

Assignment 4: Final Paper

Francesca Burbano

526251

CM2553| New Media, Culture and Entertainment

Rashid Gabdulhakov

2500 words (excluding tables, headings, references, codebook)

## **Meet the New Disney Stars: From Former Role Models to Oversexualized Deviants**

### **Introduction and relevance**

In the early 80s, MTV introduced a new mass medium that changed the way people discovered music, that is the music video. With their visual aesthetics and short in length, music videos became a popular form of entertainment, making them social relevant in this contemporary era (Niermann, 2020). However, since the launch of MTV, music videos have been criticized for their X-rated and raunchy content, demeaning women as highly sexualized and subordinate to men (Götz and Rodriguez, 2017). According to Griffith (2017), young adolescents watch music videos more often than any other age group, subsequently making them the biggest consumer of music videos.

In the early 2000s, the US music industry created a new market for ‘tweens’ selling music through television channels and movies known as *High School Musical*, Disney Channel, and Nickelodeon (Griffith, 2017). It was through this pop music where many Disney Stars found their fame and niche, becoming role models to many young girls. These Disney Stars are branded to have no sex appeal or promiscuity and need to embody an image of innocence and modesty (Götz and Rodriguez, 2017). These stars take drastic measures to discard their ‘good girl’ image and claim their sexuality in order to be seen as an adult. It is thus that my research question is as following: *To what extent has the portrayal of sexuality and sexual objectification in music videos by former female Disney Stars changed from 2000 to 2020?* I will be focusing on the sexualization of former Disney Stars as they make their transformation into the adult world, leaving their career as child stars behind to reach sexual liberation and accommodate to the sexual culture of today.

### **Theory and literature**

Carr, Moffitt, and Szymanski (2011) state that women are portrayed in sexualized demeanors in pop culture and media. Objectification theory (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997) postulates that women are a mere object of sexual desire. In a Western society that sexually objectifies the female body, objectification theory argues that women in mass media are solely valued for their sexual appeal, outer beauty, and sexual appearance (Carr et al. 2011). This signifies that women are viewed as objects, rather than a person. Consequently, this theory implies that women begin to self-objectify themselves, viewing themselves as the observer’s perspective,

that is objects to be looked at (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997). Fredrickson and Roberts (1997) state that there are psychological consequences to self-objectification, resulting in women being critical of their outer appearance, which can lead to feelings of stress, shame, and guilt. Moreover, the internalization of seeing oneself as being objectified is unavoidable due to the external pressures a woman has in order to be sexual and physically attractive in American culture (Carr et al. 2011).

According to Fredrickson and Roberts (1997), sexual objectification is prevalent in music videos through the *objectifying gaze*. This means that an individual is shown to specifically gaze at its viewer through the camera lens, which suggests a form of objectification. In addition, the camera angle can direct the gaze by focusing on sexual body parts or sexually stimulating clothing that reveals skin (Fredrickson and Roberts, 1997). Moreover, other characteristics that define sexual objectification can be seen through sexual gestures, sexual facial expressions, and sexual movements and/or posing. By using the objectification theory, I'll be able to see to what extent Disney stars exploit their sexuality in their music videos. Further, the objectification theory will allow me to emphasize on the transformation Disney stars went through to be regarded as adults, sexualizing their identity as a result. By revealing sexual body parts, wearing provocative clothing, or showing sexual movements, this entails that Disney stars focus on their sexual identities and less on their identity as an artist, hence the objectification theory.

Previous studies have shown that sexual objectification and sexuality in music videos are dominant, where women are exploited, objectified, and de-individualized (Scrine, 2017). Scrine (2017) explores how young people engage with music videos, elaborating upon discourses of female sexuality, misogyny, and gender constructs. In her study, she states an example of identity that young women are confined to, describing this as the 'good girl.' She describes the 'good girl' identity as a woman who is limited to sexuality where she is expected to be feminine, modest, and socially acceptable in contrast with promiscuous and immoral 'bad girls.' This is an interesting prospect to my topic as Disney Stars have to maintain a public image of being good, innocent, and moral due to having young viewers. Griffith (2017) explores the same theme as Scrine (2017), that is the 'good girl' image being present, especially when it comes to Disney Stars. Griffith (2017) analyzes 'tween' female artists in the years of 2006 to 2016 and how they are hypersexualized in popular media. She states that we live in a 'pornified culture' where sexual behavior is seen as empowering nowadays and there is a clear shift from sexual freedom to sexual objectification where women objectify themselves. Her study explores three female artists that were found most famous, including Miley Cyrus, Hilary Duff, and Selena Gomez.

