

## Post-postfeminism?: new feminist visibilities in postfeminist times

Rosalind Gill

Department of Sociology, City University, London, UK

### ABSTRACT

This article contributes to debates about the value and utility of the notion of postfeminism for a seemingly “new” moment marked by a resurgence of interest in feminism in the media and among young women. The paper reviews current understandings of postfeminism and criticisms of the term’s failure to speak to or connect with contemporary feminism. It offers a defence of the continued importance of a critical notion of postfeminism, used as an analytical category to capture a distinctive contradictory-but-patterned sensibility intimately connected to neoliberalism. The paper raises questions about the meaning of the apparent new visibility of feminism and highlights the multiplicity of different feminisms currently circulating in mainstream media culture—which exist in tension with each other. I argue for the importance of being able to “think together” the rise of popular feminism alongside and in tandem with intensified misogyny. I further show how a postfeminist sensibility informs even those media productions that ostensibly celebrate the new feminism. Ultimately, the paper argues that claims that we have moved “beyond” postfeminism are (sadly) premature, and the notion still has much to offer feminist cultural critics.

### KEYWORDS

Postfeminism; neoliberalism; feminism; media magazines

### Introduction: feminism, postfeminism and generation

On October 2, 2015 the London *Evening Standard* (ES) published its first glossy magazine of the new academic year. With a striking red, white, and black cover design it showed model Neelam Gill in a bright red coat, upon which the words “NEW (GEN) FEM” were superimposed in bold. To the left of this, another large headline asserted “NEELAM GILL TOP GIRL: IN MY INDUSTRY WOMEN EARN MORE.” Further teasers promised “TODAY’S GENDER WARRIORS,” “HOW TO DATE A FEMINIST,” and “BOYEURISM: MEN THE NEW SEX OBJECTS” (see Figure 1)

The timing of this publication was not accidental, coinciding as it did with the beginning of the academic year in London’s many universities. On the same day, *The Times Higher* published its global rankings, highlighting the position of several London universities near the top of the international league tables, and claiming London as the world’s most important university city. As tens of thousands of students returned to studying, or started university for the first time, the London transport network was awash with free copies of the ES magazine proclaiming feminism as stylish, successful, and youthfully hip.



Figure 1. *Evening Standard* magazine cover.

In this article I seek to unpick this constellation of values linking youth (or at least youthfulness), fashion, and feminism. I will do so by starting from this ephemeral, yet emblematic, publication—a publication whose resonance in celebrating “new generation feminism” I argue goes far beyond London but connects to a wider discursive formation in the UK and many other countries in which feminism is increasingly signified within the mainstream media as “cool” (Jessalynn Keller and Jessica Ringrose 2015; Jessica Valenti 2014). I wish to discuss a series of questions connected to feminism, postfeminism, and generation, in order to think about the current cultural and political moment—a moment in which feminism has seemingly moved from being a derided and repudiated identity among young women (Christina Scharff 2013) to becoming a desirable, stylish, and decidedly fashionable one. How should we read this apparent shift? What place does the notion of postfeminism have at a moment in which feminism has seemingly become hip? Is postfeminism irrelevant in these new times? Are we now *post-postfeminism*?

In addressing these questions, the paper seeks to respond to a number of recent discussions about the “new cultural life of feminism” (*Diffractions* 2016) and suggestions that postfeminism needs to be “problematized” (Jessalynn Keller and Maureen Ryan 2014) because “emergent feminisms” pose a “challenge to postfeminist media culture” (Jessalynn Keller and

Maureen Ryan 2015). Engaging with these ideas I will make a case for the continued relevance of postfeminism as an analytical category in media studies. Responding to the claim that postfeminism lacks analytic purchase for engaging with a moment characterized by a resurgence of interest in feminism, the paper seeks to engage with current mainstream media constructions of feminism and to unpick some of the complexities of a cultural moment seemingly characterized by a multiplicity of (new and old) feminisms which co-exist with revitalized forms of anti-feminism and popular misogyny. The paper disputes the idea that the concept of postfeminism has nothing to offer in reading the current moment and aims to show how some of the popular mediated feminism circulating is in fact distinctively postfeminist in nature. I suggest the need to make distinctions between different kinds of (mediated) feminism, arguing that the corporate/neoliberal feminism (Catherine Rottenberg 2014) of *Lean In* (Sheryl Sandberg 2013) may have little in common with—and indeed may be antithetical to—the activist feminism of those protesting budget cuts to women’s services or deportation of migrants. I posit that these feminisms may in turn be remote from dominant media constructions of feminism as a youthful, stylish identity.

Questions of generation are implicit in this paper as I seek to respond to suggestions that postfeminism is outdated as an analytical concept. Feminist scholarship does not exist outside of fashion, nor outside the pressures of contemporary neoliberal academia, that may contribute both to the investments that each of us has in particular critical vocabularies, as well as to the need for the “new,” the fresh, the unique. Whilst recognizing that generation shapes life experiences in profound ways, I am troubled by the idea of using “generations” as a lens both because I am mindful of feminism’s regular “generation wars,” and deeply informed by an ethics and politics concerned with how we “tell feminist stories” (Clare Hemmings 2011). Generational framings—including critical ones like this special issue—seem perennially to risk pulling us back into polarized positions characterized by mistrust and suspicion on both sides (and why are there always only two sides, rather than three or four generations?). That is not what I want to do. The scholars whose work I engage are feminists I like and admire; people whose new publications enthuse and excite me. Moreover, even beyond the ethical concerns, it seems to me that a focus on *political and ideological differences* within feminism is more empirically relevant and productive than one that relates to birth dates. Rather than fuelling intergenerational animosity, then, my aim is to contribute to the building of an intersectional understanding of postfeminism that can be used critically in making sense of contemporary culture. It will not tell us everything, to be sure, and it should not be the only term in our critical lexicon, but it does still have something to offer those who wish to make sense of the complexities of contemporary mediations of gender, alongside issues of gendered inequality and power relations.

## Interrogating postfeminism

Over the last three decades, the notion of postfeminism has become a key term in feminists’ critical vocabulary (e.g., Ann Brooks 1997; Vicki Coppock, Deena Haydon, and Ingrid Richter 1995; Sarah Gamble 2004; Sabine Genz and Benjamin B. Brabon 2009; Tania Modleski 1991; Sarah Projansky Projansky, 2001; Yvonne Tasker and Diane Negra 2007). The term is contested and has been characterized in various different ways: as a backlash against feminism, to refer to an historical shift—a time “after” (second wave) feminism; to capture a sense of an epistemological break within feminism, suggesting an alignment with other “post”

movements (poststructuralism, postmodernism, and postcoloniality); and to propose connections to the Third Wave. In two formulations that have been influential within feminist media and cultural studies, postfeminism (McRobbie 2009) and, in my own terms, as a “sensibility” (Rosalind Gill 2007b), deeply enmeshed with neoliberalism. According to this perspective, postfeminism is a critical analytical term that refers to empirical regularities or patterns in contemporary cultural life, which include the emphasis on individualism, choice, and agency as dominant modes of accounting (Laura Thompson and Ngaire Donaghue 2014); the disappearance—or at least muting—of vocabularies for talking about both structural inequalities and cultural influence (Elisabeth Kelan 2009; Scharff 2013); the “deterritorialisation” of patriarchal power and its “reterritorialisation” (McRobbie 2009) in women’s bodies and the beauty-industrial complex (Ana Elias, Rosalind Gill, and Christina Scharff 2016); the intensification and extensification of forms of surveillance, monitoring, and disciplining of women’s bodies (Gill 2007b); and the influence of a “makeover paradigm” that extends beyond the body to constitute a remaking of subjectivity—what I have recently characterized as a central part of the “psychic life of postfeminism” (Rosalind Gill forthcoming). Crucially, as McRobbie (2009) among others has argued, postfeminism is involved in the *undoing* of feminism.

However, the value of postfeminism as a critical term has been called into question recently by a number of scholars (Catharine Lumby 2011; Imelda Whelehan 2010). Amongst them are several scholars who have worked productively with the notion, yet who point out that the heightened visibility of feminist activism, alongside a growing sense that feminist questions and issues increasingly take up space within the mediated public sphere, should give us pause for thought. In this changed context, analysis of postfeminism is cast as out of date, “falling short,” and in need of “problematization” (Keller and Ryan 2015). As Keller and Ryan (2014) put it in a recent call for papers:

Over the past two years feminist politics have become increasingly prevalent within popular media cultures, complicating the logic that feminism is in retreat. This visibility can be mapped across a range of media texts ... Postfeminism falls short of adequately accounting for these complicated politics, as well as the internal dynamics of various forms of feminisms currently visible across media culture.

