



Backlash or Genderquake: Exploring the Chick Lit Identity

Aditi Khajuria 

¹ Associate Professor, Department of English, Government College for Women, Gandhi Nagar Jammu, J&K, India.

* Corresponding Author:

Aditi Khajuria

aditksidharth.aks@gmail.com

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21217668>

ARTICLE INFO

Article History

Received 08 Apr, 2026
Revised 18 May, 2026
Accepted 25 Jun, 2026
Available Online 30 Jun, 2026

ARTICLE ID

PHJSSH0402002

KEYWORDS

Postfeminism, Chick Lit, Backlash, Genderquake, Power Feminism, Choiceoisie, Bridget Jones.



ABSTRACT

This paper examines the postfeminist 'chick lit' woman through the competing theoretical frameworks of Susan Faludi and Naomi Wolf. It looks at the contemporary, urban, single woman in her late twenties or thirties who is professionally independent and, in popular parlance, 'has it all,' and traces how this figure has come to define a distinct literary genre. The paper offers a brief survey of the term 'chick lit' and considers how the genre reworks conventional treatments of love, courtship, and gender to reflect a hybrid, self-aware, and fun-loving feminist protagonist. It also considers how chick lit protagonists are typically single women who claim access to the freedoms long associated with men, and how the genre stages female friendship as a space of both solidarity and competitiveness, sexual striving, and anxiety. Centrally, the paper asks whether chick lit adequately reflects the lived reality of the contemporary urban woman, or whether it is better understood as a genre caught between the paradoxes of its time and society. Is chick lit, as Faludi would argue, a backlash against feminism's gains, or is it, as Wolf insists, evidence of a forward-moving 'power feminism'? The paper concludes by considering whether chick lit marks a genuine shift from female sexual objectification toward empowerment and subjectification.



1. INTRODUCTION

Postfeminism describes the advancement of a female discourse in a world where the equality of women can, at least notionally, be assumed. The prefix 'post' signals dependence and continuity rather than rejection: Postfeminism does not erase feminism so much as absorb and rework it. In the 1980s the popular media coined the term to mark a shift away from second-wave feminism, and since then it has circulated widely in popular culture, attaching itself to the female protagonists of chick lit novels such as Helen Fielding's *Bridget Jones's Diary*, Candace Bushnell's *Sex and the City*, Advaita Kala's *Almost Single*, and Shelina Zahra Jan Mohamed's *Love in a Headscarf*, among many others.

Postfeminism, then, is neither a simple rebirth of feminism nor a straightforward rejection of it, but a complex resignification that carries within it both the threat of backlash and the potential for genuine innovation. This paper takes that tension as its starting point, using Susan Faludi's *Backlash* and Naomi Wolf's *Fire with Fire* as two lenses through which to read the chick lit genre and the postfeminist woman (PFW) it represents (Butler, 1990).

The discussion proceeds in stages. It begins by laying out Faludi's and Wolf's competing frameworks, before turning to chick lit's postfeminist sensibility, its ideology of 'choiceoisie,' and its particular brand of 'power' or 'do-me' feminism. It then considers the genre's global reach through four representative protagonists *Bridget Jones*, the women of *Sex and the City*, *Aisha* in *Almost Single*, and *Shelina* in *Love in a Headscarf* before examining how the genre redefines female beauty on its own terms (Friedan, 2010). It closes by weighing the genre's optimism against the continuing realities of backlash, and asks whether chick lit is best read as retreat, as power, or as something closer to a new 'femmenism.'

2. Theoretical Framework: Backlash and Genderquake

According to Faludi's *Backlash* thesis, postfeminism quietly undoes the gains of the feminist movement by placing women in a no-win position: either they live up to an impossible 'superwoman' image, or they are condemned to a grinding 'double-day/second-shift' existence. *Backlash* propaganda, in this account, splits women's lives in two, drawing a hard line between the private and the public sphere and insisting that professional success can only ever come at the cost of marriage and family (Ferriss & Young, 2006).

Naomi Wolf's notion of the 'genderquake' offers a very different reading. For Wolf, there is no single template for postfeminism, because its manifestations are too diverse to be captured by one narrative of loss. The genderquake describes a generation of women who have effectively become a new political ruling class: power, in this view, is already available to women, and the task is simply to seize authority from men and let the rest follow. Read against each other, Faludi and Wolf frame the two poles between which any discussion of chick lit inevitably moves: retreat versus advance, loss versus power (Friedan, 2010).

