

## Two Women, a Bottle of Wine, and *The Bachelor* *Duoethnography as a Means to Explore Experiences of Femininity in a Leisure Setting*

**Callie Spencer**

Eastern Washington University

**Karen Paisley**

University of Utah

### Abstract

**Callie:** Isn't the purpose of an abstract similar to that of the *The Bachelor* show intro...to sucker you into reading the rest of the paper?

**Karen:** Yep, and I am not quite sure how to sell something like this in 120 words. *The Bachelor* does it well with sex scenes, enticing images of stunningly beautiful women on exotic vacations with a typically shirtless man, and scandalous scenes of women fighting and crying.

**Callie:** OK, so since our paper is about us using duoethnography to explore our experiences of femininity within the leisure space of watching *The Bachelor*, how do we make that sound sexy and fun enough for people to keep reading?

**Karen:** Well, we could include this conversation...

---

Callie Spencer is an adjunct instructor in the Department of Physical Education, Health, and Recreation at Eastern Washington University.

Karen Paisley is an associate professor in the Department of Parks, Recreation, and Tourism at the University of Utah.

The authors would like to acknowledge and thank Dr. Wanda Pillow and Dr. Ann Darling for their efforts in critiquing and offering valuable advice on drafts of this manuscript.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Callie Spencer, Department of Physical Education, Health, and Recreation, Eastern Washington University, 200 PEB, Cheney, WA, 99004, callie.spencer.ewu@gmail.com

Host: *This week on The Bachelor, we will meet Callie and Karen, the two women who have agreed to participate on this journey. And believe me, it will be a juicy season...*

[Camera cuts to a clip of Callie and Karen watching the show.]

Callie: That sash makes you look insane, the hat's alright, and the grandma...kinda cute.

Karen: Bunny-boiler, nut job, and what is a "blogger?"

Callie: Bad teeth! Get her outta here!

Karen: A "VIP cocktail waitress?" What's that? Just say "lap dancer." It's so bad.

Karen: You know "bimbo model" is in.



Callie: I think that "sobbing girl in the bathroom" is in.

Callie: This is upsetting [in a joking tone].

Both: [hilariously giggling]

[Camera cuts back to the host.]

Host: *We'll get an insider's look as they prepare themselves to begin their first evening of re-search. We asked Callie and Karen the same questions that we ask the bachelorettes for their bios, and we'll now reveal their responses. Let's meet Callie, a Ph.D. student from Staunton, VA, and Karen, a University Professor from Tarrytown, NY.*

	
<p>Callie, 30, Ph.D. Student</p>	<p>Karen, 41, University Professor</p>
<p><b>Hometown:</b> Staunton, VA</p>	<p><b>Hometown:</b> Tarrytown, NY</p>
<p><b>Favorite memory from your childhood?</b></p>	<p><b>Favorite memory from your childhood?</b></p>
<p>Picking blackberries, building forts, and exploring with my brothers.</p>	<p>Playing "mountain goat" on sunny afternoons (hiking, climbing rocks, wading through streams) and getting filthy!</p>
<p><b>Do you consider yourself athletic?</b></p>	<p><b>Do you consider yourself athletic?</b></p>
<p>Yes, I enjoy basketball, running, biking, and snowboarding.</p>	<p>Active? Yes. Athletic? Not even close...too uncoordinated and non-competitive.</p>
<p><b>Do you consider yourself romantic and why?</b></p>	<p><b>Do you consider yourself romantic and why?</b></p>
<p>Absolutely. I love the idea of being gray (even though I will probably dye my hair till I die) and sitting on the porch telling stories with the man who shared life with me.</p>	<p>Yes...am a sucker for happily-ever-after love stories. Awwwww....</p>
<p><b>Tattoo Count:</b></p>	<p><b>Tattoo Count:</b></p>
<p>1</p>	<p>1</p>
<p><b>What is your ideal mate's personality like?</b></p>	<p><b>What is your ideal mate's personality like?</b></p>
<p>Great sense of humor, spontaneous, adventuresome, witty, intelligent.</p>	<p>Authentic. *Nuff said. More? Patient, bright/interesting, giving/concerned for others, fun.</p>

**Duoethnographic Tenet One**

*Difference:* "The difference between duoethnographers is not only encouraged but also expected. ...Through the articulation of such differences, duoethnographers make explicit how different people can experience the same phenomenon differently. In addition, such a juxtaposition of difference aids in keeping the text open. Readers are provided with theses and antitheses and the reader can form their own syntheses" (Norris & Sawyer, 2012, pp. 17-18).

Host: *Our journey this week will take us to the “inner sanctum” of Karen’s house, the site where these women begin the duoethnography of their experience of watching ABC’s TV show, The Bachelor.*

[Camera zooms in on Karen in a red 3-button jacket over a white dress shirt paired with her “good jeans” and silver flats. Her chin-length blonde hair is tussled as she furiously tidies her basement bedroom. Wielding cleaning implements in both hands, she multitasks dusting, vacuuming, and stashing stray shoes and clothes. Profound confusion on her face, she fumbles the video camera out of its box and tries all angles of attaching it to the tri-pod. Success! She balances it on the denim blue oversized ottoman and plays with angles in which both her flat screen TV, about six feet away on the wall, and the backs of their heads will be visible in the recording.]

[Camera cuts to Callie’s bedroom. She sports black yoga pants, running shoes, and a white fleece tunic. She frowns disapprovingly in the mirror and disappears into her closet to emerge in a pair of dark-wash skinny jeans, boots, and a red cashmere sweater. Much better.]

[Camera follows Callie into her kitchen. She is holding a bottle of “two buck chuck” red wine with a pensive look on her face. She returns it to the cupboard, notices the clock on the stove, and bolts from the house. In the next shot, she wears the same worried look on her face, but this time is standing in front of racks of wine at the local liquor store. Unable to make a choice, she grabs a couple \$10 bottles with stylish-looking labels and dashes to her Honda Element to make it to Karen’s house on time.]

## Commercial Break

### Commercial One: Duoethnography

On January 2, 2012, ABC aired the first episode of the sixteenth season of the TV show, *The Bachelor*. It was a wildly successful show; millions of viewers tuned in to watch the action for two juicy hours every Monday night for 12 weeks. We were two of those millions. As white heterosexual women in the viewer age range demographic of 25-54, we epitomize the show’s target audience. Utilizing duoethnography, we videotaped ourselves watching each episode of *The Bachelor*, wrote reflections on each Monday night’s experience, and then spent a long weekend rewatching and taking notes on the 25 hours of video footage of ourselves watching *The Bachelor*. The purpose of our study was to interrogate how we perform femininity in the leisure setting of watching *The Bachelor*. Specifically, how does that experience write us as women and how do we, in turn, write culture by writing each other and ourselves? This paper is not about presenting results from our study, per se, but about inviting readers (by modeling) to assess duoethnography as a tactic to address the aims of third wave feminism, namely to reject universalist claims of a “common” or shared experience of “women,” as a collective.

