

International Journal of Media & Cultural Politics  
Volume 10 Number 2

© 2014 Intellect Ltd Article. English language. doi: 10.1386/macp.10.2.179\_1

---

**ROSALIND GILL**

City University London

**ANA SOFIA ELIAS**

King's College London

# ‘Awaken your incredible’: Love your body discourses and postfeminist contradictions

## **ABSTRACT**

*In this article we focus on a new yet under-examined cultural phenomenon: the turn to ‘Love your body’ (LYB) discourses. Taking a feminist critical standpoint, we move away from an affirmative reading of LYB discourses and instead understand them as a postfeminist articulation of sexism. Our analysis identifies the key motifs of LYB discourses and contextualizes their dramatic proliferation over the last decade. Situated at the historical convergence of neoliberal governmentality, emotional capitalism, the growth of social media and commodity feminism, we trace how LYB discourses have emerged within the advertising genre to quickly saturate media more broadly. The article concludes with a critical assessment of LYB discourses that seeks to flesh out its distinctive contradictions and its ideological workings. In so doing, we will argue that far from representing a liberation from harmful beauty standards, LYB discourses are implicated in a deeper and more pernicious regulation of women that has shifted from bodily to psychic regulation.*

## **KEYWORDS**

postfeminism  
governmentality  
sexism  
beauty politics  
love your body  
discourses  
advertising  
social media  
emotional capitalism

Congratulations to the *International Journal of Media and Cultural Politics* on its tenth anniversary! The aim of this article is to chart the emergence of ‘Love your body’ discourses in the media over a period that is coterminous with the journal’s life. Love your body discourses are positive, affirmative, seemingly feminist-inflected media messages, targeted exclusively at girls and women, that exhort us to believe we are beautiful, to ‘remember’ that we are ‘incredible’ and that tell us that we have ‘the power’ to ‘redefine’ the ‘rules of beauty’.

Love your body (LYB) discourses have emerged over the last decade as a result of multiple factors, including the growth of social media (Messaris 2012), and attempts by more established media to respond to feminist critiques of what have been characterized as both ‘unrealistic’ and ‘harmful’ body image ideals. They are part of moves towards what has been understood as ‘emotional capitalism’ (Illouz 2007) and ‘cool capitalism’ (McGuigan 2012). LYB discourses are important and powerful because of the way they appear to interrupt the almost entirely normalized hostile judgement and surveillance of women’s bodies in contemporary media culture. As such, they may have a profound affective force for women more accustomed to being invited to relate to their own and other women’s bodies in terms of ‘flaws’ (spots, cellulite, dry skin) and ‘battles’ (with eating disorders, fat, self-esteem). Online discussions testify to many women’s relief and joy at the positive message of LYB discourses, and the emotional power of being encouraged – for once – to feel okay about themselves (e.g. Lynch 2011). We have experienced this too, being moved to tears by many of the LYB videos circulating virally – marking the perpetually under-explored affective dimensions of ideology (Gill 2008).

Notwithstanding this, in this article we seek to reflect critically on these discourses. It has been argued that the shortage of literature addressing this discursive formation contrasts with its proliferation over recent years (Lynch 2011). The latest advertising campaigns by Dove (2013), Special K (2013) and Weightwatchers (2013) – and we could add many others – testify to the sustained spiralling of these discourses in the space of just one year. In subjecting them to a critical analysis, we build on and extend existing literature by arguing that they do not represent a straightforward liberation from tyrannical beauty standards, and may in fact instantiate new, more pernicious forms of power that engender a shift from bodily to psychic regulation. We will argue that they are much more ambivalent texts than they seem to be, are difficult to critique and perhaps impossible (in Judith Butler’s sense) to live.

