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ABSTRACT

Busch, Ellie (M.A., Communication)

“CALL OUT RAPISTS. STOP PROTECTING ABUSERS:” An ethnography of communication approach to calling-out perpetrators of sexual violence in DIY/punk communities

Thesis directed by Professor David Boromisza-Habashi

Recent online movements like #MeToo and #TimesUp have not only brought sexual violence into mainstream conversations, it has also illuminated the accompanying practice of “calling-out abusers” as a significant way for understanding alternative approaches to accountability for perpetrators of sexual violence. DIY/punk communities in particular serve as unique sites for studying this practice, having been engaged in this practice long before it reached mainstream popularity. Drawing on theories and methodologies from the ethnography of communication tradition, I will describe and explicate the communicative practice of “calling-out” perpetrators of sexual violence within DIY/punk communities through the SPEAKING framework and cultural discourse analysis. By looking to both the doing of and talking about the practice of “calling-out,” I uncover locally significant meanings around sexual violence, alternative accountability processes, and online settings as an increasingly common space for the enactment of community.
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Figure 1  Scales of DIY/punk communal life
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

In the spring of 2018, NPR’s Invisibilia released an episode entitled “The Callout” (Rosin & Spiegel, 2018) where hosts Alix Spiegel and Hanna Rosin “chronicle a social media call-out” in Richmond, Virginia’s hardcore music scene. The episode begins with the origin story of a woman named Emily, a member of the punk scene in Richmond. Described as a “tight little tribe,” the Richmond scene had rules for what was appropriate to wear, to sing, to drink or smoke, that both defined and bonded the community, an “us against all of them.” Emily played shows, went on tours, and was all around an involved member of this community. On one of these tours, she met a guy from another touring band, and ended up being sexual assaulted by him. At the time, call-outs within the community were not the norm, and she didn’t feel like she could do anything about the assault because he was well liked and popular within the punk community. But then things started to change. “Posts on Tumblr, or Twitter, or Facebook that started appearing about five or six years ago in social justice circles across the country” provided an outlet for disenfranchised individuals within “fringe scenes” to “call-out” problematic, abusive, and otherwise violent behavior and individuals as a result of distrust in police, courts, and other formal, legal avenues. “Call-outs were something between a warning and a wanted poster” and this vigilante justice became prominent in punk scenes like Richmond. In 2015, Emily joined a band as a frontwoman, and used this platform to discuss issues of violence and misogyny within the community on stage. During this time, Emily’s best friend, another member of the community, was publicly called-out while they were on tour together. Emily was forced to stand by the politics she used her public platform to address, and publicly condemned her best friend as an abuser on Facebook. Emily choose to “believe women” over
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maintaining this friendship. Never speaking to this (ex) friend again, it was rumored he was “kicked out of his apartment,” that “he lost his job, moved to a new city, that he was not doing well.” Emily notes “we as punks are supposed to be better than that,” to know better than to harm or abuse people, “we are supposed to police each other.” From Florida to D.C., Emily, her band, and their shows became spaces to address, condemn, and call-out sexual harassment, abuse, and violence. Then one night, a man named Herbert took to Twitter, and publicly called-out Emily for being a “pseudo-feminist” and championing issues of sexism and misogyny in the scene, when in fact, Emily had her own track record of misogyny and sexism from high school, as she had previously supported and made fun of “a nude photo of a woman” that was posted online without the woman’s consent. Emily’s call-out was retweeted “left and right,” and other members from punk scenes across the country voiced their support of Herbert, the woman who Emily violated in high school, and the call-out post itself, as well as share their own stories of Emily’s past abuse. Emily decided to “commit herself fully to the accountability process” for her past actions, and through the help of council of peers from the community, Emily was asked to “take a step back” from her prominent role within the community. Emily apologized to the woman from the original call-out post, and the woman felt the apology was genuine. But Emily’s status in the community was compromised anyway. As a “known abuser,” she was socially isolated from her former hardcore punk community; people wanted nothing to do with her. Emily was “punished” by not being allowed to go to shows, participate in community events, or even make music. Emily acknowledged that she had “no right” to tell her story, and that to do so would mean focusing on herself instead of her victims. Others in the community would even go as far to contact venues to ensure Emily would not be coming to the show, as her mere presence might trigger their PTSD.
What makes Emily’s story so profound is the utter normalcy her story represents in current U.S. society. From punk scenes to the political arena, the practice of calling-out perpetrators of sexual violence and harm more broadly has become an increasingly normalized practice. With this practice, a tension has arisen alongside it. The tension highlights the overwhelming, contemporary social desire for justice regarding instances of sexual violence, as well as a lack of consensus about how to achieve such justice, particularly when there are often unpredictable and only partially successful outcomes from various attempts at accomplishing justice. Analyzing the practice of calling-out provides an opportunity to explore this tension, and the messiness that exists as individuals and communities commit to holding abusers accountable, without always know what that is supposed to look like.

From Harvey Weinstein and Aziz Ansari to Donald Trump and R. Kelly, “calling-out” perpetrators of sexual violence\(^1\) has become a mainstream occurrence following recent, predominately online movements like #MeToo and #TimesUp. With these movements came a powerful response in mainstream media – not only were victims\(^2\) of sexual violence no longer feeling silenced by the individuals who violated them, the industries and communities many of these perpetrators belonged to were also taking action to hold them accountable for their acts of violence, often without any lawful repercussions. As these movements continue being discussed and deliberated in mainstream conversation, three issues of central concern are apparent: 1)  

---

\(^1\) I use the term “sexual violence” opposed to other terms because of its relative flexibility as an umbrella term for instances of bodily violations of a sexual nature such as rape, sexual assault, sexual coercion, and sexual harassment, among other acts.

\(^2\) While ultimately the debate over the terms “victim” or “survivor” is a deeply personal choice to the individual grappling with that part of their identity, I choose the term victim over survivor as a reminder that surviving is a process and not an intrinsic part of being sexually violated. Not everyone affected by sexual violence “survive” the experience, and assuming survivorship forces a certain narrative on those living in the aftermath of a traumatic experience that they might not identify with, a narrative that assumes healing and recovery for the victim.
stories of sexual violence are being shared that fall outside of our current, legal understandings of sexual violence, 2) victims of sexual violence are increasingly expressing doubt in our legal system to provide accountability for perpetrators of sexual violence within legal parameters, let alone those instances that fall outside of what is legally defined and prosecutable, and 3) the act of calling-out alone is also often failing to hold perpetrators accountable for their acts of violence in an ethically satisfactory manner when legal avenues are ignored or avoided.

As mainstream conversations have just begun to grapple with these issues, one community in particular has already been having these difficult conversations, well preceding the current #MeToo and #TimesUp era. DIY/punk communities\(^3\) have been and continue taking to online, mediated forms of communication to talk about sexual violence and accountability on their own terms and as it exists in their own communities. With ideological roots in anti-authoritarianism and left-leaning, anarchist politics, DIY/punk communities have often opted for taking social issues into their own hands – a “do it yourself” approach at the heart of these communities’ foundations (Mattson, 2001). As such, these communities have already been wrestling with the issues and effects of accountability and justice through the act of calling-out as opposed to more formal legal procedures. But beyond having a history of confronting sexual violence and accountability, DIY/punk communities are also significant spaces to study this practice and the ideologies that surround it. As Bag (2012) asserts, “punk attitude continues to inform counterculture, protest movements, and popular actions aimed at societal change” (p. 233). Thus, these communities serve as both unique and important sites to study the ways sexual violence and accountability are, and already have been, discussed outside of the criminal justice system. DIY/punk communities allow us to consider the implications of this practice even as it

\(^3\) I define DIY/punk communities in the literature review.
unfolds beyond these communities and in mainstream society more broadly.

As this thesis will show, a communication approach not only fills in gaps to current conceptions of DIY/punk communities, it also allows for the explicit connection between these communities, their ways of speaking and online interactions, and their social justice commitments as they are communicated both implicitly and explicitly, within the community and beyond. A communication approach provides a useful frame to better understanding DIY/punk communities’ talk about and practices around calling-out, and the significance of this talk and practice for the rest of U.S. society. A communication perspective allows the researcher and the reader to consider the ways social interaction, among other factors, shape the community, the practice, and meanings that are associated with the practice of “calling-out.” In other words, communication constitutes DIY/punk community, but it also constitutes meanings around accountability as DIY/punk communities rely on alternative justice frameworks in dealing with instances of sexual violence as a result of their relative distrust in the criminal justice system. A communication approach allows us to “appreciate the way communities have come to exist and the function(s) of communication within them” (Milburn, 2004, p. 435).

In order to study this practice of calling-out within DIY/punk communities, an ethnographic approach provides a unique and valuable frame for deeper understandings of both the practice and the community as a whole. In studying the ways individuals within these communities talk about and perform the practice of calling-out, I uncover how this practice is meaningful from the members’ perspective. Through observation and interpretation of these communities’ local, and for this study, primarily online discourse, ethnography allows the researcher to find meanings animating the practice of calling-out itself, including meanings
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sustaining community life as a whole as they are apparent in this situated talk. As Hymes\(^4\) (1980) notes, “much of what we seek to find out in ethnography is knowledge that others already have. Our ability to learn ethnographically is an extension of what every human must do, that is, learn the meanings, norms, patterns of a way of life” (p. 98). Thus, the search for both the ordinary and the orderly becomes a central concern for the ethnographer. Ethnography allows us to see how things happen and unfold within a particular site. Recently, online or “web-based ethnography has become an increasingly popular research method in a wide range of disciplines” (Airoldi, 2018, p. 661). A pioneer of online or “virtual” ethnography, Hine (2008) describes this new process in a way that “transfers the ethnographic tradition of the researcher as an embodied research instrument to the social spaces of the Internet” (p. 257). Additionally, an online ethnography of DIY/punk communities through the practice of “calling-out” allows us to hang out in the scene(s) that are comfortable for the participants as they discuss and deliberate membership in the community as well as accountability and justice for instances of sexual violence within the community and outside of the law. The immersive experience of ethnography allows for truly deep cultural meanings to present themselves across time, and for the online ethnographer, across space as well.

By looking to tweets, blogs, articles, social media posts, memes, zines, and interviews,

\(^4\)This project is grounded in the ethnography of communication tradition, founded by the late Dell Hymes. Given the nature of this research and the larger #MeToo moment we currently find ourselves, it would be inappropriate to not at least acknowledge the harm Hymes perpetuated against women faculty and advisees throughout his career (Weinberg, 2018). Misogyny and sexual harassment are not unique to Hymes, and many scholars have had to grapple with drawing on theories, methodologies, and traditions that were founded by sexist men. Hymes was a serial sexual harasser who systematically denied woman colleagues of his tenure (Elegant, 2018). He was also a fierce advocate for addressing issues of inequality in education and language more broadly (Heath, 2011). Perhaps what we can learn most from this #MeToo moment is the profound complexities that are brought to light when we experience these kinds of cultural shifts, as well as the periods of confusion, anger, and mourning that follow.
and in centering both particular instances of discourse that count as “call-outs” as well as the metadiscourse that accompany the practice, we can begin to uncover these very questions regarding sexual violence as it relates to accountability for perpetrators and justice for victims. In the process of describing the practice and interrogating these questions as they exist outside of the criminal justice system, we also begin to reveal conceptions of identity, action, relationship, feelings, and place as they relate to “being” DIY/punk and “being in” a DIY/punk community. Grounded in theories of meta- and cultural discourses, I will employ an ethnography of communication approach to investigate and analyze the culturally distinctive communicative practice of calling-out perpetrators of sexual violence in DIY/punk communities. In describing and analyzing this locally significant practice, I will also make moves to expand theoretical understandings around speech communities and the ethnography of communication tradition more broadly as they exist in and apply to online settings.

This thesis begins with a literature review that traces DIY/punk communities, their origins, and their ideologies, going on to explore speech communities and their movement to online settings, followed by literature on call-outs, #MeToo, online public shaming, and online accountability more generally. Then, I include conversations around metadiscursive theory and “terms for talk” as advanced by Donal Carbaugh (1989, 2017). After the literature review, I provide insight into my methods of data collection, followed by interpretation and analysis of the data through the SPEAKING framework and a cultural discourse analysis. Through this analysis, I show how calling-out (re)produces norms and expectations of DIY/punk identity, as well as informs communal life at both local and translocal levels. I end with a discussion of the implications, limitations, and future possible directions of this project, with theoretical interventions in the areas of speech communities and online settings, sexual violence, and
alternative accountability processes.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, I will review and put into conversation literature on DIY/punk communities as well as their histories and ideologies, speech communities and online settings, the #MeToo movement and online public shaming, and theories of metadiscourse. This literature review will set up the historical, theoretical, and contextual framework for this thesis, and this chapter will end with my research questions for this study.

DIY/punk communities. The term “punk” first appeared in the 1970s as “American rock critics used it to describe relatively unknown ‘garage bands’ of the previous decade” (Moore, 2010, p. 309). Since then, punk has been described as an amalgamation of post-war, working-class, youth subcultures (Hebdige, 1979), as a form of direct action (Barrett, 2013), for its diverse origins as a space for queers, women, and people of color (Bag, 2012), and as having “an influential, anti-capitalist, do-it-yourself (DIY) ethos that has enabled it to spread throughout the globe, influenced at every step by local cultures, music, and political needs” (Paris & Ault, 2004, p. 404). Defining punk happens along the lines of the oppositional, alternative music, style, and/or politics being produced and enacted. As such, the individuals who identify as punk or as a part of a DIY/punk community do so for any combination of the music, style, and politics that continue to be central to a punk identity across time and space.

This leads me to my use of “DIY/punk” in particular. Punk, DIY, hardcore, anarcho-punk, pop-punk, post-punk, straightedge, queercore, Riot Grrrl, emo, and punk rock, are just a few of the terms used to describe groups and communities that have come out of “punk” as it was originally conceptualized in the 1970s. While the individuals, aesthetics, venues, sounds, and personal (as well as community) ethics may vary to some degree depending on the particular
community at hand, they are all still connected through a larger history, a history known as punk, with a do-it-yourself ethos at its very foundation. As such, I employ the term DIY/punk to provide not only an umbrella term for talking about the vast, though interconnected nature of punk, but also to signal the DIY ethos that is central and inherent to these communities’ very existence.

Substantial amounts of literature have already been dedicated to exploring DIY/punk communities for their music, style, and/or politics. One foundational text in this area is Dick Hebdige’s *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*. Hebdige’s (1979) insight on punk subcultures around London in the 1970’s provides one of the first accounts on understanding the foundations, formations, and aesthetics of punk identity from an alienated working-class youth. Hebdige’s accounts of punk’s earliest iterations laid the theoretical groundwork for future studies of punk and subcultures more broadly. Subcultural style, for Hebdige, was a space of both symbolic and material action – where ideology, class, and fashion converged. Hebdige describes punk’s formations as an amalgamation of various subcultural groups. As we consider punk’s present, as a blend of various scenes and communities, those vast iterations of punk (i.e. post-punk, hardcore, anarcho-punk, queercore, etc.), as described early on in this section, do not feel so random, as fusion and confluence of various subcultural groups made up punk’s very origins.

McRobbie (2000) notably critiques scholars like Hebdige for the implicit maleness of their approaches to studying punk subcultures. McRobbie, as well as scholars like Dunn and Farnsworth (2012), point out that women were not only a part of the foundations of punk, but punk was founded in opposition to oppressive forms of masculinity. Dunn and Farnsworth note this transformation within punk: “While the initial punk movement of the late-1970s reflected a disruption of the male/masculine culture of traditional rock and roll, the scene by the late 1980s
was largely male-dominated and, in some cases, marked by pronounced sexism. As such, many women in the American punk community found themselves pushed to the margin of their own scene” (p. 138). Bag (2012) also affirms and expands on the diverse origins of punk communities in noting how the early L.A. punk scene “was made up of a broad range of individuals,” stating that “early punks were rich, poor, gay, straight, male, and female, with a good sampling of L.A.’s ethnic diversity: Latinos, blacks, and Asians were all involved along with whites in the early days” (p. 236). For Bag, “early punk was as much a rejection of the status quo as it was the product of the rejects of the status quo” (p. 236). Understanding these origin stories of punk are vital to understanding the politics, ethics, and ideologies that have resulted from punk, as well as current tensions within and across these communities.