Elsewhere, Hanna Retallack, Jessica Ringrose, and Emilie Lawrence (2016) suggest the need to “interrogate some of the core ideas of postfeminism as theorised by media scholars,” arguing that postfeminism is “potentially redundant” in the light of “fourth wave” social media-based feminist activism. In turn, Diane Negra (2014, 275) notes “we now need to inquire whether/how accounts of gender developed in an earlier era still apply.”

This work raises important questions about the extent to which existing conceptual vocabularies are up to the task of reading and engaging with change. For the contemporary feminist analyst, the current moment—by which I mean variously, this year, this month, and *right now*—must rank as one of the most bewildering in the history of sexual politics. The more one looks, listens, and learns, the more complicated it seems. Whilst some choose to offer linear stories of progress or backlash, with their associated affects of hope or despair, for most the situation seems too complicated for such singular narratives: for every uplifting account of feminist activism, there is another of misogyny; for every feminist “win,” an outpouring of hate, ranging from sexual harassment to death threats against those involved; for every instance of feminist solidarity, another of vicious trolling.

Every temporary stabilization, when the blurring pixels offer up a momentary glimpse of clarity, feels like a comforting illusion. But it is never long before the image is dancing again—and I (and I’m sure it is not *just* me) am screwing up my eyes, and squinting, trying to make sense of it all. Only a few years ago, in the tenth anniversary issue of this journal, I was bemoaning the disappearance of the word “sexism” from our collective vocabulary, and urging that “it is time to get angry again.” Since then “sexism” has become a key term again—thanks to campaigns in and beyond the UK, such as the “Everyday Sexism Project” (<http://everydaysexism.com>) and “Hollaback” (<http://www.ihollaback.org>). There has also been an outpouring of feminist rage about everything from “lad culture” on university campuses, to female genital cutting, to the gender composition of our democratic institutions. Questions about gender inequality suffuse the mediated public sphere: on any given day, in the UK at least, there will be news stories about instances of sexual harassment, inequalities in pay, the gender make-up of company boards or political parties, the sexualized treatment of female celebrities, the “confidence gap” between girls and boys, etc.

One critique made of analysts of postfeminism, then, has been—to put it in colloquial terms—that they do not “get this,” have not sufficiently attended to how much has changed, but remain stuck in a “dominant” refrain about “feminism in retreat” (Keller and Ryan 2014). Whelehan (2010, 159) captures the affective qualities of this, writing of her feeling of “frustration ... boredom and ennui” with the notion, a sense both of stating the obvious and “tilting at windmills.” In a more upbeat vein, Keller and Ryan point to the new visibility of feminism:

This visibility can be mapped across a range of media texts; Beyonce’s 2013 self-titled album, Lena Dunham’s HBO television hit *Girls*, and Tavi Gevinson’s website *Rookie* are only a few examples. Indeed, the mainstreaming of discussions of gender and feminism across media further highlights this shift, with media coverage of rape culture and online misogyny, the #YesAllWomen campaign, and the lack of strong female film characters producing public discourse within the past year that traversed mainstream and alternative media.

Keller and Ryan highlight a key issue: that as feminist scholars we are in a seemingly “new” situation—or at least one with some novel features—for which new understandings are needed. Where a few years ago it sometimes felt difficult to make *any* feminist arguments “stick” in the media (Sara Ahmed 2004), today it seems as if *everything* is a feminist issue. Feminism has a new luminosity in popular culture. Like Keller and Ryan and others, I am excited to greet new scholarship—including their own—that can grapple with and understand this situation. Like them I have long argued that media are key sites for feminist ideas with “much of what counts as feminist debate in Western countries today tak[ing] place in the media rather than outside” (Gill 2007a, 268). What is at stake, however, is how we make sense of this and what critical tools and concepts we require. In the remainder of this article I want to engage with the important questions raised about “postfeminism” but argue that it remains a powerful term for our critical vocabulary as feminists. I will begin by asking questions about the complicated nature of the new visibility of feminism, then discuss contrasting characterizations of the term postfeminism, and finally offer a brief analysis of a current mainstream magazine’s “feminism issue” in order to highlight the tenacity of post-feminist ideas even as they sit alongside celebrations of youthful, hip feminism.

## Uneven feminist visibilities

To be sure, feminism has a visibility in media culture that it did not have even a few years ago, and we are currently witnessing a resurgence of feminist discourse and activism as well as a renewed media interest in feminist stories. Comments and observations that would, in the recent past, have been dismissed as a “yawn”—too tedious or uninteresting to make the news—are “stories” again (for now)—though it would be premature, in my view, to see this as in any way indicative of the media “becoming” feminist; it is part of a cyclical—and sometimes cynical—process.<sup>1</sup> However, even accepting it in the most optimistic terms, e.g., as a “feminist zeitgeist,” it is worth trying to unpick and disentangle the profoundly uneven visibilities of different feminisms in media culture. My aim here, to be clear, is not to examine “feminism” as a set of ideas or commitments or activist practices, but rather to look—very briefly—at how different feminisms *materialize in media culture*—in order to reflect upon feminism’s new visibility.

### Feminist issues in the media

At the most general level, we can point to the current—heightened—attention accorded to (some) feminist issues in the media, compared with the earlier part of this decade. These might range from coverage of Hilary Clinton’s campaign for the US presidency, to the current preoccupation with (white, middle/upper class) women on boards, and reporting of the gender pay gap amongst Hollywood actors and actresses. Celebrity-suffused campaigns such as Emma Watson’s participation in HeForShe (<http://www.heforshe.org>) or Angelina Jolie’s UNHCR work also garner extensive media space. Increasingly, NGOs, activist groups, and transnational bodies like the UN work within, rather than outside, the values of celebrity culture (Ofra Koffman, Shani Orgad, and Rosalind Gill 2015), and the relationship of feminism and celebrity has become a key topic for analysis (e.g., *Celebrity Studies* special issue 2015 [see Hannah Hamad and Anthea Taylor 2015]).

Debates about women’s representation in different fields are also prominent—primarily organized around talk of numbers, and recycling a restricted and predictable set of topics related to “positive discrimination” (quotas, hiring practices, women-only shortlists, and so on). Read, watch, or take part in some of these newsroom or current affairs discussions and the themes become very familiar: “merit not gender is the most important thing”/“isn’t it hard for women to know they only got there because of their gender”/“what about men?” etc.

Sexism itself is also a contemporary media issue par excellence, with the “row” the predominant form. At the time of copyediting this article “sofagate” had just broken out in the UK, centred around the BBC’s decision to give a junior male reporter the more culturally valued “left side of the sofa” position on breakfast television, even though his female colleague is considerably more experienced. Reporting of the issue shared many of the features of media sexism rows—above all, their tendency to both trivialize and personalize the issue of sexism. It remains relatively rare for serious discussion of sexism to be given space in mainstream media—an exception is former Australian Premier Julia Gillard’s famous misogynist speech (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SOPsxpMzYw>) (Ngairé Donaghue 2015).

With some exceptions, sexism is generally framed within the media—even when it is taken seriously—as an individual rather than structural or systemic issue, let alone as



connected to other inequalities or located in the broader context of neoliberal capitalism. The UK's *Guardian* newspaper exemplifies this trend with its perennial recycling of the "is it ok to call yourself a feminist if you get married/shave your legs/go on a diet (etc.)" style of article in which apparently feminist credentials are held up to hand-wringing scrutiny.<sup>2</sup> Whilst welcoming the heightened visibility of feminist discussion in the mediated public sphere, it is worth noting the way in which many feminist media storms arrive *always-already trivialized*, be they about "twerking," footballers' private emails, inappropriate comments about a LinkedIn profile, or the latest feminist-baiting outburst from Donald Trump. As Joshua Gamson (1998) argued in relation to queer politics, it is worth asking not just about the amount of visibility but also about the *kinds of visibility* on offer in any seemingly "democratized" media space.

### ***Feminist activism***

The contemporary currency of various forms of emergent or ongoing feminist activism—ranging from eco-feminism to socialist-feminist anti-austerity activism, to migrant anti-deportation campaigns, to sex worker activism, queer and trans engagements, and many others—has generated relatively limited coverage (beyond social media), with some notable exceptions such as SlutWalk. Occasionally a feminist protest will break through, as in the widescale UK reporting in 2014 of a group of working class (and mainly homeless) women who occupied an East London tower block after they were evicted (FocusE15.org). But this example remains unusual in mainstream news media in which coverage of major social movements such as Occupy or Black Lives Matter is still predominantly focussed on men, and often obscures or minimizes the vibrant feminist activism within such political formations.