As a result, she found that these stars began with the 'good girl' image, that is having no references to sexuality in their music videos or identity. However, in order to get rid of the Disney Channel reputation, these artists had to exploit their sexuality to dissociate themselves with the label Disney created for them. Griffith (2017) states that there is a fine line between empowered sexuality and sexual objectification and while these Disney artists simply want to break free from being viewed as 'good girls' they lose themselves as artists and 'actively objectify themselves' in the process. Through these comparisons of previous studies, it is evident that Disney child stars go through drastic transformations of sexual objectification and sexuality in order to be seen as an adult in the music industry.

## Method

The two defined variables that will be measured in this study is the representation of sexuality and sexual objectification in YouTube music videos by former Disney stars that took place namely between 2000 to 2020. These two specific decades were chosen in order to see if there was a significant increase or decrease in references to sexuality and sexual objectification within a 10-year difference. To form a sample of music videos, it was first imperative to choose which former Disney artists would be analyzed. This was not chosen at random; I chose Disney artists that I grew up with, that is artists that I would regularly see on Disney Channel, MTV, or I was familiar with. I chose artists that were notoriously known for their sexual appeal, scandalous outfits, and promiscuous music videos; the ones that were most featured in celebrity news and gossip tabs that I remember reading about. I chose Disney artists that had a music career after they left Disney and those that reconstructed their image. The artists I chose for 2000-2010 were Christina Aguilera, Britney Spears, Ashley Tisdale, and Hilary Duff. To have an appropriate depiction, I chose the same number of artists for the years of 2010-2020, that being Miley Cyrus, Selena Gomez, Demi Lovato, and Bella Thorne, thus 4 artists for the years 2000-2010 and 4 artists for the years 2010-2020.

Further, a sample of 30 music videos were selected from each artists' Billboard Charts Top 10 Most Viewed Music Videos. From the Top 10, I chose a minimum of 2 videos and a maximum of 8 videos, depending on how many music videos each artist had. For instance, Britney Spears has released 44 music videos, thus I chose 8 from her Top 10. The unit of analysis consisted of solely the main artist and how she portrays sexuality and sexual objectification in her YouTube videos. The coding procedure consists of coding 3 content categories: portrayal of sexuality, sexual objectification, and sexual expression and within those content categories, there are 8 categories: *intimate touching*, *kissing*, *objectifying camera shot*, *sexually gazed upon*, *provocative clothing*, *sexual posing*, *sexual movement*, and *sexual facial expression*. This was established in order to grasp a general, yet specific theme of sexuality portrayed by the main artist in her music video. Coding was done so with either a 0 for absent or 1 for present.

To test intercoder reliability, one other coder recoded the first 10 music videos with 8 categories which had already been analyzed by the author. An intercoder reliability test with a sub-sample of 10 units for category 1 (sexual posing) showed that the reliability for this category was unacceptable (PA= 90.0%;  $\alpha = 0.00$ ). For category 2 (objectifying camera shot), the reliability for this category was unacceptable (PA = 80.0%;  $\alpha = 0.60$ ). For category 3 (intimate touching), the reliability for this category was unacceptable (PA = 60.0%;  $\alpha = 0.09$ ). For category 4 (provocative clothing), the reliability for this category was unacceptable (PA = 80.0%;  $\alpha = -.05$ ). For category 5 (sexual movement), the reliability of this category was undefined (PA = 100.0%,  $\alpha = \text{undefined}$ ). For category 6 (kissing), the reliability for this category was excellent (PA = 100.0%;  $\alpha = 1.00$ ). For category 7 (sexually gazed upon), the reliability for this category was good (PA = 90.0%;  $\alpha = 0.80$ ). For category 8 (sexual facial expressions), the reliability for this category was unacceptable (PA = 90.0%;  $\alpha = 0.00$ ). Once more, Krippendorff's alpha for the 8 categories was as followed: *sexual posing* (0.00), *objectifying camera shot* (0.60), *intimate touching* (0.09), *provocative clothing* (-.05), *sexual movement* (undefined), *kissing* (1.00), *sexually gazed upon* (0.80), and *sexual facial expressions* (0.00). Thus, the test scores from the reliability test indicate that there was a slight uneven difference in coding between the two coders. However, I acknowledge that with practice and training, a reliable coding scheme can be improved.

