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ABSTRACT

With the recent surge in viral videos worldwide featuring women with candid cameras walking down the streets from New York to Casablanca, street harassment has grabbed the attention of international media outlets, audiences and governments alike. At the same time, digital technologies and online activist platforms have been harnessed by social movements worldwide to mobilize communities and inspire action, such as Twitter campaigns during the Arab Spring or Facebook-based activism during the Egyptian revolution. In this thesis, I ask: What factors influence street harassment interactions and how can online platforms map these interactions and impact gendered and heterosexist public spaces in Amsterdam? I hypothesize that street harassment is a normalized gendered and heterosexist practice, where men harass individuals they perceive as women, and that digital and online technologies have the potential to expose these interactions as heterosexist and to mobilize quick, collective and widespread forms of resistance. Through analysis of a survey conducted in Amsterdam in January and February 2015, as well as data from online posts to the international anti-street harassment platform Hollaback!, this thesis aims to intervene at the intersection of street harassment and technology, to contribute to dominant street harassment discourse, and to address wider feminist concerns with heterosexism to show how such heterosexist systems of power are manifested in public spaces.

Key Words: Street harassment, Amsterdam, women, public spaces, language, digital mapping, feminist mapping, online activism, Hollaback!, New York, London.
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INTRODUCTION

On April 30, 2015 a teenage girl named Moga and her mother were thrown off of a moving bus in the north Indian state of Punjab for resisting sexual harassment from the assistant conductor. Moga subsequently died from her injuries (Victor 2015). Her story drew eerie connections to an incident in New Delhi three years earlier, where a woman known as “Nirbhaya” (“fearless”) was gang-raped on a public bus, brutally beaten, thrown off and died two weeks later (Shafi 2012). The 2012 incident triggered worldwide upheaval over women’s inability to move freely and safely in public spaces—not only in India, but everywhere from streets of Germany, to buses in South Sudan, trains in Iraq, and public spaces throughout the world (Sengupta 2015). The experiences of Moga and “Nirbhaya” in this sense are extreme reflections of a broader global culture of men accessing women in unwelcome and at times violent ways in public spaces.

In this thesis, I hypothesize that street harassment, as one of the most unexamined and pervasive forms of such access (B. W. Livingston 2012, 1), is a normalized gendered and heterosexist practice, where men harass individuals they perceive as women. I argue that digital and online technologies have the potential to expose these interactions as heterosexist and to mobilize quick, collective and widespread forms of resistance. With this work, I want to contribute to studies of gender and sexuality, language and public space by problematizing how women are constructed and accessed within street harassment interactions and why. Along with unpacking the problem, I also want to look at innovative solutions; in particular, at how digital and online technologies can be used by social movements to expose and resist such phenomena. I focus on street harassment within the context of Amsterdam, but also look at experiences in New York, London and in other parts of the world to prove this assertion.

While acknowledging that street harassment as an English and Western term cannot be universally transposed to all geographic and cultural contexts, I argue that heterosexist experiences of women in these differing public spaces points to broader concerns about the

---

1 Heterosexism in this thesis can be understood through the work of scholar V. Spike Peterson, who focuses on intersections of international relations, feminist and queer theory. Peterson discusses heterosexism as a “naturalized” system of hierarchical dichotomies that codify sex as male–female biological difference, gender as masculine–feminine subjectivity, and sexuality as heterosexual–homosexual identification. Central to this ideology is male entitlement to women's sexuality, bodies and labor” (Peterson 1999, 40).

2 Heterosexist language is often overlooked when examining street harassment interactions (Bowman 1993, 522) but is central to how these interactions play out on the ground.

3 In this thesis, ‘digital’ refers to the medium used to produce, store and disseminate stories, maps, ideas or campaigns by individuals, organizations or movements (Association for Progressive Communications 2014).
ways in which women are conceptualized and positioned, as well as the gendered construction of public spaces themselves. My interest in such conceptualization and positioning grew out of frustrations not only with the violence suffered by women in public spaces in other countries, but also from my own experiences with street harassment. In 2006, I was walking with a friend in Cairo when a riot broke out in front of a movie theater. Hundreds of men rushed the ticket office, then turned towards the streets, where they attacked nearby women (Ilahi 2009, 59). My friend was surrounded by a group of 30 men who undressed and assaulted her before a bystander intervened to help. Nine years later and 4,900 kilometers away, I was walking down the street in Amsterdam when a man approached me making kissing noises and, as with the stories of other women in India, Egypt and elsewhere, my attempts to resist resulted in an escalation of the situation, with the man becoming increasingly aggressive and physically violent. I was left feeling powerless and frustrated, knowing that my experience was not unique to me nor to Amsterdam. Along with the stories above, a colleague in the anti-street harassment movement in Amsterdam reaffirmed this idea, stating that on one occasion of being catcalled in Amsterdam, her harasser broke her nose after she told him to stop.

I recall these experiences in order to position myself and my research. For this thesis, I decided to focus on Amsterdam, in part based on my most recent experiences of street harassment and because, unlike other cities such as Cairo or New Delhi, both of which have online anti-street harassment platforms, the Netherlands had no such online space when I began my research. As part of my research, I conducted a 33-question online survey, disseminated through social media networks and other online platforms that provided an overview of the street harassment situation in Amsterdam. In conjunction with my online

---

4 The incident was not covered by the media until several weeks later, with state media outlets eventually describing the incident as simply an “isolated” event (Ilahi 2009, 59).
5 The Oxford English dictionary defines catcalling as: “A loud whistle or comment of a sexual nature made by a man to a passing woman” (Oxford Dictionaries 2015a). Interestingly, “catcall”, as defined by the Merriam-Webster dictionary, does not have any gendered or sexualized associations and is solely defined within the context of a play or sporting event (Merriam Webster Online Dictionary 2015a). In the following section, Questions, Background and Definitions, I will talk more about various definitions and their significance.
6 Harassmap is an Egyptian anti-street harassment online platform that will be mentioned later in this Chapter and in Chapters 2 and 4. India has five existing Hollaback! sites (in Bengaluru, Chandigarh, Chennai, [New] Delhi and Mumbai) [Hollaback! NYC 2015b]. I will discuss other reasons for my choice to focus on Amsterdam in the following section and in more detail in Chapter 2.
7 See Appendices C and G for a sample of the survey and its results.
survey, I also analyzed stories of street harassment posted to the Hollaback!® online anti-street harassment platform in New York and London. Through these two primary case studies, I was able to draw connections between gendered and heterosexist experiences and to show how digital and online technologies are being effectively used by existing anti-street harassment movements.

QUESTIONS, BACKGROUND AND DEFINITIONS

With this research, I therefore ask the following question: *What factors influence street harassment interactions, and how can online platforms map these interactions and impact gendered and heterosexist public spaces in Amsterdam?*. I answer this question through my two primary case studies and I hypothesize that street harassment is a normalized gendered and heterosexist practice, where men harass individuals they perceive as women, and I argue that digital and online technologies have the potential to expose these interactions as heterosexist and to mobilize quick, collective and widespread forms of resistance. It is important to note that by heterosexist, I refer to systems of power where, for example, male/man/heterosexual is in a normalized dominant position over female/woman/homosexual (Peterson 1999, 40). Through this understanding, we can then conceive of heterosexist public spaces in this thesis as spaces that facilitate and uphold such dichotomies and power structures in, for example, street harassment interactions between men and individuals they perceive as women.

Why look at such power structures in street harassment interactions in particular? Street harassment around the world is becoming an increasingly ‘sexy’ topic, which could arguably benefit from critical feminist analysis and reflection. According to researchers at Cornell University in New York, “there is some emerging evidence that [street harassment] is one of the most pervasive forms of gender-based violence” (B. W. Livingston 2012, 1). Although the concept of street harassment is arguably rooted in hegemonic Euro-American conceptualizations (Ilahi 2009, 60), more than 40 countries in six continents recognized Anti-

---

8 Hollaback! is an international web-based social movement that uses online platforms for community members to share experiences of street harassment and mobilize into offline action. As of April 2015, Hollaback! had collected over 8,000 stories around the world (Hollaback! NYC 2015d). The main website, ihollaback.org, has had 750,000 visitors as of 2012, and this total does not include visits to the local sites (Dimond 2012, 40). The Hollaback! movement was inspired by events in New York in 2005, when Thao Nguyen used her mobile phone to take a picture of a man masturbating in front of her. Nguyen brought the picture to law enforcement who dismissed her claim. She then posted the picture online in community bulletin boards and on Flickr and the picture subsequently went viral. On 26 August 2005, *The New York Daily News* featured the story on their front page and the man was arrested (May 2013). Through the Hollaback! mobile phone app or the website, people who experience street harassment are able to post their stories anonymously. The stories are then geo-tagged according to the location reported, so that instances can be exposed and lead to quick, collective and widespread action.

9 See footnote 1 for how heterosexism is defined in this thesis.
*Street Harassment Week* in 2015, organizing demonstrations, marches, chalk walks, wheat pasting and other events to promote awareness about street harassment (Stop Street Harassment 2015b). The initiation over the past ten years of 92 Hollaback! anti-street harassment sites around the world by local students, professionals and activists under the umbrella of being part of an international “anti-street harassment movement” (Hollaback! NYC 2015d) is also indicative of street harassment as a concept that is being adopted and/or co-opted by activists in different countries worldwide to bring attention to women’s lack of safety and freedom in public spaces.

More recently, in April 2015, results were released from a landmark international survey on street harassment, which was conducted by Cornell University, in conjunction with Hollaback!\(^1\) Over 16,000 responses worldwide were collected from the survey, which was disseminated online and translated into 13 different languages.\(^2\) At the time of research only the US results were available.\(^3\) Nevertheless, the findings were telling, with 85 percent of respondents reporting first experiencing street harassment before age 17 and more than 50 percent reporting that they significantly changed their behaviors, clothing or interactions with others because of their experiences (Hollaback! NYC 2015). The findings were subsequently featured in an exclusive by *Glamour* magazine,\(^4\) which claims a total audience of over 12 million (Condé Nast 2014), marking a significant shift in street harassment being understood as an increasingly important issue.

Despite this shift, the Netherlands is not an obvious choice to study street harassment. Ranked fourth in Europe by the European Institute for Gender Equality (2010), and ranked 14\(^th\) in the world according to the World Economic Forum’s Global Gender Gap Index (2014), the Netherlands at first glance appears to be doing fairly satisfactorily in terms of promoting equal treatment of men and women.\(^5\) So why do my research there? I decided to focus my research on the Netherlands for a few key reasons. The primary reason was because in December 2014, as a result of my own experiences and because there was no existing online platform to share them, I applied to start up a local Hollaback! site in Amsterdam. In the process of starting up the site, I discovered that many women had not

---

\(^1\) I used the questions from this international survey in part as a benchmark, a decision I discuss more in Chapter 2.

\(^2\) Languages included: English, Spanish, French, Italian, Dutch, Bosnian, Croatian, Hindi, Polish, Nepali, Marathi, and German (Hollaback! NYC 2015).

\(^3\) The international results were released in May 2015 and can be found on ihollaback.org and in the *Glamour* article in the footnote below.

\(^4\) The exclusive, which was titled “How to Handle Street Harassment: Don’t "Hey, Baby" Me,” was featured on April 15 (Gay 2015).

\(^5\) Note that these two indexes do not consider other or alternative gender expressions to man and woman in their reports.
shared their experiences and considered them to be normal, trivial or inevitable. According to one of the few official studies on street harassment in the Netherlands, a report released in March 2015 by the Amsterdam-Amstelland Security Monitor indicated that approximately one third of women in Amsterdam believe that women and girls receive ‘unwanted attention’ in the city (Gemeente Amsterdam 2015, 1). The report received a significant amount of attention from local and national media outlets, as well as from Dutch politicians. In this vein, after Hollaback! Amsterdam circulated a press release announcing the launch of its website on April 7, 2015, our team was approached by several news outlets and political parties who expressed their interest and commitment to publicizing the problem. It was thus clear that street harassment was happening in the Netherlands and that people wanted to talk about it. In conjunction with starting up a Hollaback! site in Amsterdam, it was then imperative to me that I also engaged with the issue from a critical academic perspective.

In the Netherlands, one mainstream narrative about street harassment is that women are harassed by men of color (Branderhorst 2015, Borrel 2015). Activists in other parts of the world assert that street harassment mostly affects younger women, or women wearing certain clothes, or women out at certain times of the day or women of certain income brackets or in certain geographic areas (Essert 2014; Hollaback! Toronto 2015; Stop Street Harassment 2015). As the stories cited earlier from India, Egypt and Amsterdam have shown, what street harassment in different parts of the world boils down to is men harassing women in public spaces without social consequence. While such a statement may appear obvious, why is not enough being done to prevent it and why does resisting street harassment, as we have seen, lead to such violent and long term consequences?

In this thesis, I aim to show how and why street harassment has continued to flourish as a normalized gendered and heterosexist practice and I do this within the geographical and cultural context of Amsterdam. As part of this exploration, I look at how existing technologies are already working to address and resist street harassment in other parts of the world. For example, I look at a popular online video posted by Hollaback! from October 2014 in which a woman walks down the streets of New York with a candid camera for ten hours and receives over 100 catcalls by men throughout the city (AreWeFamousNow 2014; Sieczkowski 2014). The video, which was posted on You Tube, has received almost 38 million views to date (HarassmentVideo 2014). Within just two weeks, a number of similarly themed videos were uploaded to the site everywhere from Morocco to the Netherlands. These videos are part of the veritable explosion of digital and online platforms for street harassment activism in just under a decade. Other online platforms have included the
volunteer-based initiative Harassmap\textsuperscript{15} launched in Cairo in 2010, and the US-based anti-street harassment movement Hollaback! launched in New York in 2005. Online platforms have thus become increasingly popular spaces to spread awareness about social issues such as street harassment and to incite action, which is why I decided to start a Hollaback! platform in Amsterdam and is ultimately what drove my interest in exploring the phenomenon within that context for this thesis. As I contextualize in Chapter 1 and substantiate in Chapter 4, harnessing online and digital forms of technology such as my online survey and posts to Hollaback! sites to both map and resist street harassment can be a powerful and effective way to address this critical issue.

Before laying the framework to support such claims, it is important to establish how street harassment will be defined in this thesis. During my research, I was not able to find a definition of street harassment in conventional English dictionaries\textsuperscript{16} but did find several definitions of ‘catcalling’, many of which were gendered in some way.\textsuperscript{17} Academics and activists have also codified definitions of street harassment that I used to inform my research. Cultural anthropologist Micaela di Leonardo is reported to have first used the term street harassment in Western scholarly work in 1981\textsuperscript{18} (Kearl 2014b, 5):

\begin{quote}
[W]hen one or more strange men accost one or more women whom they perceive as heterosexual in a public place…Through looks, words, or gestures the man asserts his right to intrude on the woman’s attention, defining her as a sexual object, and forcing her to interact with him (di Leonardo 1981, 51-52).
\end{quote}

Di Leonardo speaks to three important factors that characterize street harassment: who is harassed, how they are harassed and where harassment occurs. By not just underlining that women are predominantly affected by street harassment but “women whom [men] perceive as heterosexual”, di Leonardo makes an important point here about perceived identities.

\textsuperscript{15} Harassmap uses online and digital technologies to report and map instances of sexual assault such as street harassment (Harassmap 2015), and served as an important benchmark for my work.

\textsuperscript{16} Conventional English dictionaries include Oxford and Merriam Webster dictionaries. This is interesting to consider, as more well-known concepts such as sexual harassment or sexual assault, can both be found in these and other conventional dictionaries.

\textsuperscript{17} For example, the Urban Dictionary defines catcall largely in sexualized and gendered terms, for example as, “[a] loud whistle or a comment of a sexual nature made by a man to a passing woman” (Phalgun 2011). Although unconventional, the Urban Dictionary nevertheless averages 72 million impressions and 18 million unique readers each month (Urban Dictionary 2015). The definitions it presents thus have the potential to reach and influence a substantial number of people.

\textsuperscript{18} Although di Leonardo is cited as the first known scholar to use the term “street harassment”, other iterations have been used previously, conjunctively and since. Terms that are part of, related to or synonymic of street harassment include: “everyday sexism,” “sexual terrorism,” “public harassment,” “stranger harassment,” “uncivil attention,” “sexual violence,” “offensive public speech,” “catcalls,” and more” (Logan 2013, 25). “Eve-teasing” (Baxi 2001) in India is another example of the terms used to describe the phenomenon. Feminist scholar Laura Logan asserts that the various terms ascribed to the contemporary concept of street harassment have contributed to the lack of “a cohesive body of literature about the subject” (Logan 2013, 25).
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particularly perceived gendered and heterosexed identities that work to form the basis of my argument that street harassment interactions are driven by normalized systems of gendered and heterosexist power.

In 1993, American legal scholar Cynthia Bowman codified one of the most commonly cited English Western academic definitions of street harassment:

>[W]hen one or more unfamiliar men accost one or more women in a public place, on one or more occasion, and intrude or attempt to intrude upon the woman’s attention in a manner that is unwelcome to the woman, with language…that is explicitly or implicitly sexual. Such language includes, but is not limited to, references to male or female genitalia or to female body parts or to sexual activities, solicitation of sex, or reference…to the target of the harassment as the object of sexual desire, or similar words that by their very utterance inflict injury or naturally tend to provoke violent resentment, even if the woman did not herself react with violence (Bowman 1993, 22).

Bowman’s definition emphasizes that perpetrators of street harassment are predominantly men; that the attention is “unwelcome” (this is an important point to note, particularly when encountering arguments that instances of street harassment are nothing more than harmless compliments or gestures); and that street harassment is manifested in many different verbal, non-verbal and physical forms. Another point to highlight from the definition above is the explicit or internalized reactions that street harassment instances tend to provoke, the significance of which will be discussed in Chapter 3.

In her research on street harassment in contemporary Egypt, scholar Nadia Ilahi notes that while “the parameters of what counts as public harassment against women undoubtedly stem from a hegemonic, Euro-American definition… I adopt the term street harassment, the local manifestation of which fits the definition proposed by anthropologist Micaela di Leonardo” (Ilahi 2009, 60). Thus, while it is important to problematize street harassment as a universal concept, we can arguably draw connections between incidents and scholarly work worldwide, which situate street harassment within particular contexts, and show that such interactions are about women being marked in public spaces as verbally or physically accessible to men they do not know.

Historically, in Western Europe, street harassment as a phenomenon has been written about for at least 150 years. In records from late Victorian England (mid 1800s to early 1900s) for example, the West End of London was described as a “notorious site for street harassment of respectable women by so-called gentlemen” (Walkowitz 1998, 1). For historian Judith Walkowitz, “street impertinences” or “annoyances” marked women’s relationship to public space during this period (Walkowitz 1998, 1). Walkowitz touches upon an interesting concept above—that of respectability. Historian George Mosse speaks to this
concept, noting that: “[R]espectability assigned everyone his place in life, man and woman, normal and abnormal… any confusion between these categories threatened chaos and loss of control” (Mosse 1985, 16). Ilahi builds upon this notion of “chaos” with respect to street harassment in a non-Western context, describing women as “nefariously representing urban chaos in opposition to their male counterparts” (Ilahi 2009, 57). By employing the term “chaos”, Mosse and Ilahi arguably allude to the disruption of static gender roles that had cordoned women off to the private sphere. The shift from such positioning as women entered into the traditionally-male public sphere led to more of a hybridity or “ambiguity” of urban space (Ilahi 2009, 57). Women in public spaces were subsequently understood to be “a problem of urban order” (Ilahi 2009, 57). Along with their mere presence in public spaces, women’s “unbridled sexuality” (Ilahi 2009, 57) was then used to explain why they experienced harassment in these spaces. To the contrary of such assertions, I argue for a shift away from assigning blame to those who experience street harassment and towards those who perpetrate it, through my examination of gendered and heterosexist dynamics of power that drive normalized street harassment interactions and through exploring digital and online ways of exposing and resisting them.

**THESIS STRUCTURE**

This thesis is divided into an introductory chapter, a theoretical chapter (Chapter 1), a methodology chapter (Chapter 2), two empirical chapters (3 and 4), a concluding chapter and an appendix. Chapters 3 and 4 are structured to mirror the theoretical themes in Chapter 1. Chapter 3 addresses the literature on gendered and heterosexist positioning, language, effects and means of resistance, and public spaces discussed in sections 1.1-1.4 within the context of street harassment experiences in Amsterdam; Chapter 4 then approaches the literature in sections 1.3 and 1.4 on means of resistance and public spaces through a digital lens and addresses section 1.5 on engaging social movements with digital and online forms activism in Amsterdam and beyond. The feminist, discourse analysis, mixed-methods and grounded theory methodologies from Chapter 2 inform my research, while specific methods such as storytelling and my online survey and posts are used explicitly in Chapters 3 and 4 to show how I arrived at my findings.