The "attention" feminist activism generates is uneven, in ways that relate to established "news values" such that an individual carrying her mattress on her back to a Columbia University graduation in order to protest her rape and the university's failure to act (Lauren Gambino 2015), or a "spectacular" protest like Sisters Uncut's red carpet action (Olivia Marks 2015) at the London premiere of the film *Suffragette* will generate vastly more coverage than typical demonstrations, marches, or petitions, even if the latter involve significantly more people. Visibility is also related to the ideological complexion of the politics and the campaign's degree of challenge to the status quo (Rottenberg 2014). In this respect the space given to "I am Malala" and "Bring back our girls" might be unsurprising as they represent "comfortable" feminist campaigns for Western/Northern audiences steeped in racist and colonial discourse, safely projecting the need for feminism not here but "there" (Afghanistan, Pakistan, Nigeria), in a manner redolent of longstanding constructions of "Third World Woman" (Chandra Talpade Mohanty 1988) and the Orientalist fantasies of "rescue" associated with her (Koffman, Orgad, and Gill 2015; Scharff 2013). Black feminist organizations in the UK, by contrast, struggle to achieve such media prominence for their campaigns (e.g., Southall Black Sisters or Women Against Fundamentalism), reflecting an ongoing racism and classism within reporting of feminism (Terese Jonsson 2014).

It is worth noting also the proliferation of contemporary feminist campaigns that are themselves *about cultural representation*—e.g., the Representation Project (<http://therepresentationproject>), LosetheLad Mags (<http://www.losetheladsmags.org.uk>); No More Page 3 (<https://nomorepage3.wordpress.com>). But it is important also to point not only to the

significance, energy, and vibrancy of these campaigns but also to the hate, vitriol, and animosity they generate, both for the individuals involved in them, and more broadly in the mediated public sphere: the death threats, rape threats, and terrifyingly brutal misogyny meted out to women like Caroline Criado-Perez who led the campaign to ensure that women are not entirely “symbolically annihilated” (Gayle Tuchman 1978) from British banknotes (<http://www.thewomensroom.org.uk/banknotes>). As feminists, it is crucial that we hold and think *together* the different meanings and affects involved in the contemporary visibility of (some) feminist activism. This suggests that whilst it is crucial to examine responses to misogyny, as in Kaitlynn D. Mendes, Jessalynn Keller, and Jessica Ringrose’s (forthcoming 2016) work on digital feminist activism, it is also important not to lose sight of the other direction, i.e., misogynist responses to feminism (Sarah Banet-Weiser 2015c).

### **Corporate or neoliberal feminism**

The cultural significance of a kind of neoliberal feminism, exemplified by books such as *Lean In* (Sandberg 2013), *The Confidence Code* (Katty Kay and Claire Shipman 2014) and *Getting to 50/50* (Sharon Meers and Joanna Strober 2013), represents a further contemporary feminist luminosity—alongside the entry of corporate actors into the field. Having a broadly (neo) liberal feminist understanding of gender equality at their core, such key contemporary feminist texts have little in common with many other feminisms, being exponents of an individualistic, entrepreneurial ideology that is complicit with rather than critical of capitalism, and of other systems of (classed, racialized, and transnational) injustice (bell hooks 2013). They represent part of what Catherine Rottenberg and Sara Farris (2015) call, in an announcement about a special issue of *New Formations*, the “righting” of feminism (see also Alison Phipps 2014).

This version of feminism has extraordinary visibility in the media, not least through its psychologizing discourse and promotion of female “confidence,” self-love, and self-esteem as one-size-fits-all solutions to gender injustice. In recent work with Shani Orgad (Rosalind Gill and Shani Orgad 2015; see also Laura García-Favaro 2016) we have looked at how the cult(ure) of confidence locates feminism in neoliberal therapeutic terms, as a technology of self. It can be seen in advertising, in magazines such as *Cosmo* and *Elle*, and in the proliferation of apps designed to help women boost their self-esteem and self-belief in their daily lives (e.g., Leadership Pour Elles, Confidence Coach, Build Confidence, Happier, Mindfit). The way that “positive thinking has made itself useful as an apology for the crueller aspects of the market economy” (Barbara Ehrenreich 2009, 8) can also be seen in what Negra (2014) identifies as the inheritors of the 1990s and early 2000s “postfeminist conduct books” (Diane Negra 2009; Alison Winch 2011)—female centred business and celebrity texts. Maria Adamson’s (2016) perceptive analysis of this autobiography/self-help crossover genre by celebrities such as Karren Brady, Hilary Devey, and Ariana Huffington points to their saccharine bromides and their attempts to re-signify feminist politics in terms of “balance.” In these iterations of popular feminism, the solution to injustice is to work on the self rather than to work with others for social and political transformation. Thus whilst they can be pulled together with other examples to create a compelling story of feminist ascendancy—of new feminist visibility—it is imperative to interrogate such a vision. As Rachel O’Neill has argued (personal communication 2015) corporate feminism serves to stave off the emergence of new feminist movements and in particular any kind of feminist anti-capitalism, while at the



same time appearing to take feminism “into account.” In that way it is perfectly in keeping with postfeminism and provides an “acceptable face of feminism” for mainstream media.

### ***Celebrity and style feminism***

Also visible in the media landscape is a certain celebrity and style politics in which feminism has shifted from being a derided and repudiated identity (Scharff 2013) to becoming a desirable and stylish one. What we might call “the cool-ing of feminism” is widespread across the media and celebrity culture more generally—as seen in *Elle* magazine’s Feminism Issues, and the espousal of feminist values by celebrities including Emma Watson, Beyonce, Miley Cyrus, Lena Dunham, Angelina Jolie, Jennifer Lawrence, and Benedict Cumberbatch. The notorious “This is what a feminist looks like” T-shirt scandal, in which the high end sellers were shamed by revelations that it was a product of sweated labour, highlights the “disconnect” between certain “stylish” versions of contemporary feminism, and long time (socialist and anti-racist) feminist concerns about deeply unfair global flows between South and North and the rights and wellbeing of garment workers (e.g., Tansy Hoskins 2014; Naila Kabeer 2002).

Perhaps more striking than any single example of celebrity and style feminism is the sheer speed of the “recuperation” of a feminist identity and its reach and extensiveness across media culture. Such a shift is connected to notions of “the rebel sell” (Joseph Heath and Andrew Potter 2006) and “cool capitalism” (Jim McGuigan 2006). It is also connected to the power of brand culture (Sarah Banet-Weiser 2012). The author of a recent book entitled *Hot Feminist* (2015), Grazia columnist Polly Vernon, explains that her book is feminism “rebranded”: “What kind of feminist does that make me? The shavey-leggy, fashion-fixated, wrinkle averse, weight-conscious kind of feminist. The kind who likes hot pink and boys; oh, I like boys! I like boys so much ...” (2015, 13).

Aside from the relentless championing of heterosexuality, fashion-love, and consumerism that pervades “hot feminism,” this rebranded version—which shares much of its content with the women’s magazine culture from which it developed—is notable for both its affect policing (resolutely *not* angry) (see Gill forthcoming) and its *contentlessness*. It starts from the obviousness that women are as good as men, but proceeds with:

Of course, I should probably say at this juncture that I have absolutely no idea how *you* should be a feminist. None. I don’t know, and I wouldn’t begin to try to tell you. I wouldn’t *dare* tell you, indeed, and nor should anyone else, for the basic reason that you are *YOU*, which makes you a very different kettle of feminist fish from *ME*, or indeed *THEM*. There are as many ways to be a feminist as there are people who think of themselves as feminists—as many ways to be a feminist, then, as there are women. (Vernon 2015, 17–18, emphasis and capitalization in original)

This is not just feminism-lite but feminism-weightless, unencumbered by the need to have a position on anything: “modern feminism with style, without judgement” as *Hot Feminist*’s sub-title puts it. Or, perhaps more pertinently, it is a feminism that is actually encumbered by its desire *not* to be angry, *not* to be “difficult,” *not* to be “humourless”: it is positioned against the figure of the “feminist killjoy” so eloquently discussed by Sara Ahmed (2010). But it is difficult to see what being a feminist means if it is simply co-terminous with being a woman—though, as it turns out, men can be feminists too and that, according to Vernon, is so “charming” it makes her want to sleep with them (2015, 18). Naomie Harris’ recent interview in *Cosmo*, where she declares “you can absolutely be a feminist and a Bond girl”

offers another vivid example.<sup>3</sup> Of course celebrity statements about feminism or queer politics can be profoundly significant and have a huge cultural impact. However, I want to suggest that claiming a feminist *identity*—without specifying what that means in terms of some kind of *politics*—is problematic. Indeed, it is striking to see how just about *anything* in the mainstream media universe can be (re)signified as “feminist”—the covering or uncovering of the celebrity body, the sending or not sending of a “sexy” selfie, speaking about or not speaking about one’s struggles with an eating disorder/fat/low self-esteem, etc., etc. What is new here is not the contestation but the mere fact of feminism being championed as a cheer word, a positive value—yet in a way that does not necessarily pose any kind of challenge to existing social relations.