This critical project is important as an examination of the evolution of a particular kind of contemporary discourse seemingly aligned with the historical emergence of ‘the state of esteem’ as a technology of citizenship and self-governance (see Cruikshank 1993). It is also important because it draws our attention to the *dynamics* of sexism as an ongoing set of discourses and practices, highlighting the capacity of media discourses to change and mutate in response to critique. Situated in a broader understanding of new racism, new sexism and new homophobia (e.g. Barker 1981; Billig 1988; Gill 1993; Hansen-Miller and Gill 2011; Wetherell and Potter 1992), this perspective insists upon seeing these ideological formations and discursive practices as *fluid and malleable practices of power* rather than fixed or static sets of ideas, images or discourses. Indeed our examination of LYB discourses highlights what we regard as a distinctively *postfeminist* articulation of sexism that is quite distinct from earlier modalities. We start our discussion with a brief summary of the key motifs of LYB discourses, then

look at their emergence genealogically before moving on to their critical interrogation.

### **MOTIFS OF LOVE YOUR BODY DISCOURSE**

You refused to give up trying; you survived school; you did not run from your first kiss; you sought out adventure; you fell out of love, bravely back into it; you said yes to always being there; you stood up for what you believed in; you conquered the impossible daily; you won unwinnable battles [...] these are your stories. Never forget how incredible you are.

(Advert for Weightwatchers 2013)

At the heart of LYB discourses is the production of positive affect. If many media discourses about women’s bodies (for example, in magazines or advertising) are characterized by a focus on what is *wrong* (‘dry, lumpy, orange peel skin’) or how it can be improved (‘get smoother-looking, softer skin’), then LYB discourses constitute a dramatic – apparently counter-hegemonic – interruption. They tell women that they are ‘sexy at any size’, ‘beautiful just the way you are’, and should feel appreciative and confident about their bodies. An early example or forerunner of LYB came in a series of Nike adverts placed in women’s magazines in the 1990s, which asserted that Nike shared feminist anger about the ways in which women are set up to follow ‘impossible goals’, that are not ‘real’, but ‘synthetic illusions’ created by photographic retouching. These adverts ‘kicked off’ (Williamson 1978) against ideals of bodily perfection and featured the (now obligatory) reassurance that ‘you’re beautiful just the way you are’. Some years later, Dove’s famous advertising campaign announced that ‘beauty comes in many shapes and ages and sizes’ and used putatively ‘ordinary’ women in its poster and magazine campaigns. As one slogan put it: ‘firming the thighs of a size 8 model wouldn’t be much of a challenge’. Other ads in the series invited us to choose between various preferred and disfavoured check-box options; for example, ‘fat’ or ‘fit’ and ‘wrinkled’ or ‘wonderful’. The text that accompanied it exhorted viewers to join the ‘campaign for real beauty’ set up by Dove (for a detailed discussion, see Gill 2007; Johnson and Taylor 2008; Murray 2012). Today the company/campaign has produced a steady stream of virally circulated messages and promotional videos, which target ‘unhealthy’ body image messages and call on women to believe in their own beauty.

A common theme in these communications is a relationship to the self that has gone bad or been broken, for some – mostly unspecified – reasons. Another advert by Nike showed a cute white toddler with a pink ribbon in her hair. The slogan asked: ‘when was the last time you felt comfortable with your body?’ The implied answer is that it was sometime between your first and second birthday after which being a female embodied subject became difficult and painful. In Dove’s 2013 film ‘Selfie’, girls’ negative feelings about their bodies are attributed to their mothers, whilst the film stops just short of an all-out mother-blaming by showing that they too are suffering from similarly low self-esteem and body self-hatred. Other communications indict vague targets such as ‘TV’ or ‘magazines’.

It is interesting to note that social media are presented by contrast as a tool for subversion rather than part of the problem (the widespread hate speech and trolling of women going apparently unnoticed). In what we have elsewhere explored as ‘selfie esteem’ (Elias and Gill forthcoming), LYB

1. Whilst, at the time of writing, Dove's Patches has been viewed twenty million times on YouTube since its release three weeks earlier on 9 April 2014.

