Performative Progressiveness: Accounting for New Forms of Inequality in the Gayborhood

Adriana Brodyn and Amin Ghaziani
University of British Columbia at Vancouver

Attitudes toward homosexuality have liberalized considerably, but these positive public opinions conceal the persistence of prejudice at an interpersonal level. We use interviews with heterosexual residents of Chicago gayborhoods—urban districts that offer ample opportunities for contact and thus precisely the setting in which we would least expect bias to appear—to analyze this new form of inequality. Our findings show four strategies that liberal-minded straights use to manage the dilemmas they experience when they encounter their gay and lesbian neighbors on the streets: spatial entitlements, rhetorical moves, political absolution, and affect. Each expression captures the empirical variability of *performative progressiveness*, a concept that describes the co-occurrence of progressive attitudes alongside homonegative actions. Our analyses have implications more broadly for how conflicting visions of diversity affect placemaking efforts; how residents with power and privilege redefine cultural enclaves in the city; and the mechanisms that undermine equality in a climate of increasing acceptance.

INTRODUCTION

Attitudes toward homosexuality have liberalized since the 1990s (Loftus 2001), and the trend has continued into the present (Twenge et al. 2015). This trajectory in public opinion is positive (Saad 2010), but it conceals subtle forms of prejudice. Recent research finds that heterosexuals are willing to extend "formal rights" to same-sex couples, policies like family leave, hospital visitation, inheritance rights, and insurance benefits, but they are unwilling to grant them "informal privileges" (Doan et al. 2014:1172) such as the freedom to express affection in public places by holding hands or sharing a kiss. How does this misalignment between progressive attitudes and actions—this resistance to basic acts of human intimacy and citizenship (Hubbard 2013)—express itself on the shared streets of a city neighborhood?

Social scientists traditionally rely on survey (Westbrook and Saperstein 2015), newspaper (Schilt and Westbrook 2009), experimental (Doan et al. 2014), or other quantitative data (Andersen and Fetner 2008) to assess public opinion about gays and lesbians, including matters related to the decriminalization of consensual sex (Engel 2013), hate crime legislation (Jenness and Grattet 2001), and marriage equality (Brewer 2014; Herek 2006). Humanists make historical (Canaday 2009; Hanhardt 2013) and critical arguments

Correspondence should be addressed to Amin Ghaziani, Department of Sociology, University of British Columbia, 6303 NW Marine Drive, Vancouver, BC; amin.ghaziani@ubc.ca.

(Duggan 2003; Halberstam 2012; Warner 1991) about inequality and discrimination that are often abstracted from the specific contexts in which straights and sexual minorities interact. These studies nevertheless have produced important conceptual insights, and we build on them with our sensitivity to three features of social life. First, attitudes are an imperfect predictor of behavior (Ajzen and Fishbein 1980; Fishbein and Ajzen 1975). This widely replicated insight from social psychology prompts us to imagine liberal dispositions toward homosexuality as a starting point for new lines of inquiry rather than an outcome that we seek to explain. Second, statistical renderings of public opinion are powerful for the descriptions they offer, but quantitative assessments mask how people perceive one another as neighbors (Rich 2009). To understand how attitudes and actions misalign in the city, we use qualitative data on "cultural practices" (Greene 2014:108) to explain the contradictions between positive public opinions and persistent prejudice. Third and related, scholarly accounts of bias, especially the contact hypothesis (Allport 1954; Herek and Glunt 1993; Sherif 1956), predict that hostility will diminish as members of the majority interact with minority groups (Cullen et al. 2002; Plugge-Foust and Strickland 2000; Raiz 2006). The persistence of prejudice in a shared residential environment, one that offers opportunities for sustained face-to-face interactions, presents a special explanatory challenge: This is precisely the setting where we would expect it to recede (Ihlanfeldt and Scafidi 2002; Putnam 2000).

We hypothesize that the actively unfolding "beyond the closet" (Seidman 2002), "new gay" (Savin-Williams 2005), "post-gay" (Ghaziani 2011), "post-mo" (Nash 2013), "post-closeted cultural context" (Dean 2014), or the "post-marriage equality world" (NeJaime 2016), terms which describe in common a climate of greater societal acceptance of homosexuality, will put pressure on heterosexuals to curb explicit displays of prejudice against gays and lesbians. Implicit forms of animus will linger, however, since they represent a safety valve-like "response to problem situations" (Gross 2009:366), such as threats to whether others accurately perceive a person's liberalism and tolerance. To explore sexual prejudice in the contemporary moment, we focus on straight residents who live in demographically integrating gay neighborhoods (Spring 2013). Our objective is to develop the concept of "performative progressiveness" (Ghaziani 2014:255) by describing a set of narrative strategies that these people employ when occupying gay and lesbian urban-cultural spaces. How do heterosexuals navigate the tension between what they believe about homosexuality and how they act toward their gay and lesbian neighbors? By elaborating on the empirical variability of what prior research has assumed to be an undifferentiated theoretical concept, we show how advances toward social equality can be undermined, even in a context of observed improvement in public opinion.

ATTITUDES, ACTIONS, AND PLACEMAKING

Opinion researchers have identified a dramatic liberalization in attitudes toward homosexuality (Andersen and Fetner 2008; Brewer 2007; Werum and Winders 2001; Yang 1997). Such rapid transformations in public perceptions are rare (Page and Shapiro 1992). In this instance, the outcome stems from generational turnover alongside broad shifts in which the entire population has adjusted its outlook toward lesbians and gay men (Flores 2014). These developments have had measurable impacts in presidential elections (Brooks 2000; Brooks and Manza 2006), public policy (Burstein 1998, 1999),

media visibility of gays and lesbians (Walters 2001), Supreme Court decisions (Murdoch and Price 2001), civil rights claims (Sherrill and Yang 2000; Wilcox and Wolpert 2000; Wood and Bartkowski 2004), and residential preferences (Ghaziani 2015a).

Underlying this work is an assumption about the effects of contact: Exposure should reduce negative attitudes that members of the majority hold toward a stigmatized minority group (Smith et al. 2009). The sociological antecedents of the contact hypothesis originate in Robert Park's writings on the "progressive and irreversible" course of the race relations cycle, which proceeds from contact to competition, accommodation, and assimilation (Park 1950:150). Early research that applied Park's framework to sexuality found that it applied beyond race: Heterosexuals who knew gays and lesbians reported more positive attitudes than those who lacked such contacts (Herek 1988).

A number of studies since then have documented the effects of contact on lowering negative attitudes toward lesbians and gay men (Costa et al. 2015; Hicks and Lee 2006). Most use survey data to measure "abstract values" (Henry and Reyna 2007:275), or idealizations that influence behavior. However, as Loftus (2001) argues, "how one responds to a survey question concerning attitudes toward a group will not accurately reflect how the respondent will act when encountering an individual from that group" (p. 763). What we *should* do, in other words, is not always what we *actually* do. To evaluate the discomfort that heterosexuals experience in the presence of gays and lesbians, Monto and Supinski (2014) presented their study participants with hypothetical scenarios that described everyday interactions. When placed in scenarios of such "imagined contact" (Miles and Crisp 2014), they found that "subtle and more socially acceptable levels of homonegativity" appeared among heterosexuals (p. 903). Their study draws attention to the limits of contact, and it raises questions about the forms that homonegativity takes when societal acceptance of homosexuality is at historically high levels (Seidman 2002; Ghaziani 2011; Dean 2014).

Homonegativity is a specific form of prejudice against nonheterosexuals (Lottes and Grollman 2010). It is especially difficult to explain among straight residents of gay neighborhoods (Florida 2002; Nash 2013). Some scholars have used the dissimilarity index to show declining rates of sexual segregation in these areas of the city (Spring 2013), while others have documented how interactions between straight and gay people produce tolerance for diversity and difference (Gorman-Murray and Waitt 2009) as well as pro-equality sensibilities (Kanai and Kenttamaa-Squires 2015). Ghaziani (2014) asked straight-identified individuals who live in urban gay districts, or "gayborhoods," about their attitudes toward their gay and lesbian neighbors. He found a disjuncture between liberal positions on sexuality and conservative, at times even homonegative behaviors on the ground. To explain the puzzle, he introduces the concept of "performative progressiveness," which he defines as "a blissful but non-malicious ignorance about sexual inequality" (p. 255). Some straights in the study live in a gayborhood and espouse supportive attitudes toward gays and lesbians, yet they behave in ways that contradict those sentiments.

The Gay and Lesbian Alliance against Defamation (GLAAD) issued an "Accelerating Acceptance Report" in February 2015 which replicated Ghaziani's observations. The nationally representative survey found that "beneath progress lies a layer of uneasiness and discomfort. While the public is increasingly embracing LGBT civil rights and equal protection under the law, many are still uncomfortable with having LGBT people in their families and the communities where they live" (Stokes 2015:2). Fifty-six percent of heterosexual Americans are uncomfortable or very uncomfortable attending a same-sex

wedding (34 percent uncomfortable, 22 percent very uncomfortable); 43 percent are uncomfortable bringing a child to a same-sex wedding; and 36 percent are uncomfortable seeing same-sex couples hold hands. The GLAAD report frames the key problem that motivates our study: Sexual prejudice remains, despite changing public opinion and legal strides toward gay and lesbian rights—but its forms are subtle and difficult to detect.