There is not space here forensically to analyse how feminism materializes in different ways in contemporary media culture (see Kaitlynn Mendes 2011). That would be a different and more ambitious project than this one—and ideally a collective one. But in this brief schematic outline I have pointed to four different kinds of “feminist visibility” in mainstream media, highlighting the fact that each of them is in itself multiple and shot through with differences and contradictions. In this way I have made a small start to responding to recent calls for engagement with this complicated moment. What seems notable is how these different feminisms make visible very specific “generations” of feminists—but also how the media foment generational discord about feminism.

As Sarah Banet-Weiser (2015a) has argued feminism is certainly “popular” right now, but this does not mean a feminist future is secure, or that feminist politics are suddenly hegemonic. Indeed, alongside all these different iterations of contemporary feminism is an equally popular misogyny, seen most vividly in online cultures from the “comments” sections of news outlets (Laure García-Favaro and Rosalind Gill 2016) to Twitter death threats to revenge porn (Michael Salter 2013), and trolling, flaming, and ebile in their varied—ugly—forms (Emma A. Jane 2014; Laura Thompson 2016), but also evident “offline” in the terrifying scale of domestic violence and sexual abuse and assault (much of which has also become newly visible in recent years) and the banal cruelty of heterosexual “pick up culture” (Rachel O’Neill 2015b, *forthcoming*). Thus as well as thinking about newly visible feminisms, we need to think also of the proliferation of new and old misogynies (Banet-Weiser 2015c; Joan Smith 1990). We also need to retain a notion of postfeminism—as I argue in the next section.

## Post-postfeminism? Theorizing continuity and change

At one point in the early to mid-2000s a kind of “postfeminist canon” seemed to be emerging, as the notion was used repeatedly to examine a subset of particular media productions: *Sex and the City*, *Ally McBeal*, and Helen Fielding’s *Bridget Jones* series were key (Jane Arthurs 2003; Amanda D. Lotz 2001; Angela McRobbie 2004; Rachel Moseley and Jacinda Read 2002). Whilst generating important insights, the focus might have suggested that the term had limited analytical purchase—i.e., only applied to a few texts—those focussed on the most privileged women. One important set of recent debates about postfeminism has been connected to its value as an intersectional concept, amidst questions about whether it speaks specifically—and exclusively—about white, Western, middle class, heterosexual, and youthful cisgendered subjects (e.g., Jess Butler 2013; Simidele Dosekun 2015; see also Rosalind Gill and Ngaire Donaghue [*forthcoming*], for longer discussion). Butler (2013) has made a powerful argument for regarding postfeminism as pertinent to the lives of black and minority

ethnic women, interrogating the tendency to associate postfeminism exclusively with whiteness. Even more recently Dosekun (2015) has argued (in this journal) for a *transnational* understanding of postfeminism that does not relegate iterations of the sensibility in the global South to mere imitations or simulacra of an originary or authentic Northern/Western phenomenon. Postfeminism's classed dimensions have also been addressed in a growing body of work on gender and austerity (Kim Allen and Heather Mendick 2013; Elizabeth Nathanson 2013; Diane Negra and Yvonne Tasker 2014). Moreover, in the recent upsurge of interest in gender and ageing, the predominant focus upon youthful femininities and the luminosity of young women (Anita Harris 2004; McRobbie 2009) has been challenged by accounts that show how postfeminist media culture also hails middle aged and older women (Joanna Dolan and Estella Tincknell 2012; Deborah Jermyn and Susan Holmes 2015; Imelda Whelehan and Joel Gwynne 2014). Postfeminism, then, is increasingly theorized in *intersectional* terms, and seems to be growing, rather than diminishing, in importance as part of a critical lexicon for understanding contemporary culture, with a number of writers noting its resilience and adaptability (Tisha Dejmanee 2016; Negra 2014).

In addition to attempts to expand the term's analytical reach with intersectional and transnational perspectives, it is also striking to see the dissemination of discussions of postfeminism across multiple sites and topics. Where earlier discussions focussed predominantly on media, the term now animates debates about work (Kelan 2009), education (Jessica Ringrose 2013), organizations (Patricia Lewis, Ruth Simpson, and Yvonne Benschop 2016), peer culture (Jessica Ringrose, Laura Harvey, Rosalind Gill, and Sonia Livingstone 2013; Alison Winch 2013), the cultural and creative industries (Scharff 2013), masculinities (Joel Gwynne and Nadine Muller 2013; Hannah Hamad 2014; Rachel O'Neill, 2015a), and the body and sexuality (Elias, Gill, and Scharff 2016; Angela McRobbie 2015). Far from receding or losing analytical relevance the notion seems to be gaining prominence as a way of engaging with some of the distinctive gendered features of contemporary neoliberal societies.

Within feminist media studies the term is in prolific use today—deployed to analyse a multiplicity of media texts, but also to outline new ideological formations such as “postfeminist biologism” (Laura García-Favaro 2015), “austerity neoliberalism” (Sara De Benedictis 2016), or the novel contemporary representation of stay-at-home mothers (Shani Orgad and Sara De Benedictis 2015). It also remains central to debates about “quality television,” particularly in the US, which has evolved since the 1990s into a site of rich and complex representations of gender including *Homeland*, *Veep*, *House of Cards*, *Orange is the New Black*, *Transparent*, and *The Good Wife*. Dejmanee (2016) has recently developed a periodization of postfeminism, tracing continuities and breaks with its earlier thematics and highlighting its continued vitality as an animating force in media culture. The proliferation of writing and contestation about the term signals—as Dick Hebdige put it in relation to postmodernism—that there is “something worth struggling over” (Dick Hebdige 1988; see also Gill 2007b). As Sean Fuller and Catherine Driscoll (2015) have recently argued, postfeminism remains a “productive irritant.”

However, not everyone sees the term as useful. Perhaps one reason why some feminist scholars have argued that the term may be “redundant” or “falling short” for understanding this putatively “new” moment relates to the particular way the “post” in postfeminism is understood. This has been debated in relation to postmodernism, postcolonialism, and post-structuralism and is no less evident in discussions of postfeminism. The prefix has been extensively discussed (e.g., Gamble 2004; Genz and Brabon 2009) as has the significance of

using the word with or without hyphenation. A crucial point to highlight here is whether “post” always and necessarily means “after”—a question powerfully raised by Stuart Hall’s essay “when was the post-colonial” (1996). It seems that for those arguing that postfeminism has lost its critical force as a term, the post in postfeminism decisively signals what Tasker and Negra (2007), in their important and influential book, call “the pastness” of feminism, or, taking this further, “feminism in retreat” (Keller and Ryan 2014). Yet is this actually a widespread claim among scholars of postfeminist media culture? Many have made clear the profoundly *complicated* relation between feminism and postfeminism—one that is marked variously by incorporation, repudiation, commodification, and so on. McRobbie (2009) elaborates the view that postfeminism involves a (double) *entanglement* with feminism in which it is “taken into account” yet attacked. Another key motif has been the relation between postfeminism, individualization, and neoliberalism (Rosalind Gill and Christina Scharff 2011; McRobbie 2009, 2015). Rather than seeing postfeminist media culture as a culture in which feminism is necessarily “in retreat,” many scholars have been interested in how it is co-opted, selectively taken up, derided, and entangled in complex ways. In other formulations, the term has been used to refer to a relatively stable patterned yet contradictory sensibility (Gill 2007a)—one that is evident even in cultures that have not been though the “waves” of feminism recognizable in the West/global North. Dosekun (2015) argues that postfeminism should be understood as “transnational culture.” Her affluent interviewees in Lagos, Nigeria repeatedly voiced the postfeminist sentiment that they were “already empowered” and therefore able to embrace all the accoutrements of “spectacular femininity” in ways not dissimilar from (though absolutely not reducible to) their counterparts in London or Los Angeles.

