

Gender Role Ideology in Pixar's "Wall-E" and "Monsters University"

Putri, R.T.

English for Creative Industry, Faculty of Letters, Petra Christian University, Siwalankerto 121-131, Surabaya 60236, East Java, INDONESIA
Email: rosaliatp1994@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Animation films have increasingly evolved throughout the years. No longer just a medium to convey stories, films also become an agent to express one's beliefs. In this thesis, I discuss how Pixar demonstrates their ideal gender role through their films, *Wall-E* and *Monsters University*, with the assumption that Pixar deconstructs traditional gender role to show Pixar's belief that a character can only be successful when he or she is able to adopt traits from both extremes. In order to accomplish this, I use gender role theory. In the analysis, I find out that both films's existing ideology is that masculine gender role traits are put in higher hierarchy. However, the main characters's characterization shows gender role traits which debunk the existing ideology such that both masculine and feminine traits become equally important to adopt. As a result, I can see that Pixar supports androgyny through their main characters. I also discover that their ideology can be used for increasing their profit income.

Key words: Pixar, films, *Wall-E*, *Monsters University*, gender role

INTRODUCTION

Film has increasingly become inseparable part of our lives as they become, not just a mean for entertainment, but also for learning. "Everything I learned, I learned from the movies" said one of the most beautiful actress of all time, Audrey Hepburn. The quote is aptly put as researchers, too, agree with her regarding the impact films have in our life. Today, some of box office record-breakers are children animation films. One of the biggest hits in 2013, *Frozen*, "scored the top Thanksgiving debut of all time with a five-day gross of \$93 million" beating the previous fourteen years record-holder, another animation film titled *Toy Story 2* (McClintock, 2013). Furthermore, I can see that animation has flourished so much such that nowadays, it is not only children who watch children animations, but adults as well. For example, 17-24 year old young adult makes up 40% out of the non-family viewers of 2010 animated film, *Toy Story 3* (Hugel, 2013). Thus, it shows that the genre is reaching further and becomes more popular by the year.

Amongst the many animation studios currently existing, Pixar Animation Studios is deemed to be one of the most reputable studios. Pixar have proved to be a major powerhouse in the industry their films managed to get multiple awards such as Academy Award and Oscar. With such a sparkly track record, their name offers a guarantee of an entertaining movie with a message (Germain, 2010), like a renowned brand. Thus, people—not just children but also teenagers and even adults—flocks to watch their creations. This ensures a big number of audience for their films, and hence, whatever ideology that they have put into their films—from what people can and should do to how they portray what kind of behaviour is apt for a character from a certain background—will reach and affect a lot of people.

Indeed, Pixar always have something to tell us in each of their films, but it is not just their stories. Their films display interesting view in their ideology regarding who should have masculine and feminine characteristics. This strikes me the most in two films: *Wall-E*, and *Monster University*. These two films are thought-provoking due to several points I found while watching. The characters characterization compared to their role in the film is interesting. On one side, I can see an atypical male character, Wall-E, who looks weak and shy, and on the other side there is EVE who seems robust and domineering. Yet, the male character is still the hero in the movie. On top of that, we see a female character takes the role as a mere sidekick to the male hero. This makes me wonder why Pixar puts the characterization of the characters opposing the gender roles they assume in the film. Wall-E in particular is a puzzle to me as

sometimes he looks so weak but on some other time, he can seem so strong. This makes me wonder what Pixar is trying to do with him; not to mention that he is also the main character in the film, and thus can be seen as the most important tool to convey whatever Pixar wants to say. Therefore, the jumbled up message regarding gender role piques my curiosity to delve deeper into *Wall-E*'s world and the main character, Wall-E.