DIY/punk communities are often known for their radical (in this case, progressive, inclusive, and in opposition to “mainstream”) politics, ethics, and ideologies, such as anti-authoritarianism, anarchism, democracy, self-publishing, and activism. Mattson (2001) contends that “the DIY spirit of this youth subculture” is most apparent in its “critique of spectatorship, apathy, and passivity” (p. 84). Mattson then points out that anti-authoritarian and left-leaning anarchist ideologies were never supposed to produce “a coherent vision of political change” but were more concerned with “creating the sort of cooperative community of independent producers and zine writings that had flourished in the 1980s” (p. 86). In a similar vein, Barrett (2013) places the politics of DIY/punk communities in conversation with participatory democracy and “the direct action politics of the American punk movement” (p. 26), noting the importance of placing punk “in an appropriate historical context” that “relates its radical ethos to the broader political Left” (p. 24). These notions of coherence, community, and more equitable systems of representation as well as Leftist political leanings point not just to a disaffected youth, but also to
politically conscious individuals seeking radical spaces to create meaningful art and influence social change.

Whether and how this sense of community can be sustained in online settings is of particular interest in this thesis project. In an exploration on Internet media and its shaping of transnational Muslim punk subculture, Murthy (2010) provides insight into how one South Asian punk community exists and even thrives in online spaces like Facebook, Myspace, Twitter, and blogs, among other sites. While Murthy explains the particular socio-political circumstances that marginalize South Asian, Muslim punks and how the Internet has served as a space for these youths to “express themselves creatively and freely” (p. 191), I aim to continue this line of thought, to thinking about the ways the Internet disrupts purely geographic notions of DIY/punk community and works to create community across and among these various localized communities. As Emms and Crossley (2018) note in their study on underground metal music worlds in the United Kingdom, while “most contemporary worlds have a virtual aspect,” this online dimension is still “relatively new” (p. 114). The study of DIY/punk communities, not only for their online dimension, but how that online dimension allows various, localized communities to converge, is a central concern of this thesis.

Regardless of punk’s diverse origins or radical politics, hegemonic masculinity and other oppressive forces continue to manifest in DIY/punk communities. The Riot Grrrl movement of the early 1990s, led by women in punk bands like Bratmobile and Bikini Kill, brought to light these issues specifically, confronting and discussing “sexual identity, self-preservation, racism

---

5 Bratmobile and Bikini Kill were two bands coming out the Riot Grrrl movement that reached relatively mainstream success compared to other Riot Grrrl bands of the time. Kathleen Hanna, often noted as one of the founders/movements leaders of the Riot Grrrl movement, was the lead singer of Bikini Kill.
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awareness, surviving sexual abuse, and whether Riot Grrrls ‘fit or don’t fit into the punk community’ (Riot Grrrl Convention)” (Dunn & Farnsworth, 2012, p. 139). In an autoethnographic study of a specific DIY/punk community, Griffin (2012) confirms this sentiment noting the “under-representation of women in DIY punk” as a common theme, particularly in “heavier hardcore punk” scenes, as well as pointing to the disconnect between radical ideologies of DIY/punk subcultures and “how this plays out in practice” (p. 73-74). Griffin argues that while racism, sexism, and homophobia are usually publicly denounced in DIY/punk communities, casual instances of racism, sexism, and homophobia continue to exist in song lyrics, posters for shows, and interpersonal interactions, among other occurrences. Even when more implicit or casual instances of oppression present themselves in DIY/punk communities, the radical and relatively\(^6\) progressive history of DIY/punk’s past manifests in this public condemnation of oppressive acts and beliefs. As Lull (1987) duly notes, “contradictions exist everywhere in the punk subculture” (p. 251). As explored in this section, we also see these contradictions throughout much of DIY/punk communities’ existence, from their ideologies, gender relations, and their very own (mis)conceptions of shared histories.

**Speech communities and online settings.** One frame for conceptualizing DIY/punk communities is the notion of speech communities. From Leonard Bloomfield (1933) describing speech communities as “a group of people who use the same set of speech signals” (p. 29) to its much more nuanced development through the ethnography of communication by scholars like Dell Hymes and John Gumperz, the speech community construct provides an analytical framework for making sense of how language use sustains a shared sense of social belonging

---

\(^6\) As accounts by Griffin (2012) and Dunn and Farnsworth (2012) describe, the “progressiveness” of punk’s past has been at times been contested, particularly for more marginalized bodies.
among individuals. Influenced by Burke’s concept of “identification,” Hymes in particular pushed the field of sociolinguistics away from traditional linguistics to focus on communication competence, or language in practice, versus language competence, a rather abstracted understanding of language (Hymes, 1972; Jordan, 2005). Actual language use, and language use in context and in all its seeming imperfections became foundational to sociolinguists’ and ethnographers of communication’s understanding and application of speech communities.

Building off the work of Hymes and Gumperz, scholars like Marcyliena H. Morgan and Trudy Milburn have pushed speech communities in a more emic direction, where they are best understood as informed by shared ideologies, histories, and politics as experienced through language use. Milburn (2004) pushes back against notions of speech communities that rely too heavily on demographic features, assumed homogeneity, and a priori definitions instead of the actual “features of communication” (p. 411). Thus, in fields like communication and sociolinguistics, the manifestation of these shared ideologies, histories, and politics through similar and mutually understandable language resources is of particular interest. Morgan (2014) defines speech communities as “groups that share values and attitudes about language use, varieties and practices,” noting their development “through prolonged interaction among those who operate within these shared and recognized beliefs and value systems regarding forms and styles of communication” (p. 1). Thus, speech communities are defined not by a single, common language, “but rather by common linguistic norms” (Johnston & Marcellino, 2010, p. 61).

Morgan further explains how, speech communities are recognized as distinctive in relation to other speech communities. That is, they come into collective consciousness when there is a crisis of some sort and their existence is highlighted in relation to other communities. This is also triggered when hegemonic powers consider what the speech community is doing and saying to be a problem (p. 3).
Speech communities focus on the specific knowledge that is learned about culturally appropriate ways of speaking and acting within the socio-politically informed context in which the act or event is taking place. Thus, DIY/punk communities through this frame would be established and organized around locally recognizable communicative practices and norms that are both mutually intelligible and mark them as distinct from other speech communities.

Speech communities are particularly helpful for making sense of DIY/punk communities as they coalesce in online settings. Rampton (2009) reflects on some of the changes we have seen to the term “speech community” over time, noting a “burst of interest in the flow of people, texts, objects and ideas across local and global networks, as well as the interaction with ‘strangers’ inside, outside and at the boundaries of specific groups and institutions” (p. 694). Though not directly specific to the enactment of speech communities in online settings, this move in the conceptualization of speech communities opens up space to consider what these communities might look like online. Morgan (2014) explains how the Internet, “with its profusion of social networking sites and ever increasing formats for communication, both challenges the notion of speech communities and enthusiastically confirms its existence” (p. 100). While DIY/punk communities have historically been studied as rather confined, geographically dependent spaces, this study aims to make sense of these communities as they converge in various spaces online, in conjunction with their more physical, local, and geographically grounded orientations. As Underwood and Frey (2008) note, “communication practices simultaneously ‘build communities’ and are employed by ‘built communities’” (p. 388). By digging into the practice of calling-out in particular, we will see how community is both being built and building this communicative act as they move between the local and the virtual, the rather confined and the amorphous, the old and the new.
As people and communities move into the online realm, communication scholarship has followed. Milburn (2004) notes, “as groups are less and less defined by proximity and more and more defined through mediated forms of communication, the speech community continues to be a necessary and useful term” exactly because it helps make sense of the ways members “use local knowledge” in an effort to “make sense of what is happening around them” (p. 436). Thus, theorizing online communities is vital not just for this project, but for the study of speech communities and communication in a more general sense. Baym (2010), reminds us that the “mere existence of an interactive online forum is not community,” and proposes five qualities found in both online communities and definitions of community in a more general sense, including “sense of space, shared practice, shared resources and support, shared identities, and interpersonal relationships” (p. 74-75). The relationship between online and offline community is complex and ever-changing, and as Chayko (2017) argues, “digital life is, simply, real life” (p. 53). This move to acknowledge not just the validity of online communities but the inability to separate the online from “real life” is critical. For many, including members of DIY/punk communities, “online connectedness” is utilized “to build, bolster, and give new dimension to face-to-face interactions and communities” (Chayko, 2017, p. 64). Thus, for many, community is not happening in “the real world” or online, but is connected and often interdependent of one another.

With this in mind, I do not argue that DIY/punk communities are exclusively or even predominantly happening online, as DIY/punk communities have a long history as operating in particular localized settings while also maintaining translocal connections that produce community beyond the purely local. I do argue that we are increasingly seeing these communities interact, deliberate, and engage through online mediums. It is through the
convergence of these localized spaces in the online, translocal realm that they begin to constitute a singular speech community. Boromisza-Habashi (2016) describes this notion of translocality as a result of “an increasingly global communication culture that comprises a system of meanings speakers scattered around the world attribute to communication and that travels across boundaries separating locally defined communities of speakers” (p. 4600). Because DIY/punk communities have so often been studied in their localized settings, expanding the study of DIY/punk communities for their translocal, online properties not only extend the literature on these communities’ sense of place, it also extends literature on speech communities more broadly.

**Call-outs, #MeToo, and online public shaming.** One such way members of DIY/punk communities enact or confirm their DIY/punk identity is through the practice of “calling-out,” predominantly in online or mediated settings. Currently, a limited amount of literature on the practice of calling-out exists, so I will first draw on literature pertaining to the #MeToo movement, a prominent space for exploring this practice, as well as literature on online public shaming more generally. Before the hashtag, Me Too was a campaign founded by Tarana Burke in 2006 to highlight and address “young women of color who survived sexual violence,” with “me too” being “an expression of solidarity” (Jaffe, 2018, p. 80). Over ten years after (and without any acknowledgment of) Burke’s campaign, Alyssa Milano took to Twitter and asked that those who have been sexually harassed or assaulted respond to her tweet with ‘me too.’ It was then, in the fall of 2017, that the #MeToo movement as we currently know it was born.

After #MeToo burst into mainstream conversation, not only were victims speaking up about their experiences of sexual violence, some were explicitly “calling-out” those who harmed them. Coleman (2017) explains calling-out as “publicly describing and condemning specific
examples of sexist attitudes and behaviors” (p. 121) in her overview of instances of female indie musicians calling-out “misogyny, sexism, and harassment in audiences and the music industry” (p. 123). In their article connecting and contemplating the #MeToo movement and digital feminist activism, Mendes et al (2018) note how “survivors took to social media to share their experiences and engage in a ‘call-out culture’” (p. 236). This call-out culture, informed by an increase in frequency as well as publicity and general receptibility around increasing attention to the practice of calling-out, is a major hallmark of this #MeToo moment. But the line between calling-out and public shaming is thin, perhaps non-existent.

In exploring the media shaming of ‘ordinary’ people, Hess and Waller (2014) argue how the convergence of old and new media has created an extension of past notions of public shaming in a digital age, specifically as the ability to publicly shame has been extended to “citizen media producers and social media platforms” (p. 109). Hess and Waller explain how scholarship has often only expressed interest in the media shaming of celebrities, while “‘ordinary’ people have been largely overlooked as both subjects and perpetrators of media shame” (p. 102). This logic is both affirmed and disrupted by the #MeToo movement. We certainly see this stance sustained as much focus on #MeToo in mainstream media has been on the celebrities who have either called-out perpetrators of harm or those who have been on the receiving end of a call-out. But #MeToo has also provided space for ‘ordinary’ people who have experienced sexual violence to come forward about their experiences and call-out the ‘ordinary’ people who violated them. Mendes et al. (2018) describe the everyday experience of digital feminist activism as a result of movements and hashtags like #MeToo, and Rentschler (2018) notes how the movement provides space to “make sexual violence public” on college campuses through student activism. Both studies illuminate the scope of the #MeToo movement beyond
the celebrity, into the everyday practices of feminists and activists more broadly.

But beyond simply being a movement to call-out perpetrators of sexual violence, #MeToo also works to talk about more systematic issues with sexual violence and accountability. Jaffe (2018) points out how “to some degree,” the movement is “a reaction to a system designed to fail survivors of violence and harassment” (p. 80). As such, Jaffe wrestles with notions of alternative justice frameworks, and asks the question “how do we come up with demands that move beyond naming and shaming” when we are working outside the confines of any sort of formal, legal system (p. 85). While DIY/punk communities do not have all the answers, they do provide one such space to look.

While the #MeToo movement has yet to fully articulate what justice looks like in response to instances of sexual violence, DIY/punk communities have and continue to make explicit their distrust of the law and any such legal intervention. The ideological contrast between DIY/punk communities and mainstream society is apparent in their oppositional views towards the criminal justice system’s involvement in instances of sexual violence. The very language of resistance that DIY/punk communities communicate, through practices like “calling-out,” is in direct opposition to mainstream beliefs around the criminal justice system as a viable source of accountability for perpetrators of sexual violence. Huspek (1993), in his theory of dueling structures, argues that such “counterdiscourses,” along with “antilanguages” and “low prestige social dialects” form with the dominant structure a dialectical relation of opposition and interdependence” (p. 16). Not only are these counterdiscourses oppositional and interdependent on dominant structures, like that of the criminal justice system, but they are “very much creations of” those dominant structures, produced so that the dominant structure can assert “its own value through devaluation” of the opposing, or counterdiscourses (p. 16). Thinking of DIY/punk
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communities’ practice of calling-out as not just in opposition to but interdependent of dominant structures like the criminal justice system allow for a closer examination of that relationship and these contrasting, though very much related, ideologies.

Kelly (2011), in describing how one particular anarcho-punk community responded to sexual violence through setting up a community accountability process (by creating a collective called Philly Stands Up or PSU), explicates the importance and centrality the communicative practice of calling-out has in DIY/punk communities. “If someone was being called out for sexual assault,” Kelly explained, “was it not PSU’s raison d’etre to pursue the situation and hold the person accountable?” (p. 45). Kelly goes on to note that despite changes in the culture of these communities, “overlooking situations of sexual assault remained the norm in most anarchist/punk communities” (p. 45). The communicative practice of calling-out links together experiences of sexual violence with alternative processes of accountability outside of and in opposition to the criminal justice system. In the case Kelly describes, despite a history of DIY/punk communities not always addressing sexual violence, the practice of calling-out has also started to have tangible effects in confronting perpetrators of sexual violence within these communities. Additionally, it is impossible to separate the relationship between the historical impact of DIY/punk communities’ ethos and the socio-cultural weight of the #MeToo movement with these communities’ current ways of talking about and doing the practice of calling-out. The significance this practice has in DIY/punk communities is profound, and using theories of
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7 Chen et al (2011) define community accountability as “any strategy to address violence, abuse or harm that creates safety, justice, reparations and healing, without relying on police, prisons, childhood protective services, or any other state systems. Instead of police and prisons, community accountability strategies depend on something both potentially more accessible and more complicated: the communities surrounding the person who was harmed and the person who caused the harm” (p. xxiii).
metadiscourses can aid in understanding the use and significance of this practice within these communities and its relationship to society at large.

**Metadiscourses.** While the practice of calling-out itself has relevance for the study of sexual violence and accountability within DIY/punk communities in online settings, the ways individuals within these communities talk *about* calling-out also holds particular relevance to this practice. The “terms for talk” (Carbaugh, 1989; 2017) approach provides a frame for understanding the pragmatic aspects of talk about talk. Specifically, we see notions of community and call-outs converge as well as materialize through metadiscourse. Meanings around community life and the practices and norms central to community life become apparent through a focused analysis of these metacommunication. These theories around the significance of metacommunication in everyday talk has facilitated ways of understanding and studying socio-culturally embedded terms as they are discussed by the individuals in the context of their own culture or community. Broadly speaking, “metadiscourses comprises a large array of communicative practices that perform a variety of functions in everyday interaction” and this “talk about talk is indeed ubiquitous in public as well as private discourse” (Craig, 2005, p. 660-61). Craig (2018) continues to posit the importance of metadiscourses in noting how “every complex social practice evolves in a culture in conjunction with normative metadiscourses” (p. 291). That is, everyday metadiscourses are the “medium and the process” which both constitute and regulate any given social practice (p. 291). As such, much of what we know about any given social practice comes from the ways we talk about the practice in a particular cultural context.

Beyond simply knowing about social practices, metadiscursive theories also help us make sense of how and to what degree we value these different practices as they happen in particular, culturally-bound contexts. Cameron (2004) notes how, typically, metalinguistic vocabulary
allows us “to signal approval or disapproval” to different parts of language, which “points to an important general theme in the study of metalanguage: morality. Metalinguistic resources seem very often to be deployed to connect various aspects of linguistic behavior to a larger moral order” (p. 313). This can be helpful when thinking through a communicative practice like “calling-out,” which, as we will continue to see, is accompanied with both implicit and explicit language regarding morality and moral judgements.