3. Chick Lit and the Postfeminist Sensibility

Chick lit is best described as a postfeminist genre of fiction that covers the full breadth of female experience and treats the traditional romantic themes of love, courtship, and gender in decidedly unconventional ways. It is a genre written mainly by women, for women particularly single, working women in their twenties and thirties who are courageous and playful, frank and wry, honest, intelligent, unapologetic, and, by most measures, emancipated. 'Chick' is American slang for a young woman; 'lit' is simply short for literature (Genz, 2009).



The 'postfeminist sensibility' that runs through the genre sits at the intersection of mainstream consumer culture, neoliberal politics, and postmodern feminism. It has been read both as a retrogressive backlash that quietly undoes the social transformations feminism achieved, and as a power feminism defined by the youthful confidence of 'chick' and 'grrrl' power (Faludi, 1991). In this framing, second-wave feminism is cast as old and embittered, while postfeminism is aligned with images of youth and happiness; feminism itself is sometimes caricatured as a fanatic doctrine, confined to academia, that forces its adherents into a fixed set of attitudes man-hating, intolerant, angry, and endlessly complaining. This caricature alienates young women who want no part of being cast as 'feminist outsiders,' but who still want to use the power available to them to chart a course toward the ordinary freedoms of individual life (Ferriss & Young, 2006). The resulting generational rift is often described as a 'mother-daughter conflict' between feminists and postfeminists. Postfeminism, in this sense, is neither a radical break from feminism nor a straightforward continuation of it is both and neither, a kind of bricolage of competing and conflicting forms of agency and multiple subject positions that makes feminism at once political and popular.

4. 'Choiceoisie' and the New Feminist Subject

Postfeminism presents women with what might be called 'choiceoisie': the idea that every major life decision is an individual option rather than a culturally determined obligation. The women of this generation are the first of their sex to grow up with equal education and equal opportunity, and to accept feminism as something like a birthright. They enjoy the 'ordinary freedoms' that men have always taken for granted, but which earlier generations of women had to fight hard to win (Genz, 2009).

This new feminist figure discards the victim narrative and the bechari (helpless) image, because today's women are freer and more powerful than any generation before them, and are able to construct identities that fall outside established social categories. She might be a high-profile CEO with nine children, or the head of the World Bank cultivating a deliberately androgynous persona. She might be Indira Nooyi, drawing a salary in the millions and still feeling a pang of guilt for not being there when her children needed her, or she might be Sushma Swaraj, a high-profile Foreign Minister who nonetheless looks every inch the traditional Bhartiya naari, in her sindoor, bindi, bangles, and saree. Today, in theory at least, every woman can choose who and what she wants to be.

5. Power Feminism and the 'Do-Me Feminist'

Power feminism popularised in the 1990s by the Spice Girls, and in fiction by Bridget Jones celebrates women enjoying their feminine selves, in contrast to the more austere, aggressive image of the 1960s 'bra-burner.' Just because women do not want to be sexually exploited does not mean they do not want to be sexual; and flaunting one's sexuality does not automatically amount to submitting to the voyeurism of the male gaze (Faludi, 1991). The challenge facing this generation is to 'have it all' to balance a demanding career with a fulfilling personal life. The chick lit woman is typically a thirty-plus singleton enjoying a cosmopolitan lifestyle, financial independence, and sexual autonomy, but she is also self-obsessed, prone to bouts of anxiety or low mood, and caught between her biological clock and her career clock. She survives these contradictions because her particular brand of 'do-me feminism' tells her, again and again, that she is 'worth it.'



The chick lit woman has, in a sense, killed off the ‘Angel of the House’ and stepped outside the Lakshman Rekha drawn around her by patriarchy. The twenty-first-century woman enjoys freedoms that women of the past could barely imagine. History has recorded a handful of exceptional ‘her-stories,’ but they have always been the exception; today, most women hold the power to shape their own lives, and their femininity is defined with reference to themselves rather than to a male gaze. Sexuality once the very source of women’s oppression is reframed here as a source of empowerment (Genz, 2009). For the ‘do-me feminist,’ sexuality signals self-determination rather than patriarchal subjugation. She has nothing left to prove, because feminism has already told her she is equal to men; she only has to believe it herself. The emphasis, accordingly, falls on making the most of oneself rather than on a collective sisterhood organised against oppression (Butler, 1990).

