
Authentic Identities Straightedge Subculture, Music, and the Internet

J. Patrick Williams

University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia

In this article, the author examines the relative roles of music and the internet for self-identifying members of the straightedge youth subculture. For nearly 30 years, subcultures have been conceptualized primarily in terms of music and style. Participation has therefore typically been characterized by the consumption of specific types of music and clothing and participation in local, face-to-face music scenes. However, with the recent growth of information and communication technologies like the internet, opportunities have emerged that enable individuals to participate in subcultures in which they otherwise might not participate. The author shows that a new type of subculturalist is emerging—one whose subcultural participation is limited to the internet. Using the concepts of authenticity and scene, the author explores how participants in a straightedge internet forum negotiate their affiliations with the subculture and how some members attempt to halt others' claims to a straightedge identity. The study suggests that the internet is emerging as a new, but highly contested, subcultural scene.

Keywords: *subculture; identity; internet; authenticity; straightedge; scene*

Since the publication of Dick Hebdige's (1979) highly influential book, *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*, youth culture researchers have used the subculture concept primarily to study music- and style-based cultural phenomena. Participation in youth subcultures has therefore typically been characterized by the consumption of specific types of music and clothing and participation in local, face-to-face music scenes. What has emerged over the past 25 years of research utilizing the subculture concept is a tacit assumption that music is *the* nexus of subcultural phenomena. I offer a corrective to

Author's Note: The author thanks the regular participants of the Georgia Workshop on Culture, Power and History; the anonymous reviewers at *JCE*; and the members of the 2005 Young People and New Technologies conference in Northampton, United Kingdom, for their helpful feedback on an earlier draft of this article.

this trajectory in subculture studies by exploring the emerging importance of the internet in subcultural experience and participation.

Prior research has produced crucial and useful understandings of the links among music, culture, and identity (e.g., Bennett 2000; Frith 1996; Hodgkinson 2002; Peterson 1997; Thornton 1995). According to Simon Frith (1996), music is an essential component of many contemporary youth cultures. Frith is not interested in understanding “how a particular piece of music or a performance reflects the people, but how it produces them, how it creates an experience . . . that we can only make sense of by *taking on* both a subjective and a collective identity” (Frith 1996, 109). Similarly, Thomas Cushman (1995, 91) sees music as “not simply a static cultural object which [is] produced and consumed, but an active code of resistance and a template which [is] used for the formation of new forms of individual and collective identity.” Implicit in this line of research are two points. First, there is a dialectic relationship between music and identity, wherein music is seen as consequential in the creation of subcultures as well as a consequence of them. Second, through the musical experience—both making and listening to music—individuals are able to locate themselves in specific subcultural formations. There are several recent examples of this first point, which look at how individuals utilize music to construct collective identities and ritualize identity processes, such as Thornton’s (1995) work on club culture and Hodgkinson’s (2002) study of goths. The second point, that through the music experience we become a part of something larger than ourselves, requires that we conceptualize something beyond music, its producers, or its consumers. This something has traditionally been “subculture.”

Between the late 1970s and the late 1990s, “subculture” was the predominant sociological concept used to characterize the relationship among music, culture, and identity. This was especially true in the United Kingdom, where subculture studies has remained an active theoretical and empirical subdiscipline of sociology and cultural studies. Led originally by the University of Birmingham’s (U.K.) Center for Contemporary Cultural Studies, a host of researchers studied “resistant” youth subcultures (see, e.g., Hall and Jefferson 1976). Since the early 1980s, however, there has been increasing critical pressure on the subculture concept as theorists attempted to move beyond the conceptual problems tied to the Center for Contemporary Cultural Studies tradition of subculture studies (see, e.g., Bennett 1999; Cohen 2002; Gelder and Thornton 1997; Muggleton 2000; Widdicombe and Wooffitt 1995). Culture researchers have recently turned their collective attention to alternative concepts such as “neo-tribe” (Bennett 1999) and more often “scene” (e.g., Kahn-Harris 2004; Peterson and Bennett 2004; Straw 1991, 2001) as useful alternatives to subculture. These recent conceptual developments not only

reflect the desire among youth culture theorists to understand the complexities of youth cultural experiences but also represent the myriad ways in which youth themselves make sense of their subcultural participation.

However important music might be for the study of youth subcultures, there are changes occurring in contemporary societies that require we reassess music's central status in facilitating subcultural participation and identification. Through a multiyear ethnography in an internet forum dedicated to the straightedge youth subculture, I have explored various ways in which youth online affiliate with subcultures. What I have found challenges the thesis that youth cultural phenomena—whether subcultures or scenes—rotate on a primary axis of music production and consumption. In particular, I study the interaction that occurs among self-identifying members of the straightedge youth subculture in an internet forum. A rift between two different types of straightedge participants has emerged as more people outside of traditional straightedge music scenes learn about straightedge on the internet and begin interacting within online subcultural spaces.¹

In this article, I focus specifically on claims for “authentic” straightedge identity that participants made online. I then relate such claims to the larger issue of the symbolic meanings participants attach to music and the internet, respectively. The central issue I address revolves around the fact that there were at least two types of straightedgers present in the internet forum: those who used the forum as a *supplement* to participation in a face-to-face music scene and those whose internet use was a *primary* or *sole* source of subcultural participation. By unpacking the debate among forum participants over the authenticity of various participants and the symbolic value attached to music and the internet, I highlight how the internet functions as a new social space for subcultural identification and change.

The Straightedge Subculture Offline and Online

Straightedge emerged in the United States in the early 1980s from within the music-driven punk subculture as a sort of subcultural reaction to the uncritical and apathetic attitudes and behaviors of many mainstream American youth as well as to the emphasis placed on alcohol consumption by adult culture. Straightedgers, especially in the early to mid-1980s, subscribed to a punk ideology of resistance to mainstream cultural values and norms, which they articulated most often through music (Wood 1999). Two songs released in 1981 by Washington, D.C., band Minor Threat are especially noteworthy in the creation of straightedge. In the first song, titled “Straight Edge,” lyricist Ian MacKaye wrote about how he differed from other youth in his dis-

dain for recreational drug use (alcohol, cigarettes) and promiscuous sexual activity. In another song by Minor Threat, titled "Out of Step," MacKaye claimed, "I don't smoke, I don't drink, I don't fuck, at least I can fucking think! I can't keep up, can't keep up, can't keep up! Out of step with the world." These lyrics were almost immediately appropriated by many punks as a set of subcultural norms or "rules."

The band's new "rules" of resistance were not exceptional among punk bands as Minor Threat existed within a larger North American network of "positive youth" punk bands. However, the term "straightedge" seemed to strike a chord with some punks around the United States, and within a year of its release, youth around the country had begun claiming to *be* straightedge. Unlike many youth subcultural identities, which are grounded in sets of shared practices, the straightedge identity is based on a combination of shared practices and "not doings" (Mullaney 2001). On the one hand, straightedgers gather in local idiocultural scenes, producing and consuming straightedge music and contributing to an international D.I.Y. punk ethic (Haenfler 2004a; Mattson 2001). Such communal interaction is crucial in the construction of a straightedge social identity. At the same time, straightedgers develop personal identities grounded in an ascetic lifestyle of *not* doing drugs and *not* engaging in promiscuous sex.

Since the late 1990s, the straightedge subculture has been diffused around the globe through the internet. This diffusion has taken many forms. Individual straightedgers have posted information about the subculture, such as song lyrics and band biographies on personal and official band web sites. They have started internet listservs and developed FAQs. They have traded straightedge music via peer-to-peer networks, and they have started interactive forums that thousands of people have joined. As a result of this subcultural diffusion, individuals have discovered straightedge in a dislocated form, fractured from its musical roots. Many of these people learn about straightedge online and decide to claim a personal straightedge identity. Many of them subsequently join face-to-face straightedge scenes and develop a social straightedge identity, but many others do not. Those who join face-to-face scenes come to agree that music is a tie that binds, and participation in a face-to-face scene is an essential component of *being* straightedge. Many of these straightedgers argue that the diffusion of straightedge through the internet is leading to a "defusion" of the subculture, a stripping away of its resistant and countercultural heritage as "drug-free kids" appropriate the straightedge label. This perspective is resisted by many of these so-called drug free kids who identify as straightedge and who rely on the internet as their sole subcultural resource and means of subcultural interaction. At stake are young people's subcultural identities and their social-

psychological functions (e.g., self-esteem, self-efficacy), as well as membership in an extensive, global subcultural network.

