

“CONSCIENCE ADHERENTS” REVISITED: NON-LGBT PRIDE PARADE PARTICIPANTS*

Mattias Wahlström, Abby Peterson, and Magnus Wennerhag[†]

Foundation stones in the resource mobilization theory of social movements are the notions of “conscience adherents” and “conscience constituents,” first introduced by McCarthy and Zald in 1977. In this article, we revisit the concept of conscience adherent, by applying it to individuals and groups that are direct supporters of an LGBT movement, but who do not stand to directly benefit from the success should the movement accomplish its goals. Using quantitative data collected during Pride parades in Stockholm, Haarlem, London, and Warsaw, we analyze the group of participants who reported that they were lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender and compare them to heterosexual and gender-conforming participants, identifying factors that explain why people in the latter category participate in Pride parades. We argue that experiences of discrimination, knowing people from the beneficiary group, and/or subscribing to general principles of justice, contribute to conscience adherent participation. Furthermore, based on interviews with Pride parade organizers, we argue that mobilizations based on a more inclusive political strategy will attract more non-LGBT participants.

Today, Pride parades in numerous countries and localities provide the most visible manifestation of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) movements¹ and politics. While Pride parades are central performative events for the LGBT polity, not all participants stand to directly gain from the accomplishment of the movement’s political goals. Contemporary Pride parades in many countries include a significant share of participants who are heterosexual and have a norm-conforming gender identity. This category of participants exemplify what McCarthy and Zald (1977) would call “conscience adherents”: people who are involved in social movements but who do not belong to the category of people that primarily gain from movement successes. In this article, we examine this particular type of Pride participants, analyzing who they are and why they participate. Hence, we have a dual focus on (1) similarities and differences between LGBT and non-LGBT participants in Pride parades and (2) explaining the mobilization of the latter category of “Pride conscience adherents.” With unique data from surveys carried out during Pride parades in London, Haarlem, Stockholm and Warsaw, we use responses from participants who do not identify themselves as LGBT to investigate the characteristics of conscience adherents in the LGBT movement. Consequently, we not only capture a category of Pride participants that is easily forgotten in discussions about Pride parades, but we also use this case to explore the complexity of the category of

* The study was conceived and developed in collaboration between the co-authors. Wahlström and Peterson wrote most parts of the text with some contributions from Wennerhag. Wahlström conducted the regression analyses. Wennerhag did the class analysis as well as the main part of the coding and organization of the dataset. Mattias Wahlström is associate professor at the Department of Sociology and Work Science, University of Gothenburg. Abby Peterson is professor emerita at the Department of Sociology and Work Science, University of Gothenburg. Magnus Wennerhag is associate professor at the Department of Social Science, Södertörn University, and researcher at the Department of Sociology and Work Science, University of Gothenburg. Please direct correspondence to Wahlström: mattias.wahlstrom@gu.se.

[†] This study was supported by the Bank of Sweden Tercentenary Foundation (P2013-0861:1), the Swedish Council for Working Life and Social Research (FAS 2008-1799), and the European Science Foundation (ESF-08-ECRP-001). Thanks to Cristiana Olcese for assistance with data gathering, as well as Hans Ekbrand and Olof Reichenberg for methodological advice. We would also like to thank Stefaan Walgrave, the editors of *Mobilization* and the anonymous reviewers for valuable comments on previous versions of this manuscript.

conscience adherents in a social movement. We argue that the conscience adherents at Pride parades challenge the conventional expectation that conscience adherents are more resourceful than the average beneficiary adherents. Instead, the conscience adherents of the LGBT movement, who are most often women, often perceive themselves as belonging to other groups experiencing discrimination in society. The non-LGBT participants in Pride parades are motivated primarily by solidarity rather than the defense of their own interests. We argue their participation and their motivations for participation are influenced by the different mobilizing contexts, as the proportion of non-LGBT participants in Pride parades varies depending on whether the parade is organized as a primarily inclusive event focused on demanding political reforms or as a more exclusive and social event for LGBT people.

CONSCIENCE ADHERENTS AND CONSCIENCE CONSTITUENTS

In a now classic article in the social movement literature, McCarthy and Zald (1977: 1216ff) presented a set of concepts and related propositions drawn from the resource mobilization perspective. To understand a social movement's successes, if not its emergence, they emphasized the crucial importance of the involvement of individuals and organizations that are not the typical beneficiaries of the movement. They offered a number of conceptual distinctions. First, they differentiated between adherents, or those individuals and organizations that believe in the goals of the movement, and constituents of a social movement organization, who are those providing resources (labor and money) (p. 1221). Second, they make a further key distinction between adherent beneficiaries and constituent beneficiaries, and conscience adherents and conscience constituents. The two latter groups are individuals and organizations that share the social movement's goals or are directly active in providing resources to a social movement organization, but who do not stand to directly benefit from its success (p. 1222). They assumed that conscience adherents and constituents are typically more resourceful compared to the beneficiary constituents and adherents of the movement. Here we investigate the conscience adherents (the non-LGBT participants at four Pride parades), acknowledging that these groups of participants were seldom members of LGBT organizations, what McCarthy and Zald would term conscience constituents.

In addition to the distinction between conscience and beneficiary adherents and constituents, McCarthy and Zald (1977) argue for the partitioning of social movement supporters into mass or elite categories. They maintain that a protest strategy engaging a mass of conscience adherents to the social movement organization fighting on behalf of an oppressed group may also lead to the engagement of conscience elites to legitimate the organization and its goals to authorities. Additionally, elite outsiders also bring media visibility to a movement, thereby potentially drawing bystander publics into the movement. Lastly, the participation of political and cultural elites can lower the threshold for the participation of the wider category of conscience adherents (Meyer and Gamson 1995: 185-186).

Charles Tilly (2001) claimed that McCarthy and Zald (1977) never clearly explained why conscience constituents or adherents engage in a social movement for the altruistic benefit of others. According to Tilly (2001), McCarthy and Zald strongly implied that:

- (a) their participation costs them relatively little and (b) they participate because (and only for so long as) it gives them self-satisfaction. They actually participate for net benefits. Thus McCarthy and Zald, too, end up converting altruism—at least this mild form of altruism—into egoism or cooperation (p. 29).

However, beyond these theoretical formulations, few studies empirically investigate the role and defining characteristics of conscience adherents and conscience constituents (for an exception, see Klandermans, van Stekelenburg, and Damen 2015). Our article addresses this lacuna by empirically exploring why conscience adherents participate in Pride parades. We assume that they also participate because their involvement provides them with a sense of

self-satisfaction, they feel that it is fun, or perhaps they think that their participation may indirectly benefit their organization, party, or movement. However, we are wary of reducing their active participation to a form of underlying egoism or reputation management (Chong 1991: 50). The respondents in our study offer a wide variety of reasons for participating on the behalf of marginalized others that give us a clearer picture of conscience adherents in social movement politics more generally.

SOCIAL IDENTITY AND PROTEST PARTICIPATION

Social movement scholars acknowledge that individuals' social identity and group identification are central motivating aspects of participation (e.g., Van Stekelenburg and Klandermans 2010). However, the implicit image in this literature is one of a movement recruiting people who belong to the group or category benefitting from the movement's struggle, which leads to a focus on the extent to which the social identification with this group is salient among the potential participants (Klandermans and de Weerd 2000; Stryker 2000). The social identities of beneficiaries, using McCarthy and Zald's (1977) distinction, are embedded in their everyday experiences (Tilly 1999). In the case of conscience adherents, the relation is arguably more complex; their social identities are detached from the everyday experiences of marginalization and discrimination faced by the beneficiaries of the movement (*ibid*). Whereas it is reasonable to argue that participation in movement activities requires at least minimal group identification with the social movement, conscience adherents may not necessarily closely identify with the beneficiary group of the movement. Subsequently, we argue that the identity work engaged in by conscience adherents differs from that of beneficiary constituents and adherents. For conscience adherents of the LGBT movement, some degree of "recategorization" (Gaertner, Davidio, Anastasio, Bachman, and Rust 1993; Davidio, Gaertner, Validzic, Matoka, Johnson, and Frazier 1997; Subašić, Reynolds, and Turner 2008) should be expected, whereby they extend their social identity as heterosexuals with normative gender expressions into a potentially more inclusive political identity that can motivate their participation in Pride events.