6. The Global Appeal of Chick Lit

The runaway popularity of chick lit owes much to how closely it mirrors the lives of young, cosmopolitan singletons. It provokes a strikingly similar response in young women from Mumbai to Manhattan: ‘I am exactly like that,’ or ‘that just happened to me.’ It is not merely a passing fashion, and it is not confined to white, urban, heterosexual, middle-class women; rather, it speaks to the contradictions and challenges of the postfeminist woman across the globe. Chick lit unpacks the paradoxes of the protagonist’s personal ‘lifestyle politics,’ though whether this connects meaningfully to the wider issue of social and gender inequality remains an open question. Does its unapologetic consumerism advance the cause of feminism? Its defenders argue that it does, because it tells the truth about what young women’s lives actually look like in contemporary society (Ferriss & Young, 2006). Today’s young women want the empowerment that second-wave feminists won through hard struggle the right to make their own major life choices but they also want romance, fashion, fun, career, and marriage, because they believe they can have all of it. As the genre puts it, in effect: ‘I’m single, I’m female, and I’m having a really good time.’

7. Reading the Protagonists: Four Case Studies

7.1 Bridget Jones: Everywoman of the Zeitgeist

Bridget Jones is Everywoman in the sense that she fully embodies the zeitgeist the hip, urban, cosmopolitan singleton lifestyle of young, middle-class women (Genz, 2009). She is, in her own words, ‘young-ish and pleasant-ish’; she likes sex and designer clothes, goes to the gym, parties, and gossips with her friends. She is single but not a spinster, unmarried but not a virgin; she wants a stable relationship, but no ‘emotional fuckwittage.’ She resists easy stereotyping: she is no ‘Angel of the House,’ but neither is she a ‘bra-burner’; she is not a doormat, but neither is she a man-hater (Faludi, 1991). She has been born to accept feminism as her birthright and enjoys all the freedoms men have long taken for granted education, work, sex, travel, adventure. Born into ‘choiceoisie,’ she makes every decision for herself and answers to no one but herself. She defines herself not in relation to a male subject but with reference to her own ‘me-ness.’ In this sense, Bridget Jones is the first fictional figure to represent an entire generation of women focused, unapologetically, on themselves.

7.2 Sex and the City: The Manhattan Singleton

The metropolitan setting of Sex and the City Manhattan, the aspirational ‘Big Apple’ is itself a character, defined by high fashion, sex, and luxury, all of which women pursue with the same appetite traditionally reserved for men. Against this backdrop, the novel and its



adaptations chronicle the lives of four Manhattan-based single professional women. Carrie, Samantha, Charlotte, and Miranda, in their thirties and forties, live a designer lifestyle organised around sexual freedom, professional independence, romance, friendship, and consumerism. As the text itself observes, New York has bred a particular type of single woman “smart, attractive, successful, and...never married.” The ‘Big Apple’ signifies an aspirational high, representing the privilege of ‘do-me feminism’ as these women carve out their own individual space and identity (Friedan, 2010).

7.3 Almost Single: Desi Singledom

Advaita Kala’s *Almost Single* introduces a new paradigm: ‘desi singledom.’ In the land of the great Indian wedding, Aisha represents the young, urban, educated Indian woman who enjoys the perks of being single money, friends, parties, jobs, dating, and sex. Yet her hip, cosmopolitan lifestyle sits uneasily against a society that remains fundamentally family- and community-based, one in which marriages are arranged and sons, in particular, are prized. She is caught in a tight circle of personal desire and social obligation; the desi chick litter is clearly not suited to the role of Grihalakshmi or Dharmapatni. She is, in her own words, a ‘freemale’ who asks why boys should have all the fun and yet, in the same breath, the search for a ‘Desi Dulha’ proceeds in earnest, complete with matrimonial websites, havans, astrologers, and insistent mothers.

7.4 Love in a Headscarf: Faith and Choice

Shelina, in *Love in a Headscarf*, echoes Bridget Jones’s conviction that ‘there is no need to be anyone but oneself.’ She insists, in her own voice, that ‘no one is making us do it... it’s our choice,’ and, like Bridget, claims the freedoms of cosmopolitan singleton culture on her own terms. She decides to climb Mount Kilimanjaro despite her conservative family’s disapproval, and buys herself a sports car even after being warned that ‘nice girls don’t climb mountains’ and ‘nice girls were not supposed to buy exciting cars.’ She risks being seen as not a nice girl, but refuses to compromise on what she actually wants. Bridget Jones’s own line ‘one does not need a man’ captures something Shelina embodies just as fully: the chick lit heroine can handle whatever life throws at her (Genz, 2009).