Similarly, *Monsters University* puzzles me while I watch. On one side, I notice how there are more male students. However, the monster standing on top of it all in the film is a female monster called Dean Abigail Hardscrabble. I find it interesting due to the contrast that exists there. Furthermore, I discover that the contrast is also present in the characters's characterization. I can see that the dean is bold even though she is a woman and women are traditionally seen as timid. There is also Mike himself who is a male monster but acts like a good mother for his fraternity. It is interesting for me to see how the two characters's role seems to be reversed. I find Mike is more interesting, though, as he as a main character is well documented and therefore there is more of him that is shown and makes me curious. Thus, I believe that looking deeper into *Monsters University* will be fruitful.

Looking at the two films and their characters, Pixar may be deconstructing the traditional gender roles. Deconstruction is an approach that aims to discover the instability of an underlying assumption in a text. Consequently, the different points of interest in the two films lead me into asking how Pixar shows their gender role ideals.

In order to find out how Pixar demonstrates their gender role ideals, I will use the gender role theory in my thesis. Coined in 1955 by John Money, gender role is defined as "the role or behaviour learned by a person as appropriate to their gender, determined by the prevailing cultural norms" (gender role, n.d.), or in layman term, it is how a person from a certain gender group is expected to behave or be. Below is a compact list of general traits from feminine and masculine gender roles:

Feminine traits	Masculine traits
Supportive	Dominant, seeking social dominance
Passive, timid	Aggressive, bold
Emotional (in touch with emotions more)	Rational (in touch with ration more)
Cautious	Prone to take risks, reckless
Nurturing	Protective
	Strong

Table 1: Summary of Feminine and Masculine traits

Gender role itself deals a lot with the ideology of a society. Ideology is underlying assumptions which affect how the society think and react. As the roles are decided by the prevailing cultural norms, underlying assumptions which run deep in a society have a major impact. Therefore, in my analysis, I will focus on the ideology of the two films. After pre-analysis phase, I find gender ideology exists in the two films and it greatly impacts the world and the characters of the films. Hence, I focus on analyzing the gender role ideology. For easeness-sake, from now on, the ideology I refer to in my whole thesis is gender ideology.

From the traits above, I will firstly use several traits in order to analyze the ideology of two films. Second, I will use the traits to analyze the characterization of the respective main characters. I will then proceed to compare the results of the two parts in order to see how Pixar demonstrates their gender role ideals.

MASCULINITY AS THE GENDER ROLE IDEOLOGY

In each film, there exists a certain gender role ideology which the characters subconsciously follow. It dictates how they act, think, and respond to the different traits of a certain gender role group. *Wall-E* and *Monsters University* seem to have the same ideology in their universe: masculine gender role traits appear to be considered as of higher hierarchy. Consequentially, the society in the two films put more importance in the masculine traits because they are considered to be the ones that can lead a character to be successful in their respective universe.

Wall-E's universe appears to take having entirely masculine traits as its gender role ideology because it makes the robots successful. In *Wall-E*'s universe, being 'successful' focuses on making humans' lives better which is what every robots' directives ultimately aim to achieve. 'Better' here can be in the form of a more convenient life or safer life. From the robots, I am able to see what the gender role ideology of the society in the film is. The gender role ideology can be seen through how the robots embody the traits of being logic-oriented, strong, and dominant which are all a part of masculine traits (Schmitt, 2008).

Firstly, the robots are logic-oriented in the way they put efficiency and directive as their top priority. The directives for each type of robots are different, but they all serve to make humans's lives better in Axiom. Since robots are able to cut the time and energy that humans need to exert in order to get their grooming done, I can see that robots are efficient in Axiom. An interesting point about the robots's activity is that all they really care for is to do their job: to make humans's lives easier. Due to this, I can see that, in the name of efficiency, the robots will ignore other parts of humans, namely the bond and emotion, in order to fulfill their directive as fast and good as possible. As such, it is visible that efficiency is a priority for the robots.