discourses suggest that self-photography and the related posting to sites such as Instagram or snapchat is a tool for building rather than undermining body confidence. 'You have the power to change and redefine what beauty is', says Dove's educator in the same film. 'The power is in your hands because now more than ever it is right at our fingertips: we can take selfies!' This captures both the celebratory tone of much of this discourse, as well as its focus upon self-empowerment – another key motif. It resonates with Sarah Banet-Weiser's (2013) discussion of 'the market for self-esteem' and its role in 'neoliberal brand culture'. Shrugging off negative body image and low self-esteem are presented as simple tasks: merely a matter of 'remembering' how incredible you are (as in the Weightwatchers advert above) or 'realizing' (perhaps through a good selfie or some nice comments from other women) that 'I'm beautiful'. A powerful example of the engineering of this 'realization' is to be found in another recent campaign, Dove Real Beauty Sketches, in which a forensic artist draws two pictures of the same woman – one based on her self-description, the other (consistently more attractive) based upon what another woman says about her. The film tells us 'you are more beautiful than you think', and features the tearful epiphanies of women as they suddenly experience the mismatch between their own self-perceptions and how they may be seen by generous others.

## THE RISE AND RISE OF LYB DISCOURSE

LYB discourse in advertising picked up on feminist critiques of the body-image pressures to which women are subjected (see Gill 2007), and it also resonates with a wider movement towards the depiction of more accessible forms of 'cool' (Frank 1998; Heath and Potter 2004; Johnson and Taylor 2008). The exponential growth of social media has amplified this trend, as advertisers look for ways to get people to circulate their promotional messages for them. Warm, funny or touching films with 'feel good' factor are much more likely to be shared online than straightforward promotional films. For example, Dove's Real Beauty Sketches has, at the time of writing this article, been viewed 62 million times on YouTube.<sup>1</sup> This represents a far greater exposure than the company could hope to achieve on television, in cinemas or in print media. What's more, the link is shared with a select demographic, and the fact of receiving it from a friend with a message such as 'You must watch this – it made me cry' is believed by advertisers to heighten viewers' receptiveness as compared with traditional forms of advertising.

However, if commercially motivated LYB discourse started in advertising, it quickly spread out across a range of media. Women's magazines are a key site of such ideas, materialized both as a predictable, stable visual regime of apparently 'natural' women's bodies, and a set of discourses that report on 'real women' talking about 'real problems' in intimate and confessional language (Murphy 2013; Murphy and Jackson 2011). They enjoin women to 'celebrate your curves', 'feel kick-ass sexy' and 'get body confident for the summer'. The content reflects women's magazines' attempts to distance themselves from widespread accusations of 'promoting' eating disorders, and their move into the territory of self-esteem and well-being, alongside appearance. Here, then, confidence becomes a 'technology of sexiness' (Radner 1993) that is more important than the look or size or shape of the body. This is reinforced through interviews with heterosexual men who extol the sexiness

of body confidence, and advice from psychologists and lifestyle coaches who warn that neediness and insecurity are unattractive (see Gill 2009; see also Lynch 2011; Murphy 2013; Murphy and Jackson 2011).

Reality TV shows, too, have begun to adopt LYB discourse. ‘Makeover’ shows from the early 2000s – such as *‘What Not to Wear’* and *‘10 Years Younger’* often featured judgemental, even vicious, commentaries on their participants’ appearance, part of what Angela McRobbie (2004) labelled the ‘new nastiness’ of television. More recent body-focused series, however, are characterized by a gentler, kinder ethos – best exemplified by the warmth of presenter Gok Wan in *‘How to Look Good Naked’*, consistently encouraging women to ‘make the most of your assets’ and ‘feel good’ about themselves (see also Peck 2008 on Oprah). With a steady popularity in the United Kingdom since its debut in 2006 (Rodrigues 2012), the show’s narrative arc leads to a regular money shot in which the (previously insecure, shy, body-hating) woman must ‘bare all’ in a public space – for example, walk only in her underwear along a catwalk set up in a shopping mall. As in magazines, the representation of the undressed, ‘authentic’ woman with nowhere to hide constitutes a defining visual trope of the show. But the makeover is arguably less about the body itself than about the attitude to the body. Couched in ‘quasi-feminist terms of empowerment and antibeautey’, it ‘deemphasizes the sartorial makeover’ and aims instead to ‘engender intangible, long-term, internal change’ (Rodrigues 2012: 48). Indeed the body only becomes available to be celebrated and to be read as beautiful and desirable precisely because of the participant’s new confidence and self-appreciation – a body love, then, that is both demonstrated and constituted by the ability to put herself on display.