The idea of an interactive performance, central to the study of gender and sexuality (Butler 1990a,b; West and Zimmerman 1987) and sociology as a discipline (Goffman 1959), is at the core of these observations. When a straight person "plays a part" of a liberal resident in the "setting" of a gay neighborhood, she hopes that others will "believe the[ir] character" (Goffman 1959: 10,13). This is easier to do in theory than it is in practice, which accounts for sentiments like "It's okay to be gay, just don't touch each other" (Hawkins 2015). The concept of performative progressiveness isolates "armchair allies" (Moskowitz 2015) for analysis: straights who say they are open-minded about homosexuality but whose behavior betrays a sexual ethnocentrism, or heterocentrism. These people are not overtly homophobic but neither are they marching in the streets for gay rights.

We use performative progressiveness as a case to describe the spatial expressions of community life (Lefebvre 1991 [1974]; Putnam 2000; Sampson 2012) and inequality (Castells 1983; Lauria and Knopp 1985; Wacquant 2008). Research on placemaking points to the "innumerable dramas" (Centner 2008:218) that city living creates for its residents (Gans 1962). We bridge these insights from urban studies with research on sexuality and public opinion to detail the narrative strategies that straights in the gayborhood deploy to maintain a progressive self-image while sidestepping critical—not to mention self-incriminating—questions about what types of resources minority group members require in order to live and thrive in the safe spaces that their neighborhoods provide (Evans and Boyte 1986; Hanhardt 2013). The concept of performative progressiveness also highlights conflicting visions of place, especially how residents with power and privilege recraft cultural enclaves into "Disneyfied" commodities (Zukin 1995) and strip them of their cultural and political significance (Greene 2014; Orne 2017; Rushbrook 2002) in a neoliberal context of individualism. As more straights view the gayborhood as the "final frontier of diversity" (Florida 2002:13), scholars will need to account for the new forms of inequality that arise within them.

RESEARCH DESIGN AND DATA

Unlike many accounts of public opinion that rely on quantitative methods, we exploit the unique strengths of qualitative approaches—interviews with straight residents of two gay neighborhoods in Chicago, specifically—to describe the divergence between liberal attitudes and homonegative actions on the ground. There are lively debates about our methodological decision. Some scholars argue that interviews capture ex post facto explanations for what people have already done or thought (Vaisey 2008). Others decry an attitudinal fallacy: What people say is a poor predictor of what they do (Jerolmack and Khan 2014). Surveys can capture the prevalence of an attitude (Becker 1954) and snap-judgments (Vaisey 2009)—in a feelings thermometer about integration, for example—but this data exists at an individual level (Swidler 2008) and is abstracted from lived experiences. When ethnographers encounter interview data, they raise questions about the situated nature of social life (Becker and Geer 1957). What does it feel like

to be a straight person living next door to a lesbian or gay man? Or to walk down rainbow-lined streets alongside same-sex couples holding hands? We, like others (Monto and Supinski 2014; Miles and Crisp 2014), show the counterintuitive yet innovative inferential possibilities of interview data to capture the interactional tones of social life, provided that researchers ask about groups of people, specific situations, and concrete personal experiences—even if we ourselves were not around when the action occurred.

Chicago is "perhaps the most studied city in the world" (Lloyd 2006:14), one that has inspired its own brand of urban sociology (Park and Burgess 1925). Its history of sexuality, however, is vastly underwritten in comparison to the "vanguard cities" of New York and San Francisco (Stewart-Winter 2016:2). This makes it a compelling site for a case study. The city has two gay neighborhoods: Boystown, a commercial and nightlife district located in the East Lakeview neighborhood, and Andersonville, a historically Swedish section of the Edgewater neighborhood located to the north of Boystown. In 1997, Chicago became the first city in the United States to municipally mark its gay district. Using tax-funded dollars, city officials installed rainbow pylons along North Halsted Street in Boystown. Residents recognize Andersonville as another "queer space" (Betsky 1997). Both areas are "so strongly gay and lesbian identified that even the straight denizens of these 'hoods admit that they live in a gay neighborhood" (Bergquist and McDonald 2006:vii). According to the 2010 American Community Survey, half of Illinois' estimated 25,710 unmarried partner households are in Chicago's Cook County. Of this group, 40 percent reside in the four northernmost lakefront neighborhoods, which includes Lakeview (1,106 households, or 12 percent of the city's total) and Edgewater (951, 10.3 percent).[1]

Gender and sexuality scholars have shown that we need to examine dominant groups to understand a system of inequality (Connell 1992). Therefore, the analysis of sexual inequality in the city requires us to ponder the perspectives of heterosexuals who live in a gayborhood. The data for our study comprise 53 snowball-sampled interviews that the second author conducted with straight residents of Andersonville and Boystown. Respondents come from diverse backgrounds, and their occupations span from students and waiters to attorneys, physicians, professors, social workers, flight attendants, bartenders, dog walkers, and the unemployed. Interviews averaged 51 minutes and ranged from 25 to 80 minutes. The second author transcribed each interview, which produced 1,573 pages of textual data. Table 1 describes the demographic characteristics of the sample, especially those features that scholars who study sexual geographies commonly emphasize (Anacker and Morrow-Jones 2005; Gates and Ost 2004). Compared to Andersonville, the Boystown sample is younger, less partnered, and less established in the neighborhood—yet with more owners, women, and more racially diverse.

The second author organized a portion of the interview protocol around newspaper articles that captured a range of interactional dynamics in contemporary gayborhoods. One story from the *San Francisco Chronicle* was titled "SF's Castro District Faces an Identity Crisis: As Straights Move In, Some Fear Loss of the Area's Character." The article includes a photograph of a woman, whom the reader is to assume is straight, pushing a baby carriage on Castro Street, a rainbow flag visible behind her. The second author read out loud the following passage:

> To walk down San Francisco's Castro street—where men casually embrace on sidewalks in the shadow of an enormous rainbow flag—the neighborhood's status as a 'gay Mecca' seems obvious. But up and down the enclave that has been a symbol of gay culture for more than

TABLE 1. Interview Profiles

	Boystown Residents	Andersonville Residents	Public Officials
Age	Average: 34 years	Average: 38 years	Average: 41 years
	Range: 24–59 years	Range: 30–54 years	Range: 39–45 years
Sex	9 men (36%)	11 men (44%)	3 women (100%)
	16 women (64%)	14 women (56%)	
Race/ethnicity	21 Whites (84%)	22 Whites (88%)	3 Whites (100%)
	1 Hispanic/Latino (4%)	3 multiracial (12%)	
	3 Multiracial (12%)		
Relationship status	6 singles (24%)	7 singles (28%)	1 single (33%)
	19 partnered (76%)	18 partnered (72%)	2 partnered (67%)
	6 with kids (24%)	10 with kids (40%)	2 with kids (67%)
Residential status	10 renters (40%)	12 renters (48%)	3 owners (100%)
	15 owners (60%)	13 owners (52%)	
Residential duration	Average: 5.8 years	Average: 5.9 years	Average: 11.7 years
	Range: 1–13 years	Range: 0.25–20 years	Range: 10–15 years
N	25	25	3

three decades, heterosexuals are moving in. They have come to enjoy some of the same amenities that have attracted the neighborhood's many gay and lesbian residents: charming houses, convenient public transportation, safe streets and nice weather.

Drawing on the principle of triangulation, the second author followed the same procedure with a second story that was published in the *New York Times* and entitled "TURF: Edged Out by the Stroller Set." The piece also includes a photograph of a woman with a baby stroller with two presumably gay men on either side of her who have been wedged apart. The second author read out loud the following excerpt:

It was supposed to be a kind of homecoming. Last year, Chris Skroupa and John Wilson sold their apartment in Hudson Heights, in northern Manhattan, and moved to Chelsea, where, as a gay couple, they already spent most of their time socializing. But they soon discovered that the neighborhood was changing faster than they expected. Home prices were rising, and many of their friends were moving to Hell's Kitchen, a few blocks west of Times Square. In restaurants that used to be almost exclusively gay, they noticed an influx of straight customers, often with children in strollers. On a recent Saturday, Mr. Skroupa and Mr. Wilson went out for brunch and 'literally less than one-third of the restaurant was gay,' Mr. Skroupa said last week, pausing between bench presses at a New York Sports Club on Eighth Avenue.

The final story comes from *The Huffington Post,* and it describes a local controversy in Chicago. The piece was titled "Boystown Gay Bar Bans Bachelorette Parties":

Bar owner Geno Zaharakis sat one busy evening at the window of his gay nightclub, watching as groups of straight women celebrating bachelorette parties made their way along a strip of bars in Chicago's gay-friendly 'Boystown' neighborhood. That's when he made a decision now posted for all to see: 'No Bachelorette Parties.' Though the small sign has been there for years, it's suddenly making a big statement amid the national debate over gay marriage. While most gay bars continue to welcome the raucous brides to be, Zaharakis's bar Cocktail is fighting for what he sees as a fundamental right, and his patrons - along with some peeved bachelorettes - are taking notice. 'I'm totally losing money because of it, but I don't want the money,' Zaharakis said. 'I would rather not have the money than host an event I didn't believe in.' Gay bars are popular with bachelorettes, both for the over-the-top drag shows that

some offer and for the ability to let loose in a place where women are unlikely to be groped or ogled.

