

S M E G

# gender and the media



IRONY MEANS  
NEVER HAVING TO  
SAY YOUR SORRY

QUEER CHIC

REPORTING SEXUAL VIOLENCE  
THE SEXUALISATION OF CULTURE

NT O A M C  
BACKLASH AND RETRO SEXISM NT O B A M C  
R C THE EROTICISATION OF MALE BODIES EX P B C Y C  
EX L B OF MALE BODIES POSTMODERNISM AND POSTCOLONIALISM

THE FEMINISATION OF THE PRESS

CHIC LIT AS  
POSTFEMINIST  
ROMANCE

FROM OBJECTIFICATION TO SUBJECTIFICATION

REVENGE ADVERTS



# rosalind gill



# Contents

[Cover](#)

[Title Page](#)

[Copyright](#)

[Acknowledgements](#)

[Introduction](#)

[1 Gender and the Media](#)

[Introduction: Representations Matter](#)

[Representations of Women in the Media](#)

[Audience Studies](#)

[Changing Feminisms](#)

[Cultural Politics and Activism](#)

[Conclusion: Debates, Dilemmas, Contradictions](#)

[2 Analysing Gender in Media Texts](#)

[Introduction](#)

[Content Analysis](#)

[Semiotics and Structuralism](#)

[Ideological Critique](#)

[Discourse Analysis](#)

[Foucaultian Approaches](#)

[Postmodernism, Postcolonialism, and Queer Theory](#)

[Conclusion](#)

[3 Advertising and Postfeminism](#)

[Advertising in the Mediascape](#)

[Advertising and Postfeminism](#)

[Conclusion: A Final Word from our Sponsors](#)

## 4 News, Gender and Journalism

Here is the News ... about Men

The Gendered Cultures of Journalism

The Changing Profession: Casualization, Media Management and the Rise of the Columnist

The New Journalism

News Reporting of Sexual Violence

Sex Crime News in the Twenty-First Century

Conclusion

## 5 Talk Shows: Feminism on TV?

Introduction

Talk-Show Controversies

The Roots of TV Talk Shows

Classifying Talk Shows

The audience discussion show

The therapeutic genre

Talk Shows as the New Public Sphere

Talk Shows as the 'New Confessional'

Talk Shows and Women: Televisual Feminism?

The personal as political

Conclusion

## 6 Gender in Magazines: From Cosmopolitan to Loaded

Ideologies of Femininity

Teen Mags

Women's Magazines: Debates and Dilemmas

Men's Lifestyle Magazines

Conclusion

## 7 Postfeminist Romance

[Introduction](#)

[Feminist Approaches to Romance](#)

[Complicating the story](#)

[Romance revisited](#)

[Enter Bridget Jones](#)

[Chick Lit: Romance for the Twenty-first Century?](#)

[Must-She TV](#)

[Conclusion](#)

[8 Postfeminist Media Culture?](#)

[A Postfeminist Sensibility](#)

[Conclusion](#)

[References](#)

[Index](#)

[End User License Agreement](#)

# **Gender and the Media**

Rosalind Gill

polity

Copyright © Rosalind Gill 2007

The right of Rosalind Gill to be identified as Author of this Work has been asserted in accordance with the UK Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

First published in 2007 by Polity Press

Polity Press  
65 Bridge Street  
Cambridge CB2 1UR, UK.

Polity Press  
350 Main Street  
Malden, MA 02148, USA

All rights reserved. Except for the quotation of short passages for the purpose of criticism and review, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the publisher.

ISBN-13: 978-0-7456-9899-1

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

The publisher has used its best endeavours to ensure that the URLs for external websites referred to in this book are correct and active at the time of going to press. However, the publisher has no responsibility for the websites and can make no guarantee that a site will remain live or that the content is or will remain appropriate.

Every effort has been made to trace all copyright holders, but if any have been inadvertently overlooked the publishers will be pleased to include any necessary credits in any subsequent reprint or edition.

For further information on Polity, visit our website: [www.polity.co.uk](http://www.polity.co.uk)

# Acknowledgements

This book has taken hundreds of years to write. Well, perhaps I exaggerate a tad, but it has certainly taken much longer than it should have done. In the manner of many first books it has been through drafts and re-drafts and radical rewritings in the pursuit of some illusory (or certainly elusive) perfection. Now that I've finished the final, imperfect version two feelings dominate: first there is puzzlement - is that *it*? Why on earth did it take me so *long*?; and secondly there is *relief* - relief that finally I will be able to respond to all those friendly and kindly meant inquiries about how the book is going with a conclusive 'it's done'. In short, I'll be able to go to parties again!