Social and Personal Dimensions of the Authentic Self

Developing a symbolic interactionist conception of authentic identity helps us understand how straightedgers affiliate with the subculture as they write about the relative importance of music and the internet in their subcultural lives. In exploring how straightedgers write about music, the internet, and subcultural authenticity online, I want to emphasize the socially constructed nature of authenticity as well as its social-psychological functions in terms of social and personal identity. Many researchers assume the objectivity of authenticity, assigning labels such as “insider” and “outsider” or describing logics of subcultural capital as if they were essential qualities of people’s selves (see, e.g., Fox 1987). This is problematic because it concretizes “dominant” definitions that may arise through interaction among members of subcultural networks or from outside actors (e.g., the mass media) without adequately addressing the sociological implications of authenticity discourses. Authentic characteristics do “not inhere in the object, person or performance said to be authentic. Rather, authenticity is a claim made by or for someone, thing or performance and either accepted or rejected by relevant others” (Peterson 2005, 1086). What have been traditionally ignored in subculture research are the voices of marginal actors that exist on the peripheries of the subculture under investigation.²

In everyday life, subcultural youth often talk about themselves in essentialist terms. For example, they regularly claim to *be* real while charging others with simply *doing* subcultural things, such as dressing, speaking, or acting in certain ways in order to be cool or fit in (Widdicombe and Wooffitt 1990; Williams 2006). This is *social* identification: “[S]ocial identity . . . goes beyond any particular [context], for it places the individual as a member of a social category that differs from other categories. Membership in [a] category accompanies the person even when he or she is not [interacting with other subculturalists]—hence, the social identity of [e.g., a straightedger] is larger in scope and longer in duration than the particular situated activities on which it is based” (Hewitt 2003, 107). Of course, it is only in interaction that we can observe the articulation of a social self. Successful identification rests upon expressing a similarity of self to one’s peers as well as distinction from members of mainstream society. Subcultural participants may, for example, construct narratives that emphasize their allegiance to a group ethos or to subcultural values and norms (Williams and Copes 2005; Copes and Wil-

liams forthcoming). Such narratives build in-group cohesion and highlight how subculture differs from mainstream culture. The resulting subcultural boundaries situate some people on the “inside” and others on the “outside.” Such identifications are an affective as well as a cognitive experience, invoking positive feelings and emotions as people identify as members of a group. Because straightedgers identify themselves in contrast to mainstream culture, many of them construct rigid subcultural boundaries to control who successfully claims a straightedge identity. In short, the social dimension of authenticity refers to how individuals claim insider status in a social category.

At the same time, however, authenticity “is partly dependent on warranting claims not to have been influenced by others, subject to peer pressure and conformity” (Widdicombe and Wooffitt 1995, 212). The personal dimension of authenticity therefore represents “the valorization of individualism and the demonization of conformity” (McLeod 1999, 14). From this perspective, the authentic self is one that commits to a personal life project and is not controlled by outside influence. Subculturalists may identify in terms of a life-long commitment to a subcultural lifestyle, for example, even if that lifestyle commitment precedes or follows subcultural affiliation. Williams (2003) and Wood (2003), for example, independently found that some straightedgers talked about *being* straightedge even before they learned about the subculture; straightedge was something inside of themselves that they discovered. Similarly, Mullaney (2001) found that discourses of virginity were grounded in personal narratives of resistance to temptation, and McLeod (1999) explored how members of hip-hop subculture constructed authentic personal identities vis-à-vis sellouts and tagalongs. In short, the personal dimension of authenticity refers to how individuals articulate a personal commitment to a subcultural value structure or lifestyle.

Community and Identity Online

The expression of authentic selves occurs in the face-to-face world as well as online. I investigated a computer-mediated social space, one in which subcultural participants came and went over weeks, months, and years. Participants gathered from around the globe—from the United States and Canada, the United Kingdom and Europe, to Australia and New Zealand—to discuss their everyday lives within the frame of the straightedge subculture. As individuals interact in internet-based cultural sites, they construct and affirm meaningful collective identities based on norms and beliefs that are personally important and that are supported by others (see Rheingold 2000; Kollock and Smith 1999).

Experiences in cyberspace remain philosophical for many. As one cyber-theorist wrote, “[t]he final point of a virtual world is to dissolve the constraints of the anchored world so that we can lift anchor—not to drift aimlessly without point, but to explore anchorage in ever new places” (Heim 1993, 137). I interpret Heim as suggesting not only that the internet offers new social spaces where identity can be (re)negotiated but that a significant reason many go online is to experience new forms of social life. Indeed, research has shown that many internet users are not withdrawing from social interaction (Nie 2001), but are actively seeking it (Rheingold 2000; Wellman et al. 2001). Bromberg (1996) agrees when she writes that cyberspace is “a medium in which and with which some individuals seek meaning” (p. 147). Virtual spaces thus become analogous to virtual conduits, connecting individuals from diverse locations and facilitating the growth of meaningful communities and identities.

Researchers have for some time studied how internet users express aspects of self in computer-mediated contexts. Turkle (1995), for example, studied how individuals develop, through online personae, new understandings of their personal identities. Viewing cyberspace as sites of psychological moratoria, Turkle described cyberspaces as social spaces where individuals can try out different roles, identities, and ways of acting. Most people are concerned with how others perceive them, as Goffman (1959, 1963) so thoroughly demonstrated in his studies of the presentation of self. Of course, people are not necessarily concerned with what everybody thinks about them, but rather with the reflected appraisals of significant others (Shibutani 1955). This concern exists in both face-to-face situations and computer-mediated contexts. The anonymous qualities of the internet may empower many people to play with how they present themselves online, yet many studies suggest that users are interested in building and expressing stable, continuous selves grounded in meaningful interaction with significant others (Baym 1995; Bromberg 1996; Coate 1997; Schlee 1996).

More recently, researchers have begun to study the relationship between the internet and subcultures. Williams (2003, 67) explored how straightedgers strategically created usernames and signature files to use as “subcultural identifier[s] online that marked participants as in-group members,” while Hodkinson (2004) found that the internet played a key role in facilitating the construction of a translocal British identity among members of the goth subculture. In their comparison of rave and straightedge subcultures online, Wilson and Atkinson (2005) argued that straightedgers tended to use the internet “in more countercultural ways than the more apolitical and incorporated raver/clubber subculturalists” and that straightedgers were concerned with the expression of “true” subcultural identity in online as well as

offline contexts. Lastly, Williams and Copes (2005) studied the variety of participants on a straightedge internet site and how subcultural boundaries were constructed to distinguish “real” straightedgers from “sellouts.” With the exception of the last study, most recent research on subcultural internet usage has not adequately explored the diversity of voices within subcultural sites. Instead, online identities are often represented by researchers as mirrors or extensions of subculturalists’ offline identities. Thus, it is time to give more attention to the conflicts that are emerging between types of subcultural internet users—those whose use supplements their offline lives and those whose use substitutes for offline, face-to-face participation in subcultural scenes.