This connects more broadly to how the postfeminism held up for questioning is understood. A crucial distinction, it seems to me, needs to be made between those who see postfeminism in historical or epistemological terms and those who use the notion critically as analytical term. I argue (Gill 2007b, *forthcoming*) that postfeminist media culture should be an *object of analysis*, not a position or a perspective. I do not see myself as a “postfeminist analyst” but as an *analyst of postfeminism*—a patterned yet contradictory sensibility connected to other dominant ideologies (such as individualism and neoliberalism). It is not a term that I am attached to as a description of my identity and values—in the way that I would espouse being a feminist—rather it is an analytical category, designed to capture empirical regularities in the world. Because of this it would only make sense to me to jettison the term if I believed that it no longer spoke meaningfully to distinctive features of cultural life—something that is sadly not the case, as I argue further below.

From this perspective (that regards postfeminism as an object of analysis) there would also be scepticism about why emergent feminisms or greater visibility of feminist topics and questions in the media would even be expected necessarily to mean an “end” of postfeminism. Just as increasing anti-capitalist activism does not lead us to the false assumption that capitalism no longer exists, so too does increased feminist activism not mean that pre-feminist, anti-feminist, and postfeminist ideas are not still in circulation and with powerful force. We *know* this as feminists. Take the idea of sexual double standards. After *decades* of scholarship, activism, legislation, and media discussion they still exist—animating school and social media cultures as well as sexual and intimate relationships in revitalized (though obviously not uncontested) ways (e.g., O’Neill 2015b; Ringrose et al. 2013). This is but one example; there are innumerable others. But the key point of principle here is how we

understand and make sense of cultural change. It seems to me that we have to move beyond a taken-for-granted and unquestioned assumption of displacement—the idea that new ideas automatically displace older ones—to a more complicated but realistic understanding of the way that multiple and contradictory ideas can *co-exist* at the same moment, field, plane.

A major challenge for feminist media analysts—and indeed for scholars and activists more generally—is how to attend to the new, the seemingly novel, changed aspects of a situation, whilst not becoming mesmerized by them, and always holding on to a sense of continuities too. For me, engaging with the *contradictions* of media culture is an important part of being a feminist media scholar. It might seem after the earlier discussion of the valency of feminism within the contemporary media that there is indeed a “feminist zeitgeist.” Yet the tenacity of what we might characterize as pre-feminist or anti-feminist ideas remains striking, even in this new moment. One of the strengths of postfeminism as a critical concept is that it attends to and makes visible contradictions. Critical uses of the notion neither fall into a celebratory trap of seeing all instances of mediated feminism as indications that the media have somehow “become feminist,” but nor do they fail to see how entangled feminist ideas can be with pre-feminist, anti-feminist, and backlash ones. In the final section I highlight this through a brief analysis of a current mainstream publication that exemplifies the idea of feminism as the new cool.

## NEW GEN FEM and postfeminism

One publication which exemplifies the heightened visibility of a new feminism in the media is the *Evening Standard's* magazine issue on “NEW GEN FEM.” Published in October 2015 it is one of a number of similar media productions celebrating feminism—for example, *Elle's* (“third annual”) Feminism Issue was published the following month, with strikingly similar content and tone. I chose to analyse the NEW GEN FEM issue, however, because it came out the very week I began writing this article, it had an explicit focus upon generation, and it was free of charge, meaning its readership was perhaps more opportunistic and less “motivated” than those paying £4.00 for *Elle* or other glossies. What I seek to show in the following brief analysis is how profoundly a *postfeminist* logic and sensibility structures the entirety of this ostensible celebration of feminism.

As noted at the start of this paper, the magazine issue is entirely framed in generational terms. After the bold and capitalized title across the front page, inside the editorial page is headlined: “WOMEN'S HOUR: The time is right to celebrate the new feminist generation.” But the reader turning to the publication to gain some understanding of new generation feminism may find it a frustrating or at least perplexing experience. The feminism reported on and depicted here is oddly contentless—indeed, in article after article, the journalists and the women they are interviewing seem not only uninterested in specifying what being a feminist means to them, but actively resistant. In an article titled “Fem.Com,” one of the “new media brands giving feminism a fresh spin” is Pool.com, run and owned by broadcaster Lauren Laverne and former *Red* (magazine) editor Sam Baker:

The site doesn't have a political view, Laverne stresses, but it's feminist because they are: “I don't know what it's like to make a website and not be a feminist. For me, though, what was important was to create a platform for new women's voices.” (*Evening Standard* 2015, 16)

This statement is typical of the magazine as a whole, in which any attempt to explore the meaning of feminism is conspicuous by its absence. Instead, “feminism” is signalled or communicated in three main ways in the magazine. First, it is conveyed through a warm and enthusiastic embrace of all things female—by “championing” women and “celebrating” their “intelligence,” “beauty,” and “confidence.” The tonal quality of the magazine leaves a positive glow, as feminism becomes a “cheer word”—unimpeachable, but also devoid of substance; we are simply informed that it is “having a moment.” Secondly, feminism is signified in what has been described as a distinctly postfeminist fashion through an attitudinal pose of assertiveness and defiance. McRobbie (2009) has discussed this in relation to the postfeminist embrace of practices such as white weddings, hen nights, and the taking of male surnames in heterosexual marriages. Here, though, in an interesting shift, it is deployed to claim a feminist identity. If the first way of signifying feminism can be termed in shorthand “you go girls!,” this second is the repeated celebrity claim “I am not afraid to call myself a feminist”—a claim that turns attention away from what being a feminist is or might be, instead refocusing it on the courage and defiance of the models, actresses, or other celebrities who would dare to own this identity.

The third signifier of feminism involves the use of a lexicon and iconography borrowed from activist feminism, yet put to work in the service of ideas and perspectives that apparently offer little or no real challenge to gender power relations—again a distinctively post-feminist move. An iconic example is the use throughout the magazine of the feminist “fist” symbol, but here rendered in bright pink, and with long varnished fingernails—in a way that forms a suture between an earlier feminist radicalism and a female self-presentation style organized around girliness or traditional femininity. It is the articulation between these two sets of meanings that, in my view, makes it distinctively postfeminist. The language used throughout the magazine is fascinating in this respect, communicating ideas of struggle and radical transformation—the terms “revolutionary,” “trailblazing,” and “gender politics” are liberally used. Yet the so-called “gender warriors” turn out to include “media mogul Tina Brown” and Liberal Democrat politician Nick Clegg—neither of whom I would regard as particularly “revolutionary.” At number one, the list has Carey Mulligan for *playing* a feminist in the film *Suffragette*.

More generally, the impression given of the feminism being promoted is that it is deeply corporate and sits comfortably with neoliberal capitalism. I have already cited one of the digital feminist teams profiled; another is *The Debrief* run by former *Grazia* (magazine) staff. In 2012 the two were “given an internal brief to examine the Millennial audience” and, after speaking with young women in the UK, “they felt there was a gap in the market” so they set up *The Debrief*. They say of their ideal reader: “This woman was on Mail Online, frittering away 10 minutes looking at Michelle Keegan’s bikini body and then feeling dirty about it. Then she would top up on The Guardian.” Now through *The Debrief* she can get her celebrity and beauty news and her “serious” news in one place. Sound like most of the magazines in the market? Let’s just say I don’t think patriarchal capitalism will be quaking in its boots.

Most mainstream women’s magazines are framed around a perspective located in the worlds of fashion, media, and corporate culture. This celebration of new feminism is no exception—celebrity status is required even to count as an “activist.” It is heartening to see a greater diversity of women represented in the list of those “battling gender inequality”—including a transgender woman and two black women (one framed as “FGM crusader” and the other as an “art agitator”). It might seem more challenging if two of the three were not



also models. “Art agitator” Phoebe Collings-James apparently “makes work that challenges perceptions of race, sexuality and feminism,” but this is presented in her own words as being about needing to challenge the fact that “anyone young, female and at all desirable looking is going to be passed over for not being serious.”