In the ethnography of communication (EoC) tradition, a focus on metadiscursive vocabularies or terms for talk is one such way to think about metadiscourses. “As people reference or talk about their communication” Carbaugh (2017) contends, “they not only say something explicitly about communication as a practice, they also engage in a meta-cultural commentary about personhood or identity and other features of sociocultural life including their feelings, ways of relating, and dwelling-in-place” (p. 17). Carbaugh (1989) explicated the significance of these metacommunicative vocabularies among culturally distinctive groups, noting that there were cultural terms “being used by natives not only to refer to aspects of their talk itself, but further to refer to social relations and persons” (p. 103). Since then, ethnographers of communication “have demonstrated that speakers rely on metadiscursive practice as a communicative resource for social organization” (Boromisza-Habashi, 2016, p. 4601). Researchers also rely on the metadiscursive practice of communication to make sense of locally significant practices in their own terms. Boromisza-Habashi (2013), in his book on Hungarian hate speech as a term for talk, notes how “the various meanings of the use of the term are recoverable from actual written, spoken, or drawn discourse” (p. 115). From there, terms for talk are generally categorized at three different levels within a speech community – as an act, event, or style. The act level describes “individual performances of communication,” the event level
describes “coenactments of communication,” and the style level describes “native labels about ways of speaking” (Carbaugh, 1989, p. 98-101). These different levels that a term for talk might fall into help the analyst make sense of what the term does and means within its locally situated context. Carbaugh (1989) also proposes an additional level for terms for talk: the functional level. This level “addresses an indirect outcome of cultural terms for talk, rather than a native organization of its mean” (p. 101). In other words, this level acknowledges the social consequence of a term’s use. While using the term “calling-out” could potentially be socially consequential within the community, this level moves beyond the scope of the project at hand. With the practice of calling-out in particular, being able to identify this practice along the speech act level tells us both what the term is doing as well as how it is situated in a particular speech community.

Having set up the historical, contextual, and theoretical framework for this paper, my guiding research questions are as follows:

- What counts as “calling someone out” in DIY/punk communities, and what are the properties of talk labeled as such?
- What types of meta-cultural commentary are immanent in the practice and metadiscourse of “calling-out”?
- How does “calling-out” function as a counterdiscourse in the context of widespread concerns with sexual violence and the criminal justice system in U.S. society?
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The nature of the field. This research is an online ethnography. As Hine (2000) articulates on virtual ethnographies, “if culture and community are not self-evidently located in place, then neither is ethnography” (p. 64). Already sharing a history and a DIY ethos, DIY/punk communities have almost\(^8\) always existed as both local and translocal communities, with notions of place being both disrupted and obscured in their translocality. This translocality becomes evident as we consider the network of local scenes, shows and events, tours, and fandoms as well as newer forms of involvement through online participation that keeps these communities connected. Before the ability to participate and engage online through the likes of Twitter, Facebook, and online blogs, to name a few, DIY/punk communities continue to remain connected through touring and the distribution of zines.

Zines specifically have an important place within DIY/punk communities and their histories. Getting to the heart of a “do-it-yourself” ethos, these self-made, self-published, and often self-distributed “mini-magazines” allow for ideas and ideologies to circulate across time and space for DIY/punk communities. Lull (1987) notes how “low cost print media” such as zines were a central “instrument for the dissemination of information” within punk communities, further articulating that “print media connect punks of various cities and countries together, and also are used locally for spreading information about political issues, rallies and demonstrations, and music shows” (p. 244). While newer forms of mediated communication via online platforms become increasingly relevant in our globalized society, DIY/punk communities continue the
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\(^8\) Emms and Crossly (2018) point out that some punk scenes may only be local, with no translocal component, referring specifically to “the early days of U.K. punk” where “all activity was localized within a few sites in inner London” (p. 114).
practice of zines and zine-making alongside these technological advances, emphasizing the continued importance of these DIY artifacts as both a product of and producing translocal notions of community.

**The ethnographer’s position in the field.** As someone who sees herself as a part of, and engaged with, these communities both in person and online, I have keen insight into identifying DIY/punk ways of talking which has been helpful in finding and tracing this talk through online, mediated spaces. After relocating from mid-Missouri to Boulder, Colorado for graduate school, I became particularly aware of both a disconnect from the physical space of the community I had been a part of for many years, as well as the ability of various social media sites to keep me connected to community life despite being physically very far away. Thus, the specific “site” for this research is not really specific in any sense of the word. By both following key words around the practice of calling-out on sites like Twitter and Google, as well as watching these conversations and call-outs happening naturally on my own social media feeds, the site of my research is more an amalgamation of discursive and metadiscursive talk around the practice of calling-out, and not based in any particular geographic place. As I have increasingly relied on these online interactions to fulfill my sense of community, the data collected for this project simply represent an enhanced version of my regular consumption of social media as a community member.

Another conscious decision I have made in writing this thesis is to not use the term “alleged” to accompany discussion of perpetrators and abusers. To invoke the term alleged is a deeply political choice, marking not just the identity of the perpetrator or abuser, but marking the identity of the victim and/or accuser, as well as myself as the writer of this piece. When we use the term alleged, we are also implicitly casting doubt on the harm that was committed, casting
doubt on the person who the harm was committed against, and casting doubt on the need for an accountability process for the individual(s) who committed the harm. Doubt is not inherently problematic, but the doubt that is invoked by the marked identity of “alleged perpetrator” is infused with ideological stances about what is truth, what is fact, and what is valid. By unmarking perpetrator, I am making a conscious decision to normalize this form, and normalize the idea that when harm or violence is committed, whether or not it is upheld in a court of law, is still valid and deserves acknowledgement.

Data collection. This research happened over the course of ten months in 2018, primarily through online participant observation and data scraping. The online participant observation portion of this research followed social interactions online, as they unfolded on my own social networking feeds. This type of interaction, though mediated through online websites, still very much represents “forms of conversational talk” in the eyes of the participants, and thus myself as the researcher as well (Jones & Schieffelin, 2015, p. 211). Additionally, Hart and Milburn (2019), in their cultural discourse analysis on discourses of professionalism on LinkedIn, engaged in online, participant observation similar to my own, “by spending time on LinkedIn using [their] own accounts, from which vantage point [they] studied the platform” (p. 24). The particulars of their methods included collecting screenshots, jotting down notes, reviewing public LinkedIn pages as well as other publicly available materials from the website. This account, as well as my own, represent the changing tide of participant observation as research, and ethnography specifically, move into the online realm.

The data scraping portion of this research relied on search tools on Google and Twitter, by retroactively going back in time and reviewing online, public content that related to the subject at hand. Key words I used included variations and combinations of “call-out” (calling
out, called out), “DIY/punk” (DIY, punk), “sexual violence” (sexual assault, rape, sexual harassment), and “accountability” (justice). Data collected included tweets, blogs, articles, Google documents, Facebook posts, Instagram posts, Tumblr posts, memes, and online zines where the communicative act of calling-out was either practiced or talked about within DIY/punk communities. This form of data collection reflects a relatively new and non-traditional way of doing online ethnographic research, emerging at this intersection of data scraping and participant observation. As our understandings of community life in online settings continues to evolve, traditional ethnographic methods of data collection will have to grow and evolve as well. This study reflects one way traditional ethnographic methods can be modified to better accommodate online data, online communities, and online ethnographies more broadly.

One such way online communities, and thus online ethnographies, have evolved is the move to acknowledge online community beyond the discussion forum or chat room. Airoldi (2018) distinguishes between two ways of doing online ethnography; first describing bounded, online groups or communities, these more traditional sites for online ethnographic research known as contextual fields, and, second, meta-fields, which are “essentially a temporary informational artifact resulting from the act of ‘following’ a keyword, or an algorithm” (p. 666). As a result, “meta-fields need researchers to follow the digital discourse by following the ontological properties of the medium” (p. 670). Because I was not studying a specific, bounded, online group of individuals, my site is best articulated through this notion of meta-fields. In drawing on their shared histories and ideologies, members of DIY/punk communities enact both their DIY/punk identity and the bounded nature of their community as they engage in these online discourses, across various mediums. Meta-fields become a site for participants to perform, enact, and confirm a DIY/punk identity and community.
While most of this data came from this cross between online participant observation and data scraping, I was also able to collect certain artifacts like Tumblr posts, additional zines, and flyers from interview participants, which will be discussed in more detail shortly. I focused on these mediated forms of online communication for its ability to connect DIY/punk communities across time and place, and the power of these mediated communications to circulate messages to DIY/punk communities and beyond. The wide variety and multiplicity of data sources point to what Agar (1996/2008) describes as a “Massive Overdetermination of Pattern,” a hallmark of a “good ethnography” in that it overwhelms “the reader with the way new concepts and patterns account for this variety of information in surprising and unexpected ways” (p. 41). Additionally, the sensitive nature around the subject of sexual violence and calling-out more generally precludes many of these conversations from happening in person, particularly in spaces where myself, as a researcher, would have access to. As such, the conversations that are happening online in these mediated spaces provide details into the richness and complexity of the practice of calling-out. With this in mind, excerpts taken from individuals’ social media posts, though publicly accessible, will not be cited in this paper to ensure the confidentiality and privacy of these online users. I have altered the names of individuals, groups, and locations (like bars, venues, or cities) that might be mentioned in the following excerpts to further ensure privacy and confidentiality of both the original posters and those whose names have been mentioned.

As a secondary data point, I conducted nine phone and video interviews throughout December 2018 and January 2019. As Murthy (2008) and Hine (2017) both note on digital and online ethnographies, social life happens both online and off, digitally and physically. As such, to rely solely on data collected online would not tell the whole story of social life for members of DIY/punk communities. These interviews also served, in part, as a form of member-checking to
validate data collected during the online portion of this research. Because of my connections and past participation in DIY/punk communities, I put out a call for interviews on my personal Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram profiles (see Appendix A). Despite this, only one interviewee was someone I knew personally prior to the interview; the rest of the interview participants reached out as a result of individuals’ in my network sharing the call for interviews among their own networks. These interviews typically lasted around one hour. I designed interview questions to prompt speakers to discuss some of the particular, taken-for-granted aspects of a call-out, such as who does it, where it happens, and what form it takes. Other questions reflected on connections to larger, societal issues like the #MeToo movement (see Appendix B).

Throughout the interview process, some participants referenced particular instances of call-outs, or related material that they would, for example, distribute at shows as a result of sexual violence in the community. In instances where the call-out mentioned was referring to a rather popular band, I would typically look for specific articles or social media posts related to the instance they discussed. In another case, an interviewee provided links to a smaller-scale, more local call-out that they were involved in, after the interview took place. The interview participants varied in location from the Bay Area and Los Angeles on the West coast to Philadelphia and Syracuse on the East coast to various localities across the Midwest. Interviewees varied in age, from twenty-one to thirty-two, and predominately, though not exclusively identified as ethnically white, as two participants identified as Romani-Jewish and South Asian, respectively. I interviewed men, women, and genderqueer/non-binary individuals, and there was rather equal distribution across these gender identities. These interviews, along with the material I gathered through them, in conjunction with the data scraping and participant observation of online sites, constitute the data for this online ethnography.
**Data analysis.** This study of the DIY/punk (meta)discursive communicative practice of “calling-out” is based on both terms for talk and cultural discourse analysis (CuDA). As explicated through Carbaugh’s (2017) theorizing of the framework “terms for talk,” I use (meta)discursive to signal the study of both the practice of “calling-out” itself as well as talk about the practice of “calling-out.” CuDA explores “situated communication codes; that is, the cultural structuring of deep meanings as these are active in communication practices” (Carbaugh & Cerulli, 2018, p. 1). Using a framework based on theoretical, descriptive, interpretive, comparative, and critical modes of investigation, cultural discourse analysts seek to understand both the explicit and implicit meanings that render locally significant communicative practices meaningful. Through CuDA, these meanings can be retrieved from observable communication practices and the surrounding metadiscourse. In interpreting these meanings, “analysts employ a conceptual model of five discursive hubs and radiants: identity, relationship, action, feeling, and dwelling” (Cerulli, 2016, p. 249). Explicit meanings of directly observable communication practices are identified as hubs, while the implicit meanings that can be identified in these practices are called radiants, as they, “radiate from an explicit discursive hub” (Cerulli, 2016, p. 249). Carbaugh (2017) expanded upon CuDA in introducing how terms for talk and CuDA can be complimentary frameworks. Terms for talk make “people’s own views of communication not only primary data, but a central theoretical concern” (p. 17). This framework focuses its investigation on the “discursive hub of action in which communication about itself is made the primary analytical concern” (p. 22). By focusing on “calling-out” as a key metacommunicative term as well as a hub of action, I am able to identify additional key terms surrounding calling-out. Then I am able to formulate propositions, “the arrangements of terms that express taken-for-granted views,” based on those key terms, formulate cultural premises, “statements that
capture the essence of the participants’ beliefs,” before identifying radiants related to the hub of action as CuDA prescribes (Cerulli, 2016, p. 249).

Before identifying the hubs, key terms, propositions, premises, and radiants of this practice, I first used the SPEAKING framework, a mnemonic device developed by Dell Hymes (1962), as a descriptive framework for identifying the situation and scene, participants, ends or desired outcome of the event, act sequence, key or tone of the event, instrumentalities or channel, norms, and lastly the genre of the event (Nuciforo, 2016). The SPEAKING framework allows the analyst to link the communication pattern of calling-out to the socio-cultural context in which it takes on local significance. In other words, I will first describe the pattern of calling-out, and then I will describe how it is meaningful from the perspective of the participants. I will achieve both these levels of description and interpretation by relying on these terms for talk in both the “uses of the term or phrase in actual social interactional life” as well as “observation of the practice being represented with the terms” (Carbaugh, 2017, p. 22). Through this process, we learn how calling-out functions within DIY/punk communities, and we learn about community life more broadly.
CHAPTER FOUR
THE MEANINGS OF CALL-OUTS IN DIY/PUNK

In this chapter, I will employ two analyses: a SPEAKING framework analysis and a cultural discourse analysis. Both analyses serve different, yet complimentary functions. As previously mentioned, the SPEAKING framework will provide a thorough, rich description of the practice of calling-out, focusing specifically on elements that make up a competent call-out within this speech community. That communicative competence “involves knowing not only the language code but also what to say to whom, and how to say it appropriately in any given situation” (Saville-Troike, 2003, p. 18). Then, with the help of the descriptive work of the SPEAKING framework, I will use cultural discourse analysis to get to deeper cultural meanings around DIY/punk community life through the hub of “calling-out” as a communicative action. Through these analyses, we gain insight into the role calling-out plays in constituting community. Additionally, I make moves to re-conceptualize space and place as they inform speech communities as bounded social units. This analysis will set the stage for theoretical moves regarding speech communities in online settings and the possibility of queering sexual violence as well as transforming approaches to accountability in my discussion section.

The Call-Out as Communication Practice

In this section, I will employ the SPEAKING framework to explicate the practice of calling-out as it is relevant in the (meta)discourse within and across DIY/punk communities. The data I analyze reflect these (meta)discourses, that is, both the talk about, and the doing of, the practice of calling-out. As such, the examples represented in the data provide a clear sense of this patterned way of talk for this speech community.

“Call-out” situation: setting and scene. The setting of call-outs is not pre-
established within DIY/punk communities, rather, the act of calling-out itself establishes its own setting. The following excerpt provides an example of how calling-out would take place in publicly accessible (at least, for the community members), mediated forms of communication like zines before easy and frequent access to the Internet was the norm in DIY/punk communities.

Excerpt 1 (Zine, CrimethInc, n.d., p. 9)

How did this set of practices around responding to sexual assault and abuse emerge? In the 1990s and early 2000s, women and other survivors responded to assault and abuse in a variety of ways, including making zines calling people out to distribute at shows, discussing their experiences amongst themselves, warning people in other communities about repeat assaulters, and in some cases physically confronting them.

Beyond this excerpt, and as many of the following excerpts will show, the setting of the communicative practice of calling-out is still relatively vague (or at least not particular), as those being called out within and across DIY/punk communities are often times moving from place to place (e.g. individuals in DIY/punk bands as they go on tours). While the setting of a call-out might find its way to the perpetrator, as the above excerpt suggests, call-outs are often primarily focused on finding the community, as a call-out alerts the community to harm being committed by another community member. Though the setting is not a physical space where members of DIY/punk communities can go to, it can, and often is, a public, mediated space that individuals inhabit where they can address issues of sexual violence within the community. Because the public setting of a call-out is increasingly happening online, social media platforms are often functioning as both the setting of a call-out as well as the instrument through which the call-out takes place. The rather indistinguishable nature of the setting from the instrument with public, mediated, online call-outs allows us to consider not only the place or setting of the call-out, but the place of the community more broadly. This notion of online settings, place, and community will be explicated in more detail in later on in this chapter.
In the following excerpts, two interview participants speak to the centrality of social media to the practice of calling-out as the space in which a call-out takes place.