---

Whereas the public sphere is mostly understood in a Western context as the more visible or political sphere and associated with men, the private sphere is understood in this context as less visible and more personal sphere associated with women (Okin 1998, 116). In the context of street harassment, women’s historic entry into the traditional male public sphere can then be understood as a disruption of this conventional dichotomy.
More specifically, in Chapter 1, I frame my argument that street harassment is a normalized gendered and heterosexist practice, where men harass individuals they perceive as women and that digital and online technologies have the potential to expose and resist it in ways that are quick, collective and widespread. To do this, I use four overarching bodies of literature. This includes literature on gendered and heterosexist positioning, the power of language, public spaces and traditional and digital/virtual social movements. I position my discussion through feminist scholar Simone de Beauvoir’s ‘Woman’ category, and I problematize how women are perceived and positioned in a Western context, including the language used to enforce such positioning and the consequences to resisting it. In the latter part of Chapter 1, I engage with the work of traditional social movement theorists, as well as contemporary feminist and online and digital activists, journalists and scholars, and point to the success of such platforms and technologies in existing anti-street harassment movements and social movements more broadly.

In Chapter 2, I describe the combination of methodologies that inform my approach, including feminist and mixed-methods approaches, grounded theory, discourse analysis and online storytelling. My main method for collecting data is the 33-question online survey that I conducted in Amsterdam (see Appendices C and G for the survey questions and results). I use this method because there was no online platform before I launched Hollaback! Amsterdam in April 2015 to obtain comparable data of stories of street harassment. In line with my mixed-methods approach to this research, along with the online survey, I also looked at posts to Hollaback!’s New York and London sites (see Appendices D and E). I chose to also look at posts to Hollaback! sites for three important reasons: first, because my survey was based off of the online web form used to submit stories to Hollaback! sites; second, because my survey design and questions were also based off an international street harassment survey facilitated by Hollaback! (see Appendix B); and third, because the Hollaback! stories can show how sharing and mapping stories on online platforms exposes street harassment interactions and provides a collective space for resistance.

Based on my survey data, in Chapter 3 I prove the normalized gendered and heterosexist nature of street harassment interactions, by highlighting how factors such as the positioning of the actors involved, the language used and the spaces themselves drive these interactions in Amsterdam. I reveal how these factors effect women who are harassed and influence if and how they resist, and I use the theoretical framework established in sections 20 My discussion will not, however, be limited to the time period of de Beauvoir’s work (1952) and will also feature works and authors from the 1980s until the 2000s.
1.1-1.4 on positioning, language, effects and means of resistance, and public spaces to explain why this is the case and why this is significant. I also look at how racism\textsuperscript{21} and homophobia\textsuperscript{22} factor into how individuals are positioned in public spaces in Amsterdam, while stressing my specific point of intervention as located at the intersection of gender and street harassment, one that is based on the content of the stories I analyzed.

In Chapter 4, I build on the literature on means of resistance, public spaces and engaging social movements with digital and online activism from sections 1.3-1.5 to show how survey respondents’ experiences with street harassment in Amsterdam can then be effectively mapped and resisted through existing digital technologies and online activist platforms in New York, London and elsewhere. I claim that such technologies and platforms have the potential to expose—through digital mapping,\textsuperscript{23} online storytelling\textsuperscript{24} or Twitter, for example—street harassment interactions as heterosexist, and to mobilize quick, collective and widespread forms of resistance. I conclude my discussion with a summation of my main questions and claims and a look at how my research can be used to further combat street harassment in Amsterdam, online and beyond.

\textsuperscript{21} Racist forms of street harassment in this thesis will be defined as comments or slurs directed at survey respondents because of their identified or perceived race or ethnicity. Because the focus of this thesis is on the Netherlands, we can consider the main racial and ethnic minority populations in order of size to be: Turkish, Moroccan, Surinamese, Netherlands Antillean and Aruban populations (Vasta 2006, 4).

\textsuperscript{22} Homophobic street harassment interactions in this thesis will be primarily described as forms of “policing gender and sexuality”, and where such slurs, mostly by men, convey and embody “domination, entitlement and ownership” (Logan 2013) over public spaces and non-conforming bodies within these spaces.

\textsuperscript{23} Digital mapping has traditionally been understood within a geographical or geological context (Arlinghaus 1994; Minasny, et al. 2013; Whitmeyer, Nicoletti and De Pair 2009) but is extended in this thesis under the umbrella of feminist mapping to describe how power can be tagged, visualized and digitized. Section 1.1, [Mapping] Gendered and Heterosexist Public Spaces, talks about feminist digital mapping as it relates to street harassment interactions.

\textsuperscript{24} Online storytelling will be defined and discussed in section 2.1, \textit{Working with Data}, as a way for people to share individual stories and empower collective action (Martin and Valenti 2012, 2). As online storytelling is web-based, digital storytelling is based on different forms of digital media, such as video or photographs (Association for Progressive Communications 2014). Digital and online storytelling can go hand-in-hand, by for example, using online platforms to share digital stories or by using digital media to broadcast stories shared online.
CHAPTER 1. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

In this chapter, I frame my hypothesis that street harassment is a normalized gendered and heterosexist practice, where men harass individuals they perceive as women, and that digital and online technologies have the potential to expose these interactions as heterosexist and to mobilize quick, collective and widespread forms of resistance. In doing so, I contextualize my main research question: *What factors influence street harassment interactions and how can online platforms map these interactions and impact gendered and heterosexist public spaces in Amsterdam?*

To frame this question and substantiate my hypothesis, this chapter engages with four overarching bodies of literature: literature on gendered and heterosexist positioning, on the power of language, on public spaces, as well as on traditional and digital/virtual social movements. My entry point into this framework will be a discussion on how women are theorized and positioned in Western societies, particularly in Western European societies, in order to frame the gendered and heterosexist experiences of street harassment reported by women in Amsterdam in Chapters 3 and 4. In the latter part of this chapter, I engage with literature on traditional social movements as well as on digital and online technologies that I argue in Chapter 4 can be used by social movements to expose and resist such phenomena.

1.1. WOMEN’S POSITIONING IN HETEROSEXIST PUBLIC SPACES

This section will frame women’s positioning in public spaces and will discuss the significance of power dynamics that treat those who are perceived as women in public spaces in specific, powered ways. My category of analysis for this discussion begins with feminist scholar Simone de Beauvoir’s conceptualization of ‘Woman’ (de Beauvoir 1952 [2010], 5). I establish my entry point into my analysis through this category in order to build a theoretical framework for problematizing how female survey respondents in Amsterdam are positioned and why they are targeted for street harassment. My use of this category of analysis is thus strategic; however, I will also discuss some important limitations to using such a category of analysis later in this section. In addition to my explanation in the Introduction Chapter about the meaning of heterosexism in relation to men and women’s positioning, I use the

---

25 Although de Beauvoir’s work has led to debates within feminist circles about how to interpret ‘Woman’ as a category of analysis (Simons 1995, 171), it is nevertheless touted as laying “the philosophical foundations” (Simons 1995, 5) for many feminist movements throughout the US and Western Europe and is my entry point for this thesis.
term *heterosexist public spaces* here to highlight how male/man/heterosexual “entitlement” (Peterson 1999) is characteristic of, exercised within and facilitated by public spaces. In section 1.4, I will talk more about gendered and *heterosexist* public spaces; in this section, I focus on the effects on women’s positioning and subsequent treatment by men within these spaces.

With over 80 percent of all survey respondents identifying as female, it did not come as a surprise that the majority of street harassment experienced in Amsterdam is by women.26 In her work, de Beauvoir asks, “What is a woman?” (de Beauvoir 1952 [2010], 5): “Certainly woman like man is a human being; but such an assertion is abstract…What is certain is that for the moment [differences between men and women] exist in a strikingly obvious way” (de Beauvoir 1952 [2010], 4). De Beauvoir sets the stage here for the distinction she raises throughout her work between ‘Woman’ as an abstract category of conventionally-accepted feminine characteristics and *women*, as individuals who are expected to embody these characteristics in society. De Beauvoir’s gender categories speak to a binary27 of ‘Man’ and ‘Woman’ that positions women as holding less power in society in relation to men (de Beauvoir 1952 [2010], 6). Feminist theorist Monique Wittig echoes de Beauvoir, and speaks to the importance of understanding that although ‘Woman’ is an abstract notion, *women* in reality, including, I argue, those who took part in my survey, are nonetheless bound by the conventional norms that characterize the ‘Woman’ category:

[W]hat we believe to be a physical and direct perception is only a sophisticated and mythic construct, an ‘imaginary formation,’ which reinterprets physical features (in themselves as neutral as any others but marked by the social system) through the network of relationships in which they are perceived (They are seen…as *women*, therefore, they *are* women)” (Wittig [1981] 1993, 104; original emphasis).

Wittig underlines an important point here regarding the effects of being perceived as ‘Woman’ and consequently being treated in socially-sanctioned ways that are normalized as appropriate interactions. In this vein, it can be useful to refer to my survey, where respondents’ assumptions about why their harasser(s) harassed reflects such positioning and

---

26 ‘Woman’/woman/women will be used throughout this thesis to refer to dominant, conventional conceptualizations of ciswomen*, including both heterosexual and homosexual women, and their embodiment on the ground. Such conceptualizations are informed by de Beauvoir’s use of the category ‘Woman’ to describe how notions of womanhood and femininity are theorized and embodied. *Cis* or *cisgendered* in this context means: “denoting or relating to a person whose self-identity conforms with the gender that corresponds to their biological sex” (Oxford Dictionaries 2015). This thesis will also define the term trans or transgendered as: “An umbrella term for people whose gender identity and/or gender expression differs from what is typically associated with the sex they were assigned at birth” (GLAAD 2015).

27 The gender binary to which de Beauvoir refers is made up of ‘Man’ and ‘Woman’, where men and women embody these two categories and where the category ‘Woman’ in particular is dependent on and determined by the category ‘Man’ (de Beauvoir 1952 [2010], 6).
normalization of gendered and heterosexist behavior, and strips accountability for harassing away from harassers by portraying it as the “normal” or “natural thing to do”. In this regard, gender theorists Candace West and Don Zimmerman add that it is important to consider the normalized social interpretation or perception of gender. The scholars contend that gender is constituted through *interaction*, a process which is socially organized and conveyed as “natural” as part of that process (West and Zimmerman 1987, 129): “Gender depictions are less a consequence of our ‘essential sexual natures’ than interactional portrayals of what we would like to convey about sexual natures, using conventionalized gestures” (West and Zimmerman 1987, 130). Speaking to di Leonardo’s definition of street harassment in the Introduction Chapter, West and Zimmerman make two important points here. First, in referring to “conventionalized gestures”, the authors arguably speak to gendered behaviors that are normalized as part of socialization processes, and which I will show within the context of words and gestures used in street harassment interactions in Amsterdam. In this sense, by labeling Amsterdam survey respondents as *sexy*, by hissing or by groping, harassers constitute male/female gender binaries through such gestures. Second, West and Zimmerman assert that the repetition of such interactions and their normalization through repetition becomes important in naturalizing the words and gestures that characterize interactions such as street harassment, and the social expectations of men and women as ‘Man’ and ‘Woman’ that are conjunctive to such interactions.

Because the way in which individuals are perceived in public spaces is also shown through my survey to determine their positioning and treatment within these spaces, it is important to frame such experiences within Wittig and West and Zimmerman’s discussion on gender identification and perception. But what are some consequences to using this category of analysis? One issue that dichotomous understandings of sex and gender inevitably raise is the risk of essentializing, which in turn can bring the validity of such categories entirely into question. In this regard, feminist historian Merry Wiesner-Hanks asks: “Was ‘woman’ a valid category whose meaning is self-evident and unchanging over time, or

---

28 Thirty-three respondents believed they were harassed because it was a normal/natural thing to do.
29 West and Zimmerman arguably refer here to an individual’s sexed identity. In this thesis, one’s sex or sexed identity refers to an individual’s anatomy assigned at birth, while gender is used to refer to an individual’s expressed identity, which may or may not correlate to their assigned anatomy at birth (West and Zimmerman, Doing Gender 1987).
30 Feminist scholar Kate Millet contends that dichotomous gender categories are reified and maintained through ‘socialization’ of women as ‘Woman’ and of men as ‘Man’, and that this affirmation produces women and men who reinforce the power imbalance between the categories ‘Woman’ and ‘Man’ (Millet [1969] 2000, 31). Millet’s argument of socialization’s role in reinforcing gender categories speaks to situations of street harassment, where men, as ‘Man’, act according to notions of masculinity and heterosexuality that are legitimized through socialization, and that are manifested in catcalls towards women, perceived as ‘Woman’.
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is arguing for any biological base for gender difference (or sexual orientation) naïve ‘essentialism?’” (Wiesner-Hanks 2011, 5). In her query, Wiesner-Hanks points here to several important questions about the effects of perceived gender identity in relation to self-identified gender. Similar to West and Zimmerman, Wiesner-Hanks asserts that what is more important on the ground, such as in the lives of female survey respondents in Amsterdam, is not an essential, biological difference. Rather, Wiesner-Hanks contends that one’s perceived sex and gender—that is, what is made visible and what then provokes specific, gendered attention—is what fuels heterosexist and gendered power relations. As will be discussed in Chapter 3, indeed, regardless of some female respondents’ identification as genderqueer or as men, they were nevertheless perceived as ‘Woman’/women in public spaces and consequently experienced harassment according to this positioning.

Feminist theorist Rosi Braidotti speaks to the reality of how many women, including female survey respondents in Amsterdam, are perceived and treated on the ground, contending that “the feminine today cannot afford not to be essentialist” (Braidotti [1994] 2011, 122; original emphasis). Thus, although it is important to problematize using the ‘Woman’ category as a means of theoretical analysis, as my findings show, it is important to consider these essentialist realities of gender categorization in situations of street harassment to better understand the nature of such interactions and subsequently the ways in which they can be strategically resisted. The following section will move away from literature on gender and sexuality to look at how such power dynamics are manifested in and characterize the spaces in which they function.

1.2. POWER OF LANGUAGE IN STREET HARASSMENT INTERACTIONS

The language used in street harassment situations is reflective of gendered and heterosexist power dynamics in society more broadly as well as of the spaces where such power is exercised. I use the literature outlined here to contextualize my discussion on

31 Gender fluid, genderless or genderqueer are gender identities that are meant to convey gender as what trans queer feminist scholar Kaylee Jakubowski describes as, “an abstract and infinitely complex idea that means something different to every person” (Jakubowski 2014). With this in mind, genderqueer can be understood as referring to an individual who expresses different gender identities, constantly queering their born gender and assigned sex. Gender fluid, similar to genderqueer, is an identity that aims to pass freely between different gender expressions. Genderless individuals do not express a gender identity, describing “their relationship to gender as completely null” (Jakubowski 2014).

32 This is not to deny harassment experienced by individuals that do not identify as women, and it does not deny other factors that drive street harassment, including homophobic, racist and xenophobic attitudes (Stop Street Harassment 2015c). However, in social and political movements it can be necessary to highlight hegemonic relationships in order to more effectively organize and mobilize communities and decision-makers.
heterosexist and homosocial\textsuperscript{33} language used by harassers in Amsterdam, where I found that various forms of sexualized greetings were often used to catcall women. Taken in isolation, such comments may be appear benign and without consequence. However, taking the dialogic framework established in this section in mind, I argue in that these comments are not isolated, that they stem from gendered and heterosexist systems of power and that they contribute to long-lasting and significant effects.

Within public spaces, street harassment interactions not only exemplify broader heterosexist and gendered power structures between men and women, but my findings show that the language used also infantilizes and threatens women in these supposedly shared spaces. Language such as \textit{hey baby}, or \textit{come talk to me} arguably portrays women as childlike and is reinforced, for example, when women’s negative reactions to such language are dismissed or patronized by harassers (Calhoun 1989, 398; Kleinman 2002, 304). The use of language in catcalling is in this sense a tangible manifestation of the construction of heteronormative\textsuperscript{34} gendered and sexed identities, and does two important things to fuel divisions of power between men and women. First, it creates a hierarchy where men initiating the catcall are articulating their position of dominance, a gendered relationship that links into de Beauvoir’s previously discussed dichotomy of ‘Man’ and ‘Woman’. Second, it positions women who are targeted by the catcall as subordinate,\textsuperscript{35} a position whose historical weight I also considered through Walkowitz and Mosse’s work in the Introduction Chapter. Because as was also indicated in the Introduction Chapter, catcalling is not limited to specific areas or populations, a constant repetition of variants of this type of linguistic performance\textsuperscript{36} becomes indicative of systematized structures of power that perpetuate heterosexist, gendered hierarchies.

According to feminist linguist Deborah Cameron and social anthropologist Don Kulick, “Since in male-dominated societies, the relationship between [power and gender] is non-random and socially meaningful, there is a regular albeit not invariant, association

\textsuperscript{33}Homosocial can be defined as: of, relating to, or involving social relationships between persons of the same sex and especially between men (Merriam Webster Dictionary 2015b).

\textsuperscript{34}Heteronormativity can be understood as: “Denoting or relating to a world view that promotes heterosexuality as the normal or preferred sexual orientation” (Oxford Dictionaries 2015a). “Gender normal” or fitting “the criteria for membership in a gender category” is part of how this term can be understood (Shilt and Westbrook 2009, 440) in relation to gendered and heterosexist street harassment interactions.

\textsuperscript{35}Although women are predominantly in subordinate positions of power in such situations, means of resistance to such positions will be discussed later in this thesis.

\textsuperscript{36}By using the word \textit{performance} here, I refer to feminist queer theorist Judith Butler’s notion of gender performativity, where “polar genders as cultural fictions” are produced through repeated performance (J. Butler 1993 [2010], 179). In situations of catcalling, we can look to the following question posed by Cameron to consider language’s role in perpetuating gender performance: “[H]ow do speakers use linguistic resources to produce themselves as women or men?” (D. Cameron 2006, 168). The discussion that follows will highlight some important ways in which language articulates and mediates such gender performance.
between power and masculinity/powerlessness and femininity, and in many contexts the language that signifies one may also signify the other” (Cameron and Kulick 2003, 57). Through what Cameron terms “sex-talk”, men, such as those described through my Amsterdam survey, exercise this power and promote homosocial bonding amongst each other through language (D. Cameron 2006, 172): “Because sex-talk degrades the woman but not the man, it emphasizes a gender imbalance that gives the man the pleasure of dominating. Putting the woman down is merely another means for structuring this relationship” (D. Cameron 2006, 172). Cameron speaks here to how sex-talk reaffirms power relations between men and women. Such hierarchical relations were articulated through many respondents’ experiences with catcalling in my survey and, in the process of being articulated, were arguably normalized by being portrayed as simply annoying and unavoidable. Cameron speaks to why this normalization occurs: “[A] lot of ‘straight’ talking is about ‘doing being ordinary’… and conversely, a lot of ‘doing being ordinary’ is about the routine, seen-but-unnoticed production of heterosexual identity” (D. Cameron 2006, 178). Cameron thus highlights here how catcalling, as also a form of “straight talking”, can be understood as “routine” and as affirming of conventional standards of sexuality, an assertion that I explore further through my findings in Chapter 3.

Resistance to such normalized language, by rejecting a catcaller for example, is understood as attempting to subvert the “natural” order of such powered (hetero)sexual interactions. Linguistics scholar Penelope Eckert speaks to this in her study of gendered interactions between school-aged children: “If [girls] laugh, they are acquiescing in the objectification of their gender, but if they do not they are compromising their age-appropriate credentials” (D. Cameron 2006, 176). Eckert’s findings thus point to complicated negotiations that girls undergo when making decisions about how to most effectively respond to their male classmates’ articulations of heterosexual masculinity, which can be useful to better understand women’s responses to catcalling by men within the context of Amsterdam. Similar to Eckert’s findings, in situations of catcalling, I show in Chapter 3 how women in Amsterdam negotiate, weigh and prioritize the implications of different types of responses. Although positive engagement with the catcaller can be understood, according to Eckert, as “acquiescing”, it can also be understood as a strategy to mitigate perceived threats to personal safety that a woman might anticipate if she were to
reject or ignore her catcaller(s). 37

1.3. EFFECTS OF AND RESISTANCE TO STREET HARASSMENT

Following on Eckert and Cameron and Kulick’s findings, Chapter 3 will look at means of resistance employed by women in Amsterdam who experience verbal forms of street harassment such as catcalling based on their positioning and treatment in public spaces as ‘Woman’. Sociologist Esther Madriz frames this discussion, pointing to several common forms of resistance to street harassment, including: “altering personal appearance, looking for guardians, ignoring fears...carrying protection, [and] fighting back” (Madriz 1997, 118). Feminist sociologist Carol Brooks Gardner notes additional gendered strategies of resistance, including effecting “ugliness” and “invoking an absent [male] protector” (Gardner 1995, 206), gendered strategies that survey respondents also reported as means of deterring harassers in Amsterdam. Gardner thus speaks to the underlying heterosexist factors that influence how women expect to be perceived and, in turn, the ways in which women avoid street harassment by not conforming to these expected gendered and heterosexist perceptions (e.g. effecting “ugliness”). In this regard, nonconformity to being positioned as ‘Woman’ within the context of street harassment situations can trouble gendered and heterosexist identity categories and strip male harassers of social power during these interactions.