As feminist researchers, we chose duoethnography because it overlays well with feminist research praxis. Reinharz (1992) discusses feminist ethnography as aligning well with three goals of feminist research: “(1) to document the lives and activities of women, (2) to understand the experience of women from their own point of view, (3) to conceptualize women’s behavior as an expression of social contexts” (p. 51). Duoethnography is a form of ethnography in which researchers investigate a phenomenon (the leisure experience of women watching *The Bachelor*) through the use of themselves (through reflexivity and dialogue with the other researcher) in order to create a multivocal and critical understanding that ticks all three of these boxes. Norris and Sawyer (2012) identified nine tenets of duoethnography that we present throughout the paper in the sidebar beside exemplars from our data and experiences.

### Commercial Two: The Leisure Experience of Watching Reality TV

Within leisure studies, experiences of viewing reality TV have been overlooked as sites for cultural inquiry although leisure scholars are uniquely positioned to advance research into such spaces. To the extent that doing so is freely chosen and rewarding in some way, watching television, reality television or otherwise, can certainly be a leisure experience. Not only that, according to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, it is a highly popular everyday “leisure” experience. Their 2010 American Time Use Survey reported that the average American spends about 2.7 hours a day watching television, which accounts for about half of her/his leisure time (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2011). However, there is relative silence in the leisure literature around the topic of watching television, in general (cf. Durrant & Kennedy, 2007; Hirschman, 1985; Rhodes & Dean, 2009; Wachter & Kelly, 1998). Scant attention has been paid to watching reality TV, in particular, and the social phenomena of watching with others.

Outside of the leisure literature, however, viewer experiences of reality TV has appeared as a growing topic of research. Articles and books in Communication, Sociology, and New Media Studies have explored topics such as viewer and participant performativity, gender dynamics, audience views and experiences of “reality,” and audience and participant surveillance and consumption (cf. Andrejevic, 2004; Barton, 2009; Brown, 2005; Couldry, 2008; Ferris, Smith, Greenberg, & Smith, 2007; Gray, 2009; Hautakangas, 2010; Hill, 2002, 2005; Roberti, 2007). Much of this research has adopted a feminist lens to explore reality television (cf. Mendible, 2004; Cato & Carpentier, 2010; Fairclough, 2004; Graham-Bertolini, 2004). There are also a small group of scholars looking specifically at the reality TV show, *The Bachelor* (cf. Bonsu, Darmody, & Parmentier, 2010; Brophy-Baermann, 2005; Dubrofsky, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2009, 2011; Dubrofsky & Hardy, 2008; Yep & Camacho, 2004). Through a feminist lens, these authors have suggested that reality TV “bites back” (Pozner, 2010) and have challenged us to critically examine the ways in which we engage with reality TV.

Pozner (2010) reads reality television shows, such as *The Bachelor*, as “our prime purveyor of...cultural hegemony....media is largely responsible for how we know what we know. In other words, media shape what we think of as ‘the truth’ about ‘the way things are’” (p. 97). For Pozner, the truths that reality television teaches us about women include the following:

- Women are bitches.
- Women are stupid.
- Women are incompetent at work and failures at home.
- Women are gold diggers (p. 97).

Pozner critiques what she thinks is a shallow interaction that most American viewers have with reality TV. “Too often what passes for discussion about reality TV is limited to ‘Wow, that bitch was crazy!’...We need a deeper debate in this country about the meaning and implications of reality TV’s backlash against women’s rights and social progress” (Pozner, 2010, p. 17).

Dubrofsky (2011) takes up Andrejevic’s (2004) question, “What is the work of being watched?” Specifically, her book addresses surveillance on what she refers to as “The Bachelor Industry,” which consists of the package of ABC’s *Bachelor* programs (*The Bachelor*, *The Bachelorette*, and *The Bachelor Pad*). For Dubrofsky, The Bachelor Industry privileges compulsory heterosexuality and whiteness, and normalizes certain versions of “woman,” specifically, a certain type of emotional state (not crazy, or too emotional, but also open enough to find love), and a certain type of body (generally thin, stylish, and with flawless skin) that is deemed beautiful. In

the final chapter of her book, Dubrofsky (2011), after thoroughly exploring the question, “What is the work of being watched?,” poses the following question: “What is the work of watching others being watched?” (p. 127).

While Dubrofsky enacted a beautiful feminist analysis of The Bachelor Industry, it is her parting question that fascinates us. Most of the literature surrounding reality television in general deals with the ways in which women are portrayed on the shows and what sorts of messages are created for women watching the show. This work takes a critical, but etic, perspective on the messages created for women by the producers, advertisers, and other generators of the show. What these studies lack, however, is an emic perspective of the experience of women watching reality TV: Acknowledging the fact that surveillance exists does not provide insight into its “consumption” by women (individually or in groups) or any agency or cognizance of women viewers. Current research has not conducted an emic analysis of the ways in which women interact with those messages, whether it be in degrees of resistance, reproduction, or oblivion.

### Commercial Three: Studying Women’s Leisure in the Third Wave of Feminism

Feminist leisure scholars have explored leisure as gendered, as a space for gender production, and have asserted that gender can be performed in unique ways in leisure settings (cf. Henderson, 1994; Henderson, & Bialeschki, 1999; Johnson, 2005; Jacobson & Samdahl, 1998; Samdahl, Jacobson, & Hutchinson, 2001; Shaw, 1994, 1999).

Third wave feminism suggests participatory tactics may be best situated to study women’s leisure. While certainly introducing new layers of vulnerability (cf. Johnson, 2009), we believe that duoethnographic methods, where we study ourselves, reduces the Othering and colonization present in varying degrees as a result of other methods. “Women studying women” (Henderson, 1994), for example, involves a degree of separation that requires translation:

Indeed, an important question to ask is how we interpret and represent women’s lives within the categories invented by anthropology and within the humanistic categories and narratives invented by the Enlightenment, modernity, and even postmodernity. It is at this nexus (of writing culture and being written by culture) that we must become vulnerable and, figuratively speaking, expose our breasts in contesting anthropology’s perpetual project of inventing and redefining “culture” and “women” (Villenas, 2000, p. 75).

The idea of “baring one’s breasts,” draws upon Behar and Gordon’s (1995) edited work, *Women Writing Culture*, in which the authors contend that women write culture just as much as culture writes women. This edited collection challenges women ethnographers to practice what Pillow (2003) calls “uncomfortable reflexivity:”

“A reflexivity that pushes toward an unfamiliar, towards the uncomfortable, cannot be a simple

#### Duoethnographic Tenet Two

*Ethical Stances:* “First, by conducting research ‘with’ and not ‘on’ another, duoethnographers elude the research/researched dichotomy that situates the Other as a subject to be talked about. Duoethnographies are conversations that position the Other in dialogue, making the status one of equals....Second, duoethnographers take an ethnical pedagogical relationship with one another. ...They regard each other as both their teacher and student, assisting the Other in the making of meaning and receptive to the Other in reconceptualizing their own meanings” (Norris & Sawyer, 2012, pp. 20- 21).

story of subjects, subjectivity, and transcendence of self-indulgent telling” (p. 192). In recognizing that nothing is innocent, women as writers of culture are challenged to bare their own breasts, practicing reflexivity of their own power in what they are choosing to write and how they are choosing to represent. Most importantly, the baring breasts metaphor asks women writers to make their voice present in their writing:

When a woman sits down to write, all eyes are on her. The woman who is turning others into the object of her gaze is herself already an object of the gaze. Woman, the original Other, is always being looked at and looked over. A woman sees herself being seen....The eyes on a woman’s back are also her own eyes... Sitting down to write, a woman sheds the clothes of each of the different roles she has played and lets all the eyes of her experiences come forth as she contemplates her life and begins to put pencil to paper. (Behar, 1995, p. 2)

We respond to this challenge by baring our own breasts through our use of duoethnography as a way to interrogate and understand how we are written by and also write culture.

