TO V OR NOT TO V:
NARRATIVES, NETWORKS, AND CONTINGENCIES OF VEGANISM

A Dissertation
Submitted to
the Temple University Graduate Board

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

---

by
Corey Waters
December 2017

Examining Committee Members:

Pablo Vila, Advisory Chair, Department of Sociology
Sherri Grasmuck, Department of Sociology
Shanyang Zhao, Department of Sociology
Patricia Melzer, External Member, Department of French, German, Italian & Slavic

ABSTRACT

This study is an examination of mobilization processes, with a particular focus on how people come to contemplate and ultimately embrace or reject veganism. It is a response to social movements scholarship that has called for examinations of how identity interacts with mobilization. Engaging the narratives of 34 interview participants who interacted with vegan advocacy networks in Greater Philadelphia, the study accounts for how prospective vegans negotiate forces, such as social networks and ties, that activate or hinder their mobilization; and for how they prioritize veganism amid competing priorities. Among other manners, participants came to contemplate the prospect of becoming vegan upon recognizing veganism as congruent with their other priorities. Participants who became vegan were more likely than participants who did not to prioritize altruism and to seek information that motivated and empowered them. Rather than prioritize their veganism over competing priorities, the vegans more often sought to harmonize their veganism with competing priorities. The study also measures the capacity of people from socioeconomically and racially contrasting neighborhoods in Philadelphia to engage in a behavior and a movement such as veganism. Results from a sample of 335 survey participants suggest that people from impoverished neighborhoods may be less capable because they are less likely to know people who practice veganism. The study's findings suggest that participation in movements is contingent on how prospective participants prioritize, on the incentives with which they contemplate participation, and on their capacity to participate.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ABSTRACT ii

LIST OF TABLES iv

CHAPTER

1. INTRODUCTION 1

2. SCHOLARSHIP 15

3. METHODOLOGY 46

4. CONTEMPLATING 66

5. DIVERGENCE 102

6. PRIORITIZING 138

7. ACCESS 176

8. CONCLUSION 195

REFERENCES 203

APPENDIX 215

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Support of Social Networks and Ties.....152
2. Support of Social Networks and Ties, Excluding Indifferent and Not Aware....153
3. For you, how easy or difficult is obtaining fresh produce (fruit and vegetables)?.....182
4. Do you drive?.....184
5. How safe from crime do you consider your neighborhood to be?.....184
6. How many servings of fruit and vegetables did you eat yesterday (e.g., one medium apple, a handful of broccoli, or a cup of carrots)?.....186
7. Have you ever heard of the word vegan?..... 190
8. Do you know people who are vegan, meaning they never eat meat, fish, seafood, poultry, dairy, eggs, or honey?.....191

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Kiara didn't know anyone who practiced veganism when she moved to Philadelphia for graduate school. There, in 2009, she befriended Brandon and Brian, two colleagues in her graduate program, intellectuals who, as with her, engaged in critical thinking and theorized social justice. And, in a city known for its cheesesteak, they were vegan, meaning that they did not consume animals or animal products. While Kiara understood and respected their veganism, she initially thought that they were "going overboard." As she continued to dine out with them on a regular basis, however, their veganism gradually made more sense to her. Kiara observed how Brandon and Brian were "doing something good and healthy and ethically sound"; that their veganism was "practical"; that interacting with them in encounters with food amid their dietary restrictions was effortless; and that, while they were "unapologetic" about their veganism, they never sought to impose it on her. She started eating vegan foods beyond her traditional range of vegetables, grains, legumes, and fruit. She started reading about veganism—"anything she could get her hands on." And, in 2011, she started reducing in a gradual manner her consumption of animals. She also started dating Brandon. More and more, they were eating together, and she wanted for them to dine out at establishments where he could enjoy a delicious vegan meal and not just have a salad. So they patronized Philadelphia's vegan and vegan-friendly restaurants, places like Govinda's, where she recalls the first time she enjoyed a "huge" vegan cinnamon roll. They started cooking together when they started living together. Kiara banned animal-

based food from the house and even started to contemplate the prospect of becoming vegan. She asked questions, and Brandon answered them. While he was a "wonderful resource," and while she did not need to be convinced of the merits of veganism, she sought "outside insight" that could aid her in the process.

As a vegan advocate, Brandon had interacted with a Philadelphia-based organization called Peace Advocacy Network (PAN). Every year since 2010, PAN has conducted a Philadelphia-based vegan pledge campaign. People pledge to practice veganism for four weeks, and PAN provides mentorship and network support with the objective that pledges will permanently practice veganism. Through Brandon, Kiara learned about the pledge campaigns and, in January 2013, pledged to practice veganism. Through her pledge campaign, she found her desired "outside insight." She found an "open space to talk about concerns and cooking." At pledge gatherings, she learned "practical things," such as how to veganize her "comfort foods," "how to cook tempeh well," and where to take her parents for a dining experience that would be comfortable for them. She utilized the PAN guide to vegan and non-vegan food ingredients. She utilized her pledge mentor Jessica, who responded to her concerns by giving to her a book on vegan substitutions and by linking her to narratives of people negotiating family, religion, race, and veganism. Perhaps most importantly, Kiara encountered a mechanism, a pledge, that activated her veganism and prompted her to be accountable for her consumption behaviors. As Kiara recalled, "The vegan pledge was just a moment for me to say, 'I'm going to have to really consider this seriously. And I did.'"

Kiara went vegan; that is, she became a vegan. Through veganism, she became more intentional about her consumption habits, more conscious about her relationship with

food, and more creative with her food preparation. She incorporated into her diet fresh produce she had never cooked or eaten and realized that she liked vegan sweets just as much as non-vegan sweets. Through veganism, Kiara also started "seeing the world differently," her vision "a little more lucid" and her sensitivity to others heightened. "It's crazy just like walking down the street, looking at animals respond to things, thinking, 'Gosh, that dog's probably a little hot walking. Do you ever think that maybe he doesn't want to go for a run with you today while you are riding your bike in 98-degree weather?'" Her consideration for how nonhuman animals feel was rooted not only in exposure to veganism via Brandon, Brett, and the pledge campaign, but also in her experiences with physical pain. Kiara learned that, as with her, chickens suffer from arthritis. While she knew how her arthritis felt, she could not comprehend the arthritis experienced by chickens bred to be food. With their small legs and otherwise unnaturally large bodies, genetically modified to maximize profit for producers who breed them for food, these chickens are forced to stand on wire hour after hour, day after day. "I can't imagine standing up all day with my arthritis being at like a level 10," she said. "What poor existences!"

Kiara went vegan with support from Brandon, Brian, Jessica, and PAN more broadly. Even her non-vegan friends and work colleagues actively supported her veganism. For her birthday, one of her friends, aware that Kiara loves Rice Krispies Treats, colluded with Brandon to make vegan rice crispy treats for her. Her work colleagues similarly celebrated her birthday with vegan treats. She also went vegan with support from people she did not know. The author of the blog "black. female. christian. vegan." helped Kiara to make sense of her veganism as a woman of color and as a Christian.

Such support for Kiara's veganism has not been universal. Her family members interpret her veganism as an affront to their relationship with food and to their Christianity. For them, "meats and fried foods" are essential components of their social interactions, and the preparation of these foods for these interactions is a "labor of love." Kiara's sudden rejection of a highly valued cultural practice and product means that they "can't relate to [her] through food now." That they have attempted to do so since her pledge campaign suggests that they highly value this relationship. At a July 4th party hosted by her parents in her native Pittsburgh, her father prepared hot dogs, a food Kiara has historically loved. "I still salivate over hot dogs," she admitted. When she was by herself, meaning away from Brandon for a moment, her father asked her, "Baby girl, you sure you don't want this? I made these hot dogs just for you." She claims that her father, aware of her love for hot dogs, was attempting to exploit a weakness in the brief absence of Brandon, who her family believes "has poisoned her brain and forcefully converted her to veganism." Her family members also interpret her veganism as an "assault on Christianity." They cite the dominion principle, positing that a higher power "gave us dominion over animals" as a gift and that, as a Christian, she should be grateful for that gift. They also doubt the healthfulness of veganism. They believe that she has lost weight since pledging even though her weight is the same. "Veganism is overdetermining how they're even seeing me," she said. "They're seeing me differently." Her recent hip injury, a result of yoga, alarmed her mother, who pondered that her bones could be "too brittle" as a result of her veganism. Kiara informed her that the hip injury was muscular. Her mother sends text messages to her, expressing her wish that Kiara eat more and halt her veganism.

This fierce family resistance to her veganism is compounded by how strongly Kiara loves her family. She rejects the meats and the fried foods, but in doing so she does not want to "strain" her relationship with her family. This conflict between her valorization of veganism and her valorization of family has been emotionally taxing for her, even sending her to tears. Her veganism sparks conversation that she finds tiring and tension that she finds bothersome. Kiara could succumb to this conflict by halting her veganism or by avoiding her family, but she instead seeks to manage it, alleviate it, and ultimately eliminate it over time. On practicing veganism amid such powerful antagonism, she is "not at all deterred." Kiara strategically copes with this antagonism. She brings vegan food with her to Pittsburgh, and she subtly prevents veganism from "coming up in conversation with family." She claims that her veganism is an extension rather than a violation of her Christianity, but she avoids debating the intersection of veganism and Christianity with family. "Being good ambassadors for veganism" does not always require a "fight." "You're not going to win like that. [...] If I went into my house like a battering ram, [my family] would think that veganism really did something terrible to me."

How Kiara and other vegans remain undeterred by and strategically cope with antagonism, while others halt their prospective veganism amid antagonism, is one of multiple questions I have sought to answer in this study through conversations with people who have interacted with vegan advocacy networks. On a broader level, I ask, How do people come to engage in a behavior and a social movement such as veganism? In Kiara's isolated case, potential explanations abound. One potential explanation is social ties. Her relationships with Brandon and Brian activated her contemplation of veganism. Veganism was not the foundation of these relationships, but it became an enduring force through their

interactions, a force that prompted Kiara to examine her consumption behaviors and the prospect of going vegan. Brandon and Brian prompted Kiara to recognize veganism as congruent with ethical behavior, which she prioritizes in her life. Brandon and Brian practice veganism in large part because of their concern for nonhuman animals. The notion that veganism is ethical resonated with Kiara, who became more sensitive to the plight of nonhuman animals, a sensitivity that mobilized her. Brandon and Brian modeled veganism in a manner that mobilized her. Their demonstration of the practicality of veganism and their unostentatious yet unapologetic performance of veganism trumped and transformed her prior perception of veganism being a fringe practice. Veganism now made sense to her. Dining with Brandon and Brian activated Kiara's senses of sight, smell, and taste in the presence of particular vegan foods, which she enjoyed to the extent that she began incorporating them into meals she prepared. The taste of these foods convinced her that she could not only go vegan, but also enjoy veganism.

Another potential explanation for Kiara's veganism is how she exercised agency in her encounters with mobilizing forces such as social ties, discourses of ethics, modeling, and food. Kiara was influenced by Brandon and Brian, but she exercised agency in choosing to forge and maintain relationships with them; and in managing how they influenced her. They invoked her valorization of ethical behavior through their concern for nonhuman animals, but she chose to prioritize ethics. Brandon and Brian modeled veganism, but the effectiveness of their modeling was contingent on Kiara's assessment of this modeling. They effectively modeled veganism as practical because they satisfied her standard for practical, and she assessed practicality because she prioritized it in the context of her contemplation of veganism. Brandon and Brian exposed her to particular vegan

foods, but she assessed the taste of these foods and chose whether to incorporate them into meals she prepared. Kiara negotiated these forces with a particular incentive that spawned a stronger commitment to veganism. Her veganism was altruistic, fueled by her elevated concern for nonhuman animals. She accounted for the unimaginable pain experienced by chickens with arthritis and sought to halt her consumption of them. Kiara also sought information that motivated and empowered her to go vegan. She sought information through Brandon, through the pledge campaign, and through the intersectional blog that connected veganism with race, gender, and religion. These resources elevated her capacity to go vegan.

Another potential explanation for Kiara's veganism, and another exercise of agency, is her prioritization of veganism amid antagonistic forces. Other people may also become sensitized to the plight of nonhuman animals or recognize the practicality of veganism, but if they prioritize consuming their mother's non-vegan Thanksgiving meal over these concerns, they may be less likely to go vegan. Kiara prioritized veganism to the extent that she was willing to "offend" her family by practicing it. This did not mean that Kiara's family was not as important to her as her veganism, but rather that she refused to downgrade her veganism as a priority in favor of eating her father's hot dogs at a July 4th party, a form of consumption that had been a powerful expression of love for her father.

While revealing, Kiara's story is only one case. To assess these potential explanations for how Kiara and vegans come to contemplate and ultimately embrace veganism, while other people who contemplate veganism ultimately reject it, I have analyzed a sample of interviews with 34 people who have interacted with at least one of two particular vegan advocacy networks. Of these 34 interview participants, 33

contemplated the prospect of going vegan, and 21 went vegan. These participants encountered a series of mobilizing mechanisms, which I operationalize as forces that vaulted the salience of veganism in participants' lives and prompted them to consider veganism as a priority among other priorities. Participants assessed the salience of their prospective veganism relative to the salience of other priorities in particular encounters, in some cases constructing salience hierarchies on which some priorities trumped others (Stryker 1968). Whether they went vegan was contingent on how their prospective veganism ranked as a priority. Social ties mobilized Kiara because they vaulted veganism as a prospective priority. She managed this rise in salience, forging and maintaining her relationships with Brandon and Brian, asserting ethical behavior and altruism as priorities, seeking information, and ultimately assessing the prospect of going vegan. Her prospective veganism became salient amid competing priorities to the extent that she went vegan. Her veganism was not trumped by her family membership or her Christianity, though her veganism did not trump her family membership or her Christianity. Kiara continued to embrace her family and her religion as she embraced veganism, harmonizing these priorities rather than prioritizing them in hierarchical fashion.

Previous scholarship on social movements has found that the potential of an individual to participate in a particular movement increases if identifications of that individual are congruent with the collective identifications of that movement (McAdam and Paulsen 1993; Gecas 2000; Snow and McAdam 2000; Stryker 2000). For example, Doug McAdam and Ronelle Paulsen (1993:648, 659) found that "a strong subjective identification with a particular identity" was predictive of participation in the Mississippi Summer Freedom Project, a campaign that "brought hundreds of primarily white, northern

college students to Mississippi for all [...] or part of [...] the summer of 1964 to help staff 'Freedom Schools,' register black voters, and dramatize the continued denial of civil rights throughout the South." One applicant and eventual project participant recognized his Christianity as congruent with the project, writing, "If I'm to continue calling myself a Christian, I must act NOW to put my abstract conception of brotherhood into practice. All of us in the movement must join forces if the Summer Project is to succeed" (p. 656). Such congruence was more likely among project applicants who eventually participated in the project than among applicants who did not. In similar fashion, Kiara came to recognize her Christianity as congruent with veganism, and this congruence contributed to her mobilization.

Congruence of identifications between prospective participants and movements can be hindered, however. As Sheldon Stryker (2000:21, 31) acknowledges, "People have multiple commitments. [...] [I]dentities are potential competitors in producing behavioral choice." The Mississippi Summer Freedom Project applicant and Kiara act not just as Christians, but in accordance with countless identifications. McAdam and Paulsen (1993) argue that the applicant's participation in the project is contingent not only on his identification as a Christian, but also on the salience of his Christian identification relative to the salience of his other identifications in the context of the project. They cite Stryker's (1968) notion of identity salience.

> [I]dentities which comprise the self exist in a hierarchy of salience, such that other things equal one can expect behavioral products to the degree that a given identity ranks high in this hierarchy. The concept of identity salience may be defined as the probability, for a given person, of a given identity being invoked in a variety of situations. (P. 560)

The Christian applicant participates not just because he is Christian, but because his Christian identification is invoked by the project. In the context of the project, his Christian identification ranks highly on his salience hierarchy, perhaps trumping other identifications that would not mobilize him or that would hinder his participation. Because his Christian identification is salient in the context of the project, and because he recognizes it as congruent with his prospective identification as a project participant, his prospective identification as a project participant also becomes salient, perhaps trumping other identifications in the process. In similar fashion, Kiara's Christian identification was invoked by, among other forces, her exposure to veganism through Brandon and Brian. Because her Christian identification ranked highly on her salience hierarchy, and because she came to recognize it as congruent with veganism, her prospective veganism became a highly salient identification, salient to the extent that it was not trumped by other highly salient identifications, such as family member. Thus, the antagonism that Kiara encountered from her family did not prevent her from going vegan.

I have employed Stryker's notion of identity salience to analyze how people who come to contemplate veganism ultimately embrace or reject it. In doing so, I have employed the term priority and its verb prioritize instead of identity because priority is broader in scope and thus more analytically useful. While taste, for example, can be interlaced with an identification, as tasting soul food is interlaced with identifying as black in the United States, taste cannot always be reduced to identity. Amid competing priorities, including identifications, people rank taste not simply as an identification, but more broadly as a priority that trumps or is trumped by these competing priorities. I found that mobilizing mechanisms such as social networks and discourses vaulted the salience of

veganism by, among other manners, prompting participants to recognize veganism as congruent with their other priorities, activating emotions that were conducive to veganism, and enhancing their capacity to go vegan. I also found that participants facilitated this rise in salience by, among other manners, asserting priorities that they came to recognize as congruent with veganism, facilitating their engagement with mobilizing mechanisms, and assessing the prospect of going vegan.

While most mechanisms were not more likely to activate contemplation of veganism among participants who went vegan or among participants who did not, discourses of ethics were more likely to activate contemplation among the vegans, and discourses of healthfulness were more likely to activate contemplation among the non-vegans. Participants who were mobilized primarily by discourses of ethics were more likely to ultimately go vegan than to reject veganism, while participants who were mobilized primarily by discourses of healthfulness were more likely to ultimately reject veganism. I also found variation between the vegans and the non-vegans in the mentality with which they contemplated veganism. I operationalize mentality as the participant's incentive for contemplating veganism, and as the participant's attitude toward the prospect of going vegan. The vegans were more likely than the non-vegans to prioritize altruism as they contemplated veganism, with nonhuman animals being primary beneficiaries of this altruism. Thus, the salience of altruism was correlated with the salience of veganism. In addition, the vegans were more likely to seek information that motivated and empowered them to go vegan and more likely to narrate their veganism as inevitable. In contrast, the non-vegans expressed more passivity and less intentionality as they narrated their contemplation of veganism. Amid antagonistic forces and competing priorities, such as

family and partners, both the non-vegans and the vegans downgraded veganism as a priority in particular encounters. The vegans, of course, also asserted their veganism amid competing priorities. While they prioritized their veganism over these other priorities in particular encounters, they more often sought to harmonize their veganism with their other priorities in nonhierarchical fashion. As Stryker acknowledges, "Concurrently invoked, different identities do not necessarily call for incompatible behavior."

Going vegan is a choice, but also a capability; that is, going vegan requires the capacity to do so. Thus, while accounting for how people come to contemplate and ultimately embrace or reject veganism, I have sought to account for the capacity of people, including people who have not necessarily contemplated veganism, to engage in a behavior and a movement such as veganism. Employing the Martha C. Nussbaum (2011:x) notion of capability, which she defines as what people are "able to do and to be," I asked, How are people able to go and be vegan? The narratives of my interview participants reveal that social networks and ties are prominent among the forces that influence the capacity of people to go vegan. Other sources have argued that veganism is inaccessible to poor populations because these populations are more likely to reside in food deserts and because vegan food is relatively expensive (Loyd-Paige 2010; Williams-Forson 2010; Wrenn 2011). Exploring the legitimacy of these arguments, and the roots of this potential inequality in access, I conducted a survey to measure the capacity of populations in socioeconomically and racially contrasting neighborhoods in Philadelphia to engage in a behavior such as veganism. In two of the most and two of the least impoverished census tracts in the city, I measured the capacity of local residents to obtain fresh vegan produce, meaning fresh fruit and fresh vegetables; measured the prevalence of the terms vegan and

vegetarian in their lives and networks; and learned whether they knew vegans and vegetarians.

I found that, while survey participants in the affluent census tracts were more likely than their impoverished counterparts to report that obtaining fresh vegan produce was easy, most participants in the impoverished census tracts still reported that obtaining fresh vegan produce was easy. I also found a small disparity in whether participants had encountered the term vegan, with participants in the affluent census tracts more likely to have encountered the term. I found a larger disparity in whether participants knew vegans and vegetarians, with participants in the affluent census tracts more likely to know vegans and vegetarians. This disparity suggests that poor populations may be less capable of engaging in a behavior such as veganism because they are less likely to know people who do so.

How people come to participate in social movements matters because the process reveals how they become agents of challenge and change; because it reveals their capacity to act on their interests and needs amid structural constraints; and because it reveals how advocates of social change can effectively mobilize and perhaps empower people to participate in their movement. Veganism is an epistemologically productive movement to study mobilization and participation for at least two reasons. First, people who practice veganism do so not just in the context of advocacy or protest, but in every moment of their lives. Because participation is constant, data on how these people negotiate forces that are conducive or antagonistic to participation, and on how they prioritize as they choose whether to participate, are especially rich. Second, employing veganism, a consumption-based movement, to study mobilization and participation prompts an analysis of the capacity of people to choose to elude dominant dietary practices and consumption

behaviors that have been deemed unhealthful (e.g., Marsh, Zeuschner, and Saunders 2012), environmentally destructive (e.g., Steinfeld et al. 2006), and antithetical to the rights of human and nonhuman animals (e.g., Nibert 2002). The implications of veganism, its acceptance, and its rejection are meaningful to all beings, both human and nonhuman, and to the environment we inhabit. To study veganism is to account for how we interact with each other and with the planet.

CHAPTER 2

SCHOLARSHIP

The vast majority of the United States population consumes animals as food (Newport 2012; Stahler 2012). The Vegetarian Resource Group found that a mere 4 percent of the adult population, defined as 18 years old and older, practices vegetarianism, defined as "never eat[ing] meat, fish, seafood, or poultry"; and that 1 percent of the population, included in this vegetarian category, practices veganism, defined as "never eat[ing] meat, fish, seafood, poultry, dairy, or eggs" (Stahler 2012). That the Vegetarian Resource Group excluded honey, a non-vegan product, from this definition suggests that this 1 percent figure for veganism may be too high. Gallup's Consumption Habits survey, which did not impose definitions of vegetarianism and veganism, found that 5 percent of the population practices vegetarianism, while an additional 2 percent practices veganism (Newport 2012). With more than 90 percent of the population consuming animals as food, vegans subvert a cultural norm by practicing veganism.

Vegetarianism is largely rooted in the ahimsa concept, a basic tenet of Hindu, Jain, and Buddhist scriptures advocating "noninjury to living creatures" (Haverstock and Forgays 2012:1030; Phillips 2010). Vegetarianism in the United States has been traced back to 1817, when William Metcalfe departed the United Kingdom for Philadelphia and founded the Bible Christian Church (Maurer 2002). In 1830, Metcalfe's church hired Sylvester Graham as a "temperance lecturer" (p. 25). A student of medicine, Graham considered all "stimulation," including alcohol, sex, coffee, tea, spices, and meat, to be "health threatening." His rejection of this stimulation emerged in an era of

industrialization, an era during which "the marketplace assumed primary importance," as "hearth and home" were relegated to a "secondary role." According to Graham, this shift toward industrialization was "devastating to the growth and stability of moral character." His call to reject marketplace-induced stimulation initiated a vegetarianism movement "that reached far beyond religious congregations, turning the sacred aspects of the Bible Christian Church philosophy into a secular morality."

An animal welfare movement concerned more with protecting nonhuman animals than with advocating for their rights emerged later in the nineteenth century with the 1866 founding of the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. However, this movement and the animal rights movement that emerged later have not necessarily been coterminous with vegetarianism in the United States (Plous 1991; Krizmanic 1992; Maurer 2002). In a 1990 survey, S. Plous (1991) found that 37 percent of animal rights activists did not practice vegetarianism or veganism, and only 18 percent practiced veganism. In a complementary survey two years later, Judy Krizmanic (1992) found that 85 percent of vegetarians were not primarily motivated by animal rights. In contrast, vegetarians in the United Kingdom have been "historically and contemporarily [...] more concerned with animal rights and ethics" (Maurer 2002:22). Thus, animal rights and vegetarianism have been more coterminous in the United Kingdom.

As early as 1909, when the Vegetarian Society in the United Kingdom began to publish its journal, *The Vegetarian Messenger and Health Review* (TVMHR), vegetarian advocates questioned the consumption of all animal products, including dairy and eggs (Leneman 1999). By 1912, C.P. Newcombe, the editor of the journal, acknowledged the prevalence of "two classes of vegetarians: those who use eggs and milk (and their products,

butter and cheese) and those who do not" (p. 221). In 1944, despite regular "talks and cookery demonstrations [...] on vegetarianism without dairy products," the Vegetarian Society rejected a request to permanently establish a section on this new form of vegetarianism in TVMHR. In November 1944, society member Donald Watson responded by publishing an independent newsletter through which he coined the term vegan. In the process, he formed The Vegan Society.

A comparable national organization advocating veganism in the United States first surfaced in 1960, when H. Jay Dinshah founded the American Vegan Society (Maurer 2002). During the 1960s and 1970s, the presence of veganism and vegetarianism expanded in the United States with the emergence of a hippie counterculture, which "moved people to consider the political implications of their food choices and to return to a more natural lifestyle" (p. 35); and with the "natural foods rage," which "led to a proliferation of health food stores and natural food co-ops" (p. 60). Since the 1990s, a contingent of physicians and dietitians have advocated veganism (e.g., Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine 2012). The Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine has communicated the health risks of consuming dairy products and established the "*New* Four Food Groups": vegetables, grains, legumes, and fruit. In 2009, the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics claimed that "vegetarian diets, including total vegetarian or vegan diets, are healthful, nutritionally adequate, and may provide health benefits in the prevention and treatment of certain diseases" (Craig and Mangels 2009:1266). The presence of veganism has also expanded via celebrities who communicate their practice of veganism (Haupt 2012).

During the 1970s, philosophers such as Peter Singer and Tom Regan raised the notion that nonhuman animals have rights, positing that "human and nonhuman creatures

have an inherent value that cannot be measured hierarchically" (Maurer 2002:72). An institutionalized animal rights movement emerged and drastically expanded during the 1980s (Rowan 1989). People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA), the largest animal advocacy group in the United States, expanded its membership from less than 100 in 1980 to more than 250,000 by 1989, while The Humane Society of the United States increased from 35,000 members in 1978 to more than 500,000 in 1988. That only 18 percent of animal rights activists were practicing veganism in 1990 suggests that an expanded presence for animal rights has not necessarily resulted in an expanded presence for veganism.

This division, at least in the United States, may be rooted in the prevalence of the humane myth, which is a discourse that has been framed as antagonistic to veganism (Francione and Garner 2010). According to Gary L. Francione, the humane myth is perpetuated by consumers who are concerned with the humane treatment of nonhuman animals, but who continue to treat these animals as property to be consumed. These consumers continue to consume animals, but want for the animals they consume to be treated humanely. Ultimately they perpetuate a myth that humane treatment is compatible with relegating animals to property status. Francione identifies two consequences of the humane myth. First, subscribers to the myth advocate animal welfare regulation more than or instead of the notion that nonhuman animals have rights, such as the right to not be an economic commodity, and the right to not be food. Second, satisfying their standard for humane treatment encourages and permits them "to become more comfortable with animal exploitation," a comfort that "perpetuates and [that] may even increase the use of animals" (p. x). Francione cites the marketing strategy of Strauss Brands Incorporated, a meat

processor that has sought "to increase veal consumption by allowing people to 'fully enjoy veal with the satisfaction of knowing that veal calves are raised in a humane manner'" (p. 2). Consumer investment in this satisfaction suggests that the humane myth conflicts with veganism.

Leah Leneman's (1999) content analysis of TVMHR and documentation of the tension between the two classes of vegetarians reveals antagonism that persisted in the United Kingdom during the early twentieth century. Most of the TVMHR contributors who were lacto-vegetarians and/or ovo-vegetarians, meaning consumers of dairy products and/or eggs, respectively, recognized that such consumption was unethical. However, these lacto-vegetarians and ovo-vegetarians were confronted with forces that were antagonistic to the more ethical class of vegetarianism. In 1935, the Vegetarian Society stated that "lacto-vegetarians, on the whole, do not defend the practice of consuming [...] dairy products except on the ground of expediency" (p. 226). In a 1943 letter, J.R. Clark, a lacto-ovo-vegetarian, admitted that "[there was] no moral justification whatever for the use of dairy [products]." He then argued, in Leneman's words, that "it was a challenge to reconcile this position with living in the real world." Leneman explained,

> Clark and his wife were keen on walking, cycling, and travelling to different parts of the country by train or—in peacetime—by car. Trying to find dairy-free products in villages without a health food shop, when milk was added to all vegetable margarine and even to some bread, was a nightmare.

Among the antagonistic forces that Clark encountered in his attempt to eschew his consumption of dairy products and eggs was his desire to travel, an activity that is not universally conducive to the more ethical class of vegetarianism; his relationship with a wife who also desired and perhaps demanded this activity; and the lack of dairy-free products in particular places. His desire to travel and his relationship with his wife were

antagonistic forces that evolved into priorities with which his prospective practice of the more ethical form of vegetarianism competed for salience. Did his desire to travel trump his desire to advance his vegetarianism? Accounting for the lack of dairy-free products in particular places, how do choice and capability interact in this context? Lacking access to expanded narratives, which I have provided in this study, we cannot know.

Identity and Mobilization

How do mobilization theories explain how an individual such as Clark comes to contemplate and ultimately embrace or reject veganism? Since the 1970s, resource mobilization theory and the political process model have been two of the most prominent theoretical frameworks employed to explain mobilization (McCarthy and Zald 2001; Meyer 2004). Resource mobilization theory posits that mobilization and the success of a social movement are influenced not simply by grievances, but also by a prospective participant's or a group's access to necessary resources (McCarthy and Zald 2001); and the political process model posits that mobilization and the success of a movement are influenced by the prevalence and favorability of political opportunities (Meyer 2004). These frameworks have "focused [...] on the structural shifts that [give] collective actors the resources [and the opportunities] to act collectively" (Polletta and Jasper 2001:284), but, as critics have noted (Polletta and Jasper 2001; Davis 2002; Haenfler, Johnson, and Jones 2012), these frameworks have not adequately accounted for how mobilization interacts with identity. Francesca Polletta and James M. Jasper (2001:285) define collective identity as "an individual's cognitive, moral, and emotional connection with a broader community, category, practice, or institution." For Polletta and Jasper, mobilization is contingent not only on access to necessary resources and on the prevalence

of political opportunities, but also on the extent to which an individual "[connects] with a broader community, category, practice, or institution." This argument that identity matters in this context is empirically supported (McAdam and Paulsen 1993; Gecas 2000; McDonald 2000; Snow and McAdam 2000; Stryker 2000; Polletta and Jasper 2001; Myers 2008; Haverstock and Forgays 2012; Jasper 2014; Brouwer and Mosack 2015).

Previous scholarship on social movements has found, for example, that "a strong subjective identification with a particular identity" that is congruent with a movement's collective identity increases the likelihood of mobilization (McAdam and Paulsen 1993:659). As Sheldon Stryker (2000:21) explains, however, "identities are potential competitors in producing behavioral choice." As already discussed, Stryker (1968:560) posits that people rank identifications in a hierarchy of salience, "such that other things equal one can expect behavioral products to the degree that a given identity ranks high in this hierarchy." But how does an identification such as vegan—and a priority such as veganism—emerge on a salience hierarchy? What are the forces that prompt this emergence? How do people negotiate these forces and assess salience? How do people negotiate competing identifications and priorities? While previous scholarship provides answers to these questions, I have sought to provide a comprehensive examination of how prospective participants of a movement negotiate mobilizing mechanisms and competing priorities, and of how they prioritize their prospective participation in doing so.

Among the most prominent mechanisms that mobilize people to participate in movements are social networks and ties (McAdam 1986; McAdam and Paulsen 1993; MacNair 1998; Cialdini 2003; Christakis and Fowler 2008; 2009; Corrigall-Brown 2012; Haverstock and Forgays 2012; Lewis 2012; The Humane League 2014). Additional

scholarship has addressed the mobilizing power of mechanisms that both interact with and transcend networks and ties (Rozin, Markwith, and Stoess 1997; McDonald 2000; Snow and McAdam 2000; McAdam, Tarrow, and Tilly 2001; Smilde 2005; Cherry 2006; 2015; Risley 2012). If "identities are potential competitors in producing behavioral choice" (Stryker 2000:21), particular identities of prospective vegans may compete with their prospective veganism. Previous scholarship has found antagonism to veganism in the form of networks and ties, including family, partners, and coworkers (Merriman 2010; Hirschler 2011; Asher et al. 2014; The Humane League 2014); in the form of limited capabilities, such as weak food preparation skills and a lack of vegan options in food outlets (Haverstock and Forgays 2012; Schosler, de Boer, and Boersema 2012; Asher et al. 2014); in the form of race- and gender-based discourses that frame veganism and vegetarianism as racial colonization, as threatening to hegemonic masculinities, and as threatening to women's health (Adams [1990] 2010; Herzog 2007; Danielle 2010; Harper 2010a; 2010b; Merriman 2010); and in the form of carnism, a belief system that renders unquestioned the consumption of animals (Joy 2010). Previous scholarship has recognized people as active agents who negotiate the forces to which they are subjected (Perinbanayagam 2000; de Fina, Schiffrin, and Bamberg 2006; Jasper 2012). Prospective participants of a movement exercise agency in managing their priorities and in choosing whether to participate. I have sought to account for these processes in this study.

Amanda M. Brouwer and Katie E. Mosack (2015) display a link between identity and behavior change in an experimental study on the food consumption behaviors of female college students. Brouwer and Mosack recorded the food consumption behaviors of women who had been randomly assigned to one of three conditions: control, education, and

education and self-as-doer activity. The education group was prompted to read information about healthful eating, while the education and self-as-doer group was prompted to read the same information, "to construct six goals related to healthy eating behaviors," and to create "special 'doer' phrases," such as "fruit eater," "using the '-er' suffix" (p. 641). The control group was not prompted to perform any of these tasks. Brouwer and Mosack (p. 638) found that the self-as-doer participants "ate more healthy foods" than did the education and control participants, and that they "maintained overall healthy eating behaviors while education and control participants decreased these behaviors over the six-week period" of the experiment. The self-as-doer participants "reported how the exercise of thinking of themselves as 'doers' motivated them to make different health behavior choices" (p. 648). Identifications such as "fruit eater" and "healthy eater" spawned an elevated commitment to the behaviors that defined these identifications. Thus, fruit eaters elevated their commitment to eating fruit because they viewed the behavior as part of who they were. Katie Haverstock and Deborah Kirby Forgays (2012) display a similar link in their survey of current and former vegans and vegetarians. The current vegans and vegetarians expressed more agreement than did the former vegans and vegetarians with the statement, "My eating pattern is a part of who I am/self identity" (p. 1033). As with the self-as-doer participants in the Brouwer and Mosack study, the current vegans and vegetarians in the Haverstock and Forgays study elevated their commitment because they viewed the behavior as part of who they were.

Viktor Gecas (2000) argues that such commitment in the context of a movement is elevated through the desire for self-affirmation. He identifies three self-motives: self-esteem, self-efficacy, and authenticity. The self-esteem motive "refers to the motivation to

view oneself favorably and to try to maintain or enhance a favorable evaluation of oneself"; self-efficacy is "the motivation to perceive oneself as a causal agent in one's environment, as efficacious and competent"; and authenticity "refers to the individual's strivings for meaning, coherence, and significance," involving "assessments of what is real and what is false with regard to oneself," assessments motivated by the desire to experience oneself "as meaningful and real" (p. 101). Employing these self-motives, Gecas suggests that prospective participants of movements are motivated to view themselves more favorably, to view themselves as causal agents, and to view themselves as real. According to this theory, prospective vegans may identify vegans as good people and then go vegan because they identify themselves as good people. Barbara McDonald (2000) found this desire for congruence between value-based identifications and behaviors through interviews with vegans. Most of her participants "claimed to have been 'animal people' all their lives," an identification that "they felt may have helped them become more receptive to information about animal cruelty," information that ultimately prompted them to go vegan (p. 6). These participants were mobilized by a series of mechanisms that invoked a salient identification, "animal people." Because they wanted to be authentic animal people, and because they recognized veganism as congruent with being authentic animal people, they went vegan. These animal people went vegan to benefit nonhuman animals, thereby engaging in altruism or "ally behavior" (Myers 2008:181). Daniel J. Myers (p. 168) defines allies as "movement adherents who are not direct beneficiaries of the movements they support and do not have expectations of such benefits." McDonald's participants complicated this definition because they became beneficiaries of their ally behavior as they gained self-affirmation through this ally behavior.

Such desire for self-affirmation is consistent with Jasper's (2014:28) argument that prospective participants of movements are mobilized by "moral emotions," which "involve feelings of approval and disapproval based on moral intuitions and principles, as well as the satisfaction we feel when we do the right (or wrong) thing, and when we feel the right (or wrong) thing, such as compassion for the unfortunate or indignation over injustice." According to this argument, McDonald's participants went vegan in their quest to be authentic, and embedded in this quest to be authentic was the quest to feel authentic. Coming to identify as authentic is a cognitive process, and, according to Jasper (p. 25), this cognitive process is "saturated with emotions." He claims that "emotions are forms of thinking" and that "thinking and feeling are built out of the same raw materials: neurological activity, biochemical products, muscle contractions, bodily sensitivity to what is going on around us, and so on." Thus, he employs the term "feeling-thinking" to explain how people come to identify with a movement (p. 27). McDonald's participants engaged in feeling-thinking. They felt more authentic by going vegan, and this feeling was fused with their cognitive contemplation of veganism.

David A. Snow and Doug McAdam (2000) link identity and mobilization through network analysis. They found that mobilization of recruitment targets is largely contingent on the congruence between the collective identifications of recruiting networks and the identifications of targets; and that this congruence is largely contingent on how networks frame their movement. Snow and McAdam examined a set of framing processes, including identity construction, identity amplification, and identity extension. Identity construction becomes "necessary in all cases [characterized by] an absence of correspondence between personal identities [of targets] and movement collective identities" (p. 49). Identity

construction involves negotiation between movement and target, and this negotiation necessarily results in compromise if the target ultimately participates in the movement. Snow and McAdam posit that "the personal identities of prospective participants have to be modified so as to enhance the congruence with the movement's collective identity." Among the modification processes identified by Snow and McAdam are identity amplification, which "involves the embellishment and strengthening of an existing identity that is congruent with a movement's collective identity but not sufficiently salient to ensure participation and activism"; and identity extension, which "involves the expansion of the situational relevance or pervasiveness of an individual's personal identity so that its reach is congruent with the movement's."

The Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) employed identity amplification and identity extension in its attempt to recruit volunteers to participate in the Mississippi Summer Freedom Project. The SNCC attempted to compel participation from different groups of college students "by heightening the salience of an existing identity (identity amplification) or by extending the behavioral requirements of an already salient individual identity (identity extension)" (p. 58). To mobilize the liberal Christian community, for example, the SNCC employed "religious appeals stressing the demands of the 'social gospel' in action." To motivate teachers, it represented the project as "a kind of 'domestic Peace Corps'" (p. 59). These frames mobilized targets because they "heightened the salience" of particular identifications that were congruent with participation in the project. That the secular SNCC became strategically religious suggests that networks, as with targets, compromise in negotiations between movement and target.

Social Networks and Ties

As identifications and priorities that are congruent with veganism rise on a salience hierarchy, and as veganism rises on a salience hierarchy, people are more likely to go vegan. However, these rises in salience must be activated. Snow and McAdam cite framing processes as a mechanism that vaulted the salience of priorities that applicants of the Mississippi Summer Freedom Project recognized as congruent with participation in the project. In the process, these framing processes vaulted the salience of project participation. Snow and McAdam also cite social networks and ties as a mobilizing mechanism. The SNCC was a mobilizing mechanism in that it functioned as an effective recruitment network, a network that enhanced its capacity to mobilize by interacting with other mechanisms, such as framing processes. Networks and ties are among the most prominent forces to mobilize people to participate in movements.

Nicholas A. Christakis and James H. Fowler (2008; 2009) argue that networks are consequential because they influence people to conform to the social norms of particular networks. In a longitudinal study spanning more than three decades, Christakis and Fowler (2008:2249) found that "network phenomena appear to be relevant to smoking cessation," as smoking cessation by a spouse "decreased a person's chances of smoking" by 67 percent, while smoking cessation by a friend and a sibling decreased a person's chances of smoking by 36 percent and 25 percent, respectively. Robert B. Cialdini's (2003) study on college students' intentions to recycle yielded a similar effect of network embeddedness. Cialdini (p. 107) and his colleagues produced public service announcements portraying "a scene in which the majority of depicted individuals engaged in recycling, spoke approvingly of it, and spoke disparagingly of a single individual in the scene who failed to recycle." The attempt to construct recycling as a social norm within the networks of these college

students proved fruitful, as the more viewers "came to believe that recycling was (a) approved and (b) prevalent, the more they planned to recycle in the future" (p. 108).

McAdam and Ronelle Paulsen (1993) found network influence in their comparison between applicants who ultimately participated in the Mississippi Summer Freedom Project and applicants who did not. They examined the "breadth of support" these applicants "received for participation" from parents, friends, civil rights organizations, other volunteers, and religious groups or figures (p. 649). They found that the percentage of eventual participants reporting support from parents was "nearly double the figure" of applicants who ultimately did not participate in the project; and that the percentage of eventual participants reporting support from other volunteers was 75 percent greater than that of applicants who did not participate (p. 653). The "no-shows" were drawn to the project network to the extent that they applied to participate in the project, but they were simultaneously embedded in networks that were not necessarily conducive to participation in the project, or that were less conducive than the comparable networks in which other applicants were embedded. These findings suggest a positive relationship between supportive networks and participation in movements.

Examining data on conversion to new religious movements, James R. Lewis (2012:143) cautions that "social networks are not always the dominant point of contact for new converts," but his data still reveal that networks are a prevalent mobilizing mechanism for these movements. For example, 64.8 percent of a cohort of recent converts to the new religious movement Adidam converted through a friend, relative, coworker, or partner/spouse. Lewis emphasizes the prevalence of the Internet and books as non-network mechanisms for the religions he examined, but in some cases these mechanisms may have

surfaced through networks and ties, a phenomenon that is more effectively captured by engaging the narratives of new converts.

Individuals embedded in networks across which veganism or vegetarianism are social norms are more likely to engage in these behaviors (MacNair 1998; Haverstock and Forgays 2012; The Humane League 2014). Haverstock and Forgays (2012:1030, 1034) found that "current limiters" of consumption of animals "were more likely to belong to a vegetarian group than were former limiters during the time that they limited animal products." Haverstock and Forgays (p. 1034-1035) speculate that "this social support," provided in "potluck get-togethers" and "online message boards," "may ease the transition into a new way of eating" and provide to "new vegetarians and vegans [...] access to help with cooking, eating out, and learning what to say to friends and family members who may question their decision to limit animal products." They also acknowledge that group membership could have retained former limiters, who experienced challenges—including "difficulty preparing food, [boredom] with food choices, and cravings"—that they may have overcome with the support of a resourceful network or tie (p. 1035).

Relationships within households are also a factor in whether people practice veganism or vegetarianism (MacNair 1998). In a survey of vegetarian activists, Rachel M. MacNair (p. 99) found that 43.1 percent of her participants resided in households that were "entirely vegetarian," while an additional 36.6 percent resided in households in which some other members practiced vegetarianism. The sum of these two categories is 79.7 percent, meaning that participants who maintained their practice of vegetarianism with at least one other vegetarian in the household outnumbered by a four-to-one margin participants who

maintained their practice of vegetarianism without any fellow vegetarians in the household. This disparity underscores the likely influence of supportive networks on vegetarianism.

The Humane League (2014), an animal welfare group, conducted a survey of vegans and vegetarians who cited conversation, companion animals, and websites as influential resources that prompted them to reduce and/or eliminate their consumption of animals. Asked to select three influential resources, 33 percent of participants selected conversation, 26 percent selected companion animals, and 20 percent selected websites. Asked to select three influential resources that motivated them to maintain their veganism or vegetarianism, 41 percent selected websites, the most selected response; 30 percent cited conversation; and 27 percent cited companion animals. Because conversation is commonly rooted in a social tie, however weak, strong, or enduring the tie is, the influence of conversation on mobilization implies that social ties are influential. Companion animals can be influential social ties. They are agents interacting with their human companions, and these interactions can motivate their human companions to behave in particular manners. While websites do not necessarily foster direct interaction and conversation, they can be enduring networks that sustain relationships, communicate information, and construct social norms. The most cited factor that prompted participants to reduce and/or eliminate was documentaries and movies, selected by 43 percent. The viewing of a documentary or a movie can be a solitary endeavor, but it can also be rooted in networks and ties that facilitate the viewing. Without participant narratives, we cannot know the extent to which this and other mobilizing factors are rooted in networks and ties.

Other Mobilizing Mechanisms

The findings of Christakis and Fowler, Cialdini, McAdam and Paulsen, Lewis, Haverstock and Forgays, MacNair, and The Humane League suggest that movements such as veganism may benefit from the employment of social networks and ties that mobilize and support people and that assert social norms that are conducive to the movement's agenda. In some of these studies, networks and ties seem to have vaulted the salience of priorities, including identifications, that were recognized as congruent with movement participation, thereby vaulting the salience of movement participation. Networks and ties interact with other mechanisms, thereby enhancing their capacity to mobilize prospective participants. For example, as a mobilizing mechanism, the SNCC, a network, interacted with another mechanism, framing processes, to mobilize prospective participants of the Mississippi Summer Freedom Project.

McAdam, Sidney Tarrow, and Charles Tilly (2001) cite a series of mobilizing mechanisms with which networks and ties interact. Prominent among these mechanisms is certification, which "entails the validation of actors, their performances, and their claims by external authorities" (p. 121). One common certifying agent of veganism is scientific research involving physicians, dietitians, and nutritionists. Scientific research gains authority from actors initially external to veganism, meaning actors who initially do not practice veganism, but come to do so. In part because these actors certify, and thereby bestow authority upon, scientific research, and in part because scientific research has certified the healthfulness of veganism, these actors practice veganism.

Nurse Peter Filak went vegan upon reading *The China Study: The Most Comprehensive Study of Nutrition Ever Conducted and the Startling Implications for Diet, Weight Loss, and Long-term Health* by biochemist and nutrition expert T. Colin Campbell,

who advocates veganism (Wellock 2012). Ultramarathoner Scott Jurek went vegan upon reading *Spontaneous Healing: How to Discover and Enhance Your Body's Natural Ability to Maintain and Heal Itself* by physician Andrew Weil, who taught Jurek that good health is "really about a whole picture of nutrition and the maintenance of your body's healing system" (Comeau 2012). Blog writer Lindsay Geller (2012) went vegan upon watching *Forks Over Knives* (2012), a film that, featuring Campbell, "examines the profound claim that most, if not all, of the degenerative diseases that afflict us can be controlled, or even reversed, by rejecting animal-based and processed foods." Geller (2012) explains, "What I learned about the Western diet and our unnecessary (and unhealthy) dependence on animal by-products convinced me that I needed to get milk and eggs out of my system." These narratives may oversimplify these conversion experiences in that they cite only one event, either the reading of a book or the viewing of a film. However, these explanations still suggest that the scientific research of Campbell and Weil, along with additional scientific research presented in *Forks Over Knives*, are effective certifying agents that had acquired authority from these converted subjects. This certification of veganism seems to have vaulted the salience of health consciousness and veganism, and thus these subjects' identifications as health-conscious people and prospective vegans.

McAdam, Tarrow, and Tilly (2001:26) also discuss brokerage, a mobilizing mechanism they define as "the linking of two or more previously unconnected social sites by a unit that mediates their relations with one another and/or with yet other sites." Through interviews with self-defined punks, Elizabeth Cherry (2006) found convergence of two previously unconnected social sites: the punk and vegan subcultures. Cherry's punk participants intersected punk and veganism to create a vegan punk subculture. Thus, as

new punks arrived to this venue, to this intersection of punk and veganism, they were exposed to discourses of veganism through "examples of other vegans," resources, literature, and even music (p. 162). Such brokerage seems to have vaulted the salience of punk and veganism.

David Smilde (2005) discusses modeling, another mobilizing mechanism, in his examination of conversion to evangelicalism in Venezuela. Smilde found that many people converted to evangelicalism not because evangelicals verbally convinced them to do so, but because these evangelicals modeled behaviors that resonated with these people and that these people deemed desirable. Evangelicals converted them "by behaving in exemplary ways and overtly 'wearing their faith on their sleeve'" (p. 772). Modeling seems to have vaulted the salience of desirable behaviors that were recognized as congruent with evangelicalism, thereby vaulting the salience of evangelicalism.

Framing processes, certification, brokerage, and modeling are mobilizing mechanisms that interact with networks and ties, but some mechanisms do not necessarily interact with networks and ties. Emotions mobilized the loved ones and allies of people who had been detained, disappeared, and murdered by the military junta that governed Argentina from 1976 to 1983 (Risley 2012). These *afectados*, or affected loved ones and allies, felt "shock, grief, and anger" (p. 109). As Amy Risley observes, "Families of the detained and disappeared in particular suffered unbearable anguish and uncertainty[.]" Risley (p. 108) traces how *afectados* "transformed their pain and outrage into a collective struggle for truth and justice." They became human rights activists through their identification as *afectados*, an identification based on emotional affliction. As a mobilizing mechanism, emotions seem to have vaulted the salience of their identifications as loved

ones and allies, identifications that were conducive to becoming human rights activists. Emotions interacted with networks and ties in that *afectados* were mobilized through their embeddedness in relationships with people who were detained, disappeared, and murdered. However, these mobilizing emotions may have also transcended networks and ties.

Paul Rozin, Maureen Markwith, and Caryn Stoess (1997) employed a questionnaire to examine the influence of moralization on the behaviors of moral vegetarians, whose behaviors were contrasted with those of health vegetarians. Through moralization, "activities that were previously morally neutral acquire a moral component" (p. 67). For the moral vegetarians in the study, food consumption acquired a moral component. Moralization emerged through, among other forces, "seeing animals slaughtered for purposes of consumption" and "reading a book about animal rights." Rozin, Markwith, and Stoess found that, "compared with health vegetarians, moral vegetarians find meat more disgusting, offer more reasons in support of their meat avoidance, and avoid a wider range of animal foods." For the moral vegetarians, moralization was a mechanism that seems to have vaulted the salience of morality and thus vegetarianism. These moral vegetarians may have encountered moralization through networks and ties that framed vegetarianism as moral, but moralization can also transcend networks and ties. "[S]eeing animals slaughtered for purposes of consumption" or "reading a book about animal rights" are activities that can be experienced beyond networks and ties.

McDonald (2000) cites catalytic experiences, among other forces, as a mechanism that mobilized her sample of vegans. These experiences "presented information to the participant about animal cruelty" and prompted participants to become "oriented to further learning" about this cruelty (p. 8). Employing McDonald's language, Cherry (2015) reports

the prevalence of mobilizing catalytic experiences among her vegan punk participants. Cherry (p. 60) also identifies learning as a mechanism, as her participants "[researched] information about animal abuse and how to live a vegan lifestyle [...] through reading literature from animal rights organizations, cookbooks, and other vegetarian resource books." For the vegans in the McDonald and Cherry studies, catalytic experiences and learning seem to have vaulted the salience of their identifications as animal people and as punks, and thus their prospective identification as vegan. As with the participants who encountered moralization in the Rozin, Markwith, and Stoess study, participants who encountered catalytic experiences may have done so through networks and ties, but their experiences may have also transcended networks and ties.

Antagonism

The salience of veganism as a priority is vaulted by mobilizing mechanisms such as social networks and ties. However, networks and ties can also resist or even prevent a rise in salience. In a survey of current and former vegans and vegetarians, Kathryn Asher et al. (2014) found that the former vegans and vegetarians were more likely than the current vegans and vegetarians to cite networks and ties as antagonistic to their prospective veganism and vegetarianism. In response to "I felt (feel) the important people in my life were (are) unsupportive of my vegetarian/vegan diet," 23 percent of the former vegans and vegetarians agreed, while 11 percent of the current vegans and vegetarians agreed (p. 10). Among the former vegans and vegetarians, 33 percent lived with a non-vegan or a non-vegetarian significant other when they halted their veganism or vegetarianism, while 16 percent lived with a vegan or a vegetarian significant other when they halted their veganism or vegetarianism. These disparities suggest that networks and ties can be

antagonistic to veganism, and that network membership and significant others can emerge as priorities that compete with veganism for salience.

As with Asher et al., The Humane League (2014) quantitatively accounts for network antagonism to veganism and vegetarianism. The group conducted a survey of semi-vegetarians and omnivores along with vegans and vegetarians. Among the omnivore participants who want to go vegan or vegetarian but have not, 19 percent cited family as the reason that they have not. Family was the second most cited reason. Prompted to identify factors that "made eating meat-free meals difficult to a moderate or large extent," 19 percent of the vegans and vegetarians cited either lack of support from friends and family (12 percent) or being around people who eat meat (7 percent) (p. 34). Among the semi-vegetarians, defined as people who consume chicken, pork, beef, and seafood on a weekly basis, lack of support from friends and family (14 percent) and being around people who eat meat (19 percent) rose to 33 percent; and among the omnivores, lack of support from friends and family (16 percent) and being around people who eat meat (27 percent) rose to 43 percent. This rise in network antagonism from 19 percent to 33 percent to 43 percent among the vegans and vegetarians, the semi-vegetarians, and the omnivores, respectively, suggests that the omnivores may have been the least likely to go vegan or vegetarian because they were the least likely to act with support from their networks and ties.

Christopher A. Hirschler (2011) accounts for network antagonism through interviews with vegans. While his participants cited support from networks and ties, they also cited antagonism from significant others, friends, coworkers, acquaintances, and family members, who "[present] the most intractable problems" (p. 162). All 32 of his participants claimed that they have been forced to defend their dietary choice against

surveillance and interrogation of their vegan behaviors. This surveillance and interrogation also involved surveillance of the body. Because they are vegan, Hirschler's participants felt a burden to maintain a body image acceptable to omnivores.

> Don't think they won't notice. If you're sickly, they will use it to justify their meat eating. It's the worst thing you can do. If you want to push people miles away from being vegan, be unhealthy, be overweight, or be underweight. Whatever we do that contributes to poor health, they will use to justify killing animals. (P. 165)

This burden prompts a defense and a performance of veganism that are not only articulated in language, but also embodied. Another cited form of antagonism was social exclusion.

> However you try to finesse it, they see you as an outsider. "You're not one of us. You're a weirdo, and we don't want to be with you." It can affect your career! You're not one of the boys. You're not in the club. You don't go out with them on Friday night and eat chicken wings and beer. (P. 163)

As the reference to potential career consequences in this narrative reveals, veganism-induced social exclusion can harm more than a social life. For this participant, normative social and work interactions were antagonistic forces that evolved into priorities with which his veganism competed for salience. How he negotiated this clash of priorities is a process I have sought to understand through my study.

Ben Merriman (2010) accounts for network antagonism that is gendered. Through interviews with female and male ethical vegetarians, all white college students, Merriman found that the women in the sample were more likely than the men to encounter resistance from friends and family members. These women were "very likely to face hostile reactions and these reported hostile reactions came exclusively from [...] *male* friends and family members" (p. 421). This hostility emerged in the form of "argument, mockery, or condemnation"; and through "material efforts to interfere with the diet, including refusal to buy groceries, threats of punishment, or inclusion of meat in meals" (p. 422-423).

Merriman (p. 420) concluded that this antagonism was gendered because vegetarian women were perceived as incapable of "governing their bodies," while vegetarian men were perceived as capable. While men's vegetarianism was regarded as "a healthful demonstration of self-command," women's vegetarianism was associated with eating disorders and perceived as "an inability to manage the body" (p. 424-425). Merriman acknowledges that amid this hostile antagonism all 12 of his female participants remained vegetarian.

As already discussed, going vegan is a capability as well as a choice. The capacity to go vegan or vegetarian can vary, with veganism and vegetarianism being difficult, or at least perceived as difficult, among particular people. However real or imagined, such difficulty can be a hindrance to mobilization. Of the former vegans and vegetarians in the Haverstock and Forgays (2012:1034) study, 35.2 percent cited "difficulty preparing food" as a force that thwarted their veganism or vegetarianism. Examining "practices related to meat, meat substitution[,] and meat reduction" among surveyed consumers in the Netherlands, Hanna Schosler, Joop de Boer, and Jan J. Boersema (2012:39) found that "a lack of familiarity and skill hampered the preparation of real vegetarian meals." In response to "I did not (do not) have easy access to a health food store or a grocery store with a health food section," 23 percent of the former vegans and vegetarians in the Asher et al. (2014:9) study agreed, while 10 percent of the current vegans and vegetarians agreed. In response to "I found (find) it costs too much to eat a vegetarian/vegan diet," 26 percent of the former agreed, while 12 percent of the current agreed (p. 12). These disparities suggest that mobilization is contingent not only on choice, but also on capability, or at least perceived capability. Each of these antagonistic forces transcends networks and ties, but

they can also interact with networks and ties. On the one hand, a network of friends could exacerbate the struggle to find vegan options while dining out by choosing to dine at restaurants with minimal vegan options. On the other hand, participants in these studies could have been more capable of overcoming these forces had they been embedded in supportive networks that could have aided them in preparing vegan food and in finding affordable vegan food in food outlets.

Antagonism to veganism has emerged through discourses of race (Danielle 2010; Harper 2010a; 2010b). A vegan of color, Melissa Danielle (2010:47) has been accused of not being a "true member" of her race because she does not consume animals. Some of her accusers revere soul food, a traditional African-American cuisine "loaded with deep-fried chicken" and meats "smothered in cream-based gravies," as the animal-based diet of their legally enslaved ancestors (Loyd-Paige 2010:6). They simultaneously consider veganism to be a "white thing," a behavior for historically privileged populations (Harper 2010a:xv). They perceive vegan advocacy to be "elitist and colonizing," as an attempt to impose on them the cultural practices of the privileged class and/or race (Harper 2010b:35).

Veganism has been perceived not only as a white behavior, but also as a feminine behavior (Adams [1990] 2010). Despite Merriman's finding that female ethical vegetarians are more likely than their male counterparts to encounter hostility from friends and family, women are more likely than men to practice vegetarianism and veganism (Imaner Consultants 2003; Newport 2012; Stahler 2012; Asher et al. 2014). The Vegetarian Resource Group and Gallup found that about 5 to 7 percent of the female population in the United States practices vegetarianism or veganism, compared with 3 to 4 percent of the male population (Newport 2012; Stahler 2012). Asher et al. (2014) recorded a wider

gender gap among vegetarians and vegans in the United States, finding that women compose 74 percent. Imaner Consultants (2003) found that women compose 78 percent of vegans in the United States. On average, men seem more likely than women to suppress compassion for nonhuman animals (Herzog 2007). Men compose a majority of recreational hunters in the United States, while women compose a majority of animal rights activists in the United States and the United Kingdom. Carol J. Adams ([1990] 2010) attributes such disparities to gender ideologies embedded in the act of consuming animals. Surveying social science research, images, language, literature, popular media, and cookbooks, Adams links power and masculinities to the consumption of animals and to the exploitation of women and other men.

> People with power have always eaten meat. The aristocracy of Europe consumed large courses filled with every kind of meat while the laborer consumed the complex carbohydrates. Dietary habits proclaim class distinctions, but they proclaim patriarchal distinctions as well. Women, second-class citizens, are more likely to eat what are considered to be second-class foods in a patriarchal culture: vegetables, fruits, and grains rather than meat. The sexism in meat eating recapitulates the class distinctions with an added twist: a mythology permeates all classes that meat is a masculine food and meat eating a male activity. (P. 48)

Thus, because men exercise power via the consumption of animals, "[m]en who decide to eschew meat eating are deemed effeminate; failure of men to eat meat announces that they are not masculine" (p. 57).

Adams' claim was pertinent in 2012, when Arian Foster of the National Football League's Houston Texans declared that he had begun practicing veganism (ESPN 2012; Robertson 2012). While some online reaction approved of Foster's decision, other online reaction policed his gender and even questioned his sexuality. People declared, "REAL FBALL PLAYERS EAT MEAT!!!" (Robertson 2012); "Heard he is also going to try

wearing woman's [sic] thongs under his jeans" (ESPN 2012); "What a big pussy"; "Dude will be in an estrogen coma"; and "I heard he is replacing regular steak with tubesteak," which is slang for penis (Urban Dictionary 2002). Reactions to Foster's decision to go vegan reveal that men practicing veganism is not perceived as a social norm in the context of football and perhaps in the context of athletics; and that veganism is perceived as a feminine behavior.

In addition to racism and sexism, prospective vegans encounter carnism, defined by Melanie Joy (2010:30) as "the belief system that conditions us to eat certain animals."

> We don't see meat eating as we do vegetarianism—as a choice, based on a set of assumptions about animals, our world, and ourselves. Rather, we see it as a given, the "natural" thing to do, the way things have always been and the way things will always be. We eat animals without thinking about what we are doing and why because the belief system that underlies this behavior is invisible. This invisible belief system is what I call *carnism*. (P. 29)

According to Joy (p. 96), consuming animals is so pervasive—and perceived as so "normal, natural, and necessary"—that it becomes an unquestioned behavior. This pervasiveness is rooted largely in money and politics. The United States animal agribusiness industry annually earns about $125 billion and is controlled by a "handful of corporations" that increase profit and concentrate wealth by "buying out all related businesses," including agro-chemical and seed companies, processing companies, food manufacturers, food retailers, transportation systems, pharmaceuticals, farm equipment, and financial management plans (p. 88). This industry wields massive political clout, and the political establishment protects it, with some politicians directly participating in it. Animal agribusiness permeates "countless grocery stores, restaurants, cafeterias, and homes across the country" (p. 38). As Joy states, "Meat is literally everywhere we turn." She frames this structural power as hegemonic. "[N]obody's putting a gun to our heads when we eat meat,

but they don't have to. [...] [C]arnism compels us to participate in our coercion, doing the system's job for it" (p. 113, 116). To question a behavior that is forcefully articulated as "normal, natural, and necessary," and to eschew this behavior, requires recognizing and deconstructing an "invisible belief system" and overcoming powerful socialization processes. As Joy (p. 106) acknowledges, "practically and socially," consuming animals is "vastly easier" than not consuming animals.

Agency

As Polletta and Jasper (2001:283) explain, analyses of interactions between identity and mobilization present an alternative to resource mobilization theory and the political process model, two frameworks that emphasize "structurally given interests" as explanations for mobilization. Because people actively construct identifications and prioritize, accounting for interactions between identity and mobilization demands a thorough account of the agency exercised by prospective participants. Jasper (2012:27) problematizes the juxtaposition of structure and agency and explains mobilization as involving "players and their actions," but his call to account for the choices, or "actions," of prospective participants, or "players," remains. As he explains, "If we don't understand what players want, we can't comprehend what constrains them" (p. 14). Prospective participants are mobilized by mechanisms such as social networks and ties, framing processes, certification, brokerage, modeling, emotions, moralization, catalytic experiences, and learning, but just as movements are players, these prospective participants are players actively assessing these mechanisms and exercising choice in response to them. The moral vegetarians in the Rozin, Markwith, and Stoess study encountered a discourse of vegetarianism being moral. They exercised agency in prioritizing morality, in assessing the

notion that vegetarianism is moral, and in choosing whether to become vegetarian. In the process, they constructed and prioritized their identification as moral vegetarians.

Anna de Fina, Deborah Schiffrin, and Michael Bamberg (2006) explain how this construction process involves agency.

> On the one hand, historical, sociocultural forces in the form of dominant discourses or master narratives position speakers in their situated practices and construct who they are without their agentive involvement. On the other hand, speakers position themselves as constructive and interactive agents and choose the means by which they construct their identities vis-à-vis others as well as vis-à-vis dominant discourses and master narratives. (P. 7)

Instead of mobilizing mechanisms, de Fina, Schiffrin, and Bamberg employ the terms "dominant discourses" and "master narratives," but dominant discourses and master narratives are mobilizing mechanisms, as I operationalize the term. Prospective participants of a movement, or "speakers," exercise agency as they interact with forces that are conducive or antagonistic to participation; and as they construct who they are through these interactions. In a discussion on socialization, R.S. Perinbanayagam (2000) suggests that individuals engage in selectivity.

> The individual, subject though he or she may have been in the socialization processes to these same discursive formations, nevertheless has enough independence from them to be able to view them critically and analytically, compare them with other discursive formations and select one over the other or select elements from each and form one's own discursive formation and a discursive self with it. (P. 6)

The individual is a "deliberate agent" who "selects" among different "discursive formations." Following Stryker, this process involves ranking identifications or priorities on salience hierarchies. The moral vegetarians in the Rozin, Markwith, and Stoess study exercised agency in selecting the notion that vegetarianism is moral among other discursive formations, and in prioritizing morality amid competing priorities. Hirschler's participants

exercised agency in selecting and prioritizing veganism among other discursive formations and amid competing priorities, such as social and work interactions. As my findings reveal, such selectivity can also involve the harmonization of competing priorities in nonhierarchical fashion; that is, vegans may harmonize their veganism and their social and work interactions without prioritizing one over the other. Because such selectivity is manifested through narratives, I have analytically engaged mobilization narratives in this study.

Employing Stryker's notion of identity salience, I have sought to account for how particular mechanisms vault the salience of veganism and activate contemplation among prospective participants; and to account for how these prospective participants prioritize veganism as they negotiate these mechanisms and competing priorities. People assess salience and prioritize through narrative. Thus, for this study, I have fostered the construction of narratives through which interview participants have engaged in the selectivity to which Perinbanayagam refers, choosing what to include in their narratives. This selectivity was not commanded by my imposition of topics. I did not prompt participants to identify as a fruit eater or an animal person. Instead, in the context of their prospective veganism, I prompted participants to introduce their narrative plots among countless choices. In the process, participants identified priorities and assessed veganism as a prospective priority among other priorities. Because narrative selectivity is an exercise of agency, it reveals interplay between the forces that people encounter and the agency that they exercise in negotiating these forces. Thus, it reveals interplay between capability and choice. Through my analysis of participants' narratives, I frame veganism as a choice and a capability. I further probe veganism as a capability through my survey, which assesses the

capacity of people from socioeconomically and racially contrasting neighborhoods to engage in a behavior and a movement such as veganism.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

To account for how people come to contemplate and ultimately embrace or reject veganism, I interacted with people who have interacted with at least one of two particular vegan advocacy networks. These interactions were interviews and observations, and these networks were vegan pledge campaigns conducted by the Peace Advocacy Network (PAN), a social justice group active in Philadelphia and its suburbs; and vegan potluck dinners conducted by the staff at The Rotunda, an indoor community arts center in Philadelphia. To further account for the capacity of people to engage in a behavior and a movement such as veganism, I conducted a survey that measured the capacity of people in socioeconomically and racially contrasting neighborhoods to obtain vegan food. All research was approved by Temple University's Human Research Protection Program.

Networks

PAN (2015) is an all-volunteer "grassroots group" that "promotes a peaceful existence through veganism, social justice, and respect for the Earth's inhabitants and resources." PAN conducts annual vegan pledge campaigns in several locations, including Philadelphia and Phoenixville, a suburb of Philadelphia. A pledge campaign involves recruiting non-vegan people to pledge to go vegan for four weeks. The goal is for the pledges to permanently practice veganism. PAN assigns vegan mentors to the pledges and organizes gatherings at which pledges communicate their needs and concerns; interact with their mentors, other experienced vegans, and other pledges; learn from experts on environmental, health, and animals rights issues; and socialize. Pledges also utilize a

campaign listserv, an all-inclusive e-mail group, as a resource both during and following the four-week campaign.

The vegan potluck dinners at The Rotunda involve a collection of vegans and non-vegans habitually sharing and eating vegan food and socializing. The staff at The Rotunda conducts about two or three dinners per year, promoting them on Facebook and on The Rotunda listserv and website. The goal of the potluck dinners is to "[connect] vegans to each other" and to "[provide non-vegans] with delicious food and easy recipes."

The organizers of the pledge campaigns and the potluck dinners advocate veganism, but do so differently. This difference is rooted more in pragmatism than philosophy. PAN is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization with a board of members. Its pledge campaigns are formally and meticulously organized, a process that involves, among other features, creating a four-week schedule; pairing pledges with compatible mentors; recruiting and hosting vegan chefs and athletes, among other guests; and facilitating discussions. While each pledge campaign is a 30-day project, each potluck dinner is a one-night event. While the pledge gatherings follow a formal schedule planned weeks in advance, the potluck dinners consist of informal socializing and eating. While veganism is the basis of most of the conversations at the pledge gatherings, it is not at the potluck dinners. These differences yield different forces. One obvious force that distinguishes the pledge campaigns is the act of pledging. The pledge campaigns involve committing, even if for just 30 days, to a shift in identification from non-vegan to vegan, while the potluck dinners, which involve eating one vegan meal, do not require such a shift.

The two networks are also similar. Many people who have attended the potluck dinners have participated in the pledge campaigns as pledges or mentors. In fact, Becca,

the lead organizer of the potluck dinners and Director of The Rotunda, served as a mentor and hosted the 2013 and 2014 Philadelphia pledge campaigns at The Rotunda. More relevant to my research inquiry, the two networks are similar in that they include not just vegan advocates and movement organizers, but also recruitment targets of vegan advocacy. Pledges and potluck participants have come to contemplate veganism in various manners and have ultimately embraced or rejected it. As networks, the pledge campaigns and the potluck dinners are mechanisms that activate this contemplation. In my sample, I have included potluck participants who were vegan prior to attending their first potluck dinner because these people encountered other networks and mechanisms that activated their contemplation, and I accounted for these other networks and mechanisms. The potluck dinners, as with the pledge campaigns, are only one among many networks and mechanisms that participants encounter in the context of veganism. I accounted for these additional mechanisms through interviews, through which targets of the pledge campaigns and the potluck dinners assessed these mechanisms and assessed veganism as a prospective priority relative to other priorities. The construction of these narratives was the primary task of my interviews.

I identified the pledge campaigns and the potluck dinners as epistemologically productive venues to study mobilization for at least two reasons. First, targets of vegan advocacy are present in both venues. Previous scholarship has focused more on established members or activists of a movement than on prospective members. Second, because these venues include prospective members, they include people who ultimately reject veganism, thereby providing me with a productive comparison between people who have embraced veganism and people who have rejected veganism. Previous scholarship has focused more

on members or activists of a movement than on people who interact with movement networks yet decline to participate in the movement.

I conducted interviews with and observed participants of the pledge campaigns before I conducted interviews with and observed participants of the potlucks dinners. As I conducted interviews with pledges, I discovered that the pledge campaigns were only one of many mechanisms that mobilized pledges. As I became mindful of mechanisms that transcended the pledge campaigns, and as I became mindful that pledging was a unique avenue to going vegan, I decided to expand my sample to include people who interacted with another vegan advocacy network. While a comparison between these two networks could be revealing, I chose to foster narrative selectivity and to broaden my analysis to account for forces that both interacted with and transcended these two networks.

Interviews

From 2011 to 2015, I conducted 34 one-on-one interviews: 23 with pledges of the PAN vegan pledge campaigns, and 12 with participants of the vegan potluck dinners at The Rotunda. One interview participant interacted with both networks. I conducted interviews with pledges who participated in campaigns at some point from 2010 to 2014; and with potluck participants who attended dinners in 2014 and 2015. I conducted interviews with most of these participants within one year of, though not within one month of, their participation in a pledge campaign or a potluck dinner. I arranged these interviews through e-mail messages, Facebook private messages, and text messages. I interacted with participants on college campuses and in homes, work offices, libraries, coffeehouses, restaurants, food outlets, and parks. The interviews ranged from one hour to three hours.

All interviews were audio recorded with the consent of participants and coded according to emerging themes.

Of the 34 interview participants, 25 identified as female, 8 as male, and 1 as transmasculine; and 22 identified as white or Caucasian, 6 as black or African-American, 3 as Asian, and 1 as black and indigenous. Two participants did not identify their race. Of the 34 participants, 16 were 18 to 34 years old, 10 were 35 to 54 years old, and 8 were 55 years old or older; 14 had earned a post-graduate degree, another 12 had earned a four-year degree, and 8 had attended college without earning a four-year degree. Of these 8 participants, 6 were attending a four-year institution at the time of our interview.

Through the interviews, pledges and potluck participants narratively selected salient forces to which they were subjected and narratively selected and managed salient priorities amid these forces. I, as the researcher, limited the extent to which I introduced topics to the conversation and instead prompted participants to do so. I activated narrative selectivity by opening our interviews with a broad open-ended prompt. For the pledges, I stated, "So tell me about your experiences with the pledge." For the potluck participants, I stated, "So tell me about your experiences at the potluck(s)." My ensuing prompts and questions were based only on topics already actively selected by participants. This narrative selectivity is epistemologically productive in that as participants actively narrate their past, present, and future, they actively identify who they are and what is important to them. Such selectivity reveals "goals and intentions" and guides future behaviors (Richardson 1990:117).

Jaber F. Gubrium and James A. Holstein (2003) analyze the narratives of nursing home residents who, through interviews, actively framed their quality of care. For one interview participant, quality of care was contingent on provider-to-resident transmission of

"feelings" (p. 33). This participant valorized emotion in the context of her care, and therefore selected it as a narrative frame. For another participant, "'getting emotional' over 'these things' clouds clear judgment." This participant valorized rationality in this context and therefore narratively selected it. While emotion was salient to one participant who actively selected it as a narrative frame, rationality was salient to the other. Through interviews, Pablo Vila (2000) found that people residing in El Paso and Ciudad Juárez engage in narrative selectivity while constructing identifications in the context of the United States-México border. Activating narrative production via photographs of El Paso and Juárez, photographs that his participants selected among a set he supplied, Vila (p. 10-11) encountered two prominent tropes: "sister cities" and "Third World country versus First World country." To narrate who they are in the context of the border, many Juarenses employed the "sister cities" trope to link themselves with El Paso and the United States while distinguishing themselves from the rest of México. Explained one participant, "I consider the border different from the rest of the country. Logically, we have the influence of the U.S.! We're two joined cities and there has to be a certain *exchange* because we're united, because ... it's the same people" (p. 64). In contrast, to narrate who they are in the context of the border, many El Pasoans, including Mexican Americans, employed the "Third World country versus First World country" trope to narratively separate themselves from Juarenses and to identify as "Americans." Vila did not impose such tropes and distinctions on his interviews; rather, his participants narratively selected them as they identified who they are and what is important to them.

In my case, narrative selectivity was fruitful both epistemologically and ethically. It prompted my participants to prioritize. For example, Jasmine prioritized family

membership over veganism. She attempted to go vegan, but felt compelled to consume the non-vegan meals prepared by her mother for special family gatherings. "I have a big family. We don't do a whole lot together. When we do, I don't want to be the one who is a downer. It's more important to be with my family than what I'm eating." In our interview, I did not introduce family as a topic; rather, Jasmine narratively selected this topic as she explained her rejection of veganism. Narrative selectivity prompted Jasmine to prioritize and to explain how her priorities interacted with her prospective veganism. She prioritized family membership over veganism, a prioritization that justified her rejection of veganism and that guided her future interactions with family and her future consumption behaviors. In addition to producing knowledge, narrative selectivity also empowered participants such as Jasmine by granting to them the opportunity to construct meanings, to represent themselves, and to collaborate with me in producing knowledge through the encounter. I have employed the term participant instead of subject because the former accounts for their active participation and collaboration in the knowledge produced through the encounter.

I restricted the extent to which I introduced topics to the interviews to foster narrative selectivity. However, I inevitably introduced topics to these conversations. At the broadest level and at the beginning of each interview, I introduced the pledge campaigns and the potluck dinners as topics, though my participants were aware that we would discuss these topics before we interviewed. If the pledges did not actively address their interactions with their mentor, I asked them to do so, thereby imposing pledge-mentor interactions as a topic. If the potluck participants did not actively reveal the food that they brought to and consumed at the dinners, I asked them to do so. Even as my participants narratively selected topics, I introduced topics while probing their narratively selected

topics. As my sample expanded, I became increasingly curious about how participants negotiated tension between mobilizing mechanisms and competing priorities. Thus, when participants narratively selected mobilizing mechanisms or competing priorities as topics, I asked additional questions and prompted elaboration, imposing my research agenda and additional topics in the process. In addition, I prompted participants who identified as vegan to clarify if their veganism is simply a dietary practice or a practice that transcends diet and encompasses, for example, clothing, cosmetics, and entertainment. I also prompted participants to disclose additional biographical information that tended to connect with a topic that they had introduced to the conversation. I recorded participants' gender, race, age range, and education level. Following Erica Owens (2006:1177), I closed every interview with the question, "Is there anything else that you would like to tell me that I might not know to have asked about?" This question provided a final opportunity for participants to assess what was narratively salient to them.