Resisting gendered and heterosexist power structures in these ways can, however, come with a price. As touched upon through the work of Walkowitz, Ilahi and Mosse in the Introduction Chapter, feminist sociologists Kristen Schilt and Laurel Westbrook contend that not only do women who resist in these ways threaten men’s socialized entitlement to accessing women in public spaces (Schilt and Westbrook 2009, 460), but that such means of resistance have particular effects for women who wish to maintain their social positioning as heterosexual: “To do violence and, thus, do masculinity38 would further destabilize women’s claims to both femininity and heterosexuality. Given that masculine behavior in women is

37 In this vein, it is important to note that what is perceived or interpreted as a ‘positive’ response by a woman who is catcalled towards her catcaller does not necessarily reflect a positive reception by the woman. Rather, it is possible that it is a strategic response to avoid further engagement and threats to the woman’s personal safety (Gardner, 1990, 320).
38 Links between violence and masculinity are widely expressed throughout academic and mainstream literature (Katz 2010, Anderson and Umberson 2001); however, these links are not inextricable and must be considered critically. Philosopher Myriam Miedzian speaks to this assertions, noting that: “There is a new urgency to the need to give up destructive modes of thought and behavior by ancient, outmoded values” and to develop more nuanced approaches to masculinities and their relationship to violence (Miedzian 2002, xxii).
associated with lesbianism, cisgender women who wish to emphasize heterosexuality must respond differently” (Schilt and Westbrook 2009, 458). Although violent behaviors are acceptable means for men to demonstrate (hetero)masculinity (Schilt and Westbrook 2009, 460), such behavior is not socially condoned as a means to assert (hetero)femininity (Schilt and Westbrook 2009, 459), an assertion that I discuss further in Chapter 3 within the context of the ways in which survey respondents deter and react to street harassment in Amsterdam. Schilt and Westbrook’s discussion thus speaks to broader gendered and heterosexist systems of power that not only drive street harassment interactions, but also exert significant influence over how/if women resist such interactions on the ground.

Feminist scholar and activist Adrienne Rich speaks to such expectations of what she terms “compulsory heterosexuality” (Rich 1980, 632) underlining the gendered and heterosexist expectations of “real” women (Rich 1980, 642). By using inverted commas to bracket the word real, Rich alludes to the discussion earlier with de Beauvoir, Wittig, West and Zimmerman and others about what it means to be categorized as ‘Woman’ and to be positioned as women in society. By linking the requirements of womanhood with compulsory heterosexuality, Rich underlines a critical connection between gender and sexuality that has been alluded to throughout this discussion. We can thus take the work of these scholars into account in Chapter 3 to more fully understand through my survey findings in Amsterdam not only how street harassment exemplifies the power relations embedded in such relationships, but also who is dominant, who is subordinate and the factors that help to explain why and to what extent these power relations occur.

1.4. [MAPPING]GENDERED AND HETEROSEXIST PUBLIC SPACES

The actual spaces in which power is negotiated and enforced are a critical factor when looking at street harassment as a normalized gendered and heterosexist practice and the various ways in which it is resisted. This section will frame such a discussion by focusing on how public spaces are gendered and heterosexist and at how this helps to facilitate and normalize street harassment interactions that occur within these spaces. In establishing this framework, Chapters 3 and 4 will then look at the effects of gendered and heterosexist public spaces through the experiences of respondents in Amsterdam. This section will also turn to innovative ways of visualizing these power dynamics in order to map how spaces

---

39 See footnote 26 for an explanation of cisgendered.
facilitate gendered and heterosexist interactions, a method that will be discussed in relation to street harassment in Amsterdam more specifically in Chapter 4.

Public spaces can be defined as parks, plazas, malls, public markets, community gardens, transit systems and stations, streets, sidewalks and more (Branam 2014, 2). Historically, as I noted in the Introduction Chapter, access to public space has been a way for individuals to affirm their “right to participate in society” (Dimond 2012, 3). As we saw through the work of Walkowitz, Ilahi and Mosse, public spaces in different parts of the world have traditionally been marked as male domains. In Western Europe, as spaces hybridized and a more “heterogeneous public” (Walkowitz 1998, 17) emerged during processes of societal modernization, street harassment of women was a way for men to contest the upsetting of traditional gendered divisions of space (Walkowitz 1998, 18) and to reclaim hegemonic dominance in the public sphere.

The ongoing role of public spaces in facilitating heterosexist interactions is however often dismissed, ignored or trivialized in discussions about street harassment (O'Neil 2013, 1). In this vein, author James Howard Kunstler claims that public spaces are “neutral places” (Branam 2014, 3) that do not discriminate between different types of occupants: “The neutrality of these places makes them a blank canvas on which all members of society are invited to apply their colors” (Branam 2014, 3). To the contrary of Kunstler’s claim, I argue that public spaces help to define the area(s) where power inequities are exercised, including within street harassment interactions. Sociologist Nirmal Puwar speaks to this contention, noting that: “The very act of their appearance on the streets left the status of women open to interpretation and, often, to unwanted sexual attentions” (Puwar 2004, 24). Far from upholding their claim of neutrality, public spaces are thus constructed and skewed in significant gendered and heterosexist ways.

In this vein, architecture and environmental design scholar Michael Rios encourages a consideration of the broader power imbalances inherent in public spaces: “There is a need to shed light on marginality…as a way to expose the political in urbanism” (Rios 2013, 202). Rios highlights an important point here relating to the politicization of urban space. By using the term “marginality”, Rios is arguably alluding to groups of people who experience discrimination, including sexism, heterosexism and racism in public spaces. Rios thus underlines the intentionality of the construction of public space, and the powered, political agendas that marginalize certain groups in order to maintain the status quo. Chapter 3 will further explore such spatial marginality and its implications by highlighting the gendered, heterosexist and racial undercurrents that mark the experiences of survey respondents in
Amsterdam. In these experiences, catcalling, groping and insults directed at women’s bodies, for example, are all part of this politicization of urban spaces, and thus must be understood within this framework in order to be addressed more effectively.

Architectural scholar and activist Leslie Kanes Weisman builds on Rios’ assertion, pointing to the explicit gendered and heterosexist intentions inherent in the construction of public spaces:

The man-made environments which surround us reinforce conventional patriarchal definitions of women’s role in society and spatially imprint those sexist messages… It is neither value free nor inclusively human” (Weisman 1981 [2000], 1, 5).

Weisman thus rebuts Hunstler’s claim of neutral public spaces and underlines the gendered and heterosexist construction of these spaces. Within the Amsterdam context, in Chapter 3 I look at the effects of public spaces as constructed in these ways. Understanding the gendered construction of public spaces and the effects this has on the ground (Koskela and Tani 2005, 421) is thus critical in order to more effectively gain an overview of the landscape and to target responses accordingly.

One way to obtain such an overview is to incorporate digital technologies into mapping gendered and heterosexist public spaces. Although traditionally, digital mapping has been understood within a geographical or geological context (Arlinghaus 1994; Minasny, et al. 2013; Whitmeyer, Nicoletti and De Pair 2009), ‘feminist mapping’ uses digital technologies and online platforms to affect social change: “Feminist mapping…explores social effects, whatever their material form, to begin to answer ‘how’ questions about structure, power and organization” (FemTech Net 2014). By visualizing and mapping gendered public spaces, feminist mapping can thus be used to expose how public spaces are gendered in their construction and how power is exercised within these spaces, including in street harassment interactions. Feminist author Sheri Klein speaks to this potential, noting:

To better understand my experiences in visual terms, I looked to mapping. Visual data methods such as drawing, diagrams, and maps allow me to visualize my struggles, to explore connections between experience, facts, and my locations, and to address the intense silence about the reality of [power] differences (Klein 2012, 5).

Klein thus speaks to the power of feminist mapping to visually represent and broadcast individual experiences to broad audiences, a tool that can arguably be applied within the context of mapping the gendered spaces where street harassment occurs. In Chapter 4, I will take my claims beyond gendered and heterosexist power dynamics, and will also point to the
relation of spaces with racial marginalization through some respondents’ attributions of harassment to minority communities and neighborhoods in Amsterdam.

Street harassment interactions in public spaces can thus be understood as not only reflective of the heterosexist norms and gendered power imbalances discussed so far, but also as the result of these and other inequities that characterize public space. As is discussed in this thesis, using feminist mapping as a form of storytelling, and as a way to map the construction of different gendered public spaces arguably also has the potential to expose street harassment interactions as gendered and heterosexist and mobilize quick, collective and widespread forms of resistance.

1.5. ENGAGING SOCIAL MOVEMENTS WITH DIGITAL AND ONLINE ACTIVISM

In this section, we will move towards broader forms of digital and online activism to frame my discussion in Chapter 4 about the potential of online and digital platforms to expose—through digital mapping, online storytelling platforms or Twitter, for example—and resist street harassment interactions and the underlying gendered and heterosexist factors that drive them. These newer forms of information-gathering and activism can arguably help to shed light on the pervasiveness of gendered and heterosexist positioning, language and space that mark street harassment interactions, as well as provide fast and scalable platforms for resistance.

Traditionally, the ways in which social movements are structured, mobilize and develop strategies of resistance have been centered offline, such as in meetings, demonstrations and conferences. Sociologist James Jasper, speaks to this conventional understanding, and points to “framing”, a concept that describes organizing experiences and guiding collective action, as an integral strategy of social movements (Jasper 2010, 970). “Collective action frames” (Benford and Snow 2000, 611) are part of the concept of framing, which allow for social movements to employ broad messages in order to appeal to a larger pool of potential supporters. Based on this framework, I show in Chapter 4 that using digital and online platforms to articulate collective action frames can allow social movements to not only inform about certain social issues but to mobilize large amounts of people as part of this process (Benford and Snow 2000, 614). Sociologist and scholar Erving Goffman underlines the utility of collective action frames, noting that a “schema of interpretation” emerges through this framing that allows for individuals “to locate, perceive, identify, and label their own experiences within those of society as a whole” (Goffman 1974, 21). In
Amsterdam, survey respondents were able to gain strength through such a schema of interpretation, because it enabled them to situate their experiences as part of a broader collective phenomenon. According to Walkowitz, popular media has historically provided an important platform in Victorian England to articulate experiences of street harassment publicly (Walkowitz 1998, 2). Today, such schemas are not limited to traditional mobilization platforms or media but are also increasingly present through online activist platforms. Such platforms arguably serve a similar purpose to the newspapers of Victorian England, in that they are also “popular cultural forms to narrate personal experiences” (Walkowitz 1998, 2). Dubbed “clicktivism” or “keyboard warring” (Bates 2015), such new forms of digital and online activism can both expedite and widen the reach of social movements and serve as important new entry points into the anti-street harassment sphere.

Online activist platforms and tools such as Twitter, blogs and websites have, in this vein, been touted as “the 21st century version of consciousness raising” (Martin and Valenti 2012, 1), with online storytelling as an important method of sharing experiences and raising awareness quickly and broadly. Hollaback!’s Victoria Fitzgerald, along with 20 other online activists speak to the potential for online activism within specifically feminist social movements (Martin and Valenti 2012, 2):

No other form of activism in history has empowered one individual to prompt tens of thousands to take action on a singular issue—within minutes. Its influence is colossal and its potential is even greater. Feminists today, young and old, use the Internet to share their stories and analysis, raise awareness and organize collective actions, and discuss difficult issues (Martin and Valenti 2012, 6).

Co-founder of Feministing.com Vanessa Valenti and feminist author Courtney Martin highlight the plethora of possibilities that a few strokes of a keyboard and clicks can offer—from awareness-raising to encouraging action to policy pressure. In Chapter 4, I show that such possibilities have the potential to be harnessed and applied even more than they already are—not only by 21 US-based online activists but by social movements and activist agendas across the world, including the anti-street harassment movement in Amsterdam. Gender equality activist Keshet Bachan speaks to such a potential, stating: “The exchange of views, the proliferation of opinions, and what I believe to be the consciousness raising process that takes place any time there is a feminist debate online is invaluable to the women’s movements” (Ford 2015, 1). Bachan thus speaks to online platforms and technologies’ positioning as new forms of consciousness raising that should be considered key parts of contemporary social movement activism. Such platforms and technologies arguably have the potential to expose and resist street harassment interactions and the underlying gendered and
heterosexist factors that drive them by revealing the systematic oppression in individual experiences at scales and speeds like never before.

**Chapter Conclusion**

In this chapter I have laid the foundation to my main research question: *What factors influence street harassment interactions and how can online platforms map these interactions and impact gendered and heterosexist public spaces in Amsterdam?*. In doing so, I contextualized my case studies in Amsterdam, New York and London by engaging with four overarching bodies of literature: literature on gendered and heterosexist positioning, the power of language, public spaces, as well as on traditional and digital/virtual social movements.

I established my entry point at de Beauvoir’s conceptualization of ‘Woman’ and I built on the work of feminist scholars and activists to argue that women’s categorization and positioning as ‘Woman’ underlies gendered and heterosexist interactions between men and women in public spaces, drives the language used in these interactions and characterizes the actual spaces themselves. In this way, we can understand how these factors work to define street harassment as a normalized, gendered and heterosexist practice.

Although my category of analysis is arguably not without limitations, I pointed to the utility of strategically approaching essentialist gender categories, given their continued use on the ground. I also discussed literature on the effects and means of resistance, to show the extent to which gendered and heterosexist positioning is being troubled in existing literature on street harassment. Finally, in this chapter I presented literature on forms of digital and online mapping and activism that I argue in Chapter 4 can be used to both expose and resist gendered and heterosexist positioning and spaces, as well as offer important platforms of resistance to survey respondents in Amsterdam.
CHAPTER 2. METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, I describe the methods and methodologies that I employed to gather and analyze my empirical data, the limitations to my research and my own positioning as a researcher. My research for this project is grounded primarily in two case studies: an online survey that I conducted in Amsterdam and online posts to Hollaback! sites in New York and London. Additionally, I integrate data from Skype conversations and email exchanges to enrich my work. My research is informed by four overarching methodological approaches: feminist approaches to research methodology, grounded theory approaches, mixed-methods approaches, including quantitative and qualitative methods, and discourse analysis.

My research methodology has sought to fill existing gaps in approaches to street harassment research, which have conventionally been limited to legal literature (Bowman 1993, 522). Although the “silence” (Bowman 1993, 522) of other perspectives within the field is beginning to be unsettled, as I noted in the Introduction Chapter, academic research on street harassment remains relatively recent.

2.1 WORKING WITH DATA

2.1.1 Hollaback! Posts and Amsterdam Survey

My data for this research is primarily based on two case studies: an online survey in Amsterdam and posts to Hollaback’s New York and London sites. The online Hollaback! posts consisted of 20 submissions to each site, respectively. The Amsterdam survey was 33 questions and was open from January 19 through February 2, 2015. During this time, it received 157 responses, 93 of which were complete. In this thesis, I focus primarily on 67 completed responses of respondents who both identify and believe they are perceived as female. In particular, I look at the detailed stories from question 12 (Q12) of my survey provided by 48 of these respondents. When referring to survey responses, in this thesis I use the format: QX; RX, where QX signifies the survey question number and RX signifies the

40 While stressing the importance of acknowledging the many different groups and communities affected by street harassment in Amsterdam, including LGBTQ communities and people of color, unless otherwise indicated, this thesis will primarily focus on 67 of the survey responses, in which respondents identify as female and also are believed to be perceived as female. These individuals represent the majority of survey respondents and their stories reflect the aim of this thesis to prove that street harassment is a normalized, gendered and heterosexist practice where men harass individuals they perceive as women. In her research on street harassment in the US, feminist legal scholar Cynthia Bowman speaks to this claim, noting that: “[I]n street harassment situations, women appear to be primarily targeted while men tend to be the main aggressors” (Bowman 1993, 1).
response number (for example, Q3; R2). The survey questions and data to which I refer in this thesis are located in Appendices C and G.

When first approaching this research, I chose to only focus on my second case study, posts to existing Hollaback! sites. I made this decision because at the time of research, there was no online platform in Amsterdam to share stories about street harassment. This initial decision became significant, as I later based my survey questions for Amsterdam in part off of the online Hollaback! story submission form (see Appendix A). The Hollaback! New York and London sites also played an important role in framing how storytelling about street harassment is carried out online. I chose the New York and London sites out of the 70+ live Hollaback! sites at the time of research as these were among the highest traffic sites (J. Cameron 2015). New York and London are also major cities, which are more comparable in their position as major and/or capital cities to Amsterdam than, for example, the Izmir, Turkey or Appalachian, Ohio US sites. Because posts to each site did not typically exceed 300 words, I looked at 20 of the most recent stories for each city.41

However, I felt that my project was lacking a more meaningful connection to my own experiences in Amsterdam. Thus, while the Hollaback! posts are incorporated into Chapter 4 to show how online activist platforms are already being used to share stories and to resist street harassment, I chose to also design what I list above as my first case study, an online survey in Amsterdam. Factors such as speed and reach played an important function in ultimately determining my use of a survey method, as well as the general absence of online technologies and platforms in Amsterdam with regards to evaluating street harassment incidence and resistance. Not only was a survey a useful method given the time constraints of the research, but it also allowed for engagement with a broader audience (Miner-Rubino and Jayaratne 2013, 304-305).42 Within feminist research more specifically, quantitative methods such as my survey are also useful in exposing and mapping street harassment and in showing the various actors involved. Feminist psychologists Kathi Miner-Rubino and Tobi Epstein Jayaratne speak to this assertion, contending that: “[Q]uantitative methods are helpful when determining the best course of action in implementing social change for women because such techniques help us to identify patterns of gender oppression and they

41 I did not include stories that 1) were not specifically about street harassment but were about other forms of sexism such as workplace sexual harassment; 2) were about people the submitters knew, such as classmates or pupils; 3) did not have enough information, for example one story which only said: hissing; and 4) were posted by Hollaback! administrators about upcoming events or campaigns. See Appendices D and E for the posts.

42 We can look to the power and reach of incorporating quantitative analysis into [feminist] research, by looking at how statistics such as the gender pay gap or the infamous “We are the 99 percent” statistic that spearheaded the Occupy Wall Street campaign that began in 2011 in the US and have led to powerful ground-level effects and social change (Miner-Rubino and Jayaratne 2013, 305).
reveal how oppression operates” (Miner-Rubino and Jayaratne 2013, 305). My survey was also not created without benchmarks. I based and formatted the survey questions according to the online web form for submitting stories to Hollaback! sites as well as to the international survey conducted by Hollaback! in conjunction with Cornell University in New York that had just recently closed in January 2015.43 The Hollaback! survey and its results were unavailable when I began my research; however, I was able to obtain a copy of the questions from the project lead at Cornell.44 Designing my survey using Hollaback! as a benchmark enabled me to be more consistent in my questions and in my analysis of online posts and survey responses. After creating the survey, the next steps were to test it, circulate it, filter the responses, code45 the data and interpret the results.

Although the survey was based off an existing survey and Hollaback!'s online story submission form, I tested it with myself and three other people, including two Dutch speakers and with one of my supervisors. Because my survey was in English but was disseminated through networks in Amsterdam, I asked one of my Dutch Hollaback! teammates to review the language of the survey to ensure that it was clear and could be understood. Although my teammate’s understanding is not reflective and cannot be representative of all potential Dutch survey respondents, I was able to obtain an indication of the level of comprehension through the feedback I received. Circulation of the survey was done primarily through social media networks within Amsterdam, university newsletters and a Facebook event that I created. I used convenience and snowball sampling46 to target groups and networks I was already familiar with on Facebook and to allow for those people that I initially invited to invite more people, and so on. Although I was not able to determine the reach of some of the newsletters and listservs, I did determine that 15,000 people like or follow the various social media networks where I posted the survey and over 300 people were invited to the event I created on Facebook.