Excerpt 2 (Interview, Dec. 18, 2018, Samuel)
1. I don’t think you can be under the age of thirty-five and in the music scene and not have seen someone come out and tell their truth or accuse or defend themselves in some fashion on like Facebook, social media, Twitter, I guess.

Excerpt 3 (Interview, Jan. 9, 2019, Lang)
1. Nowadays I see it happening most with Instagram posts or stories where you know if it’s in the story format someone will collect screenshots of texts, at the beginning type like ‘hey trigger warning, content warning,’ or those kinds of things…and I’m a bit older where I’ve seen that happen more on Facebook and on Tumblr.

Social media sites like Instagram, Facebook, Tumblr, and even Twitter are common settings for call-out posts to take place. This online, mediated space notably differs from call-outs that happen in and through zines, as it allows members to not only do the call-out, but also provide support in comments or replies, through retweets or sharing, or simply a like or favorite. In both the case of call-outs in zines and call-outs on social media, the importance of the call-out is rooted in its ability to be seen and accepted by the community.

The scene in which this practice happens is one where the messages can circulate to others within DIY/punk communities, both in local scenes as well as larger, less localized, and more popular scenes. The practice of calling-out can happen where any kind of sexual violence is occurring or has occurred within a DIY/punk community, specifically by someone within the community towards someone else within the community. While the setting and scene, in the ethnography of communication, refer to a particular place in which a communicative practice is happening, DIY/punk communities also often refer to “scene” as interchangeable with “community” to refer to a group of people situated in a particular geographic place. The following excerpts point to both the “local” as well as the “national” or “broader” DIY/punk
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scenes as both places where calling-out “abusers” or problematic behavior has happened or needs to happen.

Excerpt 4 (from Oberski, 2017)
1 I have discussed certain sexual abuse allegations against popular bands/individuals
2 in the scene as well as within our Grand Rapids DIY music communities with friends,
3 colleagues, and coworkers, and many have different ideas of how these situations have
4 been held. What I have witnessed is immediate and strict social exile of the individual
5 accused of the abuse from anything to do with the local community, regardless of
6 them taking accountability for their actions or not. Some individuals have seemingly
7 fallen off the face of the earth, deleting personal social media accounts and leaving band
8 websites inactive. While many people I’ve talked to see this as a good thing, others have
9 expressed confusion and sympathy for both parties, feeling remorse for the victim but
10 also understanding that the abuser may very well no longer have any future in the
11 local scene or even broader music community. It can be difficult to choose sides when
12 the perpetrator is a close friend or family member, or has expressed their regret and
13 apologies for their actions, pledging to fix what they can and improve upon themselves. It
14 seems, however, that many groups or cliques of people within the scene, while calling
15 out known abusers publicly, hold a blissfully ignorant belief that “it doesn’t happen” in
16 their friend group, or if it does, fail to hold the person accountable for their actions. This
17 has caused much turmoil in DIY music scenes around the country, and by no means is
18 Grand Rapids an exception.

Excerpt 5 (Tweet)
1 Reminder that the hardcore/pop punk scene is no stranger to grown men knowingly hitting
2 on underaged girls. We’ve all seen it on local/national scenes alike. Call it out and don’t
3 support these bands.

Both of these excerpts, one a portion of an article addressing sexual violence and abuse in the
Grand Rapids DIY/punk community and the other a tweet, show the interconnectedness between
and across DIY/punk communities. Lines 1-3 in excerpt 4 points to the different yet connected
scenes in which the practice of calling-out might happen, such as “local” and “popular,” and then
in lines 16-18, the writer notes how this is an issue not just unique to this particular (localized)
community, but is happening in DIY/punk communities “around the country.” Excerpt 5
similarly notes that calling-out needs to happen in both “local” and “national” scenes, as abusive
behavior is happening in both spaces or communities. This represents, in part, the notion of
translocality, which as discussed previously, makes sense of “communication that travels across boundaries separating locally defined communities of speakers” (Boromisza-Habashi, 2016, p. 4600). The translocality of DIY/punk communities disrupts common conceptions around physical spaces and places as central to community formation and maintenance, and this will be explored further through the cultural discourse analysis section on dwelling.

Basso’s (1992) account of Western Apache’s historical tales, or “stalking with stories” provides an interesting point of comparison to the DIY/punk practice of “calling-out abusers.” These historical tales use a particular place or landscape within the community to tell a story about a past, problematic interaction of former members, but the primary purpose of these tales is to, in a sense, call-out problematic actions of current members of the community. Basso shows how Western Apache people use these tales to moralize not only people, but the landscape as well. The setting of these tales, both where they take place and how they use that place to tell the story, are used to tell “what it means to be a Western Apache, or, to make the point less dramatically, what it is that being an Apache should normally and properly entail” (Basso, 1992, p. 117). These tales inform “places, events, moral standards, conceptions of cultural identity,” as well as tell the community “‘about’ the person at whom it is directed” because “the telling of a historical tale is always prompted by an individual having committed one or more social offenses to which the act of narration, together with the tale itself, is intended as a critical and remedial response” (p. 122). Similarly, as we see with call-outs, the place of the Internet becomes the public setting where members within DIY/punk communities tell “about” a person in the community who has committed a social offense. But the place of the Internet is not infused with the same communal and historical significance as the landscape does for the Western Apache. Historical tales “establish highly meaningful relationships between individuals and features of
the natural landscape” (p. 123), and while the Internet certainly becomes meaningful to the practice of calling-out, online social media sites as both setting and instrument for the call-out are used to “moralize” members of DIY/punk communities, without moralizing the “place” of the Internet.

**The participants of “calling-out.”** There are many key, sometimes overlapping, players involved in this practice. At its core, the primary participants of a call-out tend to coalesce around the individual(s) making the statement and the people or person that individual is addressing as to who needs to be called-out for problematic or abusive behavior.

*Excerpt 6 (Tweet)*
1 CALL OUT RAPISTS. STOP PROTECTING ABUSERS IN PUNK AND HARDCORE.
2 don’t let these people in your shows. Don’t book their bands. This isn’t difficult.

*Excerpt 7 (Tweet)*
1 @ YORK PUNK SCENE, STOP SUPPORTING SHITTY PEOPLE. IF THEY’RE YOUR FRIENDS, CALL THEM THE F**K OUT ON THEIR BULLSHIT. IF YOU DON’T, YOU’RE PART OF THE PROBLEM AND I HAVE 0 RESPECT FOR YOU

In both excerpts 6 and 7, the individuals posting are directly addressing people within the DIY/punk community to call-out abusive individuals and their behaviors, calling them “abusers,” “rapists,” and otherwise “shitty people.” Beyond the rapists and abusers who call-outs are directed towards, we also see a more general call to community members. In these excerpts, one role community members can play in a call-out are as bystanders. These are individuals who do not call out abusers and either “protect” the abusers through their silence or actively deny or justify the abuse. One interview participant reflects on the dueling or contrasting roles the community can play in a call-out.
Excerpt 8 (Interview, Dec. 6, 2018, Dawn)
1 I feel like there’s this pattern that it’s like, man does x, you know commits assault, a
2 woman comes out, either immediately or years later – I also find it common that, and
3 this has happened with me, that they don’t see this person for a long time and then they
4 see them out and then the call-out happens, and then it’s just immediately this
5 polarizing effect, people either think about it and think about their part in it or
6 think about, you know, how they want to be a part of the solution and they flock
7 towards the woman and they’re apologetic and grateful for them calling this person
8 out, and they’re kind and understanding, or, you know, the opposite effect where
9 they are immediately a huge asshole and defensive, protective of the rapist or the
10 accused, and go out of their way to shame the woman.

Community members can “be a part of the solution” and “flock towards the woman” or they can
be “a huge asshole” and be “protective of the rapist or the accused.” One such way community
members can be a part of the solution and flock towards the woman is through showing support
on the call-out post itself. In the following three excerpts, we first see part of a Facebook call-
out, followed by two comments following the call-out.

Excerpt 9 (Facebook post)
1 I’m asking that my community commit to holding Justin accountable to these wishes so
2 that I may heal and be given space to move along with my life.

Excerpt 10 (Facebook comment)
1 I don’t know you but I need to say, thank you for sharing your story and allowing others to
2 hear you. As an advocate for mental health and survivors you’re incredibly strong and
3 thank you so much for being vulnerable and speaking up

Excerpt 11 (Facebook comment)
1 Ugh. I know so many people who were friends with them or played in bands with them and
2 this is heartbreaking. I’m sorry you went through this. And I’m pissed off that people I
3 have to assume are my friends didn’t believe you. I know we were never close but I not
4 only believe you, I’m here for you and have your back, in whatever fashion you need it.

Excerpt 9 represents part of a call-out where the individual, who is also a victim of abuse from
the person they are calling-out, asks the community to “commit to holding Justin accountable” to
the requests they have made. Two responses to this call-out, represented in excerpts 10 and 11,
voice explicit support of the call-out as well as the victim. There were nearly 50 comments following the initial call-out with similar sentiments of support expressed towards the victim doing the call-out. Thus, community members can participate in positive (supporting the victim) or negative (protecting the abuser as bystanders by being silent) ways in the call-out.

Community members might also participate in a call-out by engaging in a call-out on behalf of the victim. Excerpts 6 and 7 of tweets express that need for people to call-out “your friends” on “their bullshit.” The following excerpt explains in more detail the process of how someone might call-out on behalf of the victim.

Excerpt 12 (Interview, Dec. 20, 2018, Marie)

I feel that should the victim not be able to speak for themselves but they ask for a representative because that’s like the whole thing like do not call somebody out unless the victim asked for it, unless you have their consent, because in the end, they were the victim. Do not brutalize them any further, whether or not you’re trying to do good, you know it’s their process and it’s their trauma to handle, so let them handle it. And let them heal from it in the way they want. So conceptually, yeah, I think people should be able to call other people out for them, however, in practice, when I’ve seen it done, people that do call other people out for the victim often get a lot of disbelief, and they’re like ‘well I don’t know why you’re doing this for them,’ and it doesn’t matter how many amounts of like you know ‘this person asked me to,’ and they say they don’t believe you and they’ll be like ‘oh well I’m just going to go talk to the other person’ because you know there’s this sort of light-heartedness that comes with it, like as if because you’re their friend and you’re calling them out they should talk to their friend that’s being called out as an abuser because you know everybody’s doing the whole he said she said thing and so people should be able to do that too so I definitely have seen it happen where somebody called somebody out for somebody else and they were just completely shredded to bits by the audience.

As the above excerpt shows, “representatives” can call-out “an abuser” on behalf of “the victim,” but only when “the victim asked for it.” To do so without the victims’ consent is to further harm them. Unfortunately, call-outs that are done on behalf of the victim and not done by the victim themselves can be seen as less valid, and can be “just completely shredded to bits” by community members.

Another important layer to the participants involved in the practice of calling-out is along
gendered lines. Excerpt 5 points to the dichotomy between “grown men knowingly hitting on underaged girls,” signaling that men are the “abusers” in these communities and girls or women are the victims, as well as the individuals doing the practice of calling-out. We see similar gendered divisions between abusers and victims in the following excerpts.

**Excerpt 13 (Tweet)**
1 Scooby Doo spent most of his time in a van and calling out shitty dudes he is DIY

**Excerpt 14 (Tumblr post)**
1 I am one of multiple women who you have traumatized in a similar fashion. I hope this letter clarifies the issues you need to address, Brett, because this pattern needs to end here.

**Excerpt 15 (Tweet)**
1 I love these older guys in diy music saying that when they “came up” women weren’t facing the creepy shit they do now
2 News flash: femmes/nonbinary/nonmasculine presenting folks have always faced hardship and sexual assault in punk/diy

Excerpts 13-15 affirm this dichotomy between men and women in these communities as who is perceived to be capable of harm or abuse (men), and who is on the receiving end of the violence (women or non-men), in both implicit as well as explicit terms. Excerpt 13 additionally points to how the act of calling-out is part of being a DIY/punk individual in noting that Scooby Doo is DIY for “calling out shitty dudes,” along with spending “most of his time in a van,” with this portion of the tweet also nodding towards the translocal nature of DIY/punk communities as members might spend lots of time in a van as they go on tour. In excerpt 15, we start to see a slight disruption in this dichotomy, or at least an acknowledgment of genders beyond women and men. This excerpt still creates a dichotomy between men and “femmes/nonbinary/nonmasculine presenting folks” as non-men are seen as those who “have always faced hardships and sexual assault in punk/diy.” In the following excerpt, we see one interview participant reflect on the gendered nature of this talk.
Excerpt 16 (Interview, Dec. 6, 2018, Dawn)

1. I’m using this like binary because this is always how I see it work, the very few people who
2. I’ve seen who are men or non-binary who are survivors just like, I haven’t seen the same
3. effects of apology with them, and they also just deal with [the call-out] in a different way,
4. in my experience.

With this excerpt, as well as in excerpts 1 and 10, we see the additional variation of the participant category of victim, as “survivor” is invoked. While many interviewees used both the term “survivor” and “victim” interchangeably to refer to individuals on the receiving end of harm, one interviewee, Jane, specifically stated she prefers the term survivor. In the case of the above excerpt, the dichotomy exists instead between women, who are survivors, and “men or non-binary” people, who can be survivors, but when they are, it looks “different.” Thus, members of DIY/punk communities don’t just talk about call-outs along gendered, heteronormative lines, they are also at times aware and reflexive of this way of speaking. But even in this awareness and reflexivity, members often still fail to conceptualize where exactly non-binary people fit into the gendered dichotomy between victim/survivor and abuser/accused.

Thus, the participants involved in the practice of calling-out are first and foremost people who identify as part of DIY/punk communities. Additionally, there are those doing the calling-out and those on the receiving end of calling-out, which tends to fall along gendered lines of “victim” or “survivor” and “abuser,” “rapist,” or “perpetrator.” To complicate this, victims may or may not be the one doing the calling out. As excerpts 6 and 7 remind us though, many people in the community encourage others to call-out rapists, “shitty people,” and otherwise problematic behavior, whether or not that individual is a direct victim of the harm. Lastly, community members can participate in the call-out by voicing their support of and belief in the individual doing the calling-out as well as through their silence, as bystanders, protecting the abuser, to the
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situation unfolding.

**Key of “calling-out”.** The key of calling-out or the “tone, manner, or spirit in which an act is done” (Hymes, 1974, p. 57), is generally serious and urgent in nature. Excerpts 6 and 7 use of all capital letters as well as the use of “stop” point to a serious issue that needs to be addressed with immediacy – these issues are urgent, and tend to be fueled by anger. Anger at the “abuser” or the community’s lack of action is a tone that presents itself in many instances of “calling-out,” which we also see represented in excerpts 6 and 7. The use of swear words in excerpts 7, 13, and 15 also show the urgency and anger informing these call-outs, and the employment of paralanguage in excerpt 11 (“Ugh”) show another dimension, one of disgust at the events referred to in the call-out. Calling someone out in these communities conveys a sense of emergency, an urgency to support the victim as well as an urgency to hold the perpetrator accountable. The following excerpt from an interview participant differentiates between tones in call-out posts.

*Excerpt 17 (Interview, Dec. 8, 2018, Jane)*

1. I’ve seen a lot of like people kind of just writing like a Facebook post or something and its very kind of vague and um using a lot of really strong language….some of it can be you know really powerful and meaningful and some of it can seem really just like angry and emotional which is completely fair but doesn’t give a lot of space for discussion or learning or mediation.

Thus, tones that feel “powerful and meaningful” are marked as more valid than posts that are “just like angry and emotional,” even though the latter are still “completely fair.” Call-outs are serious and mark urgency, and while some might be fueled by anger, those tend to be seen as less productive call-outs. The line between “powerful and meaningful” versus “angry and emotional” is thin, and the emotional quality (or lack thereof) of call-out posts will be explored later in this chapter’s cultural discourse analysis through the radiant of “feeling.”

**“Calling-out” instrumentalities.** Though call-outs increasingly happen through online
posts on social media or personal blogs, excerpt 1 reminds us that it does not necessarily happen exclusively online. The particular medium in which a call-out takes place varies, and the medium of the call-out influences the type of engagement a call-out will receive. Platforms like Tumblr, Facebook, or a personal blog allow for lengthy call-outs, opposed to a medium like Twitter which has a character limit per post. As mentioned in the section on setting, the distinction between instrument and setting when the communicative practice is occurring online on social media sites is muddy at best, and the two are often, and justifiably, conflated. The instrument as setting and setting as instrument conflation has much to do with the “place” of the Internet, and this notion will be explicated in more detail in the dwelling portion of this analysis as well as in the chapter on theoretical considerations.