As I progressed through my first 12 interviews, I became increasingly curious about social networks and ties as mechanisms that vaulted the salience of veganism and activated participants' contemplation; and as forces that hindered their prospective veganism. Therefore, for the ensuing 22 interviews, I closed each interview with an exercise in which I prompted participants to identify individuals or groups with whom they regularly interact; and whether these individuals or groups have supported, acted indifferently toward, or not supported their prospective veganism. I contacted the other 12 participants online and requested that they complete the exercise with me online. Of these 12 participants, 8 participated in the exercise.

I also introduced topics when I was prompted to verbally articulate my narrative during the interviews. I never employed my privilege as a researcher to impose my narrative on the encounters, but if prompted to do so, I reciprocated for two reasons. First, I sought to foster solidarity with participants who solicited my narrative. Some participants utilized the interview to make sense of their experiences with veganism for themselves as well as for me, and, aware that I am vegan, they utilized my veganism narrative as a resource in the construction of their narrative. Second, and related to my first reason, my reflexivity was epistemologically productive. Some participants utilized my narrative to clarify their narrative, prompting me to utilize their narrative to clarify mine. For example, as Crystal sought to make sense of her rejection of veganism, she prompted me to justify my veganism. My narrative entered the conversation, and we utilized each other's narratives to clarify our own. Ultimately, we co-constructed each other's narratives. We clarified contrasting framings of ethical consumption, including veganism. While we both framed ethical consumption as a set of standards, I also framed it as an ongoing process that can always be advanced. I explained that satisfying the basic standards of veganism does not mean that I do not continue to engage in harmful behaviors that are antithetical to veganism. I framed my veganism as an ongoing reflexive project through which I strive to expose and eschew my harmful behaviors. Crystal utilized this framing to clarify her framing of ethical consumption as just a set of standards, as a project to be completed. She clarified that she sought to locate a compromise between unethical consumption and veganism, a compromise that would relieve her of the burden of having to go vegan. In this interaction, I introduced the notion of veganism as an ongoing reflexive project, but

only in response to Crystal's initiative to frame ethical consumption, a topic that she, not I, introduced.

That I practice veganism threatened my initiative to foster a symmetrical relationship with participants. The narratives of participants could have been compromised by pressure and, especially among those who ultimately rejected veganism, guilt rooted in their awareness that they were engaging in conversation with someone who practices veganism. I sought to preclude or alleviate this pressure in multiple manners. First, my requests for interviews, requests I composed and submitted via e-mail messages, Facebook private messages, and text messages, emphasized that I was interested in learning about participants' experiences with the pledge campaigns or the potluck dinners, even if they did not currently practice veganism. Second, if the opportunity surfaced during the interviews, I negated any perception of self-righteousness by disclosing that I consumed animals for the first two decades of my life, and that I consumed animal products for almost three decades. Third, my initiative to not impose narrative plots on the encounter resulted in participants' narratives taking center stage. The salience of my experiences with veganism was limited, if not absent, during the encounters as a result. My narrative became salient only when participants prompted me to talk.

Not all of my 34 interview participants contemplated the prospect of going vegan. The only exception was Jia, who attended three potluck dinners with her husband because, having immigrated to Philadelphia from China, they "wanted to meet more people" and learn what people on plant-based diets consume in the United States. She had "never considered going 100 percent vegan." While my primary comparison is between people who contemplated veganism and went vegan and people who contemplated veganism and

did not, I have not excluded Jia from my sample because her narrative is useful to my analysis.

Observations

From 2012 to 2015, I conducted observations of interactions of the Philadelphia-based PAN vegan pledge campaigns and of the vegan potluck dinners at The Rotunda. These interactions occurred both online and in person. For each pledge campaign, pledges, mentors, and organizers interacted through a listserv and during weekly three-hour gatherings that occurred each January and February at a church in Center City Philadelphia, at The Rotunda, and at a Whole Foods supermarket outlet, among other places. Pledges, mentors, and organizers utilized the listserv to introduce themselves before the first gathering; to announce social gatherings and other events; to articulate and find solutions to their concerns; and to share resources, such as recipes, discounts on products, health information, and cases of abuse and murder of nonhuman animals. At the weekly gatherings, organizers framed veganism as practical, ethical, and healthful. They distributed, among other handouts, a list of common grocery items that are vegan, a guide to vegan and non-vegan food ingredients, a guide to local vegan and vegan-friendly restaurants and stores, a guide to fast food and chain restaurants, a series of questions and answers on humane food choices, and a comprehensive vegan guidebook that addresses the ethical, environmental, and health benefits of veganism. They tapped former pledges, vegans of color, and a vegan triathlete, among others, to share their experiences with and thoughts on veganism. They also tapped chefs to deliver cooking demonstrations. Organizers utilized their expertise on animal rights, the environment, and nutrition to deliver interactive lectures on these topics. Organizers prepared food for the pledges, led

the pledges on a shopping tour at a Whole Foods supermarket outlet, and facilitated pledge-centered discussions. Pledges utilized these discussions to address various concerns, from how to cook tofu to how to negotiate with family members who resisted their veganism.

For each potluck dinner, the organizers created a Facebook event page. On these pages, they defined the dinners, explaining their purpose while emphasizing the requirement that all food be vegan. They offered to provide resources and to assist people in identifying what is vegan and what is not. Organizers and participants shared other events involving veganism and animal rights activism; and shared photographs of and compliments for the food served. While veganism was a common topic of conversation as people dined at the potluck dinners, it was only one of many topics. The potluck dinners were less formal and more socially organic than the pledge gatherings. Without any formal announcement, participants formed lines to get their meal.

I recorded all listserv interactions for the pledge campaigns and all Facebook interactions for the potluck dinners and coded them according to emerging themes. I recorded all in-person observations at the pledge gatherings and the potluck dinners in a small notebook and coded my observation notes according to emerging themes. While I announced my role as a researcher in both venues, some participants may not have been aware that they were being recorded. I was granted permission to observe in these venues by gatekeepers who coordinated the interactions I observed. The data produced through these observations have not guided my analysis in this study. Instead, these data have complemented the data produced through the interviews, with the data produced through the interviews guiding my analysis.

Survey

From 2014 to 2016, I conducted a survey to assess the capacity of 335 residents in socioeconomically and racially contrasting neighborhoods in Philadelphia to engage in a behavior and a movement such as veganism (see Appendix). I conducted this survey in response to a prevailing discourse of veganism being inaccessible to poor and nonwhite populations on account that these populations are more likely to reside in food deserts and on account that vegan food is relatively expensive (Loyd-Paige 2010; Williams-Forson 2010; Wrenn 2011). I assessed this capacity among residents in two of the most and two of the least impoverished census tracts in the city. I identified these census tracts using the 2012 wave of the American Community Survey (ACS) on Social Explorer. ACS (2013) identified the percentages of the populations aged 18 to 64 living in poverty in each census tract. An individual's poverty status was determined through a comparison of the individual's "total family income in the last 12 months with the poverty threshold appropriate for that person's family size and composition." A majority of residents in the impoverished census tracts were Latino or black, while a majority of residents in the affluent census tracts were white.

I requested residents' participation at their housing unit. I selected all housing units on particular streets within each census tract. I selected the streets that formed the boundaries of each census tract, obviously selecting housing units located on the side of my selected census tract rather than the side of the bordering census tract; and I selected the streets that paralleled, even if roughly, the boundary streets. At each housing unit, I rang a bell or knocked on a door. I did not request participation at housing units at which I anticipated that I would disturb companion dogs who were outside; at units at which residents were outside and talking on a telephone; at units that, according to neighbors,

were vacant; or at units at which, according to neighbors, residents were not available. If I established contact with residents, I introduced myself, informed them that I was conducting a survey, and asked if they could answer questions for about five minutes. If they consented, I asked for them to assess their capacity to obtain fresh vegan produce, meaning fresh fruit and fresh vegetables; whether they had encountered the term vegan; and if they knew any vegans and vegetarians. The first question assessed physical and financial access to vegan food. I have sought to account for variables that could influence this physical and financial access. Thus, I prompted participants to report whether they drove and to assess neighborhood safety. The second and third questions expanded upon the prevailing discourse of veganism being inaccessible to particular populations on account that these populations are deprived of physical and financial access to veganism. I posed these questions thinking that behaviors and movements such as veganism may be less accessible to particular populations because the notion of veganism may be more prevalent among privileged social networks; and thinking that this disparity in access to the notion of veganism may provide explanatory power for the privilege involved in veganism, to the extent that privilege is involved.

Only 1 of the 335 participants identified as vegan. I anticipated such a figure. For the survey, in contrast to the interviews, I have not been interested in why people have not gone vegan. Instead I have employed veganism as a proxy to assess the capacity of diverse populations to engage in a behavior such as veganism. However, I have sought to account for an outcome of participants' varying capacity to gain access to veganism, whether physical and financial access to veganism or access to the notion of veganism. Thus, I asked participants, How many servings of fruit and vegetables did you eat yesterday?

While this question does not establish whether a participant is vegan, it reveals a participant's capacity to engage in a behavior that is crucial to veganism.

I also recorded participants' gender, race, age range, and education level. Most of the encounters lasted three to five minutes. I read each question and prompt to participants and handwrote their responses. When necessary, I conducted the survey in Spanish.

Operationalizing Veganism

Being vegan means not consuming animals, including animal products. However, whether my interview participants labeled themselves vegan during our conversations could not be reduced to this categorical definition because participants who identified as vegan admitted that they consumed animals while identifying as vegan, with some doing so regularly. Francesca, who identified as vegan during our interview, admitted that she had "made a lot of mistakes" following her pledge campaign. Participants who confessed such "mistakes" framed them as unintentional and as isolated episodes, but some participants who labeled themselves vegan consciously violated their veganism. For example, Cheryl labeled herself "99 percent vegan," explaining that perhaps "twice a year" she consumes non-vegan desserts at parties. Raven has embraced the vegan label, but practices veganism only in the context of food consumption. She continues to wear animal-derived clothing and to style her hair with an animal-derived relaxer. Similarly, Brenda and Mary, who both identified as vegan, do not eat animals, but continue to wear them. Brenda shuns synthetic clothing in favor of wool and goose down clothing for herself and her husband, while Mary occasionally prioritizes "comfort" over "ethics." During our interview, Paul did not identify as vegan. However, he contacted me about two weeks later to inform me that he

had "gone vegan except for honey," meaning that honey was the only animal product he continued to consume.

The narratives of Cheryl, Raven, Brenda, Mary, and Paul prompted me to consider selective vegan as an analytical category that I could employ to analyze variation across my sample, but this category would have been problematic. While most participants who identified as vegan do not consume eggs or wear wool, even unintentionally, none of these participants framed their veganism as perfect, nor did any of these participants suggest that such perfection were possible. Thus, distinguishing between selective vegan and vegan would have been too subjective. Cheryl identified as "99 percent vegan," but a comparison between the rest of her narrative and the narratives of the other participants who identified as vegan reveals that she asserts her veganism in social encounters to an extraordinary extent. I asked, If Cheryl is not vegan enough, then who is? What is the boundary between selective veganism and veganism? Relegating Cheryl to a selective vegan category because she consumes a non-vegan dessert twice per year would have been misleading, would have suppressed the complexity of her narrative, and would have reified the fallacy of perfect veganism. I could have distinguished Cheryl from Raven, Brenda, Mary, and Paul on account of how she asserts her veganism, but, as with these four participants, Cheryl regularly violates her veganism, even if only twice per year.

Such complexity prompted me to not employ selective vegan as an analytical category and to manage my subsample of vegans and my subsample of non-vegans according to how participants chose to identify. Thus, despite admittedly violating their veganism in different manners, Cheryl, Raven, Brenda, Mary, and Paul are in my subsample of vegans because they identified as vegan. This analytical choice is ethical and

epistemologically productive. It is ethical in that I am valorizing participants' narratives, accounting for how they construct meanings. It is epistemologically productive in that it accounts for variation in how participants frame and practice veganism. Asserting a vegan identification and validating a vegan identification are contested processes, and accounting for whether participants choose to identify as vegan exposes rather than conceals this contestation.

The narratives of participants who identified as vegan reveal conflict concerning, among other issues, the extent to which the interests of nonhuman animals are valorized; and the notion of perfection. According to PAN (2013), a vegan "actively avoids all animal use, not just in food (dairy, eggs, honey, meat, poultry, seafood, etc.)[,] but in clothing, entertainment, and experimentation, recognizing that the use of animals is unnecessary and immoral." According to this definition, veganism involves satisfying a set of standards—not using animals as food, as clothing, as entertainment, or as experimental subjects—and doing so with a particular recognition. Through this latter requirement, PAN emphasizes that being vegan means not downgrading the interests of nonhuman animals. Cheryl, Raven, Brenda, Mary, and Paul consciously violate these requirements in different manners and to varying extents, yet they still identify as vegan, an identification that may be challenged by other vegans, including the PAN board members who composed this definition. Comparing their articulations of veganism with those of the other vegans in my sample reveals variation in how the interests of nonhuman animals are prioritized.

Claiming to be vegan while consciously consuming animals prompts two questions: Is perfect veganism possible? Should these violations undermine a vegan identification? As with every participant who identified as vegan, the PAN board members who composed

the organization's definition of vegan do not claim that perfect veganism is possible. For example, during a pledge gathering, Nicole, a pledge with whom I did not conduct an interview, informed a panel of PAN board members and pledge mentors that she plays the violin and that her bow was constructed with horsehair. She added that the "synthetic" vegan bow "sounds terrible." The panel did not discourage her from continuing to play with and purchase horsehair bows. Billy, one of the founding members of PAN, then confessed his own violations of veganism. He consumes medications that are approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, and this approval is contingent on the results of tests conducted on the bodies of nonhuman animals. He added, "I drove here today with gelatin in my tires." Billy cited these violations as an expression of solidarity toward Nicole and to communicate his recognition that perfect veganism is not practical. Lori Gruen and Robert C. Jones (2016:169) echo this notion in arguing that "[a]bstaining from the use of all animal products is virtually impossible for most consumers in industrialized societies."

If perfect veganism is not possible, under what conditions do violations of veganism undermine a vegan identification? Billy continues to identify as vegan despite consuming non-vegan medications and transporting himself on non-vegan tires. How does he maintain this identification despite these violations? Gruen and Jones are less concerned with answering this question than with reframing the notion of veganism. They advocate "aspirational veganism," which they frame "not as a lifestyle or identity," but instead "as a type of practice, a process of doing the best one can to minimize violence, domination, and exploitation" (p. 156). This form of veganism is "something that one works at rather than something one is." Gruen and Jones clarify that aspirational veganism does not justify

"consciously" consuming and exploiting animals. The objective "is to imagine and earnestly try and actualize—to the best of one's ability—a world in which there is no animal exploitation, by working to minimize violence." While Gruen and Jones effectively problematize veganism as an identification, people still identify as vegan, however they define it. Thus, I cannot ignore veganism as an identification. Articulations such as "doing the best one can to minimize violence" expose the vegan standard as subjective and gray. Because I cannot measure whether participants are exerting their "best" effort to practice veganism, and because I have sought to account for contestation over meanings of veganism, I prompted participants to identify as vegan or non-vegan, a choice through which they identified the conditions in which violations undermine a vegan identification.

Participants assigned themselves to my subsample of vegans or to my subsample of non-vegans at a particular moment in time. Participants who identified as vegan during the interview could have halted their veganism after the interview, just as participants who did not identify as vegan during the interview could have gone vegan after the interview. Some participants who identified as vegan have attempted to go vegan multiple times. Had I conducted interviews with these participants at an earlier time, they could have been assigned to the subsample of participants with whom I contrast their narrative. Because I conducted only one interview with each participant, the assignment of participants to the vegan and the non-vegan subsamples was contingent on how they identified at one moment in time. Paul's case is the only exception. Upon contacting me about two weeks after our interview to inform me that he had "gone vegan except for honey," he was reassigned from the non-vegan subsample to the vegan subsample.

Terminology

Through my research encounters for this study, and through my experiences in the vegan community beyond this study, I have regularly encountered the verb phrase going vegan and the verb veganize. Going vegan refers to the act of becoming vegan, while veganize refers to the act of making an item, such as food, or a venue, such as a social gathering, vegan. I have incorporated this colloquial vocabulary into my analysis because I have sought to engage the language of my interview participants.

In particular contexts, I have employed the term nonhuman animals instead of animals. David Nibert (2002:xv) employs the term "other animals" in reference to nonhuman animals and as an acknowledgment that human beings, as with nonhuman beings, are animals. This acknowledgment "emphasizes human commonality with other inhabitants of the planet, rather than fostering a perception of separateness and 'otherness' that helps rationalize disregard and mistreatment of other animals." As Nibert admits, the term other animals still reifies a species barrier, but unlike the term animals, it at least acknowledges "commonality" between human beings and nonhuman beings. As with Nibert, I have sought to expose the species barrier, but I have employed the term nonhuman animals instead of other animals because other animals can technically mean other human animals. Thus, nonhuman animals is more accurate. In particular contexts, the term nonhuman animals would be redundant. For example, because consuming human animals, as with consuming nonhuman animals, would not be a vegan act, I have simply employed the term animals instead of nonhuman animals with the verb consume and with the noun consumption.

CHAPTER 4

CONTEMPLATING

Raven was persuaded to go vegan by Aliyah, a vegan colleague from her university animal welfare group. A mentor for Peace Advocacy Network (PAN) vegan pledge campaigns, Aliyah prompted Raven to recognize the contradiction of advocating for cats and dogs and of consuming other animals. Aliyah called her "hypocritical" and urged her to enroll in a pledge campaign. Initially, Raven was reluctant, at one point threatening "to beat her with [her] burger." As president and vice-president, respectively, Aliyah and Raven conducted vegan bake sales to raise money for the university animal welfare group. At these sales, patrons posed the question, "If you're all for these animals, have you ever thought about going vegan and vegetarian?" Raven would respond, "Oh no, but I'm not eating a dog and a cat." Overhearing this response, Aliyah privately told her, "That's not the best answer. You know, you should probably even think about trying [veganism], especially if you're going to be the head of this organization. You're like the face of [the group]. Like you're more out there than I am, and I'm the president." Aliyah's coaxing proved effective, as Raven eventually pledged. "I told her, 'Thirty days isn't going to kill me, and if I don't like it, I'll just go and have a burger at the end.' She's like, 'I bet you won't.' I was like, 'I bet you I will.' And I haven't. [My pledge campaign] changed my life."

Raven's contemplation of veganism was activated by a social network, the university animal welfare group, and by a vegan social tie, Aliyah. It was also activated by nonhuman social ties, particular cats and dogs for whom she advocated. Raven formed

enduring and meaningful relationships with these cats and dogs as well as with Aliyah, and these relationships vaulted the salience of veganism. Raven, Aliyah, and other members of their group shared an interest in animal welfare. Raven sought to preserve and advance this interest and, in the process, her relationship with Aliyah, the other members, and the cats and dogs. Labeling Raven "the face of [the group]," Aliyah framed the group's integrity as contingent on whether Raven went vegan. The group's integrity was crucial to its mission, advancing animal welfare, and thus crucial to the cats and dogs. Raven pledged through the accountability that emerged in these relationships and through the compassion that constituted these relationships. She also acted in response to two other social ties, her mother and her father. While her parents did not suggest that she go vegan, their health problems fueled her contemplation. Both of her parents have coped with high blood pressure, which she associated with their poor diets. In the months prior to our interview, her mother had been diagnosed with diabetes, while her father had had triple bypass surgery. Raven went vegan not only because of her concern for nonhuman animals, but also to avoid inheriting her parents' health problems. Raven acted amid pressure from Aliyah and intergenerational health risks, but she did not act passively. While the idea of going vegan was rooted in her interactions with a network and with social ties, and fueled by her concerns about health, Raven actively assessed the idea, initially resisting it, and later deciding to pledge and to go vegan.

Among the most prevalent mechanisms to vault the salience of veganism and activate contemplation among my interview participants were networks and ties; books, articles, and documentaries; food; discourses of ethics; and discourses of healthfulness. Every participant who contemplated veganism was mobilized by a network or a tie. Across

many of these mobilizing networks, veganism was a prominent, if not the primary, notion and discourse. Other mobilizing networks, such as Raven's university animal welfare group, did not actively promote veganism, but were conducive to it. Most participants were tied to individuals, such as Aliyah, who practice veganism, while some participants contemplated veganism through social ties who indirectly activated their contemplation. Some participants contemplated veganism through nonhuman social ties, such as the cats and dogs for whom Raven advocated, cats and dogs with whom she had formed enduring and meaningful relationships.

Networks and ties and other prevalent mechanisms mobilized participants in multiple manners. First, consistent with the notion of congruence articulated by David A. Snow and Doug McAdam (2000), these mechanisms prompted participants to recognize veganism as congruent with their other priorities. The university animal welfare group, Aliyah, and unhealthy parents vaulted the salience of multiple priorities, including animal welfare and health. As Raven came to recognize veganism as congruent with animal welfare and good health, veganism became a salient priority and her contemplation was activated. Kiara prioritized ethical behavior. Her interactions with Brandon and Brian prompted her to recognize veganism as congruent with ethical behavior, thereby activating her contemplation. Second, employing the language of James M. Jasper (2014), mobilizing mechanisms activated feeling-thinking, a process through which participants were mobilized through feelings that became interlaced with their cognitive contemplation of veganism. Raven feared inheriting high blood pressure and diabetes from her parents, and this fear motivated her understanding of the health benefits of veganism and fueled her contemplation. Brandon and Brian felt compassion toward nonhuman animals. Kiara

came to feel this compassion through her relationships with them and came to understand veganism through this feeling. Third, mobilizing mechanisms enhanced the capacity of participants to go vegan by transmitting information and advice, thereby convincing them of their capacity to go vegan. Raven became more capable of going vegan through her connection to Aliyah, who informed her of the next pledge campaign. Kiara became more capable of going vegan through her connection to Brandon and Brian, whose seamless performance of veganism convinced her that veganism was practical and that she could go vegan; and through the blog "black. female. christian. vegan.", the author of which advised her on how to negotiate these potentially conflicting identifications.

These mechanisms activated participants' contemplation of veganism, but participants were an active force in this process. First, participants asserted priorities that they came to recognize as congruent with veganism. Raven asserted her concern for nonhuman animals and good health, and she came to recognize these priorities as congruent with veganism. Second, participants facilitated their engagement with the mechanisms that mobilized them. Raven chose to join the university animal welfare group because she prioritized her concern for cats and dogs, and she chose to forge and maintain a relationship with Aliyah. Thus, she chose to engage with the social tie, Aliyah, and the network, the university animal welfare group, that mobilized her. Third, participants assessed veganism as a prospective priority. Raven assessed Aliyah's framing of veganism and the prospect of going vegan. While other acquaintances of Aliyah or members of the university animal welfare group may have declined, Raven chose to pledge.

The temporality of participants' contemplation of veganism was highly variable. While Raven contemplated veganism over the course of several weeks, Kiara contemplated

veganism over the course of multiple years. Some participants cited mechanisms that set the stage for their contemplation without instantly activating it. For example, some participants cited childhood relationships with nonhuman animals as a root of their concern for nonhuman animals during adulthood, a concern that gradually elevated the salience of veganism and activated their contemplation. Thus, in some cases, consequential mechanisms surfaced over the course of several years and even decades. Other participants cited mechanisms that instantly activated their contemplation and prompted them to go vegan within days of the mechanism surfacing.

The roots of contemplation were more similar than different for the vegans and the non-vegans in that most of the cited mechanisms were not more likely to vault the salience of veganism and activate contemplation among one of the groups. Two exceptions were discourses of ethics and discourses of healthfulness. Discourses of ethics were more likely to activate contemplation among the vegans, and discourses of healthfulness were more likely to activate contemplation among the non-vegans. I discuss these two exceptional mechanisms in the next chapter.

In this chapter, I discuss how mechanisms, including networks and ties, vaulted the salience of veganism and activated participants' contemplation. I also analyze the agency exercised by participants in their encounters with these mechanisms.

Social Networks and Ties

Consistent with the findings of Nicholas A. Christakis and James H. Fowler (2008; 2009), among others, I found that social networks and ties spawned potential behavioral changes. More specifically, I found that, for all of my interview participants who contemplated veganism, networks and/or ties vaulted the salience of veganism and

activated their contemplation. Veganism was a prominent, if not the primary, notion across many of the mobilizing networks. Paul was not contemplating veganism when he attended a vegan potluck dinner at The Rotunda, but the dinner, highlighted by "nice people" and "good food," vaulted the salience of veganism and activated his contemplation. Sarah contemplated veganism upon interacting with PAN through the group's campaign to end horse-drawn carriages in Philadelphia. While working for Mercy for Animals (2015), an organization "dedicated to preventing cruelty to farmed animals and promoting compassionate food choices and policies," Steve, already a vegetarian, "made that additional connection" and contemplated veganism upon watching a film that, produced by Mercy for Animals, documents "brutality against nonhuman animals" in the egg industry. Schoolmates Amber and Francesca contemplated veganism upon interacting with their university vegan advocacy group. Anthony, Nick, Rahul, and Fatemah contemplated veganism upon interacting with vegetarian social groups that gathered to eat vegetarian and vegan food. Dan and Liz contemplated veganism upon interacting with networks of vegans on Facebook.

Other mobilizing networks did not actively promote veganism, but were conducive to it. The root of Daenerys's contemplation of veganism was her participation in a chapter of the Ethical Humanist Society, a movement that espouses the principle of, as Daenerys articulated, "valuing the worth of every individual," including nonhuman animals. Julie encountered PAN at a gay pride festival, where PAN was tabling and promoting an upcoming pledge campaign. She attended the festival because the nonprofit organization for which she works was also tabling there. While her nonprofit organization does not

advocate veganism, it, as with PAN, advocates human rights and social justice, common interests that linked the two networks at the festival.

Most participants were embedded in networks that were at least conducive to contemplating veganism, and most were tied to individuals who practice veganism. While the university animal welfare group did not actively promote veganism, Raven was subjected to Aliyah's vegan advocacy, which activated her contemplation. Kiara's contemplation developed as her relationships with Brandon and Brian developed. Nick met Amy, a founding member of PAN and one of the pledge organizers, at a Yahoo group's monthly vegetarian lunch, and she encouraged him to pledge. Rahul met Jonathan, a former pledge and now a vegan, at a different vegetarian social gathering. As they sat next to each other eating vegetarian and vegan food, Jonathan told him about his bus trip from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh, a trek during which he became "more and more upset" upon encountering cows exploited on farms visible from the highways across Pennsylvania. The story "immediately" resonated with Rahul, who began contemplating how he could "use the passion [he has] as fuel to do good things." A source of Amanda's contemplation was Eric, a vegan whom she paid to take her companion dog on walks. Amanda had become Facebook friends with Eric so that she could see pictures of her dog while she was away. Amanda was now exposed not only to pictures of her dog, but also to Eric's revealing posts about the abuse and murder of nonhuman animals. Eric also worked at The Rotunda and contributed to the online recruitment of pledges for the pledge campaigns hosted by The Rotunda. This promotion of the pledge campaigns, in combination with Eric's posts about exploitation, prompted Amanda to consider shifting from vegetarianism to veganism. Pam's cholesterol level was high enough for her physician to advise her to take medication.

Two nights after this physician appointment, her friend Cheryl, a former pledge and now a vegan, came over for dinner, learned of her cholesterol problem, and advised her to "just be vegan." "She walked me through what contains cholesterol, what doesn't, and what a vegan diet would be like," Pam recounted.

Some participants contemplated veganism through social ties who indirectly activated their contemplation. Jonathan realized that his vegetarian girlfriend Stephanie consumed a more ethical diet. That she sacrificed cheesesteaks, chicken nuggets, and spicy tuna sushi rolls, all of which he regularly ate, threatened the "pride" he took in not being "hedonistic" and in rejecting unnecessary consumption. He went vegetarian, which set the stage for his contemplation of veganism. Francesca attended a meeting of the university vegan advocacy group at the request of her vegetarian friend Victoria, who did not want to attend the meeting alone. "She didn't know the people," Francesca explained. Ultimately, Victoria "didn't take anything from [the meeting]," but Francesca left inspired to go vegan. Amber's primary motivation for interacting with the same group and for going vegetarian during her early teen years was her concern for nonhuman animals, a concern she developed as a child through interactions with her non-vegan grandmother, who "had appreciation and respect for the complexity of animals." "She shared that [appreciation and respect] with me and my sister," Amber explained.

Some participants contemplated veganism through nonhuman social ties with whom they had formed enduring and meaningful relationships. These nonhuman social ties emerged as a mobilizing force through their capacity to bond with human animals. Participants loved these animals in part because they were active agents who loved back. This shared love vaulted the salience of their concern for nonhuman animals, a concern that

they came to recognize as congruent with veganism. In the process, this shared love activated their contemplation. In most of the cited cases, nonhuman social ties lived with participants as companions or livestock. Crystal, for example, was mobilized by her companion dog Mickey. As a child growing up in California, Crystal "loved animals." "I checked out the hamster book from the school library like, I don't know, 10 times while I was there for three years," she recalled. "Then [my family and I] eventually got hamsters." In addition to hamsters, Crystal cared for Mickey, and they developed a bond. Her mother initially refused to host a dog at their home, but relented on the condition that Mickey remain outside in their fenced yard. One day, when Crystal was 12 years old, Mickey escaped from the yard through a hole in the fence and was struck by a car.

> I came home, tapped on the door. The dog didn't come. I realized there's a hole in the fence. Someone had come and gotten rid of it already, but I saw a blood patch [on the road]. I talked to a woman walking a stroller, and she goes, "Oh, you're looking for *that* dog." And she had to tell me. I was 12, pre-vegetarian, and my dog had gotten hit by a car. So even now, like road kill makes me sad. I get mad that, even my husband, he'll talk about the deer population here and how they have to be put down. And I'm like, "Why? 'Cause they're trying to maintain a population? How come no one's ever stopped to think that maybe we should put a restriction on our population?" Like I said, I probably advocate for animals a little bit more than I do for people, but meanwhile I'm a nurse.

For Crystal, Mickey's tragic death sparked profound sadness because he was a meaningful social tie. Mickey's life mattered to Crystal not simply because she cared about nonhuman animals in an abstract sense, but also because they had an enduring relationship. That she associated his death with road kill, deer hunting, and human overpopulation suggests that it was a root of her realization that nonhuman animals suffer and die in manners that are avoidable and rooted in human expansion. This realization, rooted in the loss of a

companion with whom she had a meaningful bond, vaulted the salience of her advocacy for nonhuman animals and set the stage for her contemplation of veganism.

Dorothy was mobilized by her companion cat Ruggles, whom she found outside of her work building at a busy intersection in North Philadelphia.

> I was leaving work with two coworkers and found a cat, about three months old, just sitting there. As everyone was walking by, he'd swivel his head. "Do you want me?" Sure enough, [one of my coworkers] picked him up. She checked his ears, checked for fleas. She wanted the cat, but she lived in an apartment in Lansdale. She asked, "Can you take him home? I'll get him tomorrow." I said, "This is not a good idea." But I did it. I thought, "I'm going to do the first unselfish thing all year." I took him home. He was really cute. He hid for two days, but then he came out. My husband loved the cat.

Ruggles never went to the coworker's apartment. He remained with Dorothy and her husband, and, as with Crystal and Mickey, they developed a consequential bond. Ruggles inspired Dorothy to become involved in cat rescue initiatives throughout Philadelphia. She attended a "cat trapping seminar" that featured a vegan lunch. Dorothy anticipated that she would still be hungry following a vegan lunch, but she was not. The meal convinced her that she could go vegan, thereby activating her contemplation. "I remember thinking I could do this," she recalled. The meal surfaced as a mobilizing mechanism through Ruggles, who set the stage for her attendance at the seminar by elevating her concern for nonhuman animals.

As with Crystal and Dorothy, Anthony, Jen, and Julie cited nonhuman companions with whom they experienced enduring relationships, relationships that elevated their concern for nonhuman animals and that set the stage for their contemplation of veganism. In contrast to these participants, Amanda was mobilized by livestock. At 10 years old, while living in rural North Dakota, Amanda was killing chickens, turkeys, and pigs at her

home. Her family had been horrified by a *60 Minutes* episode that documented practices on factory farms. Seeking to become more ethical consumers of animals by not supporting factory farms, her parents bought, tended to, killed, and consumed chickens, turkeys, and pigs. Amanda "hated" to kill these animals. She developed relationships with them, relationships that—facilitated by a network, her family—prompted her to care about them. As a result, she became acutely conscious of the suffering and death she imposed on animals by eating them. At 14 years old, Amanda went vegetarian. The conscious consumption that was the basis of her vegetarianism set the stage for her contemplation of veganism decades later.

Books, Articles, and Documentaries

Of the vegans and vegetarians surveyed by The Humane League (2014), 43 percent reported that documentaries and movies had prompted them to reduce and/or eliminate their consumption of animals. Documentaries and movies were the most cited factor. More than half of my interview participants cited a book, an article, or a documentary as a mechanism that vaulted the salience of veganism and activated their contemplation. These sources addressed the abuse, murder, rights, and welfare of nonhuman animals; broader ethical questions; and the health risks of consuming animals.

Many participants encountered mobilizing sources through social networks and ties. Steve watched the Mercy for Animals film that mobilized him because he worked for the organization, and his job involved booking screenings of the film at festivals. Thus, the film and the work-based network through which he encountered the film activated his contemplation of veganism. Alexis was mobilized in part by *Meet Your Meat,* a People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) (2002) film that "exposes the truth behind

humanity's cruelest invention—the factory farm." "This is really uncomfortable and disgusting," she thought. Alexis watched it after her vegan friend Asia posted it online. This friend was therefore a social tie who mobilized Alexis through the documentary, just as PETA surfaced as an online network that mobilized Alexis through the documentary. When Jen asked her vegan nurse colleague Lori how she maintained her high level of energy, Lori gave to her books on factory farming and on the rights of nonhuman animals, books that prompted Jen to examine her relationships with nonhuman animals. Lori thus mobilized Jen not only by modeling the healthfulness of veganism, but also by educating her on the plight and rights of nonhuman animals. Liz was exposed to similar literature through a network of vegans on Facebook. These vegans posted "one horrible thing after another"—articles on the murder of male chicks in the egg industry, on how chickens' beaks are cut without anesthesia, and on how female cows are "turned into milk machines" after their offspring are taken from them and killed. She expanded her network of vegan "friends" on Facebook, read more, and decided, "I don't want to be a part of this [animal agriculture] industry."

Books, articles, and documentaries also activated participants' contemplation of veganism independently of networks and ties. Independently of any network or tie, Dorothy watched an online documentary exposing animal agriculture practices. As she recalled, the documentary cited Paul McCartney's statement, "If slaughterhouses had glass walls, everyone would be vegetarian."

> It started all kinds of alarms in my head: What's going on here? What are they doing? I had some idea, but I wanted to know specifically and why. I thought, "If this is going on, I don't want to be part of it. I don't have to eat meat."

The documentary invoked Dorothy's concern for nonhuman animals and fueled her contemplation.

Jonathan and Amber were similarly mobilized by sources that tapped their concern for nonhuman animals, though their voracious reading spawned broader ethical questions. Jonathan read several books that prompted him to examine his relationships with nonhuman animals and that, in the process, fueled his contemplation of veganism. These books included *Dominion: The Power of Man, the Suffering of Animals, and the Call to Mercy* by Matthew Scully; and *Eating Animals* by Jonathan Safran Foer. Scully (2002) "counters the hypocritical arguments of those who insist that the Bible's message sanctions mankind to use animals as it pleases"; and Safran Foer (2009) "explores the many stories we use to justify our eating habits—folklore and pop culture, family traditions and national myth, apparent facts and inherent fictions—and how such tales can lull us into a brutal forgetting." Also prompting Jonathan to examine his relationships with nonhuman animals was *Earthlings*, a film of jarring undercover footage that documents "humankind's total dependence on animals for economic purposes" (Nation Earth 2015). Jonathan also read and viewed sources that did not prioritize, but still addressed, the plight and rights of nonhuman animals. He cited *The Omnivore's Dilemma: A Natural History of Four Meals* by Michael Pollan (2006), who engages politics and pleasure in his attempt to answer the question, "What should we have for dinner?"; and *Food, Inc.*, a film that documents the health and environmental risks of consuming animals (TakePart 2015). Relative to Scully, Safran Foer, and Shaun Monson, the producer of *Earthlings*, Pollan and the producers of *Food, Inc.* understate the plight and rights of nonhuman animals. However, in combination, all of these sources activated intersectional thinking through which Jonathan

considered not only how nonhuman animals are killed for human consumption, but also how human animals and the environment are adversely affected by this consumption.

Amber contemplated veganism because of her concern for nonhuman animals, but also because it was conducive to her personal development. She encountered the notion of veganism through personal development forums and websites that she patronized at 12 and 13 years old. Even as a child, she liked "the idea of potential." Amber read articles through which people like personal development guru Steve Pavlina narrated their experiences with veganism and vegetarianism. Having "previously respected these people's ideas," and having already developed "appreciation and respect" for nonhuman animals, she went vegetarian. At 14 years old, Amber read *The Road Less Traveled: A New Psychology of Love, Traditional Values and Spiritual Growth* by M. Scott Peck. According to Amber, Peck discusses "self-discipline and thinking about why you do every action you do." The book "enticed [her] to think about the things [that she did, things] that seemed incompatible with [her] beliefs." It elevated her consciousness of harm that she continued to exert and challenged her to elevate her respect for nonhuman animals, thereby setting the stage for her contemplation of veganism.