Research Site and Method

The internet forum I studied was dedicated to the straightedge subculture. This forum fit previous definitions of an online community as it had its own “norms, its rules (netiquette), its own emotional vocabulary—guidelines for posting, acceptable subjects, regular users, leaders, oldtimers, and a constant circulation of newcomers” (Denzin 1998, 99-100). The web site utilized an asynchronous bulletin board service, wherein individuals posted messages in forums that anyone with an internet connection and a web browser could access. Participants could interact with one another by clicking on “threads” in each forum. Once they chose a thread, participants could read statements or questions posted by other participants and add their own voice to the conversation if they wanted by posting a message of their own. These posts were cultural artifacts and are amenable to empirical content analysis. Symbolic interactionists have already begun to study these online interactions (Denzin 1998; Kendall 1998; Waskul 2003), describing them as “cybernarratives . . . moments when an utterance intersects with another utterance, giving rise to an instance of the system of action” (Denzin 1999, 110).

I approached the internet forum from an ethnographic standpoint. My initial interest was in answering the question “What is going on here?” However, after only a day or two casually reading posts, I realized that the internet functioned as a key source of conflict among various participants in the forum. At that moment, my focus became more analytic (Snow, Morrill, and Anderson 2003) as my interest in exploring the role that the internet played in subcultural interaction and identification developed. I collected data using two methodological strategies that Bainbridge (2000, 57) calls “observation ethnography” and “informant ethnography.” The former was an unobtrusive research role in which I conducted content analysis of forum threads without focused interaction with participants. During the observation ethnographic

phase, I analyzed the first message of every thread posted in the forum between February 2001 and September 2001 ($n = 285$) using interpretive and ethnographic content analysis methods (Altheide 1996) and the QSR NVivo software package.

It was during my analysis of these early posts that I noticed that straight-edgers were arguing among themselves about who was and was not “really” straightedge. Therefore, using individual posts as the unit of analysis, I began coding posts using a grounded theory method (Charmaz 2000). Informed by an initial set of topical codes, I began to develop coding schema to categorize my initial understandings of what was theoretically and empirically significant.

My second strategy, informant ethnography, was more interactive. Here, I used the themes that emerged during my initial coding phase (for example, patterns of affiliation, authenticity claims, and mechanisms of boundary maintenance) to start “focused discussions”—new thread topics for the participants to respond to. I started threads that asked participants about their affiliation with straightedge, their understandings of subcultural rules, their opinions about mainstream culture, and so on. By monitoring the threads daily, I could guide conversations, bring them back on track when participants strayed off topic, and ask follow-up questions based on initial responses. The focused discussions I developed over two years—from 2001 to 2003—resulted in nearly 1,000 posts, which I analyzed in the same way as previous, nonsolicited posts, that is, further developing my coding schema through constant comparison of forum data. In addition, I continued to monitor other threads in the forum. My analysis below includes data from my focused discussions and from several other threads that were relevant to my research interests.

During the informant ethnographic phase, I also interviewed nine key informants in order to gain clarification on the meaning of subcultural forms and activities. I selected key informants according to their level of participation (measured by total number of posts), the extent to which I noticed their participation in specific threads, or the opinions they expressed. I interviewed the web site’s owner/administrator, individuals who posted regularly over a long period, as well as some people who posted frequently for a short time before quitting. I made sure to include participants who identified themselves as members of face-to-face music straightedge scenes and members who identified themselves as being totally reliant on the internet for straightedge-related interactions. Interviews lasted between 90 and 180 minutes, and all took place online using either an instant-messaging or internet-relay-chat program, both of which are popular among young internet users. I developed the interview schedule from the themes that emerged from earlier

analysis but left it semistructured so that I could develop and change questions as the research progressed and new areas of interest emerged.

Research online requires certain precautions (Sveningsson 2004), but it also facilitates certain ethical procedures. Early in the informant ethnographic stage, I posted a message in the forums stating that I was a researcher who was analyzing the textual conversations in which people engaged. In order to ensure that participants understood what the research project was about, I typed a description of my research plan, and the web site's owner/administrator pinned it as a message at the top of the forum's main page. I made clear that I would change the usernames of all participants and not disclose the web site's address to help protect users' online identities. I never learned any demographic details about most of the participants online; thus, they remain anonymous. However, I did learn the sex of many participants, which is visible in the findings sections when I use gendered pronouns to refer to specific individuals. For those I interviewed and about whom I collected basic demographic data, I promised to protect their online and offline identities. I invited participants who wanted to know more about the research project or who did not want to be involved to contact me to discuss any problems or fears they might have or to opt out of being included in the research. Participants viewed my information post more than 400 times, and only one participant sent a message asking that her/his posts not be included in the research.

Throughout the research project, several significant codes emerged, including *affiliation* (how individuals affiliated with the subculture), *authenticity* (instances where "real" or "fake" straightedge identity was discussed), *rules* (the normative structure of the subculture), and *boundaries* (the cleavages and distinctions between the so-called mainstream and the subculture). In the remainder of this article, I focus in particular on the first two codes—affiliation and authenticity—and how they function together to illuminate the internet's role in subcultural change.

Authenticity Claims and the Importance of the Scene

With few exceptions, the discussions I observed in my research focused on the practice and experience of straightedge subculture and identity. Participants in the forum seemed generally invested in expressing a social self that was in line with their own personal sense of self. In other words, participants strived to present a straightedge self comprised of congruous social and personal identities. The internet forum provided a meaningful subcultural space within which participants could do discursive identity work. This identity

work tended to ground itself in the articulation of either a self that resisted mainstream culture or a self that was locatable within the straightedge community (offline or online). However, social and personal identities expressed in the forum were not necessarily accepted by other forum participants. On the contrary, I observed a significant amount of debate and contestation over what it meant to *be* straightedge.

The debates, disagreements, and verbal fistfights online reflect the fluid and contextual characteristics of subcultural identity. While different participants took different positions on the matter of subcultural authenticity, I distilled them into a continuum with two poles. At one pole were those forum participants who utilized the internet forum as a supplement to their participation in face-to-face straightedge music scenes. I refer to these participants as *music-straightedgers* because they tended to support the idea that only participants of a face-to-face straightedge music scene could claim a straightedge identity. At the other pole were those users for whom the internet was a primary or exclusive subcultural resource and medium for subcultural participation. I refer to these individuals as *net-straightedgers*. Users in this analytic category tended to express the belief that anyone who lived a straightedge lifestyle—following straightedge “rules” against drug uses and promiscuous sex—could be straightedge. All along the continuum, participants were concerned with expressing authentic straightedge identities.³

There were several threads in the forums that clearly contextualized the debate surrounding authenticity. One thread in particular clearly represents the heterogeneous perspectives of participants. Below, I have extracted posts from several participants to highlight some of these perspectives:

Confederate: Does punk rock, hardcore or whatever it is called nowadays still have a role in the straightedge movement? I guess what I’m asking is, can you separate the music from the scene or are they intertwined? I think the music and the “punk rock” culture is what makes straightedge unique so the two cannot and should not be separated.

XzeroX: I too believe that straightedge and hardcore/punk should forever be intertwined. I wouldn’t, however, tell someone that they can’t be sXe unless they listen to punk. This will be a touchy subject, so heads up.⁴

Amalek: I don’t believe so at all. Music may have ‘spawned’ straightedge, but I believe straightedge is fully independant from any musical ‘scene’. besides, I don’t listen to punk rock.

XantagX: Straightedge can’t be independent of the music. It’s a subculture centered around a style of music. You take away the music, you take away the subculture, and all you have left is a bunch of drug free kids.

Amalek: So you’re saying I’m not straightedge? I find that extremely funny, because that’s bullshit. I don’t listen to hardcore, and I’m straightedge.

In the opening post, Confederate stated his belief that music was a fundamental aspect of straightedge culture and asked others for their opinions. Some participants such as XantagX supported Confederate and stated explicitly that straightedge derived from the punk and hardcore music subcultures. Amalek and others who did not identify as straightedge music scene members typically disagreed, claiming a straightedge identity while disavowing any connection with a music scene. Still other participants, such as XzeroX, stated that the issue was more complicated than a simple “agree” or “disagree” answer. The heat of the debate can be understood by what was at stake—the perceived authenticity of participants’ straightedge identities. Authenticity claims link directly to the larger issue of music’s, versus the internet’s, role in the straightedge subculture. Some music-straightedgers sought to establish a rigid subcultural boundary online, while other participants argued in favor of a broader definition of straightedge that included anyone who lived the straightedge lifestyle.