43 See Appendices A and B for the Hollaback! online submission form and Cornell's international street harassment survey.
44 When open, the survey was available for all Hollaback! site countries and in all languages spoken in these countries. Because there was not a survey specifically for the Netherlands, I obtained a copy of the general version (in English), which was also available during the survey period for people whose country or language was not listed. The Introduction Chapter discusses some of the survey results in the US, which were made available in April 2015.
45 Coding will be defined here as the process of translating non-numeric data into quantifiable categories (Hesse-Biber 2012, 255). See Appendix F for a list of the 17 main codes I used in my analysis.
46 Convenience sampling is characterized by the recruitment of respondents from “places where they are easily accessible” (Hesse-Biber 2012, 249), such as the groups and networks I was familiar with on Facebook and through my own Facebook event. Snowball sampling is a variation of convenience sampling, in which “participants invite others in their social network to join the sample” (Hesse-Biber 2012, 249). Online surveys often use snowball sampling as a means to more quickly and widely disseminate the survey (Hesse-Biber 2012, 249).
The landscape of such a ‘digital playground’ and its power to both expedite and expand its reach compared to conventional paper surveys became clear as responses to the survey poured in. Whereas traditional paper-based surveys are more costly and typically receive slower response rates (Kaplowitz, Hadlock and Levine 2004, 100), my online survey was free to distribute and garnered 157 responses in just the two weeks it was open. Out of those responses, I filtered for only responses that were complete. Throughout my analysis, I applied different filters to the data depending on what I was analyzing. For example, in order to focus on experiences of respondents who both identify and believe they are perceived as women, I applied a filter for respondents who answered ‘woman’ to both of these questions and was then able to be more consistent with the parameters of my analysis. At times, I also applied more than one filter. In this way, I was able to more consistently and effectively manage the data that I was addressing.

Because I initially decided to focus only on 20 recent posts to the New York and London Hollaback! sites, I started by coding these stories. I read through each story line by line and took notes on key common categories in the margins as I read. As I read through more stories and added new categories to the margins, I went back to the previous stories and coded them with the newly added categories. As I coded, I made broader categories more specific. For example, though I started with categories such as type of harassment: {verbal; physical; other}, these categories were narrowed to include more specific types of harassment, including ‘greeting’, sexual comment or slur/insult. In the end of my coding process, I had 17 different coded categories (see Appendix F). With these categories in mind, I followed the same procedure with the 20 most recent stories posted to the London Hollaback! site. Although it was not necessary to add new main categories when coding the London stories, because London is a different city than New York, it was not surprising that it was necessary to add several additional sub-categories.\footnote{These sub-categories, for example, included adding “exposure” to physical forms of harassment, “bus” to place of harassment and “embarrassed” to harasser response.} The new sub-categories did not necessarily reflect the difference between New York and London as cities; instead, they are reflective of what was reported by respondents in these two cities in the 20 stories that I analyzed for each city.

After coding the New York and London Hollaback! posts, I turned to coding the 48 stories that were shared in my Amsterdam survey. I coded these stories with the categories that I had already established from the London and New York stories. But similar to the coding process of the London stories, several sub-categories were necessary to add to the Amsterdam stories. Again, there did not appear to be anything particularly ‘Dutch’ about the
new sub-categories; rather, they were reflective of the data that I analyzed. One important difference between the Hollaback! stories and the stories from my survey, however, was that the former had all racial and class identifiers removed before being published on the website, whereas my survey data had not. Because of this, I added new categories that included race or class information provided by Amsterdam survey respondents.

As I coded, it was important that I maintained my awareness of the potential for coding to “distort the intended meaning of the response” (Miner-Rubino and Jayaratne 2013, 320). Viewing the data through a feminist lens promoted such an awareness, and allowed for the articulation of differing perspectives (Miner-Rubino and Jayaratne 2013, 320), particularly of voices from more marginalized social standpoints such as women, LGBTQ-identified individuals, and people of color. The following section will dive deeper into such feminist methodologies as well as other approaches that informed the ways in which I gathered and analyzed my data.

2.2. APPROACHES TO RESEARCHING STREET HARASSMENT

As a feminist researcher, the ways in which I gather and interpret my data are guided by an attention to how power is manifested and negotiated within particular interactions. Feminist scholars Marika Morris and Bénita Bunjun highlight the importance of recognizing how “systems of power or exclusion interact to produce specific experiences” (Morris and Bunjun 2007, 22). In looking at street harassment, it is thus important that I consider varying forces of oppression (gender, race and class, for example) that mark such interactions and shape individual subjectivities within them. The feminist approach to my research is also evidenced through the feminist concern embedded into my research question, the way in which I interpreted and analyzed the results of my data (Morris and Bunjun 2007) as well as my reflexivity during the analysis process (Miner-Rubino and Jayaratne 2013, 306). In this regard, my entry point into my research through de Beauvoir’s ‘Woman’ category of analysis aligns with feminist theorist Sandra Harding’s standpoint theory (Harding 1987), which

---

48 The removal of racial and class identifiers from Hollaback! posts will be returned to in the following section of this chapter, Self-Positioning and Reflexivity.

49 This approach speaks to the concept of intersectionality in feminist research, which can be understood as taking these multiple axes of oppression into account in order to obtain a “deeper”, more comprehensive understanding of relations of power and their effects (Morris and Bunjun 2007, 22). However, it is important to note that the extent to which I can account for all axes of oppression within street harassment interactions in Amsterdam is also guided (and limited) by my data and by the responses I received from my survey.

50 Reflexivity plays a central role in feminist research and can be understood as “self-critical sympathetic introspection and the self-conscious analytical scrutiny of the self as researcher” (England 1994, 244). In other words, as a feminist researcher, continuously acknowledging and interrogating my own positioning is critical to more ethical research practices and methods.
positions women’s “concerns, knowledge and experience at the forefront of academic concern and inquiry” (Hesse-Biber 2010, 1). Aligning myself as a feminist researcher and highlighting street harassment as primarily gendered and heterosexist throughout this thesis speaks to such a standpoint and marks my positioning and entry point into the ways in which I present and analyze my findings.

In addition to the broader feminist perspective I take in my research, I am also guided by what Harding and feminist theorist Donna Haraway term: “strong objectivity” (Harding 1993, 69) or “feminist objectivity” (Haraway 1991, 114), respectively. These concepts rely on an acknowledgement both of the utility of knowledge as situated—that is of knowledge understood as rooted in certain contexts or positions—and of the realistic impossibility of reaching one true objective conclusion. Feminist scholars Michelle Yaiser and Patricia Leavy speak to this notion, asserting that a researcher can have the “goal of conventional objectivity” while conjunctively acknowledging “the reality that no one can achieve this goal” (Miner-Rubino and Jayaratne 2013, 301). In this sense, the survey method becomes a useful tool to obtain a sketch of street harassment in Amsterdam, but must be accompanied by a reflexive researcher who recognizes the limitations of such a method.

Throughout my research, I continuously interrogated my data and its implications by comparing survey responses to each other and to the narratives I analyzed from online posts to New York and London Hollaback! sites, emails, Skype conversations and digital geo maps that I created from my data. Sociologist Kathy Charmaz describes this process as part of grounded theory approaches to research:

From the initial stages of research and throughout the process, grounded theorists scrutinize their data by asking both action and analytic questions: “what is happening here?” And “what (theoretical category or theory) are these data a study of?” The first question pushes the researcher to examine the empirical world in close detail. The second question links this world to theoretical possibilities (Charmaz 2010, 161).

---

51 Harding described strong objectivity as a method for “delinking the neutrality ideal from standards for maximizing objectivity” (Harding 1995, 331), thus encouraging a troubling of conventional understandings of knowledge and truth as more maleable than traditionally portrayed. In this vein, Haraway describes feminist objectivity as “about limited location and situated knowledge… In this way we might become answerable for what we learn how to see” (Haraway 1991, 116). Haraway thus uses this term to also explain the limited and locational nature of knowledge and to underline the accountability of researchers who interpret and disseminate knowledge as well.

52 I will outline some important limitations to using the survey as a method in section 2.4, Research Implications, Limitations and Ethics.

53 Grounded theory came about in a Western context in the late 1960s as an “emergent method”; that is, as a method that is predicated on reducing predetermined ideas, being flexible in the directions that research might take and building “middle-range theories” as a result of the research process (Charmaz 2010, 155).
By asking these questions about my survey data, revisiting links to existing literature and theories, as well as by considering data that I obtained through online posts, Skype and email conversations, and digital maps, different parts of my research thus worked to inform each other as part of this grounded theory approach. Throughout this process, I in turn did not proceed entirely linearly from theory to empirical or vice versa; rather, I engaged on a more nuanced endeavor that allowed for increased flexibility as different types of data were taken into account.

Grounded theory was part of a broader mixed-methods approach that I chose because it allows for more of a conversation to occur between different methods and types of data. Having different types of data inform my analysis in Chapters 3 and 4 was, in this sense, a critical part of ensuring a more multifaceted understanding of street harassment interactions. Feminist sociologist Sharlene Hesse-Biber speaks to the dynamicity of feminist mixed-methods approaches in this regard:

[M]ixed methods research designs tackle the thorny questions that challenge and push boundaries of long-held foundational assumptions concerning how knowledge is built, what we can know, and how knowledge building ought to proceed [and] hold greater potential to address these complex questions by acknowledging the dynamic interconnections that traditional research methods have not adequately addressed (Hesse-Biber 2010, 1-2).

Following a mixed-methods approach from a feminist perspective thus allowed me to continuously interrogate my research findings from a critical perspective that, as Hesse-Biber notes above, takes multiple areas of knowledge into account. Along with a critical and reflexive analysis of the data obtained using my online survey, the quantitative data gathered from this method provided an “assessment” or “landscape” (Hesse-Biber 2010, 161) of the street harassment situation in Amsterdam. Combining this method with a more qualitative analysis of the results, of the discourse, of online conversations and of data mapping and visualization in turn allowed for a more vigorous approach to my research question.

Along with the mixed-methods approach, I also used discourse analysis to more fully unpack my data. Discourse analysis was primarily used to look at the language used in the Hollaback! posts and in Amsterdam survey respondents’ experiences. Analyzing discourse in this thesis was a way to measure the social power or control of, for example, the different actors in street harassment situations, including the language exchanged and the ways in which experiences are articulated. Literary scholar Teun van Dijk speaks to such processes, noting:

One important condition for the exercise of social control through discourse is the control of discourse and discourse production itself. Therefore, the central questions are: Who can
say or write what to whom in what situations? Who has access to the various forms or genres of discourse or to the means of its reproduction? The less powerful people are, the less they have access to various forms of text or talk (van Dijk 1989, 21).

In this sense, it was important to question the production, articulation and dissemination of my data, as well as the processes of mediation and interpretation that impacted its meaning. Taking the different definitions of ‘catcalling’ from the Introduction Chapter into account for example, it was essential to consider what sources produce what definitions of street harassment and who accesses, transmits and interprets these different understandings. Returning to Harding and Haraway’s notion of objectivity, different mediating actors (survey respondents, myself, the readers of this thesis, for example) have differing interpretative agendas and powers to push such agendas within the context of my research. The production of these survey responses thus becomes a chain of embedded textual moves, the effects of which I analyze through my discussion of prominent themes and concepts throughout this thesis.

The discourse analysis that I undergo throughout my research is mainly of stories that individuals share about street harassment. As discussed in section 1.5, online storytelling\(^{54}\) is a method of sharing experiences and raising awareness quickly and broadly. Sharing stories through digital channels or online platforms was essential to my research, both in how I created my survey questions, in the Hollaback! posts that I analyzed and as a potential tool for mapping who harasses, who is harassed, why and how. Traditionally, storytelling can be defined as a social practice where individuals share their experiences with others, often with the intention or effect of “creating meaning” in their own lives (Vannini 2009). From a feminist perspective and from the perspective of this thesis, storytelling can be understood as destabilizing the marginalized position of women by making their stories and experiences visible and part of a larger set of gendered experiences (Kannengießer 2012). The ways in which digital storytelling has “transformed witnessing and testimonies” (Pető 2015) in fields such as oral history and memory studies—that is, the way in which it provides a “new media narrative form” (Dorner, Jeges and Pető 2015) of articulation—is thus central to producing diverse and alternative truths, which speaks to the underlying feminist approach and emphasis of my research. In the context of sharing stories online about street harassment, feminist scholar Jill Dimond adds that framing, a concept discussed by Jasper and Benford and Snow in section 1.5, helps to explain how online storytelling can change the ways individuals think and respond to the issues they write about: “The very act of writing

\(^{54}\) See also footnote 24 in the Introduction Chapter for an explanation of the term and its applicability to this thesis.
down their story and reading the stories of others changed their cognitive orientation toward their experience, problematizing it as street harassment and connecting it to a greater phenomenon and collective experience” (Dimond 2012, 138). Dimond thus highlights the critical role storytelling can play in not only promoting awareness but also in facilitating a transformation of negative experiences into opportunities for empowerment. Through this storytelling process, in Chapter 4 I show how individuals are anonymously and collectively able to “reclaim some of the power lost when they were harassed” (Dimond 2012, 141). We can thus consider online storytelling as it relates to my research methods in three important ways: first, as enabling survey respondents and Hollaback! posters to share and disseminate their stories; second, as informing the types of questions that I asked in my survey and third; as a potential tool to engage with moving forward to digitally map stories of harassment, the spaces in which they occur, and responses on the ground.

2.3. SELF-POSITIONING AND REFLEXIVITY

As a white middle-class woman from the US, it was important that I kept my own positioning and reflexivity in mind throughout my work. The fact that I myself have experienced street harassment in multiple places around the world, as I describe in the Introduction Chapter, inevitably affected the ways in which I designed and analyzed my research. Feminist scholars Laura Logan and Judith Stacey speak to this point, asking:

Does it matter that I have experienced street harassment? Yes. Stacey (1988) suggests that: “Most feminist researchers, committed, at a minimum, to redressing the sexist imbalances of masculinist scholarship, appear to select their research projects on substantive grounds. Personal interests and skills meld, often mysteriously, with collective feminist concerns to determine a particular topic of research, which, in turn, appears to guide the research methods employed in its service” (Logan 2013, 43-44; Stacey 1988, 21).

Logan and Stacey thus note the importance of considering how such personal experiences and background can influence the topic and ways in which research is conducted. As I discussed towards the beginning of this chapter, Harding and Haraway’s encouragement of acknowledging different standpoints, locations and objectivities also played a central role in informing my research practice. Hesse-Biber speaks to the importance of such concepts within feminist research, in particular in increasing the transparency of the research(er): “The practice of ‘strong [feminist] objectivity’ can make…biases visible. When researchers disclose their values, attitudes, and biases regarding a set of research questions, their findings can maintain a higher degree of validity” (Hesse-Biber 2014, 262).
Because of my own experiences of street harassment in Amsterdam, I was also able, to a certain extent, relate to the stories and experiences shared by respondents. This type of reflexive engagement in research, particularly of research that asks respondents potentially triggering or sensitive questions, is critical to ethical and best practices. Harding speaks to this point, asserting that: “The best feminist analysis…insists that the inquirer her/himself be placed in the same critical plane as the overt subject matter” (Harding 1987, 9). Harding thus reminds us to “appreciate and value” (Hesse-Biber 2012, 253) the survey respondents, rather than to objectify them for the benefit of the research.

When designing my research, it was also important for me to acknowledge existing work and perspectives on street harassment. In this vein, through a Skype conversation with Monica Ibrahim, Communications Manager for Harassmap, I was able to gain another perspective on how online platforms can be used to map and respond to street harassment incidence in an Egyptian context. As a result of my conversation with Ibrahim, I added questions on, for example, bystander intervention and was able to consider the Western European location of my research within the broader field of anti-street harassment initiatives. I also communicated with Jae Cameron at Hollaback! headquarters in New York about the amount of visitors to the organization’s more than 70 sites, which helped to determine which would be most useful for my analysis. Cameron also provided insight onto submission approval guidelines and the organization’s anti-discrimination policy, which calls for the removal of race and class identifiers from submissions to its sites. Cameron explained that Hollaback! made this decision because, despite what their data suggests, raced and classed stereotypes continue to be how street harassment is understood in the organization’s experience (J. Cameron 2015). The removal of racial and class identifiers from the Hollaback! posts was an important omission to consider, particularly because the stories shared in my online survey were not presented to me with such omissions. It was, in this sense, critical that I avoided discussing raced or classed indicators reported from my survey

55 As of April 2015, the number of sites worldwide rose to 92.
56 Hollaback!’s anti-discrimination policy initially raised red flags with me about censoring or policing individual submissions to the Hollaback! site. However, because of prevalent beliefs throughout the US—reflected as well among some survey respondents in Amsterdam in Chapters 3 and 4—that street harassment is predominantly perpetrated by people of color (Hollaback! 2015a, 39), it is important to weigh the decision to remove racial or class indicators from submissions against the stereotypes they could end up reinforcing if they were kept.
57 According to Cameron: “[W]e see the same narrative over and over again in the media in regards to street harassment: that it’s something that happens to (young/straight/able bodied) white women by men of color. We hear over and over again that it’s a ‘cultural thing,’ which is code for racist assumptions about sexism and behaviour in Latino and Black communities (in NYC at least - these assumptions exist in many forms throughout the world, but move to excuse those in power and implicate those outside of traditional power structures). Our data shows this isn’t true, at all, but regardless of how many times we say it, how many people share their stories, you still see the same narratives emerge in mainstream media” (J. Cameron 2015).
as being unique to Amsterdam and that I avoided making inaccurate comparisons with the already-cleaned data from the New York and London stories. The following section will explore some important implications to this and other limitations of my research.

2.4. RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS, LIMITATIONS AND ETHICS

There are several important implications with regards to the design and methods of my research. My research was limited first by the available (feminist) literature on street harassment and on online and digital forms of mapping and resistance. These were not, however, significant limitations because of the available literature on power more generally in public space, heterosexism, and online activism. Second, my research was limited by the demographics of survey respondents in Amsterdam. I do not speak Dutch, and so the dissemination of my survey was limited to Dutch people who understand English. This is also not a significant limitation, as the majority of Dutch people understand English, but it nevertheless eliminates non-Dutch speaking individuals from the survey. I was also limited to individuals with Internet access, as my survey was solely online, and to individuals who use Facebook, either in the groups where I advertised my survey or who were invited by people in these groups to participate. Third, this project was limited by geography (Amsterdam) and timespan (two weeks) of my survey.

Although I incorporated a mixed-methods approach in my research, because the bulk of my data came from my quantitative survey, it is important to acknowledge challenges and limitations to working with such a method. Avoiding “privileging” (Hesse-Biber 2010, 125) of one method over another and underlining the intentionality behind focusing predominantly on this survey method is one challenge worthy of mention. Another is the lack of nuanced information that can result from respondents having to choose between certain pre-designated multiple-choice options (Miner-Rubino and Jayaratne 2013, 302). One attempt to mediate this limitation was to include comment fields for almost every question. Despite concerns over the use of quantitative data methods, combining such methods with qualitative analysis thus allowed not only for an empirical assessment of street harassment in Amsterdam, but also for a more qualitative understanding of its effects and platforms of resistance, thereby acting “in concert” (Hesse-Biber 2010, 160) with each other.

Determining the viability or credibility of my data was another issue I encountered during my research, as survey data credibility can be called into question because of the lack of development and testing prior to circulation (Kelley, et al. 2003, 263). Because of the time constraints of this research, the development of my survey was limited to just over one week,
and the testing phase to just four people. With this in mind, through a careful and critical analysis of the data from the Hollaback! sites and my survey, I had to a certain extent ‘trust’ (Campbell 2002, 132) that my questions were appropriate and that the stories presented were not intentionally false or misleading.

One method that helped to confirm the validity of my survey data was looking at whether individual answers appeared odd or extraneous (Hesse-Biber 2014, 322). If the survey was not anonymous, one additional method could have been to contact individual respondents for clarification about their answers. However, in order to encourage more people to respond, I decided to keep the survey anonymous and to examine the resulting data with such issues of credibility in mind. Although my survey and the Hollaback! posts were anonymous, neither pool of individuals can be touted as representative (Hesse-Biber 2014, 209). By employing convenience and snowball sampling techniques to disseminate my survey more quickly and widely, I must also acknowledge the issues and limitations with employing such circulation techniques. The main issue is a systematic sampling error (Hesse-Biber 2012, 249), meaning respondents are likely to invite friends to the event I created who might be of similar persuasions and share similar points of view.

Finally, because my discussion is focused primarily on heterosexism and gendered language and public spaces in Amsterdam, I also do not fully address issues of race and class that represent other important axes of oppression that affect how people experience moving through public spaces (Logan 2013, 20). The removal of such information from the Hollaback! posts and the focus of my research on heterosexist and gendered power dynamics in public spaces means that an in-depth discussion about issues of race and class-based street harassment did not fall entirely within the scope of this project. That being said, future research on this topic would benefit from more comprehensively addressing additional axes of oppression that influence street harassment situations and resistance. 58 With such limitations in mind, being critical and reflexive in my approaches to my research remained paramount throughout the process.