Though call-outs often look like one individual calling-out another individual, some call-outs happen after multiple individuals come together, realizing they’ve had similar problematic or abusive interactions with the same person.

*Excerpt 18* (Tumblr post)
1 The 4 women previously thought their incidents with Brett to be isolated. As they became aware of each other’s events and the undeniable patterns in his behavior they decided enough is enough and that there is no space for this behavior in our community.

*Excerpt 19* (Google Doc)
1 All of the experiences below are alleged due to the fact that they were told to us and because we were not there physically when these events occurred.
2 But this is my experience and many other girls’ experiences with the band the Os and this is us telling that story.

While excerpt 9, covered in the portion on participants, exemplifies part of a more typical call-out, where one individual calls-out their abuser via a Facebook post, excerpt 18 represents a call-out via a Tumblr post in which multiple women come together to call-out a person for the “undeniable patterns in his behavior.” Additionally, excerpt 19, through the platform of a Google document, represents multiple “girls’ experience” with an entire band, thus collectively
calling-out an entire group opposed to just an individual person. Thus, call-outs are done through various channels, though these channels are often mediated, and increasingly online, and a call-out can be individual or collective, calling out a single individual or an entire group, like a band.

“Calling-out” genre. As the examples presented have and will continue to show, calling-out itself is a genre of communication that is locally labeled and recognized within these communities. Genre, as Boromisza-Habashi and Reinig (2018) note, “serve as discursive resources for social participation and their use is subject to evaluation by audiences and/or conversational partners” (p. 117). As we have and will continue to see, members of DIY/punk communities, through the (meta)discourse, are constantly engaging in the evaluation of call-outs, and they also draw on call-outs to inform rules of engagement with the practice. As will be discussed in the section on norms, public call-outs as a genre should be a last resort, when the abuser has refused or proved inadequate at “taking accountability.” As such, a call-out should typically begin by pointing out the urgency and “last resort” nature of the call-out, and should showcase that the victim has tried to confront the abuser in less public mediums before resorting to the call-out. Additionally, calling-out as a genre can be understood as in opposition to the genre of “protecting abusers,” or the failure of individuals to address sexual violence within DIY/punk communities.

Norms: correct performance of “calling-out.” The norms for a call-out also varies considerably across these different mediums. One overarching norm of calling-out is the act itself having a strong connection to a larger DIY/punk ethos. In excerpt 13, we see the practice of calling-out described as the norm, as the individual claims Scooby Doo was DIY for “calling out shitty dudes.” We again see calling-out as a central component or ethos to DIY/punk
communities with roots in their very history as shown in the following excerpt:

*Excerpt 20 (Tweet)*

1. picture thinking that politics don’t belong in the hardcore n metalcore scene when those
genera [sic] roots are in the 70’s punk movement that was literally a protest n call out on the
government n political problems

At the very heart of DIY/punk communities is an anti-authoritarian ethos that guide much of how
these communities function. As such, the norm for many practices and acts in these communities
is in opposition to the norms and rules by mainstream society. Thus, their practices and their
discourses, and the norms that come from these practices and discourses, are “counter” to more
popular, or at least normalized, conceptions of appropriate responses to sexual violence and
accountability. Thus, we see a norm of interpretation, “a standard shared by members of the
speech community” (Saville-Troike, 2003, p. 124). Members understand how to interpret a call-
out in an appropriate way because it calls on ways of being DIY/punk and enacting a DIY/punk
ethos.

When one interview participant was asked when a call-out is needed, their response shed
some light on the complexity and nuances in norms around the practice.

*Excerpt 21 (Interview, Dec. 8, 2018, Jane)*

1. Um, I think definitely when its physical abuse, whether it be sexual or not. I think
2. emotional abuse is way too muddy for other people to wrap their heads around it.
3. A lot of people don’t want to and a lot of people can’t and a lot of it is mutual which
4. isn’t really discussed. And definitely I think a call-out needs to happen when there’s
5. like potential for it to happen again, like how this one guy would have treated other
6. women or has a pattern of treating women this way and was able to go on tour where
7. there’s younger women who don’t know him and what he’s capable of. So yeah, I guess
8. when there’s a threat of that. Or like, also a big thing too was like he didn’t practice
9. what he preaches. I don’t fuck with his band so I’m sure a lot of his lyrics were about, I
10. don’t know love songs or like economic politics, I’m not sure, but I doubt he’s written a
11. song about violence against women, but just being in our group of friends and our
12. community, we all come together because we do have similar politics and ideas and
13. while we all have differing ideas of how to go about discussing them or punishment or
14. whatever, you can’t say you’re fucking punk and do this shit.

While the first couple lines of this excerpt show some of the norms around what the community
accepts as a valid reason for a call-out (any sort of physical or sexual abuse, emotional abuse is “too muddy,” and when there’s “potential for it to happen again”), the last two lines explicitly state that “you can’t say you’re fucking punk and do this shit,” with “this shit” being a patterned behavior of abuse. We see the intersection between norms for calling-out and norms for being punk converge as they are, in many respects, dependent on one another. This excerpt represents a norm or rule of interaction, “an explanation of the rules for the use of speech which are applicable to the communicative event” (Saville-Troike, 2003, p. 123). These norms are more prescriptive than the norms of interpretation, and while they are not codified in a literal sense, they are deeply held beliefs about appropriate ways of interacting within the community.

Another norm around calling-out is that, generally speaking, the call-out itself is a last resort for the victim, as discussed previously in the genre section of this chapter. “Going public” with a call-out through a social media platform like Facebook or Tumblr is a last resort for many, that happens only when the abuser has refused to “take accountability” for their actions, and now it is the community’s job to hold the abuser accountable.

We do see norms in the practice of calling-out along gendered lines as showcased in many of the above excerpts as well as discussed within the section on participants. In those examples, we see an overwhelming identification of men or “shitty dudes” as the “abusers” or perpetrators of harm, and in direct opposition to women and girls as the “victims” or on the receiving end of the harm.

We also learn about norms of calling-out through reflection on incorrect performances of the practice.
Another example of the overuse and misapplication of sexual assault accountability discourse comes when people call others into accountability processes for a wide range of behaviors that aren’t sexual assault. For instance, if someone feels angry and hurt after the breakup of a non-abusive relationship, it might be tempting to frame their grievances through the lens of calling someone out and demanding accountability. 

From a zine published on assault and abuse in anarchist scenes, excerpt 22 shows us that feeling “angry and hurt after the breakup of a non-abusive relationship” is not an appropriate circumstance for calling someone out, echoing the sentiment expressed in excerpt 21 from an interview participant. Therefore, it is appropriate to call someone out when sexual violence or any physical abuse has happened. But, and quite importantly, it is not generally acceptable to call someone out if you are not the direct recipient of the abuse, and you have not received consent from the victim of the abuse. Excerpt 12 with the interviewee Marie, reminds us in lines 2 through 4 that to do so can be both “retraumatizing” and potentially “brutalizing” for the victim. While calling-out remains any important practice in DIY/punk communities, many norms around the practice dictate correct performances of the practice, and thus if the call-out will be seen as more or less valid within the community.

We see both rules for interaction and norms of interpretation at play in the above description. In order to perform or interact with a call-out correctly, one should call-out abuse when they see it, but if that abuse did not happen directly to them, they should first get consent from the individual directly affected. When going public with a call-out, one should showcase the “last resort” status of the call-out, having made an effort to address the issue in a non-public manner first. And when making a call-out, one should ensure that the violence that took place is not “too muddy,” so it is best to avoid emotional abuse, and stick to sexual or physical abuse, in order for the call-out to be taken most seriously within the community. In order to interpret a
call-out correctly, one must understand its connection to a larger DIY/punk ethos of direct action, anti-authoritarianism, and “do-it-yourself” politics. Call-outs call on a sense of communal identity, because to engage in a call-out correctly, is doing “punk” correctly.

As we consider what call-outs do to the abuser or individuals being called-out as well as how they draw on meanings of doing DIY/punk life, we see similar points of comparison to Basso’s (1992) account of Western Apache’s “stalking with stories.” Basso notes how these “historical tales have the capacity to thrust socially delinquent persons into periods of intense critical self-examination from which (ideally, at least) they emerge chastened, repentant, and determined to ‘live right.’” (p. 126). Similarly, call-outs “thrust” abusers into the public eye for breaking communal norms of interaction and interpretation. Historical tales force the individuals who have been “shot” with these stories to look inwards at their actions that have broken these communal norms, as these individuals “experience a form of anguish – shame, guilt, perhaps only pervasive chagrin – that moves them to alter aspects of their behavior so as to conform more closely to community expectations” (p. 126). Historical tales, much like the practice of calling-out, does DIY/punk communal life as it (re)produces expectations of community life for its members.

“Calling-out” act sequence. The act sequence of the communicative practice of calling-out is dependent on a number of factors like the medium through which the call-out is happening, the severity of the abuse, what the individual doing the call-out requests as “accountability” for the abuser, and the community in which the call-out is taking place. While calling-out itself is a communicative act, “the individual utterances that form the minimal unit of analysis for ethnographies of communication,” it is an act that, ideally, precipitates a larger sequence. In this section, the sequence of the call-out as well as the events that follow will both
be examined as the aftermath of a call-out is a central component of the initial call-out post (Johnstone & Marcellino, 2010, p. 61). In excerpt 4, lines 1-8, one popular act sequence of a call-out is represented as an allegation (a call-out), followed by exile (of the accused), followed by disappearance of the accused (falling “off the face of the earth”). In the excerpt 8, we see another reflection on the act sequence, including an assault happens, woman goes public with the call-out (either immediately or years later, perhaps triggered by coming into contact with the abuser), and then the community decides how to respond, either positively or negatively. In the case of the Google document of excerpt 19, a group of women called out the band, the Os, by releasing a Google document with various allegations, from sexist lyrics to instances of sexual assault and rape. Then, even more victims came forward about their own problematic experiences with various band members, the call-out circulated across various social media platforms, with the call-out resulting in the relative exile of the band, starting with the band canceling an upcoming show, and ending with the group permanently disbanding. In some instances, the community (or members of the community) will defend the abuser, which then halts the actions like exile and disappearance.

Excerpt 23 (Blog post, PutYourDamnPantsOn, 2013)

The people who are defending this scumbag are either deep in denial or rapists themselves. Some friends and I met him and took a picture with him at Warped Tour and that like…five minute interaction was enough to recognize hes a sick fuck with a rapist mentality. When we were posing for the picture he was whispering lewd things in one of my friends ears and forcibly kissed another girl on the mouth. We were all 15 at the time (and coincidentally wearing cargo shorts). Thx for calling him out like this

This excerpt is a comment on a blog post that calls out an abuser in a band after years of the abuser being protected by the community. The commenter laments that the abuser is being defended by people in the community, likening those individuals as “rapists themselves.” These oppositional act sequences, the examples of expressing belief in the validity of the call-out
(supporting the victim) and responding in a manner that condemns the abuser, or deciding not to believe the call-out and instead defend the accused (protecting rapists), represent a tension within these communities – whether or not to believe an individual that is calling-out the abuser, especially when the consequences for the abuser are often complete social exile and banishment from the community.

As discussed in the section on genre, call-outs should also be marked by not only a sense of urgency, but as a “last resort” for the victim or individual engaging in the call-out. Individuals engaging in the call-out will acknowledge the “last resort-ness” of the posts, noting things like “attempts to directly confront Ross on these matters has proven fruitless” or “I have tried everything else before I resolved to post this.” These comments are key, as they show that the victim has tried to confront to abuser in less public mediums before resorting to the call-out. Call-out posts will then, in a variety of ways, provide details of abuse or violence that has occurred between the victim(s) and abuser(s), and it will usually provide explicit details of what the abuser needs to do to be held or take accountability for their actions.

Thus, these notions of alternative accountability processes outside of the legal system are the ideal outcome following a successful call-out, and they will be explored further in the next portion of the framework, the “calling-out” ends. Additionally, as previous excerpts from this section like the blog post comment and the Google Document show, sometimes call-outs have a snowball effect, with allegations of sexual violence or abuse growing after one person opens the metaphorical door of calling-out an individual or band. Call-outs always follow some sort of patterned, abusive behavior, and the case for that abuse becomes a key part of the call-out itself. Once the call-out is public, it is now in the hands of the community to respond.

I will provide a brief, stage-based representation of a typical call-out.
• Stage one: violence or harm of some sort has to have preceded a call-out post before one can take place. Emotional violence is usually “too muddy” to justify a call-out post, but physical and/or sexual violence will always warrant a call-out.

• Stage two: it is important than the victim has made an effort to deal with the abuser in a non-public way, as a call-out should be a “last resort,” when no other option is open for the victim because the abuser has refused to take accountability themselves for their action(s).

• Stage three: the call-out itself happens. This will typically be the victim doing the call-out, but with consent from the victim, somebody else within the community can do the call-out on behalf of the victim. Call-outs coming directly from the victim will typically be taken more seriously, especially if the call-out post refrains from being too emotional.

• Stage four: the communities’ immediate response to the call-out takes place. With online call-outs, this stage usually looks like public support and belief in the victim. Silence from community members is usually taken as form of protecting the abuser, thus, public support is key, and is the first step towards the community committing to holding the abuser accountable. Without public support from the community, it is likely the abuser will not be held accountable, and will not face repercussions per the request of the victim/accuser.

• Stage five: the community holds (or does not hold) the abuser accountable. This stage will be discussed in more detail in the following section on the ends of a call-out.

“Calling-out” ends. The ultimate goal or ends of calling-out is when an “abuser” takes “accountability” for their actions, or when people in the community hold the perpetrator accountable. If call-out is not accepted by the community, the call-out will not reach a
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successful end. The victim might feel or become ostracized by the community, and the abuser will not be held accountable within the community. In this section, I will focus on the successful ends of a call-out. The following excerpt shows how an “abusers’” place of work was forced to take accountability for his actions after he was called-out by a woman in the community for harassing her. The call-out happened in a blog post and this response was posted in the comments section of the post.

Excerpt 24 (Blog post comment)

1 We at Barland are very sorry this situation occurred while you were visiting us. It is our policy to prohibit anyone from threatening or harassing anyone else and we try our best to be diligent to handle those situations as they occur. It is also our policy to ban people and bands who act in this way and we have done so. Seth is sometimes loud and brash (hence the “Yeah, he’s like that”) but he has never been threatening and confrontational like that before. We don’t always know who knows whom and we can’t always tell when loud or foul language is in jest or threatening. Unfortunately, we are forced to rely on our patrons to let us know if they are feeling threatened. As soon as you let our bartender Isaac know things had escalated to that point, he moved to handle it with a group of current and past employees of Barland as well as his bandmates who escorted Seth out and away from the scene. We’re sorry it seemed to take so long. When one feels threatened, the situation can never be handled quickly enough but please know that we were on it. We should have come to you to let you know he was long gone and that we had handled it so that you could more quickly be made to feel safe. I apologize that you were left wondering and worried what might happen next. Seth has been called out by our staff and has apologized to us for his behavior that night. Hopefully, he will also apologize to you.

This excerpt begins with an apology for what had happened to the victim as well as acknowledgement that the behavior of the abuser, Seth, though problematic, was not a normal or typical behavior for him. Lines 14-17 provide valuable insight into the practice of calling-out and what the implications of that practice are. The poster speaking on behalf of Barland⁹, where the abuse occurred, apologizes again for the uncertainty of repercussions towards the abuser that

---

⁹ Barland is a local DIY/punk venue in the Southern United States, where both local and touring bands will play shows, and community members will convene.
the victim experienced, going on to note that Seth has additionally been “called out by our staff and has apologized to us for his behavior that night,” lastly expressing hope that Seth will also apologize to the victim. Though the accountability expected on behalf of the “abuser” varies from situation to situation and community to community, the ends of a successful call-out generally culminate in some sort of accountability process for the perpetrator of harm, typically outside of the law or criminal justice system, as DIY/punk communities have historically functioned outside of such legal systems from their very beginnings. It is important for abusers to “take accountability” and it is “not punk” to call the cops or use the law, but actual processes for accountability and justice are still fairly vague. Various call-out posts have expressed calls for the abuser to go through mediation, therapy, time off music/touring, and/or (temporary or long-term) banishment of certain venues and bars. The call-out post itself is not the accountability process, but the means for ensuring some sort of accountability process happens.

The following excerpt shows this tendency towards alternative justice measures for perpetrators of harm within these communities.