As long ago as 1992 Robert Goldman was deconstructing as “commodity feminism” the old L’Oreal ads asserting “Don’t Hate Me Because I’m Beautiful.” The campaign for stunningly attractive models to be taken seriously forms part of this same distinctly postfeminist trajectory. In the context of the magazine as a whole it is significant for what it signals about new gen feminists’ concerns, but also, crucially, for how it constructs the *constitutive outside* of feminism. Where are the concerns about low pay, about migration, about poverty? Where are the public sector workers in health or education or social services? Where are the activists who work in food banks, who campaign against deportations, who take to the streets to contest cuts in funding to disabled women or organizations supporting women who experience domestic violence? Perhaps they don’t have enough models or A-listers in their midst.

Another element that is distinctly postfeminist is to be found in the cover story about British Indian model Neelam Gill. The article replays a familiar script of rags to riches, in which sexism and racism within the fashion industry are mentioned, but largely said to have been overcome through individual hard work and changing attitudes. Gill’s interview is notable in pointing to the continued racism implicit in only having “one black, Asian or Indian girl” in a show, but her aspiration is a postfeminist one: “I would love to see a British Indian girl do a Victoria’s Secret show. I would love it to be me.” She clarifies how this sits with her feminism: “you can be a feminist and do a shoot in a bikini. In fact that is empowering.”

“Empowerment” and “choice” crop up repeatedly through the magazine. Whilst they are neither new nor uncommon words, they have been extensively discussed as motifs of postfeminism (Sarah Banet-Weiser 2015a, 2015b; Melissa Burkett and Karine Hamilton 2012; Rosalind Gill 2007a, 2008; Rosalind Gill and Ngaire Donaghue 2013). Breanne Fahs (2011, 276) writes: “Of all the dangerous patterns I have observed ... the one that seems most problematic and troubling ... is the cultural tendency to twist and corrupt empowerment discourses so they become clichéd, commodified, detrimental and ultimately disempowering.” Choice in turn is a watchword repeatedly used to underscore the neoliberal fantasy that “anything can be achieved” if the right choices and “correct disposition has been adopted” (Paul Gilroy 2013, 26). These lexical selections repeatedly turn attention away from social transformation onto individual entrepreneurialism. Choices celebrated in postfeminist-inflected media are those such as “the freedom to run in heels” and the “right to wear red lipstick.” In this magazine they are given a “feisty” twist through the use of a popular vernacular—FOMO (fear of missing out), NFI’d (not fucking invited), “beef” (argument), and so on: “What do generations Gill and Grand wear to work?” the editorial asks “Anything they want, obvs.” Yeah obvs!

Finally, a postfeminist sensibility is evident in the suggestion that equality has been achieved—indeed, superseded—perhaps the most well-documented feature of postfeminism and discussed in detail by feminist media scholars (e.g., McRobbie 2009; Scharff 2013; Tasker and Negra 2007). This is seen even on the cover in the designation of Neelam Gill as a “Top Girl”—and one in an industry where “women earn more.” The editorial says: “For Neelam Gill’s generation it is a no-brainer. Intelligent, articulate and beautiful, our cover star sees no reason to apologise for out-earning the men in her industry. You go, Gill!” Such sentiments are almost the definition of postfeminist—the way she is characterized, the

defiant tone (she's not going to apologize), and the way this is tied into the idea that not only has the pay gap disappeared, but it is actually *men* who are losing out now. This resonates with the broadly postfeminist characterization of men elsewhere in the magazine—especially in the dating advice section—in which they are cast as hapless-yet-essentially-benign losers just trying to make their way in a world in which women have decisively rewritten *The Rules*. It is also evident in the article about “Boyeurism,” which gleefully reports yet another feminist turning of the tables: “ogling is no longer the preserve of boors—now forward-thinking women are indulging in male objectification too” (2015, 29). Is equal opportunities objectification the best we can do?

With all these feminist “successes” one might wonder why feminism is needed at all—and that perhaps accounts for the lack of substance to the feminism depicted here. Feminism appears as an *identity* that any young woman might like to have—it is stylish, defiant, funny, beautiful, confident, and it “champions” women—but what is really promoted in this magazine celebration of New (Gen) Feminism is, as I hope to have shown, a *postfeminist sensibility*.

## Conclusion

In this article I have sought to engage with a number of current ideas about feminism, postfeminism, and generation. Responding to arguments that postfeminism has lost its critical force in a world in which feminism is increasingly promoted rather than repudiated I have made the case for keeping, rather than jettisoning, the notion of postfeminism. I have advanced this argument in three distinct ways. First I have made an attempt to complicate and problematize the notion of new feminist visibility to bring out some tensions and contradictions between circulating media versions of feminism, and also to stress the need to think together feminism with anti-feminism, postfeminism, and revitalized misogyny. Secondly I have developed a theoretical defence of postfeminism, underscoring the term's force as a critical analytical category, and highlighting the importance for feminist media scholarship of terms that can speak to continuity and change, and that understand cultural transformation as a complex and nuanced process in which new ideas do not simply displace existing ones. Finally I have used an empirical example to try to demonstrate the persistence and tenacity of a postfeminist sensibility—even in those media productions ostensibly claiming to celebrate a feminist “revolution.” In this way I have attempted to demonstrate the value and utility of a continued attention to postfeminism.

Age undoubtedly needs to be taken more seriously in feminist intersectional scholarship. However, in understanding feminist positions, politics are much more significant than dates of birth—and certainly not reducible to age. In developing my argument here I have tried not to aggravate generational animosities, but rather—in a meta move—to draw attention to the way in which they may be animated both in academic writing and in media constructions of feminism—particularly in a world that so fetishizes “the new.” It is important that we build feminist solidarities across and between generations. In my “feminist lifetime” I have seen two key concepts almost eradicated—“sexism” and “patriarchy”—only to re-emerge and be championed by younger generations of women with passion and efficacy. Our critical vocabularies matter. In recognizing the possibilities opened up by new feminisms and their heightened visibility, I hope this will not lead to the erasure of older terms which have represented a powerful means of grappling with this contradictory cultural moment. I look

forward to the day when the constellation of values and ideas signalled by “postfeminism” no longer exert their chilling cultural force, but in the meantime, regrettably, we are a long way from being post-postfeminism.

## Notes

1. A full discussion of this is beyond the scope of this article, but it is worth raising questions about how an overly positive evaluation of change—as for example in Eric Anderson’s “inclusive masculinity theory” which suggests that homophobia is no longer a potent force in contemporary life—may work to forestall and disavow the need for change (O’Neill 2015a). Likewise suggestions of a widespread feminist consciousness among young women can be used to block—as no longer necessary—equality initiatives in schools, social policy, etc. in a manner that is decidedly postfeminist. In late 2015, there were calls to remove the teaching of feminism from the A-level history syllabus (Sarah Cassidy 2015). I am grateful to Rachel O’Neill for this example.
2. These types of articles garner thousands of comments and might be seen as a form of feminist “baiting” by the media. They certainly trivialize feminism, somehow using the idea of the “personal as political” as a way to repeatedly attempt to confine feminist debate to individual, micro decisions, which produce even more scrutiny and surveillance of women’s choices, whilst systematically ignoring wider material inequalities.
3. I am grateful to Shani Orgad for this example.

## Acknowledgements

I am very grateful to Laura García-Favaro, Elisabeth Kelan, Lia Litosseliti, Rachel O’Neill, Shani Orgad, Alison Phipps, Christina Scharff, Judith Willetts, and two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments on a draft of this article. I would also like to thank Rachel O’Neill for her invaluable editorial assistance.

## Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

## Notes on contributor

**Rosalind Gill** is Professor of Social and Cultural Analysis at City University London. Her books include *Gender and the Media* (2006), *New Femininities* (2011), and *Gender and Creative Labour* (2016). She is currently co-writing *Mediated Intimacy: Sex Advice in Media Culture*. E-mail: [Rosalind.Gill.2@city.ac.uk](mailto:Rosalind.Gill.2@city.ac.uk)

## References

- Adamson, Maria. 2016. “Successfully ‘Balanced’ Femininity in CEO Autobiographies: The Intersection of Postfeminist and Neoliberal Logic”. Paper presented at ESRC seminar series on Gendered Inclusion, Canterbury, March 9, 2016.
- Ahmed, Sara. 2004. *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. Edinburgh University Press and New York: Routledge.
- Ahmed, Sara. 2010. *The Promise of Happiness*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Allen, Kim, and Heather Mendick. 2013. “Young People’s Uses of Celebrity: Class, Gender and ‘Improper’ Celebrity.” *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education* 34 (1): 77–93.
- Ally McBeal*. 1997–2002. Television Series. Seasons 1–5. USA: Fox.