Sociologists have previously studied how members of music scenes construct identities that separate themselves from the mainstream. In one classic example, Becker (1997) studied how jazz musicians constructed an essentialist understanding of their own subcultural authenticity through the dichotomy of musician and “square.”

The term [square] refers to the kind of person who is the opposite of all the musician is, or should be. . . . The musician is conceived of as an artist who possesses a mysterious artistic gift setting him [*sic*] apart from all other people. . . . The square, on the other hand, lacks this special gift and any understanding of the music or the way of life of those who possess it. The square is thought of as an ignorant . . . person. . . . “Squareness” is felt to penetrate every aspect of the square’s behavior just as its opposite, “hipness,” is evident in everything the musician does. (Becker 1997, 57, 59, 60)

Not only were jazz musicians’ identities constructed in contrast to the ignorance of the mainstream square, but the jazz musician’s scene served as a form of informal, collective resistance to mainstream life. Recently, researchers have further explored the relationships between scenes and resistance (e.g., Haenfler 2004b; Lowe 2004; Schilt 2003). Some resistance work within scenes is collective, while other is individualized; some resistance is overt, while other is covert. Regardless of how resistance is articulated, however, it is a key aspect of subcultural authenticity.

For music-straightedgers, the face-to-face music scene represented the embodiment of collective resistance. Early on in my research, I realized that “the scene” was an important resource for articulating resistance because a significant amount of everyday interaction online was about local scenes.

The scene was not only a site of resistance but also the source of a resistance-based straightedge identity. For example, in another post from the above focused discussion, a participant authoritatively stated that “without the scene, without the music, there is straight but no edge.” In response, Amalek asked, “Where do you get the idea that if you don’t listen to a certain style of music you’re not edge? Or if you don’t ‘go to shows’ or aren’t ‘in the scene’ you’re not edge? Straightedge is a commitment till death of being drug free. [It] is a bond.” Participants framed their authenticity as subculturalists in terms of resistance to the mainstream. In the first post, being straightedge was different than simply being straight; participating in the scene made one uniquely straightedge, while not participating in the scene made one “straight,” a term not too distant today from Becker’s “square.” In the second post, Amalek constructed straightedge as an individual commitment “till death” against society’s accepted practices, rather than as a collective form of resistance.

Recently, Schilt (2003) argued that for various reasons many young people are unwilling or unable to express overt forms of resistance to the mainstream for fear of punishment from significant others (e.g., parents, peers). Instead, they become attracted to less overt forms of resistance, or what Schilt calls “c/overt resistance.” In her study of young women who use homemade zines as a mediated space for resistant-identity work, c/overt resistance involved sharing personal stories with significant (though anonymous) others. In the second post above, Amalek likened participation in the straightedge forum to a type of c/overt resistance. The forum gave him space to articulate a personal “commitment till death” to resist mainstream culture while not necessarily affecting his presentation of self offline. Such mediated forms of interaction allow young people “to overtly express their anger, confusion, and frustration publicly to like-minded peers but still remain covert and anonymous to authority figures” (Schilt 2003, 81). Such individuals thus use mediated and anonymous contexts to express authentic identities. However, unlike the zine makers in Schilt’s research and rather more like the jazz musicians in Becker’s research, most music-straightedgers viewed participation in face-to-face music scenes as an essential component of an authentic straightedge identity.

Mapping a Geography of “the Scene”

Music-straightedgers repeatedly wrote about the scene as a necessary element in constructing a straightedge identity, while net-straightedgers regularly contested such claims. Because of this conflict, we need to understand

how straightedgers in the forum constructed the concept of “scene” and what currency it had within the subculture.

Subcultural theorists and subculturalists alike use the term *scene* “to signify some kind of . . . located and subcultural space” (Bennett and Kahn-Harris 2004, 13). According to Straw (1991, 379), scenes “actualize a particular state of relations between various populations and social groups, as these coalesce around specific coalitions of musical style.” People who regularly come together to consume music—in clubs, at parties, even through sharing purchased CDs—constitute a local scene. These scenes exist, in symbolic interactionist terms, as idiocultural manifestations of a larger subculture (Fine 1979). Current research conceptualizes multiple types of scenes, from local to translocal to virtual (Bennett and Peterson 2004). Each type functions as a “framework that encompasses . . . material specificities of [such things as] global place building [and] urban experience” (Marchessault and Straw 2001, 5). Additionally, all three types share common denominators: shared space, a shared sense of purpose, and a shared sense of identity.

For the music-straightedgers in the forum, the scene had to do with their relationship to the production, distribution, and consumption of straightedge music. Belonging to the scene involved listening to straightedge music and actively helping to keep the music scene alive. One participant explicitly stated that the scene was “more than just kids sitting around not doing drugs.” Only those who participated in local subcultural events such as concerts, straightedge parties, and so on represented the scene. The apparent reverence that music-straightedgers held for local scenes cannot be explained by some external locus of control. Rather, participants expressed the relationship in dialectic, even symbiotic terms. The scene depended on people who were willing to make sacrifices in everyday life to ensure its survival. At the same time, the scene helped ensure the survival—sometimes in a very real sense—of its members.

SubPush: My life revolves around supporting the scene because I know that I owe [it] my life. Without it I would be dead or alone with no self-confidence. It wasn't until I was exposed to the hardcore scene that I felt like I could stand up for myself and use my own voice. Because of the support of some older members of the scene I learned how to stand up for myself and I learned that I could have joy in my life and not be absolutely anti-social. I cannot say that I would still be alive today if I was not exposed to [the scene] as I constantly considered suicide during my early adolescence due to feelings of alienation, loneliness, and disillusionment. I felt like there was no one who I could relate to. I owe it to the scene to give back as much as I can because it has given me everything.

This music-straightedger emphasized the scene's embeddedness in the larger punk and hardcore cultures and claimed that it was senseless to think of straightedge any other way. More important, he created a vivid picture of the importance that the scene held for some of its members. The scene was symbolically constructed in sincere and reverent terms. Net-straightedgers were consequently constructed as outsiders who could not understand the "true" meaning of the scene.

In interviews, I specifically asked music-straightedgers to define the straightedge scene. Most definitions placed explicit emphasis on attending straightedge music shows and being part of an active face-to-face community.

XXXwah: Yeah going to shows would be the base [definition of the scene] I guess, but not just that. I think it's a lot in helping out to fuel that scene in any way you can, whether it be posting flyers, helping setup gear at a show, working the door, doing favors for bands etc. Being in a band is all good, too.

The scene had many aspects, foremost of which was music. Participants saw concerts as the nexus from which straightedgers constructed their subcultural selves. Playing in a band and working with/for straightedge bands were important activities. Another straightedge music fan, xHCgrrrlx, similarly pointed to music's importance when she described the scene as "a group of kids in a city that are all edge and go to edge shows and listen to edge bands." Yet another music-straightedger conceived of the scene in terms of whom he associated with.

xTxTx: Well I hang out with a lot of kids that share my anti-drug beliefs within the hardcore community. . . . [I]t's generally the same kids hanging out together almost every weekend and exchanging ideas. I'd say it is a scene, because it's at least somewhat based on the fact that we have mutual interests and goals.

Besides the cultural dimensions of the scene (e.g., the music), additional dimensions became apparent, including social (a *group* of kids, kids hanging out *together*), geographical (a group of kids in a *city*), as well as participatory (*going* to edge shows, *helping* out, *exchanging* ideas, *doing* favors, *listening* to music). These dimensions of the scene represented criteria for subcultural authenticity from a music-straightedge perspective.

