At the earliest stages of my teaching career, I would often shy away from discussing topics that I thought were controversial, e.g., race, gender, and sexuality, afraid that students would think that I had some kind of agenda when I taught my courses. I was a young female of mixed race, preoccupied with proving that I was capable,
intelligent, and “professional.” I would often unknowingly feel the extra of trying to prove myself because we, as women of color, are often “presumed incompetent” (Muñoz, Niemann, and Gonzales, et. al. 2012). I had convinced myself that if I distanced myself from my so-called personal biases—the limitations of my own identity and how it shapes my thinking—my students would believe I was better capable of teaching them. This kind of thinking, of course, feeds into that myth of “objectivity”: that is, the belief that empirical knowledge can somehow be completely free from any kind of bias. Of course, Western empirical tradition has used this myth as the basis for differentiating itself from the tainted, subjective, often indigenous “Other” (Smith 1999; Mignolo 2011). It took quite some time before I realized that, despite my best efforts, I was never going to be able to distance myself from the key features of my identity as a woman of mixed race; in fact, those features shape my existence and are inextricable from who I am and what I do (Moya 2000; Alcoff 2000).

Most importantly, doing so was unhelpful to the students on whom I wanted to have the most impact: like myself, these were the women, students of color, and first generation college students in my classroom. Rather than removing these features of my identity as a writing instructor, I decided to let those features guide and shape my approach to writing pedagogy. It felt like a risky move: according to statistics published by Inside Higher Education (2016), women in academia are already subject to gender bias in student evaluations, manifesting in low end-of-semester evaluations and ratings from their students. As an untenured junior faculty member at an institution that values teaching, I wondered what effect this shift in my pedagogical approach would have on my teaching scores. I also felt, however, that I was communicating a dangerous message to other marginalized women who aspire to call themselves “professional” by putting my own “biases” (read: identity) at the forefront of my teaching. What I wanted to communicate to students—and what I hope this piece accomplishes—is a deeper, more nuanced understanding of resistance to patriarchy that values the many forms it takes, including forms of resistance practiced by marginalized women, that appear to be in tension with traditional academic feminism.
Despite my fears and hesitations, I have determined that sharing a deeper understanding of feminism with my students is my most important work as a teacher. Recently, I was assigned to teach an upper-level, open-topic course in writing and rhetoric. I took the opportunity to design a pedagogy that integrates features of community engagement work, feminism, rhetorical theory, and cultural rhetorics, in hopes that students would develop a more nuanced and complex understanding of feminism. Most importantly, I drew my inspiration for the course from my experiences and research with feminist rhetorical practices that happen in YouTube’s beauty community: a large, diverse online community of women who interrogate, perpetuate, redefine, and challenge both academic and mainstream notions of professionalism. Rather than hide their identities behind facades, many of these women leverage their identities as a means of establishing credibility with their audiences. They also use storytelling as a rhetorical practice to establish credibility, expertise, and build relationships. My study of the beauty community inspired an approach to digital/writing pedagogy that embraces and builds from difference and intersectionality, encourages students to play and question, and, in doing so, develop their own definitions of feminism. As a woman of color, teaching about the beauty community also provides opportunities for students to expand their understandings of “professionalism” as well as critique the cisgendered white male “professional” ethos, and finally, legitimize the identities of myself and others like me in this profession. This paper offers study findings from which I’ve developed a pedagogical approach for others also interested in exploring the intersections of marginality, feminism, and digital rhetorics with their students. I will present my experiences as a member of the community, my research on the beauty community, findings, and the pedagogical approach that I developed.

**A STUDY OF YOUTUBE’S BEAUTY COMMUNITY**

I found YouTube’s beauty community, an online community of millions of women who create and watch videos about makeup and beauty, in 2012. I chose to become a member because it was a space in which I could hear stories that were familiar to me as an Asian American, see faces that at least looked a little like my own, and feel my own experiences validated. I spent increasing amounts
of time interacting with other members of the community, building relationships with them, and learning the shared language of the community. Other women in the community described living in parts of the country where they felt a sense of isolation that I knew all too well as one of few people of mixed race in my geographic location. They reported experiencing pain and sometimes embarrassment, and using the community in part because it was a space in which they felt a sense of belonging. As my personal investment in the community increased, I began creating videos for the community. Some of the videos were makeup tutorials, and some were reviews of Asian beauty products. I monetized the videos and was invited to join YouTube’s Partner program when my channel reached 20,000 views (figure 1).