One of the consequences of taking so long to write a book is that the acknowledgements page reads a bit like a list of 'everyone who knows me'. First, I would like to thank all the people who have assisted me directly with research for this book - whether tracking down adverts, searching for newspaper articles, or sharing ideas about chick lit or lad mags. Special thanks to Elena Herdieckerhoff, Kamy Naficy, Karin Heisecke, Jennie Middleton, Rachel Lille, Samantha Reay, Jessica Pring Ellis, Matt Torney, Deborah Finding, Naureen Khan and Danielle Bikhazi for their invaluable contributions, both practical and intellectual.

Several people read all or parts of the manuscript in draft form and I would like to express my gratitude for their incisive and insightful comments. Special appreciation to the wonderful women in my writing group (Rachel Falmagne, Lesley Hoggart, Ann Phoenix, Bruna Seu and Merl Storr) who not only made constructive criticism such a positive experience, but also offered a different vision of academic labour and a pleasurable intellectual 'home' in

the cafes and bars of Bloomsbury. Angela McRobbie read and commented on the entire manuscript and I'm grateful for her feedback and encouragement, as well as the example of her own work which I have found consistently thoughtful and inspiring. Sylvia Chant's sheer energy and *joie de vivre* has made her a pleasure to know and I'm grateful for her unstinting enthusiasm for this project, and for fitting in comments on chapters while flying between Costa Rica, Mexico, Gambia and the Philippines.

Thanks also to Sadie Wearing, Dee Amy-Chinn, Christina Scharff, Paul Stenner and Dimitris Papadopoulos for helpful comments on sections of this book.

In addition to those generous people who have read and commented on parts of the book, my acknowledgements would not be complete without an expression of gratitude to a number of other people who have helped, supported and inspired me in my academic career so far. Despite its insularity, intellectual work is always a collective project and it would be impossible to thank everyone who has sparked new ideas or provoked me to think differently. But I would like to mention the following people for particular appreciation: Michael Billig, Margaret Wetherell, Stuart Hall, Jonathan Potter, Steve Woolgar and Valerie Walkerdine. Thank you.

The LSE has been a stimulating environment in which to work, and I have benefited from its excellent library, as well as from the many outstanding international scholars who provide a feast of lectures and seminars every day of the week. I'm grateful to the exceptionally interesting and talented students who have taken my Masters course in Gender and Media - many of them media practitioners themselves, and all of them set to make a positive difference in the world. I've been fortunate to have wonderful colleagues in the LSE's Gender Institute, and in



the Sociology department at Goldsmiths where I worked previously. I would like to highlight Clare Hemmings, Diane Perrons, Karen Throsby, Elisabeth Kelan and Caroline Ramozonoglu for intellectual nourishment and supportive collegiality.

Polity Press has been fabulous, and I would like to thank Gill Motley and Andrea Drugan for being a real pleasure to work with, and for good-humouredly tolerating more delays than a British train service, as I went for the unofficial award of 'most postponed manuscript in the history of academic publishing'. Thanks also, Andrea, for embracing the 'crazy' fridge idea - instead of having me committed!

Two other people deserve special mention for their absolutely crucial but invisible contributions to this project. Gabrielle Bikhazi's consistently wonderful, loving care for Katarina over the past three years has freed up many of the hours I've spent working on this book. Gaby - you are a very special person and I hope you know how appreciated you are. The other 'behind the scenes' support has come from Hazel Johnstone, departmental manager of the Gender Institute and organizer-extraordinaire. Thank you, Hazel, for help and kindnesses that are literally too numerous to mention.

Finally, I would like to thank my dear friends, my adopted 'family' in London (and Nottingham). To Andy Pratt, Bruna Seu, Wilma Mangabeira, Paulo Wrobel, Ann Phoenix, Chris Phipps, Sylvia Chant and Veronica Forwood: thank you for everything - your love of life, generosity of spirit, sense of humour, for being there during all the bad times as well as the good, and for all the wonderful conversations, delicious food and red wine we have shared - and will, I hope, continue to share.

This book is dedicated to my mother, Janet Gill, and to the memory of my father, Michael Gill. Their love, care,

humanity and passion for social justice has been a shining light throughout my life. It is also dedicated to Thomas and Katarina, with love.