### Now Back to Our Show

[We rejoin our program as the Host explains to the viewers how the journey will unfold.]

Host: *So thanks for joining us. Throughout our show this evening, we will take a journey through Callie and Karen’s viewing experiences. For those of you who are new to watching The Bachelor, here’s how it goes. The Bachelor is a 12-episode reality TV show in which 25 “eligible” women date one man—the bachelor—in this case, Ben. The goal is for Ben to find love and choose one woman to whom to propose in the dramatic season finale. Each two-hour episode consists of the bachelor going on extravagant dates to get to know the women better. There are a couple of “one-on-one” dates each week and one “group date” in which the bachelor takes several women out together. Each episode culminates with a formal cocktail party to give each woman one last chance to interact with the bachelor, followed by a “rose ceremony” during which Ben has fewer and fewer roses to give out. Any woman who does not receive a rose goes home. When there are four women left, Ben goes on a “hometown date” with each bachelorette to meet her family. When the competition is down to two, the bachelor takes each woman to meet his family. In the finale, Ben hopes to propose with a diamond ring.*

*And now, join us for the one-on-one dates...*

### Duoethnographic Tenet Three

*Currere*: “Duoethnography views a person’s life as a curriculum. One’s present abilities, skills, knowledge, and beliefs were acquired/learned, and duoethnographers recall and reexamine that emergent, organic, and predominantly unplanned curriculum in conversation with one another” (Norris & Sawyer, 2012, p. 12).

Callie	Karen
<p>I approached this experience with a plethora of questions all focused around “What is appropriate?” <i>Can I wear my sweatpants? What if I show up to her house with the “girls” free from the constriction of a bra? How much should I drink? Is one glass the limit? Two? At what point is the research hampered by my alcohol consumption? But then again, we are trying to stay true to how we would typically experience watching the show with a girlfriend, therefore, should I really limit myself, or just focus on enjoying myself? How do I talk about the women? What words do I use? Is it ok to curse? What if she asks me questions about my “boy situation?” Do I let her in, or do we keep this thing “professional?”</i></p> <p>In reflecting upon how I understood, constructed, and performed my own femininity during this experience, my ability to be the “Guru of Crazy” stands out. <i>Who says that? Who does that? Is she for serious right now? Really? She’s nuts! Cookoo! Certifiably crazy! Literally, she’s a true nutcase!</i> All of these phrases flew out of my mouth each show. If I was certain that I knew anything, it was that I could “call crazy” judge it and profess it to Karen when I saw it.</p> <p>I demonstrated my knowledge of how I am supposed to act as a woman through defining how I am <i>not</i> supposed to act: crazy. Stand-up comedian, Jeff</p>	<p>So this project has made me realize some things about myself, as a woman, that I really don’t like...that I find offensive, actually.</p> <p>First...<i>the “Southern Woman” in me reared her ugly head. Guess more of that expectation came from my first mother-in-law (who I could NEVER please or even live up to) than even from my mom, really... But was raised, in general, that your house should be clean, presentable at all times – and I SUCK at that. So vacuumed, dusted, put things away to have it look good, smell good. Which is SO not me. My housekeeping, since H [my daughter] was born, has just not been that much of a priority. Something had to go, and that was it (or one of the things...).</i> Then I thought about what to wear tonight, what would be “appropriate” in hostess mode. <i>It’s The Bachelor, for fuck’s sake...I should be braless and barefoot in sweats under my electric blankie...and instead I’m in my “good” jeans, flats, and a jacket. I even fixed my hair. SHOOT ME!</i></p> <p>Then I find out I’m a catty bitch. And elitist. <i>Found myself judging the “VIP Cocktail Waitress.” What is that?? Sounds like a lap-dancer to me... Can’t count the number of times I heard myself saying something like, “Ohmygod! WHAT is she wearing?” The jumpsuit thing, the</i></p>



Foxworthy, does a bit called “You might be a redneck if...” in which he finishes that sentence prompt with a fill-in-the blank statement that describes endearing qualities of the stereotypical redneck.

According to me, the professor of all that is crazy, you might be crazy if...

- Your outfit is too revealing, looks like a doily, or too bright green (think Wizard of Oz).
- You cannot control your emotions.
- You seem desperate (especially if you talk about babies, marriage, or that you have quit your job in order to “find love” on the first date).
- You have orange skin from your fake tan.
- You use an excessive amount of foundation.
- You have no idea how to act sexually (particularly if you give instructions when you make-out with a boy).
- You are evil to the other girls.

*My life is one huge contradiction. I am an intelligent woman, whose job it is to think critically. Why do I watch this shit? What is the draw? Why do I contradict myself? Why do I feel so guilty about it but also empowered by my guilty pleasure?*

As I write this piece, and in my academic life, I claim to be a feminist writer, a feminist thinker. Yet, in this leisure space, I contradict everything I say I believe. Courtney is one of the girls on the show who did not act

*one-sleeved dresses, the feather earrings, the raccoon eyeliner, the booty shorts, (and others) hurt my head. These are things I would never wear. :) Feels odd, tho, to be critical of folks who probably “get it” with respect to fashion...and have the bodies to pull off whatever they want. I can be a real snob sometimes...especially toward women (goes back to my “bow-head” [pretty but vapid women] aversion from time in the South). Seems more rooted in overt sexuality, tho, than in education... I’ve never been “sexy...” and maybe am jealous (?). I hope not... In general, tho, feel unattractive but smart...somehow that this position is made possible by “not being like them.” Sounds so stuck up...like watching Jerry Springer for the sake of backhanded self-validation...*

And then, I talk out of both sides of my mouth. *Am just truly amazed and saddened by Jenna’s manifestation of stereotypically, over-the-top chick emotions... I remember saying that “She’s NUTS!” Just seemed so pathetic! Dunno if that makes me unsympathetic of my sex, or just realistic. I know it’s staged, but seems to just try to highlight all of the “dark sides” of women. Should likely be more offended than I am. And later, seems, again, tho, that the real sport was the producers putting women in the position to become insane and then watch. I know, that’s what the show is all about...but is more transparent sometimes than others (or I’m willing to admit it*



### Duoethnographic Tenet Four

*Trust:* “Trust is a vital element in duoethnography. One does not want to reveal ‘warts and all’ to an unreceptive and uncaring person.... Without trust, disclosure is withheld, preventing a rich discussion of the phenomenon under investigation” (Norris & Sawyer, 2012, p. 23).

like the other girls. She acted out on her sexual desires by breaking rules and skinny dipping with Ben. She assertively staged a fake marriage ceremony. She was not sweet and kind to the other girls. For these things, I called her crazy, judging her for not fitting into the stereotypically passive mold that is instilled in my mind of how a good, Christian, southern woman should act (i.e., she should never pursue, but always be pursued by a man). What sort of feminist am I? What notion of “woman” am I ascribing to? How do I deal with the contradicting ways in which I am thinking and how I am acting? [...written after “Women Tell All” special episode]