Chapter Conclusion

In this chapter, I provided an overview of the methods and methodologies that informed the ways in which I conducted my research, as well as a reflexive look at the limitations of my research and my own positioning as a researcher. My 33-question online

58 For an in-depth exploration of how street harassment affects individuals with certain racial or classed indicators, please refer to Logan’s 2013 work, “Fear of Violence and Street Harassment: Accountability at the Intersections” (full reference in bibliography).
Amsterdam survey and the 20 posts to New York and London Hollaback! sites, respectively, served as the two primary case studies for this thesis. I supplemented these data sets with Skype conversations and personal email exchanges, in line with the mixed-methods and grounded theory approaches to my research. Though I did not employ storytelling as a method of my own research, it was central to the way individuals in Amsterdam, New York and London shared their experiences. A discourse analysis of these stories, along with feminist, mixed-methods and grounded theory approaches thus served as the basis for the way I designed and conducted my research.
CHAPTER 3. STREET HARASSMENT IN AMSTERDAM: A NORMALIZED GENDERED AND HETEROSEXIST PRACTICE

I will turn in this chapter to key themes gathered from the survey I conducted on street harassment in Amsterdam to support the first half of my hypothesis that street harassment is a normalized gendered and heterosexist practice, where men harass individuals they perceive as women. Accordingly, this chapter addresses the first part of my research question: What factors influence street harassment interactions (and how can online platforms map these interactions and impact gendered and heterosexist public spaces in Amsterdam?).

In this chapter, I build on the framework of gendered and heterosexist positioning, language, effects and resistance, and public spaces established in sections 1.1-1.4. In doing so, I show how and why these factors drive normalized gendered and heterosexist power dynamics in street harassment interactions in Amsterdam. I argue for a consideration of the gendered and heterosexist dynamics of power that shape the subjectivities of individuals, the language they use and the public spaces in which they interact in Amsterdam. My aim is thus to intervene in street harassment discourse, which normalizes the phenomenon and neutralizes public spaces, and does not take into account the long-term and widespread effects that my survey findings reveal. By incorporating mixed-methods and a feminist perspective into my analysis, I hope to show how my data can both substantiate my hypothesis as well as contribute to broader discourses on street harassment.

The Amsterdam survey data is one of my two case studies, with the second case study the online posts to New York and London Hollaback! sites. This chapter focuses on the former; Chapter 4 will then link the themes discussed here with the latter, through a discussion of innovative ways of exposing street harassment as a normalized gendered and heterosexist practice using online platforms and digital technologies.

Amsterdam Online Survey Overview

Ninety-three individuals completed my survey on street harassment in Amsterdam, the majority of whom (51) were between the ages of 25-34. A significant number (29) were aged 18 to 24 and 13 respondents were 35 or older. All respondents experienced or witnessed street harassment in Amsterdam. Male survey respondents who identified or

59 No time frame was provided, as the survey was based off of Hollaback!'s website, where stories are posted but the date of the incident(s) is not requested or always provided.
believed they were perceived as heterosexual men did not experience street harassment themselves but reported witnessing instances of women being harassed. Most of the respondents (69) identified as female, 14 as male, two as intersexed and one as a trans woman. Six of the survey respondents did not identify with a gender and described themselves as *gender fluid, genderless or genderqueer.*

### 3.1. RESPONDENT POSITIONING IN HETEROSEXIST PUBLIC SPACES

The forms and types of harassment experienced by Amsterdam survey respondents are to a large extent reflective of the gendered and heterosexist dynamics of power discussed in Chapter 1 that define interactions between men and women as well as the spaces in which they interact. This section will speak to the framework on women’s gendered and heterosexed positioning as outlined by de Beauvoir, Wittig, Wiesner-Hanks and other scholars in section 1.1, as well to the framework established in section 1.4 by Puwar, Weisman and other scholars on gendered public space, by showing how spaces in Amsterdam can be understood as gendered and heterosexist through Amsterdam survey respondent experiences.

Figure 1 on the following page shows the different forms of harassment experienced by female respondents in Amsterdam, many of which work to reinforce respondents’ gendered and heterosexed positioning within public spaces:

---

60 See footnote 31 for more on these terms. Appendix G has a sample of survey responses.
In addition to the types of harassment listed above, which respondents could select as many as applied, a significant number (25) also reported experiencing non-verbal forms of harassment such as leering, or smirking. In this vein, one respondent noted:

Looking at me with their eyes like they are already ripping my clothes off and raping me very violently. Looking at me like me fighting back would only turn them on more.
The above respondent touches upon a difficult type of harassment to pinpoint but one that is just as mired in gendered and heterosexist power dynamics as more obvious verbal and physical forms—harassment as a surveying and objectifying gaze. Feminist psychologist Laurel Watson et al. speak to the concept of the male gaze and the effects such harassment can have on women. Building on Cameron and Kulick’s earlier discussion with regards to female sexual objectification through language, the scholars describe the male gaze as a means of “sexual objectification”, where “a woman’s body or body parts are separated from the rest of her person for another’s consumption or enjoyment” (Watson, et al. 2015, 92).

Legal scholar Olatokunbo Olukemi Laniya adds to Watson et al.’s assertion and speaks to the broader meaning of the male gaze—not only as a tangible glare or sneer during a street harassment situation but as part of overarching gendered and heterosexist systems of power discussed in Chapter 1 that facilitate the positioning and objectification of women by men:

A comment such as, “I'll bet you taste real good,” or a crude gesture reinforces for women the ubiquitous message of female objectification… [and] accentuates the perpetual male gaze that allows a man to view a woman, and forces a woman to view herself as object rather than subject (Laniya 2005, 103).

Watson et al. and Laniya thus speak to Cameron and Kulick’s discussion of female objectification and to Puwar’s assertion about the role of gendered public spaces in facilitating street harassment interactions from Chapter 1. Examples from the respondent cited above exemplify the voyeuristic, surveillant and objectifying nature that Watson et al. highlight as sustaining the male gaze and show how subjectivities are shaped by the dynamics of power that characterize gendered and heterosexist public spaces in Amsterdam.

Respondents’ gender identity and sexuality, as well as how these identities were perceived by harasser(s) in turn played prominent roles in defining respondents’ positioning in street harassment interactions. Linking in with Wittig and West and Zimmerman’s discussion on the power of perception in marking individual gender identities in Chapter 1, when asked not how they identify but how they believe they are perceived, 62 72 respondents said they believed they were perceived as female; however, only 67 of these respondents also identify as female, indicating that regardless of how some people identify, they are aware that they are perceived differently. Out of the respondents who commented that their sexuality was not easily defined, the majority (5) believed they are perceived as female and experienced

61 I use surveillant (Merriam Webster Dictionary 2015) here to mean ways in which women are conventionally positioned by men in public spaces through non-verbal gestures such as staring, leering or gazing.
62 Although many people who identify as women or as men are also often perceived by others as the same, some people’s identity may not correlate to the perception of their identity by others. For example, one may identify as a man but be perceived by others as a woman.
street harassment as women. The remainder of these respondents (3) believed that they are perceived as a gender that does not correlate to their identified gender. These respondents characterized the harassment they experienced as homophobic or transphobic, indicating that respondents who are not perceived as (heterosexual) women, but are also not categorized as (heterosexual) men, reported experiencing specifically homophobic or transphobic forms of street harassment. This finding recalls the discussion in Chapter 1 with Wiesner-Hanks and Braidotti about the limitations and strategic utility of using ‘Woman’ as a category of analysis. While such a category of analysis is arguably problematic, as it risks essentializing sex and gender and rendering non-conforming sexed and gender categories invisible, my aim in this thesis is to show, as my survey findings above demonstrate, that regardless of one’s own sexed and gender identification, being perceived as a woman/categorized as ‘Woman’ is a significant qualification for experiencing street harassment in specific gendered and heterosexist ways.

In public spaces such as streets in Amsterdam, experiences of street harassment of respondents whose identity differs from how they believe they are perceived highlight a tension between intentions to trouble conventional gender structures and realities that harassers continue to work within a normative binary gender system. Although some respondents’ identification as genderqueer implies a powerful stance against conventional gendered and heterosexed dichotomies (Rich 1980, 649; Wittig [1981] 1993, 180), in reality, these hierarchies are upheld. Based on Braidotti’s discussion of the utility of essentialism in Chapter 1, such an assertion encourages us to acknowledge the reality of how gender categories, no matter how rightfully problematic, are navigated and negotiated in Amsterdam. I argue that this area of discrepancy is critical to take into account to more fully understand experiences of street harassment, the underlying power dynamics that position individuals and drive such interactions and effective means of resistance.

---

63 The latter can be demonstrated by findings that the majority of male respondents (9) described themselves as only or mostly attracted to males and the majority of experiences of street harassment reported by these respondents was homophobic. For specific stories of these individuals, see Appendix G.

64 As discussed in section 1.1, Women’s Positioning in Heterosexist Public Spaces, according to Butler, regardless of one’s identified sex or gender, iteration of other sexes, genders and sexualities through performance has the potential to alter or disrupt these preconceived norms: “Performativity cannot be understood outside of a process of iterability...this repetition is what enables a subject and constitutes the temporal condition for the subject,” (Butler 1993 [2010], 60). The iterability to which Butler speaks underlines the importance of ritualized repetition in reshaping sex and gender and, consequently, an individual’s sexed or gendered position in society, a notion that many feminists I have encountered in the Netherlands support through identifying, for example, as genderqueer. For more on Butler’s notion of performativity, see footnote 31.

65 This assertion does not eliminate individual agency or means of resistance to such forms of interaction. However, it seeks to illuminate hegemonic patterns of power, dominance and subordination, which are crucial to highlight in order to relate theory to practice, to thicken our understanding of gender categorization and to more effectively resist such categorization on the ground.
Perception is, admittedly, a tricky concept to clarify. Within the context of street harassment, I argue that perception is the extent to which individuals in public spaces are seen as women (categorized as ‘Woman’) by men who harass. As discussed in section 1.1, this perception includes the normative notions of femininity and sexuality that the category ‘Woman’ is conventionally assumed to embody, the role that anatomy plays in guiding perceptions of gender, as well as patterns of socialization that link female sex to woman gender. It therefore becomes challenging to resist gender dichotomization without also acknowledging, for example, Braidotti’s assertions in Chapter 1 about the realities of essentialist categorization and how such categories continue to perceive and socially-mark women as targets for street harassment.

Similar to gender and sexuality, race was demonstrated to also not be easily categorizeable. Just under half of the respondents (45) identified as a minority in the Netherlands—for example, of Turkish, Moroccan or Surinamese decent, Black, a recent immigrant to the Netherlands or LGBTQ. Others left comments including:

I do not look like a minority (Q5; R1).

I don’t feel like a minority (Q5; R2).

Mixed-race, lots of white privilege (Q5; R6).

Respondents here touch upon the complexities of racial or other minority identity in relation to being positioned in street harassment interactions. We can look at these experiences as well through the discussion of Wittig and West and Zimmerman in Chapter 1 as showing additional ways in which individuals are positioned and perceived and subjectivities are negotiated. Although, for example, women of color have been found to experience street harassment to a greater extent than white women in the US (Kearl 2014b, 6), further research is necessary to substantiate similar claims in the Netherlands, as my survey found that only six out of the 48 respondents who identify as a minority or are unsure of their

---

66 See footnote 30 for more on socialization and the reification of ‘Man’ and ‘Woman’ categories through such a process.
minority status tagged their experience of street harassment in Amsterdam as racist. Out of these six respondents, only four shared their experiences and did not explicitly mention racist comments or gestures in their stories. Nevertheless, respondents’ experiences of racist comments speak to two important points. First, to existing studies and discourse that show people of color to be disproportionately at risk for street harassment (Borrel 2015; Kearl 2014b, 6); and second, to the “Dutch Myth of Tolerance” (Rade 2015), a pluralistic narrative of racist undercurrents within Dutch society that lead to less visible and acknowledged forms of racially-marginalizing interactions. In this vein, one respondent who described their experience as both homophobic and racist, notes:

[S]eems a city so liberal has so many narrow minded persons visiting and residing (Q12; R14).

This respondent thus underlines contradictions between tolerant and equitable societies, as discussed in the Introduction Chapter, and experiences of individuals in Amsterdam that work to demystify such discourse.

Axes of oppression in addition to gender and sexuality, such as race and class, are thus important to consider in my research, particularly given my feminist approach as discussed in Chapter 2, which calls for a comprehensive account of the varying power relations that phenomena such as street harassment interactions invariably embody. In this vein, though survey respondents did not report explicitly racist experiences of street harassment, some nevertheless applied racial stereotypes to harassers or to areas of Amsterdam where they indicated harassment is more prevalent. Such discourse, along with the racialized stereotypes of harassers mentioned in Chapter 2, will be returned to in the following chapter. The themes discussed in the remainder of this chapter are guided by my empirical data, which revealed primarily gendered and heterosexist experiences of street harassment.

---

67 Although respondents to this survey did not often describe their experiences as racist, it is important to note that racism is an increasingly contested issue in the Netherlands. Over the last few years, public debates have ignited, for example, over Zwarte Piet (Black Pete), a character with a painted black face, large red lips and gold earrings that is touted as Santa’s helper and remains supported by much of the Dutch public and by some Dutch political parties as an “inoffensive… traditional character” (Jabber 2014). Along with the Dutch Myth of Tolerance (see next footnote), this thesis encourages a consideration of these broader discussions concerning racial prejudice in the Netherlands but focuses primarily on the material provided by the survey respondents, which indicates that racism did not often characterize the forms of street harassment respondents reported experiencing in Amsterdam.

68 Historian Marijke Gijswijt Hofstra points to the Dutch Myth of Tolerance, which will be returned to in Chapter 4 as speaking to a contentious Dutch tradition of historically “tolerating” ethnic and religious minorities. Hofstra highlights racism in the Netherlands as “perpetuat[ing] a myth of the Dutch people as tolerant that obscures the actual intolerance displayed in the modern era, toward ethnic minorities in particular” (Vogt, Wayne and Leutzsch 2014). See feminist anthropologist Gloria Wekker’s forthcoming book on this notion in the Netherlands, White Innocence (set to be published in late 2015).
3.2. POWER OF LANGUAGE IN STREET HARASSMENT IN AMSTERDAM

Taking survey respondents’ experiences of street harassment into account, it thus follows that we look more specifically at how language used in verbal experiences of street harassment works to sustain gendered and heterosexist factors that drive and normalize these interactions. This section will thus show how the discussion in section 1.2 regarding the role of language in facilitating heterosexist interactions is manifested in Amsterdam.

In November 2014, the American news channel CNN talked to Steve Santagati, president of the website Bad Boys Finish First and author of The MANual, about the New York-based video on street harassment that was mentioned in the Introduction Chapter. Santagati explained that men catcall women because, “there is nothing more that a woman loves to hear than how pretty she is” (CNN 2014). Many scholars, including sociologist Beth Quinn, social scientists Cheryl Bernard and Edit Schlaffer and social psychologists Eric Wesselmann and Janice Kelly have done extensive research on why harassers say what they say in street harassment interactions. Similar to Santagati’s assertion, Quinn found that men often perceive street harassment as “harmless fun or normal gendered interactions” (Quinn 2002, 386), which recalls the discussion in Chapter 1 about interactions such as catcalls as exemplifying “‘doing being ordinary’” (D. Cameron 2006, 178). In Bernard and Schlaffer’s research, male participants described catcalling as “fun, harmless, [and] a cure for boredom”, providing them with a “feeling of youthful camaraderie” (Bernard and Schlaffer 1984, 71). Men’s desire for ‘camaraderie’ and other homosocial incentives were also found by Wesselmann and Kelly and Quinn to play important roles in these situations (Quinn 2002; Wesselmann and Kelly 2010).

Similar to Quinn and Wesselmann and Kelly’s findings above, when asked why their harassers did what they did, the majority of Amsterdam survey respondents who identified and believed they are also perceived as female (33) said that it seemed like a normal/natural thing to do. Almost as many (31) believed that their harasser(s) were trying to impress their friends, which speaks to the homosocial undercurrents highlighted in Cameron and Kulick’s discussion about ‘sex-talk’ in section 1.2, where women’s objectification is central to male social bonding. In this vein, homosocial undertones marked the experiences of some survey respondents in Amsterdam, for example:

3 young men yelled at me asking for a gangbang (Q12; R40).
One guy…saying to his male friend: “You should fuck this lady and you will make her happy” (Q12; R63).

Survey respondents experiences thus affirm that homosocial bonding between men is often most effective with an object or a target for men to bond over, which in these cases are the female respondents they collectively harass. As discussed by Cameron and Kulick and West and Zimmerman in section 1.2, the ordinariness of heterosexual relations that are articulated through language in street harassment situations are not only affirmations of heteronormative notions of ‘opposites attract’ but are also driven by social rewards (D. Cameron 2006, 177; Quinn 2002, 395): “[W]hat is being asserted through these references is not (hetero)sexuality as such, but a kind of social legitimacy that implicates and depends on being straight” (D. Cameron 2006, 178). Cameron thus alludes here to the role of assertive heterosexuality and, conjunctively of homosociality, in shaping interactions such as catcalling in public spaces. Ultimately, if negotiated effectively, such processes help to reinforce power hierarchies between men and women that enable men to be in a position to reap the gendered, heterosexual and homosocial rewards of catcalling women. The experiences of Amsterdam survey respondents speak to the normalization of heterosexual and homosocial relations in verbal street harassment interactions that not only make harassers more applauded among their peers but reaffirm a heterosexist “system of social value” (Cameron and Kulick 2003, 70) that defines the qualifications for acceptance and linguistically mediated ways of maintaining power over women in public spaces.

3.3. EFFECTS OF AND RESISTANCE TO STREET HARASSMENT IN AMSTERDAM

The effects of the language and gestures in street harassment interactions that perpetuate and normalize heterosexist “system[s] of social value” (Cameron and Kulick 2003, 70) were reported by Amsterdam survey respondents to be widespread and long term. The physical and emotional toll reported by respondents is reflective of the framework established in section 1.3 on effects of street harassment, which reinforce women as perceived and treated as ‘Woman’, and show how the power relations that characterize such positioning normalize street harassment interactions in Amsterdam. Figure 2 below illustrates the different and often severe ways in which experiences of street harassment affected female survey respondents in Amsterdam. Taking the work on marginalization within public spaces by Puwar, Rios, Weisman and others into account from section 1.4, we also can look at several of these effects with such spatial framework in mind:
In line with the framework from Chapter 1, the survey responses thus demonstrate that the effects of being harassed in public spaces in Amsterdam were not limited to changes
in behavior, but extended to spatial and emotional consequences as well. Existing literature points to physical effects, including symptoms of depression, anxiety and sleep disorders (Watson, et al. 2015, 3), as well as emotional tolls on individuals who experience street harassment such as increased feelings of fear, anger, self-objectification and shame (Logan 2013, 33-34). Four respondents speak to these consequences, noting:

For a short while I was suspecting everyone (Q23; R1).
I take measures to be extra cautious. And plan a route which is more crowded (Q23; R4).
Frustrated to not be able to move freely inside my own neighborhood (Q23; R16).
Anxious about gaining unwarranted attention when out running, walking, cycling etc. (Q23; R23).

Such effects of street harassment highlight critical short and long-term consequences on those affected and on the spaces in which they do or do not move as a result. Through these stories, we can thus see the effects of gendered and heterosexist positioning on normalizing street harassment interactions in Amsterdam. Figure 3 shows the emotional toll street harassment took on 38 respondents who choose to share:

Figure 3 Emotional Toll of Street Harassment Reported in Amsterdam

After experiencing street harassment, how did it make you feel about your surroundings?
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The physical effects, behavior changes, spatial re-orientations and emotional tolls reported by respondents make it clear that street harassment is not simply an isolated or annoying incident but is part of a broader pattern of gendered and heterosexist power dynamics whose effects can be serious, lasting and significant. Referring back to Figure 1, in which 14 different effects of street harassment are listed, I claim through the framework established by Schilt and Westbrook, Madriz and others in section 1.3 on the effects of street harassment that such drastic impacts on the lives of individuals further highlights the critical need to acknowledge street harassment as a normalized pattern of interactions that is driven by overarching gendered and heterosexist power dynamics facilitated through public spaces.