Excerpt 25 (Zine, CrimethInc, n. d., p. 6)

1 In speaking about accountability processes, we’re referring to collective efforts to address harm—in this case, sexual assault and abuse—that focus not on punishment or legal “justice” but on keeping people safe and challenging the underlying social patterns and power structures that support abusive behavior. In the loosest sense, this might simply mean a few friends sticking up for someone who’s been hurt: asking them what they need, and trying to negotiate for those needs with the person who hurt them and among the community they share. Some processes involve a group that mediates between an individual and the person calling them out, or separate groups supporting each person and facilitating communication between them.

In lines 2 and 3 of this excerpt from an online zine, the explicit push away from “punishment or legal ‘justice’” is demonstrated, and later on in this excerpt, it provides examples of what some of these alternative approaches to justice or accountability might look like in these communities, as they work in tandem with the practice of calling-out. As such, the ends of a successful call-
out are a central component to the communicative practice, as they represent not just accountability for the abuser, justice for the victim, and healing for the community as a whole, but also represent a DIY ethos that are central to these communities’ foundations, specifically ethos of direct action, leftist political leanings, doing-it-yourself, and anti-authoritarianism. The cumulative effect of these individual call-out posts informs, and are informed by, DIY/punk ideologies that challenge structures of domination like the criminal justice system.

Meta-cultural Commentary in Call-Outs

In this section, I build on the descriptive work of the SPEAKING framework and move towards deeper meanings in the (meta)discursive talk around calling-out. While the SPEAKING framework explicated the local knowledge animating the practice of calling-out as a socio-culturally embedded practice, a cultural discourse analysis turns attention to explicit and implicit meanings we can gain from this way of speaking within DIY/punk communities through cultural propositions and premises. By homing in on the hub of acting, and the radiants of being, relating, feeling, and dwelling, we learn about the taken-for-granted aspects of the DIY/punk speech community.

Hub of Acting. Calling-out, at its very core, is a way of acting that members of DIY/punk communities can do. Generally, call-outs are commended, and the practice is signified as something done relatively more often within these communities compared to other communities. The following excerpts illustrate this type of talk around DIY/punk communities.

Excerpt 26 (Tweet)
1 Shout out to the punk scene for calling out the abusers.
Excerpt 27 (Tweet)
1  the gaming scene is so different from the DIY punk scene, no where near as much call-out
2  stuff and you get more edgelord guys

Excerpt 26 explicitly gives a “shout out to the punk scene” for the practice of “calling out the
abusers,” while excerpt 27 points out that call-outs happen more often within DIY/punk
communities than in “the gaming scene.” Previous excerpts also point to the need to call-out
abusers, even when the practice is questioned or flaws are expressed, as in excerpt 4 in the Grand
Rapids scene.

But the practice of calling-out is not the only place we see notions of acting unfold. Call-
out posts typically are accompanied by calls for “accountability,” asking for the abuser to “take
accountability” or the community to “hold” the abuser “accountable.” Accountability, as
expressed in the section on calling-out ends, can look like a lot of different things for the abuser
and the community as a whole. Once a call-out has taken place, the community also has a
chance to engage in the action, by supporting and believing the victim, or protecting and
defending the abuser. Members accomplish these actions through engaging in online, call-outs.
While one can fundamentally support and believe the victim, community members need to do so
by voicing that either directly to the victim or through a comment that the victim and other
community members will see. Otherwise, the communicative action is not seen, and thus not
acknowledged by the community. While defending and protecting the abuser can be an action
that is communicated, it can also be the absence of action, thus informing the need for supporting
and believing a victim to be an overt, communicative practice. These actions are dependent on
the call-out itself, as one cannot support a victim, protect an abuser, or take accountability if a

---

10 Edgelord, as defined by Wiktionary (n.d.), is “someone who attempts to seem edgy by doing
or saying risqué or offensive things.”
call-out has not been initiated, alerting the community and triggering further actions.

Through this talk about the practice of calling-out, and the actions that go along with this practice (doing the call-out and hoping it is met with accountability for the individual called-out), acting becomes an explicit hub for the communicative practice. An individual or group “calls-out” an “abuser” or “band” within the community, whether that is “local” or “national,” in order for the community and the abuser(s) to be aware that the abuser(s) need to take “accountability” for their problematic and “patterned” actions and/or behaviors, an accountability process that functions outside of the criminal justice system, because “punks don’t call the cops.”

Additionally, community members can either “support the victim” or “protect the abuser” once a call-out has taken place, and it is not just that the abuser must “take accountability” for their actions, but the job of the community itself to commit to holding the abuser accountable as well. As such, “calling-out” is necessary when instances of abusive, patterned behaviors or beliefs are present within DIY/punk communities, because it is a recognized and encouraged component of being a part of a DIY/punk community. The practice of calling-out can, and should, involve a large portion of the community, as supporters, believers, accusers, victims, abusers, and bystanders, as they engage in the call-out in various ways.

**Being.** Through this primary hub of acting, we are able to get to additional, deeper meanings and beliefs that are held within these communities, meanings around being or personhood of accusers/victims, abusers, and community members more broadly. Calling-out an abuser has its roots with DIY/punk communities’ very conception, and as such, it is a practice in line with a DIY/punk ethos of direct action, anti-authoritarianism, and radical, leftist politics. Calling-out abusers is locally significant and talked about within these communities, not just because sexual violence is an issue and accountability for perpetrators of harm is wanted, but
also because calling-out problematic, patterned behavior is foundational to a DIY/punk identity. “Calling-out” is part of punk history broadly, and “you can’t say you’re fucking punk” and engage in behavior that is worthy of being called-out. The following excerpt speaks more to being punk through responding to a call-out in an appropriate way.

*Excerpt 28 (Interview, Dec. 8, 2018, Jane)*

1. We were really scared of any repercussions that he could sue us for **which is not fucking punk** at all but he did end up threatening to sue us for defamation of character I mean he mentioned it to our mediators…and he told them that he was thinking of, he was seeking legal counsel, as far as defamation, which is all just like, the fucking audacity…

Once you have been called-out as an abuser, it is “not fucking punk at all” to threaten legal intervention because that is in direct opposition to a DIY/punk ethos. Thus, to engage in behavior that warrants a call-out to begin with compromises membership in DIY/punk communities, but “threatening to sue” instead of “taking accountability” marks an even further step away from a DIY/punk ethos. Two interviewees referred to the phenomenon of abusers “moving to Portland” instead of being a part of a community accountability process (Daisy; Marie). The physical effects of a geographically dispersed, translocal speech community crystallize in these instances, as abusers might be shunned from a particular, localized scene, but are enough degrees of separation away to be a part of a larger, geographically distinct scene. Thus, an abuser might lose their status as a member of a particular, geographically specific community, but they might also be able to move away and become a member of a different scene.

Often in opposition to the abuser (though this relationship will be discussed more in the following section), the accuser is another key player in the call-out, and thus we can understand ideas around what it means to be an accuser through the (meta)discourses of calling-out.

Accusers can, and often are, the victim in call-outs; that is, they have been harmed by the abuser
that is being called-out. But, as was discussed previously, with proper consent, accusers can also be other community members who call-out on behalf of the victim. Regardless, accusers have tremendous power in the identity formation process towards the abusers, as they are able to mark the identity of the abuser through the call-out post when their call-outs are accepted or “supported” by the community.

Community members, playing another key role in the call-out process, can also identify themselves as “supporting” the victim or “protecting” the abuser. Community members who support victims are seen positively in the community, whereas those who protect the abuser might find themselves in a similarly precarious space as the abuser themselves. Additionally, it is the job of the community members to ensure the needs of victim are met, as they are outlined in the call-out post itself. Community members play a tremendous role in the identity formation of both abusers and victims/accusers. If the community sides with the accused, then the victim/accuser’s identification of the accused as an abuser does not hold weight, the label of “abuser” is rejected, and the accused status as a community member is not compromised. While I did not find instances of call-outs in which this happened, many interviewees expressed concern of victims/accusers experiencing social exile from the community if their call-outs are not supported by the community. Alternatively, if the victim/accuser’s call-out is supported by the community, then the accused’s status as an “known abuser” is solidified through that community support.

As was discussed in the section on participants, how we understand “abusers” and “victims” in particular fall along deeply gendered lines. While a couple interview participants directly centered queer experience in their conceptualization of calling-out, other interview participants, as well as the (meta)discourses at large, predominately talked about this practice
along these gendered, heteronormative lines, with women synonymous with victims and men synonymous abusers. Thus, we understand personhood as it relates to victims and abusers, but we also understand personhood as it relates to men and women in these communities.

To “call-out abusers” in the community, in a way marked as appropriate by the community (and as explicated through the SPEAKING framework) is not only a DIY/punk action, it is also a way of marking identity within the community. Call-outs are made by an accuser, who is usually also the “victim” of harm, harm perpetuated by the “abuser,” which falls along deeply gendered, heteronormative lines. Additionally, community members are typically either seen as someone who “supports victims” or “protects abusers,” and to engage in the call-out practice in an appropriate way can additionally signify a “punk” identity more broadly. Therefore, when an accuser “calls-out” an “abuser” within the community, and the community supports the accusation, the abusers’ identity of being a part of the DIY/punk community is compromised because their past (and potentially continued) actions are oppositional to the community ethos. The compromised status of the abuser can be redeemed, by “taking accountability” for their actions per the request of the accuser/victim. Moreover, if an abuser resists the call-out and threatens legal intervention, they further compromise their punk identity because to rely on the law is “not punk” and is not something members of the community would acknowledge as acceptable behavior. Victims/accusers can also find their status within the community as compromised, in the chance their call-out is not supported by the community. Thus, the stakes are high for those posting the public call-out, and validation/support from the community is necessary for the victim/accuser.

Relating. From these understandings around being or personhood, we can also begin to understand meanings around relating. We are able to make sense of these different roles
individuals have in a call-out through our understandings of their relationships. Much of what we understand around the personhood of victim/accuser and abuser come from our understandings of them in relation to each other as well as their relation to the community at large, and many of these relationships were reflected in the previous section on being.

Identities of the victim/accuser in these (meta)discourses generally manifest through the call-out and in direct opposition to the abuser. The relationship between victim/accuser and abuser is communicatively and relationally constituted; one would not exist, at least publicly, without the other. Thus, the call-out itself is often the connective tissue making visible the relationship between these participants, a relationship often predicated on a history of “patterned” and “abusive” behavior.

The public nature of the call-out then extends these notions of relating onto community members through “supporting victims” or “protecting abusers.” Support and protection are both ways community members relate to the victim and/or the abuser, and these relations are deeply value-laden and morally consequential. While earlier examples (excerpt 10 and 11 most explicitly) showed what support towards the victim/accuser looks like on these call-out posts, the relation of “protecting abusers” is typically marked by a lack of action. In other words, supporting victims is an active relationship between community and victim whereas protecting abusers is a more passive relationship between community and abuser. As such, we are able to see examples of what supporting a victim might look like, particularly through engagement on social media posts, while it is not as easy to locate the relation of protecting abusers within these communities.

Engaging with and through these call-out posts are another key part of how relating manifests through public call-outs. Because of the nature of online call-outs and social media
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more broadly, it is necessary to question and interrogate the ways different mediums might invite (or not invite) the sudden deluge of sympathy to victims (recall the Facebook post from excerpt 9, with over 50 comments of overwhelming support towards the victim, with even more “likes,” “loves,” and shares of the post). While mediums like Tumblr and Google Docs allow for easy public and accessible sharing of the posts across various other mediums (one could share a link to a Tumblr post or Google Doc on Twitter, Instagram, Facebook, etc., and others would be able to view the call-out), Facebook call-out posts allow for the victim/accuser’s immediate network of friends to see the post first, perhaps prompting an increased likelihood of positive, supportive comments. A call-out posted on an Instagram story might provoke people to respond to the individual making the post, voicing support and sympathy through a direct message. In both the instance of Facebook and Instagram call-outs, the immediate and rather direct interaction of community members seeing the call-out and the accuser (likely the victim) posting the call-out, in conjunction with the rather active process of supporting victims, creates an environment that prompts people to voice support for the individual making the call-out. Tumblr and Google Docs as mediums do not afford the same sort of interpersonal interaction, though when individuals share these posts on Facebook, Twitter, or Instagram, that level of interpersonal interaction is able to be achieved.

Members of DIY/punk communities “support,” “believe,” and “love” victims through the “public” nature of call-out posts, and doing so represents an active role community members play, a role in opposition to “protecting abusers” because if you do not support victims, “you’re part of the problem.” Moving towards a deeper cultural understanding, call-outs posts themselves make explicit relations within the community, from victim/accuser and abuser, to community roles of supporting victims, an active relationship, or protecting abusers, a passive
relationship. Further, the medium in which a call-out takes place influences what community support for the victim/accuser might look like, with sites like Facebook and Instagram allowing the network of close friends/community to see and interact with the call-out. This support for the victim/accuser is in direct contrast to protecting the abuser, a relation that is marked by a lack of action on behalf of community members.

**Feeling.** Talk about sexual violence is often an emotional process. But the emotional (or lack thereof) nature of call-outs is also a contentious subject. Community members often acknowledge that call-outs are a positive, needed component of DIY/punk community life, particularly because of a lack of reliance on the criminal justice system. But call-outs that are “too emotional” are still seen as less valid than more “analytical” call-out posts. In the following excerpt, an interviewee who engaged in mediation with her abuser, but ended up publicly calling him out, shares some of her frustrations with call-outs she has seen online.

*Excerpt 29 (Interview, Dec. 8, 2018, Jane)*

1. Other kinds of call-outs have been happening amongst our community and they’re very like, I just don’t agree with them they’re very black and white like ‘this guy is a piece of shit and let’s kill him’ not really but like ‘let’s dox him,’ he’s not allowed around, there’s no discussion, ‘I don’t care about mediation, mediation’s bullshit, it means forgiveness.’ There’s a lot of, I just feel like mediation separated our emotions from it and led to discussion and all of these call-outs are just Facebook and the Internet…it’s just so easy to say something and everyone share it and there be no defense. I feel like, I’m like ‘god, am I taking the side of these rape apologists?’

In this excerpt, the interviewee explains how her experience of mediation with the individual she and a group of other women called-out “separated [their] emotions” from the call-out, something she sees as a positive, and something in opposition to other call-outs she has witnessed in the community. The interviewee juxtaposes sentiments of “‘let’s kill him’ not really but like ‘let’s dox him,’” words associated with anger and revenge, with terms like mediation, discussion, and even possibly a defense from the abuser. The following excerpt shows a small part of a call-out
post, showing the analytical nature of call-outs that purposefully remove any sort of “emotional” tone to them.

_Excerpt 30 (Tumblr post)_

1. Attempts to directly confront Ross on these matters has proven fruitless. This page will attempt to share helpful information in as clear and accessible a manner as possible.

In excerpt 30, the individuals writing the call-out frame the call-out as a way of sharing “helpful information in as clear and accessible a manner as possible.”

This move to keep emotions separated from the call-out is a strategic move – in a community that explicitly refuses legal intervention and reliance on any formal justice system, these call-outs function as the closest thing to systematic process for dealing with conflict and harm. As such, victims/accusers making their case to the community through these call-outs must do so in a way that relays facts, not feelings, and provides concrete evidence, not pure anger at the abuser. This reflects a cultural shift in these communities; “we don’t really have the kill your rapist sort of thing going on in most DIY scenes anymore,” one interviewee notes (Dec. 20, 2018, Marie). Thus, call-outs that are more emotional reflect an “old” way of thinking, one based on retributive justice that is too emotional and anger-fueled. Call-outs that reflect more analytical practices reflect the new way of dealing with accountability in these communities, one that promotes mediation (between the victim and abuser), therapy (for the abuser), and discussion (among the community as a whole). Even though this newer way of dealing with call-out posts is preferred, members also expressed understanding with emotional and anger-fueled call-outs, noting that the needs of the victim (in this case anger and other intense emotional responses) should always come first.

Within DIY/punk communities, victims/accusers should “separate their emotions” from the call-out post they are making, and they should present “information” in a “clear and
accessible” manner allowing members to make “analytical” inferences instead of judgements based purely on feelings. Moving from a cultural proposition to premise, members of these communities rely on these call-out posts as foundational resources for making decisions regarding abusers’ place within the community, a community functioning explicitly outside of formal legal procedures. Because of this, members expect individuals engaging in call-outs to separate their emotions in the call-out post in order for the post to be seen as more valid. Emotions in call-out posts show that the accuser/victim might be coming from a place of anger instead of a desire for accountability, marking an old, outdated way of dealing with abusers in the community.

Dwelling. Last but certainly not least, notions of place as they intersect with community and the Internet continue to radiate from that original hub of acting. While call-outs themselves typically happen online, the community responses that go alongside the call-out very much exist offline, in the physical world. The following excerpt speaks to this relationship between “in person” and “online.”