*Then Courtney was back and apologizing and weeping because her family has been really hurt by the tabloids, I realized that there was a really human piece to this that came out at that moment for me. For some reason, because these women are on TV, It is hard to remember that they are actually real people with real families, and I even felt a bit bad for perpetuating her demise by both buying and consuming the trashy magazines dishing juicy gossip on how nasty she is, as well as watching the “I’m winning” remix of her online. I am perpetuating her pain. Part of me almost maliciously thinks that she deserves it, that she really was a nasty person and did not portray herself well. But, then I think about all of the times I have acted badly or judged people wrongly, or said things that I wish I could take back...and how horrible it would*

*sometimes more than others). And then there’s the ho... Courtney goes skinny-dipping with Ben. Who cares? But, again, I’m frustrated by the way women are portrayed. Women who are forward alienate other women, and men suck it up (yes, that’s a generalization). And then I find myself hating Courtney for being so tacky... You’d think if I were really bothered by stereotypes, double standards, that I’d be psyched to see a woman acting in defiance of them...but, NO...I judge her as trashy. I know I sound contradictory, so bear with me. Think it goes to the idea that women aren’t really even supposed to have sexual desires, even tho they’re hyper-sexualized (in general if not personally) on a daily basis.*

All told, being conscious of my thought processes during this experience made me intensely introspective. I spend so much time juggling multiple roles...mom, wife, daughter, professor, administrator, sister, friend, sexual being...(in no particular order), and feel like I’m barely average at most of them. Go on “guilt trips” so easily...and spend so much time and emotional energy trying to pretend like I don’t. Wish I had the guts to just be bold about it...but never have, doubt I ever will. Some feminist! Hah!

So here’s my theory about watching this shit: *These folks get to do things in the name of Reality TV that most of us only dream about. It’s like a James Bond movie. When was the last time you*

*be if that stuff was recorded, replayed, and dished out to my family and friends. [...written after "Finale"]*

*I think, if anything, this experience is liberating. We are speaking badly about these women, sharing sometimes intimate tales of our lives, and being "real" or candid, and we don't give a damn...at least less of a damn as in other situations. It feels good to let loose. Although I think that getting there was a process, and that we are still holding up many filters, we are letting some of them down. We are taught at work to be mindful of "other" to not judge...to work towards making this world a more just place. However, we are othering the hell out of these women, not judging each other on it, and enjoying it. It is strange how something so "fake" or "staged" as reality TV can bring about a liberating experience for women in which we get to stop self-censoring for a moment and speak to each other impulsively in, perhaps, a more "real" way. Finally, I also realized that this show had a physical impact on me, on my female body and how I view it. Whenever Karen leaves and goes upstairs, I always check myself out in the mirror. I am not really sure why I do this but it's always like, you know, "Am I looking alright?" There is definitely a bodily thing for me in watching these women. I'm like, you know, "These women are so skinny" and "I could never be on The Bachelor unless I'm skinny" and "Maybe I need to lose some*

*saw one of those set in, for example, Mobile, Alabama? We (OK, I...I'll own it) watch to escape...to go far away to beautiful places...with beautiful people (that we hypothesize we could look like with a little more effort...or that these beautiful people would really love if they got to know us)...to do beautiful things. But, in reality (irony intended), watching all these perfect, tiny women tap dances ALL OVER my body issues...*

*So what on Earth is there to say about skiing in bikinis?? In San Francisco?? Another body-image nightmare for me...What was funny (odd, not ha-ha) was listening to C crack on herself. She's lovely, and yet has some distorted view of herself...Makes no sense to me. I didn't look like that when I was her age (or ever). Makes me wonder why women are so hard on themselves...Is that a white thing? A hetero thing? Became aware of how much time I spend at physical and other types of self-loathing, criticism...Dunno that the evening's events reflected any real intellectual or other prowess...was all about physicality. Is that what dating's about? Relationships? OK, yes, I know I'm hyper-critical of myself, so we've got to take that into account....But I know so many women who seem oblivious. Also, granted, it tends to be more physical than relational, but still. OK, too, so now I realize that this might make me sound like a prude (rooted in my own body-image issues), but I know, for example, a woman named W....she's*

### **Duoethnographic Tenet Five**

#### *Dialogic Change and Regenerative Transformation:*

Duoethnography recognizes the tyranny of reductionism... Duoethnography, therefore, makes one's current position problematic. One's beliefs can be enslaving, negating the self, but the act of reconceptualization can be regenerative and liberating. Duoethnography recognizes the need of the Other to liberate the self from the self" (Norris & Sawyer, 2012, p. 18).

*weight" "There is no way in hell I would wear a bathing suit around these guys or on TV ever, for any reason ever." I feel like there is definitely a self-conscious piece to this that is probably unconscious in me that is kind of unhealthy. I definitely notice myself comparing myself to the women on there especially when Karen leaves. I won't do it while she is there, but when she leaves, there is a mirror that is on the closet to the left, and I look at myself and think, "How am I lookin?"*

*a...big...girl. Really big. And yet she'll wear a bikini in front of folks at our house in the summer...Now is that healthy or not? I'm all about confidence and women being strong...but there seems to be a need for a reality check.*

*... watching the sheer extravagance and excess of it all somehow makes my life (which I generally love) seem pale, lacking in comparison. Honestly, makes me kinda sad.*

*And yet I still watch...like gawking at a train wreck...*

## Commercial Break

### Commercial One: Third Wave Feminism

We identify closely with the ideas of third wave feminism. Feminism cannot and should not prescribe a solution for any woman in respect to how she will navigate internal conflicts on how she will perform her gender or her sexuality. Third wave feminism presents what we call an "own it" philosophy. Can a stripper be a feminist? Sure, as long as she "owns it." Can a stay-at-home Southern Mama who supports her husband and raises her kids be a feminist? Sure, as long as she "owns it." Critical reflection upon the messages from society coupled with knowledge of the underlying power structures allow a woman to be knowledgeable about her choice on how to perform her gender identity and the implications her choice might have for calling into question (or not) the dominant structure. This process allows her to "own" her choice as she will know what she "owns" and how she is "owning it." "By occupying female subject positions in innovative or contradictory ways, third-wavers unsettle essentialist narratives about dominant men and passive women and shape new identities within the interstices of competing narratives. There is no one way to be a woman" (Snyder, 2008, p. 185). In describing this "own it" philosophy, we want to be clear by stating that we are not suggesting that oppressive structures such as patriarchy no longer exist or do not still have power to create unequal access for women. We are, instead, suggesting that there is not only more than one way to perform "woman," but also multiple ways of "resisting" (which may look more like reproduction) oppressive structures that are not traditionally thought of as counter-hegemonic performances.

### Commercial Two: Creative Analytic Practice

We operate across several paradigms, as paradigm proliferation "is a good thing to think with" in research (Lather, 2006). As Lather argues, "Neither reconciliation nor paradigm war, this is about thinking difference differently, a reappropriation of contradictory available scripts to create alternative practices of research as a site of being and becoming" (p. 52). In this paper, we think through scripts present in feminist paradigms, in poststructural paradigms, and in third wave feminism.

