Working Papers in

Urban Language & Literacies

Paper **163**

How an individual becomes a subject: Discourse, interaction & subjectification at a Brazilian gender identity clinic

Rodrigo Borba (*Federal University of Rio de Janeiro*)

2015

How an individual becomes a subject: Discourse, interaction, and subjectification at a Brazilian gender identity clinic

Rodrigo Borba
Federal University of Rio de Janeiro
rodrigoborba@letras.ufrj.br

Abstract

Grounded in a Foucauldian genealogical approach to discourse analysis and in Goffmanian-inspired interactional analysis, this paper investigates how knowledge systems that pathologize transsexuality as a mental disorder get gradually embodied in consultations at a Brazilian gender identity clinic. It investigates the Programa de Atenção Integral à Saúde Transexual (PAIST). The research draws upon 13-month ethnographic fieldwork. It analyses how pathologizing biomedical knowledge systems make available certain semiotic resources for the identification of "true transsexuals", solidifying, thus, a metapragmatic model of identity (Wortham 2006). The analyses focus on the micro-interactional dynamics of socialization trajectories (Wortham 2006) during which a new transsexual client of the clinic gradually learned how to entextualize (Silverstein and Urban 1996) the identity model of "true transsexual" in her identity and linguistic performances and, thus, gradually became a docile body for the purposes of the clinic. This learning dynamics took place in the sequential organization of turns-at-talk in the consultations and, above all, in the question-answer adjacency pair in which a psychologist repeatedly offered her interlocutor semiotic items for the construction of a performance that fulfills the requirements of the Brazilian trans-specific healthcare program. The research indicates that in the micro-interactional details of the consultations, clients' local understandings of their subjectivities and bodily practices are gradually eclipsed (or in the Foucauldian jargon, are docilized) by the diagnostic construct of the "true transsexual".

Key-words: trans-specific healthcare; agency; interactional analysis; socialization trajectories; depathologization

Introduction

In Brazil, one must be granted a psychiatric diagnosis which legitimates the authenticity of one's transsexuality in order for surgeries and hormone therapy to be offered in premises of the SUS (Unified Health System). This diagnosis is based on the evaluative criteria imposed by the World Health Organization in its International Statistical Classification of Diseases and Related Health Problems (ICD), by the American Psychiatric Association's Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM) and by the Brazilian Federal Board of Medicine's Resolutions on the trans-specific healthcare program. The necessity of a psychiatric diagnosis imposes interactional tensions, as has been noted in the available literature (Stone 2007[1991]; Newman 2000; Butler 2004; Bento 2006; Teixeira 2013; Borba 2014). Louise Newman (2000: 400), for example, proposes that the question guiding healthcare professionals is "how can I be sure that this patient is a true transsexual and is not saying what she/he thinks I want to hear in order to get treatment?" Transsexual people, on the other hand, are guided by the question: "how can I convince this sceptical doctor that I am a true transsexual and have the right to surgeries?" In this scenario, worried they will be denied access to the clinic services, transsexual clients rapidly learn "the necessary life-history required for successful 'passing'" (Hird 2002: 583).

Although the learning and the telling of an adequate diagnostic narrative is frequently referred to in the research literature, showing how little resonance such diagnostic criteria have in transsexual people's lives (Butler 2004; Bento 2006; Stone 2007 [1991]; Teixeira 2013), these analyses are largely based on second-hand, retrospective accounts of transsexual people about their

experiences with doctors. Because of this, we know little of the interactional *in situ* instantiation of such discourse, let alone the learning process that leads to its shape and to dynamics of disidentification from the "worldly" forms of living one's transsexuality that it entails.[1] This paper seeks to understand the micro-interactional phenomena that lead to the materialisation of diagnostically driven language of this kind, along with the subjectification processes it engenders. How does an individual actually become a legitimate (transsexual) subject for the institutional purposes of the Brazilian trans-specific healthcare program?

To address this question, I draw on 13-month ethnographic fieldwork at the *Programa de Atenção Integral à Saúde Transexual* (PAIST, hereafter), one of the busiest gender clinics in Brazil.[2] During fieldwork, the PAIST had three main health professionals, a surgeon, a psychologist, and a psychiatrist, and two visiting physicians who were specialising in urological surgeries. For the purposes of this paper, I analyse a corpus of 5 consultations between Verônica, a new client of the clinic, and Inês, PAIST's psychologist. Verônica had her first consultation with Inês in February 2010 and in the following months several other meetings occurred (five of them were audio-recorded and transcribed). In these consultations, Inês' therapeutic focus was on the apparent mismatch between Verônica's life narratives and bodily presentation on the one hand, and the "true transsexual" identity model on the other. As I argue, this series of consultations constitutes a trajectory of socialization (Wortham 2006), i.e. a complex of related communicative events in time, through which an individual becomes an institutionally recognisable type of (trans) subject. In order to track the multitude of phenomena that comprise this learning trajectory, I draw on Foucauldian discourse analysis and Goffmanian-inspired interactional analysis, which are discussed in the following section.