Other participants were engaged by sources that invoked not only their concern for nonhuman animals, but also their interest in health. Two such participants were Brenda and Daenerys, who both regularly watch documentaries on Netflix, which recommends "thought-provoking" documentaries. Featured among these documentaries in their accounts was *Forks Over Knives* (2012), a film that, as already acknowledged, examines the claim that halting consumption of animals can contain, if not reverse, degenerative diseases. *Forks Over Knives* especially interested Brenda, who had developed gallstones

about five years prior to contemplating veganism. At the recommendation of her physician, she eliminated dairy cheese from her diet. While her gallstones ceased to bother her despite remaining in her gallbladder, Brenda remained concerned about them, and the plant-based diet recommended by T. Colin Campbell and others in *Forks Over Knives* intrigued her. Brenda and Daenerys were persuaded by *Forks Over Knives* and its health frame, but their contemplation was also, perhaps more so, activated by documentaries that highlight the abuse and murder of nonhuman animals. Upon watching *Earthlings*, Daenerys declared, "I can't have any part of the meat industry or dairy industry." Brenda watched *Vegucated* (2012), a film that documents the "hidden sides of animal agriculture" while "[following] three meat- and cheese-loving New Yorkers who agree to adopt a vegan diet for six weeks." Brenda had been a vegetarian for decades when she watched *Vegucated*, but had not thought about "where eggs and milk came from." The state of the cows she observed in the documentary made her feel distressed. In addition to documenting the abuse and murder of nonhuman animals, *Vegucated* also addresses how consuming animals harms human health and how animal agriculture harms the environment, a phenomenon that also bothered Brenda, who prioritizes her concern for the environment.

As with Brenda and Daenerys, Sasha and ML encountered sources that addressed nonhuman animals and human health. While Brenda and Daenerys were mobilized more by the abuse and murder of nonhuman animals, Sasha and ML were mobilized more by the healthfulness of veganism. Sasha went vegetarian after reading *Meat Is for Pussies: A How-To Guide for Dudes Who Want to Get Fit, Kick Ass, and Take Names* by John Joseph (2014), who argues that "a plant-based diet offers the best path to athleticism, strength,

sexual stamina, and health." Joseph addresses the exploitation of nonhuman animals, but Sasha, a student of nutrition and an aspiring registered dietitian, was more engaged by his discussion of how consuming animals harms human health. "After reading [the book]," she recalled, "I could barely eat anything because everything looked contaminated to me." After going vegetarian, she read and viewed additional sources that addressed "health and cruelty to animals," and these sources activated her contemplation of veganism. Seeking to overcome "periods of stagnation" by setting monthly goals for himself, ML contemplated veganism through reading. He read about 20 books that are at least tangentially related to veganism in three months. As with Jonathan, ML read Safran Foer and Pollan, but he also cited Alicia Silverstone's *The Kind Diet: A Simple Guide to Feeling Great, Losing Weight, and Saving the Planet*. While Silverstone (2009), as with Safran Foer and Pollan, analytically engages the nonhuman animal, she primarily advocates good health, a priority that resonated with ML.

Food

More than half of my interview participants cited food as a mechanism that vaulted the salience of veganism and activated their contemplation. Food mobilized participants in two manners. First, food mediated interactions with social networks and ties that activated participants' contemplation. Rahul and Jonathan were united through food at a vegetarian social gathering, where, as they dined, Jonathan inspired Rahul to contemplate veganism. Francesca agreed to tag along with Victoria to the university vegan advocacy group meeting "only because there was going to be food." As they ate, she was mobilized by the group's presentation on the merits of veganism. Food mediated the occasion on which Cheryl mobilized Pam. Cheryl went to Pam's home for dinner. Pam disclosed her

cholesterol problem during dinner, and Cheryl suggested that she go vegan. While food mediated this mobilizing interaction with Cheryl, Pam's relationship with Cheryl also set the stage for the mobilizing capacity of vegan food. The second manner in which food mobilized participants was through its taste and abundance, and participants tended to encounter mobilizing food through networks and ties such as Cheryl. Pam and Cheryl regularly dined out at vegan restaurants to accommodate Cheryl's veganism. As Pam recalled, "We went to this fabulous raw [food] restaurant out on Baltimore Avenue. We went to all these places, and I started eating some really good vegan food. That was the beginning [of my veganism]." Coupled with Cheryl's encouragement, this "good vegan food" activated Pam's contemplation.

Paul and Dorothy were also mobilized by the taste and abundance of food they encountered through networks, Paul at the potluck dinner, and Dorothy at the cat trapping seminar. As Paul recalled, "For anyone who was skeptical of veganism before [the dinner], there was so much good food it would have to open your mind up." He was especially impressed that most of the dishes at the dinner did not consist of stereotypical vegan foods. "I was expecting quinoa to be shoved down my throat." Struck by the variety of dishes, Paul "tried a little bit of everything," returning for "seconds" and "thirds," and leaving the dinner convinced that he could satisfy his cravings for taste on a vegan diet. These foods set the stage for his contemplation of veganism. Dorothy expected to leave the seminar feeling hungry upon learning that the lunch provided would be vegan, but she instead left feeling full after enjoying a "beautiful full-course lunch." As we interviewed about 10 years after the event, Dorothy precisely recounted the meal: spicy vegetarian chili, crispy

fried tofu, string beans almondine, salad, rolls with vegan butter, and chocolate chip pound cake. For Dorothy, the meal was a "defining moment."

Kiara's realization that she "could do" veganism was more gradual than that of Dorothy. When Kiara began to date Brandon, she also began to regularly dine with him.

> We'd go out to eat, and I wanted to go places where he could eat something, and not have it just be a salad. So I was exploring different places. He was taking me to places like Govinda's. I ate a huge [vegan cinnamon roll] there. We started cooking together. [My contemplation of veganism at that point] wasn't an effort on my part to want to appease him. It was just something I was thinking about. We were just spending a lot of time together. And I don't want to make two meals. And so let's just make something that we both can eat, or something that I can put cheese on, but otherwise you can eat as well. It was never a moment where I felt like I was denying myself.

Kiara accommodated Brandon's veganism in selecting restaurants and while cooking at home, not because she felt forced, but because she gradually came to recognize that in doing so she was not "denying" her body of healthful food, or herself of the pleasure of food. The food they prepared at home and were served in restaurants convinced her that she could go vegan, thereby activating her contemplation.

While food tended to mobilize participants through networks and ties, food also mobilized participants independently of networks and ties. Charles, for example, dined out at a vegan restaurant in New York while in the city for an acting audition. "I thought, 'Wow! I'd like to eat like this every day.'" "Delicious" and "nutritious," the meal activated his contemplation of veganism. He then fueled this contemplation by patronizing various vegan potluck dinners, including a potluck dinner at The Rotunda.

Mobilization Patterns

Mobilizing mechanisms vaulted the salience of veganism and activated contemplation among my interview participants in particular manners. They prompted

participants to recognize veganism as congruent with their other priorities, activated feeling-thinking, and enhanced their capacity to go vegan. Social networks and ties also mobilized participants by modeling veganism in a manner that they sought to emulate and by forging relationships with other networks and ties.

Networks and ties and books, articles, and documentaries prompted recognition of congruence, thereby prompting participants to contemplate veganism as a priority. In some cases, networks and ties intentionally framed veganism as congruent. Steve and Sarah prioritized their concern for nonhuman animals, Steve through his work with Mercy for Animals, and Sarah through the PAN campaign to end horse-drawn carriages. These networks framed veganism as congruent with this concern, thereby vaulting the salience of veganism and activating their contemplation. Pam prioritized her pressing health problems. Cheryl framed veganism as healthful and supported this framing through online research during their dinner date at Pam's house.

> We spent a lot of time on the web looking up medical sites and [researching] blood cholesterol levels. I really became convinced that this was the solution. I went back to my doctor and said, "I'm not going to [take medication]. Give me six months on this vegan diet. Then we'll redo the levels. If they're still high, you can give me your pills. But if they're not..."

Jonathan does not practice Jainism, but he framed veganism as congruent with the basic tenets of Jainism. This framing resonated with Rahul, who asserted his Jain practice as a priority in their encounter.

> I ended up accidentally sitting next to [Jonathan] at one of these [dinners of] the Philadelphia Vegetarian Social Club. And at the time, half of it was vegetarian; the other half was vegan. [The host of the dinner] is vegan, her husband is vegan. None of that really dawned on me until afterwards, until [Jonathan] was talking to me about the basis for going vegan. And I think most people have this, but I in particular do this cognitive dissonance. "Oh, I'm Jain. I'm supposed to have complete harmlessness. Nonviolence is supreme. Nonviolence above truth. You know, nonviolence is first." And

> that [encompasses] harm to any living sentient beings. I had this complete dissonance with, "Oh, what am I eating? Well it has fewer senses. So it's okay that I eat it." [...] [Jonathan] was on some bus trip to Pittsburgh, and he got more and more and more upset when he saw cows. [...] And to me, what he got to was a realization that I had gotten to almost immediately, which is, it's not a way to live. It eats you up on the inside. You want to use the passion you have as fuel to do good things. [...] I said, "Damn. If you're going to do consistent things in your life, [veganism] is one of them."

Rahul's employment of the term "cognitive dissonance" suggests that he embraces ethics and values that conflicted with his consumption of animal products. Jonathan's story invoked these ethics and values. Rahul recognized that he was violating the Jainism tenet of nonviolence. In the process, he came to recognize veganism as congruent with his Jain practice.

In some cases, as with networks and ties, books, articles, and documentaries intentionally framed veganism as congruent with participants' other priorities. Liz had developed a concern for nonhuman animals and gone vegetarian almost four decades prior to contemplating veganism. The barrage of articles she encountered through her vegan Facebook friends framed veganism as congruent with this concern, thereby invoking this concern and prompting her to recognize its congruence with veganism. Sasha prioritized health as she read Joseph's *Meat Is for Pussies*. His argument that veganism is healthful invoked this priority and prompted Sasha to recognize veganism as congruent with good health. *Forks Over Knives* framed veganism as healthful, and *Vegucated* framed veganism as healthful, as conducive to the rights of nonhuman animals, and as more environmentally sustainable than animal-based diets. These framings resonated with Brenda, who was concerned about her gallstones, the rights of nonhuman animals, and the environment as she watched these documentaries.

In other cases, these mobilizing mechanisms fostered congruence of priorities without addressing veganism, but still by invoking priorities that were recognized as congruent with veganism. Through her involvement in her local ethical humanism chapter, Daenerys learned to value the worth of nonhuman as well as human animals. While ethical humanism does not advocate veganism, and while most of Daenerys's peers in her chapter were not vegan, she came to recognize veganism as congruent with the notion that "[her] life is not worth more than that of a chicken or that of a dog," and this recognition activated her contemplation of veganism. By practicing vegetarianism, Stephanie invoked Jonathan's aversion to hedonism. That she was "making this sacrifice [...] because of a moral good" made Jonathan feel "hedonistic" and "morally inferior." "I pride myself on being a frugal person," he explained. "I try to preclude hedonism in my life." For Jonathan, vegetarianism and eventually veganism were congruent with precluding hedonism. A series of articles and Peck's *The Road Less Traveled* prompted Amber to assess congruence between her actions and beliefs. She recognized the incompatibility of her respect for nonhuman animals and of her consumption of animal products. In the process, she came to recognize veganism as congruent with this respect.

In most cases, participants had asserted priorities with which veganism was assessed for congruence prior to their encounters with mobilizing mechanisms; that is, these priorities preexisted their encounters with these mechanisms. For example, Steve, Sarah, and Liz prioritized their concern for nonhuman animals prior to their encounters with the mechanisms that activated their contemplation of veganism. These mechanisms—networks, documentaries, and articles—invoked this priority in the context of veganism, prompting them to assess the congruence of this priority with veganism. In some cases,

however, congruent priorities were not simply invoked, but constructed. Daenerys's valorization of the worth of nonhuman animals did not preexist her encounters with the ethical humanism chapter, but was instead developed through her encounters with this network. This valorization was rooted in ethics and compassion that she had asserted as priorities prior to her encounters with the chapter, priorities that she came to recognize as congruent with veganism. However, the construction of a related priority, the valorization of the worth of nonhuman animals, a priority that she also came to recognize as congruent with ethics and compassion, activated her contemplation.

Networks and ties mobilized participants by activating feeling-thinking. In some cases, networks and ties activated feeling-thinking through images, articles, and food. A common source of feeling that was activated by networks and ties was the abuse and murder of nonhuman animals. Crystal was mobilized through the sadness caused by the death of Mickey, a nonhuman social tie with whom she experienced an enduring bond. This sadness was powerful enough to linger from Mickey's death until her pledge campaign more than a decade later. Crystal's recognition of veganism as conducive to respecting the complexities of nonhuman animals and to preventing unnecessary death was "saturated with emotions" (Jasper 2014:25). She came to understand and contemplate veganism through her love for Mickey and through her sadness over his death, which she deemed preventable. These emotions were not in addition to, but rather fused with, her thinking about veganism.

Many networks and ties activated feeling-thinking by employing images documenting the abuse and murder of nonhuman animals. Fatemah encountered a "veggie group" that distributed an American Vegan Society brochure emblazoned with images of

"animal cruelty" on farms that produce eggs and dairy products. As a vegetarian, she had been ignorant of the cruelty involved in the production of eggs and dairy. "I read the brochure and I saw the pictures, and that did it for me." The veggie group mobilized Fatemah by educating her on information that was laced with feeling. This information, including the brochure images, upset her. Her contemplation of veganism involved thinking about the cruelty of the egg and dairy industries, and this thinking was fused with how she felt about this cruelty. Amanda encountered images that Eric posted on Facebook.

> [Eric] doesn't post like, "You'll feel better about yourself if you do veganism." It's like a picture of a baby calf being ripped and bloody. I clicked a couple times on his posts, and I was like, "Oh my gosh!" I'd never really thought about it that way. I'm from North Dakota.

Amanda was stunned by the brutality she observed, and this feeling mobilized her. Pam encountered images that Cheryl posted on Facebook. "[Cheryl] is always posting horrific things with animals on Facebook," she said. "I'm going, 'Oh, this is so horrible.' So that's a little witness she's got going there. It was making inroads. I kept saying, '[Cheryl], I'm always afraid to look at your Facebook posts because I'm going to start crying.'" When Asia posted *Meet Your Meat,* Alexis encountered images in the form of video footage documenting factory farm practices. The documentary's footage made her feel "uncomfortable," and this feeling mobilized her. Liz also felt heightened emotion through social media, but not just through images. She felt "really bothered" upon reading about the violence of the egg and dairy industries, as documented in the articles posted by her vegan Facebook friends. Liz was mobilized not simply because she deemed this violence to be unethical, but also because this violence "bothered" her.

Among the sources of the images and articles cited by Fatemah, Amanda, Pam, Alexis, and Liz were networks and ties that sought to elicit affective commitments from

them by documenting evidence of abuse and murder. The intent of this recruitment was not simply to inform them of these phenomena, but also to make them feel "uncomfortable" with and "bothered" by these phenomena, and to make them think through these feelings. The evidence bothered these participants, just as it had bothered the networks and ties through which these participants had gained access to it. The sharing of this feeling between these networks and ties and their respective recruitment targets mobilized the latter.

Networks and ties also activated feeling-thinking through food. The taste of vegan food activated the feeling of pleasure among participants. The pleasure that Dorothy felt while tasting the meal at the cat trapping seminar was so forceful that she was able to identify every component of the meal a decade after eating it. In similar fashion, Pam and Paul felt pleasure through tasting vegan food, Pam at various vegan restaurants, and Paul at the potluck dinner. Dorothy, Pam, and Paul prioritized the pleasure they derived from taste, and they contemplated veganism upon recognizing that they could feel this pleasure through vegan food. While Dorothy, Pam, and Paul felt pleasure through vegan food, Sasha felt disgust through animal-based food, a feeling she experienced not through networks and ties, but through Joseph's *Meat Is for Pussies*. His explanation for how consuming animals harms human health effectively, perhaps intentionally, transmitted the feeling of disgust, as Sasha viewed animal-based food as "contaminated" through reading the book. This feeling of disgust set the stage for her contemplation of veganism.

In addition to influencing participants, mobilizing mechanisms empowered participants. These mechanisms enhanced the capacity of participants to go vegan. Across many networks and ties, veganism was a familiar concept, and this familiarity fostered the

transmission of information and advice that participants utilized as they contemplated veganism and attempted to go vegan. While Amber and Francesca were influenced by the university vegan advocacy group, the group also empowered them by communicating information that they utilized in their contemplation. Amber learned about the next pledge campaign through the group, while Francesca was introduced to data on the environmental destruction of animal agriculture through the group. Eric empowered Amanda by educating her on the abuse and murder of nonhuman animals and by informing her of the next pledge campaign. Cheryl empowered Pam by advising her on how to go vegan, a conversation that involved linking Pam to online resources and identifying foods that contain and foods that do not contain cholesterol. Amber, Francesca, Amanda, and Pam became more informed and thus more capable actors through the resources that they acquired from their respective networks and ties. In similar fashion, books, articles, and documentaries transmitted information that empowered participants. Steve and Liz had been ignorant of the plight of nonhuman animals whose bodies are used in the egg industry. Steve learned of this plight from the Mercy for Animals film, while Liz learned from the articles posted by her vegan Facebook friends. Sasha learned about the health benefits of not consuming animals from the sources she read and viewed, including Joseph's *Meat Is for Pussies*. Steve, Liz, and Sasha became more informed and thus more capable actors through these sources.

Food emerged as an empowering mechanism through its taste and abundance, activating participants' contemplation of veganism in the process. The pleasure derived from tasting vegan food convinced participants that they could enjoy tasting vegan food. This pleasure was crucial for Dorothy as she consumed the vegan meal at the cat trapping

seminar. She felt more capable of going vegan because of how this meal tasted. She also felt more capable because of the abundance of vegan foods at the event. Dorothy anticipated that she would feel hungry after the seminar; instead, with access to an abundance of vegan foods in the form of a full-course meal, she felt full. Feeling full made her feel more capable of going vegan. Paul was ready for "quinoa to be shoved down [his] throat" at the potluck dinner, but he instead encountered a variety of vegan dishes, many of which did not consist of stereotypical vegan foods. This abundance, in the form of great variety, made him feel more capable of going vegan. Pam was mobilized not only by the taste of the food served at the numerous vegan restaurants she patronized with Cheryl, but also by the number of restaurants, a number that represented vegan dining options and that made her feel more capable of going vegan.

As with the evangelicals in David Smilde's (2005) study, networks and ties also mobilized participants through modeling. At the first gathering of one of the pledge campaigns, Megan, a pledge with whom I did not conduct an interview, explained that she was pledging because she had met "two normal, fabulous vegans." Tiffany and Scott, both campaign mentors, had performed veganism in a manner Megan deemed "normal." Implied in Megan's explanation was that vegans can be abnormal, and that she valorized normal, at least in the context of veganism. These "two normal, fabulous vegans" mobilized her by modeling veganism as normal and thereby convincing her that she could be both vegan and normal. As with Megan, some participants contemplated veganism upon interacting with vegan social ties who effectively modeled veganism, meaning these social ties performed veganism in a manner that impressed participants and that participants sought to emulate. The evangelicals in Smilde's (p. 772) study modeled

evangelicalism and converted targets through "exemplary behavior" and by "wearing their faith on their sleeve." In my study, mobilizing vegans such as Tiffany and Scott activated participants' contemplation by performing veganism as normal; by demonstrating its practicality; by instilling conviction in participants; and by being healthy.

Brandon and Brian demonstrated the practicality of veganism to Kiara. This practicality, in combination with the reserved manner in which they discussed their veganism, convinced her that veganism was not extreme and that she could and should consider practicing it. Anthony recognized the practicality of veganism through his best friend Melissa. The ease with which she practiced veganism convinced him that he could at least go vegetarian. Melissa invited him to attend monthly vegetarian dinner parties, where he encountered pledge mentors and began to contemplate veganism. Cheryl's father went vegan about 20 to 25 years before she pledged. He was an animal rights activist who repeatedly asserted that "meat is murder" and who educated his children on his campaign to end foie gras by showing them videos of how ducks and geese are force-fed. His unapologetic assertiveness emboldened Cheryl to protest for the rights of nonhuman animals, to go vegetarian, and to eventually contemplate veganism. "I can say 'no' to meat," she declared. "Even if everyone else is eating it, I can say 'no.'"

The source of Jen's contemplation of veganism was Lori. Jen was stunned by Lori's capacity to maintain a high level of energy while working about 80 hours per week. "She could run circles around people," Jen raved. Lori introduced Jen to veganism and to arguments for the rights of nonhuman animals, and encouraged her to eat more vegetables and to juice. Having observed Lori's energy level, Jen was convinced that veganism could improve her health. A woman of color from New Jersey, Jada had encountered a discourse

of veganism being a movement of "affluent Caucasians." On Instagram and on blogs, however, she found several vegans of color who raved about how veganism had improved their health. Among the vegans of color she followed was JerseyVegan, who, as documented on her blog, had been living an unhealthful lifestyle on a demanding schedule. A friend of one of Jada's friends, JerseyVegan went vegan and improved her health. As Jada observed, "She feels great. She feels spiritually relieved in her head. She goes to sleep every night feeling good about herself." In addition to the health benefits, JerseyVegan also discussed "how she incorporates [veganism] into her daily lifestyle," reporting on the restaurants she patronizes, her consumption of alkaline water, and how to eat raw. That a woman of color, an "economic equal" also from New Jersey, was "able to incorporate what [Jada] assumed was a difficult lifestyle to maintain" empowered her to believe that she could also go vegan. "It was impressive to see someone I knew doing this," Jada said. "If it can be done, what's stopping me?"

Consistent with the McAdam, Sidney Tarrow, and Charles Tilly (2001) notion of brokerage, the organizers of the pledge campaigns and the potluck dinners effectively permeated other networks, forging relationships with these other networks and with individuals both within and beyond these other networks. In the process, they recruited some of these individuals to their networks. Acting as a member of the university vegan advocacy group that activated Amber's contemplation of veganism, I announced the next pledge campaign on the group's listserv, thereby linking the two networks and effectively recruiting Amber. PAN recruited Julie, Crystal, and Cheryl while tabling and promoting upcoming pledge campaigns at events where various networks connected. PAN recruited Julie at a gay pride festival, Crystal at an environmental festival, and Cheryl at a

fundraising gathering for animal welfare and animal rights organizations. Daenerys learned about the next pledge campaign on Meetup, a website she patronizes as a member of several groups, including the ethical humanism chapter. Although Daenerys was not a member of the PAN Meetup group through which her pledge campaign was announced, Meetup featured the event in her calendar of suggested "meetups." Highlighting the power of social ties, Brenda and Francesca were recruited to their pledge campaign by Amy via Amy's mother, who is Brenda's close friend.

The organizers of the pledge campaigns permeated other networks and actively recruited participants via oral communication, Meetup, Facebook, and flyers. They reached a variety of networks, from a university vegan advocacy group and vegetarian social groups to a university animal welfare group and nonprofit organizations. In some instances, they effectively permeated these other networks because they were members of these other networks. While recruiting Raven, Aliyah was both a pledge mentor and the president of the university animal welfare group. Multiple participants were recruited to the potluck dinners because Becca, the lead organizer, is a member of multiple networks. As Director of The Rotunda, Becca regularly hosts concerts and thus a network of musicians, and, of course, she regularly hosts potluck dinners and thus a network of vegans. Paul became her Facebook friend because he is a musician who performed at The Rotunda. Upon encountering her promotion of a potluck dinner on Facebook, he decided to attend, a decision that set the stage for his contemplation of veganism.

Agency

While my interview participants contemplated veganism in response to mobilizing mechanisms, they acted with agency in this process. They asserted priorities that they

came to recognize as congruent with veganism; facilitated their engagement with the mechanisms that mobilized them; and assessed veganism as a prospective priority.

A "multifaceted social justice activist for 35 years," Steve observed compassionate human rights activists disregarding the welfare of nonhuman animals. Concern for nonhuman animals became a priority, one he asserted as he applied for a job with Mercy for Animals, and one he asserted as he assessed the prospect of going vegan upon watching the organization's film. The organization and the film effectively activated his contemplation of veganism because he prioritized his concern for nonhuman animals, a priority that, through the film, he came to recognize as congruent with veganism. Jonathan prioritized a lifestyle devoid of hedonism, and when Stephanie's vegetarianism invoked this priority, he came to recognize vegetarianism as congruent with it. Stephanie's vegetarianism was a force that activated Jonathan's contemplation of vegetarianism, but the mobilizing power of her vegetarianism was enhanced by his prioritization of precluding hedonism, a priority he later deemed congruent with veganism. Rahul prioritized Jainism and its tenet of nonviolence, and when Jonathan's story about the exploited cows invoked these priorities, he came to recognize veganism as congruent with them. That Rahul prioritized his Jain practice and nonviolence enhanced the mobilizing power of Jonathan's story. Sasha asserted health as a priority in choosing to read and view sources that addressed the risks of consuming animals. Swayed by the evidence presented in these sources, Sasha came to recognize veganism as congruent with good health. Veganism became a prospective priority because she prioritized health.

Participants chose to forge relationships with particular networks and ties based on particular priorities. Steve applied for a job with Mercy for Animals. Prioritizing his

concern for nonhuman animals, Steve chose to engage with the network through which he encountered the film that mobilized him. Amber learned about and enrolled in her pledge campaign upon encountering my announcement on the university vegan advocacy group's listserv. This announcement fueled her contemplation of veganism, but she facilitated her relationship with this mobilizing network. Amber had been vegetarian since she was 12 or 13 years old, and had been curious about veganism for years. She prioritized her appreciation and respect for nonhuman animals and asserted this priority in choosing to connect with the university vegan advocacy group during her first semester of college. The group fueled her contemplation, but so did her assertion of this priority and her choice to participate in the group.

Participants chose to read books and articles and watch documentaries based on particular priorities. Liz chose to read articles on the violence involved in the egg and dairy industries based on her concern for nonhuman animals, a priority that had been the root of her almost four decades of vegetarianism. Thus, she facilitated her engagement with the mechanisms—the articles and the network of vegan Facebook friends through whom she encountered these articles—that activated her contemplation of veganism. Participants also chose to consume food in venues in which other people and/or the food mobilized them. Paul chose to patronize the potluck dinner, where he was impressed by the "nice" vegans and the "good food" he encountered. His decision to attend was in part motivated by his desire to "show off" his homemade vegan bread. In acting on this desire, Paul exercised agency through food and set the stage for his encounters with the vegans and the food they served. These two forces set the stage for his contemplation of veganism.

Almost all of my participants assessed veganism as a prospective priority. This assessment involved assessing the information and arguments presented by their networks and ties; the information and arguments presented in books, articles, and documentaries; the taste and abundance of vegan food; and how social ties modeled veganism. Rahul employed his Jain ideals as the criteria with which he assessed Jonathan's argument for veganism. This argument satisfied Rahul's standards and activated his contemplation of veganism. Liz assessed the information presented in the articles posted by her vegan Facebook friends and concluded that the documented violence was "horrible," a conclusion that activated her contemplation. Sasha prioritized health and therefore assessed veganism according to its healthfulness, examining evidence from the sources she read and viewed. Employing her nutrition expertise, Sasha deemed this evidence to be credible. "In general," she claimed, "plants—vegetables, fruits—all have the most natural nutrients. I think it's the most natural way to eat." She contemplated veganism as a result. Paul assessed and praised the taste of the foods served at the potluck dinner, and these foods set the stage for his contemplation of veganism. Paul also assessed the practicality of vegan food by measuring abundance. He employed his criteria for abundance, measuring according to the amount of vegan foods that were not stereotypical vegan foods at the potluck dinner. The abundance of vegan foods that were not stereotypical vegan foods at the dinner impressed him and convinced him that he could go vegan.

Anthony was mobilized by the manner in which Melissa modeled veganism, but how she modeled veganism was only as effective as Anthony deemed it to be. He was impressed by the ease with which Melissa practiced veganism. She modeled veganism by demonstrating its practicality amid discourses of veganism being difficult and inaccessible,

discourses that had interpellated Anthony. "I thought it'd be too hard," he recalled. Anthony identified himself as a "habitual person" who appreciates routine, efficiency, and organization. He needed a diet that would not disrupt his habitual tendencies. Melissa's performance of veganism as easy and practical was effective modeling because Anthony prioritized easy and practical. Jen was mobilized in part by Lori's high level of energy. Initially, Lori was simply modeling good health because Jen did not know that Lori was vegan until she inquired about her energy. "I wanted to know what she was doing [to maintain her energy]," Jen recalled. She initiated this interaction because she was concerned about her own level of energy. "I had felt like I was in a fog all the time. I felt horrible." Lori's performance of veganism as healthful was effective modeling because Jen prioritized health in the context of their encounters.

Vegetarianism and Reducitarianism

As mechanisms that mobilized my interview participants, vegetarianism and the reduction of consumption of animals, or reducitarianism, were not as cited as social networks and ties; books, articles, and documentaries; and food. However, considering that 25 of my 34 participants identified as vegetarian at one point, with an additional 6 participants having engaged in some form of reducitarianism, and considering that the decision to become vegetarian or to reduce consumption of animals involves advancing toward veganism, how vegetarianism and reducitarianism interact with veganism is a compelling question. For some participants, vegetarianism and reducitarianism operated as mechanisms that activated their contemplation of veganism. These mechanisms activated contemplation by linking participants to networks that involved veganism and by prompting them to recognize their capacity to go vegan.

As vegetarians, Nick, Rahul, and Fatemah participated in different vegetarian networks. Nick participated in the Yahoo group's monthly vegetarian lunches, where he met Amy, who encouraged him to enroll in the next pledge campaign. At another vegetarian social gathering, Rahul met Jonathan, whose mobilization experience inspired him to contemplate veganism. At a veggie group gathering, Fatemah encountered the American Vegan Society brochure that documented the violence of the egg and dairy industries and that advocated veganism, not vegetarianism. Nick, Rahul, and Fatemah felt that they belonged in these venues because they were vegetarian. In these venues, they encountered veganism, and these encounters activated their contemplation of veganism.

Many participants narrated their vegetarianism or reducitarianism as a step that was necessary for their contemplation of veganism. When they realized they were capable of reducing their consumption of animals, they could then seriously contemplate eliminating their consumption of animals. Jonathan's vegetarianism prompted his contemplation of veganism because of how "offensively easy" it was. He felt "like a great runner/athlete running one mile a day." Similarly, Alexis "didn't feel like [she] was being challenged" during her one year as a pescatarian, meaning as a consumer of marine animals, but not of other animals. She identified the pledge campaign as an opportunity to challenge herself. Anthony went vegetarian mindful that he remained complicit in the "terrible things" that happen to nonhuman animals, but he lacked confidence in his ability to go vegan. He gained this confidence through his 14 months of vegetarianism. During her courtship with Brandon, Kiara gradually reduced her consumption of animals without claiming a vegetarian identification. This gradual rather than sudden reduction prompted her to

recognize over time that she could "do veganism well." Thus, her contemplation of veganism became possible through a gradual process of reducitarianism.

However, for most participants who engaged in vegetarianism or reducitarianism, the influence of these practices was more ambiguous. Participants such as Dan and Amanda went vegetarian as they became more conscious of their consumption, and this conscious consumption set the stage for their contemplation of veganism. However, this contemplation of veganism is rooted in their conscious consumption and not necessarily in their vegetarianism. Their vegetarian identification may have increased the potential of later identifying as vegan. As already acknowledged, Nick, Rahul, and Fatemah participated in vegetarian networks because they identified as vegetarian, and these networks activated their contemplation of veganism. In addition, as the cases of Jonathan, Alexis, Anthony, and Kiara suggest, the capacity of Dan and Amanda to consume a predominantly plant-based diet may have later convinced them that they were capable of going vegan. However, whether the vegetarian identification or the capacity to go vegetarian activated their contemplation of veganism is unclear. Furthermore, their vegetarianism may have been a hindrance to contemplating veganism. Most participants who were vegetarian did not go vegetarian as part of a conscious process to eventually go vegan. They went vegetarian because they believed that vegetarianism was the behavior that was most congruent with their values and interests. This identification of vegetarianism as the most appropriate behavior precluded any potential for their contemplation of veganism at the time. Dan was vegetarian for 35 years because he thought of vegetarianism as the behavior that was most congruent with his concern for

nonhuman animals. This thinking delayed his eventual contemplation of veganism, as he remained "ignorant about the dairy industry."

Conclusion

Among the most prevalent mechanisms to vault the salience of veganism and activate contemplation among my interview participants were social networks and ties; books, articles, and documentaries; and food. These mechanisms mobilized participants in multiple manners. They prompted participants to recognize veganism as congruent with their other priorities; activated feeling-thinking; and enhanced their capacity to go vegan. Participants did not passively respond to these mechanisms. They asserted priorities that they came to recognize as congruent with veganism; they facilitated their engagement with the mechanisms that mobilized them, engaging particular mechanisms based on particular priorities; and they assessed veganism as a prospective priority.

The mechanisms discussed in this chapter were not more likely to activate contemplation of veganism among the vegans or the non-vegans. Two mechanisms that spawned divergence between the two groups were discourses of ethics and discourses of healthfulness. I address this divergence in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 5

DIVERGENCE

As a child, Kimberly had a strong desire to not eat animals. When I inquired about the roots of this desire, Kimberly rejected the notion that it was prompted by an external force. "I feel like all kids have these thoughts [about not eating animals], and get them beaten out of them by parents or leaders of society or whatever." No one was able to "beat" these thoughts out of Kimberly. She attempted to go vegetarian during her middle school years, but her parents prevented her. Following high school graduation in 2007, Kimberly embraced her independence from her parents and vegetarianism in the process. Five years later, for "ethical reasons," she attempted to go vegan while living in New Hampshire, but halted her veganism after only one month. Kimberly "had all the reasoning" to go vegan. She "just didn't put it into practice." One year later, in 2013, she read an article about how milk is violently extracted from cows and how baby calves are taken from their mothers and "sent to slaughter." For Kimberly, the article did not present any new information, but it prompted a "shift in consciousness." "I can't do this anymore," she declared. Kimberly attempted to go vegan again, and this time her veganism lasted. Her second attempt was easier because she was living in Philadelphia, a more vegan-friendly location where she had vegan friends, but the success of her second attempt was also contingent on her evolved mentality. "My heart was in it," she explained. "I was thinking a different way."

While Kimberly contemplated veganism through her concern for nonhuman animals, Jada contemplated veganism through her concern about her weight and her irregular bowel movements. She articulated this concern to her health-conscious

pescatarian friend Diamond, who suggested that she eliminate animal-based food from her diet and enroll in a Peace Advocacy Network (PAN) vegan pledge campaign. Jada also encountered female vegans of color, notably JerseyVegan, on Instagram and on blogs. These people raved about how veganism had improved their health. "Looking for the messiah mecca lifestyle where you walk around with a halo around yourself," Jada pledged. "I wanted to try something different," she said. "You hear so much about how not eating meat clears your skin, how your body assimilates food better without meat in your system." Jada had lost 25 pounds in the 10 months prior to her pledge campaign, and she wanted to lose more weight. While her bowel movements normalized, she lost only 4 pounds during her seven weeks of veganism, a result she deemed "disheartening." Dining out with her boyfriend seven weeks after pledging, Jada impulsively consumed chicken and effectively terminated her veganism. Pledge campaigns last only four weeks, and network support, both in person and virtual, tends to dissipate after the campaigns. Jada lamented the loss of this network support, but she cited her "laziness" as the primary reason for her recidivism. She also admitted that had she lost more weight during her seven weeks of veganism, "I would've stuck with it."

Kimberly's contemplation of veganism was activated in large part by discourses of ethics, while Jada's contemplation was activated in large part by discourses of healthfulness. I operationalize discourses as articulations and notions that pervade society and that in particular circumstances mobilize people to behave in particular manners; and I operationalize ethics as an act that distinguishes between right and wrong and that is conducive to social justice, including interspecies social justice. Discourses of ethics and discourses of healthfulness vaulted the salience of veganism and activated contemplation

among my interview participants in multiple manners. First, as with other mobilizing mechanisms, they prompted participants to recognize veganism as congruent with their other priorities. Kimberly prioritized ethical behavior, while Jada prioritized health. Mobilizing discourses prompted Kimberly and Jada to recognize veganism as congruent with these priorities, thereby activating their contemplation. Second, participants were convinced of the validity of discourses of ethics and discourses of healthfulness. Jada became convinced that veganism could improve her health through her assessment of the validity of this notion. In addition, discourses of ethics mobilized participants by activating feeling-thinking. They induced feeling-thinking as they were communicated in powerful manners and as they prompted participants to feel not ethical enough. The article that Kimberly read communicated the notion that consuming dairy products is wrong in a powerful manner, powerful to the extent that it prompted a "shift in consciousness" and made her feel not ethical enough. Kimberly contemplated veganism not simply through facts, but also through feelings.

Discourses of ethics and discourses of healthfulness activated participants' contemplation of veganism, but participants were an active force in this process, as they were in their encounters with other mobilizing mechanisms. First, participants exercised agency in asserting priorities that they came to recognize as congruent with veganism. Kimberly asserted ethical behavior as a priority, while Jada asserted health as a priority. They came to recognize these priorities as congruent with veganism. Second, participants actively engaged with other mechanisms, including social networks and ties, that communicated mobilizing discourses. Kimberly chose to read the article that communicated the notion that consuming dairy products is wrong, and this article prompted

her "shift in consciousness." Third, participants assessed veganism as a prospective priority, notably by assessing the validity of discourses they encountered. Jada encountered the notion that veganism can improve health through vegans of color on Instagram and on blogs, and deemed this notion to be valid according to the health benefits articulated and embodied by the vegans of color she followed. Fourth, while the cases of Kimberly and Jada did not reveal this pattern, participants contributed to the construction of discourses that mobilized them.

Kimberly and Jada reported different outcomes, with Kimberly going vegan and Jada not going vegan. These diverging outcomes were consistent with a pattern across my sample. While most of the cited mechanisms—for example, networks and ties; books, articles, and documentaries; and food—were not more likely to activate contemplation of veganism among the vegans or the non-vegans, discourses of ethics were more likely to activate contemplation among the vegans, and discourses of healthfulness were more likely to activate contemplation among the non-vegans. Participants who, as with Kimberly, were mobilized primarily by discourses of ethics were more likely to ultimately go vegan than to reject veganism, while participants who, as with Jada, were mobilized primarily by discourses of healthfulness were more likely to ultimately reject veganism. Of the 25 participants who identified discourses of ethics as a primary source of their contemplation, 19 went vegan. Of the 11 participants who identified health as a primary source of their contemplation, only 3 went vegan.