Along with St. Pierre and Pillow (2000), “we prefer to think of the relationships we are working in and out of as feminist and poststructural, a relationship that gestures toward fluid and multiple dislocations and alliances” (p. 3). Aitchison (2000) has called for poststructural feminist analyses as “one means for enhancing the theoretical sophistication” of leisure studies (p. 127). As feminist poststructural researchers, we believe that knowledge is partial and constantly in flux. Our subjectivities are continuously shifting, and are constituted within gendered discourse. Richardson (1993, 2000) asserts that the relationships between subjectivity and objectivity, fact and fiction, the author and the subject, are not necessarily oppositional. Therefore, she pushes for new creative ways of understanding to be used in the social sciences, as there are many ways of knowing. She endorses Creative Analytic Practice (CAP) as a way to do reflexivity, challenge traditional paradigms, and to come to a new unique understanding of a phenomenon. For Richardson (1993, 2000), styles of writing such as poetry, or screenplay can evoke lived experiences, drawing the reader closer to the experience and encouraging complex understandings.

To engage in the complexity of lived leisure experiences, leisure scholars have recently supported CAP as a way to analyze such experiences richly (Berbary, 2008, 2011; Berbary & Johnson, 2012; Glover, 2007; Parry & Johnson, 2007). Aside from CAP being a creative way of representing data and inviting the reader into the experience, CAP is a mode of analysis in which the author gains an understanding of herself and the phenomenon through the writing process. Richardson and St. Pierre (2005) argue that the traditional research “model is itself a sociohistorical invention that reifies the static social world imagined by our nineteenth century foreparents” (p. 517). For them, the modern qualitative research experience is not consistent with the traditional structured form of writing. Not only does the traditional model make qualitative pieces uninteresting to read, it also “requires writers to silence their own voices and to view themselves as contaminants” (p. 517). As feminist researchers, our voices are necessarily present in every step of the research process.

In writing research like a play, or in a multi-vocal multi-layered way (c.f. Lather and Smithies, 1997), the reader is invited to enter into the piece and make her or his own interpretations. Richardson (2000) provides us with five criteria for judging Creative Analytic Practice. We draw from those five below and invite you, as you read this article, to use these criteria to judge our piece.

1. Substantive contribution: Does this piece contribute to our understanding of social-life?
2. Aesthetic merit: Does this piece succeed aesthetically? Is the text artistically shaped, satisfying, complex, and not boring?
3. Reflexivity: How did the author come to write this text? How has the author’s subjectivity been both a producer and a product of this text?
4. Impact: Does this affect me? emotionally? intellectually? generate new questions?
5. Expresses a reality: Does this text embody a fleshed out, embodied sense of lived-experience? (Richardson, 2000, p. 254)

### **Duoethnographic Tenet Six**

#### *Trustworthiness Found in Self-Reflexivity, Not Validity and Truth Claims:*

“Duoethnographies portray knowledge in transition, and as such, knowing is not fixed but fluid. Truth and validity are irrelevant. What exists is the rigor of the collaborative inquiry that is made explicit in the duoethnography itself” (Norris & Sawyer, 2012, p. 20).

## Now Back to Our Show: Group Date

### What do you get when you cross a gingerbread with a hooker? (Episode 2)

[The women are heading out on a group date in which they are to put on a play written and produced by a group of elementary school children. They show up to meet Ben in order to audition in front of the children for their roles. The camera pans all of the women. We immediately begin critiquing outfits. Blakely, the “VIP cocktail waitress,” is wearing an outfit that catches our eyes. It is a blue and white pinstriped, one-piece, mini-shorts jumpsuit.]



Retrieved from: <http://gaberoberarts.com/2012/01/the-bachelor-season-16-episode-2-apparently-bens-a-boob-guy/>

Callie: What the fuck is that? Is that lingerie? Does her necklace say, “Fox?” Or “Jess?”

Karen: Her name’s Blakely....[cracking up]

[The camera pans in on the faces of the elementary school children. They have blank stares and uncomfortable looks as Blakely steps on stage to audition. We are laughing hilariously as the kids did not know what to do with the “jumpsuit.”]

Callie: Seriously...lapse of judgment [about the jumpsuit]. Makes her look insane.

Karen: [repeating comment made by a woman on the show when Blakely gets cast as the gingerbread girl in the play] What do you get when you cross a gingerbread with a hooker?

Both: [laughing hysterically]

[Camera cuts to the girls talking about Blakely]

Women on the show: “Everybody is about to punch this bitch in the face!” “She’s a slut!” “She’s toxic!” “Blakely is super fakely!”

Callie: I agree!!

### Fruit cake. Insane. Certifiable. Nuts.: Hometown dates, Where Ben goes to meet Courtney’s parents (Episode 10)

[Courtney and Ben have just left Courtney’s parents’ house. Courtney says she has one more surprise for him and takes him to a park where there are chairs and an altar area set up for a wedding ceremony. After the picnic, Courtney tells Ben that they will have a practice marriage ceremony. She whips a big bag out of nowhere and seems surprised with each item she pulls out: a bowtie, pens and paper to write vows, two rings (Note: She is wearing a white dress). We are mocking her every word.]

Karen: A picnic? A fucking picnic? What is it with the picnic?

Callie: They are writing vows? What the hell? That's it. She's going home. This is insane.

Ben (The Bachelor): She keeps me thinking.

Karen: Thinking you're nuts?

[A preacher appears. They recite their vows. Courtney tells him that she loves him and they put on rings made out of grass or twigs or something. They drive off in a car that says "almost married" and has tin cans behind it.]

Callie: That was absolutely, 100% crazy. Insane.

Karen: She is certifiable.

Callie: I would go running so fast if I was him. I mean I would high-tail it out of there.

### Am I supposed to be wearing wrinkle cream?: During commercial for Avon (Episode 7)

Callie: Am I supposed to be using wrinkle cream?

Karen: I've never used any of it. Ever.

Callie: Teresa told me she does.

Callie: She started using wrinkle cream, and so did Haintsel...when she was 22, and she says, "Just you wait, call me when you are 45 and all wrinkly."

Karen: That's probably smart, and I spent too much time in the sun and have never used anything, and that is probably stupid, so there's probably something to it.

Callie: Like what do you do, put it on at night?

Karen: I dunno, you've got the wrong girl...I have no idea.

Callie: You'd think that as southern women we would know about wrinkle cream.

Karen: We should know about Ponds Cold Cream, I think that is a southern moment.

Callie: What's that do?

Karen: It's just like really heavy, like Crisco shit, 'cause its southern.

Callie: You put it on your face?

Karen: Honey, I've never done it. You're asking the wrong girl.

Callie: Is it for colds?

Karen: It's called cold cream. It is for your face. It feels cold when you put it on.

Karen: Some people use it to remove make-up... [stops mid-thought] I don't know! [sassy]

Callie: My friend who is 45, she looks great, she uses this 70 dollar wrinkle cream stuff.

Karen: I used Oil of Olay once. But I've got nothing for you. No, when you talk about a skin regime, I don't know what that means. REGIME? More than one thing at night? I don't know. I don't wash my face at night. I don't know.

Karen: I don't wear makeup, so I don't know. I haven't worn make-up since, like, third grade.

Callie: Not even, like, eye shadow?

Karen: Nope.