As my channel grew, I felt an increasing sense of anxiety that I would be “found out”—as an academic, as a feminist, someone who should know better than to participate in activities that seem fundamentally at odds with the professional identity that I had so carefully cultivated over the years. I was participating in discourses of consumerism, female gender performance, and appearance that did not align with my beliefs about who I should be as a woman of color and an academic. I was thinking entrepreneurially while building my YouTube channel.

Figure 1: Screenshot from a video that I created for the beauty community on my YouTube channel. The above screenshot reads: “Skin79 Super Bblesh Balm (Korean brand);” help problem skin: Skin79 Korean BB cream!; sparklelysesamecat
but also thinking critically about my entrepreneurial actions. It did not occur to me until much later that this tension that I experienced between my personal and professional identities as a result of my participation in the beauty community could birth a research project, and, in time, a pedagogy.

As a researcher, I initially found that one of the most compelling and perplexing features of the community was that it did not explicitly seem to resist patriarchal structures and discourses in any way; yet, it was a place where women empowered each other. These contradictions were difficult for me to embrace, as both a community member and an academic.

Postmodern feminist theorists such as Kristeva (1986), Irigaray (1985), Butler (1990), and Haraway (1991) claim that “woman” as a stable identity is itself an essentialist concept, and draw on French poststructuralists to deconstruct the notion of a core or stable identity to which woman, as a signifier, refers. Much of my training as an academic in humanities (and I don’t believe that I am alone in this regard) was shaped by these theories. While they are integral to innumerable resistance movements that have led to important societal change, many canonical postmodern feminist theories of identity assume that all women have access to the idealized, fluid, and unstable identities that resist patriarchal ideology. In response, scholars such as Moya (2000), Moraga (2000), and Alcoff (2000) have pointed out that we have much to learn about the nature of oppression—and about ourselves—from the experiences of marginalized women, and to deny the reality of their identities as they are rooted in experience is to deprive ourselves of this knowledge.

The research that I performed and the pedagogy that I developed engages with the question of what we can learn about the activities of women in digital/professional worlds and about ourselves when we understand identity as not unstable but material, embodied, and situated. Because I also make the argument that while some of the participants’ rhetorical activities are feminist in nature, it engages the question of what we value, and why, as feminists, students, and as teachers. Through these lenses, I approached the project with several research questions: I wanted to know what was the nature of the
phenomenon known as the community, whether participants felt a sense of belonging, and how participants constructed the community.

These are questions with which I frame this project and use as a basis to make sense of the data that I collected. I learned that women in the community used rhetorical practices such as storytelling and instruction to empower each other while also building their brands and identities as entrepreneurs in a commercialized platform. The nexus of these seemingly contradictory qualities of the community—the ability to see these qualities as complementary and intertwined rather than conflicting—are at the heart of the pedagogy that I propose.

METHODS
As I conducted my research of the beauty community, I knew from my own experience that I would be concerned with the concept and experience of difference as it relates to identity politics in and outside of the community. I developed a methodology that would account for these experiences with the hope that we might learn from, rather than disregard, difference and the conditions under which it is constructed. This methodology is shaped by my own experiences (and thus shaped by my own identity) as multiracial woman of color and as a person who believes that these markers of difference are invaluable to the work that I do and to the outcomes of this project. Difference shapes the spaces (both physical and virtual) that we occupy and use, and it also shapes the ways in which we can use them. The methodology enabled me to see the different uses of the online space known as the beauty community and the ways in which the notion of difference is implicated in those uses and both constrains and enables participation. I collected both transcribed video data and interview data from two women in the beauty community. I was interested in how difference was at times even leveraged as part of a marketing strategy and the implications of this leveraging as a rhetorical act for the theories of digital and professional identity that we use in rhetoric and writing studies. For this reason I chose to use a post-positivist realist feminist theory of identity, drawing on Moya (2000), Moraga (1981), and Alcoff’s (2000) work as a theoretical frame of inquiry. Post-positivist realist identity theory has the accounts for individual experiences and relies on “our ability to acknowledge and understand the social, political, economic, and epistemic consequences
of our own social location” (Moya 2000). It reconnects the divide between identity and experience enacted by postmodernism and operates on the assumption that we can learn about the nature of oppression through the experiences of others. This theory works with my own understanding of how social location shapes experience and participants’ identity-building and professional activities and experiences in the community.