Taken together, these four protagonists have been described as a ‘career woman/girlfriend hybrid.’ Where earlier generations of women had to choose between marriage and career, the chick lit woman wants both, and asks why she should have to choose at all between professional success and personal happiness. Power feminism’s central claim is that women are entitled to equality as a matter of course, not as ‘helpless victims’ begging for it (Faludi, 1991). All four protagonists are qualified professionals earning, and spending, their own money. Where the backlash narrative warns of a looming ‘burnout’ that threatens fertility, the postfeminist woman insists she does not need marriage for financial security, sex, or children; she is looking, instead, for a companion who is simply compatible with the life she has already built. Marriage is not a compulsion but a choice, made only when and if it suits her (Butler, 1990).

8. Redefining Beauty: Style as Choice

The patriarchal concept of female beauty is likewise being rewritten by this generation, which rejects any single, male-defined standard of beauty in favour of multiple, self-authored images of what it means to be beautiful. Bridget is preoccupied with losing weight and achieving a ‘Michelle Pfeiffer figure,’ but is pragmatic enough to conclude that she ‘must get



on with life and not feel sorry for herself.' Aisha, by contrast, has her own sense of style, built around comfort: 'my philosophy in clothes is simple.' Carrie, meanwhile, is a committed fashionista who thinks nothing of travelling to the Aspen ski resort in "a white mink coat, a short dress, and white patent leather boots." To each woman her own: across the genre, style and beauty are defined not by consensus but by personal 'choiceoisie.'

CONCLUSION

The optimism and joie de vivre that define the chick lit heroine, whether she is based in London, Manhattan, or Mumbai, suggest that the genre is not simply a passing fashion but a genuine development in women's writing one that captures, with real honesty, the paradox of being an emancipated woman in a world still shaped by a patriarchal mindset. Women today have inherited basic freedoms and rights that earlier generations of women had to fight for, often at great cost. The radicalism of the second wave has, in this sense, given way to the confidence of the third: women now know they are free and equal to men, at least in principle, and are no longer compelled to fit any single mould good woman or bad, wife or girlfriend, doormat or 'libber,' married woman or career woman. Each woman can simply be herself, answerable to no one but herself (Butler, 1990). These are, on the whole, women learning to handle real problems in a real world, in a practical and clear-eyed way.

And yet it would be premature to treat this optimism as the whole story. In traditional societies such as India, the ongoing pattern of domestic and public violence against women often reinforced by religious fundamentalism and a broader misogynistic mindset is itself evidence of a live backlash against feminist politics. Whether women will allow the clock to be turned back, or whether they will hold on to the gains feminism has already secured, remains genuinely open. The masculine anxiety provoked by the feminine's intrusion into masculine space has, in turn, produced its own set of 'displaced' and 'wounded' masculinities the metrosexual, the retrosexual, the 'new man,' the 'soft lad,' and so on. This shifting 'melting pot of masculinities' is best understood as a direct response to the postfeminist woman's impact on male identity and on gender relations more broadly (Faludi, 1991).

Postfeminism, as chick lit stages it, values individualism over collectivism and assertive power over passive victimhood, and in doing so sketches a rough roadmap for the future: gender-equal workplaces, greater male involvement in domestic life, real support for female victims of violence, and the feminisation of institutions still built around older assumptions. The genre shows how women today live with 'choiceoisie'; it also shows that the postfeminist woman has not so much turned her back on feminism as reinvented it as something that might be called 'femmenism.' She is not retracing her steps but moving forward. It marks, in that sense, both the end of one era and the beginning of another: the post-Bridget Jones era.

REFERENCES

- Aapola, Sinikka, Marina Gonick, and Anita Harris, editors. *Young Femininity: Girlhood, Power and Social Change*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2005, pp. 21–39.
- Adams, Lauren. "Chick Lit and Chick Flicks: Secret Power or Flat Formula?" *Horn Book Magazine*, vol. 80, no. 6, 2004, pp. 669–678.
- Arnett, Jeffrey Jensen. *Emerging Adulthood: The Winding Road from the Late Teens through the Twenties*. Oxford University Press, 2004, pp. 43–68.
- Arthurs, Jane. "Sex and the City and Consumer Culture: Remediating Postfeminist Drama." *Feminist Media Studies*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2003, pp. 83–98.