A growing body of social psychological research investigates what predicts non-LGBT individuals' willingness to participate in collective action on behalf of the LGBT community, but non-LGBT conscience adherents remain understudied. While many of these studies analyze intentions or willingness to participate and not actual participation (e.g., Stotzer 2009), Glenda M. Russell (2011) identifies twelve distinct motives for heterosexuals who are actively engaged in LGBT rights issues, which she argues represent two general types: "motives based on fundamental principles" and "motives based on personal roles, relationships, or experiences" (p. 383). Russell emphasizes the complexity of ally motives and the importance of opinion-based motives even within the context of identity politics. Somewhat similar to Russell's two general types, Vernaglia (1999) identified two pathways to engagement for LGBT parents: "the parental loyalty pathway" and the "social justice activist pathway." Also, Duhigg, Rostosky, Gray, and Wimsatt (2010) investigate the development of heterosexual allies with a small interview sample. They describe the importance of early role models, an evolving recognition and understanding of privilege and oppression, and conflict between an awareness of sexual prejudice and values of justice and equality—moving in a process from personal experiences to fundamental principles. Fingerhut (2011: 2242ff) found in his quantitative study of heterosexuals sampled from an online panel of self-recruited research participants that their pro-LGBT actions could be explained by their personal contacts, gender (women more than men) and level of education (more highly educated). Furthermore, he found that action was most likely to be taken among individuals scoring lower in prejudice and higher in allophilia, or positive attitudes towards an outgroup, which in this case was directed towards LGBT individuals.

A related body of research on white antiracists (primarily in the U.S.) points out challenges for the identity work of these conscience adherents (albeit seldom, if ever, framed in this term). White participants in the civil rights movement were actively engaged in what Crossley (2002) calls processes of “sense making” (see also Rothschild 1982). While these activists allegedly have had to explicitly identify as white in the movement context, experiences from other types of discrimination have shaped their approach to participation (Eichstedt 2001; O’Brien 2001). In an unpublished work, Hogan and Netzer (cited by Feagin and Vera 1995, 175-179) distinguish between three types of “approximating experiences” that form the basis for white antiracist engagement: borrowed approximations, overlapping approximations, and global approximations. Borrowed approximations mean that engagement by conscience constituents/adherents is based on interactions with the potential beneficiaries of the movement; for example, they may have heard about or directly witnessed the suffering of a friend, family member, or acquaintance (see also Broad, Alden, Berkowitz, and Ryan 2008; Fingerhut 2011; Herek and Capitanio 1996; Knoke 1988: 333; Russell 2011). Overlapping approximations involve the process described by Eichstedt (1999) where individuals with other minority identities link their own experiences of suffering and oppression to the suffering of people with stigmatized skin color. This might be a general mechanism for how people belonging to oppressed groups solidarize with other oppressed groups, including LGBT persons. People who have experienced discrimination and marginalization should, according to this logic, be more easily mobilized to political engagement concerning other forms of marginalization. Last, global approximations refer individuals’ decisions to become engaged in the cause of a marginalized minority based on general and abstract notions of justice and human rights (see also Klar and Kasser 2009; Knoke 1988, 331-333; Russell 2011; Vernaglia 1999). We argue that this poignant conceptualization is potentially generalizable to conscience adherents and constituents in other movements as well, as suggested by its similarity with the types of motivations of straight allies identified in the research by Vernaglia (1999) and Russell (2011) reviewed above. In the terms of McAdam and Snow (2000), these would be three forms of identity work that people engage in to achieve identity convergence with the collective identity of the movement and to lay the basis for how conscience adherents justify their participation.

Consequently, one should expect non-LGBT participants in Pride parades to join because they (1) have social ties to LGBT persons, (2) have personal experiences of discrimination or marginalization on grounds other than sexuality, and/or (3) have an ideological commitment to the rights of LGBT people and minority groups in general. These are not mutually exclusive but may have varying import to different participants. The consequences of the three types of experiences in terms of social identity can also be expected to differ. Whereas experiences of overlapping approximations may lead to a recategorization of social identity into an ingroup of discriminated people, global approximations seem more likely to let the conscience adherents retain an outgroup-based solidarity with the beneficiaries. Consequently, depending on the approximating experiences involved, and shaped by the mobilizing context of the event, one should expect non-LGBT participants to identify with other participants to varying degrees.

CONTEXTUAL FACTORS AND CONSCIENCE ADHERENT PARTICIPATION

Originating in the U.S., Pride parades have now become translated into new contexts to suit different national and local settings. According to Armstrong and Cragg (2006: 725), contributing to the success of the Pride parade included “its annual design, compatibility with media routines, cultural power, and versatility.” Pride parades today provide sites of tension, such as between commercialization and politicization, festivity and protest, normalization and contention, and have assumed different dynamics in different cultural, political, and social settings (Peterson, Wahlström and Wennerhag forthcoming).² LGBT movements show a

clear national or regional imprint, manifesting what Adam, Duyvendak, and Krouwel (1998) have called a national paradigm that impacts their annual Pride events. Further, we argue that below the national level even local mobilizing contexts and the intentions of the organizers are important for understanding who participates and why.

The main contextual factor that we expect to be important for conscience adherents' participation in Pride parades is the character of the specific Pride parades. The parades can be staged as events primarily intended for the LGBT community or as events aimed at attracting broader groups. These possibilities relate to Bernstein's (1997) observation that even though seeking recognition for a specific identity can be the consistent goal of a movement, different actors within the movement can strategically deploy identity in different ways that can be more or less exclusive towards broader social groups.

If often having weaker ties with the movements staging the protests, conscience adherents bear some structural similarities to the category of "lone demonstrators" (Wahlström and Wennerhag 2014), who are more likely to be mobilized for protests staged by inclusive and heterogeneous movement communities than for those staged by exclusive movement communities. We may thus expect that the degree of inclusiveness of the different Pride parades may affect the degree to which conscience adherents take part in them. We also anticipate that participation of elite conscience adherents, both celebrities and political elites, lowers the threshold for the participation of mass conscience adherents.

During the development of the LGBT movement since the 1960s, different approaches towards the movement's inclusiveness and definition of their community have prevailed during different periods and among different subgroups within the movement. Analyzing one of the earliest tensions in the LGBT movement, Valocchi (2013) explains how gay men tended to build their community networks around commercial spaces (such as bars, night-clubs, bath houses, and sex clubs), while lesbian women more commonly saw themselves as part of a feminist political struggle and the women's movement. The degree to which such differences between commercialization and politicization (or gay men's more narrow focus on affirming their own community vis-à-vis lesbian women's focus on broader political issues and alliances) still persist, as well as if specific Pride parades tend to focus on one more than the other, together may influence the movement's inclusiveness.

For our analysis, we have chosen to simply contrast inclusive parades, oriented towards demanding political reforms, and more exclusive, social-oriented, parades. Subsequently, in addition to studying the three hypothetical logics of participation described in the previous section, our study was also guided by the expectation that Pride parades that are more inclusive attract a higher proportion of non-LGBT participants.

METHODS

The data analyzed here come from protest surveys collected as part of the research program, "Caught in the Act of Protest: Contextualizing Contestation (CCC)," in which the authors took part. To date, twelve Pride parades have been surveyed, including ten in Europe, but only in four of the sampled Pride parades was a question about the respondent's sexual orientation posed: Pink Saturday in Haarlem 2012; London Pride 2012; Stockholm Pride 2014; and the Warsaw Equality Parade 2014.