FINDINGS

As it turns out, I was not the only one who felt tension between my professional identity and the identity I performed on my YouTube channel. Two women, both of whom self-identify as Asian American, agreed to participate in my study of the beauty community, and one of these women, Lisa\(^1\) reported feeling a similar kind of tension between her YouTube activity and her professional identity. Lisa has a large channel, with average view counts for each video in the hundreds of thousands and a few videos with over a million views. Lisa told me that when she began participating in the beauty community years ago, she was still working full-time in a corporate job. She told me that her involvement in the community started in part because she suffered from skin problems, and “on YouTube you’re able to find millions of people, right? And people who are like you, it can be hard to find people who have acne as bad as you, who are as open about it, and who are like you.” She added, “I also lived in Minnesota, so finding Asian people who have the same skin type and all that was really difficult. So that’s kind of why I really became obsessed with YouTube” (Lisa, November 2012). Lisa told me that despite her involvement with the beauty community, she felt a sense of discomfort with the identity that she was creating online and the identity that she lived as a corporate professional. When I asked her to tell me more about this sense of discomfort, she told me that:

I’m afraid people will judge me. I mean I’m a very type A person, um, and I’ve always succeeding in like math and sciences, and you know, you know, taking like multivariable calculus and stuff like that, and I didn’t want people to find this side of me because I thought that they wouldn’t think that I was as smart, or as serious . . . I don’t understand why if a girl is into beauty, why

\(^1\) Pseudonyms were used in this study to protect participant identities
she would be taken less seriously, but I was afraid of, you know, like, future employers seeing this, or you know, just like, people having a preconceived notion or something like that. So it was actually like I didn’t go public with my YouTube until after I quit my corporate job. (Lisa, November 2012).

Lisa’s statement implies that intelligent women should know better than to participate in this type of activity. This anxiety suggests that not everyone experiences online spaces, or has access to some identities, in the same way. Her experience speaks to the power of the ways that individual experiences are influenced by social location, race, gender, class, and sex (Alcoff 2000). For Lisa, her gendered identity marks her visibly and creates a set of expectations about how she should behave as an intelligent woman. These identity markers conflict with the accepted behaviors for one who is intelligent, good at math, and successful. Lisa told me that in spite of this, she made the decision to go full-time with her YouTube channel identity; she has since left her corporate job. For Lisa, YouTube has become a career. She is quite successful in engaging with her audience and an influential member of the community. She has branded herself as the “Oprah of Beauty,” creating rather risky videos in which she divulges much about herself, her perceived flaws, and how she learned to accept and embrace them. In fact, her videos leave a very strong impression on her viewers:

“People” send me really long emails, very tear jerking, almost an autobiography about themselves, about one of the stories I portrayed because they finally found someone they can relate to and they realize, ok this girl is like this and now she’s ok so maybe I can be that way . . . they see me going through that and I guess I used to be really afraid of showing my skin, but when I did it felt very relieving and people really liked me for that. (November 2012)

Lisa uses storytelling as a rhetorical move which enables her to, in turn, use YouTube, intended as a commercial space, for both entrepreneurial and identity work. Some of Lisa’s identity work involves telling the story of who she is in a way that disrupts what have become norms about how intelligent women should behave.
Lisa also tells stories about her experiences as the only Asian child at school and of being ridiculed in her Minnesota hometown. This identity work is complicated because it is also part of her brand, which she implements as a way to attract viewers and generate income from her channel as well as spin off her startup beauty community, yourperfectbeauty.com. Lisa is a businesswoman, an entrepreneur. The identity work that she does is intertwined with her work in expanding and selling her business, and her participation in discourses of consumerism. To Lisa, success in the community is measurable in numbers: “I think everyone has [an ideal] number [of subscribers] and I think it keeps going up,” she says (June 2013). Yet Lisa also feels drawn to the community because of its capacity to serve a space in which she expresses her identity as a Chinese-American woman. Lisa’s channel is one example of a site of complexity, feminist rhetorical practices, and digital identity within the community that can serve as an important pedagogical tool in helping students develop their own understanding of feminism.