**Table 1**  
*Content Categories and Categories in Content Analysis*

| Content Categories              | Categories               | Krippendorff's Alpha |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| Portrayed sexuality             | Intimate touching        | 0.09                 |
|                                 | Kissing                  | 1.00                 |
| Depicted sexual objectification | Objectifying camera shot | 0.60                 |
|                                 | Sexually gazed upon      | 0.80                 |
|                                 | Provocative clothing     | -.05                 |
| Portrayed sexual expression     | Sexual posing            | 0.00                 |
|                                 | Sexual movement          | undefined*           |
|                                 | Sexual facial expression | 0.00                 |

## Results

The descriptive statistics for the 8 categories were as followed. Sexual posing was present in 96.7% of the 30 music videos. This indicates that 3.3% of this form of portrayed sexual expression was missing in 1 music video. Objectifying camera shot was present in 76.7% of the 30 music videos. This means that 23.3% of this form of depicted sexual objectification was missing in 7 music videos. Intimate touching was present in 73.3% of the 30 music videos. This shows that 26.7% of this form of portrayed sexuality was missing in 8 music videos. Provocative clothing was present in 96.7% of the 30 music videos. This indicates that 3.3% of this form of depicted sexual objectification was missing in 1 music video. Sexual movement was present in 93.3% of the 30 music videos. This shows that 6.7% of this form of portrayed sexual expression was missing in 2 music videos. Kissing was present in 23.3% of the 30 music videos. This indicates that 76.7% of this form of portrayed sexuality was missing in 23 music videos. Sexually gazed upon was present in 36.7% of the 30 music videos. This means that 63.3% of this form of depicted sexual objectification was missing in 19 music videos. Sexual facial expressions were present in 96.7% of the 30 music videos. This indicates that 3.3% of this form of portrayed sexual expression was missing in 1 music video.

**Table 2**  
*Frequency of Occurrence for Music Video Content Categories*

| Content Categories              | Categories               | Percentages |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|
| Portrayed sexuality             | Intimate touching        | 73.3        |
|                                 | Kissing                  | 23.3        |
| Depicted sexual objectification | Objectifying camera shot | 76.7        |
|                                 | Sexually gazed upon      | 36.7        |
|                                 | Provocative clothing     | 96.7        |
| Portrayed sexual expression     | Sexual posing            | 96.7        |
|                                 | Sexual movement          | 93.3        |
|                                 | Sexual facial expression | 96.7        |

## Analysis Reporting

A Chi-Square test for independence was used as analysis to determine if there was a significant relationship between portrayal of sexuality (*intimate touching, kissing*), sexual objectification (*objectifying camera shot, sexually gazed upon, provocative clothing*) and sexual expression (*sexual posing, sexual movement, sexual facial expression*) from 2000 to 2020.

**Table 3**  
*Sexual posing and Videoidgroups Crosstab*

|               |         |                                 | Videoidgroups |              |              |
|---------------|---------|---------------------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
|               |         |                                 | 2000-2010     | 2010-2020    | Total        |
| Sexual posing | Absent  | Count<br>%within videoidgroups  | 0<br>0.0%     | 1<br>6.7%    | 1<br>3.3%    |
|               | Present | Count<br>%within videoidgroups. | 15<br>100.0%  | 14<br>93.3%  | 29<br>96.7%  |
| Total         |         | Count<br>%within videoidgroups  | 15<br>100.0%  | 15<br>100.0% | 30<br>100.0% |

Table 3 shows that sexual posing occurs more often in 2000-2010 (100.0%) than 2010-2020 (93.3%). However, a Chi-Square test for independence reveals that videos between 2000-2020 does not have a significant relation with sexual posing,  $\chi^2(1, N = 30) = 1.03, p = .309$ .