Discourse, interaction and the production of docile subjects

To a great extent, Foucault's work focuses on the dynamics through which individuals become – or are forced to become (i.e. are docilized in his philosophical jargon) – institutionally recognizable types of subjects. In this endeavour, Foucault traces the historical emergence and the material effects of a multitude of discourses, which he understands broadly as "practices that systematically form the objects of which they speak" (Foucault 1972:49). Discourse, thus, is not only language in use as linguists claim. It involves, besides language, a complex of knowledge systems, scientific categories, institutions, laws, architecture, philosophical propositions, moral standards etc. (see Foucault 2013 [1979]). Such discourses interlace individuals in a web of knowledge systems which, when put into practice in institutions, end up transforming them into subjects. Foucault's understanding of a subject is two-fold: "subject to someone else by control or dependence; and tied to his [sic.] own identity by a conscience of self-knowledge" (Foucault 1982:781). Both senses are central to understanding how trans individuals are socialized to becoming "true transsexuals"[3] for the purposes of the Brazilian health system. As will become clear in the analyses that follow, the dependence on a health

[1] But see Speer (2009; 2010; 2011; 2013) for accounts of interactions between psychiatrists and trans clients. However, Speer's allegiance to the conversation analytic understanding of context as co-text (Billig 1999), and her focus on what members explicitly orient to, impel her to take the status of transsexuality as a mental disorder for granted. As such, her CA studies overlook the centrality of pathologizing discourses to the relationships within the gender clinic that she investigates.

[2] Pseudonyms are used to refer to the clinic, its clients and its professionals.

[3] I use the term "true transsexual" between quotation marks to point to its origins in systems of knowledge/power which produce transsexuality as a mental disorder. In this sense, the use of the concept in this format aims to highlight its diagnostic character, which is based on idealizations of what constitutes an allegedly authentic transsexuality. In addition, the use of quotation marks is intended to index the mismatch between the "true transsexual", as devised by medical knowledge systems, and the multiple contingent ways transsexual people experience their bodies and subjectivities in their daily lives.

professional's classification of one's identity and the interactional processes through which one learns how to speak as a "true transsexual" are intertwined discursive phenomena. Conjoined, they engender dynamics of unlearning how one understands oneself in order to adopt the adequate diagnostic language imposed by powerful pathologizing knowledge systems.

With his genealogy of the "different modes by which human beings are made subjects" (Foucault 1982:777), Foucault delineates a historical shift which marked the development of disciplinary societies. He traces a move from the identification of people based on their "natural" behaviour to the categorization and docilization of their mental and spiritual dispositions (Foucault 1976; 1977). In this scenario, the philosopher explains how the social and medical sciences and the development of scientific categories simultaneously allowed for the emergence of new forms of knowledge and new forms of power. A central tenet of this historical change is the proliferation of taxonomies and practices for institutionally classifying people in places such as prisons (Foucault 1977) and hospitals (Foucault 1976). The bureaucratisation of such taxonomies allowed governments and their institutions to identify such individuals and foresee and/or prescribe how they (should) behave in ways that were hitherto unavailable. So according to Foucault, the new systems of classification permitted individuals to be identified as specific kinds of subjects and made possible the development of institutional techniques of discipline and surveillance. Techniques for governing others (Foucault 2009) were installed which, in turn, would engender practices of self-surveillance and control (i.e. government of self). In this way, institutions such as hospitals and prisons would entangle the individual, progressively and by him/herself, in webs of knowledge/power. Webs of this kind gradually produce certain technologies of the self (Foucault 1988) which transform an individual into a subject dependent on others and on the available knowledge about him/herself.

The documents that pathologise transsexuality (i.e. ICD, DSM and the Brazilian legislation) are but a cog in the discursive machinery that produces individuals who disidentify with the gender they were assigned at birth as specific types of subjects. These texts entextualize (Silverstein and Urban 1996) biomedical knowledge systems which are based on the identification of a disease, its aetiology and temporal progression within a relatively fixed constellation of observable and interpretable signs and symptoms (Foucault 1976). Within trans-specific healthcare contexts, such pathologization is materialized in the institutional imposition of a psychiatric diagnosis which allows for surgical and hormonal intervention. As described above, Foucault's work is useful to our understanding of how such knowledge systems have emerged. But we know little of how such knowledge systems are embodied in the consultation rooms of gender clinics and their effects on trans clients' health needs and identities. For this, we need a more situated gaze on the details of what happens when health professionals and transsexuals clients meet to do business together, and a Goffmanian lens on interaction proves useful.

Whereas Foucault was interested in analysing the emergence of broad knowledge systems, Goffman focused on how individuals interact with each other on the ground, as it were, and within the institutions of which they are part. Foucault's research was "'top-down, directed at entire systems of thought" (Hacking 2004:278), while in contrast, Goffman's focus is said to be "'bottom-up – always concerned with individuals in specific locations entering into or declining social relations with other people" (ibid.). In Brazil, most research on transsexuality has followed a Foucauldian perspective on discourse and has mapped the emergence of discourses that pathologize transsexual people's gendered experiences (Bento 2006; Lima 2011; Teixeira 2013). With its focus on how people negotiate intersubjective relations in their ordinary interactions, Goffmanian interactional analysis can contribute to our understanding of how the classification of transsexuality as a mental disorder is embodied in the institutional practices of the Brazilian trans-specific health program.

According to Hacking (2004), both Foucault and Goffman are relevant for investigation of how individuals are transformed into subjects. Foucault's top-down genealogy of discourses provides an understanding of how certain individuals become of interest to sciences; Goffman's bottom-up

approach to situated interaction helps us study how discourse in the Foucauldian sense becomes institutionalised and embodied in people's day-to-day lives. Both approaches to discourse analysis are central to understanding the constitution of knowledge systems and their solidification in techniques of surveillance and control. In this sense, both are useful for studying the development of practices of other and self government which cumulatively produce docile subjects for the purposes of institutions. Having this in perspective, the following section provides a genealogical précis of the pathologization of transsexuality. Analyses of interactional history of Verônica and Inês at the SUS follow after that.