**FEMINISMS AND DIGITAL RHETORICS: AN APPROACH TO A FEMINIST WRITING PEDAGOGY**

In 2013, the YouTube user tadelesmith uploaded a video titled “Feminist Makeup Tutorial (PARODY).” The tutorial reached over a quarter million views in less than a week; currently the video has reached over 600,650 views. Mainstream online feminist/pop culture blogs and magazines such as *Jezebel* featured the video, followed by *Cosmo UK* and other news sites. In the video, user tadelesmith goes through the motions of a typical makeup tutorial that would appear in the beauty community. In beauty guru fashion, she applies primer to her face, followed by foundation, and narrates each step with a witty instruction. At one point she tells the audience to “Apply a rosy blush to the apples of your cheeks, so that you’ll still look cute even when you’re covered in the blood of a thousand men.” This “feminist makeup tutorial” (figure 4) offered instructions on how to both apply makeup and resist the patriarchy.

In the classroom, I often discuss the use of “PARODY” in the title of this video. Was this a parody of the many makeup tutorials that women made in the community? The application of “feminist”
suggests that this distinction makes this particular tutorial stand out from the rest of the makeup tutorials in the community, which are perhaps not understood as feminist in nature. Tadelesmith draws on the mainstream understanding of feminism as resistance to patriarchal structures in the construction of her argument. Strong intelligent women, she seems to say, resist patriarchy in very specific kinds of ways. Upon receiving an overwhelming response, which she reported was unexpected, Tadelesmith released this statement on her YouTube channel:

This video is not intended to offend anyone; if you want to take anything from it (which you don’t have to), it’s meant to play on some common misconceptions about feminism. There [sic] is a difference between feminism and misandry, and this video is a satire based on the fact that these two things get mixed up all too often.

Tadelesmith’s comments seem to suggest just the opposite of what I had initially thought she was arguing in her parody: feminism to her may not be the narrow and exclusionary definition mainstream
understanding of feminism, much of which seems to still be based on first-wave feminism—that is, the feminism of the 1960’s, often associated with women’s rights and liberation. Feminism, she says, is not “misandry,” after all. It can be more than these things. Indeed, she seems to argue, we have some say in articulating what is feminism. Her choice to make this argument by creating a parody of a video genre for which the beauty community became popular and for which it is most known speaks to the complexity of the community and its seemingly contradictory nature. Perhaps the overwhelming response that Tadelesmith received is an indicator that women’s activities in this community are not yet well enough understood, and often misunderstood, in light of mainstream feminism. Regardless, I have found that presenting this video early on in the semester can be helpful when asking students to generate ideas about how feminism is portrayed in popular and user-generated media online.

Tadelesmith’s video has been useful in generating countless classroom discussions around feminism, particularly as a tool to help students critique the aspects of white feminism that have been exclusionary AND to help students articulate the aspects of mainstream feminism that have made them reluctant to call themselves feminist. In fact, as students in my writing course developed their own definitions of feminism, many of them indicated that understanding the difference between second-wave white feminism and a more inclusive intersectional approach to feminism encouraged them to rethink what it meant to be a feminist who engages with her community. Finally, the online video format encourages students to be creative in generating their own responses (see A Pedagogical Framework, below) that use rhetorical tools to speak to issues in their communities, actively contributing to the conversation.

**A PEDAGOGICAL FRAMEWORK**

Drawing from YouTube’s beauty community as a source of digital, intersectional resistance practices has proven useful in creating a writing pedagogy that is centered around the notion of social location: that is, issues of race, class, sex, and gender (Alcoff, 2000). Students are often familiar with the platform, and, in my experience, some of the students are either already members of the beauty community or know someone who is part of the community. This is a writing
pedagogy that asks students (and the instructor) to engage with questions about their own identities and experiences, using those questions as the starting point for class discussions and as the focal point of the final project. In the course that I developed, students draw from this discussion and weekly writing exercises to explore questions such as: What does it mean to be a feminist? Who can be a feminist? What does feminism have to offer rhetoric and writing studies?

The course explores the rhetorical, cultural, and gendered dimensions of electronic writing and identity construction, focusing on computer-mediated writing spaces like YouTube (see Appendix for a sample assignment). An important aspect of this pedagogy is engagement with resistance work; that is, students draw from feminist and digital rhetorical texts of their choice to inform digital projects that engage with their own communities. This kind of project asks students to first define and explore the notion of community, in a similar manner to the ways in which they define and explore notions of feminism. Students then identify several communities—face-to-face and digital—to which they belong before articulating an audience, purpose, and context for their project. Engaging with bell hooks’ (2000) *Feminism is for Everybody*, students then choose an appropriate platform for communicating an aspect of feminism that they believe is useful or valuable to their own community. Finally, students draw from concepts in usability testing as a form of peer feedback before finalizing and circulating the projects within their communities as the final project. A key feature of this approach to writing pedagogy is the focus on asking students to leverage and draw from their own experiences and identities to connect with the communities to which they already belong. In doing so, students deconstruct the typically outward gaze of much of community engagement and outreach pedagogy, turning instead to the relationships that they have already cultivated, and drawing from the knowledge and expertise that they already possess as members of those communities.