This innovative interviewing strategy has several advantages. First, each scenario describes groups of people, specific situations, and concrete personal experiences, including men embracing on sidewalks, straight couples pushing strollers, bodies brunching, and bachelorette parties. Crafting questions in this manner enabled the second author to use interview data to make inferences about imagined contact (Miles and Crisp 2014) and quotidian interactions (Monto and Supinski 2014). Using media headlines, photos, and texts as an "indirect questioning technique" to measure "truthful responses to sensitive questions" also reduces social desirability bias (Rosenfeld et al. 2016:783) since respondents can offer comments about the characters and scenarios in a story without implicating themselves personally.

Like Goffman (1959), we try "to see through the act" (p. 10) of a progressive sensibility. Our analytic goal was to create a typology of the conditions under which a progressive performance fails, along with a corresponding conception of queer space that each respective condition implies. To accomplish this, we followed five steps. First, we used NVivo to read our interview transcripts line by line and asked: What is this statement or expression an example of? We applied conceptual labels, or codes, to attitudinal claims (what people say) and behavioral expressions (what people do) of acceptance and homonegativity. Data reduction was our goal in this initial stage of analysis. Second, we followed a "loop-like pattern of multiple rounds of revisiting the data" (Frechtling and Sharp 1997) to identify emerging patterns. This stage involved a focus on the "recurring regularities" (Miles and Huberman 1994:246) of our codes, including narrative consistencies, metaphors and analogies, symbols, and topics that our respondents avoided (Ryan and Bernard 2003). It was here that we began to create a typology of performative progressiveness and their implications for urban placemaking. In the third stage of analysis, we linked our theoretical concepts (contact, acceptance, performance, homonegativity, and place) with empirical themes using visualization techniques like data tables and thematic networks (Attride-Stirling 2001). These pattern-making exercises are qualitative versions of factor analysis; they assist researchers in grouping a large number of observed measurements into fewer unobserved conceptual categories (Miles and Huberman 1994:256). Once we identified our major themes, we asked in a penultimate step how those themes were related to theoretical debates (Zhang and Wildemuth 2009). Finally, we interpreted our findings vis-à-vis our research questions.

We now turn to the results. We begin by demonstrating our sample's positive attitudes about gays and lesbians. From here, we provide evidence for four narrative strategies that heterosexuals use as they navigate queer urban-cultural spaces.

RESULTS

ATTITUDES TOWARD HOMOSEXUALITY

The majority of straight residents in our sample say that they support gay people. Their advocacy takes several forms: acknowledging a common humanity with gays and lesbians, backing their rights, endorsing urban spaces that are culturally associated with them, and supporting integration. Below, we discuss each in turn.

Many straight residents felt a common humanity with gay men and lesbians. One 30-year-old female resident of Andersonville remarked, "I think people make too big a deal about people being gay. . . . Gay people are people." With this tautology—gay people are people—she signaled a cultural sameness that she feels with gays and lesbians. A 52-year-old male respondent in the same area described gay relationships as emblematic of "sexual diversity, rather than something being wrong [with them]." Like the first respondent, he too concluded universally that "we're all just people." A third, younger man of 39 years mused on a milieu of acceptance and asked in disbelief, "Is there anybody left in this country who actually has a problem with this? . . . I can't believe that anybody would get upset about homosexuality in this day and age."

Identifying with their gay and lesbian neighbors as "just people" prompted straights to support their rights as well, especially marriage equality (which was not yet legal at the time of the interviews). "My take on gay marriage," one female resident of Andersonville began, "is that all the ridiculousness around saying that marriage is for a man and a woman, . . . at some point we're going to look back and be like, 'oh, my God! How stupid were we that it took us so long to do that?" A straight man in Boystown echoed, "The idea of straight people saying that if two gay people get married, it's a threat to the institution, it's the most ludicrous thing. I mean, fifty-two percent of all straight marriages end in divorce. What kind of sacred thing is going on here?"

Straight residents also agreed with the city of Chicago's decision to mark Boystown as a formal gayborhood. "It did strike me that this was an official kind of thing that someone had to sponsor or approve," said a woman in Andersonville, "and it seemed impressive to me that the city had either sponsored or gone along with something to recognize that this was a gay area and promote gay pride." Another woman in the same neighborhood agreed, "As far as marking the neighborhood and marking this as a place where a lot of gay Chicago residents live, I think it's great."

Finally, straights expressed positive attitudes about integration. A female resident of Andersonville described gayborhoods as places where people can "thrive together." She explained, "I think Andersonville . . . [is] a very successful neighborhood. . . . There are a lot of gay and lesbian families and single people, and there are gay businesses, and there are children—child-friendly places and gay bars—and they're all there together. I think it's the future." Sexual integration creates a "welcoming," "inclusive," and "open" environment, other residents remarked. Many straights defined this as progress. A man in Andersonville said, "I remember walking down Halsted and feeling like I am not in Kansas anymore. I'm in a real city now where you'll see stuff like this and where you have this level of diversity and openness and progressive liberal thought."

Attitudinal claims like these show rhetorical support for gay people, their legal rights, geographic spaces, and demographic trends of integration. But these liberal stances often lack behavioral backing. Scholars call this bifurcated outcome "performative progressiveness" (Ghaziani 2014), and our data document its empirical variations.

PERFORMATIVE PROGRESSIVENESS

Our analysis shows four ways in which liberal straight residents of gay neighborhoods manage the dilemmas that arise for them when they enter minority spaces: spatial entitlement, rhetorical moves, political absolution, and affect.

Spatial Entitlements

Spatial entitlements are ways of enacting dominant social position in specific places (Bourdieu 1984). Especially apparent in this mode is a belief among some heterosexual residents that they should have unrestricted access to gayborhoods, along with the "cool" commodities (Rushbrook 2002) and "chic" (Collins 2004) social spaces within them, while denying their own sense of entitlement. Consider a personal story that one male interviewee in his late thirties relayed: "Right after our daughter was born, we needed to get out of the house for a nice, really long walk. And we ended up over in Boystown. We were starting to get hungry, and so we were going to stop for dinner. Went to this restaurant, but we walked in with a stroller, and it was like, you know how you have that proverbial scratching of the music when somebody walks in the door? It was literally like all the heads turned, and we were like, maybe we shouldn't be here." Straight couples like this are aware of their outsider status in a culturally queer space, yet many ignore it. The man decided, "This place looks nice. There's not really that much around here [that interests us]. Let's just stay." But their baby stroller marked them as heterosexual. "They didn't have a child seat, high chair," he complained. "They wanted us to put the stroller outside on the sidewalk. I mean, it was just like all these things," he sighed. "We're just kind of like, all right, fine. We're not going to stay here. We're going to get out. So, it was almost like they went out of their way to make us feel not welcome." Expectations of open access are key characteristics of spatial entitlements. These assumptions are violated in the above incident, as conflict unfolds around the stroller, which is a symbol of heterosexual presence in gayborhoods. Underlying the restlessness is a conception of gayborhoods as apolitical, neoliberal, commodity spaces (Binnie and Skeggs 2004) that the "noveau cosmopolitan citizen" (Nash and Gorman-Murray 2014:759) should be able to freely access and enjoy.

Because spatial entitlements conceal the political dimensions of queer spaces, they are characterized by another assumption: Straights have the power to shape the tone of an area. A 36-year-old male interviewee noted, "I don't want to be *that* guy or *that* family . . . [who] came in and wield[ed] our power in the neighborhood." Unlike the overtly bigoted, those who perform progressiveness are quick to highlight how they do not exert power in the same way as an imagined, generalized other (Mead 1934). The straights who enter queer spaces and exert their privilege are defined as culturally insensitive outsiders, as the following 32-year-old female interviewee described: "It's not so much [all] families; it's privileged, upper middle-class families moving in because these neighborhoods are cool or interesting but then trying to strong-arm [them]: we want this type of restaurant, we want baby stores, and we want, you know, lots of lots of things, we want sports bars, we want these sorts of businesses."

Straights who express a liberal sensibility use spatial entitlements to distinguish themselves from other "strong-arm" straight people, yet both groups assume that they have the power to shape the character, composition, complexion, or tone of the area. Our respondents think of themselves as benevolent individuals who would never "wield" their power, but research shows that they transform gay neighborhoods into "visible niche markets for retail commerce and realty speculation" (Hanhardt 2008:65). The mechanism of change is a difference in tastes about the built environment: Straight residents prefer large chain stores, which threaten "the cultural icons of queer neighborhoods" (Doan and Higgins 2011:16).

Lastly, spatial entitlements describe how straights consume gay neighborhoods in a "cosmopolitan buffet" (Rushbrook 2002:188). Gay people enter an area, "make it nice," and then straight individuals and families benefit from their efforts. This is a familiar and wide-reaching narrative on the streets. One female interviewee in her mid-twenties stated, "This is going to be a horrible example, but the [Boystown] neighborhood was 'Queer Eye for a Straight Guy'd' and now everyone's like, 'Great, let's move in because it's ready' type of a thing." Her phrase "let's move in because it's ready" suggests that many straights shift the burden of urban revitalization onto gay people. Only after they have done the groundwork do straights come in and reap the rewards. One white Andersonville resident, a male in his late forties, noted, "When a neighborhood becomes more gay, there seems to be a cleaning up of the neighborhood. There seems to be a beautification of the neighborhood. And that's a draw." Consider another example: "There's a trope," began a 32-year-old female interviewee. "I've heard it over and over—of gay people moving into a neighborhood and making it really cool and a really great place to live, and then straight people coming in and messing it up, and then gay people needing to move somewhere else." Another white female in her early forties added that the presence of gays also creates safer neighborhoods, which is appealing: "Gays have done a nice job of gentrifying certain neighborhoods, and that makes it feel safe for straight couples, especially with kids." All these statements are consistent with scholarly accounts about the social relations that transpire in gentrifying neighborhoods (Brown-Saracino 2009; Knopp 1990). Some heterosexuals are aware that gay neighborhoods provide safe spaces to sexual minorities, but this recognition does little to influence their occupation of the area. One female respondent reflected, "I don't know if it's an irony or a paradox, but people who had gone there to try and create their own space, in some ways separate, deliberately so, or at least a place that they could define and create, then gets invaded by families who say, 'Oh, they made it all nice. Oh, it's pretty. Oh, there are some cute stores here.'"