Speaking as well to Gardner’s discussion on gendered strategies of deterrence in section 1.3, 46 Amsterdam survey respondents indicated that walking with a man is a strategy they use to help unsettle these power dynamics. For example, one respondent noted that they tend to pretend that a friend they are walking with is their boyfriend to deter potential harassers (Q24; R10). These findings speak in part to an underlying fear of crime among female respondents (Gilchrist, et al. 1998; Stanko 1995), where feelings of vulnerability are gendered and where respondents in turn seek gendered remedies to such feelings through real or pretend male accompaniment. Sociologist Elizabeth Stanko notes the “gender differential” relating to fear of crime or fear of being harmed, particularly for women alone in public spaces (Stanko 1995, 47-48). The gendered undercurrent of such a fear is reflective of conjunctive power dynamics that function in public spaces. As a result of these dynamics, women such as the respondents above, resort to gendered responses by positioning men they are with as boyfriends (read: as protectors against male harassers). Beth Livingston, lead of the international street harassment survey at Cornell, speaks to the underlying feelings of fear that drive these actions and explains why these actions may appear unwarranted but, as Gardner speaks to in Chapter 1, are justified to individuals who experience street harassment:

[Street] harassment (i.e. verbal, groping, assault) could produce extreme feelings of fear, anger, shame, etc…[A]n “outsider” might deem a situation “minor” or “not a threat” but the reaction of the target is likely to be just as severe because of the experience of vulnerability and the latent threat of escalation (B. W. Livingston 2012, 2).

Livingston thus troubles normalized understandings of street harassment as simply annoying or harmless by underlining the factors of vulnerability that I argue are exploited in such situations and which trigger reactions and changes in behaviors. Geographers Hille Koskela and Sirpa Tani also speak to the fear of physical repercussions during street harassment.
situations that remains with those affected and increases feelings of vulnerability: “[H]arassment contains an element of physical threat, even in cases where physical violence eventually does not take place” (Koskela and Tani 2005, 421). Watson et al. echo Koskela and Tani, noting the relationship between such feelings of vulnerability and the anxiety that is provoked in street harassment situations or by simply moving through public spaces with such a physical threat in mind (Watson, et al. 2015, 92). As we saw historically through Walkowitz’ work and more recently through the work of Puwar, Wiesman and others in section 1.4, the aforementioned experiences of survey respondents reveal the continued effects of the gendered and heterosexist partiality of public spaces in Amsterdam. These scholars thus speak to responses reported by survey respondents and outline the extent to which, I argue, street harassment is a normalized gendered and heterosexist practice, where men harass individuals they perceive as women, and which can lead to significant effects on those who experience it.

But not all Amsterdam survey respondents experienced the effects of street harassment negatively or at all. Such data is important to consider given my grounded theory and mixed-methods approaches to this research, in which working with diverse and dynamic data is essential to obtaining more nuanced knowledge. In this vein, eight of the survey respondents indicated that their experiences did not have an effect on how they felt about their surroundings, or that they did not feel anything because they were used to it (Q23; R17). But rather than understand such responses as reason to label street harassment as simply normal and harmless, taking the discussion in section 1.1 about the power dynamics that drive and sustain women’s positioning, I argue that such responses are even more indicative of the highly engrained and normalized nature of these interactions and of how they are internalized by individuals affected.

A 2014 study published in *Gender & Society* speaks to this assertion and to those of Walkowitz and Ilahi in the Introduction Chapter, revealing that the majority of its participants considered street harassment to be a sort-of collateral damage to being in public spaces: “[M]ost young women assume that being harassed, assaulted, and abused is simply something that everyone experiences and is normal. So they may not even identify what happened as wrong” (Kearl 2014a, 12). The study thus underlines the extent to which street harassment is normalized by being conceived as “normal”, and speaks to Puwar’s assertions in section 1.4 about the “disturbance” caused by women’s movement through what she terms men’s “‘natural’ domain” (Puwar 2004, 32). In this vein, although forms of verbal harassment pitched by harassers as complimentary or harmless were abundant amidst survey
responses, three respondents, including two identified ciswomen and one transwoman⁶⁹, reported feeling flattered or excited about their experience(s). Two of these respondents provided additional details:

[Most] of it has been relatively 'benign' - i.e. idiots who think they are actually complementing you/random comments from passers by, etc. I mainly feel frustrated about the lack of ownership women have over public space in the sense that it is considered normal to judge and voice that judgment - whether negative or positive - like a constant reminder that existing in public spaces requires us to submit ourselves to those judgments (Q23; R12).

Most of it I didn’t really consider harassment at the time - lots of seemingly complementary 'hey baby' etc., though looking back I realize that it wasn’t…and over time I started to realize how much the policing of women's bodies through seemingly mundane comments and looks is a normalized part of my life (Q12; R26).

In line with the initial reactions of respondents above, New York Post writer Doree Lewark emphasizes her feelings of “euphoria” after being catcalled:

[When a total stranger notices you, it’s validating…What’s so wrong about a “You are sexy!” comment from any observant man?... For me, it’s nothing short of exhilarating, yielding an unmatched level of euphoria (Lewark 2014).

Lewark thus echoes the above survey respondents’ initial reactions of excitement with her appeal to the “exhilarating” potential of catcalls. But although the above assertions exemplify a range of reactions to street harassment, it is important to return to previous sections of this chapter and to the work of Cameron, Wittig, Weisman and others throughout Chapter 1 that underline the gendered and heterosexist power dynamics that allow for such comments to be continuously accepted as harmless, complimentary or “ordinary” (D. Cameron 2006, 178). In this vein, the aforementioned respondents highlight two significant points regarding the complimentary potential of street harassment. First, their experiences exemplify Wittig’s assertion in section 1.1 about being perceived as ‘Woman’ and consequently being treated in socially-condoned ways that are normalized as appropriate; second, at the time of experiencing street harassment and arguably as a consequence of this positioning, feeling flattered by a man’s sexualized remarks seemed like a rational, socially-sanctioned reaction. As Puwar, Weisman and others highlight in section 1.4 with regards to the partiality and “male subjectivity” of public space (Weisman 1981 [2000], 5), such normalization subsequently positioned the respondents in a public space ultimately “for men” (Kearl 2009, 19), which deterred and challenged resistance to this positioning. Respondents’ experiences are thus reflective of gendered public space and the normalized systems of power in which

⁶⁹ See footnote 26 for more on conceptions of cis- and transgender.
public places become ‘naturally’ heterosexist, reinforcing acceptance of such interactions and dissuading resistance.

How then can women effectively resist street harassment? More than half of survey respondents reported forms of active resistance, including cursing, shaming or calling out their harassers (37). Two main types of verbal engagement in Amsterdam were found: polite declines (*I politely thanked him and walked away quickly*—Q12; R15), or more aggressive demands to stop (*screaming fuck off to them*—Q12; R52). But regardless of the type of verbal engagement, in almost all cases, polite requests or aggressive demands to stop did not deter harassers. Rather, such requests or non-verbal signals (such as ignoring) only incited further harassment or resulted in the harassers changing modes of harassment, stopping but verbally recanting, leering or staring at the respondent with an intimidating smirk or other expression, or resorting to more aggressive forms of harassment such as insults or physical assault. Four respondents noted:

They would yell "Hey baby!" and when I ignored them they turned verbally aggressive, occasionally they would follow me (Q12; R36).

When I reacted verbally violent like screaming fuck off to them while having a very angry look on my face their body language immediately changed from fake nice to murderous predator (Q12; R52).

I yelled at him and smacked his hand away. The guy walked away, but turned around and gave me a horrible look which involved biting his lower lip (Q12; R44).

A man knocked me to the ground when I told him I wasn't interested (Q12; R27).

The above stories highlight an array of responses to street harassment reported by respondents. Even moving away from the situation, as demonstrated by the harasser above who still gave the respondent *a horrible look*, did not always end the harassment, recalling the earlier discussion section 3.1 with Watson et al. and Laniya about the effects of the male gaze. Along with the stories above, 31 respondents reported that their harasser(s) became more aggressive following the respondents’ reaction to the harassment, including physical or verbal threats or insults. Respondents’ experiences thus speak to Eckert’s study in Chapter 1 of school children and to Livingston’s findings discussed earlier regarding negotiations that individuals undergo in street harassment situations between potentially provoking a more aggressive response from harassers, responding in more passive ways or not responding at all. Feminist scholar Jarrah O’Neil focuses more specifically on the frustration inherent in decisions by some women to respond in the latter two ways that survey respondents expressed: “Women often vacillate between relief that they have some amount of agency in
this situation, of being able to simply not participate in public life and therefore not experience street harassment, and frustration that the only feasible strategy to prevent street harassment is isolation” (O’Neil 2013, 36). As Figure 2 cited earlier shows, while many Amsterdam survey respondents reported isolating strategies such as avoiding public transport (26), avoiding a city or area (20) or not going out at night (18), 26 opted for strategies that would allow them to feel safer when they did ride public transport or move within public spaces.

One such strategy that survey respondents reported was taking self-defense classes. We can consider the discussion on women’s positioning and resistance from sections 1.1 and 1.3 to show how acquiring agency through more active forms of resistance such as self-defense classes can work to unsettle gendered and heterosexist positioning and empower women in situations of street harassment. In this vein, social psychologist Lauri Hyers’ study of more active responses to street harassment found “better consequences on a range of measures,” including “feeling agentic in the face of an undesirable situation” (Hyers 2007, 9). Livingston echoes Hyers, adding that individuals who respond more actively to their harassers report different effects than those who respond in more passive ways (by ignoring, for example) (B. W. Livingston 2012, 4). However, in a 2013 study on women who took self-defense classes, sociologist Jocelyn Hollander found that women avoided yelling during the classes because it was seen as an “unladylike” response that clashed with their own notions of appropriate displays of femininity (Logan 2013, 142). In addition to male harassers targeting women based on a certain level of adherence to the category ‘Woman’, Hollander thus reveals that some women who experience street harassment also intentionally concede to this gender category, rather than employ strategies that resist conventional ideas of women/‘Woman’. Similar to Schilt and Westbrook’s discussion in section 1.3 about women who wish to maintain their social positioning as heterosexual when deciding how to react to being harassed, Hollander’s assertion links in with earlier discussions by de Beauvoir, and West and Zimmerman on how notions of femininity and womanhood are associated with the ‘Woman’ category and reified through expression or gesture. Particularly when alone, as discussed earlier in this section through the work on fear of crime by Gilchrist and Stanko, Amsterdam survey respondents’ mostly passive strategies to deter harassers show the extent to which they did not or could not resist to being positioned and treated according to the category ‘Woman’. Similar to the strategies outlined in Figure 2 above and to those outlined by Gardner in section 1.3, such as avoidance, ignoring or “invoking an absent [male] protector” (Gardner 1995, 206), survey respondents reported strategies including continuing
to walk or listen to music, pretending to talk on the phone or pretending a man they were walking with was their boyfriend. While these strategies usually avoided an escalation in the situation, they nevertheless arguably did little to unsettle respondents’ gendered positioning and treatment as they continued to move through public spaces. As I will show in the following chapter, moving towards more digital and online forms of resistance arguably offers an alternative to the conventional offline forms of resistance discussed so far.

Chapter Conclusion

In this chapter, I provided an empirical sketch of street harassment in Amsterdam. This sketch worked to answer the first part of my research question: What factors influence street harassment interactions (and how can online platforms map these interactions and impact gendered and heterosexist public spaces in Amsterdam?). To answer this question, I showed how factors including gendered and heterosexist positioning, language and space underlie hierarchical power relations between men and women in public spaces in Amsterdam, and in turn lead to long-term and widespread effects and deter resistance. Such factors are reflective of street harassment as a heterosexist practice and show, within the context of Amsterdam, how and why men targeted individuals they perceive as women for harassment. In the following chapter, I will argue for a move towards online and digital technologies and platforms to expose these interactions as heterosexist and to offer alternative and innovative forms of quick, collective and widespread resistance.
CHAPTER 4. DIGITAL AND ONLINE STRATEGIES OF EXPOSING AND RESISTING STREET HARASSMENT

In Chapter 3, I substantiated the first part of my hypothesis that street harassment is a normalized gendered and heterosexist practice, where men harass individuals they perceive as women. My discussion in Chapter 3 established an informed foundation for answering the second part of my research question in this chapter: (What factors influence street harassment interactions and) how can online platforms map these interactions and impact gendered and heterosexist public spaces in Amsterdam? By showing that digital technologies and online platforms such as my Amsterdam survey, online storytelling platforms and digital mapping can be and are already being used effectively to expose street harassment interactions as gendered and heterosexist, in this chapter, I substantiate my hypothesis that online and digital platforms have the potential to expose and resist street harassment interactions and the underlying gendered and heterosexist factors that drive them. I base my claim off of theoretical framework on means of resistance, mapping gendered and heterosexist public space and engaging with social movements from sections 1.3-1.5.

Whereas in Chapter 3, I focused on gendered and offline means of resistance, in this chapter, I will show how digital technologies and online platforms can be used to name harassers, empower bystanders and facilitate collective storytelling that work to map and resist the phenomenon. In this vein, I will discuss how feminist geo mapping instances of street harassment helps to visualize and expose the phenomenon in Amsterdam and map the power structures at play in such interactions, and I will return to issues of race as outlined in Chapters 2 and 3 within this discussion. I will bring in my second case study of online posts to New York and London Hollaback! sites to draw comparisons to experiences in Amsterdam and to prove that such platforms and technologies have the potential to expose street harassment and to provide a platform for collective storytelling and resistance. Finally, I will discuss how these and other platforms such as Twitter can be looked at in relation to street harassment in Amsterdam and worldwide as a tool that can be used beyond this thesis in addressing the phenomenon on the ground.

4.1. MAPPING AND RESISTING GENDERED AND HETEROSEXIST PUBLIC SPACES: DIGITAL ‘SOUSVEILLANCE’

This section will build upon the discussion in Chapter 3 about the effects of street harassment and means of resistance reported by survey respondents in Amsterdam. Whereas
Chapter 3 focused on exploring individual strategies of resistance through an offline and gendered lens, this section will expand out of the experiences and subjectivities of the survey respondents to make broader observations about how bystanders—those who witness street harassment interactions—can be effective deterrents in these situations. In this vein, this section will not only look at bystanders’ positioning within street harassment situations but also at digital means of revealing this positioning (including geo and feminist mapping, and online platforms) and as tools to resist the phenomenon.

What then is the role of the bystander in street harassment situations and why does this matter? Seventy-nine survey respondents reported some form of bystander presence in their situation in Amsterdam. In situations where survey respondents reported that a bystander was present—regardless of whether the bystander intervened—respondents indicated that the mere presence of bystanders improved the situation. We can link such findings to the work of Gardner in section 1.3, which found the invocation of a “male protector” (Gardner 1995, 206), regardless of whether one was actually present or assuming such a role, to be a strategy of deterrence. However, the majority of survey respondents reported that a person witnessed their harassment and did not try to help. Figure 4 shows the impact that this had on survey respondents in Amsterdam:

*Figure 4 Effects of Bystander Intervention on Respondents Reported in Amsterdam*

**How did the following make you feel?**

- A person witnessed your harassment experience and did **NOT** try to help you.
- A person witnessed your harassment experience and tried to help you.

- Worse than if the person wasn’t there
- Better than if the person wasn’t there
With such effects in mind, incentives for bystander to intervene or not in situations of street harassment can range from an “it’s not my problem” (Hollaback! Bristol 2015) attitude to fear of repercussions from the harasser(s). Two respondents’ experiences speak to the latter concern, where their harasser(s) verbally attacked a bystander who tried to help. In other instances, survey respondents reported that bystanders who intervened were physically attacked by harassers. We can understand harassers’ violent reactions towards bystanders within the framework of gendered public space from section 1.4 and its application in Amsterdam, in which public space, as “for men” (Kearl 2009, 19) affirms a degree of male entitlement to such space (Weisman 1981 [2000], 1, 5). Consequently, stories of violent attacks on bystanders are not isolated.²⁷ Reports by survey respondents in Figure 5 below substantiate this assertion:

**Figure 5 Harasser Responses to Bystander Intervention Reported in Amsterdam**

*How often has the following occurred?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occasion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Someone saw and</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>did NOT try to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>help</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harasser(s)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbally attacked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>someone trying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to help</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone saw and</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tried to help</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harasser(s)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physically</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attacked someone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trying to help</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The intervention of a bystander, whether male or female, thus represents what Puwar describes in section 1.4 as a “disturbance” to male harasser space and power (Puwar 2004, 32). *Salon* editor Jenny Kutner speaks to such experiences with bystanders reported by survey respondents:

²⁷ In August 2014, a man in Texas was beaten unconscious after he told several men in a car to stop catcalling a group of women (Kutner 2014). Just three months later in November 2014, a San Francisco man was stabbed nine times and suffered a punctured lung after asking a man to stop catcalling the bystander’s girlfriend (Saul 2014), to name a few additional examples.
respondents in Amsterdam, as well as to Puwar and Weisman’s assertions in Chapter 1 about gendered public space, noting:

The immediate escalation of the altercation from unwanted intervention to straightforward assault is just another sign that street harassment is dangerous… street harassment can put targets and bystanders at risk—because if someone even so much as suggests that catcalling might be out of line, it comes with the risk of getting knocked out on the street (Kutner 2014; original emphasis).

Kutner thus draws important links between harasser attacks on bystanders and the broader gendered and heterosexist dynamics of power that position women as ‘Woman’ in public spaces, and which, as Kutner asserts and survey respondents’ experiences show, lead to men feeling entitled to preserve, articulate or defend their position within such spaces. Taking Kutner’s assertion and the experiences reported by survey respondents into account, there is thus a clear risk for bystanders to intervene in street harassment situations. However, one important point concerning the presence of bystanders here is that their presence is noticed—by victims, by harassers or by both. What these findings indicate is that the more active bystanders are in situations of street harassment, the more accountable harassers are for their actions. Active bystanders can not only play critical roles in diffusing a situation but also in upsetting the gendered and heterosexist power dynamics that drive street harassment in the first place by holding harassers accountable for their actions.

One way to encourage bystander intervention is through feminist geo mapping. In line with my feminist approach to this research, I use the term feminist geo mapping as described in Chapter 1, rather than simply geo mapping to underline my intent to uncover and unsettle power relationships that make street harassment possible and prevalent. Looking at such a tool as part of the mixed-methods approach outlined in Chapter 2, we can understand feminist geo mapping as one of many ways to shed light on bystander presence as well on street harassment interactions and public spaces more broadly. Building on discussions in section 1.4 about the utility of feminist geo mapping as a way to show the gendered construction of public spaces and how power is exercised within these spaces, I will show here how such a method can be applied to anti-street harassment movements as a way to expose the phenomenon as part of systemic gendered and heterosexist systems of oppression rather than individual experience, and to motivate bystanders to intervene.

Building on discussions of women’s positioning and public space as being “for men” (Kearl 2009, 19) from Chapters 1 and 3, we can also look at feminist geo mapping as a means to empower individuals “at the bottom of the hierarchy” in street harassment
interactions, by turning the gaze by interactions, by turning the gaze71 back onto harassers. Media and technology scholars Steve Mann and Joseph Ferenbok term such a practice of reversing conventional dynamics of power embedded in “looking” or “watching” as “sousveillance” (Mann and Ferenbok 2013, 18). Coupled with digital technologies such as mobile phone apps, digital photographs or online platforms, geo mapping instances of harassment allows for “unprecedented ‘on the ground’ watching” (Mann and Ferenbok 2013, 18) of harassers that not only works to reverse the gaze, but also gathers crucial data72 on street harassment that can then be used to raise awareness and influence policy and counter-strategies. Although Hollaback! Amsterdam had not yet launched its website at the time of writing, we can see in Figure 6 below how, for example, Hollaback! New York embeds feminist geo mapping into its site to “sousvey” harassers (Barrigar 2006) as well as to visualize and map bystander presence. In Figure 6, red dots represent reports of street harassment, while green dots represent individuals reporting bystander presence:

**Figure 6 Mapping Bystander Intervention: Hollaback! New York City**

\[\text{(source: Hollaback! NYC, 2015b)}\]

71 We can recall here discussions in section 3.1. by Watson et al. regarding the gendered and objectifying nature of the male gaze and its application within experiences of Amsterdam survey respondents.

72 In addition to providing space for activism, online platforms can also serve as mega data-gathering hubs. For example, Hollaback! uses Google Analytics technology, which tracks information about visitors to the website (such as geographic location, time of visit, bounce rate and what links they clicked to arrive at the site). This data can be helpful when considering how to engage in online activism (J. Cameron 2015, 8).
Since 2012, Hollaback! has been collaborating with a group called Green Dot etcetera and has the technology embedded into its New York site (as in Figure 6). Green Dot etcetera is a non-profit initiative whose goal is to combat “bystander apathy” and to encourage active involvement in and interruption of “high-risk” situations, ranging from epidemic outbreaks to university campus rape incidents to street harassment through digital mapping (Green Dot etcetera 2010):

Visualize for a moment that unforgettable image of small red dots spreading across a computer generated map… each tiny red dot representing an individual case… Now imagine adding a green dot in the middle of all those red dots on your map. A green dot is any behavior, choice, word, or attitude that promotes safety for all our citizens and communicates utter intolerance for violence (Green Dot etcetera 2010).