In an interview, xTxTx went on to explain how forum members who did not belong to face-to-face straightedge scenes were "not really edge." When I asked other music-straightedgers about forum participants who self-identified as straightedge but did not participate in the hardcore music scene,

one replied, “a lot of those kids I think are becoming straight but not edge.” For xTxTx, they were “straight” because they did not use drugs, but he (and others) expressed a belief that net-straightedgers lacked the rebellious “edge” that characterized participants in the hardcore music scene. He did not challenge the positive choices these kids were making, but he was clear in his conviction that they were not authentic straightedgers.

In general, there was not much overt animosity expressed toward net-straightedgers, although personal attacks were not rare in the forums. Rather, music-straightedgers expressed their concerns about the dilution of straight-edge through what they saw as people bypassing essential(ized) criteria for authenticity. This perceived “defusion” was occurring because the internet facilitated the spread of subcultural information and knowledge to populations who did have that “essential” something that made straightedgers different.

Brantley: Most of the kids who are arguing to be accepted as Edge, won't be X'ing up, won't be representing Edge at shows, won't be known throughout the scene as straightedge. So who really cares? You wanna claim edge and not be a part of what it is? Who gives a fuck? Labels are just labels. And trying to argue what it is makes no sense. It is what it is. That's all. If it's not who you are, it doesn't make you any less of a person.

The scene “is what it is,” and the straightedge self appeared to be an all-or-nothing phenomenon. Many forum participants who also participated in a music scene wrote about the scene in similarly essentializing terms. They defined the scene as real, and as such it became real in its consequences (Thomas and Thomas 1928). Such naturalizing discourse left no room for negotiation. The straightedge self was reduced to a distinctly social authenticity—whether a person was “known throughout the scene.” One’s personal authenticity—her/his sense of commitment to the straightedge lifestyle—was not even considered.

In sum, music-straightedgers who participated in the forums conceived the scene as an essential component of the subculture and a straightedge identity. The scene symbolized the centrality of music and the close-knit, face-to-face tradition of straightedge subculture. Music-straightedgers expressed the belief that participation in the scene made them qualitatively different from people who did not participate in a scene. Thus, music-straightedgers constructed symbolic boundaries and worked to convince net-straightedgers to give up their claims to a straightedge identity. This did not always happen. As Peterson and Bennett (2004, 3) point out, there are almost always those “few at the core of the scene [who] may live that life entirely, but, in keeping with a

late-modern context in which identities are increasingly fluid and interchangeable, most participants regularly put on and take off the scene identity.” For many participants, the straightedge identity was not salient all the time, although it remained very central.⁵ Equally important is the idea that some participants had little or no access to scenes at all in the face-to-face world. Finally, we can look at xTxTx’s definition of scene above and ask, Is this not just what forum participants were doing online—hanging out with other kids who shared similar beliefs, similar experiences, and similar strategies for resisting mainstream culture? With this question in mind, I now turn to explore net-straightedgers’ challenges against the “dominant” music-straightedge perspective.

Disrupting Subcultural Boundaries

Despite the postmodernist assertion that people increasingly find themselves in a world where mediated realities have gained primacy over substantive ones (e.g., Baudrillard 1988), it was evident that many music-straightedgers were unwilling to accept the idea that a computer-mediated subcultural space was as valid as a face-to-face scene. Like jazz musicians (Becker 1997), rappers (McLeod 1999), gamers (Williams 2006), and other subculturalists, music-straightedgers “talked” about their subcultural selves in essentialist terms, creating boundaries between themselves and those who claimed a straightedge identity online, whom they considered poseurs or wannabes. Ironically, this was true despite the fact that *all* the straightedgers I studied were interacting in a computer-mediated context.

Authenticity, however, “is not an either/or experience” (Erickson 1995, 122). Like all symbols, authenticity is interpreted by individuals and mediated through interaction with significant others (Mead 1934). Thus, the meaning of the scene and the location of subcultural boundaries were open to interrogation. Forum participants who were not active in face-to-face straightedge scenes individually and collectively resisted or rejected the exclusive links between straightedge and the music scene and worked to disrupt the subcultural boundaries guarded by music-straightedgers.

Part of the problem for these young people was that they were active in a virtual straightedge community but not a face-to-face community. As outsiders to the music scene, they could not see the many positive things that straightedgers in the face-to-face world achieved (Haenfler 2004a). Instead, their understandings of the scene were limited to second-hand information from peers and/or reading the posts of music-straightedgers, which over time built up a “discursive environment . . . characterized by distinctive ways of

interpreting and representing everyday realities” (Gubrium and Holstein 2000, 103). As we have already seen, the discursive environment within which the music scene was contextualized online was often unwelcoming of net-straightedgers.

In contrast, net-straightedgers tended to focus on their affiliation with straightedge in terms of a personal commitment to a straightedge lifestyle. In fact, some net-straightedgers understood the subculture in such individualistic terms that they actually re-imagined the scene as a source of inauthenticity. One vocal net-straightedger, reacting to a music-straightedger’s post, put it this way during a focused discussion:

Nebula: You are blinded because you are doing what is “cool,” not what you want. You are expressing your views as being, “you can only be sXe if you are in the cool crowd.” Well I guess you’re cool and I’m not. But I am sXe because of what I want.

Nebula likened the scene to the “cool crowd.” By aligning membership in the music scene with being cool, net-straightedgers set themselves off as authentic subculturalists, first by rejecting the idea that straightedge was a popularity contest, and second by categorizing the scene as a homogeneous entity filled with people who missed the “real” reason for being straightedge. Other participants held similar opinions of music scenes.

Georg: I hate scenes . . . I hate scene drama. I hate that there is a hierarchy within the scene, almost like a caste system. I hate everything having to do with them. Scenesters are so wrapped up in the scene that they forget important things. The world is falling apart and somewhere there is a kid worried because the scene looks bad.

In short, rather than claim a social identity based on peers’ expectations, net-straightedgers emphasized personal straightedge identities grounded in a commitment to the straightedge lifestyle.⁶ Lifestyle “attributes the reflexivity which informs individual creativity to a desire on the part of individuals to take an active part in the making and remaking of their image and identity” (Bennett and Kahn-Harris 2004, 13). In other words, net-straightedgers believed that their personal actions, rather than their membership in a category, constituted their authenticity.

This criticism functioned to disrupt subcultural boundaries, opening them up for reevaluation. In addition to direct criticism of the scene, net-straightedgers emphasized their belief that straightedge was changing and that this

change was necessary for the subculture's survival. In some of my interviews with straightedgers, there emerged the idea that straightedge was a positive youth subculture that was limited by its association with punk/hardcore.

Nori: I think it would be a great thing if the [straight]edge movement could cut loose from the punk thing and become more inclusive to people like me, who aren't in it for the music.

Patrick: Do you think people in the forum would like that possibility?

Nori: Some people would love it. Me, for one. It's an open-minded thing. But you saw how people are fighting about whether ravers can say they're sXe. So some people would go up in flames about it. "It's punk only, blah blah blah."

Nori was an active forum participant for only a couple of months. During that time she became very aware of the divisions that existed among forum participants and told me during the interview how she quickly became disillusioned by the intraforum politics and infighting. Other participants voiced similar feelings in focused discussions and other threads.

Listen: Just looking at all the different threads floating around about the scene and how you need to be a part of it to be sXe and all that, I don't know if I want to be a part of this movement. It isn't fun or positive anymore, it's just a bunch of people arguing over what it is, and that's all I think it ever was now that I reflect back on it. Everyone thinks they know what sXe is, and everyone's take on it is a little bit different. I think it's lost its meaning in the process.

Like Nori, Listen and others expressed a belief that straightedge would remain limited and ineffective as a positive youth subculture if it remained tied to the hardcore music scene. More broadly, these participants were concerned with the idea that straightedge was being reduced to "just a bunch of people arguing over what it is." Arguments about what the scene was, as well as the (in)authenticity of various forum participants was, in her mind, destroying straightedge.

Net-straightedgers in the forum were concerned neither with the history of straightedge nor with the current state of affairs in the music scene. Rather, they were concerned with collectively sharing their emotional, embodied experiences that constituted a life-long commitment to a straightedge lifestyle and identity. The virtuality of the internet—an immediate conduit that connected these youth around the world—made the music scene less important or unimportant. What *was* important was sharing personal experiences online in which both personal and social identities were grounded (see also Addison and Comstock 1998; Denzin 1998; Shaw 1997).