**Table 4**  
*Objectifying camera shot and Videoidgroups Crosstab*

|                          |         |                                 | Videoidgroups |              |              |
|--------------------------|---------|---------------------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
|                          |         |                                 | 2000-2010     | 2010-2020    | Total        |
| Objectifying camera shot | Absent  | Count<br>%within videoidgroups  | 5<br>33.3%    | 2<br>13.3%   | 7<br>23.3%   |
|                          | Present | Count<br>%within videoidgroups. | 10<br>66.7%   | 13<br>86.7%  | 23<br>76.7%  |
| Total                    |         | Count<br>%within videoidgroups  | 15<br>100.0%  | 15<br>100.0% | 30<br>100.0% |

Table 4 shows that objectifying camera shot occurs more often in 2010-2020 (86.7%) than 2000-2010 (66.7%). However, a Chi-Square test for independence reveals that videos between 2000-2020 does not have a significant relation with objectifying camera shot,  $\chi^2(1, N = 30) = 1.67, p = .195$ .

**Table 5**  
*Intimate touching and Videoidgroups Crosstab*

|                   |         | Videoidgroups                   |              |              |              |
|-------------------|---------|---------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|                   |         |                                 | 2000-2010    | 2010-2020    | Total        |
| Intimate touching | Absent  | Count<br>%within videoidgroups  | 6<br>40.0%   | 2<br>14.3%   | 8<br>27.6%   |
|                   | Present | Count<br>%within videoidgroups. | 9<br>60.0%   | 12<br>85.7%  | 21<br>72.4%  |
| Total             |         | Count<br>%within videoidgroups  | 15<br>100.0% | 14<br>100.0% | 29<br>100.0% |

Table 5 shows that intimate touching occurs more often in 2010-2020 (85.7%) than 2000-2010 (60.0%). However, a Chi-Square test for independence reveals that videos between 2000-2020 does not have a significant relation with intimate touching,  $\chi^2(1, N = 29) = 2.39, p = .122$ .

**Table 6**  
*Provocative clothing and Videoidgroups Crosstab*

|                      |         | Videoidgroups                   |              |              |              |
|----------------------|---------|---------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|                      |         |                                 | 2000-2010    | 2010-2020    | Total        |
| Provocative clothing | Absent  | Count<br>%within videoidgroups  | 1<br>6.7%    | 0<br>0.0%    | 1<br>3.3%    |
|                      | Present | Count<br>%within videoidgroups. | 14<br>93.3%  | 15<br>100.0% | 29<br>96.7%  |
| Total                |         | Count<br>%within videoidgroups  | 15<br>100.0% | 15<br>100.0% | 30<br>100.0% |

Table 6 shows that provocative clothing occurs more often in 2010-2020 (100.0%) than 2000-2010 (93.3%). However, a Chi-Square test for independence reveals that videos between 2000-2020 does not have a significant relation with provocative clothing,  $\chi^2(1, N = 30) = 1.03, p = .309$ .

**Table 7**  
*Sexual movement and Videoidgroups Crosstab*

|                 |         | Videoidgroups                   |              |              |              |
|-----------------|---------|---------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|                 |         |                                 | 2000-2010    | 2010-2020    | Total        |
| Sexual movement | Absent  | Count<br>%within videoidgroups  | 0<br>0.0%    | 2<br>13.3%   | 2<br>6.7%    |
|                 | Present | Count<br>%within videoidgroups. | 15<br>100.0% | 13<br>86.7%  | 28<br>93.3%  |
| Total           |         | Count<br>%within videoidgroups  | 15<br>100.0% | 15<br>100.0% | 30<br>100.0% |

Table 7 shows that sexual movement occurs more often in 2000-2010 (100.0%) than 2010-2020 (86.7%). However, a Chi-Square test for independence reveals that videos between 2000-2020 does not have a significant relation with sexual movement,  $\chi^2(1, N = 30) = 2.14, p = .143$ .

**Table 8**  
*Kissing and Videoidgroups Crosstab*

|         |         | Videoidgroups                   |              |              |              |
|---------|---------|---------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|         |         |                                 | 2000-2010    | 2010-2020    | Total        |
| Kissing | Absent  | Count<br>%within videoidgroups  | 13<br>86.7%  | 10<br>66.7%  | 23<br>76.7%  |
|         | Present | Count<br>%within videoidgroups. | 2<br>13.3%   | 5<br>33.3%   | 7<br>23.3%   |
| Total   |         | Count<br>%within videoidgroups  | 15<br>100.0% | 15<br>100.0% | 30<br>100.0% |

Table 8 shows that kissing occurs more often in 2010-2020 (33.3%) than 2000-2010 (13.3%). However, a Chi-Square test for independence reveals that videos between 2000-2020 does not have a significant relation with kissing,  $\chi^2(1, N = 30) = 1.67, p = .195$ .