In summary, spatial entitlements describe beliefs about access to space, feelings of ownership, assumptions about power and privilege, and acts of consumerism that enable straights to occupy spaces that are designated as culturally queer in a way that feels inclusive but noninvasive and nonexploitative. The belief that gay people may have a reason to create and then protect their own spaces arises in some occasions, but even when it does, this supportive attitude among straight residents seldom translates into critical self-reflection, let alone pause, about their presence in those very same spaces.

Rhetorical Moves

The second narrative device, rhetorical moves, builds on a principle of linguistic relativity (Sapir 1929; Whorf and Carroll 1956; Whorf 1940) to highlight the conditional nature of acceptance. Our analysis shows several variants: First, some straights restrict their acceptance of homosexuality toward a heteronormative subset of gays and lesbians (Duggan 2003). Second, rhetorical moves urge gays and lesbians to abdicate what makes them culturally distinct. A third component is the strategic use of diversity to define homosexuality as a desirable expression of urban difference, in contrast to racial and ethnic minorities. Finally, straights also use the language of diversity to reframe the meaning of inclusion and allow charges of reverse discrimination. In this section, we consider each subtype of rhetorical moves.

Although some straights claim a progressive stance on matters related to gay and lesbian rights, they qualify their acceptance by admitting that they are uncomfortable with

"those" people who are "in your face," as a male respondent in his early thirties said, "I don't like it when people are putting on too much of a show all the time. I just want to go to a place where people are relaxed and they're not trying to prove something. . . . [T]hat 'in your face' stuff, it makes me feel a little bit uncomfortable." In this example, "in your face" is a rhetorical move that stigmatizes gay and lesbians who fall outside the charmed circle (Rubin 1993) of sexual restraint. The respondent and his female partner were pleased when a sexually explicit gay nightclub in Boystown—called "The Manhole"— closed while a "less obvious" business—named "Hydrate"—opened in its place: "The sexuality has diminished. I would say it's much less obvious, like, the leather-wearing and that kind of [stuff]." Implied in their pleasure is an understanding of Boystown as a sanitized place, rather than one that celebrates queer cultural communities that form around sex (Orne 2017).

Rhetorical moves celebrate gains for equality—but with a caveat. Gays and lesbians should adopt heteronormative ideals and embrace monogamy, marriage, and children. "This is what you wanted," a male respondent argued while aggressively waving his index finger in the second author's face during the interview. "*You* wanted equality. *You* wanted your rights. *You* wanted to get married. This is it!" The respondent wanted gays to soften their differences. "[I]f my gay neighbors upstairs decided to adopt, I would hope that they would come to me to learn how to change a diaper. Why not? I mean, I have the experience. This is what you want. This is what I would want." An emphasis on mainstream values like marriage and childrearing exclude radical and sexualized aspects of queer cultures. Not a single heterosexual resident remarked on kinship structures, bathhouses, or the connective and communal powers of sex.

In a third variation, straights deploy diversity discourse to allow themselves to celebrate tolerance, a notion that overgeneralizes support based on attitudes toward a narrow segment of gay people (Walters 2014). A male interviewee drew a comparison with race to reflect on the meaning of urban diversity: "In terms of ethnicity, it's a way of white people being able to say that they live in a diverse neighborhood without it being racially diverse. . . . I think it's part of the appeal because they can say, 'Look how diverse it is,' and yet it's not necessarily ethnically diverse." The logic is the same for sexuality and race. He continued, "I think that that's part of the appeal of both [gay] neighborhoods. . . . [I]t's a way of saying we live in a very diverse neighborhood. . . . [W]hite liberals can make a claim to diversity without having to actually live around ethnic minorities." Consider another brief example from a male interviewee in his late thirties who said directly, "The reason that straight people want to live in these neighborhoods is that they're white liberals who want to make a claim to diversity without having to live around ethnic minorities." Data from the 2014 ACS support this intuition: 79.7 percent of residents in Lakeview (the neighborhood that houses Boystown) identified as White, 7.3 percent as Hispanic or Latino, 3.5 percent as Black, and 6.8 percent as Asian, and 2.7 percent as other.[2]

Many straight residents of gay neighborhoods use diversity to reframe the meaning of inclusion in a way that enables a charge of reverse discrimination. For example, when a local gay-owned bakery instituted a no-child policy for their business, some straights felt discriminated against, and they criticized the business for creating an exclusive space. One female resident with children explained how she felt attacked by the policy: "I'd really love a scone because it's half-price scone day. But it's impossible to get your stroller in there, with the two doors the way they are, and also with the small size. So, you don't even bother to go in there. It makes me feel sad. I do feel discriminated against." Another

couple with a child described how several straight friends of theirs perceived the policy: "We know a lot of families, [and] we felt like it [the no-child policy] was excluding us in a neighborhood where nobody's [supposed to be] excluded."

Straights who perform progressiveness imagine gay neighborhoods and their businesses as spaces where everyone is welcome, rather than specific sites of queer cultures and communities. In response to experiencing spaces as closed off to them, some straights felt that they were targets of discrimination. They accused gays and lesbians who advocated for queer spaces as "segregationist," "separatist," and "heterophobic." Each rhetorical move positions the straight "victim" as a member of marginalized group. A 33-year-old female interviewee argued, "To me, that gets a bit segregationist. It's like— is 'heterophobic' a word?— I've definitely felt the 'oh, I'm a breeder,' . . . 'oh, breeders are moving in' mentality [and] that . . . piss[es] me off because I've been called 'breeder' one too many times." Another respondent linked this strategy to diversity, "We talk about diversity, and we talk about black people versus white people, like, racially getting along, and people really want that. It seems to me that by calling this out, it's like, 'No, don't come into our space. We just want our own space,' which feels like a little bit of a diversity issue or, for lack of a better word, being racist for straight people." Drawing on racialized discourses, rhetorical moves allow straights to think of themselves as targets of "racism for straight people."

Accusations of reverse discrimination are unconvincing because there is no structural system that supports anti-heterosexuality. Heterosexism and homophobia are institutional logics that heterosexuals have designed and that they control. They are unidirectional. Sexual minorities are responding to this system when they react against straights who move into gay neighborhoods and make claims on the area and its businesses. Cries of "straight racism" are illogical because gay people cannot institutionalize "homosexism" and "heterophobia," while cries of reverse discrimination disavow the cultural autonomy of queer spaces. More broadly, our findings about rhetorical moves suggest that straight residents see the gayborhood as a marker of cosmopolitanism, diversity, and economic competitiveness—but they are bereft to see gay people as targets of exploitation.

Political Absolution

The third expression of performative progressiveness, political absolution, emphasizes inaction, a phenomenon that is part of a larger American culture of political avoidance and apathy (Eliasoph 1998). In this section, we specify three findings that show how straights absolve themselves from political solidarity with the gay community, despite coming into contact with its members in a shared residential context: a "gay-blindness" toward inequality, solidarity exemptions, and redefining solidarity as place-based mere presence.

The first instance showcases a nonchalant attitude about social inequality. A male Boystown resident who was in his mid-forties explained the parallels between being "gay-blind" and colorblind: "[My friend is] totally 'gay-blind,' you know—a non-factor. . . . [I]t's [like being] color-blind." Those who turn a blind eye to intergroup differences believe that society has surpassed a certain threshold of equality and that gays and lesbians experience less societal disapproval (Jewell and Morrison 2012). These views imply that political activism is no longer needed, an assumption that makes straight residents feel exempt from being an active ally. Gayborhoods become social sites where gays and straights casually interact, rather than crucibles of politics and queer empowerment.

In another example, a female respondent in her early thirties reflected on how acceptance of homosexuality has contributed to the sexual integration of gay neighborhoods: "It [being gay] doesn't have the stigma that it used to, even in areas that certainly are very far away from Boystown. So, I view this as maybe just another step. . . . Maybe they don't need—it's not necessary to have a separate area, you know, safety in numbers, strength in numbers now." Many residents stated that liberal ideals had not only been realized but that experiences of discrimination were relics of the past. A female Andersonville resident in her early forties remarked, "By the time the '90s rolled around, it was sort of like, 'OK, do we really need this anymore?' Can't we just accept that gay people live everywhere, and they don't need their own separate neighborhood?" When straights express knowledge of a civil rights violation and express verbal solidarity—even outrage with it—there is a surprising level of political disengagement. "I'm just so angry about the gay marriage thing," began a 45-year-old male respondent living in Boystown. But when the second author asked follow-up questions about whether he had engaged in any concrete actions on behalf of gay rights, the man admitted to his apathy and inaction. "Well, if I really was angry enough, I'd be going out and trying to do something politically about it. So, for all my words, I haven't gone out and tried to really effect change in terms of writing letters to the editor, things like that."