# Introduction

THIS is a book about the representation of gender in the media in contemporary Western societies. It is written against the backdrop of phenomenally rapid change: changes in gender relations; transformations in media technologies, regulatory frameworks, content, ownership and control, and globalization; and theoretical 'revolutions' in the approaches used to make sense of gender representations. *Gender and the Media* aims to freeze the frame, press the pause button, or hit the refresh key to explore how the media today construct femininity, masculinity and gender relations, and to think about the kinds of theoretical concepts and cultural politics that might be needed to engage with these changes.

The book is born out of an interest in the extraordinary contradictoriness of constructions of gender in today's media: confident expressions of 'girl power' sit alongside reports of 'epidemic' levels of anorexia and body dysmorphia; graphic tabloid reports of rape are placed cheek by jowl with adverts for lap-dancing clubs and telephone sex lines; lad magazines declare the 'sex war' over, while reinstating beauty contests and championing new, ironic modes of sexism; and there are regular moral panics about the impact on men of the new, idealized male body imagery, while the re-sexualization of women's bodies in public space goes virtually unremarked upon. Everywhere, it seems, feminist ideas have become a kind of common sense, yet feminism has never been more bitterly repudiated.

Some commentators see in this evidence of a powerful backlash against feminism (Faludi 1992). Germaine Greer (1999), for instance, argues that today's popular culture is

significantly less feminist than that of thirty years ago, and Imelda Whelehan suggests that we have entered an era of 'retro-sexism' in which representations of women, 'from the banal to the downright offensive' are being 'defensively reinvented against cultural changes in women's lives' (2000: 11). By contrast, others regard the media as increasingly influenced by feminism, or, indeed, as becoming feminist. David Gauntlett argues 'the traditional view of a woman as a housewife or low status worker has been kick-boxed out of the picture by the feisty, successful "girl power" icons' (2002: 247). The media, he argues, offer popular feminism which is like 'a radio-friendly remix of a multilayered song, with the most exciting bits sampled and some of the dense stuff left out' (2002: 252). Meanwhile, Angela McRobbie points to the 'enormous energy in the way in which sexual politics now bursts across our television screens ... From Newsnight to Oprah ... [F]emale independence has entered into contemporary common sense' (1999: 126).

It seems to me that both these arguments are true. On the one hand feminist ideas are increasingly taken for granted across a range of media and genres, vibrant girlzines spring up all over the world, and the Web is home to an enormous diversity of feminist ideas ranging from support over breast cancer to 'babes against the bomb'. But on the other, boring and predictable patterns of sexism persist - such as the continued invisibility of older women on television, or the depressingly narrow range of depictions of black women - and newer representational practices are often far from hopeful - for example, the rise of 'porno chic', the growth of unabashed 'laddism', and the vitriolic attacks in press and magazines on women who fail to live up to increasingly narrow normative requirements of feminine appearance. It is precisely the contradictoriness

of contemporary representations of gender in the media that makes the field so difficult and challenging.

Added to this picture of paradox and complexity, there is another issue: like the media, gender relations and feminist ideas are themselves changing and in flux. There is no stable, unchanging feminist perspective from which to make a cool appraisal of contemporary gender in the media. Rather, feminist ideas are constantly transforming in response to different critiques, to new or previously excluded constituencies, to younger generations, to new theoretical ideas, and to the experience of various kinds of struggle. There is no single feminism, but instead many, diverse feminisms. If media representations of gender have changed, then so too have the feminist ideas used to understand and critique them. And, likewise, gender relations are constantly changing. Indeed, we are often told that Western democracies are experiencing nothing short of a 'genderquake', so profound are the current transformations.

*Gender and the Media* is an attempt to make sense of this picture of flux and transformation. The book has three main aims. First, it seeks to provide an analysis of the contemporary representations of gender in the media in Western societies, in all their messy contradictoriness. Its particular focus is upon how media constructions of gender have changed in recent years in response to feminist critiques and wider social transformations, and, to that end, it looks in detail at five types of media where different kinds of change can be seen very clearly: news, advertising, talk shows, magazines and contemporary screen and paperback romances. In relation to each it is concerned not only with the representation of women, but also with constructions of masculinity, and how contemporary gender relations are depicted. How should we make sense of the increasing presence of eroticized images of the male body

across the media landscape? What are we to make of the shift from discourses of romance to those of sex and celebrity in young women's magazines? Are talk shows like *Oprah* and *Ricki* redrawing the boundaries between the public and the private? What impact, if any, has the increasing number of female journalists had on 'news'? What kinds of constructions of heterosexual relationships are to be found in 'chick lit' and 'lad lit' and how different are these from traditional romances? These are just some of the questions asked.