*Excerpt 31 (Interview, Dec. 6, 2018, Dawn)*

1. We are talking about like these online call-outs, like these call-outs are not specific to the Internet, but **the best way to spread information is through the Internet** so I feel like something that I’ve seen connecting all of these various call-outs or call-ins are people doing what they can to discredit these survivors by saying **you know you can’t take stock in what’s said on the Internet or you know like why don’t they do this in person, it’s\**
2. **like they do, and they also do it on the Internet**

In this excerpt, the interviewee expresses how, while these call-outs are typically happening in online settings, there is also a very real, “in-person” element to the practice. The Internet is simply a way of making public the call-out, and functions as “the best way to spread information” to community members. As noted back in excerpt 1, zines used to be a prominent space for individuals in the community to engage in the practice of calling-out. The increasing
availability of Internet access and social media sites provides a newer, quicker, and easier platform for the “spread of information” through practices like calling-out. As such, calling-out extends upon DIY/punk practices like zine making/distributing and touring as a way to connect people, ideas, and information across the geographically disperse scenes that make up DIY/punk communities. Specifically, calling-out, as well as these practices around zines and tours, (re)produce translocal speech communities that hold together these various, localities. In the following excerpt, we see the connection between role of social media in these call-outs as it intersects with this very notion of translocality.

Excerpt 32 (Interview, Dec. 24, 2018, Daisy)

1. I think the issue is a lot of times whenever its not online, when there isn’t like a visible platform for it, people kind of just talk about it and talk around it, they never really put face-to-face with it, they’re just like ‘oh yeah, I heard about that,’ and that’s kind of where it ends or like they’re willing to talk one on one with these people but when it comes to a group as a total, they won’t say anything so I think when its physically out there it forces people to deal with it, there’s no option to talk around it, ignore it, act like you didn’t know it happened…it’s like even in that case there are people in different punk scenes that I’ve never met and I know shit about them because people have been like ‘oh my god did you hear about this?’ because they saw it online.

In line 1 through 7, the interviewee discusses the problem when call-out posts are not online and thus not “visible,” allowing people in the community to just “talk about it and talk around it” instead of dealing with it “face-to-face.” Posting the call-out online “forces people to deal with it,” which is a good thing because, as discussed previously, to not deal with it and take on a more passive role, is in line with “protecting abusers.”

In the above excerpt from lines 7 through 9, the interviewee speaks to not only the translocality of DIY/punk communities, but they speak to the role calling-out plays in that translocality, connecting “different punk scenes” and the interviewee with people they’ve “never met” yet they are still able to “know shit about them.” The Internet as a place allows for members of DIY/punk communities to exist, or dwell, in both the local and the translocal, being
physically present in their localized, geographically distinct scenes while also maintaining translocal connections with “different punk scenes.” Thus, the local and translocal, while deeply interconnected, are fundamentally different. The translocal would not exist without these local scenes. Members of DIY/punk communities speak to these differences, as they refer to a “local” community, like Grand Rapids, Portland, or Richmond, while simultaneously speaking to the “broader” community, hinting at the translocal properties of DIY/punk communal life.

As members move between the local and translocal, Anderson’s (1983) notion of “imagined community” becomes particular helpful as we consider how members interact both with those they know, in their localized scenes, as well as those they might not know online, translocally. Gruzd, Wellman, and Takhteyev (2011) take up Anderson’s “imagined community” in the context of Twitter, noting how “users could never know everyone on Twitter, but they are certainly aware of other users’ presence, especially in their “neighborhood” of sources” (p. 1298). While the boundaries of the local community are more geographic in nature, the boundaries of the online, translocal community are more a product of imagination, even if that imagination is informed by both communicative practices like “calling-out abusers” as well as shared history, politics, and ideologies.

The Internet functions as a “public” and “visible” place where members of DIY/punk communities, and specifically those making the call-out post, can “share information” to members in “different punk scenes.” But even more than that, the practice of calling-out as it happens online, through social media sites, (re)produces a translocal community. The practice extends upon other DIY/punk socio-cultural resources like zines and tours that aided in these translocal networks prior to the onset of easy and constant access to the Internet. Thus, while members of DIY/punk communities certainly dwell in a particular city, Oakland, Grand Rapids,
or Chicago, for example, they also dwell online, not in a geographically bounded group, but through the extended networks they have already created over decades of local and translocal communal life.
CHAPTER FIVE
THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Through the SPEAKING framework and cultural discourse analysis, we better understand the practice of calling-out, how it functions in DIY/punk communities, and what it means to be a part of a DIY/punk community more broadly. These communities explicitly do and talk about call-outs in increasingly online, mediated spaces, and in doing so, they also express more implicit meanings around DIY/punk social life through this locally patterned practice. Members of DIY/punk communities “call-out abusers,” or people who have engaged in violence within the community because that type of behavior is not tolerated and thus “not punk.” Call-outs happen outside of the law because “punks don’t call the cops” and to do so would be antithetical to a DIY/punk ethos of “do-it-yourself,” anti-authoritarianism, and direct action politics. Calling-out, then, serves as the first step in an accountability process for the perpetrator of harm, an accountability process that takes place within the community, and can include calls for mediation, therapy, avoiding certain venues or bars, and taking time off of music and touring.

In this discussion section, I will interrogate the findings from the above analysis as they relate to issues within DIY/punk communities, within academic scholarship, and beyond. First, I will consider the relationship between online groups, place, and speech communities. I will specifically reflect on the “place” of the Internet, as well as its translocal properties, as an increasingly “boundless” space for already bounded groups of individuals. This lends itself to an emic approach to understanding and analyzing speech communities. As I complicate conceptions of DIY/punk communities and speech communities more broadly, I propose a multiscale model of DIY/punk communal life. As more and more individuals interact online and
engage in community online, there is a necessity to study and theorize communal life as it moves and changes with the experiences of Internet users. How does community, and thus the frame of speech community, fit, or not fit, in the “place” of the Internet, and how might DIY/punk communities in particular help us think through this?

DIY/punk communities allow us to consider more than just the implications of online communal life. In this section, I will also discuss the implications of DIY/punk communities’ (hetero)normative and (cis)binary conceptions of sexual violence, and reflect on the possibilities of justice outside of the legal system, as practiced within these communities through the communicative practice of calling-out abusers, as well as what doing so means in this #MeToo moment. I question the convergence of radical ethos with normative discourse around gender and sexuality, and make connections between the plight of queering sexual violence with transforming approaches to accountability as they exist explicitly outside of any formal, legal institutions. As increasing distrust in our legal system coincides with public and frank conversations about sexual violence, understanding the nuances of the practice of calling-out, as it happens within DIY/punk communities, could help in not just understanding the practice in this particular context, but working with this practice in contexts beyond what has been explored in this thesis. Thus, understanding DIY/punk communities and their relationship to the practice of publicly calling-out abusers online is important for communication scholarship as it makes key connections between notions of community, sexual violence, accountability, and the nature of online settings more broadly.

**DIY/punk speech communities.** The practice of calling-out constitutes community in both overt and less explicit ways. As community members (meta)discursively engage with this practice, they are both invoking notions of community explicitly, by calling on the “community”
to hold abusers accountable, and creating (and policing) the very boundaries of community through more implicit means, by expressing someone’s actions as “not punk” for how they respond to or engage with a call-out. The making and maintaining of community through the practice of calling-out supports recent moves to re-conceptualize speech communities for their more emic properties, as they reflect concerns and practices associated with a local (and translocal), emic sense of communal belonging. As discussed previously in this thesis, formations of the concept “speech community” has been ongoing in recent decades (Morgan, 2014; Rampton, 2009; Milburn, 2004). Scholars like Marcyliena H. Morgan and Trudy Milburn have pushed this frame towards more emic conceptions, expanding on work from Dell Hymes and John Gumperz. As Morgan (2014) reminds us, “speech communities remain fundamental to the way we organize our social lives across mediums, space, places and social networks” (p. 156). This study supports such moves to define speech communities for their shared ideologies, histories, and politics as they are (re)produced through language use. These moves reflect an emic move to define a speech community, in part, by how they define themselves.

To fully understand what defining speech communities in more emic terms affords, it will be helpful to consider what is lost with an etic approach to speech communities instead. As explicated in my literature review on speech communities, there are many ways to think through this analytic frame, and it often comes down to whether the definition of the term relies on etic or emic conceptions of the speech community. Hymes, who made explicit the speech community as a unit of analysis central to the ethnography of communication, relied on rather etic conceptions of defining the speech community. Hymes (1980) acknowledged that the speech community is a “dynamic, complex, and sometimes subtle thing” that is often multilingual and always heterogeneous, though this facet of the speech community has at times been forgotten (p.
Hymes conception of speech community is etic because it takes the pre-defined concept of “speech community” and applies it to the particular group being analyzed. As Milburn (2004) notes, “one can only designate a speech community as such when the features that define it have been revealed by one’s research” (p. 433). In pushing against “a priori” definitions of a speech community, Milburn makes space for an emic conception of speech community, moving the term from one that is applied to one that emerges, and we see this emergence in the DIY/punk speech community. This move is vital to the proliferation of the speech community in online settings, especially as scholars have avoided the “speech community” frame, and opted for other terms instead, because of a belief that these communities’ are completely bounded, distinct, and rigid (Kaplan-Weinger & Ullman, 2015; Rampton, 2009). Milburn and Morgan both put the focus of the speech community back into the communicative practices that maintain them.

But the existence of a DIY/punk speech community is profound not just for its mere existence, but for the online, translocal properties that make up its existence. “Local” and “national” or more “popular” scenes coalesce in these online spaces to talk about different, though very much interconnected situations of violence, abuse, and harm within these communities. The ability to connect across space and time unify and mark these various localized DIY/punk communities as translocal. While shared histories and ideologies certainly inform much of these communities’ existence and interconnection, calling-out serves as a social connective tissue, allowing these histories and ideologies to continue to circulate throughout various, local, national, and popular scenes.

In the following infographic, I show how different scales of community life move from the hyper-local to the online, translocal. Communal life starts at the hyper-local, where members coalesce around specific venues for shows, expanding to the local, which tends to be bounded by
a particular city or regional area, where venues make up a part of that local communal life. Beyond the local, we move towards the physical, translocal, where the distribution of zines as well as touring bands allows for community life to flourish beyond a particular venue, city, or geographic area. The physical, translocal, while not based in a particular location, often is still dependent on geography. Zines and tours can only get as far as the individuals supporting them, thus, members of a local DIY/punk community based in a particular Midwest city might have more connections with other Midwestern cities’ punk scenes and their members. Lastly, we have the online, translocal scale of communal life. This exists through social media sites and online networks that allow community members of interact, through communicative practices like calling-out, in the “place” of the Internet. Importantly, this scale exists only with the scales of communal life that come before it.

*Figure 1: Scales of DIY/punk communal life*
I am not the first scholar to propose a way of thinking about DIY/punk communities in both local and translocal terms. Emms and Crossley (2018), in their study on underground metal in the United Kingdom, propose thinking of music worlds or scenes not just along local, translocal, and virtual forms, but that the relationship of these forms is that of a Venn diagram, in an effort to avoid thinking about these concepts in mutually exclusive terms. Emms and Crossley argue that “most contemporary worlds have a virtual aspect,” which I certainly agree with, as members “interact by way of email, Web sites, and Twitter, and so on” (p. 114). Emms and Crossley then go on to argue that “in some cases, this intersects with offline, local, and/or translocal activity” (p. 114). While the study’s emphasis on the interconnected natures of the local, translocal, and virtual is certainly affirmed in this study, the possibility of purely “virtual” or purely “translocal” does not hold up for DIY/punk communal life as demonstrated in this thesis. Local and hyper-local communal life radiates upwards to inform and support the translocal levels of community. Without community at the hyper-local, there would be no online, translocal community.

As discussed previously, and as Emms and Crossley (2018) acknowledge, the interconnected, translocal nature of DIY/punk communities is not new or unique to the onset of the Internet. From the distribution of zines to participating in tours, DIY/punk communities have had many translocal properties for decades, connecting otherwise geographically disperse local scenes. While tours and zines are certainly still relevant in the maintenance of these communities’ interconnection, publicly calling-out abusers online has added another scale to this interconnection. Call-outs, quite literally, call the community into being at multiple scales. These call-outs express norms and expectations of communal life at the online, translocal scale while also calling-out the local and even hyper-local community to physically hold the abuser.
accountable. Because call-outs, often explicitly, call on the community to hold the abuser(s) accountable, they do not just call the community into being, they also call the community to action. Thus, community is something that is both communicated and done in these DIY/punk spaces.

As many online users experience multiscalar community through these local and translocal properties, this notion of space, or dwelling, is something I want to home in on in particular. Our interactions online are increasingly happening in physically boundless settings, moving from Twitter to Facebook to Instagram to Gmail and beyond, yet we are not necessarily abandoning community in this movement. Notions of community as a bounded group, whether that be a neighborhood or an online forum, are not the reality for many individuals in this digital age. While community might look different in online settings, it certainly still exists in the “place” of the Internet.

But the boundless nature of the Internet should not be confused with “randomness.” In fact, it is quite the opposite of random. In the case of DIY/punk communities in particular, members are already bound together when they go online – through shared histories, ideologies, and networks, made through tours and the distribution of zines at the physical, translocal scale, as well as the local and hyper-local scales that come before it – and thus members do not need an online forum or Facebook group to enact community when they go online because that sense of community is already there, waiting to be discursively acted upon. This bound-ness does not just apply to DIY/punk communities either; other marginalized, alternative, counter-, and subcultural groups rely on similar shared histories, ideologies, and networks that have sustained community through both physical and virtual movement.
Thus, call-outs do more than just name an abuser or seek accountability, they *do* community throughout the various scales, as they both support and are supported by a community ethos of anti-authoritarianism and direct action politics infused with a do-it-yourself mentality. With the practice of calling-out, we see language use and practices intersect with fundamental beliefs about what it means to be DIY/punk and what it means to be a part of a DIY/punk community. Call-outs function as a form of boundary-management, and as we learn about what constitutes a communally-appropriate call-out, we also learn about what is *not* a DIY/punk way of doing and engaging with a call-out. Community life is done and (re)produced through these norms of interaction, and these norms are mutually intelligible for members as they exist as a speech community. Though this speech community is not a singular social unit, there is still very much coherence and pattern in how they talk about and engage with the practice of calling-out. The public, online call-out allows for the fusion of various social units, various scenes and localized communities, and various scales of communal life. Translocality, again, becomes key to current conceptions of the speech community status of DIY/punk communities.

Additionally, we are able to consider the relationship between social media, translocality, and speech communities, as social media platforms become both the site and the instrument through which call-outs increasingly take place. Members of DIY/punk communities are able to rely on the practice of calling-out to “spread information” about a problematic individual or group beyond their immediate locality because of a network, both online and offline, already existing of DIY/punk community members across a variety of geographic locations – a network that begins at the hyper-local and moves its way up. While, as previously discussed, a call-out’s function extends beyond simply spreading information, these public posts on social media are
also, in part, binding this community together at the online, translocal level, by marking members as counter to mainstream, formal, and retributive notions of justice. Community is constituted, translocally, through these call-outs, as they invoke community both explicitly and implicitly, on both local and translocal levels.

Speech communities are defined, not by a sole, common language, “but rather by common linguistic norms” (Johnston & Marcellino, 2010, p. 61). And this certainly holds true for DIY/punk communities, especially as, and when, they interact online. But as we consider the “place” of the Internet, and as we consider the translocal properties of the Internet as an increasingly boundless space for already bounded groups of individuals, an emic approach to understanding and analyzing speech communities is vital. DIY/punk communities constitute a speech community, and we see this in how they engage in the counter and meta-discursive practice of calling-out; these communities “share values and attitudes about language use, varieties and practices,” and these values and attitudes very much “operate within these shared and recognized beliefs and value systems regarding forms and styles of communication” (Morgan, 2014, p. 1). As the practice of calling-out continues to hold relevance in the face of sexual violence for not only DIY/punk communities, but mainstream society at large, how notions of gender and sexuality are invoked become another key concern.

**Sexual violence within DIY/punk communities.** In this section, I will make the case for why queering sexual violence, that is both decentering normative expectations of sexual violence and centering queer bodies and experiences, is crucial for the future of sexual violence research. With the onset of #MeToo and the series of conversations it has sparked around sexual violence, better understanding the taken-for-granted aspects of these conversations, particularly as they relate to victims/survivors and abusers/perpetrators, is both helpful and necessary. As
reflected in my analysis, DIY/punk communities certainly talk about sexual violence in a locally recognizable and relatively patterned way. Through their ways of speaking, overt as well as more implicit notions of gender and sexuality as it relates to sexual violence become apparent.