- Henry, Astrid. "Orgasms and Empowerment: *Sex and the City* and the Third Wave Feminism." *Reading Sex and the City*, edited by Kim Akass and Janet McCabe, I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd., 2004, pp. 65–83.
- Austen, Jane. *Pride and Prejudice*. T. Egerton, 1813, pp. 1–432.
- Bainbridge, Beryl. "Bainbridge Denounces Chick-Lit as 'Froth.'" *The Guardian*, 23 Aug. 2001, pp. 14–15.
- Bank, Melissa. *The Girls' Guide to Hunting and Fishing*. Viking, 1999, pp. 57–82.
- Barlas, Asma. "Muslim Women & Sexual Oppression: Reading Liberation from the Quran." *Macalester International*, vol. 10, no. 15, 2001, pp. 121–139.
- Baumgardner, Jennifer, and Amy Richards. *Manifesta: Young Women, Feminism and the Future*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2000, pp. 91–118.
- Beasley, Chris. *What Is Feminism?* Sage Publications, 1999, pp. 32–58.
- Bellafante, Ginia. "Poor Little Rich Girls, Throbbing to Shop." *The New York Times*, 17 Aug. 2003, pp. 9–11.
- Bolotin, Susan. "Voices from the Post-Feminist Generation." *The New York Times Magazine*, 17 Oct. 1982, pp. 31–39.
- Braithwaite, Ann. "Politics of/and Backlash." *Journal of International Women's Studies*, vol. 5, no. 5, 2004, pp. 18–33.
- Braithwaite, Ann. "The Personal, the Political, Third Wave, and Post-Feminism." *Feminist Theory*, vol. 3, no. 3, 2002, pp. 335–344.
- Brooks, Ann. *Postfeminisms: Feminism, Cultural Theory and Cultural Forms*. Routledge, 1997, pp. 66–92.
- Brownmiller, Susan. *In Our Time: Memoir of a Revolution*. Delta, 1999, pp. 145–171.
- Bushnell, Candace. Interview by Simon Hattenstone. "All About Sex." *The Guardian*, 5 Feb. 2001, pp. 12–16.
- Bushnell, Candace. Interview by Troy Patterson. "Sensational & Sensibility." *Entertainment Weekly*, no. 713, 6 June 2003, pp. 36–38.
- Bushnell, Candace. Interview by Lydia Slater. "A Twist in the Tale." *Evening Standard*, 12 Sept. 2003, pp. 18–21.
- Bushnell, Candace. Interview by Patty Adams. "Big Apple Babe: Candace Bushnell." *New York Post Magazine*, 21 Sept. 2008, pp. 6–10.
- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. Routledge, 1990, pp. 101–129.
- Denfeld, Rene. *The New Victorians: A Young Woman's Challenge to the Old Feminist Order*. Allen & Unwin, 1995, pp. 47–72.
- Dharmapala, Su. "The Perils of Chick Lit." *The Sweet Escape*, Australia ed., 27 May 2013, pp. 18–24.
- Donadio, Rachel. "The Chick-Lit Pandemic." *The New York Times*, 19 Mar. 2006, pp. 9–13.
- Evans, Jana, and Anita Mannur, editors. *Theorizing Diaspora: A Reader*. Blackwell, 2003, pp. 35–61.
- Faludi, Susan. *Backlash: The Undeclared War against American Women*. Crown Publishers, 1991, pp. 127–154.
- Ferriss, Suzanne, and Mallory Young, editors. *Chick Lit: The New Woman's Fiction*. Routledge, 2006, pp. 14–39.
- Friedan, Betty. *The Feminine Mystique*. Penguin Books, 2010, pp. 76–104.



-
- Genz, St phanie. *Postfeminism: Cultural Texts and Theories*. Edinburgh University Press, 2009, pp. 52–79.
- Gill, Rosalind, and Elena Herdieckerhoff. “Rewriting the Romance: New Femininities in Chick Lit?” *Feminist Media Studies*, vol. 6, no. 4, 2006, pp. 487–504.
- Glasburgh, M. Michele. *Chick Lit: The New Face of Postfeminist Fiction?* University of North Carolina, 2006, pp. 23–51.
- Harzewski, Stephanie. *Chick Lit and Postfeminism*. University of Virginia Press, 2011, pp. 91–120.
- Lakshmi, Rama. “India's Cheeky ‘Chick Lit’ Finds an Audience: Books Reveal Modern Women's Irreverent, Contrary Views on Ancient Cultural Mores.” *The Washington Post*, 23 Nov. 2007, p. A16.
- McRobbie, Angela. “Post-Feminism and Popular Culture.” *Feminist Media Studies*, vol. 4, no. 3, 2004, pp. 255–264.
- Mlynowski, Sarah, and Farrin Jacobs. *See Jane Write: A Girl's Guide to Writing Chick Lit*. Quirk Books, 2006, pp. 18–47.
- Whelehan, Imelda. *Modern Feminist Thought: From the Second Wave to ‘Post-Feminism’*. New York University Press, 1995, pp. 81–109.
- Wolf, Naomi. *Fire with Fire: The New Female Power and How to Use It*. Fawcett Columbine Books, 1993, pp. 112–139.