The robots's logic-orientedness is shown also from how babies are raised in Axiom. In the gigantic spaceship, raising babies is just another chore for the robots to do. Having babies being taken care of by the robots can be considered for the better of the humans since it is easier for the parents. It is understandable as it is the most convenient for the parents they will not need to trouble themselves because the babies, from early age, are left with the teacher robot. By making the parents's lives easier, the robots manage to fulfill their ultimate directive—to make humans' lives better. Therefore, as efficiency is put as of high priority, the film has the gender role ideology that a character is successful when he or she adopts one of the masculine traits, being efficient.

Secondly, the gender role ideology is visible from the strength of the robots. Physically sturdy and armed with destructive laser beam, EVE is a great example for this trait. Although she is supposed to be female, who traditionally is linked to a gentle and physically weak trait, she is able to chain-destroy large freighter ships with her beams. Over all, EVE looks like she is built to be ready for battle due to how sturdy she is. This is aligned with her role as a probe robot as the physical strength is necessary to be successful also because it helps her to protect herself and the plant. Hence, strength becomes a valued trait in order to become successful in carrying the robots's directives.

All in all, it can be seen that *Wall-E*'s gender role ideology is to have masculine traits through analyzing the robots in the film. In terms of metaphysical hierarchy, having masculine traits is of higher importance compared to having any other gender role traits. This means that feminine gender role traits is considered unimportant in *Wall-E*'s society. This existing gender ideology may be brought about by the shift of power in *Wall-E*'s universe. Before the timeline of the film, I can see that humans are in power above the robots. Robots are just workers for the humans, and humans, as we know, are capable of bonds and emotion. However, as time goes by and humans move to Axiom, humans become more and more dependent; they are unable to do anything without the robots, such that robots run the town. Subsequently, robots who are cold and put priority on objectives become the ones with power. Therefore, masculine gender role traits are put in higher hierarchy.

As for *Monsters University*, having chiefly masculine gender role traits in order to be a successful character is the gender role ideology. In the universe of *Monsters University*, having masculine traits is considered to be the one that can lead or mark the characters to be successful as it is what can keep the society alive. The society gets the necessary power by sending Scarers scare children to get scream energy, which make them the heroes since they brave the dangers to power the whole society. In *Monsters University* (MU), those who are considered cream of the crop of the university's society are those who were or will be a great Scarer. These monsters have similar traits which can be considered the traits of a successful monster: socially dominant and aggressive which are both the traits of masculine gender role (Schmitt, 2008).

Monsters University's gender role ideology is shown through the social dominance of a Scarer. Social dominance in this case can be in the form of fame, respect given by others, or hierarchy in the

society. Scarers in general are shown to be famous and respected by the characters. This is to no surprise as Scarers are the backbones of the society. Those who are marked as successful monsters in MU are also respected members of the university. Two monsters can be considered good example: Johnny Worthington and Dean Abigail Hardscrabble. As the president of MU's top fraternity Roar Omega Roar (ROR) in which only best Scare students can join, Johnny proves he is one of the top dogs. Also, the dean's fame as one of the top Scarers and also the head of the prestigious scare program makes her one of the leading monsters as well. From these two characters, I am able to see that monsters who hold leadership roles—and thus, social dominance in MU society—are also great Scarer-to-be or used to be a good Scarer. Therefore, this shows me that social dominance is a mark of a successful monster.

Additionally, the gender role ideology can be seen from the top monsters's aggressiveness as revealed through their appearance and action. In regards to their outer look, one way that aggressiveness is shown is through having sharp body features such as prominent spikes. Having sharp body features is considered manly, but not just that, it can be considered dangerous or aggressive as well, which is a part of masculine trait, due to the menacing look. Moreover, pointy features have the feeling of 'attack' as it reminds us of a weapon such as sword or spear. Both Johnny and the dean display this characteristic in their spiky appearance. The reason that this type of appearance can be a cue is because of what a Scarer does. A Scarer scares, so they need to be scary, and a Scarer's appearance contributes a lot in the fear factor. Hence, the aggressiveness in terms of appearance becomes one of the major reasons for a monster to be successful in *Monsters University* universe.