Secondly, this book is concerned with the theoretical tools available for analysing media representations. It aims to interrogate some of the key terms that have been used to study gender in media texts, since scholars and activists first engaged with media representations of gender. *Gender and the Media* both acknowledges its debt to the vibrant and heterogeneous feminist media scholarship since the 1970s, and also seeks to question the relevance of some central concepts to critique in today's mediated world. For example, how useful is the notion of 'objectification' in a mediascape in which far from being presented as passive objects women are increasingly depicted as active, desiring sexual subjects? What does it mean to talk about the 'feminization' of an area (e.g. news)? Are the notions of 'backlash', 'retro-sexism' and 'postfeminism' helpful for making sense of contemporary media representations? How should the pervasive irony and playfulness of today's media be understood?

Thirdly, *Gender and the Media* is interested in cultural politics. It seeks to raise questions about what forms of political or cultural intervention are appropriate and effective to challenge particular constructions of gender, in a postmodern age in which critiques are routinely reflexively incorporated into media products and in which much sexism comes in an ironic guise which rebuffs easy

protest: 'that is not a sexist image', we are told, 'it is a hilarious, knowing send-up of an old-fashioned "dumb blonde" stereotypes'! Whilst an earlier generation of feminist media activists put stickers or daubed graffiti on advertising images deemed to insult or trivialize women, today, as often as not, advertisers already orientate to potential critique within the adverts themselves - whether from feminists or simply from media-savvy and 'sign fatigued' consumers, weary of the relentless bombardment by consumer images. How, in this context, might people concerned or angry about media representations of men or women, lesbians or gays, mount an effective political critique? What kind of feminist cultural politics is appropriate for the new media age? I cannot claim exhaustively to answer these questions here, but by providing an analysis of contemporary media representations and pointing to some of the new ways in which gender is figured I hope to draw attention to the ways in which older critical languages may fail to engage with gender in the media today, and to point to spaces where a new cultural politics might be developed.

These three themes - constructions of gender, the theoretical tools for analysing gender in the media, and feminist cultural politics - are what animate this book. Above all, the book deals with what is new and distinctive about representations of gender today compared with earlier eras, what concepts are needed for making sense of this, and what kinds of cultural intervention might constitute effective engagements in the contemporary media landscape.

The book opens with a review of the central themes and concerns of research about gender and the media. [Chapter 1](#) charts different theoretical and political investments in feminist studies of media texts, and examines the turn to audience studies. Although this book is limited to

examining constructions of gender in the media, and does not report on audience research, the notion that texts are polysemic and can be interpreted in multiple ways is central to the analyses presented here. The implications of the shift away from textual determinism or hypodermic conceptions of meaning cannot be overestimated. The chapter also discusses how feminist perspectives have changed as a consequence of critiques by black and Third World women, and the impact of post-structuralism and postmodernism. The final part of the chapter considers some of the central debates about the representation of gender in the media.

The second chapter is more methodological in focus and examines the key approaches that have been used to analyse gender in media texts, for example content analysis, semiotics and discourse analysis, discussing their strengths and weaknesses. It also introduces ideas from postmodernism, postcolonial studies and queer theory, as they have been used in media studies. Together the first two chapters form a foundation for the remainder of the book, which is concerned with looking in detail at five broad areas.

[Chapter 3](#), Advertising and Postfeminism, both reviews earlier studies of gender in advertisements and provides a new analysis of how advertising is changing. Several themes of postfeminist advertising are discussed, including the prevalence of gender reversals and revenge ads, the development of images of empowered, (hetero) sexually active young women, and the growth of 'queer chic' in advertising.

[Chapter 4](#) looks at news and gender. Set against the context of journalism's transformation from a public service to a market-led product, the chapter examines the rise of 'infotainment' or 'newszak' and considers the gender



dimensions of this shift. What makes something newsworthy? How are women represented in the news? Is news being dumbed down? And what is meant by the 'feminization' of journalism? A detailed case study of the reporting of sexual violence provides an opportunity for evaluating the continuities as well as changes in news about gender.

Television talk shows are the subject of [chapter 5](#). The chapter distinguishes between audience discussion programmes, the therapeutic genre and 'trash' or confrontation talk shows, and considers whether talk shows constitute a new 'public sphere' which today eclipses political institutions as a site of significant public debate. Notions of the talk show as the new 'confessional' are also discussed and the chapter examines whether talk shows might be empowering for marginalized groups by giving voice to people not usually heard on mainstream TV and allowing the articulation of anti-normative messages.