A genealogical approach to the pathologization of transsexuality: The "true transsexual" as a metapragmatic model of identity

According to the Brazilian Federal Board of Medicine (FBM), "the transsexual patient has a permanent psychological disorder and [because of this] rejects his/her phenotype and tends to self-mutilate and/or commit suicide" (Brasil 2010, my translation). Due to their pathologised status, transsexual people who wish to have their healthcare subsidised by the State must be diagnosed as suffering from a Gender Identity Disorder (GID) – a term coined by the APA in the 4th version of its DSM.[4] So it is a psychiatric diagnosis which guides Brazilian trans-specific healthcare policies and as a consequence, informs the interactions between transsexual people and their physicians. Interestingly, the Brazilian legislation never actually mentions the DSM as a diagnostic resource,[5] but fieldwork in one of the Brazilian gender clinics has shown that it is the APA's diagnostic criteria which guide doctors' clinical gaze (Foucault 1976) when talking to a transsexual person.

Bento (2006) explains that the individuals who the APA considers to be suffering from a gender disorder were at the epicentre of epistemological conflicts between the 1950s and 1970s: different fields of medicine tried to explain the characteristics and the origin of transsexuality within their own scientific lenses. In fact Bento argues that these epistemological conflicts have produced diverging explanations of this "disorder": separate biological and psychoanalytical fields of definition were established. But despite the contradiction between them, the apparent scientific objectivity of these theories made the inclusion of transsexuality in the APA manual possible.[6] The history of the APA's interest in gender transition is a complex one which space constraints prevent me from exploring in detail. But it is important to note the centrality that two diverging medical explanations have in the current institutional standards of textuality which regulate transsexual people's and physicians' lives in gender clinics around the globe. These explanations are those of the endocrinologist Harry Benjamin and the psychoanalyst Robert Stoller. Benjamin's and Stoller's theories contradict each other due to their scientific allegiances, but surprisingly, both shape what the APA – and as a consequence, what the Brazilian government – understands about who counts as a "true transsexual" (Benjamin, 1999[1966]).

In his book *The Transsexual Phenomenon* (1999[1966]), Benjamin argues as an endocrinologist that transsexuality is a matter of biological determination. He proposes that human sex is comprised of 8 different "sexes": genetic, gonadal, germinal, endocrinological, phenotypical,

[4] The APA frequently revises the manual. The latest version, DSM-V, was published in 2012. However, I use the DSM-VR as a reference because it was the version available during the period of fieldwork in 2009-2010, and it was that version that was used as a resource for the interactional construction of the diagnosis.

[5] The pathologisation of transsexuality is also present in the text of the International Code of Diseases and Health-related problems (ICD) of the World Health Organization (WHO). For the purposes of this paper, however, I focus exclusively on the DSM text for two mains reasons: (i) it is the DSM which regulates these diagnostic encounters, and (ii) space constraints prohibit discussion of the details of the ICD and its production.

[6] "Transsexualism" first appeared in the DSM in its third version, published in 1980, the same year the APA depathologised homosexuality. Now in its fifth edition, the DSM classifies transsexuality as Gender Dysphoria. Dysphoria is the antonym of euphoria.

psychological, legal and social sex. Due to unnamed biological processes, according to Benjamin, transsexuality is the result of a radical dissociation of psychological sex from the other ones. This dissociation produces a gender identity that is not in accordance with the more biologically based sexes of the body (i.e. genetic, gonadal, germinal, endocrinological, and phenotypical). Benjamin explains, however, that this separation of the psychological sex may have different degrees, and that there are 6 degrees of transsexuality. Only the most intense (types V and VI) should be classified as "true transsexuals" and should be considered for sex reassignment surgeries.

In Benjamin's view, "true transsexuals" "feel that they *belong* to the other sex, they want to *be* and *function* as members of the opposite sex, not only to appear as such. For them, their sex organs, the primary (testes) as well as the secondary (penis and others) are disgusting deformities that must be changed by the surgeon's knife" (Benjamin 1999[1966]: 11, emphasis in original). Viewing transsexuality in these terms, Benjamin always supported the necessity of sex reassignment surgeries, because, in his view, psychological sex cannot be changed. Since psychological sex is more ingrained, one should modify the morphology of the body, which, due to technological advances, can be transformed.

Benjamin's views, however, did not go unchallenged. The psychoanalyst Robert Stoller was a prominent opponent of sex reassignment surgeries, and viewed transsexuality as the product of dysfunctional socialisation within gender roles in the family. Stoller focussed his efforts on analysing the socialisation processes that would supposedly lead to gender non-conforming behaviours in adulthood. To this end, he worked with young boys whose parents were concerned about their sons being "effeminate". In his book *The Transsexual Experience* (Stoller 1982[1975]), he proposes that the origin of gender non-conforming behaviour in children (which could lead to the desire to undergo sex reassignment in adulthood) is the product not of behaviours and preferences *per se*, but of traumatic psychosocial dynamics imposed by the children's relationship with their parents, especially the mother.