In addition, the monsters's aggressiveness can also be seen through how the monsters actively maintain their social dominance. Being aggressive means that the monster is on the offense or actively tries to do something against another monster in order to achieve their purpose, which in this case is to keep their social status quo. The aggressiveness here is not physical such as a punch or a kick but more on how the top monsters take down those who they deem unworthy of similar position in a social hierarchy level; that way, they are able to keep their social dominance. Both the dean and Johnny express aggressiveness against different characters to keep their status quo as top Scarers. This kind of aggressiveness is necessary for monsters to be successful because it acts as a filter. Not everyone can be a Scarer due to the risks involved. Through the aggressiveness of the existing legendary Scarer and best Scarer-to-be, the quality of future Scarers can be maintained, thus leading to consistent flow of energy intake. Hence, aggressiveness shows the gender role ideology in the film.

Thus, I am able to see that having masculine traits is of essence in *Monsters University* because it can lead them to be successful monsters as Scarers. Due to this, having mainly masculine traits becomes the gender role ideology in *Monsters University's* universe. Seeing the gender role ideology in terms of its metaphysical hierarchy, masculine gender role is of higher place because of how important it is in the society. Subsequently, it is clear that feminine gender role traits are of lower ground. It seems to be deemed as unnecessary in the society because it cannot lead the monsters to be successful monsters—Scarers.

CHARACTERIZATION REVEALING THE INSTABILITY OF THE IDEOLOGY

Albeit the pre-existing gender role ideology, the main characters of the two films reveal to us that the ideology is inconsistent in practice as their lives prove how the ideology is not entirely true. The concept of how masculine traits are of higher hierarchy becomes questionable because, for the main characters, being masculine is not enough; they are unable to be the successful characters in their society by following the existing ideology. In this section, I will first look at the characteristics of the respective main character. Then, I will look into how the gender role traits, which the main characters display, show the instability in the ideology.

Wall-E's existence in *Wall-E* universe reveals the instability in the gender role ideology of the film. As a start, we need to look into his characteristics. Wall-E is a dominantly feminine male robot as shown through firstly how sentimental he is. Most of his actions are based on emotion rather than reason or logic like other robots. One example is how, when EVE comes, he abandons his job. Since EVE arrives, all we see in the film is Wall-E trying to get close to her by following her around and wooing

her by creating a statue for her. His feelings for her cause him to abandon his directive. Through this, it can be observed how his feelings can even override a strong impulse, to fulfill his directive. Another example is how he is so entranced by the scene of a couple singing while holding hands that he just stays and stares, burning the scene into his memory. His fascination is to the extent that he repeatedly requests holding hands with EVE. In view of this, I can see that he is captivated by the idea of love, another form of emotion. Hence, Wall-E is definitely an emotion-centric robot.

Aside from being sentimental, I can see Wall-E is mainly feminine from how timid he is. He is easily spooked, often seen hiding or even trembling particularly in front of something foreign. For example, when he sees the picture of a sun in Axiom, he is so spooked that he almost hides his eyes into his body, like a turtle's defense mechanism.

On top of his timidity, he is also physically weak. His only source of destructive power is a small laser that he uses for work. Although it can be used to destroy something, the power is not that big. Also, compared to the other robots, he is vastly less sophisticated. For example, his method of movement is outdated compared to the rest: flying and floating. It can also be seen when he and EVE each is holding a bulb: Wall-E cannot make it light up, but EVE can. This may mean that his energy system is older and less powerful. Hence, he can be considered weak.