[Chapter 6](#) focuses on magazines. It describes some of the shifts in recent years in magazines aimed at girls and women, in particular the adoption of a feminist register, the emphasis upon celebrity, and the promotion of the sexualized body as the key site of femininity. It also examines in detail the rise of the 'lad magazines' since the mid-1990s and asks how this should be understood - as a response to feminism, a reaction against 'de-sexualized' new man scripts or a distinctive new classed and racialized articulation of masculinity.

The last of the substantive chapters considers the genre of romance, which has shown remarkable resilience and staying power in the face of significant social structural shifts and ongoing transformations of intimacy. Focusing on *Bridget Jones's Diary* and the rise of 'chick lit' the chapter examines constructions of gender, 'race' and sexuality and

asks in what ways contemporary popular depictions of heterosexual love are different from earlier romances. These texts are interesting because they are structured both by conventional formulas and by an engagement with feminism. Do they offer new versions of heterosexual partnerships? How different are their constructions of femininity and masculinity compared with Harlequin or Mills & Boon novels? Why and in what way have singleness and the body become such preoccupations? The chapter concludes with a discussion of two popular TV shows - *Ally McBeal* and *Sex and the City* - to put forward an argument about a new postfeminist sensibility.

This argument is developed in the conclusion, which draws together the strands of the book and attempts to provide an assessment of some of the ways in which the representation of gender in the media is changing - partly in response to feminism. The concluding chapter also returns to questions about cultural politics, and, in the light of the arguments provided in the book, asks what kinds of intervention are needed today to engage with and challenge representations of gender in the media in order to produce gender relations that are more equal, open, generous and hopeful.

# 1

## Gender and the Media

### Introduction: Representations Matter

WE live in a world that is stratified along lines of gender, race, ethnicity, class, age, disability, sexuality and location, and in which the privileges, disadvantages and exclusions associated with such categories are unevenly distributed. We also live in a world which is increasingly saturated by media and information and communication technologies. In many respects, the last four decades of research in feminist media studies has been an attempt to explore the relationship between these two facts.

Starting from the proposition that representations matter, feminist analyses of the media have been animated by the desire to understand how images and cultural constructions are connected to patterns of inequality, domination and oppression. Sometimes this has involved examining representations and textual practices in some detail. Sometimes it has emphasized the active, creative negotiations that audiences make with texts. Sometimes the pleasures offered by the media have been foregrounded, and at other times their ideological impact has been stressed. Occasionally, researchers have gone 'behind-the-scenes' to look at the production of particular media, or at the political economy of media industries which means that some media products are made, while others are not even dreamed. Taken together this research has produced a field that is vibrant, exciting and diverse. It is a field that strives to be both theoretically engaged and empirically driven, and which produces rigorous analyses

in the context of ethical and political commitments to creating a more just world.

The study of gender and media is extraordinarily heterogeneous. Researchers may agree that cultural representations constitute an important site for examination and struggle, but on all else they disagree. The field is thus characterized by a plurality of different approaches and perspectives: different methodologies, different theoretical perspectives, different epistemological commitments, different understandings of power, different conceptualizations of the relationship between representations and 'reality', and different understandings of how media images relate to individuals' sense of identity and subjectivity. A feeling for the differences and debates should emerge throughout this book, and the diversity of different approaches is dealt with in detail in [chapter 2](#). In this chapter I want to offer an overview of the field, looking at some of its central themes and preoccupations and examining how and why the study of gender and the media has changed. Of course, this review is a partial and interested one, and its focus is upon laying the foundations to think about how representations have changed since the early studies of gender and media in the 1960s and 1970s, how the available critical vocabularies have been transformed, and what kind of feminist cultural critique is now possible.

The chapter is divided into five parts. In the first part I will look at the assumptions that underpinned early feminist studies of the representation of women in the media and will highlight a number of key features of this work, including its connection to and embeddedness in feminist activist communities and its sense of certainty and confidence about both the meaning of images and the possibility of change. This section will then go on to consider the impact of more complex theories of meaning

coming from post-structuralist theory, psychoanalysis and deconstruction, and will also examine the 'turn to pleasure'.

The second section of the chapter is concerned with the development of audience studies, as a reaction against problematic notions of textual determinism which posited the viewer/reader/hearer as entirely passive. Three types of audience research are considered: focused on interpretations, pleasures, and the use of media as (domestic) communication technologies. This section also raises dilemmas about the role of the feminist cultural critic: should she be claiming respect for women's pleasures or criticizing gender ideologies; celebrating women's choices or formulating alternative representational strategies? What is the relationship of the feminist intellectual to women as a group?