## LYB DISCOURSE: A CRITICAL ASSESSMENT

In a culture that tells women to hate their bodies, and subjects female celebrities and women in the public eye to ‘nano-surveillance’ (Elias 2014) and excoriating critique for the most minimal of aesthetic ‘misdemeanours’ (having a stray undepilated hair, a blocked pore, lined hands), LYB discourses may seem a Good Thing, a welcome intervention into a landscape of hostile scrutiny. We want to suggest, however, that they are more ambivalent than they may at first appear to be.

The first and most obvious point of critique concerns what many have pointed out as the ‘fakeness’ of the visual regime of LYB (e.g. Murphy and Jackson 2011; Murray 2012). Many of the companies adopting the iconography of ‘natural’, ‘real’ women, and passing it off as ‘authentic’ use precisely the techniques that they claim to reject: make up and Photoshop. For instance, there has been discussions of the realness/visual fraud of Dove Pro-Age texts (Murray 2012: 15), which revealed the company’s espousal of the very same battery of visual effects (cosmetic and technological) of which it has been critical – for instance, in the ‘Evolution’ film, which exposes the transformation of a ‘real’ woman into a billboard supermodel (see Murray 2012: 12). Real bodies – un-made up, naturally lit, and shot without the benefits of filters, skin tone retouching or resizing – are just not lovable enough, it seems. Indeed, there is a marked disjuncture between the verbal and visual texts: while linguistic texts reject ‘beauty pressures’ and highlight the artifice and toxicity of perfect model ideals, the visual texts seem strikingly to resemble just these.

Linked to this ‘paradox of realness’, second, we would note that the apparent ‘democratization’ of beauty and ‘diversification’ of body types, sizes

and ages represent only a tiny shift from the normative ideal of female attractiveness seen in most adverts – what has been referred to as the ‘diversity paradox’ (Rodrigues 2012) or ‘a mediated ritual of rebellion’ (Kadir and Tidy 2011) (see also Gill 2015, on race and class in modelling). In 2010 Dove was exposed placing an advert in New York City *Craigslist* searching for ‘flawless’ non-models for the next commercial. The Craigslist ad stated: ‘Beautiful arms and legs and face[...] naturally fit, not too curvy or athletic[...] Beautiful hair and skin is a must’. An article in *The Week*, commenting upon this, noted that Dove’s ‘Come as You Are’ campaign has an ‘if you’re flawless, that is’ clause attached. (To say nothing of the assumptions about age, cis gender and able-bodiedness involved.)

Third, it is striking to note that many of the companies at the forefront of promoting LYB are precisely those invested in maintaining female body dissatisfaction in order to sell their products (Gill 2007; Johnson and Taylor 2008; Lynch 2011; Markula 2001; Murphy and Jackson 2011). A 2013 virally circulated advert for the diet cereal brand Special K is a good example. Entitled ‘Let’s shut down fat talk’, it claims that 93 per cent of women ‘fat talk’, that is, make negative comments about their own (and others) weight and attractiveness. It dramatizes this powerfully by creating a shopping environment in which the so-called ‘actual fat talk’ (such as ‘I’m feeling so disgusted about my figure at the moment’ or ‘cellulite is in my DNA’) is reproduced on labels and posters around the store. The unwitting female customers respond with horror: ‘what *is* this?!’ before acknowledging ‘I’ve said those things about myself’. The advert concludes that we are doing this to ourselves and must all stop – a response that paradoxically involves *silencing* women: ‘ssshhh’, say the women together, ‘let’s shut down fat talk’. Again, this is an affectively powerful piece – much viewed on YouTube – but what might be overlooked in this call to arms is Special K’s own problematic role in decades of aggressive advertising that suggests that being lovable is contingent upon being thin. ‘Stay special’, the brand’s byline, has often been used subtly (and in our view chillingly) to imply that bad things will happen to women who do not attend to their weight vigilantly (for example, their partners will no longer love them). Special K women are uniformly slim but curvy, and appear in a variety of red clothing (to match the brand colour) from swimsuits to slinky dresses. Meanwhile, the Special K website features diet, ‘slimming’ and exercise plans and a BMI counter – somewhat at odds with its critique of ‘fat talk’ (though astute observers will note that this form of hate speech is not condemned in its own right, but only because it is a ‘barrier’ to ‘weight loss’). Their 2014 slogan – in tune with the LYB and ‘confidence movement’ zeitgeist – promises that Special K will help you ‘Discover a more confident you’.