As observable, Wall-E, the hero of the society, is mainly feminine. This is misaligned with the gender role ideology of the society that a character is to be mainly masculine to be successful as, not just Wall-E is mainly feminine but his feminine traits also help immensely in his journey to help the humans. For example, his emotion-orientedness provides him with much needed help throughout his journey by allowing him to forge bonds with robots and humans around him. That becomes his ultimate weapon to be a hero. The fact that Wall-E's feminine trait, emotion-oriented, is the major cause of him becoming a hero is completely misaligned with the gender role ideology. Moreover, he is a dominantly feminine hero in a universe where masculine traits is held in high regards. This puts doubt on the ideology as it is no longer possible to say that the concept of "being a successful character" is in being dominantly masculine. Thus, Wall-E reveals how the existing gender ideology in *Wall-E* is inconsistent. On top of that, Wall-E introduces the possibility of feminine gender role traits as being more important, which will completely overturn the prevailing hierarchy in the existing ideology. However, when I take a closer look, the fact that Wall-E is a dominantly feminine robot does not mean that masculinity does not help either.

Along the way, Wall-E develops a masculine trait: reckless. This development also helps him to be a successful character in the film's universe. An important thing to note, though, that, although Wall-E picks up the masculine trait, he is still dominantly feminine; these traits are born due to his emotion-orientedness which is his major trait. This is visible from how he only exhibits masculinity when he is involved with certain subjects such as EVE—either helping her to fulfill her directive or wanting to be with her. Hence, the masculine trait is just a temporary part of him.

Wall-E's first newly-acquired trait, recklessness, helps to push him into action to continue in his path as a hero. Reckless means "showing lack of danger and the possible result of (one's) actions" (reckless, n.d.). Similarly, Wall-E often disregards the dangers of his actions, but in Wall-E's case, he does not care about the result his actions has on himself. He first displays this when he follows EVE by holding onto the spaceship that takes her away. This is careless of him due to the high risk it holds; he may fall from the sky or drift off in space if somehow his hold is loose and not to mention that he does not seem to know the concept of space as shown by his surprise regarding no-gravity space. Still, he does not consider any of this, choosing to follow EVE. This shows how he is reckless since he endangers himself. Furthermore, his recklessness helps to make him a hero by making him sacrifice himself to let the humans come back to earth despite how it ends up killing him. Thus, his recklessness ends up helping him to be a hero by probing him to act.

Through the closer reading, I am able to see that masculine trait also helps Wall-E to finish his job just the same like that of feminine trait. The two traits actually intertwine as without both sides together within him, Wall-E will not be able to succeed. For example, if Wall-E is not emotion-centric, he will not be able to get help from the characters around him. Similarly, if he is not reckless, he will not

be able to even start the journey. In the end, this synergy between the two groups of traits is necessary for Wall-E to pave his way as a successful character in *Wall-E*'s universe. This fact gives way to doubt to both the existing gender ideology which puts masculine traits in higher hierarchy and the thinking I mentioned earlier where feminine traits may be more important. As Wall-E becomes a proof that both feminine and masculine traits are necessary, I can see that Pixar is showing their gender role ideal which is having both masculine and feminine traits.

As for Michael 'Mike' Wazowsky, this intelligent hardworking green monster has the same dream as many others in his society have: to be a Scarer. For him, the only way he can achieve that is through enrolling in MU's scaring program. As such, he cannot afford being expelled. However, before he can be a successful character, this dominantly-male monster faces many problems caused by his masculine traits; This is interesting as Mike, a dominantly masculine monster, should not encounter much difficulty to be successful in a society which highly regards masculine traits. The fact that he does encounter problems, particularly due to the masculine traits themselves, proofs the instability of the ideology. As a start, I will be looking into how Mike is a dominantly masculine monster. Two of his masculine traits are: aggressiveness and recklessness.

First, Mike's aggressiveness is shown through how he strives to be dominant in two different ways: as the best Scarer and socially. As a future Scarer, he proactively tries to proof he is the best in that department. This is most apparent in his rivalry with Sulley. He can be seen taunting with Sulley several times on different instances. For example, Mike taunts Sulley after being praised by their professor while Sulley is criticized. As his actions are meant to be against another monster, Sulley, this proofs that he is aggressive. Additionally, Mike also displays his insistence towards becoming dominant by putting himself in a leading role above other monsters. To illustrate, he states that he is the captain of OK's Scaring Game team to the OK members albeit being the newest member and without any appointment by the rest of the team. Hence, from these, I can see that he is an aggressive monster.