Kimberly and Jada also varied in how they exercised agency. They both asserted priorities that they came to recognize as congruent with veganism, both actively engaged with other mechanisms through which they encountered mobilizing discourses, and both

assessed the validity of these discourses. In these exercises, however, they varied in mentality, and Kimberly varied in mentality between her first and second attempts to go vegan. As already discussed, I operationalize mentality as the participant's incentive for contemplating veganism, and as the participant's attitude toward the prospect of going vegan. While Kimberly's contemplation persisted even after her failed first attempt, her second attempt was activated by the "shift in consciousness" that she experienced upon reading the article. As she recalled of her elevated commitment to veganism, "My heart was in it." In contrast, Jada contemplated veganism because "she wanted to try something different." She was "looking for the messiah mecca lifestyle where you walk around with a halo around yourself." Kimberly and Jada diverged in at least two manners. First, Kimberly's contemplation was altruistic. Her "shift in consciousness" involved heightened mindfulness of how she had been complicit in the abuse and murder of cows. Jada's contemplation was not altruistic. She identified herself as the primary beneficiary of her prospective veganism. While Kimberly also accounted for how she could personally benefit from going vegan, she identified nonhuman animals as primary beneficiaries of her veganism. Second, Jada's assertion that "she wanted to try something different" suggests less intentionality than does Kimberly's assertion that her "heart was in it" and that she was "thinking a different way." The different mentalities with which Kimberly and Jada contemplated veganism were consistent with a pattern across my sample, as the vegans were more likely than the non-vegans to prioritize altruism as they contemplated veganism. In addition, the non-vegans expressed more passivity and less intentionality as they narrated their contemplation of veganism. In contrast, the vegans were more likely to seek

information that motivated and empowered them to go vegan, and more likely to narrate their veganism as inevitable.

In this chapter, I discuss how the vegans and the non-vegans diverged in their contemplation of veganism. First, I discuss how discourses of ethics and discourses of healthfulness vaulted the salience of veganism and activated participants' contemplation, with discourses of ethics operating more among the vegans, and discourses of healthfulness operating more among the non-vegans. Second, I discuss the diverging mentalities with which the vegans and the non-vegans contemplated veganism, with the vegans more likely to prioritize altruism and to display initiative and determination.

Discourses of Ethics

Of my 34 interview participants, 31 cited discourses of ethics as a mechanism that vaulted the salience of veganism and activated their contemplation. For 6 of these 31 participants, however, discourses of ethics was a secondary mechanism, meaning that they narrated other mechanisms as more forceful in activating their contemplation. Of the 25 participants for whom discourses of ethics was a primary mechanism, 19 went vegan. Most of the cited discourses of ethics involved nonhuman animals. Perhaps the most cited discourse was the notion that consuming animal products is wrong. Additional cited discourses of ethics involved broader ethical considerations that accounted for, but also transcended, nonhuman animals; and ethical considerations toward the environment. Most of the cited discourses of ethics were communicated through social networks and ties in which participants were embedded.

Almost all of the vegans who were mobilized primarily by discourses of ethics were vegetarian for ethical reasons before going vegan. In large part, though not exclusively,

through networks and ties, these participants encountered the notion that consuming animal products is wrong and the notion that veganism is more ethical than vegetarianism. Among these participants were Fatemah, Liz, and Amanda, all three of whom were ethical vegetarians for decades and were unaware that the production of eggs and dairy involved murder; and all three of whom ultimately went vegan. At 15 years old, while attending a school at the Iranian embassy in Kuwait, Fatemah was inspired by a teacher who challenged her and her classmates to think about their relationships with nonhuman animals.

> He pointed his finger to the class and said, "What makes you think that you can take a life away just because you have the power to do so? What makes you think you can eat animals? Would you do that to a [human] baby just because you have the power and you can?"

Fatemah was convinced that she did not have the right to "take a life away." She immediately attempted to go vegetarian, but her parents prevented her. When she moved to the United States for college two years later, she went vegetarian. She continued to consume eggs, incorrectly thinking that the production of eggs did not involve murder. Two decades later, upon reading the American Vegan Society brochure distributed by the veggie group, Fatemah encountered another discourse: consuming eggs is wrong. She was now convinced that not only did she not have the right to consume animal flesh, she did not have the right to consume animal products either. For Fatemah, discourses of ethics, as communicated by her teacher, the veggie group, and the American Vegan Society, vaulted the salience of vegetarianism and eventually veganism, thereby activating her contemplation.

As with Fatemah, Liz went vegetarian unaware that veganism was an "important step." "I figured, 'What's the big deal? If the chickens are treated well and eating their eggs

isn't hurting them, what's the big deal?' I didn't really think anything of it." The articles posted by Liz's vegan Facebook friends documented the violence of the egg and dairy industries and communicated the notion that consuming eggs and dairy products is wrong. This notion activated Liz's contemplation of veganism. Amanda had been vegetarian for more than two decades when she encountered Eric's posts on Facebook. These posts communicated the violence involved in vegetarianism, thereby revealing to her the "inconsistency of vegetarianism" and activating her contemplation. "Until [Eric's] posts, I hadn't thought about vegetarianism that way," she said.

Jen, Cheryl, and Steve also contemplated veganism and ultimately went vegan through the notion that consuming animal products is wrong. Jen was impressed with the energy displayed by Lori, but when she inquired about Lori's "secret" to good health, Lori explained that her veganism was motivated by the notion that nonhuman animals have rights. Lori gave to Jen literature on factory farming and on the rights of nonhuman animals. Lori "got [her] into it." During our interview, Jen identified herself as an "animal rights-type person." Mobilized in part by the notion that nonhuman animals have rights, Jen went vegan while living in rural northern Maine in 2001. She halted her veganism and settled for vegetarianism in an environment that she claimed was not conducive to veganism, but after 12 years of vegetarianism, and now living in a Philadelphia suburb, she contemplated veganism again and enrolled in a pledge campaign. Cheryl learned about veganism and the animal rights movement through her vegan father, as he repeatedly declared that "meat is murder." This discourse resonated with Cheryl, as she contemplated vegetarianism and eventually veganism. Steve had been an ethical vegetarian for 27 years when he contemplated veganism upon watching the Mercy for Animals film. As a social

justice activist, Steve had been aware of how different forms of oppression intersect and perpetuate each other in an economic system that prioritizes profit, but he had excluded speciesism from his intersectional thinking. The Mercy for Animals film prompted him to make "that additional connection," to account for the notion that other forms of oppression perpetuate speciesism, just as speciesism perpetuates other forms of oppression. "Tired of human-centered thinking," Steve contemplated veganism.

The discourses of ethics that mobilized these participants were communicated by networks in which they were embedded and by social ties with whom they were linked. In cases in which these participants had been ignorant of the merits of veganism, the communication of these discourses by their networks and ties was crucial to the activation of their contemplation of veganism. While these networks and ties did not create the notion that consuming eggs is wrong, they relayed it to an audience that had not considered it. As Kimberly and Dorothy revealed, discourses of ethics also transcended networks and ties. Kimberly encountered the notion that consuming dairy products is wrong upon reading the article about the violence of the dairy industry, and this notion activated her contemplation. As Dorothy watched the documentary on animal agriculture practices, she encountered the notion that slaughterhouse practices are cruel, a notion that activated her contemplation.

Kiara, Jonathan, and Rahul contemplated veganism and ultimately went vegan through their concern for nonhuman animals, but they were mobilized by discourses that involved broader ethical considerations that transcended nonhuman animals. Through Brandon and Brian, Kiara encountered the notion that veganism is ethical. Kiara did not cite this notion as articulated by Brandon and Brian, but instead as performed by Brandon and Brian. They were "doing something ethically sound," thereby communicating without

words that veganism is ethical and that, by not practicing veganism, Kiara "had been ethically weak." "I had a weak constitution," she claimed. The notion that veganism is ethical activated her contemplation. Through his relationship with Stephanie, Jonathan was interpellated by the notion that consuming animals is hedonistic. Stephanie did not articulate this notion, but, as with Brandon and Brian, communicated it through performance. That she was "making this sacrifice in her life by giving up cheesesteaks, chicken nuggets, and spicy tuna sushi rolls made [Jonathan] feel more hedonistic." He asked himself, "Why do I have to stuff my face with this sushi? She doesn't." This recognition and resentment of hedonism prompted Jonathan to go vegetarian, a decision that set the stage for his contemplation of veganism. Jonathan activated Rahul's contemplation as he recounted the exploited cows he observed during his trek to Pittsburgh. For Rahul, the story invoked a Jainism tenet: nonviolence is supreme. Without uttering this phrase, Jonathan reminded him that nonviolence is supreme. Rahul asked himself, "What am I eating?" Jonathan's story and the discourse it invoked activated Rahul's contemplation.

Mother and daughter Brenda and Francesca contemplated veganism and ultimately went vegan in part through their ethical considerations for the environment. Francesca encountered the notion that animal agriculture harms the environment through the university vegan advocacy group. Implied in the notion that animal agriculture harms the environment is that veganism is more environmentally sustainable, and this notion activated Francesca's contemplation. As with her daughter, Brenda encountered the notion that veganism can "save the planet." Brenda did not cite a particular network as the source of her encounter with this discourse; rather, she cited *Vegucated*, among other

documentaries, along with her gradually increasing awareness that "we should have a nice ecosystem living out there," and that "we are the ones destroying everything because we can't live together with animals." The notion that veganism can "save the planet" prompted Brenda to identify veganism as an opportunity "to do something."

The 6 participants who were mobilized primarily by discourses of ethics and who ultimately rejected veganism similarly cited discourses that involved nonhuman animals and broader ethical considerations that transcended nonhuman animals. These participants rejected veganism in large part because they differed from the vegans in how they exercised agency. In addition, they may have encountered stronger antagonism to their prospective veganism than that encountered by the vegans, though the vegans reported strong antagonism.

Discourses of Healthfulness

While most interview participants who were mobilized primarily by discourses of ethics went vegan, most participants who were mobilized primarily by discourses of healthfulness did not. Of the 34 participants, 18 cited discourses of healthfulness as a mechanism that vaulted the salience of veganism and activated their contemplation. For 7 of these 18 participants, however, discourses of healthfulness was a secondary mechanism, meaning that they narrated other mechanisms as more forceful in activating their contemplation. Of the 11 participants for whom discourses of healthfulness was a primary mechanism, only 3 went vegan. For 4 of these 11 participants, discourses of healthfulness interacted with social networks and ties to mobilize them. Jada, for example, encountered the notion that veganism can improve health through a social tie, Diamond, and through a network of female vegans of color on Instagram. That fewer than half of these participants

were mobilized by discourses of healthfulness through networks and ties contrasts with the finding that most participants who were mobilized primarily by discourses of ethics encountered these discourses through networks and ties. Discourses of ethics may have spawned more vegans than discourses of healthfulness did in part because they were more frequently communicated through influential networks and ties in which participants were embedded.

All 11 participants for whom discourses of healthfulness was a primary mechanism were mobilized by the notion that veganism can improve health. Among the 8 participants who were mobilized primarily by discourses of healthfulness, but who ultimately rejected veganism, was Janet, who, as with Jada, contemplated veganism thinking it could cure a health problem, in her case high cholesterol. The notion that veganism can cure health problems vaulted the salience of veganism, which Janet deemed congruent with her desire to lower her cholesterol. She encountered this notion through vegan- and vegetarian-defined Meetup groups, which prompted her to be "more conscious" of her health. She contemplated veganism as a result. Alexis also encountered the notion that veganism could cure her health problems, but not through a particular network or tie. She had been "lazy" and "too tired to do anything." Her doctor stated that she needed to drop 100 pounds. Alexis encountered the notion that veganism could alleviate these problems by increasing her energy and by decreasing her weight.

Jasmine, Sasha, and Nick also contemplated and ultimately rejected veganism in response to the notion that veganism can improve health, though they were not seeking to cure a health problem. Jasmine, another student of nutrition and aspiring registered dietitian, encountered this notion through me. As I was protesting a circus that forces

nonhuman animals to perform, Jasmine and I engaged in a conversation about veganism, and I encouraged her to attend an event that I was hosting as part of my social justice speaker series at Temple University. The event featured a lecture by Billy, who, along with being a founding member of PAN, is a registered dietitian. The event also featured clips from *Forks Over Knives*. The talk and the documentary convinced Jasmine that veganism is healthful, thereby activating her contemplation. "That really opened my eyes," she said. "That's when I was like, 'Yeah, I'd be interested in doing this pledge [campaign].'" Sasha encountered the notion that a vegan diet can be healthful, but not through a particular network or tie. She learned from the John Joseph book *Meat Is for Pussies*, among other sources, that "not eating meat is good for the body." While Nick was not dealing with a health problem, he encountered other people who "looked terrible," and these encounters prompted him to become more "health-conscious." Through online exploration, he encountered the notion that consuming more vegetables than he had already been consuming could improve his health. The thought of increasing his consumption of vegetables fueled his contemplation.

ML and Charles also contemplated and ultimately rejected veganism in response to the notion that veganism can improve health, but for them this discourse was laced with ethical implications. ML encountered the notion that the pursuit of good health is a social justice act, and not through a particular network or tie. Queer and transgender, ML recognized that "to be healthy in a space that doesn't want you to exist is at times a radical act." He explained, "Because you're dealing with so much stupid shit—homophobia, heterosexism—it's so easy to be destructive." For ML, veganism became a potential "way

to take care of [himself]." Charles encountered the notion that the most prevalent dietary practices in the United States are unhealthful, and not through a particular network or tie.

> We call ourselves the richest nation in the world. That's our propaganda. But we have the poorest diet. I knew someone who was in the Peace Corps in Malawi. He said the chicken tasted nothing like here. Even if I ordered chicken in Thailand—I was there for a while—that chicken was cackling 20 minutes ago. It's that fresh. The food that we eat is really awful in this country, with all the GMOs, pesticides, antibiotics, hormones. We're eating all these things our bodies are not made to digest. Hence cancer, heart disease, all these diseases. So I'm very interested in a healthy diet.

Charles identified veganism as a healthful diet and as a form of resistance against an unhealthful food system.

The 3 participants who were mobilized primarily by discourses of healthfulness and who ultimately went vegan similarly cited the notion that veganism can improve health. These vegans diverged from the non-vegans in large part because they differed in how they exercised agency. The divergence may have also been rooted in variation in the antagonism participants encountered. A potential third explanation for the divergence is that the 3 vegans were also mobilized by discourses of ethics, with 2 of the 3 mobilized by discourses that involved nonhuman animals; and these discourses were more prevalent in their narratives than they were in the narratives of the non-vegans.

Mobilization Patterns

Discourses of ethics and discourses of healthfulness vaulted the salience of veganism and activated contemplation among my interview participants in particular manners. They mobilized participants by prompting them to recognize veganism as congruent with their other priorities and through their perceived validity. Discourses of ethics also mobilized participants by activating feeling-thinking.

Participants prioritized ethics and health, priorities that, through mobilizing discourses, they came to recognize as congruent with veganism. Fatemah and Liz prioritized their concern for nonhuman animals as vegetarians. Their encounters with the notion that consuming eggs and dairy products is wrong invoked their concern for nonhuman animals and prompted their recognition that this concern is more congruent with veganism than with vegetarianism. This notion vaulted the salience of veganism and activated their contemplation. Steve prioritized social justice as he encountered the notion that speciesism intersects with other forms of oppression. This discourse invoked this priority and prompted him to recognize veganism as congruent with social justice along with his concern for nonhuman animals. This recognition of congruence activated his contemplation. Rahul prioritized nonviolence. His conversation with Jonathan prompted him to think about his consumption behaviors and invoked the notion that nonviolence is supreme, a notion to which he had long subscribed. This invocation in the context of his consumption behaviors prompted him to recognize veganism as congruent with nonviolence. Brenda and Francesca prioritized their concern for the environment. Their encounters with the notions that animal agriculture harms the environment and that veganism can "save the planet" invoked this priority and prompted them to recognize veganism as congruent with this priority.

Jasmine and Sasha prioritized health. They sought to maximize their health and to become registered dietitians. The notion that veganism can improve health invoked their prioritization of health and prompted them to recognize veganism as congruent with good health, thereby activating their contemplation of veganism. In some cases, participants prioritized health because such prioritization became necessary. Health became salient for

Janet because of her high cholesterol, just as it became salient for Alexis because of her low energy and excess weight. The notion that veganism can improve health invoked these prioritized health problems and prompted Janet and Alexis to recognize veganism as congruent with good health.

In most cases, as with other mobilizing mechanisms, discourses of ethics and discourses of healthfulness prompted participants to recognize veganism as congruent with other priorities that preexisted their encounters with these discourses. For example, as a vegetarian, Fatemah prioritized her concern for nonhuman animals prior to encountering the notion that consuming eggs is wrong. This discourse invoked this priority, prompting her to assess the congruence of this priority with veganism. However, in some cases, as already discussed, congruent priorities were not simply invoked, but constructed. Jen did not prioritize her concern for nonhuman animals prior to encountering the notion that they have rights. This concern was constructed through her encounter with this discourse, and she came to recognize this concern as congruent with veganism. The construction of a new and congruent priority activated her contemplation of veganism.

Discourses of ethics and discourses of healthfulness also mobilized participants through their perceived validity. Through Eric's posts, Amanda was interpellated by the notion that vegetarianism is inconsistent. She assessed this discourse and concluded that it was valid and that her vegetarianism was inconsistent with her convictions. She contemplated veganism as a result. Through the university vegan advocacy group, Francesca encountered the notion that animal agriculture harms the environment. She assessed this notion by considering the evidence cited by the group and the evidence she later found through her research. Swayed by this evidence, Francesca deemed the notion

that animal agriculture harms the environment to be valid. In large part through documentaries such as *Vegucated*, Brenda encountered the notion that veganism can "save the planet." Brenda became convinced that this discourse was valid in large part through the evidence cited by the documentaries, evidence that exposed the adverse effects of animal agriculture on the environment.

Jasmine encountered the notion that veganism is healthful through my series event, at which she listened to Billy and watched *Forks Over Knives*. She assessed the evidence presented by Billy and the documentary and concluded that it was valid and that veganism is healthful. The mobilizing power of this evidence was enhanced by Billy's credentials and by those of the scholars, including T. Colin Campbell, featured in the documentary. These credentials especially impressed Jasmine, a student of nutrition. She contemplated veganism as a result. Sasha encountered the notion that consuming animals is unhealthful through the sources she read and viewed. She assessed the evidence presented in these sources and deemed it to be valid. Beyond the data, she was impressed by the prevalence of successful vegan athletes, whose veganism convinced her of its healthfulness. Upon encountering the notion that the prevailing dietary practices in the United States are unhealthful, Charles assessed these practices and the dominant food system more broadly. He deemed the notion to be valid.

Discourses of ethics also mobilized participants by activating feeling-thinking. They prompted participants to feel not ethical enough or, as Kiara articulated, "ethically weak." These participants wanted to feel ethical, a finding that is consistent with Viktor Gecas' (2000) notion of authenticity. Lacking "congruence between their self-values and their behavior," Gecas (p. 101) argues, "leads to feelings of inauthenticity." For my

participants, valuing ethics yet behaving unethically resulted in feeling ethically weak and inauthentic. Jonathan felt ethically weak as he examined his consumption behaviors relative to Stephanie's consumption behaviors. Her "sacrifice," vegetarianism, made him "feel more hedonistic" and thus less ethical. Interpellated by the notion that consuming animals is hedonistic, Jonathan recognized that he was engaging in a hedonistic behavior, and this recognition was laced with feeling, as revealed in his explanation that her "sacrifice" made him "*feel* more hedonistic" (emphasis mine). He came to understand and contemplate vegetarianism and ultimately veganism through this feeling. Ambushed by the notion that speciesism intersects with other forms of oppression, Steve did not feel ethical enough as a self-proclaimed intersectional social justice activist who consumed animal products. Ambushed by the notion that animal agriculture harms the environment, Brenda and Francesca did not feel ethical enough as individuals who were concerned about the environment, yet who consumed animal products. Steve, Brenda, and Francesca contemplated veganism through feeling not ethical enough, a feeling that was fused with their thinking about veganism, and a feeling to which they were averse as self-proclaimed ethical people.

Agency

My interview participants exercised agency in their encounters with discourses of ethics and discourses of healthfulness in some of the same manners in which they exercised agency in their encounters with social networks and ties; books, articles, and documentaries; and food. They asserted priorities that they came to recognize as congruent with mobilizing discourses and thus with veganism; they facilitated their engagement with other mechanisms through which they encountered mobilizing discourses, again engaging

with particular mechanisms based on particular priorities; and they assessed veganism as a prospective priority, notably by assessing the validity of discourses they encountered. In encounters with discourses of ethics, participants also exercised agency in contributing to the construction of the discourses that mobilized them.

Participants' prioritization of ethics and health enhanced the mobilizing power of discourses of ethics and discourses of healthfulness. Discourses of ethics challenged participants' identification as ethical people, prompting them to feel not ethical enough. Participants sought to defend and further assert their identification as ethical people by going vegan. Upon encountering the notion that vegetarianism is less ethical than veganism, Fatemah felt ethically weak, a feeling that bothered her because she had prioritized her concern for nonhuman animals as an ethical vegetarian for two decades. This discourse invoked this priority, but its mobilizing power was contingent on her initiative to assert her concern for nonhuman animals as a priority in her encounter with this discourse. Fatemah's prioritization of this concern, which she came to recognize as congruent with veganism, activated her contemplation of veganism.

Francesca prioritized her concern for the environment, a priority she brought to her encounters with the notion that animal agriculture harms the environment. She further asserted this priority after the university vegan advocacy group meeting by conducting research on how animal agriculture affects the environment. The notion that animal agriculture harms the environment invoked this priority, but the mobilizing power of this notion was contingent on her initiative to assert her concern for the environment as a priority. Jasmine prioritized health even as a child. Health was her favorite school subject during her grade school years. She later became a student of nutrition at the university

level and a fitness trainer. The notion that veganism is healthful invoked her prioritization of health, but the mobilizing power of this notion was contingent on her initiative to assert health as a priority.

While participants encountered mobilizing discourses through other mechanisms, such as networks, documentaries, and books, they exercised agency in facilitating their engagement with these other mechanisms. This exercise of agency was interlaced with the assertion of priorities, as participants engaged with particular mechanisms based on particular priorities. Fatemah facilitated her engagement with the veggie group based on her concern for nonhuman animals. Thus, she chose to engage with the network through which she encountered the notion that consuming eggs is unethical, a notion that activated her contemplation of veganism. Dorothy "always liked animals" and especially "loved cats." Her interactions with cats, among other animals, and her involvement with multiple rescue organizations fostered her concern for nonhuman animals, a priority she asserted in choosing to watch the documentary on animal agriculture practices. The notion that animal agriculture practices are cruel invoked her prioritization of her concern for nonhuman animals, but the mobilizing power of this notion was contingent on her initiative to assert this priority and to watch the documentary through which she encountered this mobilizing discourse. Sasha developed an interest in nutrition during a six-year eating disorder that started when she was 16 years old. She asserted health as a priority in choosing to study nutrition and to read Joseph's *Meat Is for Pussies*, through which she first encountered the notion that veganism can improve health. This discourse mobilized Sasha, but she set the stage for her encounter with this discourse by asserting health as a priority and by reading the Joseph book.

Participants assessed veganism as a prospective priority in part by assessing the validity of discourses they encountered. Sasha assessed the notion that veganism can improve health and deemed it to be valid; Francesca assessed the notion that animal agriculture harms the environment and deemed it to be valid; and Amanda assessed the notion that vegetarianism is inconsistent and deemed it to be valid. Sasha, Francesca, and Amanda imposed their criteria and standards on their respective assessments. Thus, they managed the mobilizing power of the discourses that mobilized them.

Participants also exercised agency in contributing to the construction of the discourses that mobilized them. Amanda prioritized being consistent throughout her life, and she brought this priority to her encounters with Eric's posts. Amanda did not cite the employment of the terms consistent or inconsistent from Eric's posts. These posts communicated the notion that vegetarianism is unethical. Upon encountering this discourse, Amanda connected the notion of consistency to the notion that vegetarianism is unethical, an act rooted in her prioritization of being consistent. Eric's posts and Amanda's prioritization of consistency collaboratively constructed the notion that vegetarianism is inconsistent, and this notion activated Amanda's contemplation of veganism. In similar fashion, Jonathan and Rahul asserted their respective priorities to collaboratively construct mobilizing discourses with other discursive forces. Jonathan prioritized not being hedonistic, and Rahul prioritized the Jainism tenet that nonviolence is supreme. These priorities interacted with ethical discourses of veganism to construct new discourses, such as consuming animals is hedonistic, and veganism is nonviolence. These new discourses mobilized Jonathan and Rahul.

Mentality

In some manners, the vegans and the non-vegans did not vary in how they exercised agency as they contemplated veganism. For example, both groups asserted priorities that they came to recognize as congruent with veganism, and both groups facilitated their engagement with the mechanisms that mobilized them. In other manners, however, the agency exercised by the two groups diverged. In two particular manners, they diverged in the mentality with which they contemplated veganism. First, the vegans were more likely than the non-vegans to prioritize altruism as they contemplated veganism, with nonhuman animals being primary beneficiaries of this altruism. While the vegans valorized how they personally benefited from their veganism, they prioritized how their veganism benefited others, specifically nonhuman others. In some cases, this priority coexisted with their other priorities and with equal force, but even in these cases, the altruistic incentive was not trumped by another priority. The vegans who framed themselves along with nonhuman animals as beneficiaries cited the health benefits of veganism and the emotional satisfaction of engaging in a behavior they deemed ethical. In doing so, they complicated Daniel J. Myers' (2008:168) articulation of "allies" as "movement adherents who are *not* direct beneficiaries of the movements they support" (emphasis mine). While they engaged in "ally behavior" as allies of nonhuman animals, they framed themselves as well as nonhuman animals as beneficiaries (p. 181). Second, relative to the vegans, the non-vegans expressed more passivity and less intentionality as they narrated their contemplation of veganism. In contrast, the vegans were more likely to seek information that motivated and empowered them to go vegan, and more likely to narrate their veganism as inevitable.

These two patterns of divergence in mentality complemented each other. As altruism rose in salience, so did participants' initiative to seek information. These two

patterns also complemented the findings that most participants who were mobilized primarily by discourses of ethics went vegan, while most participants mobilized primarily by discourses of healthfulness did not. The notion of altruism was more prevalent in the cited discourses of ethics than in the cited discourses of healthfulness. In addition, participants mobilized primarily by discourses of ethics displayed more initiative and determination than did participants mobilized primarily by discourses of healthfulness.

Among participants who prioritized altruism and who framed themselves as prospective allies of nonhuman animals, most went vegan. Among participants who did not prioritize altruism or frame themselves as prospective allies of nonhuman animals, most did not go vegan. Participants became allies through their observation or new awareness of the violence to which nonhuman animals are subjected as they are transformed into food; through their recognition of the complexity of nonhuman animals; and through their perceived obligation to advocate for nonhuman animals. The most cited manner through which participants became allies was through their observation or new awareness of the violence to which nonhuman animals are subjected.

Among the altruistic vegans were Dan and Jen, both of whom witnessed violence in person. In 1978, while cycling across the country, Dan and a friend were intrigued by a giant building adjacent to a road in Kansas. "Let's check it out," they thought. The building was a slaughterhouse. As Dan explained, in an era before animal rights activists were labeled terrorists by the United States government via legislation such as the Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act (U.S. Congress 2006), slaughterhouse staff provided tours. Dan and his friend took a tour.

> I heard cattle scream. I saw pigs hanging upside down by their ankles, having their throats slit, gargling on their blood, screaming as they die. I

> saw cows waiting in line watching their brothers and sisters being slaughtered. You could hear them crying. I walked out of there and vomited for about five minutes. I had eaten meat for the last time. I couldn't do it. It was the awakening I needed in my life. I was so full of shame that I had lived 23 years of blindly consuming animals, but that was my turning point.

Dan was exposed to the violence of a slaughterhouse. He was also exposed to cattle and pigs resisting this violence and showing an interest not only in their lives, but also in the lives of their "brothers and sisters." As a result of this "awakening," Dan immediately went vegetarian. More than three decades later, he toured dairy farms and encountered baby calves "being torn away from their mothers." These encounters activated Dan's veganism, an altruistic form of veganism through which he prioritized his concern for nonhuman animals. "Forget about my health," he said. "My health is secondary. Coexisting is much more important than me living a thousand years. I'd rather live 70 years and treat all living animals fairly than live to 100 eating steak every day." Here Dan revealed his altruism, asserting that his veganism is more for nonhuman animals than for himself.

While living in Maine, Jen regularly witnessed hunters weighing moose they had just killed. "It would just kill me," she said. "It just was horrible. How can you shoot a moose? They're such majestic, beautiful animals. I just don't understand that." Seeing the dead moose and the blatant manner in which they were disembodied and commodified prompted her to contemplate her relationships with nonhuman animals and set the stage for her contemplation of veganism. This contemplation was fueled by the animal rights literature she obtained from Lori. While Jen was motivated by the health benefits of veganism, as embodied by Lori, her primary motivation for going vegan was her concern for nonhuman animals. Thus, she went vegan as an ally of nonhuman animals.

Fatemah, Liz, and Kimberly, each of whom went vegan, did not cite encounters with nonhuman animals, but rather brochures and articles that exposed the abuse and murder of nonhuman animals. Already an altruistic vegetarian, Fatemah encountered the American Vegan Society brochure that communicated the cruelty of the egg and dairy industries. She had been acting according to the altruistic notion that she did not have the right to "take a life away," a notion she had encountered through her teacher during adolescence, but she had been ignorant of the practices of the egg and dairy industries. She carried this same notion and mentality into her contemplation of veganism, still convinced that she did not have the right to "take a life away."

> When people say [veganism is] too hard, I don't want to blame them. It's probably because of how they were brought up. Once the idea hits someone, it's scary. I never thought about it that way. It could be because of how I felt about animals. I have no right [to consume them]. It depends on how you perceive [veganism] at first. If you do it for health, it's like dieting. If you're watching your fat or your carbs, it's okay [to consume animals] this meal. It's different. I never felt like I had that right. I'm glad that happened because it makes you very mindful.

Here Fatemah claimed that the difficulty of going vegan was less consequential to her than to others because her veganism is altruistic. Her recognition that she had "no right" to consume animals tended to overpower the antagonism she encountered.

From the articles posted by her vegan Facebook friends, Liz learned that male chicks and baby calves are killed soon after birth in the egg and dairy industries, that chickens' beaks are cut without anesthesia, and that female cows are repeatedly impregnated. Liz acted on this information with empathy. "When I read about things done to these animals, I imagine these things being done to me. How would I feel? If it's not right to do it to me, why is it right to do it to them?" Liz framed her empathy for nonhuman animals as a primary root of her veganism, thereby framing her veganism as

altruistic. Kimberly had questioned her consumption of animals since childhood. She ultimately went vegan upon reading the article on the violence of the dairy industry. She framed her veganism as a "moral thing about animals."

Amber and Pam, both of whom went vegan, became allies of nonhuman animals through recognition of their complexity and intelligence. As a child, Amber learned to recognize the capacities of nonhuman animals to think and to feel. She also learned that human animals regularly dismiss such capacities. Amber posed a series of questions, such as "Why do we put animals in cages?" and "Why do we love dogs more than other animals?" Her veganism is an altruistic act in resistance of the injustice implied in these questions. While Pam's veganism is rooted in her preference for a healthful alternative to medication, it is also rooted in her growing appreciation of nonhuman animals, an appreciation that evolved in part through Cheryl's Facebook posts about the abuse and murder of nonhuman animals. "I just think we underestimate animals," she said. "We think of them as so much less than what they are. At least mammals have an intact affect system where they're feeling pain and sorrow and joy just as we are. They have so many gifts and skills that we don't have." Pam's veganism is an altruistic act in resistance of the tendency of human animals to "underestimate" nonhuman animals.

Cheryl and Steve, both of whom went vegan, became allies of nonhuman animals simply through their perceived obligation to advocate for them. Introduced to animal rights activism by her father, Cheryl, a vegetarian for 10 years, had thought critically of her relationships with nonhuman animals long before she encountered PAN promoting an upcoming pledge campaign. As she recalled, "The seed had already been planted." However, her veganism had yet to sprout. The encounter with PAN prompted her to

reassess her relationships with nonhuman animals. "I didn't feel that I was doing anything for animals." Implied in this statement is that Cheryl felt obligated to advocate for nonhuman animals. "I thought, 'Maybe [the pledge campaign] is just what I need, to make a commitment. Just like anything in life, just to make that commitment.'" Cheryl made that commitment for herself, but also for nonhuman animals, for whom she went vegan. Upon watching the Mercy for Animals film, Steve recognized how the various forms of oppression he had long resisted as a social justice activist intersect with speciesism. For Steve, advocating for social justice now involved advocating for nonhuman animals. Thus, he became an ally of nonhuman animals and went vegan.

That participants went vegan for altruistic reasons did not mean that their veganism was an entirely unselfish act. Many of these participants, of course, cited the health benefits of veganism, but even their altruism was not entirely unselfish. Jonathan, Rahul, and Amanda went vegan for and as allies of nonhuman animals. However, by going vegan for nonhuman animals, they also went vegan for themselves. They practiced altruistic veganism in part to view themselves more favorably. Their altruism paralleled and satisfied their desire to feel more ethical and more authentic. Jonathan was mobilized in part by his concern for nonhuman animals, a concern that he revealed as he recounted the exploited cows he observed during his trek to Pittsburgh. Upset by this exploitation, Jonathan unselfishly went vegan for cows and for all nonhuman animals consumed by human animals. However, by going vegan for nonhuman animals, he selfishly went vegan for himself as he sought to construct a more authentic self, as he sought to feel more ethical. Upon recognizing that Stephanie precluded hedonism by refusing to unnecessarily consume animal flesh, an act that "made [him] feel more hedonistic," Jonathan went

vegetarian. He then found vegetarianism to be "offensively easy" and still felt hedonistic with his unnecessary consumption of gelatin-laced gummy bears, among other non-vegan foods. He asked himself, "Why exactly is that okay? But eating meat on a thigh is not good?" For Jonathan, veganism was more congruent with precluding hedonism and thus conducive to constructing a more authentic self.

Rahul was also mobilized in part by his concern for nonhuman animals, a concern that Jonathan tapped with the story about the exploited cows. Rahul went vegan for nonhuman animals and, in the process, for himself. He prioritized his Jainism, which he continually reconstructed by adhering to the Jain tenet that nonviolence is supreme and by practicing the Jain tenet of "complete harmlessness." Jonathan's story exposed Rahul's dissonance. Rahul had excluded "other types of sentient beings" from his pursuit of nonviolence and complete harmlessness. Veganism became an act through which Rahul could foster harmlessness, construct himself as a more authentic Jain, and feel better about himself. Amanda was mobilized in part by Eric's posts about the abuse and murder of nonhuman animals. Bothered by this abuse and murder, Amanda went vegan for nonhuman animals, and by going vegan for nonhuman animals, she went vegan for herself. Amanda prioritized consistency. For her, authenticity meant consistency, and vegetarianism was inconsistent with her concern for nonhuman animals. It was also inconsistent with her professional identification as a university scholar and professor of Earth and environmental science. "I have to start investigating things on my own," she thought. "Why am I so active in investigating things in other parts of my life, but in my everyday life, and how I live, I'm just not investigating things in the same way?" Through

altruistic veganism, Amanda constructed a more consistent self and a more authentic self, and she felt better about herself in the process.

The non-vegans also engaged in authenticity work as they contemplated veganism. However, the mentality of most of the non-vegans diverged from that of the vegans in that this work tended to not involve altruism. Jasmine, for example, prioritized her identification as a nutrition major seeking to become a registered dietitian. As she came to recognize veganism as congruent with this identification, she sought to construct a more authentic self through veganism. In contrast to Jonathan, Rahul, and Amanda, however, Jasmine did not pursue authenticity through altruism; and in contrast to Jonathan, Rahul, and Amanda, Jasmine did not go vegan.

In contrast to the vegans, most of the non-vegans did not prioritize a concern for nonhuman animals or frame their prospective veganism as altruistic. These non-vegans framed themselves as the primary beneficiaries of their prospective veganism. They prioritized their health problems and their health consciousness. Some of these participants expressed concern for nonhuman animals, but this altruism was trumped by how their prospective veganism could benefit themselves. A minority of the non-vegans contemplated veganism primarily because of their altruistic concern for nonhuman animals.

Alexis, Jada, and Janet contemplated veganism as a solution to their health problems. Alexis was concerned about her lack of energy and her excess weight; Jada was concerned about her irregular bowel movements and her excess weight; and Janet was concerned about her high cholesterol. They prioritized these concerns and, in the process, framed themselves as the primary beneficiaries of their prospective veganism. Alexis became "more convinced" to attempt veganism upon watching *Meet Your Meat*. Thus, her

contemplation was at least in part altruistic. However, she clarified her hierarchy of priorities, asserting that her health was her "main focus." "That sounds really selfish," she added. "I feel like I should be more worried [about nonhuman animals]."

Sasha, Jasmine, and Nick contemplated veganism through their health consciousness. As aspiring registered dietitians, Sasha and Jasmine were invested in learning the most healthful dietary practices. Through various sources, including books and documentaries, Sasha and Jasmine concluded that veganism is healthful. While not a student of nutrition, Nick became similarly "health-conscious" through encounters with unhealthy people. Sasha, Jasmine, and Nick prioritized their health consciousness and, in the process, framed themselves as the primary beneficiaries of their prospective veganism. As with Alexis, Sasha was also mobilized in part by her concern for nonhuman animals. As a vegetarian, "her ethics towards animals completely changed." In addition, in *Meat Is for Pussies*, Joseph addresses animal cruelty, and this discussion further fueled Sasha's contemplation as she read the book. Thus, her contemplation was at least in part altruistic. However, as with Alexis, she clarified her hierarchy of priorities, asserting that her "health has always kind of come first."

In the context of altruism, the cases of ML and Charles were more complex. They contemplated veganism because of the ethical implications of their pursuit of good health. ML pursued good health as a form of resistance against transphobia, an oppression that threatens his existence. He identified veganism as congruent with good health and therefore trans justice. Charles framed himself as an individual pursuing good health in a food system that hinders this pursuit. He identified veganism as an avenue to resist this system and to pursue not only good health, but also health justice. ML and Charles

prioritized their health and therefore framed themselves as primary beneficiaries of their prospective veganism, but they were not the only potential beneficiaries. ML acted in solidarity with trans populations in his pursuit of good health, while Charles acted in solidarity with people who reject the dominant food system in the United States. Their peers in these respective populations were also potential beneficiaries of their pursuit of good health and health justice through veganism. However, ML and Charles are, of course, a part of these populations of beneficiaries. As with Alexis and Sasha, ML was also mobilized in part by his concern for nonhuman animals. "If I'm going to really believe and preach and practice this idea of interlocking oppressions, then I can't just like arbitrarily draw lines between things," he argued. "Like, 'Okay. Labor movements are going to be okay for me to participate in, but I'm not going to care about animals.'" ML's initiative to intersect the oppression of nonhuman animals with that of human animals suggests that his contemplation was at least in part altruistic. However, as with Alexis and Sasha, he clarified his hierarchy of priorities, stating that his health was the "main impetus" of his prospective veganism.