In this most Freudian vein, Stoller suggests that the mother of a prospective transsexual person is a masculine woman whose penis envy is so strong that she transfers her unfulfilled desires onto her son. This produces family dynamics in which the mother is powerful and dominating and the father is absent and emotionally unavailable. In this context, the father cannot establish himself as a masculinity model and the Oedipus complex is interrupted by, among other things, the excess of physical contact between mother and child. Stoller believed that it was possible to inculcate gender-conformity in these children via what he termed the "therapeutically motivated Oedipus complex" (Stoller 1982 [1975]: 101), in which the (male) therapist must serve as a "representative of society, health and of conformity with the external reality" (ibid.:80), providing the child with a model of masculinity. In his clinical practice, Stoller attempted to lead the child to disidentify with his envious mother, which was supposed to turn the child's attention to stereotypically masculine activities, games and clothing preferences. The importance of Stoller in the current understandings of transsexuality stems from the centrality he gave to childhood activities and to socialisation.[7]

The DSM-IV definition of GID reentextualizes these contradictory discourses on transsexuality and produces a Benjamin-Stoller hybrid. This diagnostic manual establishes the set of "symptoms" individuals desiring to undergo sex reassignment surgeries must demonstrate in order to be diagnosed as "true transsexuals" in the APA's terms. As such, the text imposes certain narrative demands (Coupland et. al. 2005) which must be fulfilled if one is to be granted institutional authorisation to have one's healthcare needs covered. According to the DSM, there are four main symptom areas that a mental health professional must pay attention to in order to diagnose someone as a "true transsexual":

[7] Space constraints prevent me from going any deeper in the discussion of the historical and epistemological construction of the APA's view on transsexuality. For more detailed discussions, see Heath (2006). For a critical discussion of what Brazilian sociologist Berenice Bento (2006) calls the "dispositive of transsexuality", see Bento (2006) and Santos (2011).

A. A strong and persistent cross-gender identification (not merely a desire for any perceived cultural advantages of being the other sex).
   In children, the disturbance is manifested by four (or more) of the following:
   1. Repeatedly stated desire to be, or insistence that he or she is, the other sex;
   2. In boys, preference for cross-dressing or simulating female attire; in girls, insistence on wearing only stereotypical masculine clothing;
   3. Strong and persistence preference for cross-sex role in make-believe play or persistent fantasies of being the other sex;
   4. Intense desire to participate in the stereotypical games of the other sex;
   5. Strong preference for playmates of the other sex […]
B. Persistent discomfort with his or her sex or sense of inappropriateness in the gender role of that sex […]
C. The disturbance is not concurrent with a physical intersex condition;
D. The disturbance causes clinically significant distress or impairment in social, occupational or other important areas of functioning.

(American Psychiatric Association 1994:537-538)

In this text, stereotypical gender behaviours make possible the reentextualisation (Silverstein and Urban 1996) of Benjamin's and Stoller's theories in the DSM. The symptoms of Gender Identity Disorder do not merely materialize the medicalisation of transsexuality – in a broader sense, their entextualisation medicalises gender and, more significantly, the non-linearity between sex and gender. As such, the DSM text is a vector of social control that attempts to maintain the current matrix of gender intelligibility (Bento 2006). By pathologising gender transition through the supposed neutrality and objectivity of scientific language (Martínez-Guzmán and Íñiguez-Rueda 2010) and by producing it as a medical fact, this text homogenises transsexual experiences and effaces the idiosyncrasies of alternative context-specific forms of transsexuality.

Although the APA published a new version of the DSM in 2012 in which the GID category has been replaced by the concept of Gender Dysphoria, also slightly modifying the diagnostic criteria, the history of emergence of the "true transsexual" concept still finds its way into contemporary gender clinics. As such, the "true transsexual" acts as a metapragmatic model of identity (Wortham 2006), for it has been engrained in the medical and social imaginary through its history of repetition in "objective" scientific knowledge systems. A metapragmatic model is a "model of recognizable kinds of people (e.g. inappropriately resistant students) participating in a recognizable kind of interaction (e.g. refusing to participate in class)" (Wortham 2006:32). Analytically, linguistic signs used in situated interaction (cf Goffman) can only make sense when, in amalgam, they indexically point to a history of discourses (cf Foucault) that produces the framework to understand the metapragmatic model in action. According to Wortham (2006) however, one must not see the relations between linguistic signs and models of identity as static and a-historical.

The genealogy above of medical discourses on transsexuality considers how the "true transsexual" model has emerged from constellations of knowledge/power within medical fields from endocrinology to psychoanalysis. This discursive construction has established the fields of action "true transsexuals" may engage, i.e. they must want to undergo surgeries as well as hate their genital organs and tell narratives of the type "I'm a man/woman trapped in the wrong body". Such a history of use constrains the effect of the linguistic sign locally. Thus "the metapragmatic model 'regiments' the sign (i.e. it makes it clear which aspects of the context are relevant to interpreting of the sign in this case) from among the various contextual aspects that might be relevant. Such regimentation […] limits the possible meanings of the sign, making it easier for people to interpret it or react to it" (Wortham 2006:33). In this sense, becoming an institutionally recognizable type of subject implies the situated contextualization of a sign in fields of meaning that extrapolate its local use. It is to this process that the following section turns attention. After all, how are the discourses of the "true

transsexual" identity model embodied in gender identity clinics? What are their effects on the identity performances of trans clients and on the language that they speak?

How an individual (interactionally) becomes a "true transsexual"

The previous section tracked the emergence of the "true transsexual" as a model of identity by critically analysing the discourses that have produced transsexuality as a mental disorder in different systems of knowledge. This section now focuses on how these discourses (in the Foucauldian sense) become materialized in a situated series of interactions between Verônica, a new client at PAIST at the time of fieldwork, and Inês, the clinic's psychologist. In 2010, between February and June Verônica met Inês at least 10 times. Five of these consultations were audio-recorded. Analytically, this series of consultations allows me to track the micro-details of the interactional trajectory through which Verônica slowly learned the language of the "true transsexual" model. In this way, the analysis problematizes the issues of agency and trans-autonomy. Can transsexual people really speak?