As prefaced in section 1.4 through discussions of feminist digital mapping and gendered public spaces, a tool such as Green Dot etcetera as part of a feminist geo mapping initiative not only has the potential to expose where street harassment occurs but also to show how the spaces in which street harassment occurs are structured and what kinds of actors are present (and active) in these situations. In this way, such technology holds the potential to expose the phenomenon in a way that is quick, visual, and accessible. Because there is currently no Green Dot etcetera program or similar digital technology in place in Amsterdam to hold bystanders accountable, such a technology, in conjunction with an online platform, can arguably be used there to effectively engage and mobilize community members against street harassment. In addition to the more conventional offline means of active and passive resistance discussed in Chapter 3, feminist geo mapping of bystander presence is thus another tool that can be combined with online activist platforms such as Hollaback! to more effectively monitor street harassment incidence and offer an alternative strategy of collective resistance to individuals affected in Amsterdam.

4.2. RISKS OF ENGAGING SOCIAL MOVEMENTS WITH DIGITAL AND ONLINE ACTIVISM

As was discussed in Chapter 1 with regards to the gendered construction of public spaces, feminist mapping and online storytelling have the potential to quickly reach large amounts of people through online platforms (Martin and Valenti 2012, 6). As part of such strategies to map and resist street harassment in the context of Amsterdam, Figure 7 shows a geographical mapping of reported street harassment incidence by survey respondents (Appendix E includes a list of locations reported):
Figure 7 Locations of Street Harassment Reported in Amsterdam Survey

Figure 7 shows survey respondents reporting a total of 48 locations. It is important to underline here that 13 respondents indicated that they believe they would be harassed less if they were in a different neighborhood and that some respondents reported experiencing street harassment predominantly in areas where minority communities are common, such as in eastern parts of the city (Biljmer, Zuid-Oost and Oost).\(^7\)

As touched upon in the Introduction Chapter and in Chapters 2 and 3 (Hollaback! 2015a; Borrel 2015), some survey respondents cited cultural factors such as race and ethnicity as characterizing harassers and areas where street harassment occurs:

A lot of catcalling, primarily from members of black communities (Q12; R5).

\(^7\) See Appendix G for the locations reported. It is interesting to note that while respondents reported eastern parts of Amsterdam as being more prone to street harassment, Figure 7 shows that incidents were reported throughout the city. In fact, the majority of locations were in the center of Amsterdam.
In my experience, harassment was worse in neighborhoods with a lot of immigrants from cultures...Moroccans for example.  

The cultural and ethnic factor in harassment was very visible to me (Q12; R12).

Without denying the specific experiences that these respondents had with street harassment, it is important to underline here the implications of making generalized statements about races (black communities) or cultures (Moroccans). These racialized statements speak more to why Hollaback! removes racial and class identifiers from its submissions, and reaffirm the myth of Dutch tolerance discussed in Chapter 3 (Rade 2015), showing the extent to which entire communities are associated and racialized through respondents’ reports.

Taking feminist geo mapping into account, it is important to then consider how such tools can not only be used as tools of collective means of sousveillance and resistance, but also as tools to racially mark certain places as spaces to avoid. In this regard, race, particularly in the context of stereotyping harassers, was also (albeit ‘accidentally’) perpetuated by Hollaback!’s own New York-based video that was cited in the Introduction Chapter. Consequently, such channels cannot easily retract contentious material, particularly when that material goes “viral”, as the New York video reportedly did (B. Butler 2014; Association France Presse 2014; Palmer 2014). Hollaback!’s decision to remove racial identifiers from submissions, as discussed in Chapter 2, can in turn be further understood with these implications in mind. It is thus important to incorporate approaches such as grounded theory and reflexivity when assessing respondents’ individual experiences with street harassment, in order to avoid laying disproportionate amounts of blame on entire races or cultures. Approaching survey responses in this way is key when moving forward with anti-street harassment initiatives, particularly in relation to digital and online forms of activism and awareness-raising that have the potential to influence millions of people in short periods of time.

---

74 This statement was made by a survey respondent in Amsterdam during an informal conversation on February 10, 2015 after the survey closed. The respondent revealed their identity to me but preferred to remain anonymous for the purpose of this thesis.

75 The New York video received a significant amount of backlash for portraying street harassers as men from minority communities (Rhodan 2014). In response to this backlash, Hollaback! released an apology statement, which acknowledged the bias of the video and spoke to the organization’s anti-discrimination policy that was discussed in the Introduction Chapter: “We regret the unintended racial bias in the editing of the video that over represents men of color... It is our hope and intention that this video will be the start of a series to demonstrate that the type of harassment we’re concerned about is directed toward women of all races and ethnicities and conducted by an equally diverse population of men” (Hollaback! 2014).
4.3. BEYOND AMSTERDAM: HOLLABACK! NEW YORK AND LONDON

All of the aforementioned technologies discussed thus far—from feminist geo mapping to Green Dot etcetera, to more broadly online activist platforms and digital technologies within anti-street harassment activism—are already being used effectively by social movement organizations such as Harassmap and Hollaback!. As outlined in Chapter 2, I looked at stories of street harassment posted to the Hollaback!’s New York and London sites in order to show the extent to which such data substantiated my claims that digital technologies and online activist platforms facilitate sharing experiences of street harassment while conjunctively working to resist it. As with stories reported by Amsterdam respondents in Chapter 3, men were the perpetrators in all of the experiences reported in New York and London. Also similar to in Amsterdam, verbal forms of harassment, including sexual comments, ‘greetings’, ‘compliments’, shouting, questions and commands were among the most common reported. Hollaback! posters in New York and London also reported similar physical forms of harassment, including masturbating/exposing, touching, groping, kissing and grabbing, as well as non-verbal or physical forms of harassment, including lip-smacking and staring, leering or smirking, the latter of which recall the concept of the male gaze discussed in section 3.1 within the context of Amsterdam.

Two important conclusions can be drawn from examining posts to New York and London Hollaback! sites. First, that the answer to the question of what factors influence street harassment interactions in Amsterdam? is strikingly similar to if it were asked in these other two cities, with the only major difference being the types of public spaces that exist in New York and London but not in Amsterdam. Second, that the role of an online activist platform such as Hollaback!, in New York and London is critical to encouraging individuals to share their experiences with a vast online community, and to expose their experiences using geo mapping and Green Dot etcetera technologies. Ultimately, the accessible and visual tools provided by these technologies and by this online platform facilitate an incredibly effective and unique form of storytelling. Storytelling in this way not only promotes awareness about street harassment but also facilitates a reconceptualization and more positive result from respondents’ and posters’ negative experiences. Digital and online storytelling as “new media forms” (Peto 2015) thus have an incredible transformative potential to affect the ways in which people receive and understand issues of concern such as street harassment. Dimond speaks to this assertion and links into discussions in section 1.5 with Jasper and Benford and

76 See Appendices D and E for New York and London data.
Snow about the role of framing in social movements to the online anti-street harassment movement more specifically:

As a result of reading and writing stories on Hollaback, participants went through a frame transformation process. The very act of writing their experience and reading other stories changed their cognitive orientation toward how they viewed their experience, problematizing the experience as street harassment and connecting it to a greater phenomenon and collective experience (Dimond 2012, 115).

Dimond raises several important points here that speak to the theoretical framework laid out in section 1.5 on social movement framing, and applies such framework to digital and online technologies and their power to re-conceptualize the anti-street harassment movement landscape. First, on an individual level, participants were able to change the way they thought about their experiences of street harassment, and their own positioning within those experiences not as culpable, but rather as part of a broader system of oppression. Second, Dimond underlines the important effects that sharing, mapping and reading stories of street harassment through online platforms have on framing or extending the framing of the issue from one of individual worth to one of actionable societal worth. Thus, beyond exposing street harassment as a gendered and heterosexist practice, such forms of digital storytelling work to alter the ways in which individuals think and react to their experiences. The discussion in this section therefore builds upon the themes gathered from my Amsterdam survey and shows how online platforms such as Hollaback! and the digital technologies that these platforms incorporate work to extend the framing of street harassment beyond the individual and to the societal in a way that is accessible, visual and innovative.

4.4. THE REVOLUTION WILL NOT BE TWEETED

In addition to showing how online platforms such as Hollaback! and the digital technologies they incorporate can be used within the Amsterdam context, I will show in this section how Twitter as a specific platform can be harnessed by anti-street harassment movements as well in Amsterdam. When searching for online platforms and digital technologies in the Netherlands being used to map and resist street harassment, Straatintimidatie (Street intimidation), an online campaign in the Netherlands that is vying

---

77 Bedford and Snow describe a frame transformation process as one in which old understandings are transformed into new ones (Benford and Snow 2000, 625).
for a law against street harassment\textsuperscript{78} was the only online presence that I came across. However, Straatintimidatie does not have a space—online or off—for community members to share stories and strategies about street harassment. Nevertheless, the campaign’s Twitter feed has a combined reach of over 52,000 people\textsuperscript{79} (Twiangulate 2015a), which is considerable and indicates that engaging more in online activism about street harassment in Amsterdam and throughout the Netherlands could gain significant momentum with the introduction of more diverse online platforms. Although most Amsterdam survey respondents had not visited a specific website dedicated to combating street harassment, almost half (45) have tweeted or posted their thoughts of experiences of street harassment on social media, signaling a need that, for example, engaging more with these technologies could help to fill.

Apart from Hollaback!, many social movements and online platforms already incorporate “hashtag activism” into their campaigns, which are particularly effective in reaching many people very quickly (Ford 2015, 1). The Guardian’s Liz Ford speaks to this potential, particularly in relation to raising awareness about issues affecting women:

\begin{quote}
Hashtag activism has helped to propel women’s rights to the forefront of political agendas, bringing attention to issues often under-reported by mainstream media… Social media has helped women to share experiences of sexual violence… and has kept international attention focused on events that have slipped off the news agenda (Ford 2015, 1).
\end{quote}

In this vein, Harassmap’s Monica Ibrahim indicated that one of the main ways the organization obtains information about street harassment in Egypt is through crowd-sourced information from hashtags (Ibrahim 2015). With over 21,000 followers as of March 2015, a single hashtag tweeted by Harassmap has the potential reach over 13 million people (Twiangulate 2015).

Ibrahim also spoke to the power of online platforms and social media in fostering a sense of collective experience among website visitors (Ibrahim 2015). To this effect, several global hashtag activism campaigns that were launched in 2014 included #YesAllWomen, #YouOKSis and #WhyIStayed and #endSH (endStreet Harassment). Although the names of the aforementioned campaigns are not very descriptive, they nevertheless speak to issues of gender equality, bystander support and to goals for action being discussed virtually

\textsuperscript{78} The primary goal of the campaign is to obtain signatures for a petition that will be considered by the Dutch government once 40,000 signatures are reached (at the time of writing, over 17,000 signatures had been obtained) (Branderhorst 2015).

\textsuperscript{79} A Twitter user’s reach means the sum of all users mentioning that particular user handle + the sum of the mentioning users’ followers (Shively 2013).
worldwide. Figure 8 below, for example, shows the geographic reach of the hashtag #endSH from the period of June 2014 to May 2015 (Followthehashtag 2015):

**Figure 8 Mapping of #endSH Tweets Worldwide**

With a reach of over 13 million (Followthehashtag 2015), the above map of tweets using #endSH thus speaks not only to global experiences of street harassment, as outlined in the Introduction Chapter, but also to individuals around the world\(^80\) collectively exposing street harassment as a gendered and heterosexist practice and, in doing so, arguably working to unsettle and resist the power structures that sustain it.

From an alternative angle, we can also look at the uproar on Twitter in April and May 2015 regarding the French hashtag, #Plutotsympa (*rather nice*). The hashtag was born out of a tweet by Sophie de Menthon of the Economic, Social and Environmental Council of France (CESE), in which Menthon described street harassment as “rather nice” (Methon

---

\(^80\) The veritable absence of tweets from Russia, Mongolia, Mali, Eritrea and other countries is important to underline in Figure 8 as an important limitation to engaging with digital and online forms of activism. As noted in Chapter 2, limitations regarding Internet connectivity are not as applicable in countries like the Netherlands, where 93 percent of the population have access to the Internet, as they are in countries like Eritrea, where only 0.8 percent of the population has Internet access (International Telecommunication Union 2012). Additional factors such as political instability or government regulation of Internet access also need to be considered when assessing the saliency of such technologies or platforms to map and resist street harassment.
Menthon’s tweet and the virtual ripple effect that ensued speaks to assertions of Lewark and survey respondents in section 3.3 about the complimentary potential of catcalls, and shows how online platforms such as Twitter can be used by individuals with differing opinions and experiences to trigger large scale and widespread dialogue and debate. Further research into this technology that also incorporates discourse analysis of the content of each tweet could arguably shed further light on dominant street harassment discourse, the underlying power dynamics and language used in different contexts, as well as means of resistance to the phenomenon around the world.

Despite social movements gaining increasing traction through digital technologies and online activist platforms, there are nevertheless reservations about the efficacy of such traction. New Yorker journalist Malcolm Gladwell, for example, contended: “[T]he revolution will not be tweeted” (Gladwell 2010). Gladwell contends that the “weak ties” that form through online communities give the illusion of support but in reality, these ties do not translate into offline action (Gladwell 2010). Consultant Andy Smith and economics scholar Jennifer Aaker echo Gladwell’s contention, and speak to the ‘slacktivism’ that characterizes online forms of activism: “Social networks are effective at increasing participation—by lessening the level of motivation that participation requires” (Gladwell 2010; original emphasis). Smith and Aaker raise an important point here about the distinction between the quantity and quality of participation in a social movement; however, they do not address the potential implications of quicker, less invested forms of participation that online platforms harness to engage and mobilize communities. Citing her findings about the relationship between Hollaback! and its technologies, Dimond reaffirms my claim, asserting: “[D]igital activism may help deconstruct the identity of the professional activist and help create a pipeline of new activists who have never engaged with activism before. This finding provides more nuance than charges that activism online is merely ‘slacktivism’” (Dimond 2012, 81).

Another question that may arise from this discussion on digital and online activism and storytelling is how online forms of activism connect to the offline lives of affected individuals. Hollaback!’s online platform for storytelling, in combination with offline initiatives such as rallies, workshops and demonstrations, shows that a separation between online and offline activism is not inevitable (Dimond 2012, 137). Although the effect of such online technologies and platforms on policy is not entirely clear (Ford 2015, 1), as we saw

---

81 Original tweet by Menthon from 16 April 2015 read: “100% des femmes seraient ‘harcelées’ quotidiennement. Ne pas tout confondre: être sifflée dans la rue est plutôt sympa!” (“100% of women are “harassed” every day. Don’t be confused: being whistled in the street is actually rather nice!”) (Methon 2015).
82 “Slacktivism” can be understood as: “Actions performed via the Internet in support of a political or social cause but regarded as requiring little time or involvement” (Oxford Dictionaries 2015b).
with the hashtag campaigns above, there are evidently immense pools of virtual activists using these online platforms, which I argue can be tapped into order to more effectively expose and resist issues such as street harassment in Amsterdam. According to Mollie Vandor, a product manager at Twitter, there has been a 300 percent increase in conversations on Twitter about feminism since 2012. Vandor points to hashtag activism as not simply a lot of people talking but as a lot of people talking about specific issues that gain momentum over time and have the potential to effect change on unprecedented scales. “It’s easy to dismiss these social media moments as just ‘talk’, but I really believe that the more we talk about what gender equality means and why it’s important, the more that conversation picks up volume and the harder it is to ignore” (Ford 2015, 1).

Returning to discussions in Chapters 1 and 2 on collective action framing in social movements and the utility of storytelling as a method to share experiences and empower individuals, the sense of collective action provided by storytelling on online activist platforms thus provides a space for individuals affected by sexism to regain and reclaim power and control in what Laura Bates, founder of the popular online platform The Everyday Sexism Project, terms “a sense of protest over powerlessness” (Bates 2015, 2): “Don’t underestimate the catharsis and empowerment that can come simply from telling your story and having it accepted and believed, in a world where it is so often ignored or brushed off” (Bates 2015, 2). Looking at online anti-street harassment platforms such as Harassmap or Hollaback!, it thus becomes clear how such platforms can work to empower individuals, expose these interactions as part of broader heterosexist systems of power and mobilize quick, collective and widespread forms of resistance in Amsterdam and beyond.

**Chapter Conclusion**

This chapter answers the second part of my research question: (What factors influence street harassment interactions and) how can online platforms map these interactions and impact gendered and heterosexist public spaces in Amsterdam?. I answered this question through the theoretical framework on means of resistance, mapping gendered and heterosexist public spaces and engaging with social movements from sections 1.3-1.5. Based on this framework and through my two case studies—the Amsterdam online survey and online posts to New York and London Hollaback! sites—I show how digital technologies and online activist platforms can be effective tools to not only expose street harassment incidence but also to provide a space of collective resistance, where harassers are named, bystanders applauded and stories shared on unprecedented scales and at unprecedented speeds.
By engaging with existing technologies such as Green Dot etcetera, geo mapping and Twitter, and with existing online activist platforms such as Harassmap or Hollaback! New York and London, it is clear that such technologies are both feasible and effective, that they can show how street harassment is part of a systemic oppression rather than simply an individual experience, and that they have the potential to offer alternative ways for individuals to strategize and resist the phenomenon. The results of the survey presented in Chapter 3 show that street harassment is indeed a normalized gendered and heterosexist practice, where men harass individuals they perceive as women—what this chapter then proves is the potential for digital and online technologies to expose these interactions as heterosexist and to mobilize quick, collective and widespread forms of resistance.
CONCLUSIONS

With this research, I asked the following question: *What factors influence street harassment interactions and how can online platforms map these interactions and impact gendered and heterosexist public spaces in Amsterdam?*. Through data from my two primary case studies—my online Amsterdam survey and posts to New York and London Hollaback! sites—I substantiated the following hypothesis: street harassment is a normalized gendered and heterosexist practice, where men harass individuals they perceive as women, and digital and online technologies have the potential to expose these interactions as heterosexist and to mobilize quick, collective and widespread forms of resistance. I did this by showing how factors such as the language used in street harassment interactions and the spaces that facilitate them in Amsterdam lead to street harassment being understood as simply annoying, harmless or complimentary and reinforce women’s position in these situations as less powerful than the men who harass. I highlighted the long term and widespread effects of street harassment on survey respondents to show how the reinforcement of such positioning has ground-level and impactful consequences, and I showed if and how Amsterdam respondents have resisted to this positioning within street harassment interactions. I also substantiated my hypothesis by showing how digital technologies and online platforms can be effective tools to not only expose street harassment as a gendered and heterosexist practice, but also to provide a space of collective resistance, where harassers are named, bystanders applauded and stories shared on unprecedented scales and at unprecedented speeds.

My research is grounded in the theoretical framework presented in Chapter 1, which consists of literature on gendered and heterosexist positioning (including the work of de Beauvoir, Wittig, Wiesner-Hanks and West and Zimmerman), the power of language (including the work of Cameron and Kulick, Kleinman, Quinn and Bernard and Schlaffer), public spaces (including the work of Branam, Walkowitz, Puwar and Weisman), and traditional and digital/virtual social movements (including the work of Jasper, Benford and Snow, Martin and Valenti and Dimond). This quadripartite served as the frame of reference for my research question and the interpretation of the data I gathered through my two primary case studies—my online Amsterdam survey and the submissions to Hollaback! New York and London sites.

Bringing this literature and the data together substantiated my hypothesis that street harassment interactions are part of broader normalized gendered and heterosexist power structures that drive positioning, language and spaces in Amsterdam and beyond. It also
facilitated my claim that digital technologies and online platforms are innovative means of exposing and resisting these power structures within street harassment interactions. Such claims are part of my intervention to tackle the gaps between theory on gender and sexuality and dominant discourse on street harassment, its impact on the material conditions of those affected by it, and the lack of effective means of resistance.

As part of this intervention, it is important to reaffirm as I discussed in Chapter 2 that gender and sexuality are not the only axes of oppression experienced in situations of street harassment. More discussion is needed to comprehensively address additional axes, including race and class, which position individuals differently and affect their experiences of street harassment. With this in mind, this thesis is positioned through my data, which shows a predominance of gendered and heterosexist factors that mark the experiences of Amsterdam survey respondents and online posters to Hollaback! sites in New York and London. Hollaback!’s removal of raced and classed identifiers, as discussed in Chapter 2, is an important factor to consider in this respect, as I was unable to adequately analyze racial and classed factors in street harassment situations reported to their New York and London sites as a result. Although I highlighted implications of race on survey respondents’ own experiences as well as on how they conceptualized their harassers in Chapters 3 and 4, as I indicated in these chapters, further research would benefit from exploring this axis in more depth, particularly within the context of the Dutch Myth of Tolerance.