Local research teams surveyed the Pride parades in the Netherlands and the UK to create variation in demonstration topics in the CCC dataset, whereas the Stockholm and Warsaw parades were deliberately surveyed to achieve variation in terms of Pride traditions and political context.

To obtain reliable, valid, and comparable findings, two techniques were employed at all four locations (following van Aelst and Wahlgrave 2001; Walgrave and Verhulst 2011). First, researchers worked to ensure that every protester had an equal chance of being selected for an interview. Teams of interviewers worked their way through the full length of the parades, and

a so-called “pointer” organized the dissemination in each team by directing the interviewers to hand out postal surveys to demonstrators at fixed intervals. Second, to control for non-response to the postal survey, short face-to-face interviews were conducted with every fifth demonstrator who was handed a postal survey. These interviews served as a means to assess possible bias arising from nonresponses and to control for it. For each demonstration, face-to-face interviews were conducted with approximately 100 participants who also received postal survey questionnaires. Questionnaires were handed out to an additional 500–1,000 participants per location. Since we could not send out reminders to those who had received our postal questionnaires, return rates were comparatively low, varying between a low of 19% in London and a high of 29% in Stockholm. A comparison of those responding to the postal questionnaire with those who only responded to the face-to-face questions indicates that any nonresponse bias broadly follows the pattern for protest surveys identified by Walgrave, Wouters, and Ketelaars (2016).

There is no significant gender bias, nor any bias related to political interest or motivation to participate. However, university-educated and older participants overall appeared somewhat more likely to respond to the postal survey. In addition, participants who had previous experience from demonstrating (six times or more) were overrepresented among the postal survey respondents. We could not test for nonresponse bias along the main dimension of interest to us—whether the respondent was LGBT or not. However, in our sample, non-LGBT identity was not correlated with any of the seemingly biased variables. We therefore assert that our analysis is unlikely to be severely affected by nonresponse bias.³

We complemented our quantitative data with interviews with organizers of the surveyed Pride parades and key LGBT activists engaged in Pride events: seven interviews in the Netherlands, of which one was a group interview; five interviews in Stockholm; four interviews in Warsaw; and five interviews in London. These semistructured interviews averaged between one and two hours. In the interviews we probed the organizers’ intentions for the event, including who they were trying to reach with their messages and the groups that were mobilized, as well as problems they had encountered in organizing the parade.

We also used data from round six of the European Social Survey (ESS), collected in 2012. The percentages reported in the bivariate analysis are weighted according to the ESS recommendation, to compensate for undersampling and predicted nonresponse biases (the “post-stratification weight”).⁴

Table 1. Sample of Pride Parades.

	Netherlands Haarlem	Poland Warsaw	Sweden Stockholm	United Kingdom London	
Sampling Characteristics	July 7, 2012	June 14, 2014	Aug. 2, 2014	July 7, 2012	Total
<i>Number of participants in parade (according to CCC research teams)</i>	1000	2500	40,000	20,000	63,500
<i>Number of oral surveys (F2F) made</i>	74	61	158	140	433
<i>Number of distributed postal surveys</i>	368	779	~810	1000	2957
<i>Number of returned postal surveys</i>	100	185	238	194	717
<i>Response rate</i>	27%	24%	29%	19%	24%

Operationalization of Variables

We define the main group of interest—non-LGBT participants—as those Pride participants who identify as heterosexual and who do not have a non-normative gender identity (e.g., transgender, nonbinary, or gender queer). The questionnaire contained a question where the respondent could indicate (choosing several alternatives, if needed) one of the following cate-

gories: lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and heterosexual.⁵ To determine whether a respondent's gender identity could be classified as non-normative, we used the open question "What is your gender identity?"⁶ in combination with a question about sex assigned at birth and the information about transgender people that we got in the aforementioned question.

Unfortunately, we have no direct way to measure social ties to LGBT persons among the non-LGBT participants. We could reasonably assume that almost every non-LGBT participant in a Pride parade knows at least one LGBT person, but by measuring what social ties the respondents had to those accompanying them at the parade, we can draw conclusions about the role that contacts play in mobilizing non-LGBT participants compared to LGBT participants. The question was multiple choice and formulated as follows: "Were you at this parade: Alone? With your partner? With your children? With friends? With relatives? With acquaintances? With colleagues or fellow students? With members of an organization you are a member of?" A limitation of this study is that we have no data on whether a respondent's companion(s) at the parade was LGBT or not.

Since we theorized that personal experiences of discrimination may translate to an increased propensity for engaging in struggles for the rights of other groups of people experiencing discrimination, the ideal would be a direct measure of this characteristic. However, we only had responses to the question "Would you describe yourself as being a member of a group that is discriminated against in this country?", with follow-up questions about different bases for discrimination. Personal experiences of discrimination dramatically increase the tendency to regard oneself as belonging to a discriminated group, so the question should be regarded as a reasonable proxy. The question also had the advantage of being used in the ESS survey, which made comparison with the general population possible.

Motives for participation were measured by six items in response to the overarching question "Please indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with the following statements? I participated in the parade in order to. . . ." The six items were: "defend my interests," "express my views," "pressure politicians to make things change," "raise public awareness," "express my solidarity," and "because I felt morally obliged to do so."⁷ This list of motives is certainly not exhaustive of the possible motives that participants might have, but it does reasonably cover the types of motives that we found most theoretically interesting for this study.

Identification with the other participants and the organizers was measured with the items: "To what extent do you identify with the other people present at the parade?" and "to what extent do you identify with any organization staging the parade?"

WHO ARE THE CONSCIENCE ADHERENTS?

The proportions of non-LGBT participants in the four surveyed parades can be seen in table 2. The proportion was highest in Stockholm with 41% non-LGBT participants and lowest in London with 15%. Since we have only four country cases, it is difficult to draw any conclusions about the impact of the country context on these proportions. On the one hand, the

Table 2. Proportions of Gender and Sexual Identities in Pride Parades.

Identity	Equality Parade (Warsaw)	London Pride Parade (London)	Pink Saturday Parade (Haarlem)	Stockholm Pride (Stockholm)
<i>Non-normative gender identity</i>	4%	11%	3%	9%
<i>Non-heterosexual</i>	72%	84%	71%	56%
<i>Non-LGBT person</i>	28%	15%	29%	41%

proportion of non-LGBT participants is highest in Sweden where tolerance for sexual diversity is also high, and where the participation of elite conscience adherents, particularly political-elite conscience adherents, was widespread. On the other hand, according to this logic, one would have expected the lowest proportion of non-LGBT persons in Warsaw and not in London. However, the demonstration context and framing also help explain the significant participation of conscience adherents where the Pride parades were heavily politicized, which was the case in Warsaw and, to a somewhat lesser extent, Stockholm (Wahlström 2015).

A factor behind the significant percentage (29%) of non-LGBT participants in the Pink Saturday Parade in Haarlem, we argue, was the dominance of lesbian women in the parade, as encouraged by the organizers (61% of LGBT participants in Haarlem identified as women). Even in Stockholm Pride, more lesbian and bisexual women than gay and bisexual men participated (among LGBT participants 49% identified as women, 38% as men, and 13% reported another gender identity); London Pride, in stark contrast, was dominated by gay men (65% of LGBT participants), with the lowest percentage of lesbian women (29% of LGBT participants). Among the LGBT participants in the Warsaw Equality parade, men also comprised the largest group, albeit with a lesser margin than in London (among LGBT participants, 58% were gay men and 38% were lesbian women).