Apart from his aggressiveness, Mike is also reckless. He does not think about the consequences of his actions, both to himself and others. For example, he makes a ruckus during the end term exam which leads to him being expelled from the program. Making a lot of noise during exam is something that all students know they should not do. The fact that Mike ignores this shows how reckless he is. Likewise, he has the audacity to challenge Dean Hardscrabble's judgment. As a legendary Scarer and head of the scaring program for years, many will assume that the dean's judgment should be right and challenging that will be a foolish thing to do, particularly also because she is one of the strongest member of the university. However, Mike does not think about what will happen to him when he challenges her. This highlights how reckless he is. Additionally, he dares to break into the door laboratory, which is forbidden to unauthorized students because there are doors that lead to the poisonous human world in the lab. Still, without caring for the dangers both for him and the society he lives in, Mike enters one of the doors without permission. Hence, I can see that Mike is a reckless character.

As it can be seen, Mike is a dominantly masculine monster which should pave a way for him to be a successful character in *Monsters University* universe since the existing gender ideology puts masculine gender role traits as of higher hierarchy. Nevertheless, all that the audience is shown is how Mike fails to be successful in the majority of the film. Instead of succeeding, Mike's path to success is stopped due to his masculine traits. For example, due to his aggressiveness, he ends up being expelled from the scaring program. This happens because of his fight for dominance against Sulley which results in Dean Hardscrabble expelling them both. From this, I can see how his activeness to attain social dominance backfires. Instead of helping him, it almost gets him expelled from the university itself. This is of course a major disadvantage for someone who wants to be a Scarer. As such, his aggressiveness turns into a problem instead. Likewise, Mike's recklessness only becomes a problem for him. Due to this trait, he gets expelled from MU. Again, this will only hinder him at that time who wants to be a Scarer. Hence, his masculine traits are mostly hindrances to be a successful character.

As seen from how his personality does not lead to success, Mike reveals the instability of the gender role ideology in *Monsters University*. In a universe where it is thought that a character will be successful when she or he is dominantly masculine, Mike's existence casts doubt on that belief. Although

he is a majorly masculine character, that masculinity of his becomes a trouble instead of a help. This casts doubt on the existing gender role ideology because it is no longer possible to say that being majorly masculine can lead to the concept of "being a successful character". Yet, this also does not mean that feminine gender role traits can lead a character to be successful either, which is why it is important for me to read Mike's development of feminine trait.

In the course of the film, Mike's character grows such that he attains a feminine trait: supportiveness. Being supportive means "giving help, encouragement or sympathy to somebody" (supportive, n.d.). It can also mean the person becomes a beta, a helper of the leader in a group. For Mike, becoming supportive ends up being the trait that helps him to be successful in the society by allowing him to gain a lot of energy for the society, which is the ultimate goal of a Scarer. This is first shown when he helps OK's members to be better in The Scare Game. As a result, they perform great, and Dean Hardscrabble let them in to the scaring program. In other words, Mike has helped the university discover potential Scarers. By providing potential students, Mike also helps the society to possibly earn more energy in the future. In fact, the energy Mike can get through this method will be multiplied. As such, his supportiveness makes him a successful character.

In the light of his new trait, Mike's older traits need to be reconsidered as well. After he becomes supportive, his recklessness turns for the better. In the name of supportiveness, he takes the risk to break into a scaring company so that he can encourage his OK-mates which brings out their potential as Scarers. Albeit the risk, as it is done for someone else, it becomes a positive action instead. Consequently, it also helps him to be successful because of how his team members become potential Scarers after his reckless support. As such, his recklessness becomes a positively-impactful trait for his path to achievement. Moreover, Mike's aggressiveness becomes a great contribution to his path to success once he is able to step back and become a support instead. This trait turns into his main driving force to grow. Proactively trying to be dominant in the scaring company, Mike climbs up from just a mailman to a part of a scare team duo with Sulley. He is also called "coach" by Sulley, showing that in the team, Mike is actually the one running the show, even though Sulley is the Scarer. By becoming an assist, Mike ends up being the dominant member instead. Thus, the addition of a feminine trait assists the rest of the traits into those that brings about positive results for Mike, helping him to be successful.