**Table 9**  
*Sexually gazed upon and Videoidgroups Crosstab*

|                   |         |                                 | Videoidgroups |              |              |
|-------------------|---------|---------------------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
|                   |         |                                 | 2000-2010     | 2010-2020    | Total        |
| Sexual gazed upon | Absent  | Count<br>%within videoidgroups  | 4<br>26.7%    | 15<br>100.0% | 19<br>63.3%  |
|                   | Present | Count<br>%within videoidgroups. | 11<br>73.3%   | 0<br>0.0%    | 11<br>36.7%  |
| Total             |         | Count<br>%within videoidgroups  | 15<br>100.0%  | 15<br>100.0% | 30<br>100.0% |

Table 9 shows that the artist being sexually gazed upon is done more often in 2000-2010 (73.3%) than 2010-2020 (0.0%).

A Chi-Square test for independence reveals that the videos between 2000-2020 does have a significant relation with the artist being sexually gazed upon,  $X^2(1, N = 30) = 17.37, p < .001$ .

**Table 10**  
*Sexual facial expressions and Videoidgroups Crosstab*

|                           |         |                                 | Videoidgroups |              |              |
|---------------------------|---------|---------------------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
|                           |         |                                 | 2000-2010     | 2010-2020    | Total        |
| Sexual facial expressions | Absent  | Count<br>%within videoidgroups  | 0<br>0.0%     | 1<br>6.7%    | 1<br>3.3%    |
|                           | Present | Count<br>%within videoidgroups. | 15<br>100.0%  | 14<br>93.3%  | 29<br>96.7%  |
| Total                     |         | Count<br>%within videoidgroups  | 15<br>100.0%  | 15<br>100.0% | 30<br>100.0% |

Table 10 shows that sexual facial expressions occurs more often in 2000-2010 (100.0%) than 2010-2020 (93.3%).

However, a Chi-Square test for independence reveals that videos between 2000-2020 does not have a significant relation with sexual facial expressions,  $X^2(1, N = 30) = 1.03, p = .309$ .



## Change Over Time

These results indicate no significant increase or decrease of how portrayal of sexuality, sexual objectification, and sexual expression changed over time. However, the artist being sexually gazed upon in music videos did decrease for the years 2010-2020,  $\chi^2(1, N = 30) = 17.37, p < .001$ . These results suggest that although portrayal of sexuality, sexual objectification, and sexual expression in music videos did not change between 2000 and 2020, representation of sexuality sexual objectification, and sexual expression continue to be pervasive in current music culture. Sexual content by itself is not necessarily problematic and could provide valuable references for adolescents when developing their own sexuality. However, my findings elaborate on the objectification theory (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997), which states that Western media sexually objectifies women by focusing on their sexual appeal and physical appearance. It is evident that former Disney artists are presented in a sexually objectified way as they are a target of the objectifying gaze, objectifying camera shots, wear provocative clothing, and are sexually glamorized. This in turn can have consequences on how they internalize themselves and their self-sexualizing behavior can influence adolescents. There is a blurring between what is considered liberating and empowering towards women versus what is seen as sexual objectification, hypersexualization, and pornification in mass media. Future research is thus needed to explore the fine line between feminism, empowerment, and sexual objectification.

## Discussion and Limitations for Future Research

Previous analyses of music videos critiqued the objectification and hypersexualisation of women in music videos. Similar to Götz and Rodriguez (2017) claim that music videos portray women as highly sexualized and subordinate to men, Griffith (2017) argued that female artists are ‘trapped in the pornographic gaze’ of music videos, that is that they feel the need to portray themselves as sexual in order to escape a confined role of innocence. As a result, they are sexually objectified and hypersexualized, valuing themselves based on their physical appearance and observer’s perspective, emphasizing on the objectification theory. The objectification theory was prevalent in this study as I focused on the visual portrayal of sexuality, sexual objectification, and sexual expression in music videos. Although I managed to establish intercoder reliability, coding in general, in particular the depiction of sexual objectification and sexual expression remains a challenge due to its many forms of interpretation. For example, *provocative clothing*, was difficult to interpret because for the music videos analyzed for the years 2000-2010, it was common for artists in the early 2000s, such as Britney Spears and Christina Aguilera, to wear crop tops, skimpy skirts, and tight pants as these were current 2000s fashion trends, thus it is crucial for future research to keep pop cultural trends and references in mind when looking at different decades.