Some straights redefine solidarity by excluding requirements for political engagement. One resident of Andersonville described how he felt solidarity with his gay and lesbian neighbors. When the interviewer probed about whether his solidarity translated to specific actions, he freely reported that it did not and compared his political absolution with the Swedish heritage of the neighborhood:

Respondent: "I'm not Swedish, but I feel solidarity with the Swedish markers in Andersonville.

Interviewer: You do? *[Logic: a soft inquiry about identity and solidarity]*

Respondent: Yes. It's become my home.

Interviewer: If you feel solidarity with Swedes, do you do things on behalf of the Swedish community to show your support? *[Logic: a direct inquiry about the relationship between solidarity and social action]*

Respondent: No. It has nothing to do with being Swedish.

Interviewer: Are actions in support of the community not related to solidarity? *[Logic: specification of relationships among variables]*

Respondent: When I see those symbols [a water tower painted in the colors of the Swedish flag, bakeries and delis, and a Swedish American Museum, all of which are based in the neighborhood], it makes me feel like I'm home. It doesn't have anything to do with it being Swedish or not."

For this respondent, solidarity is a place-based personal experience, not something that emerges from interpersonal networks and alliances. "It's a differentiation of a place," he continued. "So what defines my neighborhood? Well, part of it is that there are these symbols, [and] there is something to rally behind, like the Swedish flag. I can see that [the water tower] from my living room window. So, I feel like I'm home." Notice the absence of sexuality as a defining characteristic of the neighborhood. Straight residents like this identify with impersonal markers, rather than the people who live in an area. In doing so, they redefine solidarity as their mere presence, a notion that eliminates expectations for actual political engagement.

The theme of feeling progressive by virtue of living in a minority neighborhood—but not doing anything on behalf of the group—emerged repeatedly in the data. A male interviewee in his late twenties stated, "I guess living here makes me feel good as an overall accepting person, and I would hate to lose that." His partner, also in her late twenties, echoed the sentiment: "I have taken some pride in the fact that I live in a gay neighborhood. Like I said, it makes me feel better about myself, [that I'm] more accepting." Some residents were aware of this potentially hypocritical stance, which one individual described as "talk[ing] out of both sides of your mouth": "You see that with people [who] move into the neighborhood, and they go, 'Oh, it's really cute to be gay,'" began a 48-year-old male Andersonville resident, "and then on the other hand, they're complaining, saying, 'Oh, we've got to shut that bar down,' or 'we've got to do this,' or saying 'we don't like it,' you know what I mean—where you talk out of both sides of your mouth." As a narrative device, political absolution involves denying inequality and redefining solidarity as unrelated to material support.

Affect

The final expression of performative progressiveness that emerged in our data pertains to the emotional expectations that straights have for their gay and lesbian neighbors. Scholars have documented emotion work in family contexts (Hochschild 1979); we extend the finding to urban settings. Our analysis identifies a belief that gays and lesbians should "be happy" about the presence of straight people in gay neighborhoods. An Andersonville resident asked, "Isn't that what *they* wanted?" To clarify, he compared sexuality with race, as many others had done as well: "If we just stopped talking about racism and just got along, or homophobia, isn't that what *you* want? What would happen to these people [gays and lesbians] once they got what they wanted? . . . If everybody got along, and let's say there was no sexuality, what would these people have to be mad about then? And if you really are striving for utopia, you have to keep that in the back of your mind that once you get what you want, you have to be happy with that." This resident seems unaware that the legislative landscape is far from a "utopia." Later in the conversation, he conflates equality with cultural loss, assuming the former requires the latter: "This is what you wanted. Maybe it wasn't the consequences that they wanted, and if it's not the consequence that they wanted—that they did want to have their own neighborhood with no straight people living in it—then that's just not a good person, whether you're gay or straight. That makes you a racist or a bad person." The interviewee concluded that those gays and lesbians who wish to maintain their own culturally designated neighborhood are "bad people" because they violate an expectation of happily including straight newcomers. Another interviewee similarly struggled to understand why gays and lesbians were unhappy with the demographic changes in gay neighborhoods: "While I can understand that they might want their quote-unquote 'space,' I'm like, well, if you want equality, why aren't you happy that it's people just wanting to live together in harmony and one big neighborhood?"

Arguments about affect locate the cause of conflict in gay individuals, rather than a structural context of disadvantage and discrimination that creates a need for gay neighborhoods in the first place. According to this narrative device, discontent with the straightening of urban gay districts is an individual problem that gay people need to "just get over." One interviewee said, "If people are really upset about straight couples moving in and having families and pushing strollers and having kids running around, just get

over yourselves. I consider that more of an individual—it's that person's problem, not my problem." Said another, "Anybody that is upset about a straight man or a family moving into a gay neighborhood because they're comfortable in it, I would think that your ultimate goal is for people to be comfortable with who you are and what you are and how you live your life. So, why would you be upset about that?"

All these examples highlight a disbelief among straights that some gays and lesbians might desire their own spaces and to be around others who are like them. Gay people should be "happy," they say, and "welcoming" to straights who want to live next to them. When straights encounter gay and lesbian residents who express displeasure or resistance, they become angry and confused, as was the case with a 36-year-old male interviewee: "When I see those rants and raves [against straight people moving into gay neighborhoods], it makes me mad because isn't that what you want? I don't understand. You want equality, but when it's there and we're all comfortable together, and we all can live together, why would you look down on us? Why would you fight that?" These respondents misattribute a desire to maintain queer spaces as a rejection of the ideal of equality. "If they really thought about it, and they really wanted to have equality, then that [sexual integration] is what that means," one man asserted. "We should all live in the same neighborhood. It's one big neighborhood, whether you're black, Puerto Rican, gay, lesbian, straight." According to their view, gays are obliged to repay the acceptance that society has shown to them by welcoming straights into the gayborhood. Anger is an individual problem, they say, thereby concealing the institutional nature of inequality.

CONCLUSIONS: INEQUALITY IN THE GAYBORHOOD

An emerging trend in sexualities research is to identify the pathways through which inequality remains central to the social construction of sexuality and the sexual construction of social life (Moon 2008; Teunis and Herdt 2007). We began with a puzzle that is made murky by statistics that show a liberalization of attitudes toward homosexuality: Acceptance does not displace prejudice; it recrafts it into subtler forms (Doan et al 2014). In an era of public support (Dean 2014; Nash 2013; Savin-Williams 2005; Seidman 2002; Sullivan 1996) and favorable opinion (Flores 2014; Loftus 2001; Twenge et al 2015), how exactly does the disjuncture between progressive attitudes toward gays and lesbians and inaction toward addressing the inequalities that are directed at them manifest on the shared streets of a gayborhood? Based on an innovative use of interview data, we developed four aspects of "performative progressiveness" (Ghaziani 2014): spatial entitlements, rhetorical moves, political absolution, and affect (Table 2).

The narrative devices, cognitive frames, and styles of reasoning listed in the table provide different ways that liberal-minded straights decouple their attitudes toward gays and lesbians from their resistant behavioral responses to the unique "sex cultures" (Ghaziani 2017) that gayborhoods promote for their residents and the "vicarious citizens" (Greene 2014) who maintain ties with the area.

Our findings advance theoretical conversations about the contact hypothesis. Those who champion it suggest that only sustained contact, rather than incidental exposure, is necessary to change attitudes (e.g., Henry and Hardin 2006). We have shown that even this is not enough. The fact that performative progressiveness appears in gayborhoods—urban districts that provide ample opportunities for extended face-to-face contact—offers

TABLE 2. Performative Progressiveness, Inequality, and Placemaking

Mode	Key Feature	Expressions of Inequality	Conflicting Views of Place
Spatial Entitlements	Relationship with Space	Open access to queer spaces Assumptions of power within queer spaces Consumption of queer spaces	The surprise that comes from "feeling not welcome" implies a view of gayborhoods as trendy commodities, rather than safe spaces for sexual minorities.
Rhetorical Moves	Linguistic Relativity	Acceptance contingent on heteronormativity Equality contingent on the loss of cultural identity Diversity discourse justifies racial homogeneity Diversity discourse allows reverse discrimination	The discomfort from meeting someone who is "in your face" implies a heteronormative view of gayborhoods, rather than places that celebrate queer sex and cultural communities.
Political Absolution	Ignorance about Sexual Inequality	"Gay blindness" Solidarity exemptions Redefining solidarity as place-based	To say that being gay is a "nonfactor" implies a view of gayborhoods as places of casual social interactions, rather than crucibles of political engagement and material support.
Affect	Emotion Work	Be happy and welcoming to straights "This is what you wanted" Individual versus structural context of disadvantage	The desire "to just get along" implies that gayborhoods are utopias where everyone can live, rather than places where minorities find relief from structural discrimination and social isolation.

a striking challenge to such scholarly predictions: Exposure to sexual diversity does not change minds fully, at least not in a way that enables the straight residents of gayborhoods like Boystown and Andersonville to recognize and respect the culturally specific uses of those spaces. At the core of our observations is a consistent demand by heterosexuals to experience the gayborhood on *their* terms, a move that allows them to infuse their privilege into the interactional dynamics of urban space and thus to dispute its queer ethos. This explains why contact can produce discomfort and homonegativity, even after 20 years of sharing the same streets. The performance of progressiveness brings into focus the limits of acceptance, rather than its positive trajectory as revealed by public opinion polls, and the fuzzier ways in which power operates on the ground.