To address this matter, I focus on question-answer sequences, given their centrality in doctor-patient communication (Heritage 2010). More specifically, I investigate the discursive positions (Kendal 2008) produced by Inês's questions and their subjectification effects on Verônica's actions. Such effects can only be studied as the cumulative result of a series of intertextual links that connect each of the consultations over time. As space constraints prevent a full account of the complexities of the interactional history between Verônica and Inês, I shall focus on the changes in Verônica's understanding of her genitals as a feature that is relevant for her to be classified as a "true transsexual".

On 24th February, in her first consultation with Inês, Verônica was exposed to the diagnostic centrality of her relation to her penis. The talk about what she thought of her genitals was parallel to the broader agenda of this consultation, namely the difference between a transsexual person and a travesti. Grossly speaking, travestis are male-bodied individuals who identify as gay men, dress up in women's clothes and drastically modify their bodies by ingesting female hormones and injecting industrial silicone in order to look more attractive to "heterosexual" men (see Kulick 1998; Borba and Ostermann 2007). Due to their body modification practices, travestis and transsexual people share a very close social space in Brazilian culture. Commonsense has it, however, that the defining characteristic setting these two groups apart is that travestis do not wish to undergo sex reassignment surgeries since their penises may be a source of pleasure (and income for those who work as sex professionals). In contrast, "true transsexuals", as we saw earlier, must demonstrate hatred of their bodies and more specifically their genitals.[8] In this first consultation, in the design and sequencing of her questions Inês discursively positioned herself as a psychotherapist, as a teacher and as a judge of Verônica's performance of transsexuality.[9]

Verônica's first consultation: 24th February 2010

1	Inês:	Verônica >vô pedi pra você< me falá- me
2		explicá qual é a diferença entre transsexual
3		<e travesti>.
4		(4.2)

[8] As researchers and transsexual activists have been arguing in their political fight against the pathologization of transsexuality, not all transsexual people hate their genitals as propounded by the diagnostic manuals. Transsexual people's relation to their genitals is complex and multifaceted, ranging from total disgust to nonchalance.

[9] Transcription conventions were adapted from Jefferson (2004) and can be found in the appendix. Here I first present the transcription in Brazilian Portuguese, the language in which consultations originally happened, followed by a translation into English.

5 Verônica: °ô:: como é° que vô explicá isso,
6 Inês: >não precisa-< ↑fala com seu coração Verônica
7 Verônica: que que eu a::cho?
8 (.)
9 Verônica: ah eu acho que são::- são pessoas diferentes
10 que tem a- pensa da maneira diferente né=
11 Inês: =>exatamente< sentem diferente=
12 Verônica: =é. [se sentem-]
13 Inês: [tem a <sexua]lidade> [diferen-]
14 Verônica: [diferen]te uma da
15 outra=
16 Inês: =i:::sso mesmo. esses suas- >seus amigos<
((11 linhas omitidas))
28 Inês: <o transexual> ele- na grande maioria ele
29 não tem relação (sexual) °com pênis°
30 (0.7)
31 Inês: entendeu?=
32 Verônica: =uhum
33 Inês: já o travesti não. eles são- tanto eles são
34 ativos quanto eles são [passivos]
35 Verônica: [passivo] isso eu sei,
36 [são os dois]
37 Inês: [então eles] U::sam o pênis,
38 Verônica: uhum
39 (0.6)
40 Inês: >entendeu< a diferença?
41 Verônica: °entendi°=

---

1 Inês: Verônica >I'll ask you< to tell me- to explain to me
2 the difference between a transsexual <and a
3 travesti>.
4 (4.2)
5 Verônica: °a:: how can° I explain this,
6 Inês: >you don't need-< open up your heart Verônica
7 Verônica: what do I thi::nk?
8 (.)
9 Verônica: ah I think they are:::- they are different people who
10 have the- they think in different ways right=
11 Inês: =>exactly<, they feel different things=
12 Verônica: =right. [they feel-]
13 Inês: [their <sexua]lity> is di[fferen-]
14 Verônica: [different] one from the
15 other=
16 Inês: =tha:::ts right. these friends- >your friends< who say
((11 lines omitted))
28 Inês: <the transsexual> he- the great majority they
29 don't have (sexual) relations °with the penis°
30 (0.7)
31 Inês: get it?=
32 Verônica: =uhum
33 Inês: but the travesti don't. they are- they are
34 both top and [bottom]
35 Verônica: [bottom] this I know,
36 [they do both]
37 Inês: [so they] U:::se the penis,
38 Verônica: uhum
39 (0.6)
40 Inês: >understand< the difference?

41 Verônica: °I do°=

The question Inês poses in lines 1-3 positions her as having less epistemic access (Heritage 2010) to the matter that she is asking about than Verônica – she positions herself as knowing less than Verônica about the difference between transsexual people and travestis. At the same time, Inês is an institutional representative in a gender identity clinic, a place where professionals are expected to be knowledgeable about the issues on which, in this consultation, she seemed to know less than her interlocutor. Her job, in other words, contradicts the discursive position articulated in her question, and it may be this mismatch that produces the delay in line 4 before Verônica replies. Instead of seeing it as a legitimate inquiry about something that the psychologist knew less, this delay may indicate that Verônica sees Inês' question as actually doing just the opposite: testing the client's knowledge about the matter. With this interpretation in mind, Inês' question resembles what conversation analysts call a "known information question" (Mehan 1979; Koshik 2010), which is a type of question commonly used by teachers in conventional lessons or, in Foucault's jargon, panoptical classrooms (Fabrício 2007). In such contexts, the teacher has the power to reproduce knowledge and test his/her students with questions for which she/he already has a pre-established agenda. This allows him/her to correct answers she/he considers wrong. Such a dynamic imposes a panoptical structure on the teacher-student interaction: the teacher knows and sees it all. In Foucauldian terms, we may say that this type of question works as a disciplinary device in which "the subjects of education, their relations amongst themselves and with others and their attitudes to knowledge are regulated and transformed" (Fabrício 2007:127, my translation). So Inês' question projects a complex footing (Goffman 1981): she acts not only as a psychotherapist but also as a judge of Verônica's identity.