The Internet as a Straightedge Scene

Regardless of their orientation toward straightedge music, many of the forum participants agreed that straightedge was about a scene, yet were not certain whether the scene was *only* about music. Some participants, who at one point argued against the authenticity of net-straightedgers, came to change their opinions over time and subsequently claimed in the forum that at some level the definition of *scene* was vague and open to multiple interpretations.

Confederate: What is important is participation in the punk/indie subculture. Participation includes listening to the music, interacting with others in the scene, going to shows, even popping up on the internet. Scene includes everything from listening to music, to going to shows to the internet.

In this and similar cases, forum users acknowledged that internet participation counted for something, though music preference appeared to remain a key criterion for inclusion. In another example, XdoitdoitX wrote that the internet functioned primarily as a source of information to individuals outside of the punk/hardcore music scene. "Since most people who are straightedge come from the hardcore scene, everyone assumes one has to listen to hardcore to be straightedge. Sure that's where it came from, but people make the decision all the time to be drug free without ever hearing of *Chain of Strength* [a straightedge band]. They just happen to start claiming edge because of the education through the internet and other media." Importantly, XdoitdoitX recognized that, in addition to information, the internet served as a source from which identities were constructed. In his research on the goth subculture, Hodgkinson (2002) found not only that "the internet usually functioned in the same way as goth events, to concentrate . . . involvement in the goth scene and to reinforce the boundaries of the grouping" (p. 176) but also that "the internet was increasingly significant to [users'] level of commitment to and attachment to the subculture." (p. 191). More generally, Bell (2001) argued that many contemporary subcultural groupings use the internet to diffuse information, facilitate interpersonal communication, and structure subcultural identity formation.

In the public forums and in a private interview, the web site's owner/administrator and I discussed the idea of the internet as a new type of straightedge scene. During the interview, he wrote about how he learned about straightedge.

The Man: I think I was wasting time in some chat room and someone was asking me all this stuff, "Do you drink" "Do you, etc., etc." And they pretty much just

said, "You're straightedge, are you?" And having no idea what the hell they were talking about . . . I looked up some info on it that day and sort of took the name on at the same time.

Like him, other net-straightedgers reported learning about straightedge from the internet. PunkRockBob, for example, said that he researched the term *straightedge* after he heard about it from a schoolmate: "My main source of info was the internet because no one else I know knows anything about it really." Similarly, Nori related to me how, although she knew some punk straightedgers in the face-to-face world, most of her information and communication about straightedge came from the forum. Yet another participant wrote, "I was told about sXe by a cyber goth friend." Most of the participants I interviewed—even music-straightedgers—shared similar stories of first hearing the word "straightedge" through friends, TV, or magazines but gaining most of their early information directly from internet sites.

The usefulness of the internet in facilitating the diffusion of straightedge subculture is clear in these comments, just as it is clear in the discussions about authenticity. As one participant wrote, a scene is "just about creating a positive space that's drug free and supporting it. That's all, I guess it's about making a difference. Small as it may be, it's something, you know?" Added to this growing awareness of the power of the internet, there were many net-straightedgers who openly questioned the relative roles of music and the internet in spreading straightedge culture. In the following post, Listen made clear a cultural truth: all cultures change as people come to attach new sets of meaning to their own practices and to the social objects involved in those practices.

Listen: Music is transient. Hardcore will eventually warp into other forms of music and fade from existence, whether you like to believe it or not. Once the music is gone, does that mean you hardcore scenesters want sXe and all of its ideals gone with it? sXe is a positive movement that could influence SO many people for the better. It has helped so many people change their lives for the better. That, to me, is a LOT more important than your stupid scene. Maybe you think "that's great" but you still don't think they should call themselves sXe. Well I say who gives a damn? Obviously the sXe label helped them out, so for fuck's sake . . . let them have it! If the internet can provide that, then I think that's great. I know I found out about sXe one way and someone else found out about it another way, etc. and this is just yet another way of doing it. It opens up the barrier a little bit. If you don't like how it does that, then I don't know why you would sign up here and support its occurrence.

Conclusion

The diffusion of subculture through the internet is indicative of how subcultures spread globally as well as the extent to which information and communication technologies now inundate everyday life (Wellman and Haythornthwaite 2001). Sherry Turkle argues that “as people spend more and more time in virtual places, there is a push, a kind of expression of human desire, to make the boundaries between the physical and the virtual more permeable. To have communities on the screen and to bring them into the physical surrounds, to have communities in the physical and bring them into the virtual, and in so doing, to enhance their possibilities for action and communication, and political power” (Turkle and Salamensky 2001, 236). Certainly, we can see such desire in the discourse of net-straightedgers as they transgressed boundaries not only between the online and face-to-face worlds but between mainstream cultures and subcultures.

The quality and quantity of threads that emphasized the differences among music- and net-straightedgers represent the extent to which computer-mediated communication is affecting the straightedge subculture. The continually assumed predominance of music in the straightedge subculture is evident in even the most recent social-scientific research (Helton and Staudenmeier 2002; Wood 2003; Haenfler 2004b). Among straightedgers who participate in online scenes, however, the centrality of music is repeatedly contested. Appropriating prior researchers claims about music, I have explored how *the internet* “is not simply a static cultural object . . . but . . . is used for the formation of new forms of individual and collective identity” (Cushman 1995, 91). Similarly, Frith’s (1996, 91) words help us conceptualize how “the issue is not how [*the internet*] reflects the people, but how it produces them, how it creates an experience.” Much like straightedge music has created an experience for members of music scenes over the past 25 years, internet forums simultaneously function as a subcultural resource, a form of subcultural expression, and a medium for subcultural existence for young people outside music scenes.

Following Thornton (1995), we can see that media, including the internet, “are integral to the formation of subcultures, playing a significant role in both their origin as well as prolonging their lifecycle. The media exist as systems of communication critical to the circulation of ideas, images, sounds and ideologies that bind culture(s) together. . . . Some media legitimate while others popularize, some preserve the esoteric while others are seen to sell out” (Stahl 2004, 31). Understanding how the internet functions within youth subcultural formations therefore depends on how we conceptualize it. In symbolic interactionist terms, it is a social object to which different people

attribute different (sets of) meanings. For participants of face-to-face sub-cultural scenes, the internet may be an information and communication medium in the strictest sense—it gets used primarily to communicate information about the face-to-face world (Hodkinson 2002). For individuals who do not participate in face-to-face scenes, however, the internet is more than a medium; it is a social space through which personal and social identities are constructed, given meaning, and shared through the ritual of computer-mediated interaction. From this perspective, “communication becomes a powerful tool that organizes individual desires and dreams of belonging by representing a certain range of experiences, thereby offering the possibility for deep, affective investment” (Stahl 2004, 36).

I have linked the conflict between music and the internet to such affective investment via the struggle for authentic subcultural identity. By constructing alternate paths to authentic selfhood, individuals who do not meet preexisting subcultural criteria still have the opportunity to construct a subcultural identity and to reap the social-psychological benefits that come with it (Rosenberg and Kaplan 1982). I have not judged the relative authenticity of forum participants’ identities, because doing so would deny the importance of how participants discursively achieve the identities I have highlighted. Instead, I have been interested in developing a picture of how participants struggle with defining themselves and others as authentic.

The struggle for authenticity occurs through the active appropriation of new communication media. Young people appropriate and rework communication media, constructing new narratives of personal and social experience. The traditional measurement of authenticity within straightedge appears to be through *doing* straightedge community in local punk/hardcore music scenes and earning respect through what one net-straightedger facetiously called “the scenester point system.” The growth of internet scenes confounds the idea that a face-to-face scene is necessary because the internet allows individuals who are disconnected from local punk/hardcore music scenes to interact within the subculture. New members, disconnected (often by choice) from hardcore music scenes, consider themselves authentic and utilize computer-mediated spaces to articulate their identities and experiences *as* straightedgers.