Between the different categories of participants, gender identity is clearly differently distributed. Consistently there are considerably fewer men than women among the non-LGBT participants, with the overall proportions of 28% non-LGBT men versus 72% non-LGBT women. This result dovetails with Russell's (2011) and Fingerhut's (2011) findings regarding heterosexual LGBT allies. Gender appears to be the major predictor of participation in Pride Parades for non-LGBT persons. This could be related to women transferring their own experiences of discrimination to support for LGBT issues, as well as a general ideological affinity between women's rights issues and LGBT rights issues.

In terms of other sociodemographic variables, we saw no consistent differences of note between beneficiaries and conscience adherents. Taken as a whole, the proportion of participants with (or currently in) university education was around 75% in both groups and the class composition was also similar. In both groups, 83% of employed participants held middle or upper-middle-class occupations.

Group Identification

If identification with the protesting group is an important contributing factor to participation, it is vital to identify conscience adherents' relative degree of identification with other participants in the Pride parade. A bivariate analysis shows that non-LGBT participants consistently identify with both organizers and other participants to a lesser degree than do LGBT participants. Nonetheless, in absolute numbers, they display a relatively high degree of identification. In terms of identification with other participants, non-LGBT participants score on average 3.4 on a 5-degree scale, where 1 signifies "not at all" and 5 signifies "very much," and on average 2.8 for identification with organizers. The corresponding average figures for LGBT participants are 4.1 (identification with other participants) and 3.4 (identification with organizers). However, Haarlem stands out with lower scores; average identification of non-LGBT participants with other participants amounted only to 2.2, and average identification with organizers was 1.8. All categories of respondents score lower on their identification with the staging organization compared to their identification with the other participants.

Mobilizing Social Ties

Although we have no information about non-LGBT participants' relationships with LGBT people, we can investigate the varying role of different social ties in mobilizing the two categories of participants. We operationalized social ties by examining who accompanied the participants at the parade. The most obvious difference, found in table 3, is that while LGBT

Table 3. Companions of Non-LGBT and LGBT Pride Parade Participants. Percent.

<i>Pride Parade</i>	<i>Sexual Identity</i>	At the parade...							<i>Organizational comembers</i>
		<i>Alone</i>	<i>With Partner</i>	<i>With Children</i>	<i>With Friends</i>	<i>With Relatives</i>	<i>With Acquaintances</i>	<i>Colleagues or Fellow Students</i>	
Equality Parade, Warsaw <i>N</i> = 181	LGBT	8	43	2	53	10	45	37	18
	Non-LGBT	14	38	8	44	8	38	28	20
Pride Parade, London <i>N</i> = 186	LGBT	6	35*	2***	58	5**	23	22	58
	Non-LGBT	0	11*	21***	50	21**	25	29	32
Pink Saturday Parade Survey, Haarlem <i>N</i> = 94	LGBT	18	52	12	46	15	13	4	13
	Non-LGBT	11	33	15	26	26	7	11	11
Stockholm Pride <i>N</i> = 233	LGBT	3	39**	13	68*	9	36***	13***	36*
	Non-LGBT	3	22**	19	52*	9	16***	33***	45*
Total <i>N</i> = 2694	LGBT	7	40***	6***	58**	9	31*	21*	35
	Non-LGBT	7	26***	16***	46**	13	22*	28*	33

Note: Cramer's V test of significance. * $p < 5\%$, ** $p < 1\%$, *** $p < 0.1\%$.

persons more often participated together with their partner, non-LGBT participants more often participated together with their children (see also Broad et al. 2008). LGBT participants typically also more often participate together with friends and acquaintances, although these were common types of mobilizing social ties for both groups. Except in Warsaw, non-LGBT participants more often marched with colleagues and/or fellow students.

Experiences of Discrimination

A strikingly high proportion of non-LGBT participants in Pride parades perceive themselves to be a member of a group that experiences discrimination. The percentages are many times higher than the corresponding figures for the entire population: on average 34% among non-LGBT participants and 8% on average among the general populations, according to the European Social Survey (ESS). In a follow-up question the respondents were asked on what grounds their group was discriminated against. Among the non-LGBT participants, gender was the main perceived ground for discrimination, with between 22% and 26% giving this response in London, Stockholm, and Warsaw (the question about discrimination was not asked in the Haarlem survey). In the national populations (based on ESS data), the proportions of people considering themselves to belong to a group that is discriminated based on gender varies between close to 0% (Poland) and 2% (Sweden).

To further substantiate our interpretation, we pooled the dataset on Pride participants with ESS data for the three countries where the discrimination question had been used in our surveys. To single out mechanisms specifically for non-LGBT mobilization, we excluded respondents in the Pride survey dataset that were coded as LGBT. Lacking an explicit question about sexuality in the ESS dataset, we excluded respondents that either considered themselves to belong to a group that is discriminated against based on sexuality or indicated that they lived together with a partner of the same sex. Based on the assumptions that a negligible proportion of the participants in the ESS survey had taken part in any of the Pride parades included in our study and that the Pride parades had potentially national reach, the pooled dataset approximates a stratified sample of participants and nonparticipants in Pride parades.⁸ We base this conclusion on the logic of "choice-based sampling" (e.g., Manski and McFadden 1981), which has an established usage in fields where rare events are analyzed statistically. The main problems of not having data for identifying Pride participants in the ESS dataset are that the difference between participants and nonparticipants might be underestimated with resulting false negatives among the tested correlations, and that we cannot

properly adjust the intercept as well as country dummies (which are grossly overestimated compared to the real population since they correspond to the ratio of respondents in the national surveys and Pride surveys rather than the proportion of Pride participants in the populations). With this taken into account, binary logistic regressions with Pride participation as dependent variable nevertheless provided a means for us to corroborate the significance of belonging to a discriminated minority for Pride participation among non-LGBT persons. Since very few respondents saw themselves as belonging to a group that is discriminated against based on color/race, nationality, language, religion, or ethnicity, these variables were merged under the label “ethnonational characteristics.”

In table 4 we present separate regressions for Poland, Sweden, and the U.K. Since the absolute numbers of non-LGBT participants in each country were small we also chose to provide a joint regression including the cases from all three countries. Pride participation among non-LGBT people is consistently positively correlated with considering oneself as belonging to a category that experiences gender-based discrimination. Age and disability also appear to be grounds of discrimination that are positively related to Pride participation. Participation is significantly positively correlated with being female in Sweden and when all countries are included in one model. The included control variables indicate that this relationship holds when controlling for age, political interest, and university education⁹ (of which the latter stands out as consistently strongly correlated with Pride participation). This supports the assumptions about overlapping approximations as partial grounds for conscience adherent engagement.

Motives and Principles

As can be seen in table 5, among the six types of motives for participation suggested to the respondents, defending one’s interests ranked lowest among non-LGBT persons. Perhaps unsurprisingly, it is also the motive type that differs most between LGBT and non-LGBT participants. Non-LGBT participants also had a slightly lower tendency to participate in order to raise awareness (about LGBT issues), perhaps because participation in a Pride parade does not have the same connotations of being “out” and visible (thereby raising public awareness of one’s existence) as it has for LGBT individuals. Expressing solidarity appeared to be the most important motive for LGBT persons, as well as for the non-LGBT participants, given that expressing solidarity might bear different meanings for LGBT and non-LGBT participants. Solidarity can imply both support among “equals” as well as support for a relatively disadvantaged group (Wahlström 2015). “Global approximations,” in Hogan and Netzer’s (cited in Feagin and Vera 1995) terms, should imply a strong sense of moral obligation among non-LGBT participants, as was the case for non-LGBT participants in the Equality Parade in Warsaw and Stockholm Pride. However, this motive was less strong in London Pride and even less among non-LGBT participants in the Pink Saturday Parade in Haarlem.¹⁰ In Warsaw and Stockholm, non-LGBT participants were also distinctly more intent on pressuring politicians compared to their counterparts in Haarlem and London.