Verônica's reaction to this footing could have consequences for her access to the clinic's body modification services, and a wrong answer could provide reasons for refusing her participation in the program. So Inês' question puts Verônica in a difficult place, and this is indicated in the repair sequence (Schegloff, Jefferson and Sacks 1977) she initiates in line 5. In line 6, faced with her interlocutor's difficulty addressing the agenda of her question, Inês launches an utterance typical of psychotherapeutic discourse: 'open up your heart Verônica'. According to Vehvilainen (2011), turns that try to motivate their interlocutors to speak freely, "from their heart", without the constraints of concepts of right and wrong, are sequentially inserted in contexts where therapists encounter clients' resistance to tackling a problem that the therapists advance. So "open up your heart" seems to indicate that there is no correct answer, and that Verônica may say whatever comes to mind. This is what she does in lines 7-10: for her, transsexual people and travestis 'are different people who have the- they think in different ways'. Although Verônica's answer is very broad and vague with regard to Inês' agenda, the psychologist seems satisfied with it (line 11). At the same time, Inês' turn in line 11 consolidates her discursive position as teacher and evaluator by closing the interactional sequence, a move that is infamous among students of classroom discourse. If we analyze the series of turns in lines 1-3, 7-10, and 11 (temporarily disregarding the repair sequence in 4-6), we find a standard Initiation – Response – Evaluation sequence (Sinclair and Coulthard 1975; Mehan 1979). In a sequence of this kind, the teacher, who knows it all, produces a question whose answer he/she knows in advance, the student answers and then gets feedback from the teacher in terms of right or wrong.

Importantly, in Verônica's first consultation with Inês, the evaluative character of this sequence is disguised by the repair in lines 5-6, when Inês positions herself as a therapist, inciting Verônica to open up her heart. The psychologist's turn in line 6 has at least three effects for the development of intersubjective relations between these interlocutors. First, it forces the client to abandon the repair she initiated in line 5, which did not meet the psychologist's agenda in line 1. Second, it disguises the evaluative stance Inês took up with her question. Third, it frames the sequence within psychotherapeutic discourses, in this way effacing the possibility of moral

judgment. Produced like this, the repair tones down the pedagogic character of the interaction, so that Inês can receive answers that are not constrained by the agenda for the consultation set by her question in line 1. In other words, Inês' turn in line 6 masks the pedagogic-disciplinary effect of the IRE sequence in which it is embedded.

The presence of the IRE sequence in the trans-specific healthcare program indicates that the institutional function of mental health professionals involves more than just providing psychotherapeutic follow-up to clients' emotional issues, as the FBM Resolutions require. These professionals in fact act as evaluators of clients' identities. In this context, the IRE materializes the discursive conflict between different models of identity - specifically, the "true transsexual" model, which pathologizes trans subjectivities, and the multiple forms of experiencing gender variance that clients bring with them to the clinic. The latter are not ratified by the knowledge systems that produced transsexuality as a medical problem and must, thus, be superseded in this context by more "legitimate" models. So here the IRE sequence and the pedagogic position it produces seem to act as an interactional device to inculcate pathologizing medical discourses in clients' linguistic performances, and this will become clearer as the analysis of Verônica and Inês' interactional history proceeds.

In line 11, the psychologist completes the trajectory of the IRE sequence by making a slight but enormously consequential correction to Verônica's answer in lines 9 and 10. Verônica says transsexual people and travestis are different because they *think* differently, but Inês says that `they feel different things`. With this substitution of 'think' by 'feel', Inês frames her turn as an evaluation by using a lexical item that is common in the diagnostic criteria of the DSM (see above). In line 12, Verônica orients to this correction and rephrases her answer, this time repeating Inês' lexical offer. The psychologist elaborates on her evaluation and adds that transsexual people and travestis do not simply feel different things, but, more importantly, have different sexualities (line 13). Verônica's turn after that – '`different one from the other' –` may have different functions: it either complements, in overlap, Inês' prior turn, it may have been a continuation to Verônica's own turn in line 12, which was interrupted by Ines' overlap. But the health professional favours the first interpretation and, once more, takes an evaluative position, judging Verônica's turn as agreement with what she has been saying (`=tha:::ts right.`). Having made sure that Verônica understands that transsexual people and travestis have different sexualities, Inês goes on to explain what she means by this. According to her, the great majority of transsexual people '`don't have (sexual) relations °with the penis°`, whereas travestis do as they are '`both top and [bottom]'` (lines 28-34) so they '`U:::se the penis'` (line 37 – note the emphasis given with vowel elongation). With this explanation, Inês not only maintains her discursive stance as "teacher", but also echoes the epistemological position of the medical discourses that the DSM reentextualizes. This first pedagogical sequence is closed with Inês certifying that her interlocutor understands this central diagnostic criterion: '`>understand< the difference?'` (line 40), to which Verônica replies bluntly and without the hesitations, delays and hedges displayed in her previous turns: '`°I do°=`'.

