I wrote my historical research paper, *American Advertisement and the Revival of the Housewife, 1950-1969* for my HIST208G course, which was instructed by Derek Leininger for the spring 2015 semester. The section of the course required me to write a historical research piece that was familiar to the topic of popular culture in the United States during the twentieth century.

I began searching for my research topic for HIST208G by looking at past articles and books I read that were in relation to the subject of popular culture in the United States. One book in particular, *The Hidden Persuaders* by Vance Packard, caught my attention due to the book’s intriguing and shocking content. *The Hidden Persuaders* is about psychological and motivational manipulation that companies create in its advertisements in order to persuade customers to buy a certain product or to influence them to vote for a particular politician. From this book, I knew I wanted to write my paper on popular advertisements and the influence it had on women in American culture during the mid-twentieth century. With the assistance of my instructor, Derek, I was able to narrow down my topic to housewives and domesticity in the United States. Derek introduced me to a book, *More Work for Mother: The Ironies of Household Technology from the Open Hearth to the Microwave*, which allowed me to connect and question an important relationship between a housewife, domestic products, and advertisements. *More Work for Mothers* notes how technological advancements in domestic products ironically created more work for housewives. Connecting this notion with Packard’s book, which was published in a little over a decade after World War II, it made me question how and why women in the United States were still attached to the title of just a “housewife” after the war. During World War II, millions of women joined the labor force and acquired jobs that was once only available for men. Even then, the notion of a “housewife” came back into American culture quickly in the 1950s and 1960s. While there seems to be a discussion on how the war has liberated women in the United States from domestic duties, I question why were women then still seen to fulfill the role of a housewife in a traditional family? Why were new domestic products rapidly increasing in sales? Why were advertisements for domestic products only showing images of women and illustrating specific tropes? Through a series of questions and my own curiosity, I knew I wanted to conduct research on advertisements that targeted women. More specifically, I wanted to see how advertisements depicted women in order to sell products to a new generation of women who came back from working in the labor force.

In order for me to delve into my research, I first had to carefully select which primary and secondary resources I wanted to use from Maryland’s libraries. I first headed into Hornbake Library’s Maryland Room where I asked the librarian if I could see any sources regarding advertisements in the 1950s and 1960s. Unfortunately, the librarian told me that the Maryland Room did not carry the resources I was searching for. However, he kindly redirected to McKeldin Library informing me that I would most likely find the resources I needed in microfilm.
At McKeldin Library, I went to the reference desk where a librarian asked me if I needed any help. I informed her on the topic of my research paper and asked if I could find any sources at McKeldin that would aid me in writing my paper. The librarian gladly pointed out *Good Housekeeping* magazines that were in microfilm on the first floor of the library. When opening the drawer to see the *Good Housekeeping* magazines in microfilm, I was awed at how many microfilms there were and the vast amount of choices I had to make concerning which films to choose from. One of the biggest challenges I faced was reviewing through and narrowing down which advertisements I wanted to choose for my paper. Reviewing through several microfilms, I decided to first narrow down my search by reviewing *Good Housekeeping* magazines that were only published from 1950 to 1969. From there, I began searching for similar tropes and tactics in advertisements that were promoting domestic products such as microwaves, refrigerators, and groceries. In addition, I made the decision to only look through two magazine companies. As for microfilm, I chose *Good Housekeeping* magazines because not only did it provide a vast amount of advertisements in their magazines, but also because the magazine company itself tailored its audience towards women. Secondly, I chose to review through *LIFE* magazines from 1950 to 1969. After emailing librarian Eric Lindquist, he suggested that I look through Google Books in order for me to find digitized copies of *LIFE* magazines. Since *Good Housekeeping* magazines targeted women as its audience, I decided to also review through a magazine company that target both men and women. Through these two magazine companies, I believed that these sources provided a good balance regarding the advertisements they both provided.

Researching through the immense amount of primary resources, I realized that it is nearly impossible for one researcher to examine every primary source available on a particular topic. Despite this, I learned that a researcher’s examination of even a small amount of primary source could provide a meaningful contribution to the field of knowledge. I learned that being able to contribute to the scholarly discussion is not synonymous with using every resource available. Instead, making critical and relevant use of resources, no matter how big or small, is what makes a research paper significant. My research paper could not have been completed without Derek Leininger’s supervision and the library staff at both McKeldin and Hornbake Library. Completing the research paper was rewarding, however, the experience of writing and researching using University of Maryland resources was one that I still hold great value to.