In his ethnography of hardcore music-straightedgers, Darrell Irwin (1999) wrote that straightedge “may be viewed as a fascinating movement away from the drug scene” and that “the values promulgated by this subculture may subject the larger youth culture to re-evaluation and change” (p. 367). The data provided in this article suggest that Irwin’s claim has only partially played out. The internet provides sources of information and new social spaces within which youth from outside punk cultures come to learn about,

and self-identify as, straightedge. These youth evaluate their own positions within youth (drug) cultures and decide to claim a resistant, abstinent identity. But the influx of youth from outside the punk/hardcore music subculture does not go unchallenged. Net-straightedgers' personal commitments to straightedge norms do not convince all music-straightedgers that they are more similar to each other than net-straightedgers are to drug-free grandparents, Mormons, or D.A.R.E. participants. Nevertheless, net-straightedgers continue to build their own forms of authenticity online as internet sites emerge as new subcultural scenes. These scenes are built with the understanding of the fluid and contingent nature of subculture.

Notes

1. To date, *all* social scientific research on straightedge has assumed the centrality of music within the subculture. Examples are Haenfler (2004a, 2004b), Helton and Staudenmeier (2002), O'Hara (1999), Wilson and Atkinson (2005), and Wood (1999, 2003).

2. This is a problem not simply of subculture studies but of mainstream sociology as well. See Fraser, Kick, and Williams (2002) for a discussion of taking a margin perspective in sociological research.

3. I do not mean to imply that any person who claims to be straightedge is *more* or *less* straightedge than anyone else. The two "types" of straightedge participant are analytic categories that I employ to contextualize my discussion of authenticity, music, and the internet. These analytic categories are not merely ideal types in the Weberian sense. Rather, the categories emerged from my analysis of participants' naturally occurring interaction; that is, the categories represent how many of the forum participants construct straightedge boundaries.

4. I edited the posts for grammar and spelling mistakes but was careful not to edit out subculturally relevant argot. For example, forum participants regularly use the acronym *sXe* as shorthand for "straightedge." It comprises the *S* and *E* from *straightedge* surrounding an *X*, which is a straightedge symbol. The *X* can also be seen incorporated into many usernames. In many cases, participants chose usernames that represented some aspect of their personal or subcultural selves. I changed the participants' usernames for confidentiality purposes but created user pseudonyms that maintained some sense of these expressed identities.

5. Fine and Kleinman (1979) described two axes of subcultural identification: salience and centrality. Salience refers to the frequency with which a person activates a subcultural identity in a situation. Centrality refers to the level of commitment a person feels toward that identity. As one example: an inmate in a penitentiary is likely to have a very salient "prisoner" identity at all times because of the situations in which s/he finds her/himself (e.g., interacting with other "prisoners" and "guards," being confined, and so on). However, s/he may be ashamed of that identity or very uncommitted to it, hoping to shed it as soon as possible; therefore, the identity would not be very central to her/his self-concept. Similarly, net-straightedgers expressed high levels of commitment to the straightedge identity without necessarily making it highly salient in their offline lives, such as through a lack of music consumption or regular interaction in a music scene.

6. In her ethnomethodological research, Sue Widdicombe explores in-depth how self-identifying members of youth subcultures construct authentic personal identities by distancing themselves from prototypical members. See Widdicombe (1993, 1998) and Widdicombe and Wooffitt (1990, 1995).

References

- Addison, J., and M. Comstock. 1998. Virtually out: The emergence of a lesbian, bisexual, and gay youth cyberculture. In *Generations of youth: Youth cultures and history in twentieth-century America*, edited by J. Austin and M. N. Willard, 367-78. New York: New York University Press.
- Altheide, D. L. 1996. *Qualitative media analysis*. Qualitative research methods 38. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bainbridge, W. S. 2000. Religious ethnography on the World Wide Web. *Religion and the Social Order: Religion on the Internet* 8:55-80.
- Baudrillard, J. 1988. Simulacra and simulations. In *Jean Baudrillard: Selected writings*, edited by M. Poster. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Baym, N. K. 1995. The emergence of community in computer-mediated communication. In *Cybersociety: Computer-mediated communication and community*, edited by S. G. Jones, 138-63. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Becker, H. 1997. The culture of a deviant group: The "jazz" musician. In *The subcultures reader*, edited by K. Gelder and S. Thornton, 55-65. London: Routledge.
- Bell, D. 2001. *An introduction to cybercultures*. London: Routledge.
- Bennett, A. 1999. Subcultures or neo-tribes? Rethinking the relationship between youth, style and musical taste. *Sociology* 33 (3): 599-617.
- . 2000. *Popular music and youth culture: Music, identity and place*. London: Macmillan.
- Bennett, A., and K. Kahn-Harris. 2004. Introduction. In *After subculture: Critical studies in contemporary youth culture*, edited by A. Bennett and K. Kahn-Harris, 1-18. New York: Palgrave.
- Bennett, A., and R. A. Peterson, eds. 2004. *Music scenes: Local, trans-local and virtual*. Nashville, TN: University of Vanderbilt Press.
- Bromberg, H. 1996. Are MUDs communities? Identity, belonging and consciousness in virtual worlds. In *Cultures of internet: Virtual spaces, real histories, living bodies*, edited by Rob Shields, 143-52. London: Sage.
- Charmaz, K. 2000. Grounded theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods. In *The handbook of qualitative research*, 2nd ed., edited by N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln, 509-35. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Coate, J. 1997. Cyberspace innkeeping: Building community online. In *Reinventing technology, rediscovering community: Critical explorations of computing as a social practice*, edited by P. E. Agre and D. Schuler. Greenwich, CT: Ablex.
- Cohen, S. 2002. *Folk devils and moral panics*, 3rd ed. London: Routledge.
- Copes, H., and J. P. Williams. Forthcoming. Techniques of affirmation: Deviant behavior, moral commitment, and subcultural identity. *International Journal of Deviant Behavior*.
- Cushman, T. 1995. *Notes from underground: Rock music counterculture in Russia*. New York: Albany State University of New York Press.
- Denzin, N. K. 1998. In search of the inner child: Co-dependency and gender in a cyberspace community. In *Emotions in social life: Critical themes and contemporary issues*, edited by G. Bendelow and S. J. Williams, 97-119. London: Routledge.
- . 1999. Cybertalk and the method of instances. In *Doing internet research: Critical issues and methods for examining the Net*, edited by S. G. Jones, 107-25. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Erickson, R. J. 1995. The importance of authenticity for self and society. *Symbolic Interaction* 18 (2): 121-44.
- Fine, G. A. 1979. Small groups and culture creation: The idioculture of little league baseball teams. *American Sociological Review* 44:733-45.