We can also position our research in the literature on the consumption of diversity among urban cosmopolitans—also known as members of the creative class (Florida 2002)—who seek out certain communities in postindustrial cities to indicate their "hip" and "tolerant" cultural capital (Bourdieu 1986). Rather than emphasizing the role of economics (Black et al. 2002; Ruting 2008), assimilation (Ghaziani 2015a), voluntarily shared tastes (Brown-Saracino 2011), sex (Orne 2017), or mutual respect between gays and straights (Nash and Gorman-Murray 2014), we elevate the roles of contact and conflict. The range of dynamics within performative progressiveness challenge the assumptions that scholars make about the contexts in which people relate to one another

spatially, especially those moments that create opportunities for interactions across categories of sexual orientation. Our findings suggest that living in a diverse urban area, whether defined by its racial, economic, or sexual composition, can flare unease (Dixon et al 2005; Lee 2000; Stein et al 2000)—even if interactions have a positive tone (Barlow et al. 2012)—because attitudes that are directed toward individuals do not always scale up to the group level (Lee et al 2004; Matejskova and Leitner 2011).

The empirical variations of performative progressiveness that we found in our data also challenge arguments about the integration of gayborhoods as evidence of the declining significance of compulsory heterosexuality (Brown 2014; Dean 2014) and homophobia (McCormack 2012). Had we restricted our analysis to trends in public opinion (Saad 2010) or the media's declaration of gayborhoods as passé (James 2017; Leigh Brown 2007), we would have mistakenly concluded that integration is an always desirable outcome, one that signals a change in how sexuality structures our lives, relationships, and cities. We would have overlooked the subtle interactional dynamics through which straight people continue to exert their perspectives and preferences in queer spaces—and thus the protean quality of prejudice. In addition, celebrating the arrival of straight people into gayborhoods as evidence of equality valorizes heterosexuality as a symbol for what is normal, moral, and desirable. Implied in such an assessment is an unstated "problem" of homosexuality and queer spaces. This is a beguiling misdirection. Integration may be a means for achieving equality, but it cannot be the substance of equality, which must include advancements like employment nondiscrimination, closing the sexual orientation wage gap, addressing antigay hate crimes, and redressing housing discrimination (Ghaziani 2015b). We encourage future researchers to measure tolerance as a variable property of social life, and to conceptualize urban cultures and diversity not as epiphenomenal to economics (Florida 2002) or a mere residual but as a core set of textured experiences (Suttles 1984).

Qualitative analysis is less interested in generalizing to a larger population than it is in the "generalization of ideas" (Suter 2012:353). In this spirit, we offer one final thought about the portability of our findings. Similar to Goffman's (1959) writings on performance, our concept of performative progressiveness applies to race as well as sexuality, and its explanatory potential reaches well beyond the gayborhood. Consider California, a state whose population is 39 percent white, 38 percent Latino, 14 percent Asian, 7 percent Black, and 2 percent Native American. Dan Schnur, executive director of the Unruh Institute of Politics, described the state as "the most demographically diverse community in the history of the planet Earth."[3] In an April 2015 poll of 1,504 Californians, nearly two-thirds of voters say race relations are better in their home state than they are in other areas of the country—and that diversity plays a positive role in their daily interactions.[4] The pollsters followed-up and asked if "diversity creates a racism-free utopia." They, like scholars (Ayers et al. 2009; Stein et al. 2000), found that the highest levels of hostility occur in the most racially diverse areas where contact between groups is common. The lesson? "Diversity" says more about *perceptions* of improved race relations than it does the *material conditions* of racial discrimination. It is a "feel good" word that "lets white people off the hook from doing something" and allows them to "sidestep persistent, alarming racial inequalities" (Berrey 2015). Some scholars call this "racism without racists" (Bonilla-Silva 2013). We similarly found homonegativity without homophobes. Writing for *Vox* and creating a powerful bridge with our findings about performative progressiveness as a new

form of inequality, Jenée Desmond-Harris (2015) warns, "[It] is a sobering reminder not to assume that melting pots automatically create equality."

Notes

[1]For ACS data, see www.windycitymediagroup.com/gay/lesbian/news/article.php?AID=31459. While Boystown is a municipally recognized gay neighborhood, Andersonville's reputation is more layered and "textured" (Suttles, 1984). Some residents are drawn to it as an historic ethnic enclave (a Swedish neighborhood), while others are attracted to its gendered residential and social composition as "Girlstown" (Ghaziani, 2014). Research shows that local place characteristics can affect "orientations to sexual identity" (Brown-Saracino, 2015). We did not find similar variation in our data (e.g., expressions of performative progressiveness as a function of neighborhood). Whereas Brown-Saracino asks how place affects identity, we show how acceptance affects inequality. The implications of our differences are provocative: Place may shape identity more readily than inequality.

[2]http://www.cmap.illinois.gov/documents/10180/126764/Lake+View.pdf

[3]"Think Diversity Creates a Racism-Free Utopia? Check Out This California Poll," http://www.vox.com/2015/4/20/8445003/race-relations-diversity-racism

[4]http://www.gqrr.com/articles/2015/4/12/new-university-of-southern-california-dornsife-college-of-letters-arts-and-scienceslos-angeles-times-poll

REFERENCES

Ajzen, Icek, and Martin Fishbein. 1980. *Understanding Attitudes and Predicting Social Behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Allport, Gordon W. 1954. *The Nature of Prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Anacker, Katrin B., and Hazel A. Morrow-Jones. 2005. "Neighborhood Factors Associated with Same-Sex Households in U.S. Cities." *Urban Geography* 26(5):385–409.

Andersen, Robert, and Tina Fetner. 2008. "Cohort Differences in Tolerance of Homosexuality: Attitudinal Change in Canada and the United States, 1981–2000." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 72(2):311–30.

Attride-Stirling, Jennifer. 2001. "Thematic Networks: An Analytic Tool for Qualitative Research." *Qualitative Research* 1(3):385–405.

Ayers, John W., C. Richard Hofstetter, Keith Schnakenberg, and Bohdan Kolody. 2009. "Is Immigration a Racial Issue? Anglo Attitudes on Immigration Policies in a Border County." *Social Science Quarterly* 90:593–610.

Barlow, Fiona Kate, Stefania Paolini, Anne Pedersen, Matthew J. Hornsey, Helena R. M. Radke, Jake Harwood, Mark Rubin, and Chris G. Sibley. 2012. "The Contact Caveat: Negative Contact Predicts Increased Prejudice More Than Positive Contact Predicts Reduced Prejudice." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 38(12):1629–43.

Becker, Howard S. 1954. "Field Methods and Techniques: A Note on Interviewing Tactics." *Human Organization* 12(4):31–32.

Becker, Howard S., and Blanche Geer. 1957. "Participant Observation and Interviewing: A Comparison." *Human Organization* 16(3):28–32.

Bergquist, Kathie, and Robert McDonald. 2006. *A Field Guide to Gay and Lesbian Chicago*. Chicago, IL: Lake Claremont Press.

Berrey, Ellen. 2015. "Diversity Is for White People: The Big Lie behind a Well-Intended Word." *Salon* (October 26) (http://www.salon.com/2015/10/26/diversity_is_for_white_people_the_big_lie_behind_a_well_intended_word/). Accessed May 1, 2016.

Betsky, Aaron. 1997. *Queer Space: Architecture and Same-Sex Desire*. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc.

Binnie, Jon, and Beverley Skeggs. 2004. "Cosmopolitan Knowledge and the Production and Consumption of Sexualized Space: Manchester's Gay Village." *Sociological Review* 52(1):39–61.

Black, Dan, Gary Gates, Seth Sanders, and Lowell Taylor. 2002. "Why Do Gay Men Live in San Francisco?" *Journal of Urban Economics* 51(1):54–76.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2013. *Racism without Racists: Color-Blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in America*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

———. 1986. "The Forms of Capital." Pp. 46–58 in *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education,* edited by John Richardson. New York: Greenwood.

Brewer, Paul R. 2007. *Value War: Public Opinion and the Politics of Gay Rights.* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

———. 2014. "Public Opinion about Gay Rights and Gay Marriage." *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 26(3):279–82.

Brooks, Clem. 2000. "Civil Liberalism and the Suppression of a Republican Political Realignment in the United States, 1972 to 1996." *American Sociological Review* 65:483–505.

———, and Jeff Manza. 2006. "Social Policy Responsiveness in Developed Democracies." *American Sociological Review* 71(3):474–94.

Brown, Michael. 2014. "Gender and Sexuality II: There Goes the Gayborhood?" *Progress in Human Geography* 38(3):457–65.

Brown-Saracino, Japonica. 2009. *A Neighborhood That Never Changes: Gentrification, Social Preservation, and the Search for Authenticity.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

———. 2011. "From the Lesbian Ghetto to Ambient Community: The Perceived Costs and Benefits of Integration for Community." *Social Problems* 58(3):361–88.

———. 2015. "How Place Shapes Identity: The Origins of Distinctive LBQ Identities in Four Small U.S. Cities." *American Journal of Sociology* 121(1):1–63.

Burstein, Paul. 1998. "Bringing the Public Back In: Should Sociologists Consider the Impact of Public Opinion on Public Policy?" *Social Forces* 77:27–62.

———. 1999. "Social Movements and Public Policy." Pp. 3–21 in *How Social Movements Matter,* edited by Marco G. Giugni, Doug McAdam, and Charles Tilly. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Butler, Judith. 1990a. *Gender Trouble.* New York: Routledge.