Similar to mainstream conversations, DIY/punk communities tend to talk about sexual violence along deeply gendered as well as heteronormative lines – with men typically labeled as “abusers,” who are committing acts of harm against women, typically labeled as “victims” or “survivors” in these conversations. This strict binary between victim and perpetrator (which is informed by and also still informs the strict binary between man and woman) creates an easily digestible narrative when talking about sexual violence. The reliance on heteronormative and cis-binary ways of talking about sexual violence reflects deeply held beliefs about what constitutes sexual violence itself, tied up in outdated conceptions around gender and sexuality.

While some of the (meta)discourse throughout the analysis refer to the experiences of trans, non-binary, and gender non-conforming individuals, those conversations are not only few and far between, but they disagree on whether these experiences are grouped together with women as victims/survivors, or with men as perpetrators/abusers. In excerpt 15, we see “femmes/nonbinary/nonmasucline presenting folks” grouped together as members of the community who “have always faced hardship and sexual assault in punk/diy.” In excerpt 16, the interviewee, while acknowledging that non-women can be survivors of sexual violence, explains how “men or non-binary [sic] who are survivors” deal with call-outs “in a different way.” Thus, even when individuals that fall outside of the gender binary are included in the conversation, their existence is still deeply tied to a binary they simply do not exist within. Non-binary individuals are grouped together with women or men, lacking any autonomy to exist in the conversation outside of the gender binary. While DIY/punk conceptualizations of
accountability, which will be discussed in the following section, are counterdiscursive to the criminal justice system as an institution and mainstream society more generally, their talk about sexual violence, though perhaps more expansive than the legal system (as members of DIY/punk communities are not concerned with strictly legal definitions of sexual violence), still aligns with more dominant, hegemonic discourses.

The implications of such discourses silence and further marginalize experiences of violence and abuse that fall outside of heterosexual encounters as well as outside of the gender binary. Chen et al. (2011) and Patterson (2016) both provide examples of queer experiences of sexual violence in alternative communities and the importance that comes in recognizing non-normative instances of sexual violence within these communities. When we walk outside of sexual violence in exclusively cisgender, heterosexual relationships, many of the preconceived ideas about who can be a victim and who can be a perpetrator are immediately obscured. By blurring these boundaries, dichotomies, and binaries that exist in popular understandings (that are then re-perpetuated through discourse) around sexual violence, we can open up our understandings towards sexual violence in a radical, inclusive, and explicitly queer way. DIY/punk communities have the history, the ideologies, and certainly the radical individuals to more inclusively talk about sexual violence, and we see an aspect of queering sexual violence in their discourses already as they move beyond the purely legal to make sense of sexual violence within their communities. Additionally, there are individuals within these communities that are leading the way to having these difficult conversations and opening up space for queer and non-binary individuals, but these voices still stand on the fringe of these already subcultural communities. If DIY/punk communities as a whole want to truly stand by their history of radical ideologies, engaging in (meta)discourses that make space for experiences
of sexual violence outside of the norm, or *queering* sexual violence, will be an imperative component in that work. In queering sexual violence, the focus is not solely on anti-queer violence like hate crimes, but intimate partner violence experienced within queer communities, to and from queer bodies. While “queering” everything from pedagogy (Linville, 2017) to prison abolition (Stanley & Spade, 2012) has reflected a rise in centering the experiences of queer bodies and de-centering normative experiences more broadly, efforts to queer sexual violence are still relatively absent from mainstream discourses, both within and beyond academia. From Cvetkovich (2003) and her work on lesbian sexuality and trauma to Patterson’s (2016) edited collection explicitly making the move to queer sexual violence, efforts are being made in academia as well as anti-sexual violence movements to move beyond normative and binary experiences of sexual violence. In the quest to queer sexual violence, we also open up the conversation to transform approaches to accountability and justice outside of the legal system as we decenter normative and taken-for-granted aspects of sexual violence, including how we confront it.

*Alternative accountability processes within DIY/punk communities.* While DIY/punk ways of talking about sexual violence re-perpetuates mainstream, hegemonic discourses around sexual violence more broadly, these communities’ conceptions of accountability are far from the norm of mainstream society. As one zine puts it, “we became anarchists because we hate cops” (CrimethInc, n.d.). As such, after an abuser has been called out, and the community has expressed its support of the victim, the community does not rely on formal legal processes to bring accountability to the abuser. Instead, the community takes to these alternative approaches to accountability to bring justice to the victim, and perhaps the community as a whole. But what these approaches to accountability look like are not necessarily imminent in the (meta)discourses
of calling-out. Bands disbanding, canceling shows, as well as abusers apologizing to victims, going to mediation or therapy are some of the actions we see following these call-outs, marking some sort of accountability being taken. These alternative approaches to accountability are markedly counter to mainstream, retributive, and prison-centric beliefs around accountability for perpetrators of sexual violence.

The emphasis on mediation and therapy in particular for perpetrators of sexual violence has not always been the case for DIY/punk communities. While the previously held “kill your rapist” mentality certainly represented an approach to accountability that was explicitly outside of the law, it was still very much rooted in retributive accountability measures. Thus, calling-out is not an inherently non-retributive approach to justice, as it can be accompanied by calls to hold an abuser accountable, through mediation or therapy, but it can also be accompanied by calls for figurative or physical violence against the abuser.

As discussed previously in excerpt 4 on sexual violence within the Grand Rapids DIY/punk scene, some individuals within DIY/punk communities have also expressed concern with the practice of calling-out, expressing “confusion and sympathy for both parties, feeling remorse for the victim but also understanding that the abuser may very well no longer have any future in the local scene or even broader music community” (Oberski, 2017). In noting how the practice has caused “turmoil” not just in the Grand Rapids DIY/punk community but in communities across the country, Oberski provides a nuanced take on the practice of calling-out, and the implications the practice has for individuals who have been “called-out” as “abusers.” In a zine published by the organization CrimethInc (n.d.), a similar sentiment is expressed:

A major source of controversy has been the pre-emptive banning of individuals who’ve been called out for sexual assault or abuse from anarchist gatherings. In recent years, survivors and their supporters have increasingly requested for particular individuals who have sexually assaulted others to be banned from upcoming events. Organizers have
struggled to prioritize believing survivors without pre-emptively condemning people, and
to balance transparency against privacy and avoiding retraumatization (p. 12).

The profound, negative, impact the act of calling-out has had for those on the receiving end of a
call-out, when little to no accountability is required for the individual doing the call-out, creates a
potentially antagonizing situation for some individuals in the community, especially when the
division between abuser and victim is so deeply entrenched in problematic and outdated notions
of gender and sexuality. While remaining sensitive to the needs of victims in these situations as
well as acknowledging a larger, societal (not-so-distant) history of silencing and invalidating
victims of sexual violence when they have publicly come forward with their stories of assault,
DIY/punk communities across the board need to better formulate the accountability process
required for an abuser if they want this practice to remain viable within and across these
communities. Kelly (2011), in describing the community accountability process for an anarcho-
punk scene in Philadelphia following a series of sexual assaults, explains how “[transformative
justice] offered a conceptual apparatus that directly linked our sexual assault work with the
various political projects and leanings in our lives, from economic justice to radical mental
health, and, most substantially, prison abolition” (p. 49). Because there is not a “one-size-fits-
all” approach to community accountability, different communities will report different accounts
of the way community accountability looked like for them. For Kelly (2011), this looked like a
community collective formed in response to the issue of sexual violence in their community.
This collective worked on education initiatives in the community aimed at prevention and
awareness of both “micro” (more interpersonal instances of sexual violence) and larger,
systematic issues of oppression and violence that exist in society at large and permeate into their
community. Additionally, they provide a guide to a five “phase” process as follows: assessing
the situation based on the needs of the victim and initiating contact with the perpetrator of
harm, designing a process based on the specific needs of that situation, attempting to create a balanced and grounded environment for the perpetrator, determining the tools needed to help the perpetrator’s recovery as they account for their actions/behavior (storytelling, writing, role-playing, etc.), and lastly, the complicated act of closing the process when deemed appropriate and the need(s) of the victim are met.

Community accountability is a complicated process and requires a lot out of vulnerability from the victim, the perpetrator, and the community as a whole. It does not always provide clear answers surrounding “guilt” and “innocence” of the individuals involved in the familiar ways of our criminal justice system. Instead, community accountability focuses on preventing, addressing, and removing harm from communities in all of its insidious forms, as well as promoting trust, healing, and growth. Though not a perfect system, and limited by the lack of time and resources the individuals employing community accountability have to deal with violence in their communities, this account points to the complex nature of community accountability, and even more so points to the transformative possibilities of community accountability for DIY/punk communities when dealing with instances of sexual violence and harm within their communities and outside of the legal system.

---

11 Kelly (2011) importantly notes, sometimes a perpetrator of harm will proactively initiate contact with the collective in order to set up an accountability process for themselves.
CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSION

Through the ethnography of communication and cultural discourse analysis, I explicated and reflected on the practice of calling-out, as it operates within DIY/punk communities, through increasingly online, mediated settings. Though complex, this practice is very much patterned and reflective of DIY/punk ways of acting, as well as DIY/punk ways of being, relating, feeling, and dwelling. In these communities, it is important to call-out abusers, to call-out “shitty dudes,” and other problematic behavior, but it’s also important to actively believe and support the victim, who is often, though not necessarily, the person doing the call-out. Call-outs are warranted when one becomes aware of a rapist in the community, but unless on the receiving end of the harm, consent from the victim is necessary before one can engage in the call-out. Call-outs are typically relegated for instances of sexual violence specifically, but the question of emotional abuse as a legitimate cause of a call-out is ambiguous at best. Within the call-out, the victim or accuser will call on the community to commit to holding the abuser accountable, with accountability increasingly looking like mediation and therapy, opposed to a more outdated “kill your rapist” mentality. These complexities, and at times outright contradictions, complicate an already perplexing practice.

How individuals in DIY/punk communities talk about and do the practice of calling-out can tell one a lot about deeply held cultural beliefs within these communities. The significance of this practice comes not from it simply happening within these communities, but from the frequency and depth with which calling-out is being talked about among the individuals within DIY/punk communities. Through the analysis of calling-out as well as talk about calling-out, we are able to make sense of deeply held cultural beliefs around accountability as well as sexual
violence within these communities. The practice of calling-out is first and foremost in line with a DIY/punk ethos, and thus one can index a DIY/punk identity and morality by “calling-out” an “abuser” in a culturally appropriate way (a way that follows the SPEAKING framework). Through call-outs as well as talk about the call-outs, more implicit meanings also become apparent, about who can do and be harmed by sexual violence, as well as what accountability should look like within these communities.

While the ideas about sexuality and gender that are implicated in that (meta)discourses around calling-out uphold relatively mainstream, hegemonic discourses, the move to expand definitions of sexual violence beyond the strictly legal, as well as practice non-retributive accountability process, reflects these communities’ direct opposition to formal institutions like the legal system and dominant discourse as a whole. As Saville-Troike (2003) notes, “resistance and rebellion against establishment norms of interaction are often opaque…but they take their meaning from their opposition to the dominant discourse” (p. 273-74). Because DIY/punk communities’ ethos (direct action, anti-authoritarianism, self-publishing, etc.) are foundationally in opposition to mainstream, neoliberal logics, their resistance to dominant discourse through their own ways of speaking as well as acting comes with little surprise. Calling-out specifically functions as a counterdiscourse as it circulates through these radical, alternative communities, but also because it resists dominant ideologies around retributive justice and strictly legal definitions of sexual violence.

While this study has provided insight into relationships between speech community and online settings, gender/sexuality and sexual violence, as well as alternative accountability process and retributive justice, it has not come without its limitations. Acknowledgment of race and racial difference is notably absent throughout this analysis. While Bag (2012) and others
have described punks’ racially diverse origins, Moore (2004) notes how “punk scenes became even more exclusively white than they had been in the late 1970s” even with a political ideology that “espoused inclusion and opposition to racism and sexism” (p. 322). Moore notes how the whitening of DIY/punk communities came hand-in-hand with the conflation of punk subculture with skinhead neo-Nazism, though hardcore punk scenes often remained united “in opposition to skinheads and their overt racism” (p. 322). With this history in mind, the absence of race is still a severe limitation of this analysis on DIY/punk communities, and something I hope myself and other punk scholars can engage further in future analyses.

Future punk studies, particular related to the practice of calling-out, would also benefit from an explicit international focus. While the online data for my analysis was not exclusively specific to the United States, it was all data from English speakers. Research into a global DIY/punk speech community, if it exists, and the implications of such translocality at work would be an immense contribution to punk studies.

Having already been engaged in the practice of calling-out abusers long before Harvey Weinstein’s name circulated media outlets for weeks at a time and the #MeToo movement transformed mainstream discourses around sexual violence, DIY/punk communities have been engaging in the practice of publicly addressing perpetrators of harm in their communities for decades. With ideological roots invested in dealing with community conflict outside of the law, DIY/punk communities offer a unique site of study for future research in radical accountability practices that function independent of the criminal justice system. When so much day-to-day conversation happens through online, mediated forms of communication, the likelihood that these online, mediated (meta)discourses of DIY/punk communities might have an impact on
more mainstream conversations as well as traditional justice measures as a whole becomes a very real possibility.
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Hello all –

I am seeking participation in a study for my Master’s thesis. My project aims to understand the ways members of DIY/punk communities do and talk about the practice of “calling-out” in online settings. I am seeking participants for interviews, either in person or over the phone. I am looking for individuals who meet the following criteria for these interviews: identifies as part of a DIY/punk community, over the age of eighteen years, considers themselves to engage in online discourses around and about DIY/punk communities, and has witnessed or engaged in the practice of calling-out in an online setting.

If you are interested in being a part of this study, would like more information, or know someone who might be interested in partaking in this study, please reach out and let me know!
APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Introduction
I am conducting this interview to better understand the practice of “calling-out” as it happens in online settings around and about DIY/punk communities. I am conducting this research for my master’s thesis at the University of Colorado Boulder. I am interviewing members of DIY/punk communities who engage in online discourses and are familiar with the practice of “calling-out” as it happens in online settings. The questions I would like to ask you today relate to the topics of DIY/punk communities and the practice of “calling-out”. Everything you tell me will only be used for this research project, and will not be shared with anyone. Also, you and any person or group you might mention will be given a pseudonym to ensure that no one can identify you with any answers that you give today. You have already consented to the interview with the consent form. Do you have any questions before we begin?

Background Information
No. of interview:
Pseudonym:
Age:
Geographic area:
Gender identity:
Pronouns:
Ethnicity:

Opening questions
Can you remember a time when you saw someone being called out? What happened?

Questions about participants involved in a “call-out”
Generally speaking, when is a call-out needed?

Generally speaking, who participates in calling someone out?
- Probe: Who is able to call someone out? (i.e. does it have to be the victim?) Who is not able to call someone out?
- Probe: Beyond the act of calling-out itself, are there other ways people can participate in a call-out? What might that look like?
- Probe: Do you think it is important for you (and others) to engage in the practice of calling-out? If so, why?

How can you identify an abuser? A victim?

Questions about calling-out online
Have you ever witnessed or engaged in a “call-out” online? How would you describe that event?
- Probe: Who was called-out?
- Probe: Who did the calling-out?
- Probe: How did people react or respond to that/these instance(s) of calling-out?

Do you feel like calling-out differed online vs in person?
- Probe: Was the way it played out different?
- Probe: Were the reactions or responses to it different?

Do you feel that appropriate action(s) were taken towards the individual, group, or entity that was called-out?
- Probe: If not, what would have made it more appropriate?

**Questions about online calling-out and community**

When you see someone being called-out online, how do you feel?

When someone is called-out online, how do you think others who see this (not the one who are calling-out/being called-out, just other social media users) feel?

Do you experience a sense of relationship to others when you see others being called out?
- Probe: How would you describe that relationship?
- Probe: Do you think this is the type of relationship others experience as well, or is this unique to you?

**The uniqueness of calling-out in the DIY/punk community**

Do you feel there is any relationship between recent conversations around sexual violence, #MeToo, and the practice of calling-out within DIY/punk communities? If so, how would you articulate that relationship?

Do you think there is a certain or specific DIY/punk “ethos”? If so, do you think those ethos influence how DIY/punk communities engage (or not) with the practice of calling-out?

Do you think the practice of calling-out can (or should) serve as an alternative to formal legal intervention/procedures in instances of sexual violence? Why?

**Closing questions**

Where or how do you see the future of calling-out, in its relationship to DIY/punk communities and beyond?

How would you describe a society without the need to call anyone out?