The Pride Parade Organizers

Differences in the percentage of non-LGBT participants, we argue, can also be understood as relating to the degree of inclusiveness of the Pride parades. This inclusiveness could in turn be both an effect of strategic choices by the Pride organizers—the degree to which they see conscience adherents’ participation as important—but could also be an unintended effect stemming from the type of movement culture given prominence during the event, or from the parts of the LGBT movement that have had a dominant role in the mobilization of the parade.

Table 4: Binary Logistic Regression on Pooled Dataset from CCC Protest Data and ESS Population Data for Poland, Sweden and United Kingdom. Dependent variable: Pride participation.

	Poland			Sweden			United Kingdom			Combined Model		
	B	S.E.	Exp(B)	B	S.E.	Exp(B)	B	S.E.	Exp(B)	B	S.E.	Exp(B)
Constant ^a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Gender (binary): Woman	-0.20	0.37	0.82	0.50	0.27	1.65	0.45	0.50	1.57	0.28	0.20	1.32
Age	0.00	0.01	1.00	-0.01	0.01	0.99	-0.02	0.01	0.98	-0.01	0.01	0.99
University education	3.60***	0.57	36.61	1.97***	0.27	7.15	3.12***	0.58	22.62	2.57***	0.21	13.03
Interest in politics (1-4)	1.18***	0.23	3.24	1.20***	0.16	3.32	0.87***	0.25	2.39	1.06***	0.11	2.87
<i>Member of discriminated group:</i>												
Ethnonational characteristics	1.21	0.98	3.36	0.38	0.61	1.47	-0.30	0.79	0.74	0.26	0.38	1.30
Age	0.85	0.93	2.34	1.22	0.62	3.38	2.35*	0.98	10.50	1.41***	0.42	4.11
Gender	2.87***	0.57	17.67	2.24***	0.42	9.43	2.74***	0.63	15.46	2.56***	0.28	12.92
Disability	1.02	1.52	2.77	2.39**	0.82	10.93	2.14	1.16	8.47	1.98***	0.57	7.22
Other	1.40	0.77	4.04	-0.11	0.82	0.89	-17.51	5220.34	0.00	0.47	0.48	1.61
Units, parades	1			1			1			3		
Units, individual:	1928			1923			2247			6098		
Missing:	20			3			33			56		
-2 Log likelihood	280			516			202			1062		
Nagelkerke's pseudo r^2	0.43			0.36			0.30			0.35		

Notes: ^a Since Pride participation was not measured in the ESS dataset, we had no means of establishing a correct intercept, nor correct country effects in the combined model. * $p < 5\%$, ** $p < 1\%$, *** $p < 0.1\%$.

Table 5. Motives of LGBT Participants vs. Non-LGBT Participants

		<i>Defend Interests</i>	<i>Express Views</i>	<i>Pressure Politicians</i>	<i>Raise Awareness</i>	<i>Express Solidarity</i>	<i>Moral Obligation</i>
<i>Pride parade</i>							
Equality Parade (Warsaw)	LGBT person	4.35	4.50	4.37	4.71	4.71	3.98
	Non-LGBT	2.42	4.53	4.39	4.70	4.96	3.98
	<i>N</i>	178	181	182	183	180	177
	<i>Eta</i>	0.40***	<i>n.s.</i>	<i>n.s.</i>	<i>n.s.</i>	0.19*	<i>n.s.</i>
London Pride Parade (London)	LGBT person	4.06	4.35	3.93	4.63	4.54	3.19
	Non-LGBT	2.62	3.77	3.12	4.30	4.52	3.04
	<i>N</i>	189	187	189	191	192	190
	<i>Eta</i>	0.18***	0.06***	0.06***	0.03*	<i>n.s.</i>	<i>n.s.</i>
Pink Saturday Parade (Haarlem)	LGBT person	2.87	3.10	3.08	3.81	4.23	2.69
	Non-LGBT	1.19	2.33	1.88	2.59	3.85	1.96
	<i>N</i>	92	94	93	91	96	95
	<i>Eta</i>	0.30***	0.07*	0.16***	0.15***	<i>n.s.</i>	0.07*
Stockholm Pride (Stockholm)	LGBT person	3.90	4.38	3.44	4.47	4.52	3.38
	Non-LGBT	2.53	4.29	3.65	4.43	4.78	3.87
	<i>N</i>	225	230	230	231	233	229
	<i>Eta</i>	0.51***	<i>n.s.</i>	<i>n.s.</i>	<i>n.s.</i>	0.17**	0.17**
Total	LGBT person	3.94	4.23	3.80	4.50	4.54	3.39
	Non-LGBT	2.33	4.01	3.52	4.23	4.66	3.51
	<i>N</i>	684	692	694	696	701	691
	<i>Eta</i>	0.52***	0.09*	0.10*	0.13***	<i>n.s.</i>	<i>n.s.</i>

Note: * $p < 5\%$, ** $p < 1\%$, *** $p < 0.1\%$.

The president of the Stockholm Pride Association stressed that the Pride parade in the country's capital had deliberately chosen to be both "close to the establishment," thereby encouraging elite conscience adherents, and "oriented towards the broader masses," thereby encouraging mass conscience adherents (interview with female organizer, February 27, 2015). In the 2014 Pride Parade in Stockholm, the then Conservative Prime Minister and most of the members of government marched, as did the political party leaders of the Social Democrats, Liberals, Centre Party, Left Party, Green Party, and Feminist Initiative (the far-right party, the Sweden Democrats, was not allowed by the organizers to participate); the Archbishop of Sweden joined the ranks of participants; the Commander in Chief of the Swedish Military Forces, together with the Minister of Defense, marched in front of the gay military contingent. This massive show of support for the LGBT movement in Sweden by elite conscience adherents, we argue, substantially lowered the threshold for mass conscience adherents in the parade. We argue that elite participation impacts the number of mass conscience adherents in a specific parade insofar as they, as was the case in Stockholm, publicly announced their participation beforehand or were seen participating in prior Pride parades.

When the Stockholm organizer compared their parade to other large Pride parades across Europe, she also underlined that what makes Stockholm different from, for example, London, Madrid, and Barcelona, is the less prominent role gay clubs and other companies connected to the LGBT community play for organizing the Pride parades in Stockholm (interview with female organizer, February 27, 2015). When comparing the Stockholm event with these parades, the Stockholm organizer thus portrayed other parades as more oriented towards having parties in the streets and going to clubs, and emphasized that these clubs are "in general gay men clubs." This seems to suggest that Stockholm Pride has deliberately tried to orient their parade towards including participants that do not necessarily want to participate in the (gay men dominated) club scene of the LGBT community.

The organizers of the Warsaw Equality Parade also stressed that they try to have a broader framing of their parade, but they do so differently than the parade organizers in Stockholm. First, the name of the parade is the Equality Parade, and not a Pride parade, which

reflected a framing of protesting against inequalities in society in general: “The equality parade is not only about LGBT issues, but this is for all the minorities and communities that are, can be or might be discriminated or excluded” (interview with a male organizer, June 12, 2014.). The parade was organized in connection with the Warsaw Equality Parade Festival, and the symbol of the parade was a heart with rainbow stripes, but the parade also addressed other inequalities, including animal rights and discrimination of disabled people. Thus, this framing subsequently contributed to a more heterogeneous and less exclusive mobilization. For the Equality Parade organizers, the choice to use the broader frame of equality has been both ideological and strategic; the organizers believe that the equality framing has made it easier to get support from Polish politicians and state officials than if it had been only framed as concerning LGBT issues (since these issues are highly controversial in Polish politics), and the framing has also made it easier to involve other types of organizations in the organizing committee (e.g. political parties—from the left and from anticlerical liberals—and animal rights organizations) (male organizer, June 12, 2014; female organizer, June 13, 2014).