The synergy between the transformed original masculine traits and newly grown feminine trait which helps Mike to reach success consequently reveals the instability of the existing gender role ideology. Since the traits that help Mike comes from both feminine and masculine, the concept of "being a successful character" can no longer be classified in either extremes of the binary oppositions of masculine and feminine. Rather than only putting one gender role as of higher hierarchy like what the existing ideology believes, Mike shows that a collaboration of traits from both group results in a success instead. Therefore, Mike shows us that Pixar's gender role ideal is for a person to adopt both masculine and feminine gender role traits.

Through these two films and main characters, Pixar has demonstrated to the audience that their gender role ideology is one that encompasses both masculine and feminine gender role. Pixar shows this through deconstructing the existing gender role ideology in the film and showing a new ideology. The existing ideology is a traditional one as it prioritizes one extreme of the gender groups. Pixar debunks that traditional ideal through creating a main character who is successful despite not following the preexisting ideals. In this way, Pixar deconstructs the existing ideology, and through that method, they are able to show what their gender role ideal is which is for a person to adopt both masculine and feminine gender role traits. This leads me to conclude that Pixar may be an advocate for androgyny. Androgyny means "having the characteristic or nature of both male and female" (Androgyny, n.d.), which clearly speaks of Wall-E and Mike when they are able to be heroes in their own society. This sounds like a great belief to have as it equally recognizes both sides. Nevertheless, it may only be a publicity stunt in the name of commercialism. Pixar's audience is largely those who are on the young side which ranges from young children to adults. These people are the ones who have been exposed to social problems regarding genders—from feminism to sexism. These problems are now still ongoing, and they are one of the most common problems in our society as many talk about it—either through social media, news, arts, or films.

Consequently, people become more interested in watching Pixar's creations because their films are pro-equality, which is the basic idea of feminism and sexism. By garnering more interest through that way, Pixar is able to crank up the number of people who like and support their films. As a result, their profit increases. Not just that, if people like and support them enough, they may buy Pixar films's merchandises which add more to the profit. Thus, I believe that Pixar's androgynous belief regarding gender role may be birthed by their commercialism.

REFERENCES

- Androgyny*. (n.d.). Retrieved May 14, 2017, from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/androgyny>
- gender role*. (n.d.). Retrieved April 6, 2016, from <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/gender-role>.
- Germain, D. (2010, June 21). '*Toy Story 3*' boasts big \$109M debut. Retrieved June 11, 2016, from <http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2010/jun/21/toy-story-3-boasts-big-109m-debut/>
- Hugel, M. (2013, December 11). *Why children's film audiences are filled with 24-year-olds*. Retrieved March 17, 2016, from <http://mic.com/articles/76207/why-children-s-film-audiences-are-filled-with-24-year-olds#.6TC4dmjXj>.
- Pixar*. (n.d.). Retrieved March 17, 2016, from <http://www.pixar.com/about/Our-Story>.
- Reckless*. (n.d.). Retrieved May 08, 2017, from <http://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/reckless?q=reckless>
- Schmitt, D. P., Voracek, M., Realo, A., & Allik, J. (2008). Why can't a man be more like a woman? Sex differences in big five personality traits across 55 cultures. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 94(1), 168-182. Retrieved April 10, 2016, from <http://www.bradley.edu/dotAsset/165918.pdf>.
- Supportive*. (n.d.). Retrieved May 10, 2017, from <http://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/supportive?q=supportive>