#### Duoethnographic

#### Tenet Seven

#### Polyvocal and

#### Dialogic: "Promoting

heteroglossia—a multi-voiced and critical tension (Bakhtin, 1981)—dialogues are not only between the researchers but also between researcher(s) and artifacts of cultural media (e.g., photographs, songs, the written study itself)" (Norris & Sawyer, 2012, p. 14).

Callie: Eye liner?

Karen: No.

Callie: Zit cover up?

Karen: Nope.

**They aren't human-sized: During commercials for KY-jelly and Weight Watchers (Episode 1)**

Karen: I think I'm gonna call Kacie B. as my horse [to win].

Callie: Hmmmm...he did say he liked brown-haired girls. The model is gonna make it far. I can tell you that for free. First of all, I look like a house compared to all those girls.

Karen: I mean they are not human-sized. What size are they?

Callie: I look like a hippo compared to them.

Callie: How do I look like that? Stop eating for a couple of months?

Karen: Seriously.

Karen: I wonder what it would be like if they actually had real women on here?

**She makes me want to take my nose ring out: Blakely and Rachel have a two-on-one date with Ben. They go to a salsa class. (Episode 6)**

Karen: [On Blakely's salsa dress] Wow, that's like a bad prom dress from the eighties.

Callie: [On salsa instructor] Look at her ass! Good gosh how do you get an ass like that?

Karen: Dance in heels.

Karen: [On Rachel] What she is doing is not sensual. Someone tell her. She needs a smaller nose ring too. It's making me crazy.

Callie: I agree. All of those piercings she has are just trashy. Too many piercings.

Karen: [When rewatching] She makes me want to take my nose ring out. Why is that? Except for that I don't want to be like her?

**I don't own enough damn dresses. (Women Tell All Special Episode)**

Karen: You should be on it [as a contestant]. Come on, be the PhD student. But, don't be crazy.

Karen: [To Emily] Stop being crazy. You are a PhD student.

Callie: If I was on *The Bachelor*, I would say, "Hold up, I've gotta call my professor to make sure what I did tonight is not crazy." [Pretending to make a phone call] "Karen, I've had 17 glasses of wine and I'm not sure if I should punch this girl in the face."

Karen: [Pretending to answer the phone call] "Don't be crazy."

Callie: What do you do all day on the show except for sit around the house and drink?

Karen: You get 20 minutes a day with him, then you drink.

Callie: I wonder if they make you sign something that you won't write about your experience once you leave?

Karen: No one ever has and that is weird. They keep 'em drunk all the time.

Callie: No one would let me on there, but I would love to go on there!

Callie: I am not skinny enough and I don't own enough damn dresses.

Callie: And they never wear the same dress twice, have you noticed that?

Karen: Nobody owns that many dresses! I'm not sure what you are supposed to do about that.



Karen: I was trying to think if I own one that would be appropriate.

Karen: [While re-watching] How do you even fit all that in a suitcase?

Callie: I don't know if I have a single dress I could wear.

Karen: I can't help ya. I've got nothing.

### **I'm embarrassing myself: Jamie and Ben before rose ceremony (Episode 6)**

[Enter the most awkward part of the season. Jamie, the only one remaining who has not kissed Ben, plans her next meeting with Ben at the cocktail party right before the rose ceremony.]

Jamie: [Alone, during interview before she sees Ben] I want to turn Ben on. I want him to be attracted to me. He is looking for a sexy, fun girl and that's what I am going to give him. He's gonna be shocked.

Jamie: [to Ben] I have really big plans.

Ben: What are these really big plans?

Karen: Oh God, tell me she's drunk.

[Jamie hops on his lap, straddling him and ripping her dress.]

Karen: Oh my gosh, that is so not going well!

Jamie: I don't want to be that fancy with someone unless I really want to.

Callie: Fancy? Oh man you are getting fancy!

Jamie: I'm embarrassing myself.

Ben: No, you are not embarrassing yourself.

Callie: Oh, yes you are!

[They kiss. It looks horribly awkward.]

Jamie: I wanted to do something different.

Ben: I wasn't expecting you to go from zero to sixty in 3 seconds.

Jamie: I want to have a great kiss with you. First of all, when my mouth was open, your mouth was closed, So here is what we are going to do. We are gonna start with our mouths closed, and when we feel it out, we will open our mouths.

Callie: Is she drunk?

Karen: I hope so!

Ben: You are serious now? This is like an instruction guide. I can't handle this.

Jamie: [Alone, to camera after their kiss] I wanted to give myself to him and I don't think he thought I was cute.

Callie: I think if you have to give a guy an instruction manual on how to make out, it's not gonna go well. She's totally getting kicked off.

Karen: That hurt!

### **Women Tell All: Failure? Are We "Bad" Feminists?**

Callie: What happens when "baring our breasts" is embarrassing?

Karen: I'm not sure. I can tell you that I'm not proud of some of the things I've said.

During the "Women Tell All" special episode, all of the women who have "failed" to receive roses are back and in front of a live studio audience. The Host replays some of the most embarrassing and heartbreaking moments of the show. We see our performances as third wave feminists (while we were watching the show) as "failing to receive a rose." Let us begin with a bit of a recap. First, take a moment to reread the very first conversation we had with one another (located at the very beginning of this paper). Next, consider a refresher on third-wave feminism:

Third-wave feminism insists that each woman must decide for herself how to negotiate the often contradictory desires for both gender equality and sexual liberation... Despite media caricatures, however, the third-wave approach actually exhibits not a thoughtless endorsement of "choice," but rather a deep respect for pluralism and self-determination. (Snyder-Hall, 2010, p. 255)

Finally, remember what sort of a text is created through duoethnography: "Duoethnographies, then, are fluid texts where readers witness researchers in the act of narrative exposure and reconceptualization as they interrogate and reinscribe their previously held beliefs" (Norris & Sawyer, 2012, p. 9).

One commercial in this piece presents us as confident third-wave feminists, sure of our ability to "own it," ready to "bare our breasts," and strong in our stance as open-minded and nonjudgmental. Some feminists we are: We judge ourselves, judge our bodies, and judge other women who are potentially defining a version of feminism that is opposing the norm (think Blakely, the VIP cocktail waitress, and Courtney, the skinny-dipping model).

As we mentioned in the second commercial break, we are thinking across several paradigms. We find the contradictions in our lived experience very difficult to discuss from within just one paradigm. Therefore, it is useful to present a poststructural look at our experience by thinking through the way in which Butler (1997) presents language as a speech act. Language, for Butler, has the power to constitute a subject as well as to physically injure:

The one who speaks the performative effectively is understood to operate according to uncontested power... "It's a girl!"...The power to "race" and, indeed, the power to gender, precedes the "one" who speaks such power, and yet the one who speaks nevertheless appears to have that power. If performativity requires a power to effect or enact what one names, then who will be the "one" who speaks with such a power, and how will such a power be thought? (p. 49)

As we "named" each of the women on the show "bunny boiler" or "slut" or "crazy," we performed injurious speech acts against them. Although they were not present to hear these acts, the physical ramifications were felt as we also performed a constitutive speech act. In marking the girls as "sluts" or "crazy," we were producing our own subjectivity (albeit in different ways). Our performances privileged certain versions of sexuality over others and, thus, we disciplined one another into performing a certain gendered subject position (perhaps as "sane," "normal," or "acceptable"). Further, our language around what a feminine body should look like again privileged a certain type of physicality, which, in this case, fit nicely with and reproduced the stereotypical woman as portrayed in magazine ads. We also injured ourselves.