There is a history of broad coalitions around LGBT issues in Poland. According to Binnie and Klesse (2012: 456), when attempts by LGBT groups to stage demonstrations in various Polish cities were attacked by the Christian right and nationalist groups, a broad solidarity movement came to the LGBT movement’s defense, involving feminists, left-wing or progressive movements, organizations and parties, Jewish community groups, artists, workers, and transnational actors. Feminists, they maintain, were core actors in these coalitional politics. Even collective actors can motivate their support for the LGBT movement on the basis of solidarity—overlapping with borrowed approximations.

The organizers of the Pride events in Groningen (2011) and Haarlem (2012) all compared their Pride events and Pink Saturday Parades with Canal Pride in Amsterdam, which they saw as dominated by gay men and commercial interests (male interview March 4, 2014 and male group interview March 7, 2014). They pointed out that most important for the success of the Pride events, which have ambulated between the provincial cities in the Netherlands since 1981, was the provision of adequate camping facilities for all of the lesbians and their children. “Unlike the gay men participating in Amsterdam, our participants do not want expensive hotel rooms” (male group interview March 7, 2014). They claimed that these events provided a social outing for lesbians, their children, and their friends, and that much of the dynamics of the Pride events could be found in the informal meetings and activities in the camping sites.

The organizers of London Pride emphasized their goal of opening the parade for everyone who self-identifies as part of the LGBT community in London and for their friends (interviews with male organizers: July 22, 2015, July 23, 2015, and July 27, 2015). “Our role is to facilitate an event under which you can demonstrate, you can march, you can parade. . . . In other words, be yourself. Our job today is to allow an event which allows everyone to safely do that” (interview, male organizer, July 27, 2015). According to the organizers, prominent politicians, such as the mayor of London, and business figures regularly attend the Pride events. The authorities want to show that London is an LGBT-friendly city and a great place for major corporations, which are generally LGBT friendly if not led by LGBT people.

Organizers think that commercial sponsors are fundamental for raising the funds needed to pay those subcontractors who guarantee the safety of and accessibility for participants. Speaking about the World Pride Parade 2012, an organizer offered the following:

2012 was a complete disaster and that was because the organizers then failed to raise sufficient funds and more importantly they failed to tell authorities that they were unable to guarantee the safety of all attendants because they did not have the money to pay the [security and street cleaning] subcontractors. The authorities found out a month before the event was due to take place and actually cancelled the street parties in Trafalgar Square, reduced the size of the parade by banning floats and advanced the time of the parade two hours (interview, male organizer July 27, 2015).¹¹

All of the Pride Parades in our sample were nonconfrontational, primarily advocating policy reforms, even if more radical contingents could be found in the parades, particularly in Stockholm Pride.¹² All of the parades combined politics with party, but the weight they placed on the one or the other varied. In the more inclusive political Pride Parades—Stockholm and Warsaw—the organizers strategically reached out to mobilize a broad participation of political groups/parties, unions, public authorities, and more. Organizers of the more social-oriented parades—London and Haarlem—have primarily seen their role as facilitators for a secure and festive space for the LGBT community (Wahlström and Peterson 2016), with the caveat that London Pride was dominated by gay men and lesbians dominated the Haarlem event.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

While a vast body of research uses McCarthy and Zald's (1977) original notion of conscience adherents (among the most cited: Benford and Snow 2000; Kriesi 1996; Oberschall 1995; Snow, Rochford, Worden, and Benford 1986; Staggenborg 1988) the concept has seldom been applied to participants in demonstrations.¹³ Our results supported our theoretical expectations that conscience adherents engage in specific types of identity work in becoming mobilized in collective actions of the LGBT movement.

This identity work did not necessarily result in unequivocal identification with the movement beneficiaries. Our analysis demonstrated that while all Pride participants on average experienced a significant degree of group identification with each other and (typically somewhat less so) with the parade organizers, non-LGBT participants consistently experienced a lower degree of group identification. We argued that the social-identity convergence work they engaged in to make sense of their participation differs from that of beneficiaries, and thus has to be studied in its own right.

We interrogated four tentative hypotheses, which we argued could be viable explanations for why and under what conditions conscience adherents, i.e., non-LGBT individuals, participate in Pride parades. First, we argued that they are likely to have social ties to LGBT people, which in turn encourage them to lend support and show solidarity with the LGBT movement's goals—borrowed approximations for their identity work in aligning themselves with the movement. Our analyses indicate that non-LGBT participants often participated with friends, colleagues, co-members of an organization, and children. We argue that this reflects their typical relationships to the beneficiaries. Solidarity as an expressed motive was a significant factor behind their decision to participate, but not necessarily more so than for LGBT participants. The difference in degree of identification with other participants could indicate that while LGBT participants' solidarity is oriented towards the ingroup, the non-LGBT participants more often feel an outgroup-oriented solidarity. In the most politicized Pride events in Warsaw and Stockholm (Wahlström 2015; Wahlström and Peterson 2016), conscience adherents were more inclined to provide the motive of expressing solidarity than the LGBT participants, and, to a somewhat lesser degree, in the less politicized and more social parades in Haarlem and London.

Second, regarding overlapping approximations for their identity work, in which people translate experiences of discrimination and/or marginalization into solidarity with other discriminated groups, we found a markedly high percentage of non-LGBT participants reporting that they belonged to a discriminated group in society, considerably more than the general population in their country. Among the non-LGBT participants, gender was the main perceived ground for discrimination. This pattern was confirmed in a logistic regression which showed that female gender identity and the experience of belonging to a discriminated group in society had independent effects on the odds for non-LGBT participation in Pride parades. The conscience adherents were overwhelmingly women, who, we argue, transferred their own experiences of discrimination to support for LGBT issues and, to a higher degree, identify with other Pride participants.

Third, we argued that global approximations, meaning the abstract principles of human rights and justice, should imply a strong sense of moral obligation among non-LGBT participants, which we found was the case for non-LGBT participants in the Equality Parade in Warsaw and Stockholm Pride. Among non-LGBT participants, those participating in Warsaw and Stockholm were also more strongly motivated by a wish to pressure politicians. Similar to the pattern we found regarding expressing solidarity, this motive was less strong in London Pride and even less so among non-LGBT participants in the Pink Saturday Parade in Haarlem. In Pride events, which are in general more political, a strong ideological statement that participation was prompted by a sense of moral obligation appears to be more common than in events which more often have a primarily social and celebratory meaning for the participants (see Wahlström 2015).

Fourth, we found that the Pride parades in which the organizers most explicitly deployed an inclusive political strategy had the highest percentage of conscience adherents, which was the case for Stockholm (41%) and Warsaw (28%). The exception was the Dutch Pink Saturday Parade (29% non-LGBT participants), where the event had a broad political platform but the organizers expressly catered to attracting lesbians, their children, and their friends. Both LGBT and non-LGBT respondents emphasized social reasons for their involvement. At London Pride, although the organizers also emphasized their ambition to be inclusive, they primarily saw their role as facilitating the safe participation of the wider LGBT community. Among the key activists that we interviewed, there was a general consensus that the parade had become largely (albeit not entirely) depoliticized and more like a party compared to prior decades. Gay men numerically dominated the parade. This event attracted only 15% conscience adherents. The mobilizing context for Pride events interacts with the three identity convergence mechanisms in our model. The participation of elite conscience adherents was most extensive and visible in the 2014 Stockholm Pride, which, we argue, could well have facilitated the participation of mass conscience adherents, together with the organizers' emphasis upon the human rights paradigm and nonconfrontation.