Further, while I solely focused on the main artist in each video, in several cases, women as extras played decorative roles or dancers would be around the main artist, wearing revealing clothing, sexually dancing, kissing, or touching. In this sense, all portrayals of sexuality, sexual objectification, and sexual expression were not analyzed. Thus, additional categories other than of the main artist could be accounted for in future analyses in order to get a clear representation of how sexuality is present in music videos in an overall sense for each decade. Moreover, to provide an even more in-depth distinction of how former Disney artists convey their sexuality between 2000-2020, lyrics could be analyzed in combination with visual analyses. By analyzing the lyrics, there could be references to sexuality that is not present in the music videos. Further, it is important to understand what these artists are singing about and how this contrasts with what they are portraying visually, do their words enforce their sexual actions? In other words, do their lyrics describe why they are expressing their sexuality? When it comes to former Disney artists, it is of necessity to understand what they have gone through before and after their careers in order to come to an adequate conclusion.

## **Conclusion**

To conclude, my study has shown that representations of sexuality and sexual objectification in music videos by former Disney Stars in music videos during 2000-2020 have not changed over time. I believe that the sexuality represented in music videos in 2010-2020 is not necessarily progress from that of 2000-2010; rather, it is a mere continuation or extension of it. There is a distinction between two artists and the others. An interesting approach that needs to be further explored is that with Britney Spears and Christina Aguilera, they've been unfairly sexualized and objectified in order to sell music and attract audiences, whilst the other artists exploited their sexuality to reach sexual liberation, becoming objectified in the process. For instance, Britney Spears and Christina Aguilera, were groomed from such young ages to be overtly sexual, consequently allowing themselves to become objectified, that is a product to be sold.

In contrast, artists such as Miley Cyrus, Selena Gomez, Demi Lovato, Bella Thorne, Ashley Tisdale, and Hilary Duff, were groomed at young ages to be the opposite of sexual and needed to maintain an image of being good and innocent, not allowed to make any references to sexuality. It is through these artists where there was a clear shift from being a 'good girl' to a 'bad girl' in the eyes of mass media. It is evident that being famous when you are young is tough because you are constrained to this child-like reputation, put on a pedestal and you're not supposed to be human and make mistakes. On the contrary, you're supposed to be perfect at all times, be a role model for your fans, and invoke values that are acceptable to society, which demeans sexuality. This study was important because it explored how former Disney stars went from Disney role models to sexual icons, transitioning into adulthood and shedding the adolescent image. The content analysis explored in this study demonstrates that the portrayals of sexuality, sexual objectification, and sexual expression in music videos remain a universal element of mainstream culture. I have been able to identify how former Disney artists have made a transformation from adolescence to adulthood within their music career. However, the reason behind their sexual doing should serve as a starting point for future research.

## Reference list

- Fredrickson, B. L., & Roberts, T. (1997). Objectification theory: Toward understanding women's lived experiences and mental health risks. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 21*, 173-206. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.1997.tb00108.x>
- Griffith, J. (2017). *From Dreamers to Dangerous Women: A Shift from Abstinence and Hypersexuality to Sexuality with Shame in Pop Music in Pop Music Listened to by Tween Girls in 2006 and 2016* (Bachelor's thesis, Pace University). Retrieved from [https://digitalcommons.pace.edu/honorscollege\\_theses/153/](https://digitalcommons.pace.edu/honorscollege_theses/153/).
- Götz, M. (2017). Just Want to Look Good for You. Stereotypes in Music Videos and How to Overcome the Self-Evident Sexism in Germany. In 1222782325 909535695 A. E. Rodriguez (Ed.), *Beyond the Stereotypes? Images of Boys and Girls, and their Consequences* (pp. 119-130). Göteborg: Nordicom.
- Niermann, J. (2020, April 17). Why Music Videos Are Making a Comeback in the Age of Coronavirus. Retrieved February 28, 2020, from <https://musebycl.io/>
- Scrine, E. (2017). 'Dear Future Husband': Young people's critical exploration of gender and sexuality in pop music videos. *Networking Knowledge: Journal of the MeCCSA Postgraduate Network, 10*, 3rd ser., 6-26. doi:<https://doi.org/10.31165/nk.2017.103.516>
- Szymanski, D. M., Moffitt, L. B., & Carr, E. R. (2011). Sexual Objectification of Women: Advances to Theory and Research. *The Counseling Psychologist, 39*(1), 6-38. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000010378402>