- Arthurs, Jane. 2003. "Sex and the City and Consumer Culture: Remediating Postfeminist Drama." *Feminist Media Studies* 3 (1): 83–98.
- Banet-Weiser, Sarah. 2012. *AuthenticTM: The Politics of Ambivalence in a Brand Culture*. New York: New York University Press.
- Banet-Weiser, Sarah. 2015a. "'Confidence You Can Carry!': Girls in Crisis and the Market for Girls' Empowerment Organizations." *Continuum* 29 (2): 182–193.
- Banet-Weiser, Sarah. 2015b. "Whom are we Empowering? Popular Feminism and the Work of Empowerment." Paper presented at Console-ing Passions, Dublin, June 18.
- Banet-Weiser, Sarah. 2015c. "Popular Misogyny: A Zeitgeist." *Culture Digitally*, online. Accessed February 22, 2016. <http://culturedigitally.org/2015/01/popular-misogyny-a-zeitgeist/>
- Brooks, Ann. 1997. *Postfeminisms: Feminism, Cultural Theory and Cultural Forms*. London: Routledge.
- Burkett, Melissa, and Karine Hamilton. 2012. "Postfeminist Sexual Agency: Young Women's Negotiations of Sexual Consent." *Sexualities* 15 (7): 815–833.
- Butler, Jess. 2013. "For White Girls Only?: Postfeminism and the Politics of Inclusion." *Feminist Formations* 25 (1): 35–58.
- Cassidy, Sarah. 2015. "Feminism to be dropped from A-level syllabus under Department for Education plans." *The Independent*, November 19. Accessed February 22, 2016. <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/education/education-news/feminism-to-be-dropped-from-a-level-politics-syllabus-under-department-for-education-plans-a6740881.html>
- Coppock, Vicki, Deena Haydon, and Ingrid Richter. 1995. *The Illusions of Post-feminism: New Women, Old Myths*. New York: Routledge.
- De Benedictis, Sara. 2016. "One Born, Austerity and Securing Consent." Paper presented at Gendering Austerity conference, Birkbeck College, London, May 16.
- Dejmanee, Tisha. 2016. "Consumption in the City: The Turn to Interiority in Contemporary Postfeminist Television." *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 19 (2): 119–133.
- Diffractions* Issue 6, Spring 2016. <http://www.diffractions.net>
- Dolan, Joanna, and Estella Tincknell, eds. 2012. *Aging Femininities: Troubling Representations*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Donaghue, Ngaire. 2015. "Who Gets Played By 'The Gender Card'? A Critical Discourse Analysis of Coverage of Prime Minister Julia Gillard's Sexism and Misogyny Speech in the Australian Print Media." *Australian Feminist Studies* 30 (84): 161–178.
- Dosekun, Simidele. 2015. "For Western Girls Only? Post-Feminism as Transnational Culture." *Feminist Media Studies* 15 (6): 960–975.
- Ehrenreich, Barbara. 2009. *Smile or Die*. London: Granta.
- Elias, Ana, Rosalind Gill, and Christina Scharff, eds. 2016. *Aesthetic Labour: Beauty Politics in Neoliberalism*. London: Palgrave.
- Evening Standard*. 2015. "New (Gen) Fem Issue," October.
- Fahs, Breanne. 2011. *Performing Sex: The Making and Unmaking of Women's Erotic Lives*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Fuller, Sean, and Catherine Driscoll. 2015. "HBO's *Girls*: Gender, Generation, and Quality Television." *Continuum* 29 (2): 253–262.
- Gambino, Lauren. 2015. "Columbia University student carries rape protest mattress to graduation." *The Guardian*, May 19. Accessed February 22, 2016. <http://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2015/may/19/columbia-university-emma-sulkowicz-mattress-graduation>
- Gamble, Sarah, ed. 2004. *The Routledge Companion to Feminism and Postfeminism*. London: Routledge.
- Gamson, Joshua. 1998. *Freaks Talk Back: Tabloid Talk Shows and Sexual Nonconformity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- García-Favaro, Laura. 2015. "'Porn Trouble' On the Sexual Regime and Travels of Postfeminist Biologism." *Australian Feminist Studies* 30 (86): 366–376.
- García-Favaro, Laura. 2016. "'Just be Confident Girls!': Confidence Chic as Neoliberal Governmentality." In *Aesthetic Labour: Beauty Politics in Neoliberalism*, edited by Ana Elias, Rosalind Gill and Christina Scharff. London: Palgrave.
- García-Favaro, Laura, and Rosalind Gill. 2016. "'Emasculation Nation has Arrived': Sexism Rearticulated in Online Responses to Lose the Lads' Mags Campaign." *Feminist Media Studies* 16 (3): 379–397.

- Genz, Sabine, and Benjamin B. Brabon. 2009. *Postfeminism: Cultural Texts and Theories*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Gill, Rosalind. 2007a. *Gender and the Media*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Gill, Rosalind. 2007b. "Postfeminist Media Culture: Elements of a Sensibility." *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 10 (2): 147–166.
- Gill, Rosalind. 2008. "Empowerment/Sexism: Figuring Female Sexual Agency in Contemporary Advertising." *Feminism & Psychology* 18 (1): 35–60.
- Gill, Rosalind. Forthcoming. "The Cultural and Psychic Life of Postfeminism." *European Journal of Cultural Studies*.
- Gill, Rosalind and Ngaire Donaghue. 2013. "As if Postfeminism Had Come True: The Turn to Agency in Cultural Studies of 'Sexualisation.'" In *Gender, Agency, and Coercion*, 240–258. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gill, Rosalind, and Ngaire Donaghue. Forthcoming. "For Young Women Only? Thinking Age in Intersectional Understandings of Postfeminism." Under submission.
- Gill, Rosalind, and Shani Orgad. 2015. "The Confidence Cult(ure)." *Australian Feminist Studies* 30 (86): 324–344.
- Gill, Rosalind, and Christina Scharff. 2011. *New Femininities: Postfeminism, Identity and Neoliberalism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Gilroy, Paul. 2013. "... We Got to Get Over Before We Go Under ... Fragments for a History of Black Vernacular Neoliberalism." *New Formations* 80/81: 23–38.
- Goldman, Robert. 1992. *Reading Ads Socially*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Gwynne, Joel, and Nadine Muller. 2013. *Postfeminism and Contemporary Hollywood Cinema*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hall, Stuart. 1996. "When was 'the Post-Colonial'? Thinking at the Limit." In *The Post-Colonial Question: Common Skies, Divided Horizons*, edited by Iain Chambers and Lidia Curti, 242–260. London: Routledge.
- Hamad, Hannah. 2014. *Postfeminism and Paternity in Contemporary US Film: Framing Fatherhood*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Hamad, Hannah, and Anthea Taylor. 2015. "Introduction. Feminism and Celebrity Culture (Special Issue)." *Celebrity Studies* 6 (1): 124–127.
- Harris, Anita. 2004. *Future Girl: Young Women in the Twenty-First Century*. Psychology Press.
- Heath, Joseph, and Andrew Potter. 2006. *The Rebel Sell: Why the Culture Can't be Jammed*. Toronto: Harper Collins.
- Hebdidge, Dick. 1988. *Hiding in the Light*. London: New York, Routledge.
- Hemmings, Clare. 2011. *Why Stories Matter: The Political Grammar of Feminist Theory*. London: Duke University Press.
- Homeland*. 2011–present. Television Series. Season 1–5. USA: Showtime.
- hooks, bell. 2013. "Dig deep: Beyond *Lean In*." *The Feminist Wire* (online), October 28. Accessed February 22, 2016. <http://www.thefeministwire.com/2013/10/17973/>
- Hoskins, Tansy. 2014. *Stitched Up: The Anti-Capitalist Book of Fashion*. London: Pluto Press.
- House of Cards*. 2013–present. Television Series. Seasons 1–4. USA: Netflix.
- Jane, Emma A. 2014. "'Your a Ugly, Whorish, Slut': Understanding E-bile." *Feminist Media Studies* 14 (4): 531–546.
- Jermyn, Deborah, and Susan Holmes, eds. 2015. *Women, Celebrity and Cultures of Ageing*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Jonsson, Terese. 2014. "White Feminist Stories: Locating Race in Representations of Feminism in The Guardian." *Feminist Media Studies* 14 (6): 1012–1027.
- Kabeer, Naila. 2002. *The Power to Choose: Bangladeshi Women and Labour Market Decisions in London and Dhaka*. London: Verso.
- Kay, Katty, and Claire Shipman. 2014. *The Confidence Code: The Science and Art of Self-Assurance—What Women Should Know*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Kelan, Elisabeth. 2009. *Performing Gender at Work*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Keller, Jessalynn, and Jessica Ringrose. 2015. "'But then Feminism Goes Out the Window!': Exploring Teenage Girls' Critical Response to Celebrity Feminism." *Celebrity Studies* 6 (1): 132–135.