———. 1990b. "Performative Acts and Gender Constitution." Pp. 270–82 in *Performing Feminisms,* edited by Sue-Ellen Case. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Canaday, Margot. 2009. *The Straight State: Sexuality and Citizenship in Twentieth-Century America.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Castells, Manuel. 1983. *The City and the Grassroots: A Cross-Cultural Theory of Urban Social Movements.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Centner, Ryan. 2008. "Places of Privileged Consumption Practices: Spatial Capital, the Dot-Com Habitus, and San Francisco's Internet Boom." *City & Community* 7(3):193–223.

Collins, Alan. 2004. "Sexual Dissidence, Enterprise and Assimilation: Bedfellows in Urban Regeneration." *Urban Studies* 41(9):1789–806.

Connell, Raewyn W. 1992. "A Very Straight Gay: Masculinity, Homosexual Experience, and the Dynamics of Gender." *American Sociological Review* 57(6):735–51.

Costa, Pedro Alexandre, Henrique Pereira, and Isabel Leal. 2015. "'The Contact Hypothesis' and Attitudes toward Same-Sex Parenting." *Sexuality Research and Social Policy* 12(2):125–36.

Cullen, Jennifer M., Lester W. Wright Jr., and Michael Alessandri. 2002. "The Personality Variable Openness to Experience as It Relates to Homophobia." *Journal of Homosexuality* 42(4):119–34.

Dean, James Joseph. 2014. *Straights: Heterosexuality in a Post-Closeted Culture.* New York: New York University Press.

Desmond-Harris, Jenée. 2015. "Think Diversity Creates a Racism-Free Utopia? Check Out This California Poll." *Vox,* April 20, 2015. http://www.vox.com/2025/4/20/844503/race-relations-diversity-racism

Dixon, John, Kevin Durrheim, and Colin Tredoux. 2005. "Beyond the Optimal Contact Strategy: A Reality Check for the Contact Hypothesis." *American Psychologist* 60(7):697–711.

Doan, Long, Annalise Loehr, and Lisa R. Miller. 2014. "Formal Rights and Informal Privileges for Same-Sex Couples: Evidence from a National Survey Experiment." *American Sociological Review* 79(6):1172–95.

Doan, Petra L., and Harrison Higgins. 2011. "The Demise of Queer Space? Resurgent Gentrification and the Assimilation of LGBT Neighborhoods." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 31(1):6–25.

Duggan, Lisa. 2003. *The Twilight of Equality? Neoliberalism, Cultural Politics, and the Attack on Democracy.* Boston, MA: Beacon.

Eliasoph, Nina. 1998. *Avoiding Politics: How Americans Produce Apathy in Everyday Life.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Engel, Stephen M. 2013. "Frame Spillover: Media Framing and Public Opinion of a Multifaceted LGBT Rights Agenda." *Law & Social Inquiry* 38(2):403–41.

Evans, Sara M., and Harry C. Boyte. 1986. *Free Spaces: The Sources of Democratic Change in America.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Fishbein, Martin, and Icek Ajzen. 1975. *Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Flores, Andrew R. 2014. *National Trends in Public Opinion on LGBT Rights in the United States.* Los Angeles: Williams Institute.

Florida, Richard. 2002. *The Rise of the Creative Class.* New York: Basic Books.

Frechtling, Joy and Laure Sharp, eds. 1997. *User-Friendly Handbook for Mixed Method Evaluations.* WWW Document: National Science Foundation: Division of Research, Evaluation, and Communication (http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/1997/nsf97153/start.htm). Accessed May 1, 2016.

Gans, Herbert J. 1962. *The Urban Villagers: Group and Class in the Life of Italian Americans.* New York: Free Press.

Gates, Gary J., and Jason Ost. 2004. *The Gay and Lesbian Atlas.* Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Ghaziani, Amin. 2011. "Post-Gay Collective Identity Construction." *Social Problems* 58(1):99–125.

———. 2014. *There Goes the Gayborhood?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

———. 2015a. "'Gay Enclaves Face Prospect of Being Passé': How Assimilation Affects the Spatial Expressions of Sexuality in the United States." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 39(4):756–71.

———. 2015b. "The Radical Potential of Post-Gay Politics in the City." *Environment and Planning A* 47:2409–26.

———. 2017. *Sex Cultures.* Boston, MA: Polity Press.

Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life.* New York: Random House.

Gorman-Murray, Andrew, and Gordon Waitt. 2009. "Queer-Friendly Neighbourhoods: Interrogating Social Cohesion across Sexual Difference in Two Australian Neighbourhoods." *Environment and Planning A* 41(12):2855–73.

Greene, Theodore. 2014. "Gay Neighborhoods and the Rights of the Vicarious Citizen." *City & Community* 13(2):99–118.

Gross, Neil. 2009. "A Pragmatist Theory of Social Mechanisms." *American Sociological Review* 74(3):358–79.

Halberstam, J. Jack. 2012. *Gaga Feminism: Sex, Gender, and the End of Normal.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Hanhardt, Christina B. 2008. "Butterflies, Whistles, and Fists: Gay Safe Street Patrols and the New Gay Ghetto, 1976–1981." *Radical History Review* Winter(100):60–85.

———. 2013. *Safe Space: Gay Neighborhood History and the Politics of Violence.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Hawkins, Rich. 2015. "It's Okay to Be Gay, Just Don't Touch Each Other." *Huffington Post* (June 23) (http://www.huffingtonpost.com/rich-hawkins/its-okay-to-be-gay-just-d_b_7637046.html). Accessed May 1, 2016.

Henry, P.J., and Curtis D. Hardin. 2006. "The Contact Hypothesis Revisited." *Psychological Science* 17(10):862–68.

———, and Christine Reyna. 2007. "Value Judgments: The Impact of Perceived Value Violations on American Political Attitudes." *Political Psychology* 28(3):273–98.

Herek, Gregory M. 1988. "Heterosexuals' Attitudes toward Lesbians and Gay Men: Correlates and Gender Differences." *Journal of Sex Research* 25:451–77.

———. 2006. "Legal Recognition of Same-Sex Relationships in the United States: A Social Science Perspective." *American Psychologist* 61(6):607–21.

———, and Eric K. Glunt. 1993. "Interpersonal Contact and Heterosexuals' Attitudes toward Gay Men: Results from a National Survey." *Journal of Sex Research* 30:239–44.

Hicks, Gary R., and Tien-Tsung Lee. 2006. "Public Attitudes toward Gays and Lesbians: Trends and Predictors." *Journal of Homosexuality* 51(2):57–77.

Hochschild, Arlie. 1979. "Emotion Work, Feeling Rules, and Social Structure." *American Journal of Sociology* 85(3):551–75.

Hubbard, Phil. 2013. "Kissing Is Not a Universal Right: Sexuality, Law, and the Scales of Citizenship." *Geoforum* 49:224–32.

Ihlanfeldt, Keith R., and Benjamin P. Scafidi. 2002. "The Neighbourhood Contact Hypothesis: Evidence from the Multicity Study of Urban Inequality." *Urban Studies* 39(4):619–41.

James, Scott. 2017. "There Goes the Gayborhood." *New York Times* June 21.

Jenness, Valerie, and Ryken Grattet. 2001. *Making Hate a Crime: From Social Movement to Law Enforcement.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Jerolmack, Colin, and Shamus Khan. 2014. "Talk Is Cheap: Ethnography and the Attitudinal Fallacy." *Sociological Methods and Research* 43(2):178–209.

Jewell, Lisa Margaret, and Melanie Ann Morrison. 2012. "Making Sense of Homonegativity: Heterosexual Men and Women's Understanding of Their Own Prejudice and Discrimination toward Gay Men." *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 9(4):351–70.

Kanai, Juan Miguel, and Kai Kenttamaa-Squires. 2015. "Remaking South Beach: Metropolitan Gayborhood Rrajectories under Homonormative Entrepreneurialism." *Urban Geography* 36(3):385–402.

Knopp, Lawrence. 1990. "Some Theoretical Implications of Gay Involvement in an Urban Land Market." *Political Geography Quarterly* 9(4):337–52.

Lauria, Mickey, and Lawrence Knopp. 1985. "Toward an Analysis of the Role of Gay Communities in the Urban Renaissance." *Urban Geography* 6(2):152–69.

Lee, Barrett A., Chad R. Farrell, and Bruce G. Link. 2004. "Revisiting the Contact Hypothesis: The Case of Public Exposure to Homelessness." *American Sociological Review* 69(1):40–63.

Lee, Jennifer. 2000. "The Salience of Race in Everyday Life: Black Customers' Shopping Experiences in Black and White Neighborhoods." *Work and Occupations* 27(3):353–76.

Lefebvre, Henri. 1991 [1974]. *The Production of Space.* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Leigh Brown, Patricia. 2007. "Gay Enclaves Face Prospect of Being Passé" *New York Times* October 24. Retrieved 7 December, 2011 (http://www.nytimes.com/2007/10/30/us/30gay.html).

Lloyd, Richard. 2006. *Neo-Bohemia: Art and Commerce in the Postindustrial City.* New York: Routledge.

Loftus, Jeni. 2001. "America's Liberalization in Attitudes toward Homosexuality, 1973–1998." *American Sociological Review* 66:762–82.

Lottes, Ilsa L., and Eric Anthony Grollman. 2010. "Conceptualization and Assessment of Homonegativity." *International Journal of Sexual Health* 22(4):219–33.