As this analysis indicates, Verônica was exposed to linguistic signs reentextualizing the pathologizing discourses of the "true transsexual" metapragmatic model of identity right at the beginning of her first consultation at PAIST. Through the design of her questions, their sequencing and the discursive positions they constructed, Inês acted not only as a therapist but, more importantly, as a judge of Verônica's identity. These turn-design and sequencing features indicate that Inês' aim in this consultation was to make sure her interlocutor knew the correct answers. Later in the consultation of 24th February, Inês brought up the issue of how "true transsexuals" relate to their genital organs, making clear what she meant by "different sexualities". The interactional context, however, differed. This time she did not refer broadly to the difference between transsexual people and travestis; instead, she funneled the issue down to how Verônica herself saw her body morphology. As we saw in the previous section, one of the central criteria for identifying "true transsexuals" is their aversion to their genitals, which, in turn, frames the transsexual experience as asexual. The insertion of this diagnostic element set up a new discursive structure for the interaction,

moving it from pedagogic talk to diagnosis, also introducing a new position for Inês (i.e. diagnostician rather than teacher/evaluator).

Verônica's first consultation: 24th February 2010

```
210   Inês:       bom e quando você tem- tem relação você:::
211               <prefere> que você fique
212               (.)
213   Inês:       totalmen[te nu:::a,]
214   Verônica:           [totalmente]::- totalmente assim à
215               vontade,>por exemplo< numa ca::ma né melhor
216               [na rua-]
217   Inês:       [sim mas] não te incomoda de vê assim o
218               pê::nis?
219               (1.5)
220   Inês:       o SEU pênis.
221               (0.9)
222   Verônica:   se não me incomo::da?
223               (.)
224   Verônica:   ↑n::ão:: até que não
225   Inês:       cê não se incomoda com ele,
226   Verônica:   não:::
227               (0.3)
```

```
210   Inês:       right and when you have- have intercourse you:::
211               <prefer> to stay
212               (.)
213   Inês:       total[ly na:::ked,]
214   Verônica:        [totally]:::- totally like at ease,
215               >for example< on a be::::d right that's better
216               [on the street-]
217   Inês:       [alright but] doesn't it bother you to see like
218               the pe::nis?
219               (1.5)
220   Inês:       YOUR penis.
221               (0.9)
222   Verônica:   if it doesn't bo::ther me?
223               (.)
224   Verônica:   n::o:: not really
225   Inês:       you don't care about it,
226   Verônica:   no:::
227               (0.3)
```

In lines 210-2011, Inês launches a question which aims to check the quality of Verônica's relation with her penis. The design and content of this turn implicitly presuppose a fact that Stoller (1982 [1975], see above) had observed in his psychoanalytical approach to transsexuality: in order to disguise the genitals in sexual intercourse (which is rare), transsexual people make use of artifices such as underwear and towels (see Heath 2006). But Verônica does not orient to this element of the "true transsexual" model (after all, this is her first consultation) and she answers, as requested by the psychologist, from her heart. Inês rephrases her question (lines 217-218) and makes its diagnostic function clear, i.e. being uncomfortable with her penis will insert Verônica in the metapragmatic model the question presupposes. The client does not take the turn Inês offers her (line 219) so the psychologist retakes the conversational floor and increments her question by making it clear that she is referring to Verônica's penis and not her partner's (line 220). Although Inês has already explained the differences between transsexual people and travestis (see above), Verônica's answer does not reentextualize the diagnostic criterion that would confirm her participation in the identity model

which frames the function of Inês' question. The client affirms that her penis does not bother her: 'n::o:: not really' (line 224). Faced with a negative answer to this central diagnostic element, Inês repeats the question as a formulation (Heritage and Watson 1979) which summarizes her interpretation of what her interlocutor has just said – 'you don't care about it' (line 225). Verônica then repeats she does not care about her penis.

Although Inês provided Verônica with linguistic signs for her to understand the differences between transsexual people and travestis, as is supported in the biomedical knowledge systems of the DSM, in her answers Verônica was not able to reentextualize the diagnostic criterion that she had been exposed in her first consultation with Inês, namely aversion to genitals. The absence of this element in Verônica's identity performance seems to have produced a classificatory hiatus: could Verônica be a travesti despite her claims to being a "true transsexual"? It is this categorization problem that Inês addressed in the consultation of 9th March.

Verônica's second consultation: 9th March 2010

289 Inês: então me explica o que é transexual,
290 (0.4)
291 Verônica: ah:: >não sei< acho que o tran[sexual t-]
292 Inês: [fa:::la com]
293 seu coração, >o que você entende<=
294 Verônica: =sei lá:::: acho- acho que transexual acho
295 que gosta das duas coisa, tanto de mulher
296 como com::- com- com ho::mem=
297 Inês: =ah::::: en[tendi]
298 Verônica: [não é?]
299 (1.2)
300 Inês: será que isso que você está falando não-
301 não é:: <tra::vesti>=
302 Verônica: =é, travesti então,
303 Inês: então não=
304 Verônica: =transexual é trave- mas travesti gosta-
305 (0.3)
306 Verônica: o travesti- o travesti mesmo gosta de::::
307 tanto homem quanto mulher.
308 Inês: i::::sso=

---

289 Inês: so explain what is a transsexual,
290 (0.4)
291 Verônica: ah:: >don't know< I think that the trans[sexual t-]
292 Inês: [o:::pen up]
293 your heart, >what do you understand<=
294 Verônica: =not su::::re I think- I think that the transsexual I
295 think likes both things, both women as- as- as-
296 as well as me::n=
297 Inês: ah::: I [got it]
298 Verônica: [isn't it?]
299 (1.2)
300 Inês: isn't it you're talking about, isn't it-
301 isn't i::t <tra::vesti>=
302 Verônica: yes, travesti right,
303 Inês: so isn't=
304 Verônica: =transsexual is trave- but travestis like-
305 (0.3)
306 Verônica: travestis- the real travesti likes bo:::th
307 men and women.
308 Inês: right=

