro and American Advertising, 1946-1965." *Journal of Marketing Research*, 6 (1), 29-39.

Kenway, Jane.1990. *Hearts and Minds: Self-Esteem and the Schooling of Girls*. New Fetter Lane, London: Routledge Falmer.

Kingsbury, G. G., Maruyama, G., & Rubin, R. A. 1981. Self-esteem and educational achievement: Independent constructs with a common cause. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,40,* 962-975.

Kitch, Carolyn. 2001. *The Girl on the Magazine Cover: The Origins of Visual Stereotypes in American Mass Media.* Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.

Lacey, Barbara. 1996. "Visual Images of Blacks in Early American Imprints." *The William and Mary Quarterly*, Third Series, 53 (1), 137-180.

Lemons, J. Stanley. 1977. "Black Stereotypes as Reflected in Popular Culture, 1880-1920." *American Quarterly*, 29 (1), 102-116.

Lont, Cynthia. 1995. *Women and the Media: Content, Careers, and Criticism*. Belmont, CA:Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Means-Coleman, Robin. 2002. *Say It Loud: African American Audiences, Media, and Identity!* New York, NY: Routledge.

Morgan, JoAnn. 1995. "Mammy the Huckster: Selling the Old South for the New Century." *American Art*, 9 (1), 87-109.

O'Sullivan, Tim and Brian Dutton, et al. 1994. *Studying the Media*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Owens, T. J. 1992. The effect of post-high school social context of self-esteem. *The Sociological Quarterly,33,* 553-578.

Rhodes, Jane. 1993. "Falling through the cracks: Studying Women of Color in Mass Communication." Pamela Creedon (Ed.) *Women in Mass Communication*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Rineheart, James. 1963. "The Meaning of Stereotypes." *Theory into Practice*, 2 (3), 136-143.

Rooks, Noliwe. 2004. *Ladies Pages: African American Women's Magazines and the Culture that Created them*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Russell, Dick. 1998. *Black Genius and the American Experience*. New York, NY: Carroll and Graf Publishers, Inc.

Wadium, Andrew. 2008. "Earl G. Graves LTD. Corporate Fact Sheet."

Woodard, Jennifer Bailey and Teresa Mastin. 2005. "Black Womanhood: "Essence" and its Stereotypical Images of Black Women." *Journal of Black Studies*, 36 (2), 264-281.

Wright, Michelle and Antje Schuhmann. 2007. *Blackness and Sexualities*. Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Anita N. DeLoach was born June 19, 1986 in Fort Rucker, Alabama. She graduated from Lovejoy High School, Hampton, Georgia in 2004 in the top ten percent of her class. She received her Bachelor of Arts in Sociology from Georgia State University, Atlanta, Georgia in 2007. She graduated Cum Laude from Georgia State University. Anita was inducted into the Kappa Delta Honor Society at George Mason University in 2009 where she also received her Masters of Arts in Sociology from George Mason University in 2009.