Not only do these current LYB advertisements obscure their own investment in the ‘fat talk’ they claim to oppose, but they also – seemingly paradoxically – rely upon repeatedly making visible what we might call ‘hate your body talk’ – reinforcing the very ideas they purport to challenge – and relocating them as individual women’s problems (as if they were entirely disconnected from an injurious culture). This leads to a fourth point of critique, then, namely the way in which LYB discourses rely upon and reinforce the cultural intelligibility of the female body as inherently ‘difficult to love’ (see, for instance, Lynch 2011; Murphy 2013). In doing so, they ‘re-cite’ (Butler 1997) hateful discourse about the female body that depends upon its normalized cultural pathologization (McRobbie 2009). As we discuss elsewhere (Elias and Gill forthcoming), this is figured contradictorily as a profound and enduring broken relationship with

the self, and yet, simultaneously, as superficial, self-generated and relatively easy for any individual woman to slough off. LYB discourse repeatedly suggests that women 'do this to themselves' (i.e. the blame and responsibility lies with them) and can therefore simply 'stop' 'because the power is in your hands' (all quotes come from current advertising campaigns). As one woman in the special K advert discussed above put it, 'fat talk [...] is like bullying yourself'. Once she realized this, another woman commented, 'I can't speak that way about myself [anymore]'. In this way, women's difficult relationships to their own embodied selves are both dislocated from their structural determinants in patriarchal capitalism and shorn of their psychosocial complexity (see also Lynch 2011; Murphy 2013). There is a sharp disjuncture, we contend, between the levels of pain and distress portrayed in LYB discourses we have considered, and the apparently 'simple' solutions on offer: 'all you need is a pen and a piece of paper' asserts 'Operation Beautiful' (Boyle 2009), whilst other texts suggest a digital upgrade – 'selfie esteem' (Elias and Gill forthcoming) or a 'camo confession' (Dermablend 2014).

Finally, we would argue that LYB discourses are problematic for the way they are implicated in a new cultural scaffolding (Gavey 2005) for the regulation of women. No longer is it enough to work on and discipline the body, but in today's society the beautiful body must be accompanied by a beautiful mind, with suitably upgraded and modernized postfeminist attitudes to the self. Women must makeover not simply their bodies but now – thanks to LYB discourse – their subjectivity as well, embracing an affirmative confident disposition, no matter how they actually feel. The psychosocial costs of this have barely begun to be studied. But as one student of ours vividly put it after hearing us discuss this material, if in the old regime you watched your weight and went to the gym, in the era of LYB you now go straight from the gym to the therapist's couch to work on instilling the proper compulsory 'body love'. Far from representing a liberation, then, it would seem that LYB discourse is implicated in an ever deeper and more pernicious regulation of women, that has shifted from *body* as image/project to *psychic life*. Beauty becomes 'a state of mind', not in a feminist sense that involves a rejection of and liberation from patriarchal appearance standards, but in a way that represents an *intensification* of pressure and its *extensification* from body work to psychic labour. In line with other critics (Gill and Scharff 2011; Murray 2012; Rodrigues 2012), we suggest that this move to the arena of subjectivity needs to be understood vis-à-vis a new historical articulation of power – knowledge in Western societies, which highlights the interplay between neoliberal and postfeminist governmentality, emotional capitalism and the labour of self-confidence. Crucially then, LYB discourses 'may be shaping subjectivities by enlisting audiences' labor' in the service of institutional power (Murray 2012: 13) 'in a way that confounds any neat separation of the "empowered" from the powerful' (Cruikshank 1993: 341). It is this entanglement, this multi-layering of oppression – and its penetration into psychic life – that our work aims to critique.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many thanks to Ann Phoenix, Christina Scharff and Bruna Seu for their helpful comments on a draft of this article, and to Sara de Benedictis, Simidele Dosekun, Laura Garcia Favaro and Rachel O'Neill and for inspiring ongoing conversations about women's bodies in postfeminist culture.