The most important discovery that I made in the course of developing this writing pedagogy emerged out of self-reflection. I am no longer hiding my identity and trying to keep it separate from my “professional” self: these aspects of my identity are inseparable.
and intertwined. My students have taught me even more about the nuances of feminism and resistance practices, as they share their experiences and stories about communities to which they belong, both online and off. As difficult—at times vulnerable—as it has felt, especially in light of recent political events in the United States and around the world that are fueled by fear of difference, to teach from a place where issues of identity (including my own identity) are central, the conversations and learning opportunities that emerged were paramount to working towards a more inclusive feminism and understanding of resistance.
APPENDIX A: FINAL PROJECT

Feminisms and Digital Rhetorics Final Proposal

Recall the bell hooks (2000) reading we did at the beginning of the semester: according to hooks, the project of feminism involves distributing feminist ideas for empowerment in communities. hooks assumes the traditional print/paper mode of communication is most appropriate, but as we’ve discussed in class, many digital modes of communication allow us to reach different audiences in different contexts and for different purposes. You will draw on the theories of feminisms and digital rhetoric that you have cultivated over the semester to create a project for a community to which YOU belong. This might be a home community, work, church, school, or other group or organization. You can deliver the project in any medium that you think best fits the intended message, so long as it addresses one of the major questions and/or conversations that we have discussed in the class in a way that is appropriate for the intended audience and purpose. A few examples of digital projects, just to help you get thinking, might include:

• An infographic providing information about consent for Fraternity and Sorority houses on campus
• A website (Weebly, Wix, and Wordpress are all good free platforms to consider) for students interested in joining a particular cause
• A short video (2-3 minutes) explaining heteroflexibility and alternative family structures
• A tutorial on how to…?

The project should draw from the issues and concepts from course readings across the semester, e.g., women in the workplace, alternative family structures, the gendered nature of public/private, issues of identity and experience, cyberfeminism, counterpublics, tactics and strategies, marriage and gender roles, etc. Take a look at our class collaborative glossary and discussion posts if you need ideas!
Your proposal should be no more than a page in length and should
discuss your digital project idea as well as your intended audience,
context (where will it live or be used?), and purpose (what do you
hope to accomplish?). You should also cite 4–5 sources that you plan
to draw from (including those that we have read in class).
APPENDIX B: FINAL PROJECT

Feminisms and Digital Rhetorics Final Digital Project and Written Paper

Recall that one of the outcomes of this course is to imagine, as hooks urges, ways in which the feminisms that we’ve developed as a class can be distributed in innovative ways into the communities outside of the classroom/academy. As you create a digital project (or perhaps a mockup of a digital project) that engages your community, you will also develop a written report that you will turn in along with the project. This report (5 single spaced or 10 double spaced pages, including images) will be written to me, and should include and explain the theories, sources, and rationale that inform the project. Your report should contain:

- A literature review (or summary) of sources, including readings from class and any outside readings that you used, that synthesizes the key concepts and ideas that are relevant to your project, and explains how these concepts informed your digital work
- A description of the community for which you created this project, and how (or where) your digital project would be used: the audience, context, and purpose of your digital project and where it will live
- An explanation of your role and investment in the community (why is this important to you?)
- The process of creating your project: what did you use to make it? (e.g., tools, software and hardware, collaboration with other people)
- An explanation of the design concepts that you used in making your project and your rationale for your design (why was this the best choice for your audience?)
- An explanation of the usability testing and feedback that you received on your project, and how this shaped the final project
- Visuals (e.g., screenshots) of your digital project showing your process and final product. Please use figure numbers to label your images (e.g., Fig. 1, Fig. 2,….)
- A works cited page in MLA format
In other words, you can think of this written component as a **narrative** that engages the concepts we’ve discussed and provides background theory and information (which wouldn’t necessarily be useful to the community for which you are creating this project, but is useful to me). You can organize the report in any way that you choose, but if it helps, you can use the sections that I suggest above to organize your written content. Your final report and digital project should be submitted together, either in Sakai, or with an alternative platform (such as Google Drive or dropbox) if Sakai does not have the storage capacity for your project. You will receive one grade for both components of the project.
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