Finally, with respect to the differences between adherent and constituent beneficiaries and conscience adherents, our study complements and augments the original notion of conscience adherents. McCarthy and Zald (1977) assumed that conscience adherents and constituents are typically more individually resourceful compared to the beneficiary constituents and adherents of the movement. This was not the case for the conscience adherents in our study; apart from gender, they more or less mirrored the beneficiary adherents and constituents. Both LGBT and non-LGBT participants are overwhelmingly from the middle strata, highly educated, and young (aside from the Haarlem Pink Saturday Parade). Individually, they are rich in potential political resources (Peterson, Wahlström and Wennerhag forthcoming). The political resources conscience adherents generate are their collective participation, which can contribute to the legitimization of the claims of the LGBT movement. Given their importance, yet variable and sometimes ambivalent position within different political mobilizations, conscience adherents deserve significantly more attention in future social movement scholarship.

NOTES

¹ There is no agreement on the collective name of the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Intersex, and Queer movement. We find LGBT the most common acronym but the use of LGBTQ and LGBTI is increasing. In Sweden the most common acronym seems to be HBTQ, merging lesbian and gay under the category of homosexual. We have chosen to simplify and use LGBT throughout this article.

² See also e.g., Holzhaacker 2012; Browne 2007; Browne and Bakshi 2013; Ross 2008; Enguix 2009 and 2013; Duggan 2010; Calvo and Trujillo 2011; Robinson 2012; Gruszczynska 2009; Markwell 2002; Johnston 2007; and Warner 1999.

³ Because of this, we chose not to apply any weights to the sample. In addition, since some sources of possible bias were non-significant in some parades, weighting would have been precarious and possibly counterproductive.

⁴ Reports on discrimination for certain categories are likely to be somewhat underestimated in countries where these categories of persons are heavily stigmatized, since that may cause reluctance to respond truthfully about these aspects of personal identity (Romeijn 2015).

⁵ The questionnaires in Warsaw and Stockholm also had the further alternative “other,” where the respondent could specify through an open question what “other” meant.

⁶ In the London questionnaire, this question was phrased slightly differently: “When it comes to gender, how do you label yourself?” The alternatives were male, female, and other. For those choosing “other,” it was possible to answer to an open question to specify what ‘other’ meant.

⁷ Possible responses ranged from “strongly disagree,” “disagree,” “neither,” “agree,” to “strongly agree.”

⁸ See Wahlström and Wennerhag (2016) on this procedure applied to May Day marches.

⁹ The variables measuring respondents’ education were not identical in the ESS survey and the CCC protest survey. While the ESS survey asks for the highest “completed” level of education, the protest survey adds, “If you are a student, at what level are you studying?” To compensate for this, we operationalized the variable “university education” in the ESS data as someone who had either finished a university level education or had finished the equivalent of at least upper secondary education and was an active student.

¹⁰ The questionnaire also included the open question, “Please tell us why you participated in this Pride parade?” Wahlström (2015) coded these responses according to thirteen different motive types brought up by the respondents. One of these types was “conviction/duty,” designating motives that were related to participating because of a sense of moral obligation, duty, or ideological convictions. Using this coded data, we examined who brought up this particular motive type among Pride participants. We found that non-LGBT persons appeared to be more likely to express this motive type in all four parades, although the N was too small in Haarlem and London to provide significant results. Overall, 22% of non-LGBT participants expressed this motive versus 10% among LGBT participants. This is at least an indication that participation as a matter of principle at least partly represents a distinct pathway for non-LGBT participants.

¹¹ The London interviews were conducted by Dr. Cristiana Olcese.

¹² It appears as if the tension between confrontative and nonconfrontative strategies can be neutralized under the broad canopy of a highly inclusive Pride Parade.

¹³ Klandermans, van Stekelenburg, and Damen (2015) use similar demonstration level data, but strictly speaking it is questionable whether they study conscience constituents, as the older demonstrators in their study most likely are predominantly university employees who, like the students, have vested interests in cutbacks in higher education.

REFERENCES

- Adam, Barry D., Jan Willem Duyvendak, and André Krouwel. 1998. “Gay and Lesbian Movements beyond Borders?” Pp. 344–371 in *The Emergence of Gay and Lesbian Politics*, edited by Barry D. Adam, Jan Willem Duyvendak, and André Krouwel. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Armstrong, Elizabeth A., and Suzanna M. Cragie. 2006. “Movements and Memory: The Making of the Stonewall Myth.” *American Sociological Review* 71(5): 724–51.
- Benford, Robert D., and David A. Snow. 2000. “Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 26: 611–39.
- Bernstein, Mary. 1997. “Celebration and Suppression: The Strategic Uses of Identity by the Lesbian and Gay Movement.” *American Journal of Sociology* 103(3): 531–65.
- Binnie, Jon, and Christian Klesse. 2012. “Solidarities and Tensions: Feminism and Transnational LGBTQ Politics in Poland.” *European Journal of Women’s Studies* 19(4): 444–59.
- Broad, K. L., Helena Alden, Dana Berkowitz, and Maura Ryan. 2008. “Activist Parenting and GLBTQ Families.” *Journal of GLBT Family Studies* 4(4): 499–520.
- Browne, Kath. 2007. “A Party with Politics? (Re)making LGBTQ Pride Spaces in Dublin and Brighton.” *Social and Cultural Geography* 8(1): 63–87.
- Browne, Kath, and Leela Bakshi. 2013. *Ordinary in Brighton? LGBT, Activisms and the City*. Farnham, UK: Ashgate Publishing.
- Calvo, Kerman, and Gracia Trujillo. 2011. “Fighting for Love Rights: Claims and Strategies of the LGBT Movement in Spain.” *Sexualities* 14(5): 562–79.
- Chong, Dennis. 1991. *Collective Action and the Civil Rights Movement*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Crossley, Nick. 2002. *Making Sense of Social Movements*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Dovidio, John F., Samuel L. Gaertner, Ana Validzic, Kimberly Matoka, Brenda Johnson, and Stacy Frazier. 1997. “Extending the Benefits of Recategorization: Evaluations, Self-Disclosure, and Helping.” *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 33(4): 401–20.
- Duggan, Marian. 2010. “Politics of Pride: Representing Relegated Sexual Identities in Northern Ireland.” *The Northern Ireland Legal Quarterly*. 61(2): 163–178.
- Duhigg, Julie M., Sharon S. Rostosky, Barry E. Gray, and Mary K. Wimsatt. 2010. “Development of Heterosexuals into Sexual-Minority Allies: A Qualitative Exploration.” *Sexuality Research and Social Policy* 7(1): 2–14.