## REFERENCES

- Banet-Weiser, S. (2013), 'Am I pretty or ugly? Girls and the market for self-esteem', *Girlhood Studies*, 7: 1, pp. 83–101.
- Barker, M. (1981), *The New Racism: Conservatives and the Ideology of the Tribe*, London: Junction Books.
- Billig, M. (1988), 'The notion of "prejudice": Some rhetorical and ideological aspects', *Text*, 8: 1–2, pp. 91–110.
- Boyle, C. (2009), [blog] *Operation beautiful*, <http://www.operationbeautiful.com/about-2/>. Accessed 30 April 2014.
- Butler, J. (1997), *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative*, New York: Routledge.
- Cruikshank, B. (1993), 'Revolutions within: Self-government and self-esteem', *Economy and Society*, 22: 3, pp. 327–44.
- Dermablend's Camo confession (2014), *Dermablend Professional*, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=yBKr4uxXRi0>. Accessed 30 April 2014.
- Dove's Beauty Sketches (You are more beautiful than you think) (2013), *Dove/Unilever*, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XpaOjMXyJGk>. Accessed 30 April 2014.
- Dove's Selfie (2014), *Dove/Unilever*, [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=\\_3agBWqGfRo](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_3agBWqGfRo). Accessed 30 April 2014.
- Elias, A. (2014), 'Young women, postfeminism and self-beautification: A feminist cross-cultural and psychosocial analysis', Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, London: King's College.
- Elias, A. and Gill, R. (forthcoming), 'Love your body but hate it too: Postfeminism, neoliberalism and selfie esteem', under submission to *Feminism & Psychology*.
- Frank, T. (1998), *The Conquest of Cool: Business Culture, Counterculture, and the Rise of Hip Consumerism*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gavey, N. (2005), *Just Sex? The Cultural Scaffolding of Rape*, London: Routledge.
- Gill, R. (1993), 'Justifying injustice: Broadcasters accounts of inequality in radio', in E. Burman and I. Parker (eds), *Discourse Analytic Research: Readings and Repertoires of Texts in Action*, London: Routledge, pp. 75–93.
- (2007), *Gender and the Media*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- (2008), 'Culture and subjectivity in neoliberal and postfeminist times', *Subjectivity*, 25: 1, pp. 432–45.
- (2009), 'Mediated intimacy and postfeminism: A discourse analytic examination of sex and relationships advice in a women's magazine', *Discourse & communication*, 3: 4, pp. 345–69.
- (2015), *Gender and the Media* (Second edition, expanded, revised and updated), Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gill, R. and Scharff, C. (eds) (2011), 'Introduction', in *New Femininities: Postfeminism, Neoliberalism and Subjectivity*, Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.
- Hansen-Miller, D. and Gill, R. (2011), "'Lad flicks": Discursive reconstructions of masculinity in popular film', in H. Radner and R. Stringer (eds), *Feminism at the Movies: Understanding Gender in Contemporary Popular Cinema*, New York: Routledge, pp. 36–50.
- Heath, J. and Potter, A. (2004), *The Rebel Sell: Why the Culture Can't Be Jammed*, Toronto: HarperCollins.
- Illouz, E. (2007), *Cold Intimacies: The Making of Emotional Capitalism*, Cambridge: Polity Press.