- Keller, Jessalynn, and Maureen Ryan. 2014. "Call for Papers: Problematizing Postfeminism." Accessed February 22, 2016. <http://arcyp.ca/archives/4244>
- Keller, Jessalynn, and Maureen Ryan. 2015. "Call for Papers: Emergent Feminisms and the Challenge to Postfeminist Media Culture." Circulated May 12, 2015.
- Koffman, Ofra, Shani Orgad, and Rosalind Gill. 2015. "Girl Power and 'Selfie Humanitarianism.'" *Continuum* 29 (2): 157–168.
- Lewis, Patricia, Ruth Simpson, and Yvonne Benschop, eds. 2016. *Postfeminism and Organization*. Routledge.
- Lotz, Amanda D. 2001. "Postfeminist Television Criticism: Rehabilitating Critical Terms and Identifying Postfeminist Attributes." *Feminist Media Studies* 1 (1): 105–121.
- Lumby, Catharine. 2011. "Past the Post in Feminist Media Studies." *Feminist Media Studies* 11 (1): 95–100.
- Marks, Olivia. 2015. "Why did Sisters Uncut protest at the premier of Suffragette?" *The Guardian*, October 9. Accessed February 22, 2016. <http://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2015/oct/09/domestic-violence-campaigners-suffragette-movie-kanye-west>
- McGuigan, Jim. 2006. "The Politics of Cultural Studies and Cool Capitalism." *Cultural Politics* 2 (2): 137–158.
- McRobbie, Angela. 2004. "Post-Feminism and Popular Culture." *Feminist Media Studies* 4 (3): 255–264.
- McRobbie, Angela. 2009. *The Aftermath of Feminism: Gender, Culture and Social Change*. London: Sage.
- McRobbie, Angela. 2015. "Notes on the Perfect: Competitive Femininity in Neoliberal Times." *Australian Feminist Studies* 30 (83): 3–20.
- Meers, Sharon, and Joanna Strober. 2013. *Getting to 50/50: How Working Parents Can Have it All*. St Ives: Cleis Press.
- Mendes, Kaitlynn. 2011. *Feminism in the News: Representations of the Women's Movement since the 1960s*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Mendes, Kaitlynn D., Jessalynn Keller, and Jessica Ringrose. Forthcoming 2016. "Speaking 'Unspeakable Things': Documenting Digital Feminist Responses to Rape Culture." *Journal of Gender Studies*.
- Modleski, Tania. 1991. *Feminism without Women: Culture and Criticism in a "Postfeminist" Age*. London: Routledge.
- Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. 1988. "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses." *Feminist Review* 30: 61–88.
- Moseley, Rachel, and Jacinda Read. 2002. "Have it Ally: Popular Television and (Post)Feminism." *Feminist Media Studies* 2 (2): 231–250.
- Nathanson, Elizabeth. 2013. *Television and Postfeminist Housekeeping: No Time for Mother*. New York: Routledge.
- Negra, Diane. 2009. *What a Girl Wants?: Fantasizing the Reclamation of Self in Postfeminism*. New York: Routledge.
- Negra, Diane. 2014. "Claiming Feminism: Commentary, Autobiography and Advice Literature for Women in the Recession." *Journal of Gender Studies* 23 (3): 275–286.
- Negra, Diane, and Yvonne Tasker, eds. 2014. *Gendering the Recession: Media and Culture in an Age of Austerity*. London: Duke University Press.
- O'Neill, Rachel. 2015a. "Whither Critical Masculinity Studies? Notes on Inclusive Masculinity Theory, Postfeminism, and Sexual Politics." *Men and Masculinities* 18 (1): 100–120.
- O'Neill, Rachel. 2015b. "The Work of Seduction: Intimacy and Subjectivity in the London 'Seduction Community.'" *Sociological Research Online* 20 (4): 5.
- O'Neill, Rachel. Forthcoming 2016. "The Aesthetics of Sexual Discontent: Notes from the London 'Seduction Community.'" In *Aesthetic Labour: Beauty Politics in Neoliberalism*, edited by Ana Sofia Elias, Rosalind Gill, and Christina Scharff. Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Orange is the New Black*. 2013–present. Television Series. Seasons 1–3. USA: Netflix.
- Orgad, Shani, and Sara De Benedictis. 2015. "The 'Stay-at-Home' Mother, Postfeminism and Neoliberalism: Content Analysis of UK News Coverage." *European Journal of Communication* 30 (4): 418–436.
- Phipps, Alison. 2014. *The Politics of the Body: Gender in a Neoliberal and Neoconservative Age*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Projansky, Sarah. 2001. *Watching Rape: Film and Television in Postfeminist Culture*. New York: NYU Press.



- Retallack, Hanna, Jessica Ringrose, and Emilie Lawrence. 2016. "‘Fuck Your Body Image’: Teen Girls’ Twitter and Instagram Feminism in and Around School." In *Learning Bodies*, 85–103. Singapore: Springer.
- Ringrose, Jessica. 2013. *Postfeminist Education? Girls and the Sexual Politics of Schooling*. London: Routledge.
- Ringrose, Jessica, Laura Harvey, Rosalind Gill, and Sonia Livingstone. 2013. "Teen Girls, Sexual Double Standards and ‘Sexting’: Gendered Value in Digital Image Exchange." *Feminist Theory* 14 (3): 305–323.
- Rottenberg, Catherine. 2014. "The Rise of Neoliberal Feminism." *Cultural Studies* 28 (3): 418–437.
- Rottenberg, Catherine, and Sara Farris. 2015. "Call for Papers: The ‘Righting’ of Feminism." Accessed February 22, 2016. <https://call-for-papers.sas.upenn.edu/node/62921>
- Salter, Michael. 2013. "Responding to Revenge Porn: Gender, Justice and Online Legal Impunity." Paper delivered at *Whose Justice? Conflicted Approaches to Crime and Conflict*, University of Western Sydney.
- Sandberg, Sheryl. 2013. *Lean In: Women, Work, and the Will to Lead*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- Scharff, Christina. 2013. *Repudiating Feminism: Young Women in a Neoliberal World*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Sex and the City*. 1998–2004. Television Series. Seasons 1–6. USA: HBO.
- Smith, Joan. 1990. *Misogynies*. London: Faber & Faber.
- Tasker, Yvonne, and Diane Negra, eds. 2007. *Interrogating Postfeminism: Gender and the Politics of Popular Culture*. London: Duke University Press.
- The Good Wife*. 2009–2016. Television Series. Seasons 1–7. USA: CBS.
- Thompson, Laura. 2016. "Exposing yourself is illegal—so why should the law tolerate cyber-flashing on online dating apps?" *The Independent*, February 4.
- Thompson, Laura, and Ngaire Donaghue. 2014. "The Confidence Trick: Competing Constructions of Confidence and Self-Esteem in Young Australian Women’s Discussions of the Sexualisation of Culture." *Women’s Studies International Forum* 47: 23–35.
- Transparent*. 2014–present. Television Series. Seasons 1–2. USA: Amazon Video.
- Tuchman, Gayle. 1978. "The Symbolic Annihilation of Women by the Mass Media." In *Hearth and Home: Images of Women in the Mass Media*, edited by Gayle Tuchman, Arlene Kaplan Daniels, and James Benet, 64–81. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Valenti, Jessica. 2014. "When everyone is a feminist, is anyone?" *The Guardian*. Accessed February 22, 2016. <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/nov/24/when-everyone-is-a-feminist>
- Veep*. 2012–present. Television Series. Seasons 1–5. USA: HBO.
- Vernon, Polly. 2015. *Hot Feminist: Modern Feminism with Style without Judgement*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Whelehan, Imelda. 2010. "Remaking Feminism: Or Why is Postfeminism so Boring?" *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 9 (3): 155–172.
- Whelehan, Imelda, and Joel Gwynne, eds. 2014. *Ageing, Popular Culture and Contemporary Feminism: Harleys and Hormones*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Winch, Alison. 2011. "‘Your New Smart-mouthed Girlfriends’: Postfeminist Conduct Books." *Journal of Gender Studies* 20 (4): 359–370.
- Winch, Alison. 2013. *Girlfriends and Postfeminist Sisterhood*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.