Matejskova, Tatiana, and Helga Leitner. 2011. "Urban Encounters with Difference: The Contact Hypothesis and Immigrant Integration Projects in Eastern Berlin." *Social and Cultural Geography* 12(7):717–41.

McCormack, Mark. 2012. *The Declining Significance of Homophobia.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Mead, George Herbert. 1934. *Mind, Self, and Society from the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Miles, Eleanor, and Richard J. Crisp. 2014. "A Meta-Analytic Test of the Imagined Contact Hypothesis." *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations* 17(1):3–26.

Miles, Matthew B., and A. Michael Huberman. 1994. *Qualitative Data Analysis.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Monto, Martin A., and Jessica Supinski. 2014. "Discomfort with Homosexuality: A New Measure Captures Differences in Attitudes toward Gay Men and Lesbians." *Journal of Homosexuality* 61(6):899–916.

Moon, Dawne. 2008. "Culture and the Sociology of Sexuality: It's Only Natural?" *Annual Review of Sociology* 619:183–205.

Moskowitz, Peter. 2015. "Why You Should Stop Waving the Rainbow Flag on Facebook." *Washington Post* (July 2) (http://www.washingtonpost.com/posteverything/wp/2015/07/02/why-you-should-stop-waving-the-rainbow-flag-on-facebook/). Accessed May 1, 2016.

Murdoch, Joyce, and Deb Price. 2001. *Courting Justice: Gay Men and Lesbians V. The Supreme Court.* New York: Basic Books.

Nash, Catherine J. 2013. "The Age of the 'Post-Mo'? Toronto's Gay Village and a New Generation." *Geoforum* 49:243–52.

———, and Andrew Gorman-Murray. 2014. "LGBT Neighbourhoods and 'New Mobilities': Towards Understanding Transformations in Sexual and Gendered Landscapes." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 38(3):756–72.

NeJaime, Douglas. 2016. "Marriage Equality and the New Parenthood." *Harvard Law Review* 129(5):1185–266.

Orne, Jason. 2017. *Boystown: Sex and Community in Chicago.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Page, Benjamin I., and Robert Y. Shapiro. 1992. *The Rational Public: Fifty Years of Trends in Americans' Policy Preferences.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Park, Robert E. 1950. *Race and Culture (Collected Writings).* New York: Free Press.

———, and Ernest W. Burgess, eds. 1925. *The City: Suggestions for Investigation of Human Behavior in the Urban Environment.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Plugge-Foust, Carol, and George Strickland. 2000. "Homophobia, Irrationality, and Christian Ideology: Does a Relationship Exist?" *Journal of Sex Education and Therapy* 25(4):240–44.

Putnam, Robert D. 2000. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community.* New York: Simon and Schuster.

Raiz, Lisa. 2006. "College Students' Support of Rights for Members of the Gay Community." *Journal of Poverty* 10(2):53–76.

Rich, Meghan Ashlin. 2009. "'It Depends on How You Define Integrated': Neighborhood Boundaries and Racial Integration in a Baltimore Neighborhood." *Sociological Forum* 24(4):828–53.

Rosenfeld, Bryn, Kosuke Imai, and Jacob N. Shapiro. 2016. "An Empirical Validation Study of Popular Survey Methodologies for Sensitive Questions." *American Journal of Political Science* 60(3):783–802.

Rubin, Gayle S. 1993. "Thinking Sex: Notes for a Radical Theory of the Politics of Sexuality." Pp. 3–44 in *The Lesbian and Gay Studies Reader*, edited by Henry Abelove, Michele Aina Barale, and David M. Halperin. New York: Routledge.

Rushbrook, Dereka. 2002. "Cities, Queer Space, and the Cosmopolitan Tourist." *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 8(1-2):183–206.

Ruting, Brad. 2008. "Economic Transformations of Gay Urban Spaces: Revisiting Collins' Evolutionary Gay District Model." *Australian Geographer* 39(3):259–69.

Ryan, Gery W., and H. Russell Bernard. 2003. "Techniques to Identify Themes." *Field Methods* 15(1):85–109.

Saad, Lydia. 2010. "Americans' Acceptance of Gay Relations Crosses 50% Threshold." (http://www.gallup.com/poll/135764/americans-acceptance-gay-relations-crosses-threshold.aspx). Accessed May 1, 2016.

Sampson, Robert J. 2012. *Great American City: Chicago and the Enduring Neighborhood Effect*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Sapir, Edward. 1929. "The Status of Linguistics as a Science." *Language* 5(4):207–14.

Savin-Williams, Ritch C. 2005. *The New Gay Teenager*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Schilt, Kristen, and Laurel Westbrook. 2009. "Doing Gender, Doing Heteronormativity: 'Gender Normals,' Transgender People, and the Social Maintenance of Heterosexuality." *Gender & Society* 23(4):440–64.

Seidman, Steven. 2002. *Beyond the Closet: The Transformation of Gay and Lesbian Life*. New York: Routledge.

Sherif, Muzafer. 1956. "Experiments in Group Conflict." *Scientific American* 193:420–29.

Sherrill, Kenneth, and Alan S. Yang. 2000. "From Outlaws to in-Laws: Anti-Gay Attitudes Thaw." *Public Perspective* 11(1):20–31.

Smith, Sara J., Amber M. Axelton, and Donald A. Saucier. 2009. "The Effects of Contact on Sexual Prejudice: A Meta-Analysis." *Sex Roles* 61(3):178–91.

Spring, Amy L. 2013. "Declining Segregation of Same-Sex Partners: Evidence from Census 2000 and 2010." *Population Research and Policy Review* 32(5):687–716.

Stein, Robert M., Stephanie Shirley Post, and Allison L. Rinden. 2000. "Reconciling Context and Contact Effects on Racial Attitudes." *Political Research Quarterly* 53(2):285–303.

Stewart-Winter, Timothy. 2016. *Queer Clout: Chicago and the Rise of Gay Politics*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Stokes, Zeke. 2015. *Accelerating Acceptance*. New York: GLAAD.

Sullivan, Andrew. 1996. *Virtually Normal: An Argument about Homosexuality*. New York: Vintage.

Suter, W. Newton. 2012. *Introduction to Educational Research*. New York: Sage.

Suttles, Gerald D. 1984. "The Cumulative Texture of Local Urban Culture." *American Journal of Sociology* 90(2):283–304.

Swidler, Ann. 2008. "Comment on Stephen Vaisey's 'Socrates, Skinner and Aristotle: Three Ways of Thinking about Culture in Action'." *Sociological Forum* 23(3):614–18.

Teunis, Niels, and Gilbert H. Herdt, eds. 2007. *Sexual Inequalities and Social Justice*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Twenge, Jean M., Nathan T. Carter, and W. Keith Campbell. 2015. "Time Period, Generational, and Age Differences in Tolerance for Controversial Beliefs and Lifestyles in the United States." *Social Forces* 94(1):379–99. https://doi.org/0.1093/sf/sov050.1972-2012

Vaisey, Steven. 2008. "Socrates, Skinner, and Aristotle: Three Ways of Thinking about Culture in Action." *Sociological Forum* 23(3):603–13.

———. 2009. "Motivation and Justification: A Dual-Process Model of Culture in Action." *American Journal of Sociology* 114(6):1675–715.

Wacquant, Loic. 2008. "Ghettos and Anti-Ghettos: An Anatomy of the New Urban Poverty." *Thesis Eleven* 94(1):113–18.

Walters, Suzanna Danuta. 2001. *All the Rage: The Story of Gay Visibility in America*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

———. 2014. *The Tolerance Trap*. New York: New York University Press.

Warner, Michael. 1991. "Introduction: Fear of a Queer Planet." *Social Text* 29(4):3–17.

Werum, Regina, and Bill Winders. 2001. "Who's 'In' and Who's 'Out': State Fragmentation and the Struggle over Gay Rights, 1974–1999." *Social Problems* 48(3):386–410.

West, Candace, and Don H. Zimmerman. 1987. "Doing Gender." *Gender & Society* 1(2):125–51.

Westbrook, Laurel, and Aliya Saperstein. 2015. "New Categories Are Not Enough: Rethinking the Measurement of Sex and Gender in Social Surveys." *Gender & Society* 29(4):534–60.

Whorf, Benjamin, and John B. Carroll, eds. 1956. *Language, Thought, and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Whorf, Benjamin Lee. 1940. "Science and Linguistics." *Technology Review* 42(6):229–31.

Wilcox, Clyde, and Robin Wolpert. 2000. "Gay Rights in the Public Sphere: Public Opinion on Gay and Lesbian Equality." Pp. 409–32 in *The Politics of Gay Rights*, edited by Craig A. Rimmerman, Kenneth Wald, and Clyde Wilcox. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Wood, Peter B., and John P. Bartkowski. 2004. "Attribution Style and Public Policy Attitudes toward Gay Rights." *Social Science Quarterly* 85(1):58–74.

Yang, Alan S. 1997. "Trends: Attitudes toward Homosexuality." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 61(3):477–507.

Zhang, Yan, and Barbara M. Wildemuth. 2009. "Qualitative Analysis of Content." Pp. 308–19 in *Applications of Social Research Methods to Questions in Information and Library Science*, edited by Barbara M. Wildemuth. Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited.

Zukin, Sharon. 1995. *The Cultures of Cities.* Oxford, UK: Blackwell.