By exploring my research claims through the four main theoretical lenses mentioned above, as well as through feminist methodological, discourse analysis, mixed-methods and grounded theory approaches, this thesis thus aims to inspire a more comprehensive understanding of street harassment, as well as of the broader issues of male access to women in public spaces. In this regard, gathering data from different sources, including an online survey in Amsterdam, online posts to Hollaback! sites in New York and London and email and Skype conversations allowed for more dynamic data sets. Basing my online survey off of the Hollaback! online submission form and international street harassment survey is one important example of the ways in which different data informed each other throughout my research process. In this vein, incorporating approaches such as grounded theory allowed for more flexible analysis. Maintaining reflexivity throughout the process of gathering and analyzing my data was in turn paramount to developing my claims in an informed but adaptable manner that did not lead to one, ‘objective’ (Harding 1993, 69; Haraway 1991, 114) truth about street harassment but rather to more elastic deductively and inductively gained conclusions.
I followed these approaches in Chapter 3 to bring concepts around women’s positioning from the theoretical level to the ground level in Amsterdam, where I showed how they shape the experiences and subjectivities of individuals moving through public spaces and work to normalize street harassment as a gendered and heterosexist practice. Within this process, I problematized street harassment as reinforcing what de Beauvoir terms as the ‘Woman’ category (de Beauvoir 1952 [2010], 5) and troubled theoretical resistance to essentialist gender categorization through the lived experiences of survey respondents in Amsterdam. In this vein, I highlighted language within street harassment interactions such as “sex-talk” and “straight talk” (D. Cameron 2006, 172; 178) as indicative of how such gendered and heterosexist dynamics play out on the ground dialogically, using the spatial lens established in Chapter 1 to look more broadly at how public spaces themselves are complicit in facilitating street harassment interactions. The visibility of such systems is arguably masked by the myth of the “ordinary” (D. Cameron 2006, 178) and natural organization of sexed and gendered relations, as they are articulated through space, language and interaction.

Thus, although street harassment itself is arguably quite public and visible, I aimed in this thesis to shed light on the often less-visible heterosexist and gendered factors that drive and facilitate its propagation through experiences reported in Amsterdam. In my discourse analysis that traces the differing structures and actors that shape and are shaped through these interactions, I thus encourage an understanding of street harassment as a normalized, powered and impactful social phenomenon. I argue through the work of Madriz, Livingston, Schilt and Westbrook and others that the drastic impacts on the lives of individuals who experience street harassment, as evidenced by reports by Amsterdam survey respondents, further highlights the critical need to acknowledge street harassment as not simply an annoyance or as a compliment, but as a normalized pattern of interactions that is driven by overarching gendered and heterosexist power dynamics facilitated by factors such as language and public spaces.

In Chapter 4, I pivot my analysis to show how, in addition to exposing the normalization of street harassment and the gendered and heterosexist factors that drive the phenomenon, digital and online tools also offer innovative means of resistance, by providing broad and powerful platforms to bring experiences of street harassment to a virtual floor. As I show in Chapters 3 and 4, the experiences of women who share their stories online—whether in New York, London or Amsterdam—is thus a powerful reminder of the utility of online activist platforms in not only mapping interactions of street harassment but in empowering individuals on large scales to resist. Supplementing the bulk of my analysis with
a look at online storytelling in New York, London and other cities worldwide not only paints a broader picture of how street harassment functions in different contexts but the Hollaback! sites also served as an important benchmark for the way I designed my survey for Amsterdam.

As evidenced by the response rate of my Amsterdam survey (157 responses in just two weeks), the online posts I analyzed from New York and London Hollaback! sites, conversations with Harassmap in Cairo and with Hollaback! headquarters in New York, I have not only claimed that digital and online technologies are effective; rather, I have grounded my claims by demonstrating the effectiveness of such technologies in existing social movements as providing spaces to share collective experiences and be empowered at speeds and on scales like never before. Through technologies such as feminist geo mapping, I also showed how street harassment interactions can be exposed so that harassers are more readily named, bystanders more visibly applauded and the notion of shared or collective experiences made into a virtual reality. In this vein, I extended my discussion about the male gaze from Chapter 3 to show how digital technologies such as feminist geo mapping can be used to subvert or ‘sousvey’ (Mann and Ferenbok 2013, 18) the gaze. Through technologies such as Twitter, I showed how spaces can be reconceptualised and shrunk in a way that allows for a conversation to happen among millions and for those reluctant to share their experiences offline to be empowered through the online communities that these technologies facilitate. Just as Walkowitz touted the historical power of offline popular media in Victorian England to articulate experiences of street harassment publicly (Walkowitz 1998, 2), so do these newer digital and online platforms hold this potential.

Returning to my arguably unorthodox decision to look at street harassment not in India, nor Egypt, but in the Netherlands, it is important to return to the reasoning behind and the significance of this choice. As I noted in the Introduction Chapter, the Netherlands boasts a high-gender equality ranking relative to other countries worldwide (European Institute for Gender Equality 2010; World Economic Forum 2014), and is arguably not the first country that comes to mind with regards to street harassment. As my data on the pervasiveness of street harassment in Amsterdam has shown however, it was important that I not be tempted to simply delegate problems such as street harassment outside of the Netherlands, beyond Western Europe, or to countries in the Global South. Linking into my discussions in the Introduction Chapter and Chapter 4 about attributing street harassment to men of color or to communities in Amsterdam of color, I argue that unsettling the Dutch rank on gender equality, as with troubling its Myth of Tolerance, is critical to fostering a
more nuanced understanding about the phenomenon and to unsettling street harassment as a normalized gendered and heterosexist practice. With this in mind, it is important to acknowledge the severity of harassment experiences that I discussed in the Introduction Chapter in public spaces by girls and women such as Moga in Punjab state, ‘Nirbhaya’ in New Delhi, my friend in Cairo and countless others around the world. Rather than see these experiences as separate, I argue through my survey findings in Amsterdam and online data from New York and London Hollaback! sites, as well as through my discussions with anti-street harassment movement leaders in Egypt and my own experiences worldwide, for a more dynamic consideration of the gendered and heterosexist positioning of women, the use of language and the construction of space more broadly. In this vein, as I showed in Chapter 4, incorporating digital technologies and online platforms into both mapping and resisting street harassment has the power to transgress geographic, dialogic and cultural borders, to allow individuals around the world to share experiences, to create conversations and to mobilize communities into action: “[I]t makes me feel better to know that there are other women going through the same thing and trying to put a thought to it,” stated an anonymous submitter to Hollaback!. “I know I can be a little star on the map for someone else so they know they are not alone either and part of the collective activism” (Dimond 2012, 108).

This story, along with those from Amsterdam, New York, London and millions that are shared and tweeted across the world is setting the stage not only for increased awareness and more dynamic conversations about street harassment; it is also paving the way for newer forms of digital and online activism to combat the phenomenon on a scale and at a speed like never before. This thesis has thus explored the gendered and heterosexist realities of street harassment in Amsterdam and the possibilities for combatting its ubiquitous practice in Amsterdam, online and beyond. If feminist scholars and academics hope to inspire a transformation in the way women experience public spaces, as with any feminist concern, it is then essential that street harassment is understood as a normalized practice rooted in these systems of power, and that conscious efforts are made to engage with digital and online technologies as tools to expose the problem and as opportunities for effective and scalable resistance.
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A. HOLLABACK! ONLINE STORY SUBMISSION FORM

This form is used to submit stories of street harassment to Hollaback! sites and served in part of the basis for my Amsterdam survey questions (Hollaback! NYC 2015c).
B. INTERNATIONAL STREET HARASSMENT SURVEY

In addition to Hollaback!’s online story submission form (see Appendix A), I based my Amsterdam survey in part on an international street harassment survey that was being conducted at the time of research by Hollaback! New York, in conjunction with Cornell University. Below are the first two pages of a copy of the survey questions that I received from Beth Livingston, project lead at Cornell (B. Livingston 2014). The full survey is available upon request.

International Street Harassment Survey

Informed Consent

At Hollaback (www.ihollaback.org) we are dedicated to fighting street harassment. The following questions are being asked of people across the world to help inform our public policy agenda and to help men and women around the world who encounter street harassment. Please answer as honestly as possible, and thank you for your participation!

Risks to participation: All of your responses will remain anonymous. However, we will be asking sensitive questions about your experiences with street harassment. Please be aware that there may be triggers in this survey for some people. We anticipate that your participation in this survey presents no greater risk than everyday use of the Internet.

Benefits for participation: Hollaback (and its partners) will use this information to inform its international policy agenda moving forward, and local affiliates will be able to tailor responses to the people in their area. This information is critical for the future. This survey will take you approximately 15-20 minutes to complete and is completely voluntary.

Although we would like for you to complete the entire survey--and you can return the survey within 6 days to complete it if you could not complete it in one sitting--you may end the survey at any time without penalty. Contact: this survey is being conducted by ihollaback.org (and facilitated by Professor Beth Livingston, Cornell University, BAL93@cornell.edu). If you have any questions or concerns regarding your rights as a subject in this study, you may contact the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for Human Participants at 607-255-6182 or access their website at http://www.irb.cornell.edu. You may also report your concerns or complaints anonymously through Ethicspoint online at www.hotline.cornell.edu or by calling toll free at 1-866-293-3077. Ethicspoint is an independent organization that serves as a liaison between the University and the person bringing the complaint so that anonymity can be ensured. If you consent to participating in the survey, please answer the questions below and proceed throughout the survey. If you have any questions about Hollaback, please contact: Emily May Executive Director Hollaback! ihollaback.org twitter: @ihollaback facebook: facebook.com/ihollaback Debjani Roy Deputy Director Hollaback! 30 Third Avenue, 800B Brooklyn, New York 11217 (347) 889-5510 debjani@ihollaback.org

www.ihollaback.org

First, we'd like to ask you a few demographic questions about who you are. This will help us to understand more about those who are most affected by street harassment and will aid in reporting these findings.
Q1 What is your age?
○ Under 18 (1)
○ 19-30 (2)
○ 31-40 (3)
○ 41-50 (4)
○ Above 50 (5)

Q2 At birth, you were described as:
○ Male (1)
○ Female (2)
○ Intersex (3)
○ If other, please specify: (4) ____________________
○ I prefer not to say (5)

Q3 Which of the following describes how you think of yourself now:
○ Male (1)
○ Female (2)
○ In another way: (3) ____________________

Q4 People are different in their sexual attraction to other people. Which best describes your feelings? Are you:
○ Only attracted to females (1)
○ Mostly attracted to females (2)
○ Equally attracted to females and males (3)
○ Mostly attracted to males (4)
○ Only attracted to males (5)
○ Not sure (6)
○ Other (please specify) (7) ____________________

Q5 Have you ever visited Hollaback's website (or another website dedicated to stopping street harassment)?
○ Yes (1)
○ No (2)

Complete survey available upon request.
C. AMSTERDAM STREET HARASSMENT SURVEY (CONSENT AND QUESTIONS)

Below is the first two pages of my Amsterdam street harassment survey (based off of Appendix 1 and 2). The full survey is available upon request.
Complete survey available upon request.
D. RAW DATA: HOLLBACK! NEW YORK STORIES

Below are the first five stories I analyzed from Hollaback!’s New York site. My data, as well as the image of the first post below, is from the Hollaback! NYC archives, located at: http://nyc.hollaback.org/archives, and spans from October to December 2014 (Hollaback! NYC, 2015e).

1. **HOLLA ON THE GO: “No passerbys stopped to help”**
   Was handing out fliers for nearby college by a subway station the 2 or 5 at 149th and 3rd when someone came up to me, grabbed me, touched me in inappropriate places, grabbed my face said ‘come here’ tried to kiss me on the lips, ended up kissing the cheek when I finally succeeded in pushing them off me they shouted ‘got ya!’ And went on the subway. No passerbys stopped to help, and my boss had a ‘shit happens’ stance on the matter.
   *Published on January 10, 2015 at 2:15 am*

2. **Anonymous’ Story: Inappropriate advances**
   Hot dog vendor asked where me and my friend where we were from (we’re from New York but Asian). He said he was Egyptian when I asked. Then he randomly asked if he could kiss me as if it was perfectly fine. I was shocked and disgusted.
   *Published on January 3, 2015 at 4:50 am*

3. **HOLLA ON THE GO: Stalked on the subway**
   I was sitting on the 2 train going uptown on 12/30/14 and a male with glasses wearing a puffy brown coat sat next to me. He kept staring at me. I pretended to exit the train and got in the next car. I move four cars over and I looked back and he was following me. He followed me all the way to the first car. I informed the train conductor he let me out and closed the train doors. I ran up the stairs and took a uptown bus.
   *Published on December 31, 2014 at 6:16 am*

4. **Amy’s Story: Caught in the act**
   This man proceeded to move his seat so that he was in my line of vision – then whipped out his junk and leered at me as he tugged it.
   *Published on December 30, 2014 at 3:42 am*

5. **Margaret’s Story: Groping on the Subway**
   On my way to Brooklyn on F train during rush hour (around 4:45pm), I went into a extremely crowded subway car. I was standing very close to one particular man who carried a side backpack where his arm hanging over the bag. As the car began to fill up even more (making us even closer together), he gradually moved his hand closer to my crouch area and began to grope me. I was able to jerk away but he still continued to grope. After about two subway stops later, I was able to move away from him but he continued to stare at me. Then after another two stops, he gave me one last look and got off the train.
   *Published on December 18, 2014 at 4:41 am*

*Remaining posts available upon request.*
E. RAW DATA: HOLLABACK! LONDON STORIES

Below are the five stories I analyzed from Hollaback!'s London site. My data, as well as the image of the first post below, are from the Hollaback! London archives, located at: http://london.ihollaback.org/archives, and spans from August to December 2014 (Hollaback! London, 2015).

A. What I did catch was incredibly rude and made me feel sick
New submission from phone app
Some guy in a builders’ truck yelled at me as he drove past. I was so taken aback that I didn’t hear most of what he said, but what I did catch was incredibly rude and made me feel sick. All I had time to respond with was the angriest of angry glares.
Published on December 20, 2014 at 4:02 pm

B. As we walked away, one of them threw a glass at me.
New submission from Shannon
I was walking down Earlham Street with my friend to go to Piccadilly Circus when a group of guys standing outside a bar turned to stare and leer at us. As we got closer, they started shouting, “hey baby,” and, “come hang out with us,” among other things. When we tried to walk by them, they stood in my way (my friend was able to get by in time). One guy reached to grab my arm when I said, “Shut up and get out of my way.” They did not react well. As we walked away, one of them threw a glass at me. It only hit my ankle, but when we hopped on the bus later, I was shaking from anger and fear. It could have been more violent than that. My experience inspired me to write a post about it to an American website (I’m an American student studying abroad in London) I contribute to thelala.com, in hopes to get more university girls talking about the harassment they endure every day.
Published on December 4, 2014 at 1:30 am

C. ‘I would RUIN that.’
New submission from Louise
I had left work for lunch and was walking to meet a friend and I walked past a group of what looked like builders. They all glanced over as I passed but the one nearest me said ‘I would RUIN that.’ loud enough for all of us to hear and probably anyone sitting outside the Starbucks opposite. I never feel like I can respond in these situations because I just feel outnumbered and a bit intimidated. What does that even mean – you’re going to ruin me… great. Every woman loves getting ruined I guess. Another one happened a couple of days after, I ducked into a Sainsburys local quickly out of the rain with a couple of friends and a guy in the doorway said ‘mmm, very nice, you very gorgeous’ aside from making me feel like a piece of meat he continued to stare at me walking around the shop instead of leaving it like I assumed he was going to do. These two encounters are a drop in the ocean of incidents I have experienced as a teenager and a woman. (I’ll recount one more from when I was 14 and riding home on the bus in my school uniform… a creepy guy got on, obviously sat next to
me, to my horror proceeded to put his head in my lap and then came up a minute later with a horrible leer on his face and said ‘No ring then?’ I later presumed he meant a marriage ring.

Published on November 13, 2014 at 5:30 pm

D. Ever since then I’ve been more vocal when it’s safe to be.

New submission from Cait

I was sitting next to a young woman (like me) on the bus. She had long, blonde braids. A guy got on the bus, sat in the seat in front of ours and turned around to stare. At first he just stared at her for a minute, but then he started to say “Hey gorgeous, I like your blonde hair. You’re beautiful.” I was so angry on her behalf. There were at least 15 people on the bus, it was around 2 in the afternoon and no-one said a thing. The woman looked uncomfortable. At first she said thanks, and then became silent when he got more explicit. Usually I’m scared of large guys when they’re aggressively harassing women, but I became too angry to care. I told him “Leave her alone and turn around, you’re making me uncomfortable.” He then said “I’m not bothering her.” “No,” I replied, “You’re bothering me.” He then asked if I was her girlfriend, and if she was a lesbian. “No, she’s a human being.” I think I half-yelled it. He stared at me for the longest time, until a guy on the bus distracted him and they spoke about football. When I got off, she thanked me – all I could think of was how awful it has been when I have been harassed and no-one stood up for me. Ever since then I’ve been more vocal when it’s safe to be.

Published on November 3, 2014 at 6:53 pm

E. At the bus stop, a guy kept creepily following me around, moving to stand near me every time I moved to get away from him.

New submission from Emmeline

It’s about 1am, I am on my way home – alone – from a halloween party – in costume as a blank and white bmovie character (top hat, greyscale makeup. I have a long coat on over ter esof my costume)

As I crossed from the train station to the bus station (a 1 minute walk) two men approached me separately with a suggestively toned ‘hello’.

At the bus stop, a guy kept creepily following me around, moving to stand near me every time I moved to get away from him.

Then three young men walked past, and one said “You look niiiice.”

I ignored them.


Published on November 2, 2014 at 10:34 am

Remaining posts available upon request.
**F. CODED CATEGORIES**

**AMSTERDAM SURVEY STORIES; NEW YORK AND LONDON HOLLABACK! POSTS**

Below is a list of the 17 main categories that I used to code my data from stories reported in the Amsterdam survey as well as online submissions to the New York and London Hollaback! sites. Each of the 17 categories had anywhere from 2-12 sub-categories. All stories were labeled with a letter and were categorized next to all relevant sub-categories of each main category. Not all categories were applicable to each story.

1. Reported or implied harasser gender
2. Reported harasser age
3. Reported or implied gender of person harassed
4. More than one person harassed?
5. General type of harassment
6. Type of physical harassment
7. Type of verbal harassment
8. Harassment type as a sound
9. Harassment type as a gaze
10. Other type of harassment
11. Place of harassment
12. Reaction reported by person harassed
13. Response reported by person harassed
14. Harasser reaction to above reaction/response of person harassed
15. Harasser response to above reaction/response of person harassed
16. Bystander intervention
17. Other details

To exemplify the coding process, below is an example of stories from the London Hollaback! site coded for types of verbal harassment. As I coded the stories, I added sub-categories as needed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbal Harassment</th>
<th>Story</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual</td>
<td>C,D,E,J,P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slur/Insult</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question/Request</td>
<td>L,S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command</td>
<td>B,P,T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shout</td>
<td>A,H,J,L,M,O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeting</td>
<td>B,E,G,J,L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliment</td>
<td>D,E,J,M,R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatphobic</td>
<td>E,R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Complete coding sheets are available upon request.*
G. RESULTS: AMSTERDAM STREET HARASSMENT SURVEY

Below are data from my Amsterdam survey (conducted 19 January to 2 February) that I cited in this thesis. This includes Q1, Q2, Q5, Q10, Q11, Q12, Q23, Q24, Q28 and Q29. Where respondents left comments for a question, these are included below the graph. These results are for all respondents and are not filtered for only female survey respondents. The remaining survey results for all 33 questions are available upon request.
How do you think you are perceived by strangers?
Please tell us about an experience of street harassment you've ever had or witnessed in Amsterdam (check all that apply)
Location of harassment:
Harassment Type (check all that apply):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fencing with 2 new pickets to couple to existing pickets</td>
<td>2/26/19: 1:24 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>New rail</td>
<td>2/26/19: 1:54 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Can I add a row of 20' to the previous change made on 2/1 that cost $400?</td>
<td>2/26/19: 1:54 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Remove 2 new pickets</td>
<td>2/26/19: 1:54 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Provide full structure for the previous total mentioned</td>
<td>2/26/19: 1:54 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How often has the following occurred?

How did the following make you feel?

Complete survey results available upon request.