As with most of the vegans, a minority of the non-vegans prioritized their altruistic concern for nonhuman animals as they contemplated veganism. However, the mentality of these and other non-vegans diverged from that of the vegans in other manners: their passivity and their intentionality. The non-vegans expressed more passivity than the vegans did as they contemplated veganism. Sasha's passivity was evident in her distinction between body and mind. She framed her pledge campaign as a "health experiment," narrating her prospective veganism as contingent not on her mind making an active decision, but on how her body would react independently of her mind. "I was seeing how

my body would like [a vegan diet]," she explained. This passive approach precluded any potential persistence amid adversity. The moment her body reacted negatively to her vegan diet, Sasha predictably halted her veganism. ML compared the pledge campaign to a "personal trainer." "Having a personal trainer is good for me. I can't lift weights without accountability. I'm not good at forcing myself." ML claimed that he needed such accountability through his pledge campaign. In the process, he convinced himself that he was dependent on the pledge campaign and that he could not independently go vegan. This dependence precluded any potential persistence beyond the pledge campaign. When the pledge campaign ended, his interactions with his mentor became less frequent, he lost his "personal trainer," and he ceased to be vegan. Jada and Janet displayed passivity in describing themselves as "lazy." "I had the willpower to continue," Jada claimed. "I have the means and tools to do it. [...] If I gave myself the mindset to continue beyond the seven weeks [that I was vegan], if I saw [an animal-based meal] and said, 'Don't get that,' instead of being lazy, I think I would've continued." Janet agrees with the "principles" of veganism, but she explained, "I'm too lazy and too selfish and too gluttonous to practice them."

The non-vegans also expressed less intentionality than the vegans did as they contemplated veganism. Sasha contemplated veganism, but never committed to eschewing animal-derived clothing. For her, pledging was "not so much about becoming vegan in every aspect of [her] life." Similarly, Charles "experienced" veganism without ever fully committing, claiming, "I'm not a purist." "I explored it, experienced it, enjoyed it, but didn't wholeheartedly maintain it." For Alexis and Jada, pledging was less about conviction and commitment than about exploring and experimenting. Alexis narrated her

pledge campaign as a "fun" opportunity "to challenge herself" and "to pick up a new lifestyle." Jada "wanted to try something different" in her quest to lose weight. For Nick, the pledge campaign "was a social thing more than anything else." His prioritization of socializing in this context was not conducive to sustaining his veganism beyond his pledge campaign.

The vegans displayed more agency as they contemplated veganism. They were more likely than the non-vegans to seek information that motivated and empowered them to go vegan. Jen learned of the next pledge campaign not because she encountered PAN at an event or because she was informed by a social tie, but through her online research of animal rights activism in Philadelphia. "This is something that I really want to do," she thought at the time. Jen pledged and ultimately went vegan. Francesca, Liz, and Dan also displayed seeking through research. After encountering the notion that animal agriculture harms the environment at the university vegan advocacy group meeting, Francesca conducted research, learned more, and chose to go vegan. Rather than ignore the articles posted by her vegan Facebook friends, Liz engaged them by reading, commenting, and seeking additional related articles. She did not ignore, but rather took account of, how baby calves are removed from their mothers after birth and how these mothers are "turned into milk machines." As with Liz, Dan took account of dairy industry practices through articles and videos posted on Facebook. Dan's research also involved in-person observation of these practices. He visited and observed dairy farms, where he witnessed baby calves "being torn away from their mothers." Refusing to be complicit in such practices, Liz and Dan went vegan.

Jen, Francesca, Liz, and Dan sought information because they were determined to know the consequences of their behaviors, and they went vegan because they were determined to behave in a manner that they deemed appropriate. Other vegans displayed determination that transcended acquiring information. Amber and Steve narrated their veganism as pre-determined. "I was predisposed to doing this," Amber claimed. "[Going vegan] wasn't that much of a decision." Steve added, "I had already made the decision before I totally acted on it." For Amber and Steve, going vegan was less about deciding to go vegan than about activating the inevitable. Dorothy did not know any other vegans when she first went vegan. She struggled with this isolation, but her determination trumped it. "Just goes to show you, if you want something, you make it work," she said. In contrast to the mentality of Sasha and the other non-vegans, the mentality of Amber, Steve, and Dorothy—defined by the notion that their veganism had already been determined—empowered them to activate their veganism amid antagonistic forces and competing priorities. Jonathan was similarly laced with this notion. His capacity to navigate antagonism was bolstered by his initiative to embrace it. He framed antagonism as positive, arguing that "the hard is good." He found vegetarianism to be too easy and challenged himself to be less hedonistic by going vegan. For Jonathan, encountering more antagonism was "good" in that such encounters meant that he was doing more "good" for nonhuman animals and for himself.

Conclusion

Discourses of ethics and discourses of healthfulness were among the most prevalent mechanisms to vault the salience of veganism and activate contemplation among my interview participants. As with other mechanisms, discourses of ethics and discourses of

healthfulness mobilized participants by prompting them to recognize veganism as congruent with their other priorities. They also mobilized participants through their perceived validity. Participants actively negotiated mobilizing discourses by asserting priorities that they came to recognize as congruent with mobilizing discourses and thus with veganism; by facilitating their engagement with other mechanisms through which they encountered such discourses, again engaging with particular mechanisms based on particular priorities; and by assessing veganism as a prospective priority, notably by assessing the validity of discourses they encountered.

While other mechanisms were not more likely to activate contemplation of veganism among the vegans or the non-vegans, discourses of ethics were more likely to activate contemplation among the vegans, and discourses of healthfulness were more likely to activate contemplation among the non-vegans. Participants who were mobilized primarily by discourses of ethics were more likely to ultimately go vegan than to reject veganism, while participants who were mobilized primarily by discourses of healthfulness were more likely to ultimately reject veganism. Participants also diverged in the mentality with which they contemplated veganism. First, the vegans were more likely than the non-vegans to prioritize altruism as they contemplated veganism, with nonhuman animals being primary beneficiaries of this altruism. Among participants who prioritized altruism and framed themselves as prospective allies of nonhuman animals, most went vegan. Second, the vegans were more likely than the non-vegans to seek information that motivated and empowered them to go vegan, and more likely to narrate their veganism as inevitable. In contrast, the non-vegans expressed more passivity and less intentionality as they narrated their contemplation of veganism.

In addition to encountering forces that were conducive to veganism, participants also encountered forces that were antagonistic to veganism. I discuss these antagonistic forces and how participants prioritized veganism amid these forces in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 6

PRIORITIZING

Rahul's contemplation of veganism was activated and fueled by his desire to advance his ethic of nonviolence, a tenet of Jainism, and a tenet that he came to recognize as congruent with veganism. A lifelong vegetarian, Rahul patronized the vegetarian social gathering where he met Jonathan, who mobilized him with the story about the exploited cows he observed during his trek to Pittsburgh. Rahul was bothered by this exploitation and by his complicity in this exploitation. "I had complete dissonance with my Jainism," he concluded. Jonathan encouraged him to enroll in a Peace Advocacy Network (PAN) vegan pledge campaign. Rahul did so two months later and ultimately went vegan. As he contemplated veganism, Rahul encountered several antagonistic forces, including family, discourses of healthfulness, work, food, events, and volunteering. These forces evolved into priorities with which his prospective veganism competed for salience. In particular encounters, he downgraded his veganism in favor of these other priorities on his salience hierarchy, but such episodes were exceptional.

Rahul's family expressed "doubts" about his veganism, wondering if he was "going to waste away" on a vegan diet and if his veganism was "just a temporary fad." His family and work colleagues celebrated a lucrative contract signing by eating "special" dairy chocolates from Europe. When Rahul declined, a "major investor" at the event, someone "you don't want to piss off," asked him why he refused to eat a chocolate. "We're celebrating," Abhishek declared. "Why won't you have it? [...] I don't understand you people." Rahul's refusal to consume a chocolate offended Abhishek. In these cases, Rahul

encountered direct network resistance to his veganism, with his family expressing doubts and concerns, and with Abhishek confronting his rejection of the chocolates. In the latter case, Rahul also encountered network resistance that was indirect. At the celebration, the consumption of non-vegan chocolates was an ingrained and unquestioned social norm, a norm that surfaced as an inconvenience for Rahul. Most of the people at the event probably did not seek to intentionally exclude Rahul from participating in a meaningful activity, the consumption of chocolates. However, these people were not mindful of veganism as they organized this event, and this lack of mindfulness emerged as an indirect form of antagonism to Rahul's veganism.

Rahul encountered indirect network resistance elsewhere. Following his pledge campaign, his two children were invited to a birthday party at a zoo that imprisons nonhuman animals. He permitted his children to attend the party and he patronized it with them, an act he framed as a violation of his veganism. A manager with seniority, Rahul regularly feels obligated to act in accordance with a professional work norm and pay for the animal-based food ordered by staff members whom he supervises and treats for business lunches and dinners. "It's just the way it is," he explained. Rahul regularly contributes to preparing and serving community dinners for homeless people. While he does not purchase animal-based food for these dinners, he has been "bothered" by the community's decision to serve and consume animal-based meals. He has also encountered indirect resistance that transcends networks. An immigrant from India, Rahul was raised using ghee, or clarified butter from India, where it is employed as a "solution for lots of issues," from providing nutrients to healing chapped lips. The prevalence of ghee in his life made eschewing his consumption of ghee a challenge.

Rahul tends to assert his veganism as a priority amid antagonistic forces and competing priorities. He asserted his veganism amid his family's doubts and concerns, and he asserted his veganism as he refused to consume a chocolate at the celebration. In these encounters, Rahul refused to prioritize his family membership or his participation in celebrations over his veganism. Amid competing priorities, Rahul also violated his veganism, according to his definition of veganism. He patronized a zoo for a birthday party, treated his employees to animal-based meals, and served animal-based meals at the homeless community dinners. Rahul prioritized his veganism by refusing to consume animals as he dined out with his employees, and by refusing to purchase animal-based food for the homeless community dinners. However, he prioritized being a senior manager over being a vegan as he purchased animal-based meals for employees; prioritized being a servant to the homeless community over being a vegan as he served animal-based meals; and prioritized being a father over being a vegan as he patronized the party at the zoo. While Rahul violated his veganism in these encounters, he sought to rectify these violations in the future. Following the pledge campaign, he had three opportunities to patronize zoos with his children. Because of his recent recognition that patronizing zoos is not vegan, Rahul declined on two of the occasions, relenting on the third occasion for the party. Troubled by his attendance at this party, he wanted "to cycle his way to zero visits" and to cease patronizing zoos. Also troubled by the animal-based food at the homeless community dinners, Rahul asked the coordinator of the dinners if he could prepare a vegan or a vegetarian dish. She said, "Go for it." Rahul framed this initiative as "my step forward."

> If I'm going to be living in this world, there are certain things that I will do that will not look and feel vegan, much less vegetarian, much less consistent

> with my practices and principles. It also means that I can't just accept it as is and say, "There's nothing I can do to change."

While Rahul constructed hierarchies on which his veganism trumped his other priorities, and on which his veganism was trumped by his other priorities, he more often sought to harmonize competing priorities in nonhierarchical fashion. For example, rather than prioritize his veganism over his volunteer work at the homeless community dinners, or vice versa, he sought to harmonize these priorities in nonhierarchical fashion. Rather than quit his volunteering gig because he was bothered that animal-based food was served, he asked if he could prepare and serve a vegan or a vegetarian dish, and his request was granted. For Rahul, the impetus for harmonizing competing priorities with his veganism was to avert isolating himself as a vegan and to avert bringing attention to his veganism. He prioritized his veganism, but he also prioritized his engagement with communities of non-vegans. He sought "to exist in a social world" while maintaining his principles. "I'm not yet living in a cave," he quipped.

Rahul has engaged in multiple strategies to harmonize competing priorities. First, he does not make his veganism "a point of conversation." He welcomes conversation about it, but does not initiate this conversation. He practices this tactic to avert isolating himself socially and to avert framing himself as a "martyr." In doing so, he harmonizes his veganism and his social life. Second, when Rahul is prompted to talk about his veganism, often in the context of being challenged on the subject, his responses are "short and concise." He employs "Twitter format," which means that he attempts to respond in 140 characters or less. He employs Twitter format to make veganism seem "simple," to avert proselytizing, and to construct an image of himself as normal. Responding to the warning, "You're not getting enough vitamins and minerals," Rahul succinctly stated, "I'd love to go

into the details, but when I went vegan, I gained weight." Asked, "What do you eat?", he responded, "Same stuff you do. Except some of my stuff is not as tasty and as rich." With these concise responses, Rahul harmonizes being vegan and being normal in nonhierarchical fashion. In the process, he frames veganism as normal.

Clashes of competing priorities such as being a vegan and being a father who brings his children to a birthday party at a zoo were common among my interview participants, and veganism was trumped in some of these clashes. Family and partners and health concerns evolved into two of the most prevalent competing priorities to trump veganism on participants' salience hierarchies. These antagonistic forces restricted the capacity of participants to prioritize veganism. The non-vegans may have been less capable of prioritizing veganism because they seem more likely to have encountered antagonism from their social networks and ties than the vegans seem to have encountered from theirs. However, as with the vegans, the non-vegans seem to have encountered more support than opposition from their networks and ties. Rather than construct hierarchies on which they prioritized or downgraded veganism, the vegans more often sought to harmonize competing priorities in nonhierarchical fashion. Rahul sought to harmonize his veganism and his volunteer work without prioritizing one over the other. Of course, prioritizing veganism requires mindfulness of veganism. Some vegans violated their veganism not because they downgraded it as a priority, but because they succumbed to absent-mindedness embedded in habitual consumption. In these cases, veganism was not even assessed as a prospective priority. While some non-vegans also succumbed to habits, they tended to do so because of the convenience of not being vegan. In these cases, in contrast to the vegans, the non-vegans were mindful of their violations as they committed them.

In this chapter, I discuss how participants prioritized veganism amid antagonistic forces and competing priorities. I identify and analyze three of the most cited forces that prompted violations of veganism among the vegans as well as the non-vegans; analyze variation in antagonism encountered by the vegans and the non-vegans; elaborate on how, amid network-based antagonism, the vegans prioritized veganism in nonhierarchical rather than hierarchical fashion; and elaborate on how the vegans and the non-vegans varied in how they succumbed to and responded to habits.

Downgrading Veganism

While the vegans predictably tended to assert their veganism amid competing priorities, they, as with the non-vegans, also downgraded their veganism in favor of these other priorities in particular encounters. For example, Raven, who identified as vegan, prioritizes her job over her veganism. To maintain a professional appearance while working as a meeting planner, she uses a hair relaxer that is tested on nonhuman animals. A woman of color, Raven explained that she would have a fro if she were to not use the relaxer, and she ascertained that a fro would be perceived as unprofessional, particularly for a meeting planner, a job that demands professionalism. "I'd look stupid," she said. Raven's prioritization of her job over her veganism is in part influenced by the cost of hair salons that can manage her hair, a cost that she claimed is "twice as much money as getting your hair done in a regular place." "I just don't have that kind of money," she said.

As Raven's case reveals, how my interview participants prioritize veganism amid competing priorities is contingent not only on choice, but also on capability. Raven's capacity to assert her veganism is limited by multiple forces. First, she needs to maintain a professional appearance at work to keep her job, which she needs to maintain a steady

income. Second, this professional appearance is contingent on using a hair relaxer because she is black and because, as she has surmised, her natural black hair is not perceived as professional enough for her particular position. Third, she cannot afford the services of hair salons that can manage her hair. Raven still retains the capacity to assert her veganism amid these forces, but her choice to downgrade her veganism as a priority is influenced by the power of these forces. Raven's case is also consistent with a pattern of participants prioritizing the interests of human others over the interests of nonhuman others. In prioritizing her job, Raven is obviously prioritizing herself. She is a beneficiary of this prioritization, as using the relaxer contributes to the maintenance of her professional image and, in the process, protects her good standing with her employer and her clients. In the process, Raven is also prioritizing human others, and she is doing so at the expense of nonhuman others. She maintains a professional image for her employer and her clients. Their assessment of her professionalism matters. Trumped in this prioritization of professionalism are nonhuman animals, who, without consent, serve as test subjects for a hair relaxer.

Among the most prevalent antagonistic forces to prompt violations of veganism were family and partners, health concerns, and habits, which I address in another section of the chapter. As antagonistic forces, family and partners and health concerns evolved into priorities that competed with veganism for salience. Rahul prioritized being a father over being a vegan upon bringing his children to the birthday party at the zoo. Jasmine felt pressure as she imagined refusing or veganizing a Thanksgiving meal prepared by her mother. Refusing or veganizing her mother's food would be too abnormal for Jasmine. She prioritizes family membership over veganism. "It's more important to be with my

family than what I'm eating," she declared. In this case, "to be with my family" means not only to be physically present, but also to behave as the rest of her large family behaves in this space on this occasion, to consume a turkey along with other animals, and to display gratitude to her mother, who invests ample time and energy preparing food for their large family. Crystal also prioritized family membership over veganism. As her Chinese family gathered at a Chinese restaurant for a nine-course animal-based meal prior to a funeral, she recognized that she could order a separate vegan dish or that she could refuse to eat. However, as with Jasmine, Crystal felt "pressure" to acquiesce to the normative behavior of the occasion and space; that is, she felt pressure to eat animals.

> Because it's a Chinese restaurant, it's a banquet meal, and it's family, if I don't eat [from the nine-course meal], it's sort of offensive. Well not really. I mean, the widower wasn't going to say anything. But it would have been harder. Around people, family members I don't see that much, I really didn't want to welcome that.

Crystal chose to not assert her prospective veganism amid this pressure.

In contrast to Jasmine and Crystal, Fatemah and Andrea identified as vegan, but they continued to prepare non-vegan meals for family. While Fatemah and Andrea did not consume these meals, they framed the act of preparing them as inconsistent with their veganism. Fatemah's husband is "very supportive" of her veganism, but his consumption of animals and her perceived obligation to cook for him "once in a blue moon" surface as antagonistic forces. "It's disgusting," she said of the experience. "I feel guilty, but I only do it for him." Fatemah both asserts and downgrades her veganism as a priority on these rare occasions. In refusing to consume the animal-based food she prepares, she prioritizes her veganism and her marriage in nonhierarchical fashion. However, in preparing animal-based meals, an act she deemed inconsistent with her veganism, she prioritizes her

marriage over her veganism. Andrea prepares animal-based meals every day for her husband and two of their adult sons. An "old-fashioned Christian woman type," Andrea explained that cooking for her family is her "role" in the family.

> I'm like old school traditional. I know this sounds bad this day and age, but I'm like the old traditional submissive wife. My husband is the head of the household, and pretty much my role is to take care of my family and to provide for my family. And cooking and providing for them in that area is my job. So that's why I do all the cooking.

This "role" and, of course, her family's consumption of animals force her to touch animal-based food. "I really am physically repulsed every time I have to do their food," she said. As with Fatemah, Andrea both asserts and downgrades her veganism. In refusing to consume the animal-based meals she prepares, she prioritizes in nonhierarchical fashion being a vegan and being a "traditional submissive wife." However, in preparing these meals, she prioritizes being a wife over being a vegan.

Some participants prioritized health concerns over veganism. Crystal declared, "Sometimes it almost makes sense to me more to have gotten something that isn't vegan, but it's healthier." While she "will go to lengths to try to eat healthy *and* vegan" (emphasis mine), "healthy" is more important. She articulated conflicting desires. On the one hand, Crystal does not want to be complicit in the murder of nonhuman animals. "I don't ever want to fish a day in my life. I think that's awful. I know that [fish] have high nerve endings in their teeth." On the other hand, Crystal "wanted to have omega-3s from fish," and this latter desire ultimately trumped the former. Paul halted his consumption of animal products, except for honey. While not "a big honey eater," he continued to eat it "sparingly and occasionally," believing that it "helps with allergies and immunities." As with Crystal, Paul articulated conflicting concerns. He acknowledged that he "sometimes [feels] sorry

for bees" whose honey is taken for humans, but this concern was trumped by his concern about allergies and immunities. He further justified this prioritization by explaining that the locally produced honey he consumes does not involve killing queen bees. "I know how my bees are treated," he said. Explaining his attendance at a vegan potluck dinner at The Rotunda, Charles said, "I know I'm going to eat well and feel good." However, he questioned the healthfulness of "fanatic" veganism, which he defined as never consuming animal products, a definition other participants simply attributed to veganism.

> There are people who are fanatics. They don't look too healthy. They don't look that great. Maybe there are some that are, but I've met a lot that look like a good wind will blow them away. I've seen vegan athletes that look fabulous, like the ideal Renaissance man or woman. I don't know. I guess it's a combination of factors. What is the ideal balance? How do you get the nutrition you need while living such a diet, is a key question to look at.

By questioning the healthfulness of "fanatic" veganism, Charles revealed that he cared about his health and that he prioritized being healthy over being a fanatic vegan. He ultimately rejected fanatic veganism.

While Crystal, Paul, and Charles prioritized health concerns as they contemplated veganism, ML and Sasha prioritized particular health problems. ML copes with stress by consuming "emotionally-soothing calories." "I eat emotionally to deal with my problems," he explained. "It will be like, 'I need chocolate right now, and I don't really care that it's not vegan.' I just need the emotional comfort of it." On some occasions, ML "will go out of [his] way to get something that's vegan," but on other occasions, "given the time constraints or wherever [he is]," he will not. During these latter occasions, he has prioritized relieving his stress over his prospective veganism, which he has halted. Sasha was not seeking to cure a health problem as she contemplated veganism, but her contemplation triggered the reemergence of an old health problem. She enrolled in her pledge campaign two years after

overcoming her six-year eating disorder. Going vegan required elevated focus on her food consumption, and this elevated focus triggered the anxiety she had experienced during the eating disorder. She halted her prospective veganism in favor of relieving this anxiety.

Amanda and Mary prioritize health over veganism as they get egg-derived vaccines, Amanda for herself, and Mary for her infant daughter. Amanda, who identified as vegan, called herself a "hypocrite" for downgrading her veganism in this context. While Mary identified as vegan, she shunned the vegan label in "gray" situations, such as whether to vaccinate. "Some vegans would say [receiving a vaccine is] not vegan," she observed. "It's like, well what do you do? At that point you have to make a decision about benefits versus risk. So I think that's tough." Mary chooses "benefits" for her daughter. In doing so, she prioritizes not only health over veganism, but also parenting over veganism. Mary also prioritizes health and parenting in choosing to raise her daughter on a vegan diet. Thus, in the context of diet, Mary prioritizes health, parenting, and veganism in nonhierarchical fashion. In the context of vaccines, veganism is trumped by these other two priorities.

As revealed in Raven's management of her hair, how participants prioritized was contingent not simply on choice, but also on capability. Jasmine and Crystal could assert their prospective veganism while dining with family, but the "pressure" to consume animals in these encounters limits their capacity to do so. This pressure is imposed by the prevalence of carnism across these families and by the meanings these families attach to their consumption of animals. Consuming a turkey with her family on Thanksgiving is an act through which Jasmine reiterates her family membership and expresses love for her mother. Consuming animals with family before and after the funeral was an act through which Crystal showed respect for her family, especially for the widow of the deceased

family member, during an emotional occasion. For Jasmine and Crystal, the power of these meanings has restricted their capacity to prioritize veganism. Andrea could halt her preparation of animal-based meals for her husband and their adult sons, but the power of her identification as an "old-fashioned Christian woman type" and her gendered role of caring for the family in the domestic sphere render her less capable of doing so. Her choice to continue preparing these meals involves more than individual preference. Her capacity to halt this tradition is limited by pressure exerted by her husband and their adult sons, all of whom have an interest in maintaining this tradition. In contrast to Andrea, who cooks for her family on a daily basis, Fatemah cooks for her husband only "once in a blue moon." As with Andrea, however, Fatemah feels pressure to prepare animal-based meals for her husband on these occasions, pressure that weakens her capacity to adhere to her veganism.

ML and Sasha could have asserted their prospective veganism amid their health problems, but their capacity to do so was limited by these problems. ML was limited by the stress he encountered. His capacity to go vegan was restricted not only by the need to relieve this stress, but also by the manner in which he did so. ML sought "emotionally-soothing calories" to relieve his stress, and he consumed them in impulsive fashion, regardless of whether the food from which these calories were derived was vegan. This impulsive consumption conflicted with his prospective veganism because veganism requires mindfulness to which he felt less capable of committing in moments of stress. Sasha was limited by the history of her relationship with food, as attempting to go vegan triggered the anxiety she felt during the six-year eating disorder. The resurgence of this anxiety and the need to relieve it restricted her capacity to go vegan.

In many cases, participants violated their veganism or prospective veganism in prioritizing themselves over nonhuman animals, a selfish prioritization. In other cases, however, participants violated their veganism or prospective veganism in prioritizing the interests of human others over the interests of nonhuman others. Jasmine and Crystal have prioritized the feelings of family members as they have violated their prospective veganism. They have chosen to respect the normative consumption of animals during their particular family gatherings instead of asserting their prospective veganism, which could have been perceived as an affront to family traditions. For Jasmine, the priority is to not upset her family during a holiday gathering, and especially to not upset her mother. For Crystal, the priority was to not upset her family during an emotional family funeral, and especially to not upset the widow of the deceased family member. Because these priorities required consuming animals, they obviously trumped the interests of these animals. Andrea and Fatemah prioritize the interests of partners and adult sons for whom they prepare animal-based food. In Andrea's case, her husband and their adult sons have become accustomed, perhaps even dependent, on a decades-old arrangement of Andrea exclusively preparing their food. As she acknowledged, "They'd be in a state of shock" were she to halt this arrangement. She prioritizes protecting them from this shock and feeding them animal-based food over the interests of the animals whose bodies she reluctantly cooks. Mary prioritizes the health of her infant daughter. She believes that an egg-derived vaccine is necessary to proactively maximize her daughter's health. Thus, she prioritizes her daughter's health over the interests of the animals whose bodies are used to create the vaccine.

Support of Social Networks and Ties

The capacity of the vegans and the non-vegans to prioritize veganism may have varied according to variation in the antagonism they encountered. The non-vegans seem to have encountered more opposition to their prospective veganism from family and partners, among other social networks and ties, than the vegans seem to have encountered from theirs. However, as with the vegans, the non-vegans seem to have encountered more support than opposition from family and partners, among other networks and ties. As already discussed, of my 33 interview participants who contemplated veganism, 29 participated in an exercise in which they identified individuals or groups with whom they regularly interact; and reported whether these individuals or groups supported, acted indifferently toward, or did not support their prospective veganism. Participants could categorize a particular individual or group into more than one category. For example, a particular individual or group could be categorized as both supportive and not supportive.

This exercise was limited on multiple accounts. First, I imposed the terms supportive, indifferent, and not supportive on participants, thereby oversimplifying the complex interactions and relationships participants experienced with their networks and ties. Many participants introduced terms, such as "condescending," "curious," and "tolerant." Other participants elaborated on the notion of support with terms such as "grudgingly supportive" and "not wholly supportive." While I classified such cases as supportive and not supportive, I did not account for terms such as "grudgingly" and "not wholly." Second, the intensity of the support or the lack of support from particular individuals or groups could have varied. Lack of support from one important individual could have been more consequential than the support of multiple individuals. While I accounted for this variation through the broader narratives of participants, I did not account

for it in this exercise. Despite these limitations, the exercise produced insight into variation of support from networks and ties and how this variation correlated with whether participants went vegan. Such insight could not be gleaned from the broader narratives constructed during the interviews.

Table 1

Support of Social Networks and Ties	Percent
Vegans	
Supportive	69.9
Not supportive	8.1
Indifferent	19.7
Not aware	2.3
N = 173	
Non-vegans	
Supportive	47.5
Not supportive	11.3
Indifferent	35.0
Not aware	6.3
N = 80	

Of the 253 individuals and groups identified by participants, 62.8 percent were categorized as supportive of their prospective veganism, 9.1 percent as not supportive, 24.5 percent as indifferent, and 3.6 percent as not aware. Thus, most of the networks and ties in which participants were embedded were supportive. Of the 29 participants who participated in this exercise, 27 reported a greater number of supportive networks and ties than unsupportive networks and ties, and only 1 reported more unsupportive networks and ties. As Table 1 reveals, the vegans reported a higher percentage of supportive networks and ties than the non-vegans did by 22.4 percentage points. Thus, the networks and ties of the vegans were more likely to support their prospective veganism than the networks and ties of the non-vegans were to support theirs. Despite this disparity, only 11.3 percent of the networks and ties of the non-vegans were reported as not supportive, a figure that is only slightly higher than that of the vegans, who reported 8.1 percent. Thus, only a small

minority of the networks and ties of the non-vegans were antagonistic to their prospective veganism.

Table 2

Support of Social Networks and Ties, Excluding Indifferent and Not Aware	Percent
Vegans	
Supportive	89.6
Not supportive	10.4
N = 135	
Non-vegans	
Supportive	80.9
Not supportive	19.1
N = 47	

Isolating the supportive and not supportive categories from the indifferent and not aware categories yielded similar results, as revealed in Table 2. With this isolation, the networks and ties of the vegans were 8.7 percentage points more likely to support their prospective veganism than the networks and ties of the non-vegans were to support theirs. Having encountered more antagonism from their networks and ties than the vegans encountered from theirs, the non-vegans may have been less capable of asserting their prospective veganism amid competing priorities, such as being a family member or being a partner. However, as with the networks and ties of the vegans, most of the networks and ties of the non-vegans supported their prospective veganism.

Asserting Veganism

As my interview participants downgraded veganism amid competing priorities, they prioritized these other priorities over veganism. As participants, including the non-vegans, asserted veganism amid these competing priorities, they reversed this prioritization in some cases; that is, they prioritized veganism over these other priorities. More often, however, the vegans sought to harmonize their veganism with their other priorities in nonhierarchical

fashion. They commonly sought to harmonize their veganism with their membership in social networks across which veganism was not a norm. Such nonhierarchical prioritization required that the vegans assert their veganism in encounters with these networks because veganism was not a norm across these networks; and that they do so in a strategic manner to preclude discord with other network members, thereby preserving their network membership. One prevalent strategy involved participants asserting their veganism in a consciously polite manner or through compromise to avert becoming an affront to others as they sought to preserve their network membership. Another prevalent strategy involved participants bringing vegan food to network gatherings to ensure their full participation in the gatherings, thereby preserving their network membership.

In some cases, other members of networks in which the vegans sought to establish or preserve their membership rejected their nonhierarchical prioritization, downgrading their veganism in favor of their network membership. Identification involves not only how a subject chooses to identify, but also how that subject is identified by others. Thus, the rejection of the vegans' nonhierarchical prioritization was a threat to this prioritization. For these vegans, however, such rejection was limited to particular encounters and/or particular people. Every vegan who encountered such rejection persisted in prioritizing in nonhierarchical fashion and gained recognition of this prioritization from other network members and, in some cases, from the people who initially rejected their veganism. While the vegans more often engaged in nonhierarchical rather than hierarchical prioritization, many engaged in both across different encounters.

Rahul, Dan, Steve, and Francesca strategically fostered a nonhierarchical prioritization of their veganism and their membership in particular networks, firmly

asserting their veganism in a consciously polite manner. By celebrating the contract signing and by asserting his veganism, Rahul prioritized in nonhierarchical fashion his veganism and his membership in a family and work-based network. He attempted, though struggled, to negotiate this prioritization in a polite manner. When the server offered a chocolate, he politely declined. While the server immediately understood, other patrons, especially Abhishek, prompted him to explain his rejection. "It's just chocolate," they said. "Yeah, it comes with some milk inside," Rahul responded. "No big deal." Abhishek pressed him on why he would not eat a chocolate: "Why? We're celebrating. Why won't you have it? I mean, I asked you. Why can't you just eat it?" "I just choose not to," Rahul answered. Rahul asserted his veganism by explaining that the chocolate "comes with some milk inside," thereby declaring that he does not consume cow's milk. However, he capped this explanation by attempting to frame his rejection as "no big deal," as inconsequential to his participation in the event as a family member and a work colleague. Thus, while Rahul asserted his veganism, he sought to deflect attention away from his veganism to preserve his membership in the network. He also sought to deflect attention by responding in succinct fashion. His intentionally brief responses were an attempt to preclude further controversy that could have ensued had he elaborated on his veganism.

As with Rahul, Dan attempted and struggled to both assert his veganism and preserve his membership in a network while dining with his girlfriend and her parents on Thanksgiving. Dan asserted his veganism in choosing to consume sweet potatoes, corn, broccoli, and salad, and in choosing to not consume turkey and ham. He consciously attempted to be polite as he made these choices. When offered turkey and ham, he said, "No, thanks. I'm just not in the mood." "I didn't say anything more," he told me. By

articulating that he was "not in the mood," Dan sought to frame his choices as isolated preferences in the moment rather than as ethically rooted in his veganism. He recognized that the latter could have inflamed his girlfriend's parents, and he did not want to alienate himself from them, preferring to preserve his membership in the network. As with Rahul, Dan was also intentionally succinct in his responses, as he sought to deflect attention away from his veganism. He encountered hostile resistance from his girlfriend's mother, who labeled his rejection of her food "impolite." She eventually requested that he and his girlfriend leave. Dan prioritized his veganism and his network membership in nonhierarchical fashion, but his girlfriend's mother did not accept this nonhierarchical prioritization. She valorized Dan's network membership more than his veganism, and for her, membership in this network on this occasion meant consuming animals. While Abhishek did not request that Rahul leave the celebration, he similarly did not accept Rahul's nonhierarchical prioritization of his veganism and his membership in the family and work-based network at the event. He valorized Rahul's network membership more than his veganism and interpreted Rahul's rejection of the chocolates as a rejection of the celebration. For Rahul and Dan, respectively, such rejection was limited to particular individuals, Abhishek and the girlfriend's mother. Other people accepted their nonhierarchical prioritization.

Steve and Francesca did not encounter the categorical rejection that Rahul and Dan encountered as they also prioritized in nonhierarchical fashion their veganism and their membership in networks. They also employed a strategy of conscious politeness to preserve their membership in these networks. Steve's nonhierarchical prioritization encountered a degree of resistance, while Francesca's nonhierarchical prioritization gained

acceptance. Steve's family members had ridiculed his vegetarianism, and the "joking" intensified when he went vegan. This joking involved "tempting [Steve] to eat meat." In addition, his inattentive mother "would be ready to throw [non-vegan] butter" into spaghetti sauce. "Well if you do that," Steve would warn her, "I can't eat it." "And then she would remember," he said. Steve asserted his veganism in these interactions, refusing to be tempted amid the teasing, and proactively observing his mother's food preparation and reminding her of his veganism. However, he did so with patience, strategically coping with the joking and the inattentiveness. He did so because he highly valued his family membership and because he prioritized this membership and his veganism in nonhierarchical fashion.

While with family in Italy, to where she traveled during her first summer as a vegan, Francesca attended a birthday dinner that consisted of a three-course meal. She could not eat one of the first two courses and could eat only one portion of the other. She was able to eat the third course, pasta with mushrooms. During the first two courses, the party host asked Francesca why she was not eating. In Italian, she and her native Italian cousin explained that she was vegan. "Why didn't you tell me?" the host asked, indicating to her that he would have accommodated her veganism. "He was pretty fine with it," she said. At another birthday party during her summer in Italy, the hosts noticed that Francesca was the only patron not eating pizza and asked the same question. When she informed them that she did not consume dairy cheese, they served to her a pizza without cheese. In these two encounters, Francesca encountered antagonism that Rahul, Dan, and Steve encountered: the prevailing assumption that everyone at a gathering would be able and willing to consume animals. Amid this antagonism, Francesca asserted her veganism,

refusing to consume animals and informing people at both parties that she was vegan. However, she did so without verbally attracting attention. She reluctantly attracted attention by refusing to consume food, and explained her reason when prompted to do so, but she did not announce in advance that she was vegan, and would not have identified herself as vegan had she not been prompted to do so. Francesca employed this tact to preserve her membership in these networks as she asserted her veganism, harmonizing these two priorities in nonhierarchical fashion. This nonhierarchical prioritization was accepted by the hosts and patrons of both parties. Steve encountered more antagonism than Francesca did. His family's joking suggests that his family membership may be more valorized than his veganism. However, as in the cases of Rahul and Dan, this resistance was limited to particular individuals. Furthermore, his family's resistance was episodic and limited to particular encounters.

Cheryl was less concerned about behaving politely than were Rahul, Dan, Steve, and Francesca. She employed compromise as a strategy to simultaneously preserve her veganism and her membership in a network. A piano player, Cheryl is embedded in a "creative community" that regularly gathers for salons in people's homes. These events involve live music and food, some of which is animal-based. Cheryl plays at and even volunteers to aid the hosts of these salons, but she also asserts her veganism. She confronted the host of one particular salon for serving dairy cheese. Explained the host, "I have a lot of friends and they really like cheese." Instead of downgrading her membership in this network in favor of her veganism, Cheryl chose to remain engaged with the network. "I won't volunteer with the food part," she said. "But I can help out in other ways." At this particular salon, Cheryl "[helped] out at the door," welcoming and admitting patrons as

they arrived. While Rahul, Dan, Steve, and Francesca intentionally sought to limit the attention their veganism attracted in their encounters, Cheryl intentionally elevated this attention in her encounter. She firmly asserted her veganism and emerged as a vegan advocate, questioning the presence of the dairy cheese. She refused to consume the cheese, refused to volunteer in the serving of the cheese, and communicated her disapproval of the presence of the cheese. However, she sought a "compromise" with the host to preserve her network membership. She volunteered at the door and remained engaged with the salon, prioritizing her veganism and her network membership in nonhierarchical fashion. As in Francesca's encounters at the birthday parties, Cheryl's nonhierarchical prioritization was accepted by the host and other patrons at this particular salon.

Amanda, Kiara, Dorothy, and Andrea also prioritized their veganism and their membership in particular networks in nonhierarchical fashion. Their strategy involved bringing vegan food to network gatherings. They deemed this strategy to be conducive to simultaneously preserving their veganism and their membership in these networks because it ensured that they could eat and thus fully participate at the gatherings. In preparation of a family reunion, Amanda informed family members that she planned to bring a vegan dish. She was ensuring that she could eat a full meal at the reunion, and she was ensuring her status as a participating member of a network. In nonhierarchical fashion, she was prioritizing her veganism and her family membership. Her proposal was resisted by an extended relative who stated that bringing a vegan dish is "not very nice for the people who eat meat," and by her mother, who suggested that patrons could add meat to Amanda's dish. Amanda reasserted her veganism in rejecting her mother's suggestion and in repeating that she would bring a vegan dish. In the process, she also reasserted her family membership.