Butler (1990) pushes for us to question any "successful" gender performance, asserting that one's gender is not some underlying construct that can successfully be reached; instead we should expose the failure to successfully perform. In examining failure, we can begin to understand the gendered power relations around such a constitution. Visweswaran (1994) attributes failure in feminist research to both epistemological and historical issues. She argues that part of the feminist fantasy is the idea that "we" as "women" can fully understand and relate to one another:

I argue for a suspension of the feminist faith that we can ever wholly understand and identify with other women (displacing again the colonial model of "speaking for," and the dialogical hope of "speaking with"). This requires a trickster figure who "trips" on, but is not tripped up by, the seductions of a feminism that promises what it may never

deliver: full representation on the one hand, and full comprehension on the other. . . . it is trickster agency that makes the distinction between success and failure indeterminate, alerting us to the “possibilities of failure.” (p. 100)

We had hopes and full intentions of speaking with one another. However, speaking with someone else necessarily requires a grasp of your own subjectivities. Contradictions exist between how we were reflecting in our journals, how we were performing our femininity as we watched the show, and how we now are attempting to perform reflexivity through the writing process. With our understandings of ourselves and our femininity in constant flux, how can we speak in unison “with” one another?

If there is one thing upon which we both agree, it is that we cannot reach full comprehension of ourselves, much less of the “other.” Each time I (Callie) reread our transcriptions, I read myself saying, “Who says that?” when referring to the other women. I then thought, “Who says what you just said?” back to myself. As I was criticizing the women for sounding, looking, and acting “crazy” (desperate, unstable, overly emotional), I was similarly performing the same “crazy” that I was critiquing in them.

With these examples, could it be that we really are more in alignment with McRobbie’s (2007) ideas of postfeminism? She suggests that the current state of dissent and contradiction in feminist thought could be attributed to our current political state. She uses examples of the current political state of things (George Bush’s conservative stance on marriage vs. gay couples now able to adopt) to describe what she calls a “double entanglement” (p. 28). “This comprises the coexistence of neoconservative values in relation to gender, sexuality, and family life with processes of liberalization in regard to choice and diversity in domestic, sexual, and kinship relations” (p. 28). Does my (Karen) traditional southern upbringing collide with my liberal life as a university professor in order to produce such a “double entanglement?” Is this why, as a third wave feminist I profess to reject being judgmental, or “othering,” and then call women who dress provocatively “tarts?”

If we are calling for a feminism in which we reflexively “own” our decisions, what does that look like? What does that look like in academic space? What does that look like in leisure space? One of the most prevalent outcomes of feminist leisure is empowerment through resistance (Henderson, 1996; Henderson & Gibson, 2013). Linking “empowerment” with “resistance” and opposed to “reproduction” of an oppressive status quo serves to create a narrow understanding of how a complex, “real-world” empowerment might manifest. Further, linking these concepts makes empowerment inextricably dependent upon the very hegemonic structures that created the need for it. This public performance demonstrates our experience of a more “messy” empowerment, one borne of reflexivity (positioning ourselves among and between resistance and reproduction). We ridiculed other women for engaging in stereotypical behaviors, thus making ourselves the catty bitches we mocked. For us, the empowering piece lies in the vulnerable, authentic, reflexive performances shared with you (the reader) in this document.

In reading this duoethnography, you have witnessed us in the “act of narrative exposure and reconceptualization” in which we have (uncomfortably at times) worked through how our leisure experiences of watching *The Bachelor* have both written us as we, in turn, write culture.

### **Duoethnographic Tenet Eight**

*Disrupts Metanarratives:* “Duoethnography, by being polyvocal, challenges and potentially disrupts the metanarrative of self at the personal level by questioning held beliefs. By juxtaposing the solitary voice of an autoethnographer with the voice of an Other, neither person can claim dominance or universal truth” (Norris & Sawyer, 2012, p. 15).

### Duoethnographic Tenet Nine

#### *Audience Accessibility:*

"Duoethnographies, then, are a form of praxis writing in which theory and practice converse....

Duoethnographies do not end with conclusions. Rather, they continue to be written by those who read them" (Norris & Sawyer, 2012, p. 21).

Through the writing process and performing the duoethnography, we have begun to realize our lived contradictions as third wave feminists. It is our hope that you (the reader) can enter into and continue the conversation by interrogating your own experiences of watching TV, reality or otherwise.

Callie: There's always that one person who has to slam every-one else...it's not attractive.

Karen: Check this out! Enter Oz [girl in green dress]! We're off to see the Wizard...

Both: [singing] ...the wonderful wizard of Oz!

[sound of laughing and glasses clinking]

Karen: So now he'll propose to the bitch, get dumped, and then end up on *Dancing with the Stars*.

## References

- Aitchison, C. (2000). Poststructural feminist theories of representing Others: A response to the 'crisis' in leisure studies' discourse. *Leisure Studies*, 19, 127–144.
- Andrejevic, M. (2004). *Reality TV: The work of being watched*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Barton, K. M. (2009). Reality television programming and diverging gratifications: The influence of content on gratifications obtained. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 53(3), 460–467.
- Behar, R. (1995). Introduction: out of exile. In R. Behar & D. Gordon (Eds.), *Women writing culture* (pp. 1–33). Berkeley, CA: University of California.
- Behar, R., & Gordon, D. (1995). *Women writing culture*. Berkeley, CA: University of California.
- Berbary, L. A. (2008). *Subject to sorority: Women's negotiations of competing discourses of femininity*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from: <http://dbs.galib.uga.edu>
- Berbary, L. A. (2011). Post-structural writerly representation: Screenplay as creative analytic practice. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 17(2), 186–196.
- Berbary, L. A., & Johnson, C. W. (2012). The American sorority girl recast: An ethnographic screenplay of leisure in context. *Leisure/Loisir*, 36(3-4), 243–268.
- Bonsu, S. K., Darmody, A., & Parmentier, M. (2010). Arrested emotions in reality television. *Consumption Markets & Culture*, 13(1), 91–107.
- Brophy-Baermann, M. (2005). True love on TV. *Poroi*, 4(2), 17–51.
- Brown, L. S. (2005). Outwit, outlast, out-flirt? The women of reality TV. In E. Cole & D. J. Henderson (Eds.), *Featuring females: Feminist analyses of media* (pp. 71–83). Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Bureau of Labor. (June 6, 2011). *American Time Use Survey Summary-2010 Results*. Retrieved April 30, 2012 from <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/atus.nr0.htm>
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1997). *Excitable speech: A politics of the performative*. New York: Routledge.
- Cato, M., & Carpentier, R.D. (2010). Conceptualizations of female empowerment and enjoyment of sexualized characters in reality television. *Mass Communication and Society*, 13, 270–288.