Section three turns to feminism itself and argues that this too has transformed over the past decades in response to black women's critiques, to post-structuralist theory, to the growth of interest in masculinity and the arrival of queer theory on the intellectual scene.

The fourth section is concerned with feminist cultural politics and activism and explores the diverse ways in which feminist analyses of media representations have been translated into demands for change.

Finally, section five, the conclusion of the chapter, raises questions about the efficacy of contemporary critical vocabularies for both analysing and contesting media representations, briefly discussing different views of irony, objectification and the incorporation or commodification of feminist ideas, all of which are taken up and discussed in more detail later in the book. Overall, the chapter seeks to highlight the differences and debates within the study of gender and the media and to give a sense of the ongoing

transformations in this field as critical, theoretical and political perspectives change alongside profound changes in the media themselves.

## **Representations of Women in the Media**

### **The 1970s and all that**

Those involved in the tide of feminist creativity, thinking and activism that swept the Western world in the late 1960s and 1970s faced a challenge that earlier women's movements had not known: a world dominated by media. Unlike their mothers and grandmothers, second-wave feminists were bombarded daily by representations of womanhood and gender relations in news and magazines, on radio and TV, in film and on billboards. Not surprisingly, then, the media became a major focus of feminist research, critique and intervention.

Early feminist media critique came from a number of different sources. Women working or studying in universities within the newly emerging disciplines of cultural studies or communication studies became increasingly aware of the 'blind spot' that characterized these fields in relation to gender. Whilst research from the 1960s and 1970s had a significant interest in the ideological nature of media (particularly news), it was largely defined in a way that excluded questions about the portrayal of women. It focused instead on topics such as the reporting of demonstrations and industrial disputes. The issues of class and class conflict were paramount - reflecting the early influence of Marxism - and research rarely engaged with gender, race or sexuality (CCCS Women's group 1978). Women in universities found that they were up against the 'male as norm' problem, in which

women were frequently entirely invisible, and men were taken to stand for the whole human population.

A second strand of critique came from women who worked within journalism or broadcasting and were concerned about the lack of opportunities for women working within the media. They argued that the lack of interesting fictional roles, the absence of female newsreaders, and the poor representation of women within senior media positions had a profound impact upon how women were seen in society as a whole. Organizations such as Women in Media and the Equality Working Party of the National Union of Journalists in the UK played a key part in promoting awareness of issues about the representation of women and campaigning for change.

Meanwhile, outside both the academy and media industries, other groups of women were angry about what they saw as the narrow range of patronizing or demeaning stereotypes through which women were represented. A number of feminist groups were established in Europe, Australia and the USA (and elsewhere) whose aim was to monitor the way that women were portrayed, to campaign against sexist advertisements, and to challenge 'degrading' presentations of women, such as televisual events like the Miss World competition.

One of the things that is striking about this moment was the degree of congruence and overlap between the agendas of academics, media workers and activists. Indeed, one of the earliest and most famous studies of the representation of women in advertising in the USA was conducted by the National Organization of Women (NOW) and published in the *New York Times Magazine* (Hennessee 1972). It relied on 'ordinary women' from all over the USA analysing and coding television adverts. The study analysed more than 1,200 commercials over an eighteen-month period. It found

that more than one-third of adverts showed women as domestic agents who were dependent upon men, and nearly half portrayed women as 'household functionaries'. The study also reported many examples of women being depicted as 'decorative objects' and portrayed as 'unintelligent'.

Many other studies from this era were conducted using a similar content analytic strategy. Essentially content analysis involves counting the number of instances of particular kinds of portrayal - such as the number of women relative to men, or the number of times women in adverts or dramas are shown in the kitchen or bedroom - to produce quantitative statistical data (see [chapter 2](#) for more discussion). The advantages of this approach are that it is quick, cheap and produces high-status quantitative results. As the NOW study demonstrated, it can also be done by anyone after a minimum of training, and produces data that are hard-hitting and useful for campaigning purposes.

Not all gender and media research in the 1970s relied upon content analysis, however. Some researchers were extremely critical of the limitations of this form of analysis - attacking it for its problematic 'realist' assumptions, a preoccupation with only the manifest content of representations, and a focus on single images - usually well-worn stereotypes - rather than broader structures of meaning (Cowie 1978; Gledhill 1978; Baehr 1980; Jaddou and Williams 1981). In Europe, two other traditions of work developed in the 1970s - semiotic analysis and ideological analysis. This research did not rely for its force upon contrasts between representations and 'reality' but instead was concerned with how texts operate to produce meanings which reproduce dominant ideologies of gender (e.g. McRobbie 1977; Williamson 1978; Winship 1978).