*Sexuality in Former Disney Stars Analysis Codebook*

**Portrayal of sexuality in the *Billboards'* most viewed music videos 2000-2010**

| Video ID                                 | Artist ID | Year | Sexual posing | Objectifying camera shot | Intimate touching | Provocative clothing | Sexual movement | Kissing | Sexually gazed upon | Sexual facial expressions |
|--|-----------|------|---------------|--------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Come On Over Baby (All I Want Is You) | 1.        | 2000 | 1             | 0                        | 1                 | 1                    | 1               | 0       | 0                   | 1                         |
| 2. I'm A Slave 4 U                       | 2.        | 2001 | 1             | 1                        | 1                 | 1                    | 1               | 0       | 1                   | 1                         |
| 3. Boys                                  | 2.        | 2001 | 1             | 0                        | 0                 | 1                    | 1               | 0       | 1                   | 1                         |
| 4. Overprotected                         | 2.        | 2002 | 1             | 1                        | 0                 | 1                    | 1               | 0       | 1                   | 1                         |
| 5. Dirty                                 | 1.        | 2002 | 1             | 0                        | 1                 | 1                    | 1               | 0       | 1                   | 1                         |
| 6. Toxic                                 | 2.        | 2003 | 1             | 1                        | 1                 | 1                    | 1               | 1       | 1                   | 1                         |
| 7. My Prerogative                        | 2.        | 2004 | 1             | 1                        | 1                 | 1                    | 1               | 1       | 1                   | 1                         |
| 8. He Said She Said                      | 3.        | 2006 | 1             | 0                        | 1                 | 1                    | 1               | 0       | 0                   | 1                         |
| 9. Gimme More                            | 2.        | 2007 | 1             | 1                        | 0                 | 1                    | 1               | 0       | 0                   | 1                         |
| 10. Stranger                             | 4.        | 2007 | 1             | 1                        | 0                 | 1                    | 1               | 0       | 1                   | 1                         |
| 11. With Love                            | 4.        | 2007 | 1             | 0                        | 0                 | 1                    | 1               | 0       | 1                   | 1                         |
| 12. Womanizer                            | 2.        | 2008 | 1             | 1                        | 1                 | 1                    | 1               | 0       | 1                   | 1                         |
| 13. If U Seek Amy                        | 2.        | 2008 | 1             | 1                        | 1                 | 1                    | 1               | 0       | 1                   | 1                         |
| 14. Crank It Up                          | 3.        | 2009 | 1             | 1                        | 0                 | 1                    | 1               | 0       | 0                   | 1                         |
| 15. Reach Out                            | 4.        | 2009 | 1             | 1                        | 1                 | 0                    | 1               | 0       | 1                   | 1                         |

**Portrayal of sexuality in the *Billboards'* most viewed music videos 2010-2020**

| Video ID              | Artist ID | Year | Sexual posing | Objectifying camera shot | Intimate touching | Provocative clothing | Sexual movement | Kissing | Sexually gazed upon | Sexual facial expressions |
|-----------------------|-----------|------|---------------|--------------------------|-------------------|----------------------|-----------------|---------|---------------------|---------------------------|
| 16. Can't Be Tamed    | 5.        | 2010 | 1             | 1                        | 1                 | 1                    | 1               | 0       | 0                   | 1                         |
| 17. Who Owns My Heart | 5.        | 2010 | 1             | 1                        | 1                 | 1                    | 1               | 0       | 0                   | 1                         |
| 18. Come & Get It     | 6.        | 2013 | 1             | 1                        | 1                 | 1                    | 1               | 0       | 0                   | 1                         |
| 19. We Can't Stop     | 5.        | 2013 | 1             | 1                        | 1                 | 1                    | 1               | 1       | 0                   | 1                         |
| 20. Wrecking Ball     | 5.        | 2013 | 1             | 1                        | 0                 | 1                    | 1               | 0       | 0                   | 1                         |

|                         |    |      |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
|-------------------------|----|------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 21. Slow Down           | 6. | 2013 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 22. Neon Lights         | 7. | 2013 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 23. Adore You           | 5. | 2013 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 24. Good for You        | 6. | 2015 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 25. Cool for the Summer | 7. | 2015 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 26. Hands to Myself     | 6. | 2015 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 27. Fetish              | 6. | 2017 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 28. P**** Mine          | 8. | 2018 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 29. Prisoner            | 5. | 2020 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| 30. Shake It            | 8. | 2020 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