- Fine, G. A., and S. Kleinman. 1979. Rethinking subculture: An interactionist analysis. *American Journal of Sociology* 85 (1): 1-20.
- Fox, K. J. 1987. Real punks and pretenders: The social organization of a counterculture. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 16 (3): 344-70.
- Fraser, J. C., E. L. Kick, and J. P. Williams. 2002. Neighborhood revitalization and the practice of evaluation in the United States: Developing a margin research perspective. *City and Community* 1 (2): 217-35.
- Frith, S. 1996. Music and identity. In *Questions of cultural identity*, edited by Stuart Hall and Paul du Gay, 108-27. London: Sage.
- Gelder, K., and S. Thornton, eds. 1997. *The subcultures reader*. London: Routledge.
- Goffman, E. 1959. *The presentation of self in everyday life*. New York: Anchor.
- . 1963. *Behavior in public places*. New York: Free Press.
- Gubrium, J. R., and J. A. Holstein. 2000. The self in a world of going concerns. *Symbolic Interaction* 23 (2): 95-115.
- Haenfler, R. 2004a. Collective identity in the straight edge movement: How diffuse movements foster commitment, encourage individualized participation, and promote cultural change. *Sociological Quarterly* 45 (4): 785-805.
- . 2004b. Rethinking subcultural resistance: Core values of the straight edge movement. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 33 (4): 406-36.
- Hall, S., and T. Jefferson, eds. 1976. *Resistance through rituals: Youth subcultures in post-war Britain*. London: Hutchinson.
- Hebdige, D. 1979. *Subculture: The meaning of style*. London: Methuen.
- Heim, M. 1993. *The metaphysics of virtual reality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Helton, J. J., and W. J. Staudenmeier Jr. 2002. Re-imagining being "straight" in straight edge. *Contemporary Drug Problems* 29:445-73.
- Hewitt, J. P. 2003. *Self and society: A symbolic interactionist perspective*, 9th ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Hodkinson, P. 2002. *Goth: Identity, style, and subculture*. Oxford, UK: Berg.
- . 2004. Translocal connections in the goth scene. In *Music scenes: Local, trans-local and virtual*, edited by A. Bennett and R. A. Peterson, 131-48. Nashville, TN: University of Vanderbilt Press.
- Irwin, D. D. 1999. The straight edge subculture: Examining the youths' drug-free way. *Journal of Drug Issues* 29 (2): 365-80.
- Kahn-Harris, K. 2004. The "failure" of youth culture: Reflexivity, music and politics in the black metal scene. *Cultural Studies* 7 (1): 95-111.
- Kendall, L. 1998. Meaning and identity in "cyberspace": The performance of gender, class, and race online. *Symbolic Interaction* 21 (2): 129-53.
- Kollock, P., and M. Smith. 1999. Introduction. In *Communities in cyberspace*, edited by M. Smith and P. Kollock, 3-28. London: Routledge.
- Lowe, M. 2004. "Tween" scene: Resistance within the mainstream. In *Music scenes: Local, translocal and virtual*, edited by A. Bennett and R. A. Peterson, 80-95. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Marchessault, J., and W. Straw, eds. 2001. Scenes and sensibilities. Special issue of *Public* 22 (3).
- Mattson, K. 2001. Did punk matter? Analyzing the practices of a youth subculture during the 1980s. *American Studies* 42 (1): 69-97.
- McLeod, K. 1999. Authenticity within hip-hop and other cultures threatened with assimilation. *Journal of Communication* 49 (4): 134-50.
- Mead, G. H. 1934. *Mind, self and society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Muggleton, D. 2000. *Inside subculture: The postmodern meaning of style*. Oxford, UK: Berg.

- Mullaney, J. 2001. Like a virgin: Temptation, resistance, and the construction of identities based on "not doings." *Qualitative Sociology* 24 (1): 3-24.
- Nie, N. H. 2001. Sociability, interpersonal relations, and the internet. *American Behavioral Scientist* 45 (3): 420-35.
- O'Hara, C. 1999. *The philosophy of punk*. London: A. K. Press.
- Peterson, R. A. 1997. *Creating country music: Fabricating authenticity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 2005. In search of authenticity. *Journal of Management Studies* 42 (5): 1083-98.
- Peterson, R. A., and A. Bennett. 2004. Introducing music scenes. In *Music scenes: Local, trans-local and virtual*, edited by A. Bennett and R. A. Peterson, 1-16. Nashville, TN: University of Vanderbilt Press.
- Rheingold, H. 2000. *The virtual community: Homesteading on the electronic frontier*. Rev. ed. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rosenberg, M., and H. A. Kaplan. 1982. *Social psychology of the self-concept*. Arlington Heights, IL: Harlan Davidson.
- Schilt, K. 2003. I'll resist with every inch and every breath: Girls and zine making as a form of resistance. *Youth & Society* 35 (1): 71-97.
- Schleef, D. J. 1996. Lawyers online: Professional identity and boundary maintenance in cyberspace. *Research in Community Sociology* 6:193-214.
- Shaw, D. F. 1997. Gay men and computer communication: A discourse of sex and identity in cyberspace. In *Virtual culture: Identity and communication in cybersociety*, edited by S. G. Jones, 133-45. London: Sage.
- Shibutani, T. 1955. Reference groups as perspectives. *American Journal of Sociology* 60:562-69.
- Snow, D. A., C. Morrill, and L. Anderson. 2003. Elaborating analytic ethnography: Linking fieldwork and theory. *Ethnography* 4 (2): 181-200.
- Stahl, G. 2004. Tastefully renovating subcultural theory: Making space for a new model. In *After subculture: Critical studies in contemporary youth culture*, edited by A. Bennett and K. Kahn-Harris, 27-40. New York: Palgrave.
- Straw, W. 1991. Systems of articulation, logics of change: Communities and scenes in popular music. *Cultural Studies* 5 (3): 368-88.
- . 2001. Scenes and sensibilities. *Public* 22 (3): 245-57.
- Sveningsson, M. 2004. Ethics in internet ethnography. In *Readings in virtual research ethics: Issues and controversies*, edited by Elizabeth Buchanan, 45-61. Hershey, PA: Information Science.
- Thomas, W. I., and D. Thomas. 1928. *The child in America*. New York: Knopf.
- Thornton, S. 1995. *Club cultures: Music, media, and subcultural capital*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Turkle, S. 1995. *Life on the screen: Identity in the age of the internet*. New York: Touchstone.
- Turkle, S., and S. I. Salamensky. 2001. Techno talk: E-mail, the Internet, and other "conversations." In *Talk, talk, talk: The cultural life of everyday conversation*, edited by S. I. Salamensky, 225-45. London: Routledge.
- Waskul, D. D. 2003. *Self-games and body-play: Personhood in online chat and cybersex*. New York: Lang.
- Wellman, B., A. Q. Haase, J. Witte, and K. Hampton. 2001. Does the internet increase, decrease, or supplement social capital? *American Behavioral Scientist* 45 (3): 436-55.
- Wellman, B., and C. Haythornthwaite, eds. 2001. The internet in everyday life. Special issue of *American Behavioral Scientist* 45 (3).
- Widdicombe, S. 1993. Autobiography and change: Rhetoric and authenticity of "gothic" style. In *Repertoires and readings of texts in action*, edited by E. Burman and I. Parker, 94-113. London: Routledge.

- . 1998. "But you don't class yourself": The interactional management of category membership and non-membership. In *Identities in talk*, edited by C. Antaki and S. Widdicombe, 52-70. London: Sage.
- Widdicombe, S., and R. Wooffitt. 1990. "Being" versus "doing" punk: On achieving authenticity as a member. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* 9 (4): 257-77.
- . 1995. *The language of youth subcultures*. New York: Harvester-Wheatsheaf.
- Williams, J. P. 2003. The straightedge subculture on the internet: A case study in style-display online. *Media International Australia Incorporating Culture and Policy* 107:61-74.
- . 2006. Consumption and authenticity in collectible strategy games subculture. In *Gaming as culture: Social reality, identity and experience in fantasy games*, edited by J. Patrick Williams, Sean Q. Hendricks, and W. Keith Winkler. Jefferson, NC: McFarland.
- Williams, J. P., and H. Copes. 2005. How edge are you? Constructing authentic identities and subcultural boundaries in a straightedge internet forum. *Symbolic Interaction* 28 (1): 67-89.
- Wilson, B., and M. Atkinson. 2005. Rave and straightedge, the virtual and the real: Exploring online and offline experiences in Canadian youth subcultures. *Youth & Society* 36 (3): 276-311.
- Wood, R. T. 1999. "Nailed to the X": A lyrical history of the straightedge youth subculture. *Journal of Youth Studies* 2 (2): 133-51.
- . 2003. The straightedge youth sub-culture: Observations on the complexity of sub-cultural identity. *Journal of Youth Studies* 6 (1): 33-52.

J. Patrick Williams is a Franklin Teaching Fellow and visiting assistant professor in the University of Georgia's Department of Sociology. His teaching and research interests focus on youth subcultures, internet and gaming cultures, and identity.