Looking back from the vantage point of the twenty-first century, all this work is notable not only for building the foundations of feminist media studies, but also for the extraordinary (by today's academic standards) *confidence* of the analyses produced. Reviewing a decade of studies in 1978, Gaye Tuchman (1978) unequivocally entitled her article 'the symbolic annihilation of women in the mass media', and wrote of how women were being destroyed by a combination of 'absence', 'trivialization' and 'condemnation'. Such clear evaluations were not unique and were accompanied by similarly robust calls to action – whether these were voiced as demands for more women in the industry, campaigns for 'positive images' or 'guerrilla interventions' into billboard advertisements. Writing about this period of research on gender and the media, Angela McRobbie (1999) has characterized it as one of 'angry repudiation'.

### **Beyond transmission: instabilities of meaning**

By the late 1980s 'angry repudiation' had largely given way to something more equivocal and complex. As Myra Macdonald (1995) has noted, one of the reasons for this is that media content changed dramatically over this period. The notion that the media offered a relatively stable template of femininity to which to aspire gave way to a much more plural and fragmented set of signifiers of gender. There was a new playfulness in media representations, a borrowing of codes between different genres, and a growing awareness and interest in processes of image construction, as evidenced in the increasing number of programmes which featured humorous outtakes from films, home video compilations, and behind-the-scenes programmes about the making of films, adverts and TV series. Overall, media output was shaped by producers and consumers who were increasingly 'media-

savvy' and familiar with the terms of cultural critique, including feminism (Goldman 1992).

Paralleling this change in media content was a profound shift in the theoretical languages available to media scholars. Liesbet Van Zoonen (1994) has argued that despite the significant differences between content analysis, semiotics and ideological analysis, these positions all relied upon a *transmission model* of the media: a view that the media are agents of social control conveying stereotypical and ideological values about women and femininity. This view was challenged and disrupted by the arrival of post-structuralism onto the intellectual scene: a collection of ideas loosely associated with the writings of Derrida, Foucault and Lacan. There is not space to explore these thinkers' ideas in any detail here (but see [chapter 2](#) for a longer discussion). Their impact on feminist media studies was felt largely in three ways.

First, this body of writing gave weight to the critique of realism that was already underway within feminist media studies. Indictment of media content for its bias or distortion relied on the notion of an unproblematic distinction between 'representations' and 'reality' that - in post-structuralist terms - is unsustainable: being premised on a notion of some pure, unmediated access to reality. In practice, as Charlotte Brunsdon (1987) has argued, calls for more realistic representations of gender are usually calls for one's own version of reality to be depicted.

Moreover, 'more feminist' images might be perceived as thin and propagandist by many audiences because they do not have the familiarity or easy-recognizability of other more stereotypical representations. Rather than calling for a hall of mirrors in the media, calls for realism might best be reformulated as attempts to create greater diversity in representations of women - in a context in which most women who appear in the media are young, white, able-

bodied, middle-class, apparently heterosexual and conventionally attractive (Macdonald 1995).

In place of the view of the media as reflecting reality, research drawing on post-structuralist frameworks argued that the media were involved in constructing reality. Quite literally they produced and constituted understandings, subjectivities and versions of the world. This insight extended to gender: rather than there being a pre-existing reality to the meaning of the categories masculine and feminine, the media were involved in actively producing gender. In the words of Theresa de Lauretis (1989), cinema, television, magazines are 'technologies of gender' (as well as of 'race', class, and other differences): the representation of gender *is* its construction. (A discussion of how Judith Butler's work extended this notion is found in [chapter 2](#).)

This constructionist argument connects to a second impact of post-structuralism on feminist media studies: namely a developing interest in identity, subjectivity and desire. This represented a break with the traditional notion of the unified rational subject, and suggested that subjectivity was split, fragmented and contradictory. Femininity and masculinity were thus conceived of as shifting and subject to change; ongoing discursive constructions rather than fixed positions. In film studies and analyses of visual culture this led to developing interest in how texts positioned spectators. In the less psychoanalytically influenced world of media studies it was felt more powerfully as a 'turn to discourse' and an interest in the discursive construction of gender and sexuality. (Queer theory is discussed in [chapter 2](#).)