**Artist ID:** Next to the Video ID, there is the artist's ID number from the following list. ID Numbers 1 through 4 showcase the artist's music videos from 2000-2010, whereas ID Numbers 5 through 8 showcase the artist's music videos from 2010-2020.

| ID | Artist             |
|----|--------------------|
| 1. | Christina Aguilera |
| 2. | Britney Spears     |
| 3. | Ashley Tisdale     |
| 4. | Hilary Duff        |
| 5. | Miley Cyrus        |
| 6. | Selena Gomez       |
| 7. | Demi Lovato        |
| 8. | Bella Thorne       |

### Coding Instructions

For all coding, use only the information available for category descriptions. If any category description in the music video is shown, assign a 1 for it being present or a 0 if it is absent. Thus, 1 implies a clear depiction of portrayed sexuality, sexual objectification and/or sexual expression, whereas 0 implies that it is not being shown.

0= Absent

1= Present

## Category Descriptions

**Portrayed sexuality:** Portrayal of sexual behavior included two coded variables: *intimate touching* and *kissing*. Both variables had to clearly present sexual intimacy to be defined as sexual behavior. Thus, a light kiss, such as a peck, lips almost touching, or lips grazing on any body part (i.e. neck), was not coded as kissing. The kiss had to be clearly between the artist and someone else; extras or back up dancers kissing did not count as kissing. Further, the kiss had to be distinctly visible in the music video. Intimate touching included the artist touching another person in a sexual way, such as grazing their sexual body parts (i.e. breasts, genital area, hips, thighs) and visa versa. Intimate touching also included the artist sexually touching herself, that is her hands touching her breasts, inner thighs, or genital area. Thus, a hug, holding hands, or a warm embrace was not coded as intimate touching. It is important to note that the portrayal of sexual behavior is only coded when the artist is involved.

**Depicted sexual objectification:** Representation of sexual objectification included three coded variables: *objectifying camera shot*, the artist being *sexually gazed upon*, and *provocative clothing*. Objectifying camera shot included visible camera shots which were solely focused on the sexual body parts of the artist without showing her face (i.e. breasts, upper thighs, inner thighs, crotch, legs, or cleavage). The artist looking at the camera in a sexual way was also coded as objectifying camera shot, that is sexually objectifying herself in the presence of the camera. In addition, the artist being sexually gazed upon was coded if the artist was being looked at in a sexual way by someone else. However, being sexually gazed upon, does not include flirting or concurrent eye contact between the artist and another person. An example of being sexually gazed upon could be a man looking at the artist in a sensual or erotic way, that is wanting her in a sexual manner. Another typical shot could include the artist passing by in front a group of men who are gazing at her, whistling/catcalling, or commenting on her body. Depicted sexual objectification also included the presence or absence of provocative clothing. Provocative clothing implied the artist wearing clothes that accentuated sexual body parts, such as lingerie, corsets, stockings, short skirts/dresses, or shirts with deep cut-outs. Further, the artist's clothing was coded as sexually objectifying when it included leather or transparent cloth and unbuttoned shirts/pants only to a degree where their sexual body parts are shown, implying sexual provocativeness.

**Portrayed sexual expression:** Depiction of sexual expression included three coded variables: *sexual posing*, *sexual movement*, and *sexual facial expression*. Sexual posing included movement that had no relation to dancing, such as standing, laying with legs open, breasts pressed forwards, or posing in a seductive manner. An example of this could be the artist laying on a bed/couch in such a way that initiates a sexual position, her body movement implying sex. On the other hand, there is sexual movements, which included dancing movements, that is meant to be stimulating, such as grinding, twerking, thrusting hips, or pole dancing. Since dancing can be hard to differentiate with what is sexual or not, sexual movements are only coded if the movement is sexually arousing. Therefore, dancing that is choreographed in a way where the artist seems to solely dance in a non-sexual way is not coded. Sexual facial expression included facial behavior that is seen as sexual, such as biting lips, making a so called 'sex' face where the mouth is open as if moaning, licking lips, sucking thumb, or seductively gazing.