- Couldry, N. (2008). Reality TV, or the secret theater of neoliberalism. *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 30(1), 3–13.
- Dubrofsky, R. E. (2005). *The Bachelor industry: The surveillance and governing of women*. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, <http://search.proquest.com/docview/304985891?accountid=14677>
- Dubrofsky, R. E. (2006). *The Bachelor: Whiteness in the harem*. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 23(1), 39–56.
- Dubrofsky, R. E. (2007). Therapeutics of the self: Surveillance in the service of the therapeutic. *Television & New Media*, 8(4), 263–284.
- Dubrofsky, R. E., & Hardy, A. (2008). Performing race in *Flavor of Love* and *The Bachelor*. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 25(4), 373–392.
- Dubrofsky, R. E. (2009). Fallen women in reality TV: A pornography of emotion. *Feminist Media Studies*, 9(3), 353–368.
- Dubrofsky, R. E. (2011). *The surveillance of women on reality television: Watching The Bachelor and The Bachelorette*. Plymouth, UK: Lexington Books.
- Durrant, P., & Kennedy, E. (2007). Sonic Sport: Sound Art in Leisure Research. *Leisure Sciences*, 29(2), 181–194.
- Fairclough, K. (2004). Women's work? Wife Swap and the reality problem. *Feminist Media Studies*, 4(3), 344–347.
- Ferris, A. L., Smith, S. W., Greenberg, B. S., & Smith, S. L. (2007). The content of reality dating shows and viewer perceptions of dating. *Journal of Communication*, 57, 490–510.
- Glover, T. D. (2007). Ugly on the diamonds: An examination of White privilege in youth baseball. *Leisure Sciences*, 29, 195–208.
- Graham-Bertolini, A. (2004). Joe Millionaire as fairy tale: A feminist critique. *Feminist Media Studies*, 4(3), 341–344.
- Gray, J. (2009). Cinderella burps: Gender performativity and the dating show. In S. Murray & L. Ouellette (Eds.), *Reality TV: Remaking television culture* (2nd ed.) (pp. 260–277). New York: New York University.
- Hautakangas, M. (2010). Trans-audiencehood of *Big Brother*: Discourses of fans, producers and participants. In S. Van Bauwel & N. Carpenter (Eds.), *Trans-reality television: The transgression of reality, genre, politics, and audience* (pp. 229–250). Lanham, MD: Lexington.
- Henderson, K. A. (1994). Perspectives on analyzing gender, women, and leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 20(2), 119–137.
- Henderson, K. A., & Bialeschki, M. D. (1999). Markers of meanings: Feminist perspectives on leisure research. In E. L. Jackson & T. L. Burton (Eds.), *Leisure studies: Prospects for the twenty-first century* (pp. 167–176). State College, PA: Venture.
- Henderson, K. A., & Gibson, H. J. (2013). An integrative review of women, gender, and leisure: Increasing complexities. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 45(2), 115–135.
- Hill, A. (2002). *Big Brother: The real audience*. *Television & New Media*, 3 (August), 323–340.
- Hill, A. (2005). *Reality TV: Audiences and popular factual television*. New York: Routledge.
- Hirschman, E. C. (1985). A multidimensional analysis of content preferences for leisure-time media. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 17(1), 14–28.
- Johnson, C. (2005). 'The first step is the two-step': hegemonic masculinity and dancing in a country-western gay bar. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education (QSE)*, 18(4), 445–464.

- Johnson, C. W. (2009). Writing ourselves at risk: Using self-narrative in working for social justice. *Leisure Sciences*, 31(5), 483–489.
- Jacobson, S. A., & Samdahl, D. M. (1998). Leisure in the lives of old lesbians: Experiences with and responses to discrimination. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 30(2), 233–255.
- Lather, P. (2006). Paradigm proliferation as a good thing to think with: Teaching research in education as a wild profusion. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 19(1), 35–57.
- Lather, P., & Smithies, C. (1997). *Troubling the angels: Women living with HIV/AIDS*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- McRobbie, A. (2007). Postfeminism and popular culture: Bridget Jones and the new gender Regime. In Y. Tasker, & D. Negra (Eds.), *Interrogating postfeminism: Gender and the politics of popular culture* (pp. 26–39). Durham, NC: Duke University.
- Mendible, M. (2004). Humiliation, subjectivity, and reality TV. *Feminist Media Studies*, 4(3), 335–338.
- Norris, J., & Sawyer, R. D. (2012). Toward a dialogic methodology. In J. Norris, R. D. Sawyer, & D. Lund (Eds.), *Duoethnography: Dialogic methods for social, health, and educational research* (pp. 9–39). Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast.
- Parry, D. C., & Johnson, C.W. (2007). Contextualizing leisure research to encompass complexity in lived leisure experience: The need for creative analytic practice. *Leisure Sciences*, 29, 119–130.
- Pillow, W. S. (2003). Confession, catharsis, or cure? Rethinking the uses of reflexivity as methodological power in qualitative research. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 16(2), 175–196.
- Pozner, J. L. (2010). *Reality bites back: The troubling truth about guilty pleasure TV*. Berkeley, CA: Seal Press.
- Reinharz, S. (1992). *Feminist methods in social research*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University.
- Rhodes, R. E., & Dean, R. N. (2009). Understanding Physical Inactivity: Prediction of Four Sedentary Leisure Behaviors. *Leisure Sciences*, 31(2), 124–135.
- Richardson, L. (1993). Poetics, dramatics, and transgressive validity: The case of the skipped line. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 34(4), 695–710.
- Richardson, L. (2000). Evaluating Ethnography. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 6, 253–255.
- Richardson, L., & St. Pierre, E. A. (2005). Writing: A method of inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 959–978). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Roberti, J. W. (2007). Demographic characteristics and motives of individuals viewing reality dating shows. *The Communication Review*, 10, 117–134.
- Samdahl, D. M., Jacobson, S. A., & Hutchinson, S. L. (2001). When gender is problematic: Leisure and gender negotiation for marginalized women. In S. Clough & J. White (Eds.), *Women's leisure experiences: Ages, stages and roles* (pp. 139–146). Eastburn, UK: Leisure Studies Association.
- Shaw, S. M. (1994). Gender, leisure and constraint: Toward a framework for the analysis of women's leisure. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 26(1), 8–22.
- Shaw, S. M. (1999). Gender and leisure. In E. L. Jackson & T. L. Burton (Eds.), *Leisure Studies: Prospects for the twenty-first century* (pp. 271–282). State College, PA: Venture.
- Snyder, R. C. (2008). What is third-wave feminism? A new directions essay. *Signs*, 34(1), 175–196.
- Snyder-Hall, R. C. (2010). Third-wave feminism and the defense of 'choice.' *Perspectives on Politics*, 8(1), 255–261.

- St. Pierre, E. A., & Pillow, W. S. (2000). Inquiry among the ruins. In E. A. St. Pierre, & W. S. Pillow (Eds.), *Working the ruins: Feminist poststructural theory and methods in education* (pp. 1–24). New York: Routledge.
- Villenas, S. (2000). This ethnography called my back: Writings of the exotic gaze, “othering” Latina, and recuperating Xicanisma, In E. A. St. Pierre & W. S. Pillow (Eds.), *Working the ruins: Feminist poststructural theory and methods in education* (pp. 74–95). New York: Routledge.
- Visweswaran, K. (1994). *Fictions of feminist ethnography*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.
- Wachter, C. J., & Kelly, J. R. (1998). Exploring VCR use as a leisure activity. *Leisure Sciences*, 20(3), 213–227.
- Yep, G., & Camacho, O. (2004). The normalization of heterogendered relations in *The Bachelor*. *Feminist Media Studies*, 4(3), 338–341.