Thirdly, post-structuralist ideas destabilized conventional notions of meaning. Building on the semiotic idea of chains of signification, Derrida's work pointed to the ways that

meaning could resist fixity and could be endlessly deferred. In post-structuralist theory meaning is never single, univocal or total, but rather is fluid, ambiguous and contradictory: a site of ongoing conflict and contestation. One of the issues this raised for studies of gender in the media was how, then, to identify representations as sexist or progressive. Was their meaning completely open? This remains a central tension in the field with ongoing debates about how particular images should be read. As notions of irony, parody and pastiche abound, such dilemmas have become even more complex: in the last few years, images that for some commentators represent crude and offensive stereotypes have been reclaimed as ironic, playful or even subversive comments or send-ups.

Finally post-structuralism called into question the 'innocence' of feminism, asking it to acknowledge its 'will to power', a point that had particular resonances with black women's critique of the ways that the feminist knowledge could be used to support attacks on the black population, for example in racist immigration policies (see later in this chapter). One can think also of how feminist-sounding ideas about women's oppression under the Taliban regime in Afghanistan were used by the Bush administration to justify bombing that country.

## **Media pleasures**

If the language for critical evaluation of texts changed in the late 1980s, then feminist media studies was also transformed by what we might call the 'turn to pleasure'. This had a number of determinants. At a general level it grew out of the collapse in the notion of a straightforward, unproblematic distinction between high and popular culture that is associated with postmodernism and with the increasing institutional respectability of media and cultural studies (Jameson 1984; Foster 1985; Featherstone 1991).

This challenged traditional notions of aesthetic value and argued that it was as meaningful to study Bob Dylan as John Keats, as one famous discussion put it (Hare 1992). It was connected with radical critiques of the artistic and literary 'canon' and with a desire to democratize what was seen by some as a white, male, elitist notion of 'culture'.

Another set of influences on the turn to pleasure came from the growing anger amongst feminist writers that media forms enjoyed by women were ignored, or condemned as trivial and uninteresting. This was not just a matter of academics ignoring popular culture; a specifically gendered dynamic was in play: it was understood as the dismissal of women's culture. Writing about her decision to study soap operas, for example, Christine Geraghty (1991) argued that programmes enjoyed by so many women should not be ignored and were worthy of attention simply because they offered so much pleasure to female audiences. The lack of attention to what were sometimes (problematically) known as 'women's genres' was regarded as part of a more general double standard which always worked to ignore or disparage women's interests: the time had come to 'rescue' these and accord them some proper attention and respect.

Alongside these factors there was also increasing frustration at the straitjacketing effect of critical readings of texts and what was perceived by some as the tedious monotony of their depressing findings about sexism in the media. For some writers, the reduction of studies of the media to studies of the working of gender ideologies constituted too restricted and impoverished an understanding. It did not even begin to address the multiple, contradictory and pleasurable ways in which media played a part in people's lives (Brown 1990). For others, a focus on pleasure was needed not to counterbalance the focus on ideology, but to deepen understandings of it: without knowing how texts address

profound unmet desires or offer pleasures, a full understanding of the workings of ideology in the media was not deemed possible (Modleski 1982; Radway 1984).

The move was also given impetus by the 'guilty prefaces phenomenon'. This was the tendency of feminist critics to start their books or articles by professing of their (often secret) enjoyment of the texts under consideration (e.g. glossy magazines or soap operas) before proceeding with an ideological deconstruction in which pleasure would never be mentioned again (Winship 1987). As Jean Grimshaw put it, 'it is perfectly possible to agree in one's head that certain images of women might be reactionary or damaging or oppressive while remaining committed to them in emotion or desire' (1999: 99).

One of the earliest and most significant attempts to take pleasure seriously is to be found in Tania Modleski's (1982) *Loving with a Vengeance*, which analysed soap operas, Gothic novels and Harlequin romances. Positioned partly as a critique of earlier feminist writing on romance which dismissed it variously as a seductive trap to make male domination more palatable, a distraction (from women's struggle for equality) or a kind of false consciousness, Modleski used psychoanalytic theory to attempt to theorize the kinds of pleasure offered to women by these forms. Talking about popular romances, Modleski argued that they are not simply escapist fantasies designed to dope women but fictions that engage in complex and contradictory ways with real problems - offering temporary, magical, fantasy or symbolic solutions (see [chapter 7](#) for detailed discussion).

Modleski's book was a *tour de force* which had a dramatic impact on the entire way romance was understood.

Nevertheless it is worth pointing out that her thesis about the pleasures of soaps and other fictions was based entirely on her own textual reading and did not include any form of