In today’s society, the sexualization of young females seems as the most understated concern. Almost everything sexualizes women, to an extent and stopping it at the beginning of the tracks can seem complicated. Through the use of statistical facts and personal stories from affected people, Stephanie Hanes makes an argument that young girls grow up too soon, and effectively convinces her audience that it is a result of sexualization. Hanes makes an appeal that the first step into this loop involves Disney Princesses, and that parent entailment is crucial to a child’s life.

On October 3rd, 2011, Christian Science Monitor published Hanes's article that talks about the major roles in shaping a girl’s life and the outcomes of allowing the Disney Princess Effect to take place. In the first discussion Mary Finucane, a mother of a 3 year old, expresses a personal story on how, “her daughter’s youth was taken” (509). From the influence of princesses, her daughter began to only wear dresses and wait for her prince, rather than running and playing around. This empirical evidence relates to any mother, father, or caretaker and shows one example on how young girls grow up too soon. Never fat or have blemishes, princesses, in general, always seem “done up.” As stated in the article, Hanes provides numerous of statistics that show the result of the Princess Effect. For example, according to the University of Central
Florida a poll found that “50 percent of 3 to 6 year olds worry that they are fat” (510). By giving the readers proven evidence, Hanes's credibility increases.

One effective feature of the article that really stands out is organization. After a very brief introduction, the body of the essay presents Hanes evaluating four main points of sexualizing youth. Introduced in large, bold font, each point introduces a new aspect, immediately followed by Hane’s response. For example, she addresses her first belief, “Soccer Heading Makes a Bad Hair Day,” and goes in depth with a research, from Washington-based Center on Education Policy, showing the performance of girls in various subjects. She continues on, explaining that, “women perform just as well as men,” and “sports can be linked to lower teen pregnancies and higher body image” (511). This user-friendly format, allows readers to clearly see what commonly held beliefs are addressed and what stance the author takes on them and why. Organized in both an efficient and effective manner, the article separates the key points and lays out a structure for the audience.

In addition to her use of an effective organizing structure, Hanes also uses some of the rhetorical appeals. She uses logos by providing factual information in response to each point about the sexualization concerns. In fact, each of these points function as an assertion, as do Hane’s responses. For example, according to Hanes, “the American Academy of Pediatrics recommends very strongly that infants should have no screen time,” and “screen time should be limited as a child grows” (512). However, Hanes shows that, “sexualization is unpreventable for multiple reasons,” and even though parents may limit screen time, the sexualization of women stays evident, since no one can control what children view on their own in public spaces (512). She includes many examples, varying from schools, magazines, radios, and billboards, that also
can have a role of sexualization in society.

Hanes’s tone helps readers understand and perhaps agree with her views. Her tone produces a more greater effect than the historical facts she presented. In addition, her word choices seem deliberated and intended as she makes her readers feel her anger towards self-objectification, cyberbullying, and unhealthy body images. For example, in referring to the sexualization in marketing aspect, she uses words and phrases such as “attract,” “popularity,” “age compression,” “ubiquitous,” and “unprecedented” (514). In the concluding paragraph, Hanes uses an ironic tone to show that parents need to evaluate themselves before looking at their children when referring to the constant use of cell phones or social media. Hanes must have thought that a critical tone would help readers see the truth about the media’s impact on a girl's life.

The author’s main use of pathos is closely connected to her tone, but also seen in her focus on advancements of a human. For example, in one paragraph, speculation as to why “thong underwear is sold to 7 year olds,” or “ padded bras showing up on the racks for 5 year olds,” can raise many opposing views (514). By giving this example, Hanes probably hoped to make readers angry at the marketing establishments and make them reconsider their own assumptions about the morality of the sexualization of young girls. On another note, regarding to gender divisions, Professor Brown, mentioned by Hanes, gives her theory as, “there being no equivalent ‘pink’ for boys” (514). This opens up the concept of “boys having far more options of how to define themselves,” and ultimately defends the fact that a girl conforms easily to standards - liking pink, wearing makeup, and being skinny (514). This and other similar examples are used by Hanes to elicit emotional responses from her readers, the most likely being anger and shame.
Hanes’s article, both interesting and persuasive, shows concern of girls growing up too soon thoroughly. The strategies she uses are effective and would easily persuade readers to reconsider their assumptions about the Disney Princess Effect on young girls. Still, she could have made it a stronger argument by using more of her own personal connection to the matter at hand, by giving insight into her own life and experiences. The points she makes can open up more accusations and theories how small things, such as Disney Princesses, result in an impactful way.
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