That she remained engaged with the reunion amid this antagonism from family suggests that she valued this membership.

Kiara's family members opposed her veganism to the extent that she felt "anxious about going home" to Pittsburgh to visit them. She asserted her veganism amid this antagonism, but did so strategically to preserve her family membership. To foster harmony between her veganism and her family membership, Kiara brought vegan food with her as she traveled home. Bringing food enabled her to simultaneously be vegan with convenience and be with family. She acted strategically not only in choosing to bring food, but also in her selection of the food she brought. As she explained, "I think of things that I can bring home with me to eat, that isn't like the face of veganism. So I'm not going to bring tofu chicken salad with me. Or I don't drink a ton of soy milk." Kiara identified tofu and soy milk as stereotypical vegan products, meaning products that are strongly associated with veganism. Thus, to deflect her family's attention away from her veganism, which threatened her interactions with her family, she chose to not bring these items. Her decision to bring food and to bring food that was not stereotypical vegan food revealed her nonhierarchical prioritization of her veganism and her membership in this network.

Kiara's family and Amanda's family rejected their nonhierarchical prioritization of their veganism and their family membership, prioritizing family membership over veganism. In contrast to Rahul and Dan, Amanda demanded and eventually gained acceptance of her nonhierarchical prioritization, as her family reluctantly accepted her vegan dish. Kiara did not emulate Amanda's persistence, instead plotting to deemphasize her veganism even as she asserted it by bringing vegan food with her to Pittsburgh. Thus, Kiara accepted her family's rejection while simultaneously continuing to prioritize her

veganism and her family membership in nonhierarchical fashion. For Amanda and Kiara, such rejection was limited to particular individuals, as other people accepted their nonhierarchical prioritization. Amanda's case was similar to Steve's case in that her family's resistance was episodic and limited to particular encounters. In contrast to Amanda and Kiara, Dorothy and Andrea gained acceptance of their nonhierarchical prioritization, though this acceptance did not mean that their veganism became a celebrated practice.

Before her husband's death, Dorothy regularly interacted with her in-laws as they hosted holiday gatherings. She described her late husband's family as "close-minded" "rednecks" and "Nazi sympathizers." "Their idea of a good time is to go to a remote cabin five hours away and go deer hunting. I married into a hot mess." Dorothy sought membership in this network because she was married and therefore considered her husband's family to also be her family. Predictably, his family perceived her veganism to be "very odd." Her sister-in-law managed the food preparation for holiday gatherings and regularly served ham or non-vegan cheese manicotti. She did not prepare vegan food for Dorothy and instead invited her to bring a vegan dish. Dorothy asserted her veganism amid this lack of accommodation while remaining engaged with the network that would not accommodate her. She regularly brought a vegan casserole to these gatherings, an act that ensured that she could eat a full vegan meal while participating in the gathering and preserving her network membership. While Dorothy felt slighted by the lack of accommodation, she "didn't make a big deal about it." "I don't want to be negative," she explained. Being positive amid the lack of accommodation revealed her investment in simultaneously preserving her network membership and her veganism. Her in-laws

accepted her as a family member and as a vegan, though such acceptance and recognition of her veganism did not result in accommodation.

Andrea seeks to harmonize her veganism and her membership in family and friendship networks for birthday and anniversary gatherings. She has brought vegan food to such gatherings, a choice that ensures that she can conveniently eat full meals and interact with her family and friends. Andrea inquired in advance about the planned buffet for a friend's 50th birthday party and realized that she would not be able to compose a full meal at the party. "They didn't even have a salad on the buffet," she said. She informed the party hosts that she would bring a vegan meal, and they responded negatively. "They got so upset. You would think I said, 'I'm going to set this place on fire.' They said, 'We will handle it.'" Before the party, her husband went to a restaurant and bought a full vegan meal for her. He brought the meal to the catering staff at the party, and the staff served it to Andrea. "Everybody thought my food looked better than the buffet food," she boasted. Andrea's initiative to harmonize her veganism and her membership in this network of friends was ultimately accepted by others in the network in which the membership was desired. This acceptance was evident in the hosts' attempt to "handle" her meal. However, she earned this acceptance only after resisting the antagonistic assumption that everyone at a gathering would be able and willing to consume animals. Andrea resisted this assumption and, with assistance from her husband, consumed a separate meal because she valorized her veganism as well as her network membership, and she was not willing to downgrade either.

As with Amanda, Kiara, Dorothy, and Andrea, Jen has also brought vegan food to gatherings of a particular network, but not because this network has been unwilling to

prepare vegan food for her. Her family members seek to accommodate her veganism in a manner that Jen deemed "over the top." Their initiative to accommodate her veganism surfaces as an antagonistic force to her veganism because the "stress" that they experience in this accommodation causes Jen to feel like an "imposition" and a "burden." Her "high-strung" stepmother "freaks out a little bit" when she prepares a vegan meal for her. "She just tends to make too much out of [my veganism]," Jen said. "I always tell her that I'll have a salad. But she has to make all this stuff. She makes a lot of food." While Jen appreciates the accommodation, she feels uncomfortable being the source of the stress that her family, especially her stepmother, feels. "I just don't want them to feel like they have to go out of their way, because I'm very adaptable. Salad is fine." In her often futile attempts to alleviate the stress that her family members feel, Jen emphasizes that she would be satisfied with just a salad. To preclude this stress, and to preclude feeling like a burden, she regularly brings food to family gatherings. In contrast to the cases of Amanda, Kiara, Dorothy, and Andrea, for Jen, bringing food is not about ensuring that she can eat, but rather about being an "adaptable" family member who, even as a vegan, can socialize with other family members without causing them to feel stress. While her membership in this network is not threatened by her veganism, how her family responds to her veganism prevents her from being the family member she wants to be, one who is not burdensome. She prioritizes being an adaptable family member and being a vegan in nonhierarchical fashion.

While the vegans more often harmonized priorities in nonhierarchical fashion, many also prioritized in hierarchical fashion, valorizing their veganism more than their membership in networks in particular encounters. However, the vegans engaging in this

hierarchical prioritization also engaged in nonhierarchical prioritization in other encounters. For example, Amanda prioritized her veganism over her participation in her department's annual "end-of-year celebration," which is a pig roast, thereby prioritizing her veganism over her department membership in this particular encounter. However, Amanda prioritized her veganism and her participation in the family reunion in nonhierarchical fashion. Amanda and the other vegans were selective in choosing whether to construct hierarchies or to prioritize in nonhierarchical fashion. In most cases, hierarchical prioritization did not mean that the vegans eschewed their membership in the networks that were trumped by their veganism. Amanda and Amber prioritized their veganism over their membership in particular networks, but this prioritization did not threaten their membership in these networks. Raven prioritized her veganism over her membership in a particular network, and while this prioritization did not terminate her membership in this network, it strained it. Cheryl prioritized her veganism over her membership in particular networks, and this prioritization terminated her membership in these networks.

Amanda did not attend her department's pig roast because of her veganism. "I have had excuses to not go," she said, laughing. "I'll bring it up once I get tenure." In this case, Amanda's colleagues were not aware of her hierarchical prioritization because she articulated "excuses" that did not acknowledge her veganism. While she prioritized her veganism over her department membership in this particular encounter, she did not cease to be a department member. Participation in the pig roast was only one of countless acts through which she could reiterate her department membership, and she compensated for her absence at the pig roast by reiterating this priority through other acts. Beyond the clash between her veganism and the pig roast, Amanda prioritized her veganism and her

department membership in nonhierarchical fashion. She stated that upon attaining tenure, which would provide her with more job security and power in the department, she would address the conflict between her veganism and the pig roast. This statement revealed her desire to participate in the end-of-year celebration and to prioritize her participation, her department membership, and her veganism in nonhierarchical fashion.

When Amber is home from college, she prepares her meals "almost every time" she eats, and she rarely dines with her non-vegan parents, who come from "meat and potatoes" families. Her absence at the dinner table concerned her father when she went vegetarian at 12 or 13 years old.

> My decision to be fringe and express myself and my ideals through vegetarianism was going to break up our family by not allowing us to eat dinner together. Even to this day, I still get comments of how back in the day when I went vegetarian, it broke our family apart so that we can't eat dinner together.

Her family members, including her father, now support her veganism because they recognize that she "would rather not eat" than to eat animals, and because they prefer that she eat her food rather than not eat at all. Amber prioritizes her veganism over her participation in family dinners, but, echoing Amanda's interactions with her department beyond the pig roast, she seeks to harmonize her veganism and her family membership in other interactions. Thus, just as Amanda has not ceased to be a department member despite prioritizing her veganism over her participation in the pig roast, Amber has not ceased to be a family member despite prioritizing her veganism over her participation in family dinners.

Raven prioritized her veganism and her participation in family gatherings in nonhierarchical fashion, but, as she encountered opposition to her veganism from family, this prioritization became more complex and her family membership became strained.

Raven's family members refused to eat vegan food she had prepared for them, arguing that nonhuman animals "are there for us to eat." She recounted an encounter that had occurred at home less than two weeks before our interview.

> I brought my own food. I tried to make something, they didn't want it, and it hurt my feelings. 'Cause I was just like, "You're not open to what I am doing. I promise you, it's good." So I told 'em, I said, "You know, next time I come home, you will eat whatever I'm making, 'cause I will throw out everything in your house. Don't get it twisted." I told my mom, I was like, "I don't want to force it upon you, but I want you to be open to what I'm doing."

Raven's nonhierarchical prioritization of her veganism and her participation in family gatherings was revealed in her initiative to prepare vegan food for her family members and in her expressed determination to gain their approval of her veganism, approval that for her was largely measured by their willingness to eat her food. Despite this determination, Raven planned to minimize her participation in family gatherings. "I try not to go home, 'cause I'm like, 'What am I going to eat?'" This restriction on her participation revealed that she prioritized her veganism over her participation and her family membership in the context of the gatherings. However, she still expected to participate in future gatherings, even if less frequently, and to persuade her family members to eat her food. She revealed that their consumption of her food, and thus approval of her veganism, would prompt her to abandon her hierarchical prioritization in favor of harmonizing her veganism and her participation in gatherings in nonhierarchical fashion.

Cheryl prioritized her veganism and her participation in the salons in nonhierarchical fashion, but she prioritized her veganism over two jobs, ultimately quitting these jobs because she deemed the entities for which she worked to be inconsistent with her veganism. For more than a decade, Cheryl was employed as a piano player at an Italian

restaurant, a job that involved playing for singing servers and customers as they served and consumed animals, respectively. As she went vegan with her heightened awareness of how nonhuman animals suffer as they are transformed into food served at the restaurant, she struggled to reconcile her veganism with entertaining people as they engaged in a non-vegan act. "People were all happy eating their meat, and I'm playing for singing servers," she recalled. "I was shrinking like a shrinking violet. I was like, 'I don't know if I can do this much more. I feel so guilty.'" Cheryl lasted only "a few more months" and informed her employer of the guilt she had been feeling as an employed entertainer in a network that was complicit in the death of nonhuman animals. Her employer later attempted to lure her back, but she refused. "I just can't do it," she responded. "I know what these poor babies went through, and their mothers too. I can't like just be all happy. They suffered because of this." Cheryl quit another paying gig as a keyboard player in a burlesque show orchestra, a network of which she had been a member for eight years. Her participation in an anti-fur protest on Black Friday heightened her awareness of the abuse and murder of nonhuman animals in the fur industry. One month after the protest, Cheryl realized that the burlesque show dancers were wearing fur and feathers during the shows. While backstage, she witnessed one of the dancers "flaunting fur like it was parts of an animal." "I was so horrified," she said. She remained with the show for two more months before informing its producers that "she was uncomfortable being on stage with someone wearing real fur."

Cheryl prioritized her veganism and interrelated concern for nonhuman animals over these two jobs. In doing so, she prioritized her ethics over the rewards of membership in these two networks. "I try to put my words into practice," she explained. "If I'm going to encourage people to go fur-free, then I have to examine my own actions." Her long

tenures in these positions—more than a decade at the restaurant and eight years with the show—suggest that she found rewards in these networks. Quitting meant sacrificing these rewards. Among these rewards were "fun" experiences and, of course, money. I asked her if she could "afford to keep quitting these jobs." "It's hard," she responded. While the burlesque show was "not a big money-maker," she felt the absence of the "restaurant money." "I miss the tips," she said. As with Amanda, Amber, and Raven, Cheryl found value in being a member of particular networks, but she could not harmonize her veganism with her membership in the restaurant network or the show network. Amanda, Amber, and Raven did not compromise their ethics to preserve their membership in particular networks, but in contrast to Cheryl's interactions with the restaurant network and the show network, they seemed more capable of navigating their particular networks and thus more capable of prioritizing their veganism and their membership in these networks in nonhierarchical fashion. In similar fashion, Cheryl seemed more capable of navigating the salons than navigating the restaurant and the show. As she acknowledged, the restaurant "wasn't about to stop serving meat." Thus, Cheryl's options were to continue entertaining customers as they consumed animals, thereby violating her veganism, according to her assessment; or to prioritize her veganism and quit. She similarly felt powerless in her desire for the dancers to not wear fur. Over time, however, she may have been more capable of navigating the show. Cheryl shared literature on the fur industry with the dancers, and, as already acknowledged, communicated her disapproval of the use of fur to the show's producers as she was quitting. She attended a performance of the show in the weeks prior to our interview and noticed that the dancers were wearing faux fur.

Habits

Prioritizing veganism requires mindfulness of veganism. Veganism cannot be salient for an individual who is not conscious of it in a particular context. Many of my interview participants cited habits as forces that were antagonistic to their prospective veganism. These participants formed habits through their embeddedness in structures that normalized consumption of animals and that fostered the pervasiveness of non-vegan products. In some cases, this pervasiveness fueled participants' non-vegan habits by hindering mindfulness of consumption and spawning absent-mindedness. This pervasiveness fostered absent-mindedness to the extent that even vegans acting with elevated mindfulness of their consumption "made mistakes." Amber succumbed to absent-mindedness amid "the day-to-day mundane." "If [veganism is] not righteously at the forefront of my understanding, then it's almost like all too easy to just have a system there that I fall into." Amber framed this system as an arrangement designed to foster absent-mindedness and the habitual consumption of animals. Overcoming this habitual consumption requires an elevated level of conscious consumption. Amber's parents buy coffee creamer that contains dairy derivatives. Whenever Amber would return home from college, she would consume this coffee creamer unaware that it contained dairy derivatives. "I never even thought to look on the back [of the product] because [veganism] just wasn't at the forefront," she said. This particular consumption was complicated by a misleading "non-dairy" label on the product. "That's good enough for me," Amber thought upon reading the label. In this case, she was subjected to the power of her habitual consumption, to the pervasiveness of dairy products in her home, and to the misleading label. Each of these forces fostered absent-mindedness, which, in turn, fostered the habitual consumption

of the coffee creamer. Amber's veganism was not trumped by other priorities. Her absent-mindedness prevented her veganism from even being assessed as a prospective priority.

Francesca was also ambushed by her absent-mindedness. "Sometimes [veganism] slips my mind," she said. "I won't think, 'Oh, that's leather,' instead of, 'That's a cute pair of shoes.'" For Francesca, finding vegan shoes is not the problem. "There are definitely enough choices," she claimed. Instead, the problem is being mindful of her veganism as she shops. "I need to make that connection. I don't think about it." Her absent-mindedness was embedded in the habit of buying and wearing leather and fostered by the pervasiveness of leather in outlets that sell shoes. This pervasiveness limited her mindfulness and fostered her tendency to identify shoes as "cute" before identifying shoes as "leather." In this case, as in Amber's case, veganism was not trumped by other priorities, but prevented from being assessed as a prospective priority. As Amanda's case reveals, absent-mindedness can surface even at times when consciousness of consumption is elevated. One month after her pledge campaign, Amanda traveled to Vienna with her mother and her infant daughter to deliver an academic presentation. While there, she and her mother struggled to find vegan meals, but they persisted and found them. "We really went out of our way for vegan food," she said. Through this stubborn pursuit of vegan food, Amanda was especially conscious of her consumption. However, following her presentation, and without recognizing that she was violating her veganism, she ate a slice of pizza with dairy cheese. She had been "very nervous" about the presentation, and her investment in it distracted her even after she had delivered it. While the salience of her veganism had been elevated during her time in Vienna, for one brief moment of absent-mindedness following her presentation, her veganism was not even assessed as a prospective priority. Her absent-

mindedness was caused by her habitual consumption of non-vegan pizza, by her investment in her presentation, and by the event hosts' normative and unquestioned decision to serve non-vegan pizza following the event.

The pervasiveness of non-vegan products also perpetuated the convenience of not being vegan, thereby hindering participants' attempts to overcome their non-vegan habits. Julie, Janet, and ML rarely prepare food. They are not "big kitchen people," as Julie articulated. Whether vegans need to be "big kitchen people" is debatable, as other participants attested, but Julie, Janet, and ML framed their prospective veganism as contingent on becoming "big kitchen people." Becoming "big kitchen people" and becoming vegan would have required more mindful planning, and Julie, Janet, and ML asserted priorities that trumped such planning and that, in the process, trumped their prospective veganism. Julie "hates" cooking. "I have zero interest," she declared. She also claimed that she did not have adequate time to learn how to cook.

> I get home from work usually at 6:00. I have two hours to spend with my daughter. In that [sic] two hours, I have to make dinner, give her a bath, spend time with her, read to her, get her to brush her teeth. And everything is a fight at this age. My partner is not helpful.

Lacking enough desire, and with limited time, a young daughter, and a partner who, despite being vegetarian, opposed her prospective veganism, Julie resorts to a habitual cycle of basic meals that tend to be vegetarian instead of vegan. This cycle includes stir-fry, tofu, vegetables, non-vegan veggie burgers, and scrambled eggs. She and her partner eat non-vegan pizza "probably three nights a week." Sometimes she eats a bowl of cereal with cow's milk for dinner. For Julie, veganism would require halting this habitual cycle and finding vegan alternatives to replace scrambled eggs and non-vegan veggie burgers, pizza,

and bowls of cereal. Halting this habitual cycle would require more mindful planning, which she frames as an inconvenience.

In similar fashion, Janet is mired in a habitual cycle of consuming pre-made meals at home and dining out at restaurants. "I eat out too much," she admitted. Janet could consume pre-made vegan meals at home and vegan meals in restaurants, but she does not think that she is capable of going vegan just because of the availability of these vegan alternatives. She framed her capacity to go vegan as contingent on her initiative to prepare food. "It's harder to carry on a certain way of eating if you don't prepare your own food," she claimed. Preparing food and simply finding pre-made vegan meals to eat at home would require more mindful planning, which she deems inconvenient. On average, ML dines out at least once per day. At home, the extent of his food preparation is thawing frozen food in a microwave. As with Julie, ML cited time as a hindrance to cooking. He is a busy graduate student whose schedule does not follow standard work hours. Amid this busy and unusual schedule, he does not prioritize cooking, instead preferring a habitual cycle of restaurant meals and microwavable meals. While he regularly consumes vegan meals both in restaurants and at home, he also regularly consumes non-vegan meals in both venues because he tends to not plan his meals in advance, instead preferring to eat impulsively. Considering the pervasiveness of non-vegan food and the more mindful planning required for veganism, ML is prone to consume non-vegan food with this habitual impulsiveness. He becomes especially impulsive when he experiences stress. "When those like stress, emotional eating moments happen is when I'm less likely to be really vigilant about whether a cupcake is vegan or not," he said. ML prefers to eat a vegan cupcake, but has not invested in the more mindful planning required to veganize his emotional eating.

"For me, it's about planning ahead and knowing like, this is going to be a stressful week. And so I should probably have some vegan dessert available, at hand. As opposed to needing to go purchase it."

The vegans were more likely to cite absent-mindedness as they discussed habits, while the non-vegans were more likely to cite the convenience of not being vegan. This divergence revealed variation in mentality between the vegans and the non-vegans. Absent-minded violations of veganism were largely unintentional choices, while violations rooted in convenience were largely intentional choices. The vegans sought to avert future violations by becoming more mindful, while the non-vegans framed their agency as limited amid constraints. Amber, Francesca, and Amanda, each of whom went vegan, violated their veganism due to diminished or lack of awareness. They did not assess whether products they had been habitually consuming were vegan simply because they did not think about their veganism during these moments. They invoked absent-mindedness as a narrative plot because they were bothered by these episodes and because they sought to always remain conscious of their veganism to prevent future violations. They sought to, in Amber's words, "commit all the way." In contrast, Julie, Janet, and ML, each of whom did not go vegan, did not invoke absent-mindedness. They did not frame their violations of veganism as accidental, but as conscious decisions influenced by the convenience of not being vegan. They recognized that going vegan required more mindful planning, and they chose to not invest in such planning. Amber, Francesca, and Amanda also encountered the convenience of not being vegan in their episodes. The event hosts for Amanda's presentation could have served vegan pizza following her presentation, but instead Amanda was subjected to the inconvenience of non-vegan pizza. However, the notion of

convenience was less salient in Amanda's narrative than in the narratives of Julie, Janet, and ML because she, along with Amber and Francesca, had already invested in more mindful planning and progressed to the stage of eschewing absent-mindedness. Amanda, Amber, and Francesca intended to shake their non-vegan habits because they prioritized veganism, while Julie, Janet, and ML did not express this intention because they did not prioritize veganism.

Conclusion

Just as my interview participants encountered mechanisms that vaulted the salience of veganism and activated their contemplation, they also encountered forces that were antagonistic to their prospective veganism. Among the most prevalent antagonistic forces were family and partners, health concerns, and habits. As antagonistic forces, family and partners and health concerns evolved into priorities that competed with veganism on participants' salience hierarchies. Both the non-vegans and the vegans downgraded veganism in favor of other priorities in particular encounters. The non-vegans seem to have encountered more antagonism from their social networks and ties than the vegans seem to have encountered from theirs, a finding that suggests that the non-vegans may have been less capable of prioritizing veganism. However, as with the networks and ties of the vegans, most of the networks and ties of the non-vegans supported their prospective veganism.

While the vegans prioritized their veganism over their other priorities, they more often sought to prioritize their veganism along with their other priorities, such as membership in networks, in nonhierarchical fashion. They necessarily asserted their veganism in networks across which veganism was not a norm, and they employed

strategies to preserve their network membership while asserting their veganism. They asserted their veganism in a consciously polite manner or through compromise to avert becoming an affront to others, and they brought vegan food to network gatherings to ensure their full participation in the gatherings. The absent-mindedness cited by some vegans reveals that prioritizing veganism in any fashion requires elevated mindfulness of consumption, a mindfulness that can be hindered by powerful habits that are reinforced by the pervasiveness of non-vegan products. While the vegans tended to succumb to habits because of absent-mindedness, the non-vegans tended to succumb to habits because of the convenience of not being vegan. This pattern revealed divergence in mentality between the vegans and the non-vegans, as absent-minded violations of veganism were largely unintentional choices, while violations rooted in convenience were largely intentional choices.

As already discussed, going vegan is a capability as well as a choice. In this chapter, I accounted for how antagonistic forces and competing priorities influenced participants' capacity to go vegan. In the next chapter, I account for the capacity of people from socioeconomically and racially contrasting neighborhoods to obtain vegan food.

CHAPTER 7

ACCESS

My interview participants varied not only in choosing whether to go vegan, but also in their capacity to make this choice. First, they varied in their capacity to obtain vegan food. Mary and ML framed their capacity to obtain vegan food as "easy," with ML specifying that "being vegan in Philly" is "totally easy." However, the history of Jen's capacity to obtain vegan food was more complex. She did not maintain her veganism on her first attempt to go vegan while living in northern Maine, where, as she explained, hunting is common and vegan options in food outlets are minimal. On her second attempt 12 years later, she maintained her veganism indefinitely while living in a Philadelphia suburb, where she had more convenient access to vegan food and where she consequently became more capable of maintaining her veganism. Second, participants varied in their connection to vegans, variation that spawned variation in their capacity to go vegan. Charles lamented the lack of a vegan community in Northeast Philadelphia, where he resides, citing this lack of community as the primary reason that he did not go vegan. "Changing your diet is really a hard thing to do, especially when you don't have a support system or a community, which we don't. I don't. Not here." In contrast to Charles, Kiara lived with a vegan partner as she contemplated veganism and went vegan. Brandon not only influenced her, but also empowered her by, among other manners, convincing her of her capacity to go vegan. Jia was incapable of going vegan because she was not aware that someone could identify as vegan. Despite knowing the dietary definition of veganism, despite her participation in vegan potluck dinners at The Rotunda, and despite being "about

90 percent vegan" in the context of diet, Jia had not been aware of the notion of being a vegan until I introduced it during our interview.

Previous scholarship has asserted that the capacity to engage in a behavior and a movement such as veganism varies, with populations that are marginalized on class- and race-based hierarchies being less capable (Loyd-Paige 2010; Williams-Forson 2010; Wrenn 2011). Two prevalent interrelated explanations for this relationship are that these marginalized populations are more likely to reside in food deserts; and that vegan food is relatively expensive. However, these explanations lack empirical consensus. Psyche Williams-Forson (2010:x) claims that a "majority of neighborhoods of color promote junk foods [...] and that these locations are wholly deficient in offering grocery stores that provide fresh and affordable produce." Thus, for people of color living in these neighborhoods, "living healthier is simply not a choice." While some people of color and some poor people may reside in food deserts, Williams-Forson does not empirically support the claim that a "majority of neighborhoods of color" are deprived of outlets with fresh and affordable produce. In a compelling discussion intersecting speciesism and racism, Michelle R. Loyd-Paige (2010:5) addresses access through cost, asking, "Why does it cost more to eat healthy?" She frames eating vegan as eating healthfully. While some healthful vegan foods may be expensive, Loyd-Paige does not empirically support the claim that is implied in her question, the claim that eating healthfully costs more than not eating healthfully. Corey Lee Wrenn (2011:19) adds that "[m]iddle-class persons are in a better position to afford special diets," but, as with Loyd-Paige, Wrenn does not provide evidence that "special diets" such as veganism cost more.

To measure the capacity of socioeconomically and racially contrasting populations to engage in a behavior such as veganism, and to test some of the implications of the claims articulated by Williams-Forson, Loyd-Paige, and Wrenn, I conducted a survey with people who reside in two of the most and two of the least impoverished census tracts in Philadelphia to assess their capacity to obtain fresh vegan produce, meaning fresh fruit and fresh vegetables. I found that, while survey participants in the affluent census tracts were more likely than participants in the impoverished census tracts to report that obtaining fresh vegan produce was easy, most participants in the impoverished census tracts still reported that obtaining fresh vegan produce was easy. I complement this survey finding with a discussion of conflicting scholarship that has found 1) that privileged populations have greater access to large food outlets and thus greater access to more food choices (Morland et al. 2002; Powell et al. 2007; Dutko, Ver Ploeg, and Farrigan 2012); and 2) that low-income and nonwhite populations have greater access to large food outlets and thus greater access to more food choices (USDA 2009). I also engage scholarship that undermines the argument that vegan food is relatively expensive (Golan et al. 2008; Berners-Lee et al. 2012; Lusk and Norwood 2016).

The capacity to engage in a behavior such as veganism also varies by access to the notion of veganism. People like Jia cannot go vegan if they do not know what veganism is. Nigel Pleasants (2008) reveals the power of such access in his vegetarianism narrative.

> I realize that the condition of my holding the beliefs and commitments that I do is the existence of vegetarianism as an established social practice with many other adherents. I did not discover the empirical facts of animal exploitation through first-hand inquiry, and I did not work out the moral issues through independent analysis and reasoning. Without the exhortation and example set by others, I would have had no reason even to consider whether I should become a vegetarian. (P. 198)

Mindful that awareness of "the existence of [veganism] as an established social practice" is necessary for mobilization, I assessed participants' access to the notion of veganism. Relative to the variation of participants' self-reported capacity to obtain fresh vegan produce, I found more variation in whether participants had encountered the term vegan and in whether they knew any vegans and vegetarians, with participants in the impoverished census tracts less likely to have encountered the term and less likely to know vegans and vegetarians. I suggest that this explanation for the varying capacity of people to engage in a behavior such as veganism merits as much attention as explanations concerning food access.

The Census Tracts

I conducted the survey with people who reside in two of the most impoverished census tracts in Philadelphia. These census tracts are located in Kensington, a neighborhood located between North Philadelphia and Northeast Philadelphia, and Parkside, a neighborhood located in West Philadelphia. I also conducted the survey with people who reside in two of the least impoverished census tracts in Philadelphia. These census tracts are located in Girard Estate, a neighborhood located in South Philadelphia; and Torresdale, a neighborhood located in Far Northeast Philadelphia.

The 2012 wave of the American Community Survey (ACS) (2013) found that 63.3 percent of the population aged 18 to 64 in the Kensington census tract lived in poverty. This figure towered over that of Philadelphia, which was 24.4 percent, and that of the United States, which was 13.7 percent. Of the 6,310 inhabitants of this census tract, 76.1 percent were Hispanic or Latino, and 64.2 percent were Puerto Rican. Of my 111 survey participants in Kensington, 79.3 percent identified as at least partially Hispanic or Latino,

with 70.3 percent identifying as Hispanic or Latino only; and 61.3 percent identified as at least partially Puerto Rican, with 55.0 percent identifying as Puerto Rican only. Only 1 of these 111 participants had earned a four-year college degree, and only 53.2 percent had completed high school or a General Educational Development (GED) program. While in Kensington, I encountered numerous Puerto Rico flags; Spanish language hip hop music booming from cars; habitual porch sitters on days of warm weather; and loud trains speeding along the Market-Frankford Subway-Elevated Line, or the El, above Kensington Avenue. I also encountered a homeless population, abandoned housing, ample litter on the ground, and drugs. I was regularly offered weed and "China dope" by dealers, one of whom, upon discovering that I was conducting a sociological survey, eloquently explained that his dealing was rooted in his poverty. Some residents of this neighborhood incessantly work to keep their blocks clean of both litter and drugs, and multiple agencies based in the neighborhood provide hunger relief and addiction recovery support.

The 2012 wave of the ACS found that 59.2 percent of the population aged 18 to 64 in the Parkside census tract lived in poverty, a figure that is only 4.1 percentage points lower than that of Kensington. Of the 3,488 inhabitants of this census tract, 95.4 percent were black or African-American. Of my 110 participants in Parkside, 90.0 percent identified as at least partially black, with 85.5 percent identifying as black only. Only 9.1 percent of these participants had earned a four-year college degree. However, 90.0 percent had completed high school or a GED program, a figure that is drastically higher than Kensington's 53.2 percent. Parkside is so named because it is adjacent to a section of Fairmount Park. Parkside Avenue features residential homes on one side and open green space and a concert venue on the other. On one occasion, I heard Will Smith's

"Summertime" playing on loud speakers in the park. The song was appropriate considering the summer season and the artist, who hails from West Philadelphia. The building of a neighborhood elementary school displays murals of Smith and other black icons. As I had in Kensington, I regularly heard music thumping from cars and homes, though the music played in Parkside tended to be English language hip hop and rhythm and blues. I also regularly encountered porch sitters, block parties, kids playing basketball, and abandoned housing. As in Kensington, multiple agencies provide needed social services for a marginalized population.

While the impoverished populations of Kensington and Parkside composed a majority in their respective census tracts, the impoverished populations of Girard Estate and Torresdale composed a small minority in their respective census tracts. The 2012 wave of the ACS found that only 3.1 percent of the population aged 18 to 64 in the Girard Estate census tract lived in poverty, while a mere 1.8 percent of the population aged 18 to 64 in the Torresdale census tract lived in poverty. Both of these figures are well below the city and the national averages. Of the 3,668 inhabitants of the Girard Estate census tract, 99.2 percent were white only. Of my 63 participants in Girard Estate, 87.3 percent identified as white only. Of the 3,310 inhabitants of the Torresdale census tract, 91.4 percent were white only. Of my 51 participants in Torresdale, 80.4 percent identified as white only. Along with being less impoverished and more white, the populations of Girard Estate and Torresdale were also more educated. In Girard Estate, 39.7 percent of participants had earned a four-year college degree, while in Torresdale, 35.3 percent had earned a four-year college degree. These figures overwhelm Parkside's 9.1 percent and Kensington's 0.9 percent. Furthermore, 14.3 percent of participants in Girard Estate had earned a post-

graduate degree, a figure that is slightly higher than Torresdale's 11.8 percent. Only 1 of the 110 participants in Parkside had earned a post-graduate degree, and none of the 111 participants in Kensington had earned a post-graduate degree.

While not as densely populated as Kensington, Girard Estate is more densely populated than Parkside, and back-in angle parking is enforced throughout much of the congested neighborhood to maximize the number of available parking spaces. While Puerto Rico flags were prominently displayed in Kensington, Italy flags were prominently displayed in Girard Estate. A majority of the white majority in Girard Estate has Italian ancestry. Also on display were yellow flags, which commemorated Pope Francis's September 2015 visit to Philadelphia and revealed the prevalence of Roman Catholicism in the neighborhood. I encountered food trucks, block parties, and a large outdoor recreational complex that includes tennis courts, volleyball courts, basketball courts, baseball fields, and a swimming pool. While Kensington, Parkside, and Girard Estate are urban environments, Torresdale maintains a suburban feel in Far Northeast Philadelphia, where it borders Bucks County between Route 95 and the Delaware River. In contrast to the other three census tracts, the Torresdale census tract does not have a notable commercial district. Torresdale boasts a picturesque waterfront with large populations of ducks and seagulls, ample green space, and Glen Foerd on the Delaware (2016), a waterfront estate listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Access to Vegan Food

Table 3

For you, how easy or difficult is obtaining fresh produce (fruit and vegetables)?	Percent
Kensington	
Very difficult	1.8
Somewhat difficult	18.9

Somewhat easy	24.3
Very easy	55.0
N = 111	
Parkside	
Very difficult	1.8
Somewhat difficult	10.1
Somewhat easy	25.7
Very easy	62.4
N = 109	
Girard Estate	
Very difficult	0.0
Somewhat difficult	4.8
Somewhat easy	27.4
Very easy	67.7
N = 62	
Torresdale	
Very difficult	0.0
Somewhat difficult	8.8
Somewhat easy	14.7
Very easy	76.5
N = 51	

Survey participants in Girard Estate and Torresdale were more likely than participants in Kensington and Parkside to report that obtaining fresh vegan produce, meaning fresh fruit and fresh vegetables, was easy. However, as Table 3 reveals, 83.6 percent of participants in Kensington and Parkside reported that obtaining fresh vegan produce was easy, including 88.1 percent in Parkside. Thus, while the collective corresponding figure for Girard Estate and Torresdale was higher at 93.4 percent, the prevalence of poverty in Kensington and Parkside did not hinder most participants in these census tracts from obtaining fresh vegan produce, if they were to choose to do so. Among the minority of participants who deemed obtaining fresh vegan produce to be difficult, the most cited hindrance was lack of money. These participants cited low income, high prices, and the inadequacy of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), a United States government program that "offers nutrition assistance to millions of eligible, low-

income individuals and families" (USDA 2017). Other commonly cited hindrances were location of food outlets, which participants claimed were too far, and low-quality fruit and vegetables in the outlets to which they had convenient access. These hindrances were more prevalent among participants in Kensington and Parkside, but these participants were a minority in their census tracts, where access to fresh vegan produce was deemed easy by the majority.

Table 4

Do you drive?	Percent
Kensington	
Yes	40.5
No	59.5
N = 111	
Parkside	
Yes	54.5
No	45.5
N = 110	
Girard Estate	
Yes	84.1
No	15.9
N = 63	
Torresdale	
Yes	90.2
No	9.8
N = 51	

Table 5

How safe from crime do you consider your neighborhood to be?	Percent
Kensington	
Very safe	10.8
Somewhat safe	24.8
Somewhat unsafe	21.2
Very unsafe	43.2
Don't know	0.0
N = 111	
Parkside	
Very safe	21.1
Somewhat safe	25.2
Somewhat unsafe	37.2

Very unsafe	15.6
Don't know	0.9
N = 109	
Girard Estate	
Very safe	28.6
Somewhat safe	58.7
Somewhat unsafe	11.1
Very unsafe	1.6
Don't know	0.0
N = 63	
Torresdale	
Very safe	30.4
Somewhat safe	63.7
Somewhat unsafe	5.9
Very unsafe	0.0
Don't know	0.0
N = 51	

I suspected that variation in the capacity to drive and to move safely through a neighborhood could influence variation in the capacity to obtain fresh vegan produce. Thus, I asked participants, "Do you drive?"; and I asked, "How safe from crime do you consider your neighborhood to be?" As Table 4 reveals, participants in Kensington and Parkside were drastically less likely to drive than were participants in Girard Estate and Torresdale. Among participants in Kensington and Parkside, 47.5 percent reported that they drove, including only 40.5 percent in Kensington. Among participants in Girard Estate and Torresdale, 86.8 percent drove. As Table 5 reveals, participants in Kensington and Parkside were drastically more likely than participants in Girard Estate and Torresdale to report that their neighborhoods were unsafe. Among participants in Kensington and Parkside, 58.6 percent reported that their neighborhoods were unsafe, with 64.4 percent of Kensington participants reporting unsafe and 43.2 percent reporting very unsafe. Among participants in Girard Estate and Torresdale, only 9.6 percent reported that their neighborhoods were unsafe. These disparities suggest that participants in Kensington and

Parkside may be less capable of obtaining fresh vegan produce. The capacity to drive enhances the capacity to efficiently move in desired directions, and security enhances the capacity to navigate without threat and to do so at night as well as during the day. Despite these disparities, again, most participants in Kensington and Parkside reported that obtaining fresh vegan produce was easy. Their standard for easy may differ from that of participants in Girard Estate and Torresdale. These people may be so accustomed to having to walk to a food outlet in a violent neighborhood that these variables may not influence their assessment of whether obtaining fresh vegan produce is easy or difficult.

Table 6

How many servings of fruit and vegetables did you eat yesterday (e.g., one medium apple, a handful of broccoli, or a cup of carrots)?	Mean
Kensington	2.09
N = 111	
Parkside	2.14
N = 110	
Girard Estate	2.76
N = 62	
Torresdale	2.38
N = 51	

As Table 6 reveals, participants in Kensington and Parkside reported consuming fewer servings of fruit and vegetables on the day prior to taking the survey than did participants in Girard Estate and Torresdale. This disparity may prevail because participants in Kensington and Parkside are less capable of obtaining fruit and vegetables. It may prevail because consumption of fruit and vegetables is not as prevalent in the social networks of participants in Kensington and Parkside. It may also prevail because participants in these census tracts are less likely than their counterparts in Girard Estate and Torresdale to choose to consume fruit and vegetables. While prevalent, the disparity is

small. The figure for Torresdale is closer to those of Kensington and Parkside than to that of Girard Estate. Even participants in Girard Estate, where consumption was highest, consumed less than one serving more than did participants in Kensington, where consumption was lowest.