- Eichstedt, Jennifer L. 2001. "Problematic White Identities and a Search for Racial Justice." *Sociological Forum* 16(3): 445–70.
- Enguix, Begonya. 2009. "Identities, Sexualities and Commemorations: Pride Parades, Public Space and Sexual Dissidence." *Anthropological Notebooks* 15(2): 15–33.
- Enguix, Begonya. 2013. "Sexual Politics, Pride, and Media Mediation in Spain." *Observatorio (OBS*)* 7(2): 33–56.
- Feagin, Joe R., and Hernán Vera. 1995. *White Racism: The Basics*. New York: Routledge.
- Fingerhut, Adam W. 2011. "Straight Allies: What Predicts Heterosexuals' Alliance With the LGBT Community?" *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 41(9): 2230–48.
- Gaertner, Samuel L., John F. Dovidio, Phyllis A. Anastasio, Betty A. Bachman, and Mary C. Rust. 1993. "The Common Ingroup Identity Model: Recategorization and the Reduction of Intergroup Bias." *European Review of Social Psychology* 4(1): 1–26.
- Gruszczynska, Anna. 2009. "Sowing the Seeds of Solidarity in Public Space: Case Study of the Poznan March of Equality." *Sexualities* 12(3): 312–33.
- Herek, Gregory M., and John P. Capitanio. 1996. "Some of My Best Friends': Intergroup Contact, Concealable Stigma, and Heterosexuals' Attitudes Toward Gay Men and Lesbians". *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 22(4): 412–24.
- Holzhaecker, Ronald. 2012. "National and Transnational Strategies of LGBT Civil Society Organizations in Different Political Environments: Modes of Interaction in Western and Eastern Europe for Equality." *Comparative European Politics* 10(1): 23–47.
- Johnston, Lynda. 2007. *Queering Tourism: Paradoxical Performances of Gay Pride Parades*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Klandermans, Bert, Jacqueliën van Stekelenburg, and Marie-Louise Damen. 2015. "Beneficiary and Conscience Constituencies: On Interests and Solidarity." Pp. 155–169 in *Austerity and Protest: Popular Contention in Times of Economic Crisis*, edited by Marco Giugni and Maria T. Grasso. Farnham, UK: Ashgate.
- Klandermans, Bert and Marga de Weerd. 2000. "Group Identification and Political Protest." Pp. 68–90 in *Self, Identity, and Social Movements*, edited by Sheldon Stryker, Timothy J. Owens, and Robert W. White. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Klar, Malte, and Tim Kasser. 2009. "Some Benefits of Being an Activist: Measuring Activism and its Role in Psychological Well-Being." *Political Psychology* 30(5): 755–77.
- Knoke, David. 1988. "Incentives in Collective Action Organizations." *American Sociological Review* 53(3): 311–29.
- Kriesi, Hanspeter. 1996. "The Organizational Structure of New Social Movements in a Political Context." Pp. 152–184 in *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures, and Cultural Framings*, edited by Doug McAdam, John D. McCarthy, and Mayer N. Zald. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Manski, Charles F., and Daniel McFadden. 1981. *Structural Analysis of Discrete Data with Econometric Applications*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Markwell, Kevin. 2002. "Mardi Gras Tourism and the Construction of Sydney as an International Gay and Lesbian City." *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 8(1–2): 81–99.
- Snow, David A., and Doug McAdam. 2000. "Identity Work Processes in the Context of Social Movements: Clarifying the Identity/Movement Nexus." Pp. 41–67 in *Self, Identity, and Social Movements*, edited by Sheldon Stryker, Timothy J. Owens and Robert W. White. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- McCarthy, John D., and Mayer N. Zald. 1977. "Resource Mobilization and Social Movements: A Partial Theory." *American Journal of Sociology* 82(6): 1212–41.
- Meyer, David S., and Joshua Gamson. 1995. "The Challenge of Cultural Elites: Celebrities and Social Movements." *Sociological Inquiry* 65(2): 181–206.
- Oberschall, Anthony. 1995. *Social Movements: Ideologies, Interests, and Identities*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- O'Brien, Eileen. 2001. *Whites Confront Racism: Antiracists and their Paths to Action*. Lanham, MD.: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Peterson, Abby, Mattias Wahlström, and Magnus Wennerhag. Forthcoming. "'Normalized' Pride? Pride Parade Participants in Six European Countries." *Sexualities*.
- Robinson, Brandon A. 2012. "Is This What Equality Looks Like?" *Sexuality Research and Social Policy* 9(4): 327–336.

- Romeijn, Jeroen. 2015. *Accepting Homosexuality: Measuring and Explaining Levels of Perceived Discrimination among Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual People in the European Union*. Master's thesis in European Studies. University of Gothenburg.
- Ross, Charlotte. 2008. "Visions of Visibility: LGBT Communities in Turin." *Modern Italy* 13(3): 241–60.
- Rothschild, Mary Aickin. 1982. *A Case of Black and White: Northern Volunteers and the Southern Freedom Summers, 1964–1965*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Russell, Glenda M. 2011. "Motives of Heterosexual Allies in Collective Action for Equality." *Journal of Social Issues* 67(2): 376–93.
- Snow, David A., E. Burke Rochford Jr., Steven K. Worden, and Robert D. Benford. 1986. "Frame Alignment Processes, Micromobilization, and Movement Participation." *American Sociological Review* 51(4): 464–81.
- Staggenborg, Suzanne. 1988. "The Consequences of Professionalization and Formalization in the Pro-Choice Movement." *American Sociological Review* 53(4): 585–605.
- Stotzer, Rebecca L. 2009. "Straight Allies: Supportive Attitudes toward Lesbians, Gay Men, and Bisexuals in a College Sample." *Sex Roles* 60(1–2): 67–80.
- Stryker, Sheldon. 2000. "Identity Competition: Key to Differential Social Movement Participation?" Pp. 21–40 in *Self, Identity, and Social Movements*, edited by Sheldon Stryker, Timothy J. Owens and Robert W. White. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Subašić, Emina, Katherine J. Reynolds, and John C. Turner. 2008. "The Political Solidarity Model of Social Change: Dynamics of Self-Categorization in Intergroup Power Relations." *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 12(4): 330–52.
- Tilly, Charles. 1999. "From Interactions to Outcomes in Social Movements". Pp. 253–270 in *How Social Movements Matter*, Marco Giugni, Doug McAdam, and Charles Tilly, eds. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Tilly, Charles. 2001. "Do Unto Others." Pp. 27–50 in *Political Altruism? Solidarity Movements in International Perspective*, Marco Giugni and Florence Passy, eds. Lanham, MD: Rowan & Littlefield.
- Valocchi, Stephen. 2013. "Gay and Lesbian Movement". In *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social and Political Movements*, edited by David A. Snow, Donatella della Porta, Bert Klandermans, and Doug McAdam. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley Blackwell.
- Van Aelst, Peter, and Stefaan Walgrave. 2001. "Who Is That (Wo)man in the Street? From the Normalisation of Protest to the Normalisation of the Protester." *European Journal of Political Research* 39 (4): 461–86.
- Van Stekelenburg, Jacquélien, and Bert Klandermans. 2010. "Individuals in Movements." Pp. 157–204 in *Handbook of Social Movements Across Disciplines*, edited by Bert Klandermans, Conny Roggeband, and Jacquélien van Stekelenburg. New York: Springer.
- Vernaglia, Elizabeth Rudow. 1999. "Parents as Straight Allies: A Qualitative Study of the Experiences of Heterosexual Parents in the Gay Rights Movement." *Boston College Dissertations and Theses*: AAI9961584.
- Wahlström, Mattias. 2015. "Proud Protest and Parading Party: The Meanings That Pride Parades in Six European Countries Have to Their Participants." *Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Sociological Association*, August 22–25, 2015, Chicago, USA.
- Wahlström, Mattias, and Abby Peterson. 2016. "Friends of Pride: Mobilizing Individual and Organizational Allies in Different Political and Cultural Contexts." Paper presented at the conference *Proud in Europe? LGBTI Emancipation in Comparative Perspective*, 4–5 August 2016, Amsterdam, the Netherlands.
- Wahlström, Mattias, and Magnus Wennerhag. 2014. "Alone in the Crowd: Lone Protesters in Western European Demonstrations." *International Sociology* 29(6): 565–83.
- . 2016. "Methods for Studying May Day Demonstrators: Sampling, Estimating Non-Response Bias and Pooling Data with General Population Surveys." Pp. 262–278 in *The Ritual of May Day in Western Europe: Past, Present and Future*, edited by Abby Peterson and Herbert Reiter. London: Routledge.
- Walgrave, Stefaan, and Joris Verhulst. 2011. "Selection and Response Bias in Protest Surveys." *Mobilization* 16(2): 203–22.
- Walgrave Stefaan, Ruud Wouters, and Pauline Ketelaars. 2016. "Response Problems in the Protest Survey Design: Evidence from Fifty-One Protest Events in Seven Countries." *Mobilization: An International Journal* 21(1): 83–104.
- Warner, Michael. 1999. *The Trouble with Normal: Sex, Politics, and the Ethics of Queer Life*. New York: The Free Press.