- Johnson, J. and Taylor, J. (2008), 'Feminist consumerism and fat activists: A comparative study of grassroots activism and the dove real beauty campaign', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 33: 4, pp. 941–66.
- Kadir, S. and Tidy, J. (2011), 'Gays, gaze and aunty Gok: The disciplining of gender and sexuality in how to look good naked', *Feminist Media Studies*, 13: 2, pp. 177–91.
- Lynch, M. (2011), 'Blogging for beauty? A critical analysis of operation beautiful', *Women's Studies International Forum*, 34: 6, pp. 582–92.
- Markula, P. (2001), 'Beyond the perfect body: Women's body image distortion in fitness magazine discourse', *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 25: 2, pp. 158–79.
- McGuigan, J. (2012), 'The coolness of capitalism today', *tripleC*, 10: 2, pp. 425–38.
- McRobbie, A. (2004), 'Notes on "what not to wear" and post-feminist symbolic violence', *The Sociological Review*, 52: s2, pp. 97–109.
- (2009), *The Aftermath of Feminism: Gender, Culture and Social Change*, London: Sage.
- Messararis, P. (2012), 'Visual "literacy" in the digital age', *Review of Communication*, 12: 2, pp. 101–17.
- Murphy, R. (2013), '(De)Constructing "body love" discourses in young women's magazines', Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Victoria: University of Wellington.
- Murphy, R. and Jackson, S. (2011), 'Bodies-as-image? The body made visible in magazine love your body content', *Women's Studies Journal*, 25: 1, pp. 17–30.
- Murray, D. P. (2012), 'Branding "real" social change in Dove's campaign for real beauty', *Feminist Media Studies*, 13: 1, pp. 83–101.
- Peck, J. (2008), *The Age of Oprah: Cultural Icon for the Neoliberal Era*, Boulder: Paradigm Pub.
- Radner, H. (1993), 'Pretty is as pretty does: Free enterprise and the marriage plot', in H. Collins, H. Radner and A. Preacher (eds), *Film Theory Goes to the Movies*, New York: Routledge, pp. 79–97.
- Rodrigues, S. (2012), 'Undressing Homogeneity: Prescribing Femininity and the transformation of self-esteem in how to look good naked', *Journal of Popular Film and Television*, 40: 1, pp. 42–51.
- Special K's Shut Down Fat Talk (2013), *Special K/ Kellogg Company*, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6roJKaihNf0>. Accessed 30 April 2014.
- Weightwatchers's Awaken your incredible (2013), *Weightwatchers*. (Australia), <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jaPzQXahvQw&feature=youtu.be>. Accessed 30 April 2014.
- Wetherell, M. and Potter, J. (1992), *Mapping the Language of Racism: Discourse and the Legitimation of Racism*, Hertfordshire, UK: Harvester Wheathersheaf.
- Williamson, J. (1978), *Decoding Advertisements: Ideology and Meaning in Advertising*, London: Marion Boyars.

## SUGGESTED CITATION

- Gill, R. and Elias, A. S. (2014), '"Awaken your incredible": Love your body discourses and postfeminist contradictions', *International Journal of Media & Cultural Politics*, 10: 2, pp. 179–188, doi: 10.1386/macp.10.2.179\_1

## CONTRIBUTOR DETAILS

Rosalind Gill is Professor of Cultural and Social Analysis at the City University of London. Her research interests are in the areas of gender and media, cultural and creative work, and mediated intimacy. Professor Gill has been a leading academic voice in debates about the 'sexualization of culture'. Her latest book is *Theorizing Cultural Work: Labour, Continuity and Change in the Creative Industries* (Routledge, 2013).

Contact: Department of Music, Culture, and Creative Industries, School of Arts and Social Sciences, City University London, Northampton Square, London EC1V 0HB, UK.

E-mail: rosalind.gill.2@city.ac.uk

Ana Sofia Elias is a Ph.D. student at the Department of Culture, Media and Creative Industries, at King's College London. Her research examines young women's negotiation of beauty practices in contemporary Portugal and the United Kingdom. Her work seeks to contribute to the conceptualization and empirical study of postfeminism anchored in feminist transnational epistemologies. Ana is currently co-editing a book with Professor Rosalind Gill and Dr Christina Scharff entitled *Aesthetic Labour: Rethinking Beauty Politics in Neoliberalism* (Palgrave, forthcoming).

Contact: Department of Culture, Media and Creative Industries, King's College London, Strand, London WC2R 2LS, UK.

E-mail: ana\_sofia.elias@kcl.ac.uk

Rosalind Gill and Ana Sofia Elias have asserted their right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as the authors of this work in the format that was submitted to Intellect Ltd.

---

Copyright of International Journal of Media & Cultural Politics is the property of Intellect Ltd. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.