The capacity to obtain fresh vegan produce is influenced by the accessibility of food outlets that sell it. The Parkside and Girard Estate census tracts and the census tracts bordering the Kensington census tract include large food outlets that sell ample fresh vegan produce. Neither the Torresdale census tract nor its bordering census tracts have a large food outlet, but with 90.2 percent of participants in Torresdale driving, the lack of a large food outlet in these census tracts does not seem to deprive these participants of easy access to fresh vegan produce, at least according to the 91.2 percent of participants who framed their access as easy. In Kensington and Parkside, two of the most impoverished neighborhoods in Philadelphia, the prevailing claim that obtaining fresh vegan produce is easy is supported by the presence of large food outlets. While I accounted for only four neighborhoods in one city, the presence of large food outlets in the impoverished neighborhoods of color would be exceptional in the context of Williams-Forson's (2010:x) claim that a "majority of neighborhoods of color" are deprived of these outlets. It would also be exceptional in the context of previous scholarship that has found that impoverished neighborhoods of color are more likely to be deprived of convenient access to large food outlets (Morland et al. 2002; Powell et al. 2007; Dutko, Ver Ploeg, and Farrigan 2012).

Across 221 census tracts in five states in the United States, Kimberly Morland et al. (2002:26) found more supermarkets in "wealthier neighborhoods" than in the "lowest-wealth areas" by a margin of more than three-to-one; and more supermarkets in

predominantly white neighborhoods than in predominantly black neighborhoods by a margin of four-to-one. Similarly, Paula Dutko, Michele Ver Ploeg, and Tracey Farrigan (2012:iii) found that "areas with higher poverty levels are more likely to be food deserts," defined as "areas where people have limited access to a variety of healthy and affordable food"; and that "in all but very dense urban areas, the higher percentage of minority population, the more likely the area is to be a food desert." Lisa M. Powell et al. (2007) found that low-income neighborhoods have only 75 percent of the chain supermarkets available in middle-income neighborhoods; that African-American neighborhoods have only 52 percent of the chain supermarkets available in white neighborhoods; and that Hispanic neighborhoods have only 32 percent of the chain supermarkets available in non-Hispanic neighborhoods. This disparity between Hispanic and non-Hispanic neighborhoods does not exist, however, in urban neighborhoods. Powell et al. also found that non-chain supermarkets are more prevalent in low-income and predominantly nonwhite neighborhoods, suggesting that disparities in access to chain supermarkets do not necessarily result in deprived access to supermarkets.

Employing nationally representative data, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) (2009:18) further complicates the results of Powell et al. and contradicts the results of Morland et al. and Dutko, Ver Ploeg, and Farrigan, finding that the "median distance" to a supermarket "for low-income individuals is about 0.1 of a mile less than for those with higher income"; and that "median distance to the nearest supermarket for [nonwhite] individuals is 0.63 miles, compared with 0.96 miles on average for [whites]." In addition, more than 90 percent of SNAP participants "spend at least some of their benefits in a supermarket, and close to 90 percent of all benefits are redeemed in

supermarkets or large grocery stores" (p. 78). The USDA results suggest that we cannot conclude that low-income and nonwhite populations are more deprived of access to large food outlets. The presence of large food outlets in Puerto Rican Kensington and black Parkside is not extraordinary.

The capacity to obtain fresh vegan produce is also influenced by the capacity to afford it. While impoverished populations may be less capable of obtaining fresh vegan produce simply because of their impoverished state, previous scholarship suggests that a vegan diet is not relatively expensive (Berners-Lee et al. 2012; Lusk and Norwood 2016). In fact, in a study based in the United Kingdom, M. Berners-Lee et al. (2012:189) found that vegan and vegetarian diets are cheaper than the "UK-average diet." In a survey of people in the United States, Jayson L. Lusk and F. Bailey Norwood (2016:232) found that "true" vegetarians, distinguished from "partial" vegetarians who "sometimes eat or buy meat," spend less on food than do habitual consumers of meat. Vegan and vegetarian diets do not seem to require privilege in the context of affordability, as Wrenn (2011:19) suggests in claiming that "[m]iddle-class persons are in a better position to afford special diets."

A discourse of veganism being too expensive for particular populations may be associated with a discourse of healthful foods, such as fruit and vegetables, being too expensive. Elise Golan et al. (2008:32) found that "eating healthfully does not necessarily mean paying more," but that "subjective notions about affordability undermine some healthy food choices." As a result, "U.S. consumers seem to think that healthy foods such as fruit and vegetables are too expensive." Loyd-Paige (2010:5) displayed this thinking in asking, "Why does it cost more to eat healthy?" Golan et al. (2008) cite the USDA food

plans, which, arranged according to cost level from lowest to highest, are labeled Thrifty, Low-Cost, Moderate-Cost, and Liberal. The Thrifty Food Plan, almost half of which is composed of fruit and vegetables, "corresponded to about 8 percent of median income for a four-person household" in 2006 (p. 28). That the average household in the United States spends about 10 percent of its income on food suggests that this dietary plan deemed healthful by the USDA is, on average, more affordable than the diet of the average household. These figures suggest that eating healthfully does not cost more.

Access to Veganism as a Notion

Table 7

Have you ever heard of the word vegan?	Percent
Kensington	
Yes	38.7
No	61.3
N = 111	
Parkside	
Yes	80.9
No	19.1
N = 110	
Girard Estate	
Yes	87.3
No	12.7
N = 63	
Torresdale	
Yes	90.2
No	9.8
N = 51	

If veganism is a movement characterized by privilege, such privilege may be rooted more in social networks and ties than in food access. People may become more capable of engaging in a behavior and a movement such as veganism if they are embedded in networks across which veganism exists in language and through which they know vegans. Suspecting that discourses of veganism are more prevalent in privileged networks, I asked my survey participants if they had "ever heard of the word vegan." As Table 7 reveals, I

found that participants in Kensington and Parkside were less likely to have encountered the term vegan. Only 38.7 percent of participants in Kensington had encountered the term, a figure that is in part rooted in the prevalence of Spanish speakers in this census tract. Of the 40 participants with whom I conducted the survey in Spanish, only 4, or 10.0 percent, had encountered the term *vegano* or the English translation vegan. Among the 71 participants, including native Spanish speakers, with whom I conducted the survey in English, 54.9 percent had encountered the term. This English-only figure is still drastically lower than those of Parkside, Girard Estate, and Torresdale. In Girard Estate and Torresdale, 88.6 percent of participants had encountered the term, while in Parkside, 80.9 percent had encountered the term. Thus, on account that they were more likely to have encountered the term vegan, participants in the affluent census tracts seem to be more capable of practicing veganism. Despite the margin, most participants in Parkside had encountered the term, thereby suggesting that if they are less capable on this account, they are only slightly less capable. I also asked participants if they had "ever heard of the word vegetarian." Of the 335 participants across the four census tracts, only 3 reported that they had not encountered the term. In Kensington, where only 2 of the 111 participants reported that they had not encountered the term, the Spanish translation *vegetariano* was more recognized than *vegano*.

Table 8

Do you know people who are vegan, meaning they never eat meat, fish, seafood, poultry, dairy, eggs, or honey?	Percent
Kensington	
Yes	10.1
No	89.9
N = 109	
Parkside	
Yes	21.3

No	78.7
N = 108	
Girard Estate	
Yes	47.6
No	52.4
N = 63	
Torresdale	
Yes	36.0
No	64.0
N = 50	

My interview participants became more likely to contemplate veganism through their interactions with particular networks and ties. In many cases, these social ties were vegan and these networks included vegans. In some cases, knowing vegans and interacting with vegans increased the likelihood of going vegan because interactions with these social ties enhanced participants' capacity to go vegan. Brandon and Brian did not just activate Kiara's contemplation of veganism; they also empowered her to go vegan. Kiara learned about veganism and developed and recognized her capacity to go vegan through her interactions with these two social ties. As Table 8 reveals, survey participants in Kensington and Parkside were less likely than participants in Girard Estate and Torresdale to know vegans, a finding that suggests that participants in Kensington and Parkside may be less capable of engaging in a behavior such as veganism. Only 15.7 percent of participants in Kensington and Parkside knew vegans, compared with 42.5 percent of participants in Girard Estate and Torresdale. I also found a disparity in whether participants knew vegetarians. In Kensington and Parkside, 50.7 percent of participants knew vegetarians, while in Girard Estate and Torresdale, 66.4 percent knew vegetarians. Considering the socioeconomic and racial homogeneity of these census tracts, these disparities suggest that poor populations and populations of color may be less capable of

connecting with vegans and vegetarians and thus less capable of going vegan or going vegetarian.

Conclusion

My survey data are based on only four census tracts in only one city. However, my small sample complicates prevailing conventional wisdom concerning variation in the capacity to engage in a behavior and a movement such as veganism. Veganism may be more accessible to socioeconomically and racially privileged populations, and these populations may be more capable of going vegan as a result. However, variation in physical access to vegan food and variation in affordability of vegan food are weak explanations for variation in the capacity to practice veganism across socioeconomically and racially contrasting populations. While I found, for example, that survey participants in Girard Estate and Torresdale were more likely to report that obtaining fresh vegan produce is easy, most participants in Kensington and Parkside reported the same; and while I found that participants in Girard Estate and Torresdale reported consuming more servings of fruit and vegetables the previous day, the disparity was minimal. The most notable disparity in my data was that participants in Girard Estate and Torresdale were more likely than participants in Kensington and Parkside to know vegans. While socioeconomic and racial inequalities in access to vegan food may prevail in particular locations, inequalities in access to the notion of veganism seem prevalent to the extent that they merit attention as a force that inhibits populations from engaging in a behavior such as veganism. I have employed veganism as a proxy for behaviors and movements that people embrace as they act in pursuit of self-identified interests, needs, and principles. Knowing participants of

such movements can influence an individual to participate, and, as Kiara's narrative reveals, knowing participants can also empower an individual to participate.

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

Most of my interview participants assessed the salience of vegan as an identification relative to other identifications, and more broadly the salience of veganism as a priority relative to other priorities. According to Sheldon Stryker (2000:21), this assessment of salience can involve competition, as "identities are potential competitors in producing behavioral choice." Following Stryker's argument, veganism must become salient among other priorities if an individual is to go vegan. In response to Stryker, I asked, How does an identification such as vegan—and a priority such as veganism—emerge on a salience hierarchy? To answer this question, I prompted interview participants to engage in narrative selectivity, an exercise through which they explained the processes through which veganism emerged as a salient priority; and an exercise through which they ranked and prioritized what was important to them and how what was important to them interacted and contended with veganism. Their narratives revealed how a series of mobilizing mechanisms vaulted the salience of veganism and activated their contemplation. For example, social networks and ties vaulted the salience of veganism by, among other manners, prompting their recognition of veganism as congruent with their other priorities.

In response to Stryker, I also asked, How do people negotiate mobilizing forces and assess salience? While interview participants were prompted to recognize veganism as congruent with their other priorities, they asserted these other priorities, thereby setting the stage for congruence. They acted with a particular mentality in this process. The vegans were more likely than the non-vegans to prioritize altruism as they contemplated veganism,

with nonhuman animals being primary beneficiaries of this altruism. The vegans were more likely to seek information that motivated and empowered them to go vegan, and more likely to narrate their veganism as inevitable. In contrast, the non-vegans expressed more passivity and less intentionality. I also asked, How do people negotiate competing identifications and priorities? In particular encounters, both the non-vegans and the vegans downgraded veganism in favor of other priorities, such as family and partners and health concerns. While the vegans also downgraded other priorities in favor of veganism, they more often sought to harmonize their veganism with these other priorities in nonhierarchical fashion. The vegans commonly sought to harmonize their veganism and their membership in networks across which veganism was not a norm.

Because narrative selectivity is an exercise of agency, my interviews inevitably account for the agency exercised by prospective vegans. This accounting is a response to mobilization scholarship that emphasizes the influence of identity, which people construct as they select among different discursive formations (Perinbanayagam 2000). My findings suggest that this selection process involves assessing congruence between movement participation and other priorities. In this assessment, movement participation and other priorities are not static forces, but rather malleable forces altered by mobilizing mechanisms, such as networks and discourses, that can be conducive or antithetical to forging congruence; and by agency exercised by prospective participants. As these forces are malleable, congruence can be forged by prospective participants. While David A. Snow and Doug McAdam (2000) reveal how movement networks can deploy mechanisms such as framing processes to forge congruence between their collective identifications and the identifications of recruitment targets, my findings account for how targets influence the

prospect of such congruence. Prospective participants assert the priorities that they assess for congruence. The salience of participation is vaulted by mechanisms, but prospective participants facilitate their engagement with these mechanisms, conduct the assessment for congruence, and ultimately choose how to prioritize movement participation among other priorities. Prospective participants also influence the prospect of congruence and mobilization by acting with particular mentalities that vary in conduciveness to participation. My findings suggest, for example, that the initiative to seek information conducive to participation can vary across a population of prospective participants, thereby spawning variation in whether they are mobilized.

My findings also suggest that prospective participants who come to participate pursue congruence between participation and other priorities that contend with participation for salience. Rather than construct hierarchies on which particular priorities trump others, these people seek to participate in a movement and to preserve, for example, their membership in networks across which movement participation is not a norm and is perhaps even opposed. This nonhierarchical prioritization suggests that mobilized participants strive to participate while not alienating themselves from other networks and from society more broadly. Considering the prevalence of carnism, such nonhierarchical prioritization may be especially crucial for prospective vegans who need to, in Rahul's words, "exist in a social world."

Ultimately, prospective participants of a movement choose whether to participate. My interview participants chose whether to go vegan. However, my findings also reveal that, while prospective participants exercise agency, they do so only in relation to forces to which they are subjected. Most people who participate in movements do not create these

movements. Thus, in contemplating participation, they are subjected to the motives and frames of the movement they may join. My participants were subjected to particular definitions and framings of veganism. Such definitions and framings are a force with which a prospective participant's priorities are assessed for congruence. This congruence does not automatically result in mobilization. Consistent with the Snow and McAdam explanation of identity amplification and identity extension, mobilization becomes more likely when congruence is activated by mechanisms. Prospective vegans may consider themselves ethical or identify veganism as an ethical behavior. However, their mobilization becomes more likely when they are prompted by a mechanism, such as a network or a discourse, to recognize congruence between their prioritization of ethical behavior and their prospective veganism. Mechanisms such as networks and discourses can invoke their prioritization of ethical behavior; that is, they can vault the salience of ethics in the context of veganism. As Snow and McAdam suggest in their articulation of identity construction, such mechanisms can also construct new identifications and priorities that are recognized as congruent with movement participation; that is, an individual who does not prioritize ethical behavior may come to do so upon interacting with a particular network or upon being interpellated by a particular discourse. Furthermore, mechanisms can foster the development of new mentalities that are conducive to participation. Altruism, for example, is not a static force and can be developed through encounters with a mobilizing network or a mobilizing discourse.

While my findings suggest that the forces to which prospective participants of a movement are subjected can influence them to participate in a movement, they also suggest that such forces can empower them. Prospective participants may become more likely to

participate as they become more capable of doing so. Prominent among the mobilizing mechanisms that empower prospective participants are networks and ties, which transmit information and advice that enhance their capacity to participate. My survey findings suggest that poor populations and populations of color may be less capable of engaging in a behavior and a movement such as veganism because they are less likely to know vegans. If particular networks and ties empower people to participate in movements, variation in connection to such networks and ties can influence variation in the capacity to participate in a movement. While my study is a response to the call to account for identity in mobilization processes, my interview and survey findings reveal the influence of resources on the capacity of prospective participants to participate in a movement, thereby confirming the basic argument of resource mobilization theory. Identity matters, but so do resources.

Advocating Veganism

As already discussed, how people come to participate in social movements matters because the process reveals how advocates of social change can effectively mobilize and perhaps empower people to participate in their movement. Research on how people come to contemplate and ultimately embrace or reject veganism is important because it can contribute to previous scholarship on mobilization processes, but such research is also important because of the societal implications of this particular movement. While veganism does not seem to be a priority for most people in the United States, where only 1 to 2 percent of the population practices veganism (Newport 2012; Stahler 2012), the social and environmental forces that the movement challenges affect all beings, human as well as nonhuman. These forces include unhealthful consumption behaviors, environmental

destruction, and the oppression of human and nonhuman animals. Prioritizing in nonhierarchical fashion my social research and my vegan advocacy, I humbly seek to employ the findings of this study to contribute to discussions on maximizing the effectiveness of vegan advocacy.

I present four recommendations. First, I recommend that vegan advocates and vegan advocacy networks foster some form of narrative selectivity among recruitment targets. I recognize that advocates probably do not have the resources to conduct and analyze 34 one- to three-hour interviews. However, they could still foster narrative selectivity by creating a forum in which targets can express and prioritize their concerns and needs in the context of their consumption behaviors and their prospective veganism. The identification of these narratively selected priorities could enhance the capacity of advocates to accommodate targets and to forge congruence between their prospective veganism and their other priorities. Second, I recommend that advocates and networks consciously and strategically function as social ties and networks mindful of their capacity as social ties and networks to mobilize people. All of my interview participants who contemplated veganism were mobilized by a network or a tie. Networks and ties mobilized participants by, among other manners, linking them to other networks and ties that were conducive to veganism. The organizers of the Peace Advocacy Network (PAN) vegan pledge campaigns and the organizers of the vegan potluck dinners at The Rotunda recruited participants by permeating various networks, which then connected participants to a pledge campaign or a potluck dinner. While much of this linking was intentional, these organizers could expand the reach of their recruitment by intentionally connecting with and forging

relationships with more networks and ties. Advocates bring a presence to veganism, and they expand this presence as they forge relationships with new networks and ties.

Third, I recommend that advocates and networks address the how as well as the why; that is, they should communicate how to go vegan and remain vegan along with their argument for why people should go vegan. Some interview participants contemplated veganism upon recognizing their capacity to go vegan, a capacity they recognized through networks and ties, among other mobilizing mechanisms. Some did not go vegan not because they dismissed arguments for veganism, but because they doubted their capacity to do so. Thus, empowering targets to go vegan is as crucial as convincing them of the merits of veganism. To enhance targets' capacity to go vegan, advocates could collaborate with them to negotiate forces that hinder this capacity. Such collaboration could involve the transmission of resources and the development of confidence. Because circumstances and capacities are particular to each individual, such collaboration would require some form of narrative selectivity through which targets identify and articulate their most salient challenges. Fourth, I recommend that advocates and networks prioritize without ever downgrading ethical and altruistic frames for veganism. Among interview participants whose contemplation of veganism was activated primarily by discourses of ethics, most went vegan; and among participants who prioritized altruism, with nonhuman animals being primary beneficiaries of this altruism, most went vegan. Ethics and altruism seem to elicit commitment. Thus, advocates should promote ethics and altruism and frame veganism as conducive to these notions. Advocates do not need to restrict their advocacy to these notions. They could also, for example, frame veganism as healthful, a discourse

that mobilized most of my participants. However, my findings suggest that, amid countless other frames, ethics and altruism should not be downgraded in vegan advocacy.

REFERENCES

(ACS) American Community Survey. 2013. "ACS 2012 (5-Year Estimates)." Social Explorer. Retrieved October 2014 (https://www.socialexplorer.com/tables/ACS2012_5yr/R11528662).

Adams, Carol J. [1990] 2010. *The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory*. New York: Continuum.

Asher, Kathryn, Che Green, Hans Gutbrod, Mirna Jewell, Galina Hale, and Brock Bastian. 2014. *Study of Current and Former Vegetarians and Vegans: Tables & Methodology*. Humane Research Council. Retrieved December 2014 (http://spot.humaneresearch.org/system/files/HRC+Study+of+Current+%2526+Former%20%20+Vegetarians+%2526+Vegans+Dec+2014.pdf).

Berners-Lee, M., C. Hoolohan, H. Cammack, and C.N. Hewitt. 2012. "The relative greenhouse gas impacts of realistic dietary choices." *Energy Policy* 43:184-90.

Brouwer, Amanda M. and Katie E. Mosack. 2015. "Motivating Healthy Diet Behaviors: The Self-as-Doer Identity." *Self and Identity* 14(6):638-53.

Cherry, Elizabeth. 2006. "Veganism as a Cultural Movement: A Relational Approach." *Social Movement Studies* 5(2):155-70.

------. 2015. "I Was a Teenage Vegan: Motivation and Maintenance of Lifestyle Movements." *Sociological Inquiry* 85(1):55-74.

Christakis, Nicholas A. and James H. Fowler. 2008. "The Collective Dynamics of Smoking in a Large Social Network." *New England Journal of Medicine* 358(21):2249-58.

------. 2009. *Connected: The Surprising Power of Our Social Networks and How They Shape Our Lives*. New York: Little, Brown.

Cialdini, Robert B. 2003. "Crafting Normative Messages to Protect the Environment." *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 12(4):105-09.

Comeau, Elizabeth. 2012. "Scott Jurek on running ultramarathons, being a vegan." *Boston Globe*, June 5. Retrieved June 2012 (http://www.boston.com/lifestyle/health/fitness/getmovingblog/2012/06/scott_jurek_on.html).

Corrigall-Brown, Catherine. 2012. *Patterns of Protest: Trajectories of Participation in Social Movements*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.

Craig, Winston J. and Ann Reed Mangels. 2009. "Position of the American Dietetic Association: Vegetarian Diets." *Journal of the American Dietetic Association* 109(7):1266-82.

Danielle, Melissa. 2010. "Nutrition Liberation: Plant-based Diets as a Tool for Healing, Resistance, and Self-reliance." Pp. 47-52 in *Sistah Vegan: Black Female Vegans Speak on Food, Identity, Health, and Society*, edited by A.B. Harper. Brooklyn, NY: Lantern.

Davis, Joseph E. 2002. "Narrative and Social Movements: The Power of Stories." Pp. 3-29 in *Stories of Change: Narrative and Social Movements*, edited by J.E. Davis. Albany, NY: State University of New York.

de Fina, Anna, Deborah Schiffrin, and Michael Bamberg, eds. 2006. *Discourse and Identity*. New York: Cambridge University.

Dutko, Paula, Michele Ver Ploeg, and Tracey Farrigan. 2012. "Characteristics and Influential Factors of Food Deserts." Economic Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture. Retrieved September 2012 (http://www.ers.usda.gov/media/883903/err140.pdf).

ESPN. 2012. "Arian Foster says he's a vegan." *ESPN*, July 10. Retrieved July 2012 (http://espn.go.com/nfl/story/_/id/8143634/arian-foster-houston-texans-says-going-vegan).

Forks Over Knives. 2012. "Synopsis." Retrieved September 2012 (http://www.forksoverknives.com/about/synopsis/).

Francione, Gary L. and Robert Garner. 2010. *The Animal Rights Debate: Abolition or Regulation?* New York: Columbia University.

Gecas, Viktor. 2000. "Value Identities, Self-Motives, and Social Movements." Pp. 93-109 in *Self, Identity, and Social Movements*, edited by S. Stryker, T.J. Owens, and R.W. White. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.

Geller, Lindsay. 2012. "Personal stories: Why I became a vegetarian." *This Dish Is Veg*, May 24. Retrieved May 2012 (http://www.thisdishisvegetarian.com/2012/05/personal-stories-why-i-became.html).

Glen Foerd on the Delaware. 2016. "About Us." Retrieved August 2016 (http://www.glenfoerd.org/about).

Golan, Elise, Hayden Stewart, Fred Kuchler, and Diansheng Dong. 2008. "Can Low-Income Americans Afford a Healthy Diet?" *Amber Waves* 6(5):26-33.

Gruen, Lori and Robert C. Jones. 2016. "Veganism as an Aspiration." Pp. 153-71 in *The Moral Complexities of Eating Meat*, edited by B. Bramble and B. Fischer. New York: Oxford University.

Gubrium, Jaber F. and James A. Holstein. 2003. "From the Individual Interview to the Interview Society." Pp. 21-49 in *Postmodern Interviewing*, edited by J.F. Gubrium and J.A. Holstein. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Haenfler, Ross, Brett Johnson, and Ellis Jones. 2012. "Lifestyle Movements: Exploring the Intersection of Lifestyle and Social Movements." *Social Movement Studies* 11(1):1-20.

Harper, A. Breeze. 2010a. "Introduction: The Birth of the Sistah Vegan Project." Pp. xiii-xix in *Sistah Vegan: Black Female Vegans Speak on Food, Identity, Health, and Society*, edited by A.B. Harper. Brooklyn, NY: Lantern.

------. 2010b. "Social Justice Beliefs and Addiction to Uncompassionate Consumption: Food for Thought." Pp. 20-41 in *Sistah Vegan: Black Female Vegans Speak on Food, Identity, Health, and Society*, edited by A.B. Harper. Brooklyn, NY: Lantern.

Haupt, Angela. 2012. "Me, Give Up Meat? Vegan Diets Surging in Popularity." *U.S. News & World Report*, July 24. Retrieved July 2012 (http://health.usnews.com/health-news/articles/2012/07/24/me-give-up-meat-vegan-diets-surging-in-popularity).

Haverstock, Katie and Deborah Kirby Forgays. 2012. "To eat or not to eat. A comparison of current and former animal product limiters." *Appetite* 58(3):1030-36.

Herzog, Harold A. 2007. "Gender Differences in Human-Animal Interactions: A Review." *Anthrozoos* 20(1):7-21.

Hirschler, Christopher A. 2011. "'What Pushed Me over the Edge Was a Deer Hunter': Being Vegan in North America." *Society & Animals* 19(2):156-74.

Imaner Consultants. 2003. "Vegan profile." Retrieved February 2011 (http://www.imaner.net/panel/profile.htm).

Jasper, James M. 2012. "Introduction: From Political Opportunity Structures to Strategic Interactions." Pp. 1-33 in *Contention in Context: Political Opportunities and the Emergence of Protest*, edited by J. Goodwin and J.M. Jasper. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.

------. 2014. "Feeling-Thinking: Emotions as Central to Culture." Pp. 23-44 in *Conceptualizing Culture in Social Movement Research*, edited by B. Baumgarten, P. Daphi, and P. Ullrich. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Joseph, John. 2014. *Meat Is for Pussies: A How-To Guide for Dudes Who Want to Get Fit, Kick Ass, and Take Names*. New York: Loudspeaker.

Joy, Melanie. 2010. *Why We Love Dogs, Eat Pigs, and Wear Cows: An Introduction to Carnism*. San Francisco, CA: Conari.

Krizmanic, Judy. 1992. "Here's Who We Are." *Vegetarian Times*, October, pp. 72-80.

Leneman, Leah. 1999. "No Animal Food: The Road to Veganism in Britain, 1909-1944." *Society and Animals* 7(3):219-28.

Lewis, James R. 2012. "Cracks in the Network Conversion Paradigm." *International Journal for the Study of New Religions* 3(2):143-62.

Loyd-Paige, Michelle R. 2010. "Thinking and Eating at the Same Time: Reflections of a Sistah Vegan." Pp. 1-7 in *Sistah Vegan: Black Female Vegans Speak on Food, Identity, Health, and Society*, edited by A.B. Harper. Brooklyn, NY: Lantern.

Lusk, Jayson L. and F. Bailey Norwood. 2016. "Some vegetarians spend less money on food, others don't." *Ecological Economics* 130:232-42.

MacNair, Rachel M. 1998. "The psychology of becoming a vegetarian." *Vegetarian Nutrition: An International Journal* 2(3):96-102.

Marsh, Kate, Carol Zeuschner, and Angela Saunders. 2012. "Health Implications of a Vegetarian Diet: A Review." *American Journal of Lifestyle Medicine* 6(3):250-67.

Maurer, Donna. 2002. *Vegetarianism: Movement or Moment?* Philadelphia, PA: Temple University.

McAdam, Doug. 1986. "Recruitment to High-Risk Activism: The Case of Freedom Summer." *American Journal of Sociology* 92(1):64-90.

McAdam, Doug and Ronnelle Paulsen. 1993. "Specifying the Relationship between Social Ties and Activism." *American Journal of Sociology* 99(3):640-67.

McAdam, Doug, Sidney Tarrow, and Charles Tilly. 2001. *Dynamics of Contention*. New York: Cambridge University.

McCarthy, John D. and Mayer N. Zald. 2001. "The Enduring Vitality of the Resource Mobilization Theory of Social Movements." Pp. 533-65 in *Handbook of Sociological Theory*, edited by J.H. Turner. New York: Kluwer Academic / Plenum.

McDonald, Barbara. 2000. "'Once You Know Something, You Can't Not Know It': An Empirical Look at Becoming Vegan." *Society & Animals* 8(1):1-23.

Mercy for Animals. 2015. "About Mercy for Animals." Retrieved October 2015 (http://www.mercyforanimals.org/about).

Merriman, Ben. 2010. "Gender differences in family and peer reaction to the adoption of a vegetarian diet." *Feminism & Psychology* 20(3):420-27.

Meyer, David S. 2004. "Protest and Political Opportunities." *Annual Review of Sociology* 30:125-45.

Morland, Kimberly, Steve Wing, Ana Diez Roux, and Charles Poole. 2002. "Neighborhood Characteristics Associated with the Location of Food Stores and Food Service Places." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 22(1):23-29.

Myers, Daniel J. 2008. "Ally Identity: The Politically Gay." Pp. 167-87 in *Identity Work in Social Movements*, edited by J. Reger, D.J. Myers, and R.L. Einwohner. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.

Nation Earth. 2015. "*Earthlings*." Retrieved October 2015 (http://www.nationearth.com/earthlings-1/).

Newport, Frank. 2012. "In U.S., 5% Consider Themselves Vegetarians." *Gallup*, July 26. Retrieved September 2012 (http://www.gallup.com/poll/156215/consider-themselves-vegetarians.aspx).

Nibert, David. 2002. *Animal Rights / Human Rights: Entanglements of Oppression and Liberation*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

Nussbaum, Martha C. 2011. *Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap.

Owens, Erica. 2006. "Conversational Space and Participant Shame in Interviewing." *Qualitative Inquiry* 12(6):1160-79.

(PAN) Peace Advocacy Network. 2013. "Vegan Guidebook: A Guide through Veganism." Peace Advocacy Network.

------. 2015. "About." Retrieved October 2015 (http://www.peaceadvocacynetwork.org/about/).

Perinbanayagam, R.S. 2000. *The Presence of Self*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield.

(PETA) People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals. 2002. "*Meet Your Meat*." Retrieved October 2015 (https://www.peta.org/videos/meet-your-meat/).

Phillips, Layli. 2010. "Veganism and Ecowomanism." Pp. 8-19 in *Sistah Vegan: Black Female Vegans Speak on Food, Identity, Health, and Society*, edited by A.B. Harper. Brooklyn, NY: Lantern.

Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine. 2012. "The *New* Four Food Groups." Retrieved October 2012 (http://www.pcrm.org/pdfs/health/4foodgroups.pdf).

Pleasants, Nigel. 2008. "Structure and Agency in the Antislavery and Animal Liberation Movements." Pp. 198-216 in *Eating and Believing: Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Vegetarianism and Theology*, edited by R. Muers and D. Grumett. New York: T&T Clark.

Plous, S. 1991. "An Attitude Survey of Animal Rights Activists." *Psychological Science* 2(3):194-96.

Pollan, Michael. 2006. *The Omnivore's Dilemma: A Natural History of Four Meals*. New York: Penguin.

Polletta, Francesca and James M. Jasper. 2001. "Collective Identity and Social Movements." *Annual Review of Sociology* 27:283-305.

Powell, Lisa M., Sandy Slater, Donka Mirtcheva, Yanjun Bao, and Frank J. Chaloupka. 2007. "Food Store Availability and Neighborhood Characteristics in the United States." *Preventive Medicine* 44(3):189-95.

Richardson, Laurel. 1990. "Narrative and Sociology." *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography* 19(1):116-35.

Risley, Amy. 2012. "Human Rights in Argentina: Alison Brysk's *The Politics of Human Rights in Argentina*." Pp. 83-113 in *Contention in Context: Political Opportunities and the Emergence of Protest*, edited by J. Goodwin and J.M. Jasper. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.

Robertson, Dale. 2012. "Arian Foster's veganism is food for thought for Texans." *Ultimate Texans*, August 7. Retrieved August 2012 (http://blog.chron.com/ultimatetexans/2012/08/arian-fosters-veganism-is-food-for-thought-for-texans/).

Rowan, A. 1989. "The Development of the Animal Protection Movement." *Journal of NIH Research* 1(Nov/Dec):97-100.

Rozin, Paul, Maureen Markwith, and Caryn Stoess. 1997. "Moralization and Becoming a Vegetarian: The Transformation of Preferences into Values and the Recruitment of Disgust." *Psychological Science* 8(2):67-73.

Safran Foer, Jonathan. 2009. *Eating Animals*. New York: Little, Brown.

Schosler, Hanna, Joop de Boer, and Jan J. Boersema. 2012. "Can we cut out the meat of the dish? Constructing consumer-oriented pathways towards meat substitution." *Appetite* 58(1):39-47.

Scully, Matthew. 2002. *Dominion: The Power of Man, the Suffering of Animals, and the Call to Mercy*. New York: St. Martin's Griffin.

Silverstone, Alicia. 2009. *The Kind Diet: A Simple Guide to Feeling Great, Losing Weight, and Saving the Planet*. New York: Rodale.

Smilde, David. 2005. "A Qualitative Comparative Analysis of Conversion to Venezuelan Evangelicalism: How Networks Matter." *American Journal of Sociology* 111(3):757-96.

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 S. Stryker, T.J. Owens, and R.W. White. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.

Stahler, Charles. 2012. "How Often Do Americans Eat Vegetarian Meals? And How Many Adults in the U.S. Are Vegetarian?" *The Vegetarian Resource Group Blog*, May 18. Retrieved September 2012 (http://www.vrg.org/blog/2012/05/18/how-often-do-americans-eat-vegetarian-meals-and-how-many-adults-in-the-u-s-are-vegetarian/).

Steinfeld, Henning, Pierre Gerber, Tom Wassenaar, Vincent Castel, Mauricio Rosales, and Cees de Haan. 2006. *Livestock's Long Shadow: Environmental Issues and Options*. Rome, Italy: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

Stryker, Sheldon. 1968. "Identity Salience and Role Performance: The Relevance of Symbolic Interaction Theory for Family Research." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 30(4):558-64.

------. 2000. "Identity Competition: Key to Differential Social Movement Participation?" Pp. 21-40 in *Self, Identity, and Social Movements*, edited by S. Stryker, T.J. Owens, and R.W. White. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.

TakePart. 2015. "About the Film." Retrieved October 2015 (http://www.takepart.com/foodinc/).

The Humane League. 2014. *Diet Change and Demographic Characteristics of Vegans, Vegetarians, Semi-Vegetarians, and Omnivores*. Retrieved April 2014 (http://humaneleaguelabs.files.wordpress.com/2014/04/diet-change-and-demographic-characteristics.pdf).

Urban Dictionary. 2002. "tubesteak." Retrieved September 2012 (http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=Tubesteak&defid=3971296).

U.S. Congress. Senate. *Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act*. S. 3880. 109th Congress, 2nd Session, 2006. Retrieved October 2015 (https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/109/s3880/text).

(USDA) United States Department of Agriculture. 2009. *Access to Affordable and Nutritious Food: Measuring and Understanding Food Deserts and Their Consequences*. Economic Research Service. Retrieved November 2012 (http://www.ers.usda.gov/media/242675/ap036_1_.pdf).

------. 2017. "Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)." Food and Nutrition Service. Retrieved May 2017 (https://www.fns.usda.gov/snap/supplemental-nutrition-assistance-program-snap).

Vegucated. 2012. "Synopsis." Retrieved October 2015 (http://www.getvegucated.com).

Vila, Pablo. 2000. *Crossing Borders, Reinforcing Borders: Social Categories, Metaphors, and Narrative Identities on the U.S.-Mexico Frontier*. Austin, TX: University of Texas.

Wellock, Bill. 2012. "Vegan hopes radical diet is key to long life." *The Citizens' Voice*, August 5. Retrieved August 2012 (http://citizensvoice.com/news/vegan-hopes-radical-diet-is-key-to-long-life-1.1354586).

Williams-Forson, Psyche. 2010. "Preface." Pp. ix-xi in *Sistah Vegan: Black Female Vegans Speak on Food, Identity, Health, and Society*, edited by A.B. Harper. Brooklyn, NY: Lantern.

Wrenn, Corey Lee. 2011. "Resisting the Globalization of Speciesism: Vegan Abolitionism as a Site for Consumer-Based Social Change." *Journal for Critical Animal Studies* 9(3):9-27.

APPENDIX

SURVEY

Tract:

How many servings of fruit and vegetables did you eat yesterday (e.g., one medium apple, a handful of broccoli, or a cup of carrots)?

For you, how easy or difficult is obtaining fresh produce (fruit and vegetables)?

1 = very difficult; 2 = somewhat difficult; 3 = somewhat easy; 4 = very easy

explanation:

For you, how easy or difficult is shopping for necessities?

1 = very difficult; 2 = somewhat difficult; 3 = somewhat easy; 4 = very easy

explanation:

In a typical week, do you access the Internet?

Do you drive?

How safe from crime do you consider your neighborhood to be?

1 = very safe; 2 = somewhat safe; 3 = somewhat unsafe; 4 = very unsafe

Have you ever heard of the word vegetarian?

Do you know people who are vegetarian, meaning they never eat meat, fish, seafood, or poultry?

number:

Have you ever heard of the word vegan?

Do you know people who are vegan, meaning they never eat meat, fish, seafood, poultry, dairy, eggs, or honey?

number:

Do you have children?

number:

Do you have a job?

number/hours/week:

Age.
1 = 17 or younger; 2 = 18-34; 3 = 35-54; 4 = 55 or older

Gender.
1 = female; 2 = male; 3 = transgender; 4 = intersex

Race.
1 = white / Caucasian; 2 = black / African-American; 3 = Asian; 4 = Pacific Islander; 5 = American Indian / Alaskan Native; 6 = Hispanic / Latino; 7 = other:

Education.
1 = some high school or less; 2 = high school graduate / GED; 3= some college / trade school / associates degree; 4 = college graduate; 5 = post-graduate degree