As we saw earlier, in her consultation on 24th February Verônica was offered discursive tools to produce a linguistic performance of "true transsexual" via the design and sequencing of Inês' questions. On 9th March, Verônica and Inês met again. Two weeks after her first consultation, Verônica was still not able to speak the diagnostic language that Inês had tried to teach her. Due to the lack of production of this language, Inês framed her second consultation with Verônica so that the client's classificatory difficulties could be solved. Once again, PAIST's psychologist asked her interlocutor to 'explain what is a transsexual'. The proper answer to this question had been repeatedly offered to Verônica on 24th February: a "true transsexual" hates her genitals. Even so, Verônica could not show that she had indeed learned the lesson. Most importantly, in her second consultation, she seemed to be confused with the categories "transsexual" and travesti, as she imputed to the former attributes that, on 24th February, had been explained as characteristics of the latter (lines 294-296). Inês noticed this categorial confusion and in line 300, she produced a question aimed at repairing her interlocutor's answer – after all, she had already told Verônica what the difference was. Verônica promptly corrected her answer and gave the answer Inês was looking for (line 308).

On 9th March, Inês limited her efforts to help Verônica define identity boundaries to similar but conflicting categories. As Verônica's answers demonstrate, by then she seemed to have mastered the differences between travestis and transsexual people by adopting footings which supported Inês' discursive positions as evaluator and teacher. In fact Inês recycled this topic in the opening of her third meeting with Verônica on 5th May: '>I remember< when we started talking you had- you had a certain- you said you were a travesti.' Interestingly, though, Verônica had never self-identified as a travesti in her first consultation. But she did say this on 9th March due to the categorial confusion she still had then, which was swiftly solved, as the excerpt above illustrates. On 5th May, following her own understanding of what it means to be a transsexual person, Verônica contradicted what Inês told her in her first consultation, namely that "true transsexuals" feel they are women, and affirmed that she did not feel "completely as a woman because of her genital organ" (excerpt not shown). Note that she did not say her penis disgusted her, but that it prevented her from being a complete woman. So Inês addressed this issue by once again drawing on the diagnostic discourses that constitute the "true transsexual". The consultation on 5th May, then, followed very similar steps to the two previous meetings: Inês and Verônica spent the entire time discussing what it means to be a "transsexual". Even so, this consultation represented an important point in Verônica's trajectory of being socialized into the "true transsexual" model, thereby unlearning her understanding of her own body and subjectivity. As we can see below, on May 5th, Verônica started to adopt some of the linguistic signs Inês had been providing her, and started to demonstrate she had indeed learned some of the lessons her psychologist taught her in the previous consultations.

Verônica's third consultation: 5th May 2010

```
539   Inês:       =essa é Uma ou é a única maneira de
540               dife[renciá-]
541   Verônica:       [não é u]:::ma
542               (0.4)
543   Inês:       e qual a se- qual você acha que seria a
544               <outra>?
545               (8.1)
546   Verônica:   .hhh bom geralme- o travesti:::::
547               (0.3)
548   Verônica:   >geralmente travesti< é o que eu fiquei já
549               sabendo né, não::::: tem vontade de fazê
550               essa cirurgia,
551               (0.7)
552   Verônica:   agora eu acredito- >>sei lá<< a trans- a
553               <transexual> já:::::
```

554 (0.4)
555 Verônica: já tem vontade de fazê a ci[rurgia]
556 Inês: [então] começando
557 por essa maneira de pensá, é::::: porque será
558 que o transexual qué fazê: >a cirurgia< e o
559 travesti não qué?
560 (.)
561 Inês: pois se <<aparentemente>> >eles são iguais<
562 (4.2)
563 Verônica: sei lá::: XXXX=
564 Inês: =pensa Verônica, [pensa]
565 Verônica: [às ve(hhh)]zes- @@@ às
566 vezes é::::::
567 (0.5)
568 Verônica: não sei:::, não- não vô dizê todos >mas às
569 vezes< tem algum transexual que não se sente
570 bem::
571 (.)
572 Verônica: né?
573 (0.6)
574 Inês: °°(como?)°°
575 Verônica: ah sei lá, não se sente bem,
576 (0.7)
577 Verônica: <<em sê:::>> >>em- em- em-<< em sê do jeito
578 que é,
579 (0.3)
580 Verônica: né?
581 (0.4)
582 Inês: °°.hh ta bom°°

---

539 Inês: =is this ONE or the ONly way to set
540 them [apart-]
541 Verônica: [no, it's] o:::ne
542 (0.4)
543 Inês: and what do- which do you think would be
544 <the other>?
545 (8.1)
546 Verônica: .hhh well general- the travesti:::::
547 (0.3)
548 Verônica: >generally travestis< that's what I heard right,
549 they do::::n't have the wish to undergo
550 this surgery,
551 (0.7)
552 Verônica: now I believe- >>don't know<< the trans- the
553 <transsexual> do:::::es
554 (0.4)
555 Verônica: they have the wish to have the sur[gery]
556 Inês: [so] starting
557 from this way of thinking, a:::: why is it that
558 the transsexual wants to ha:ve >the surgery< and the
559 travesti doesn't want it?
560 (.)
561 Inês: if <<apparently>> >they are similar<<
562 (4.2)
563 Verônica: don't kno:::w XXXX=
564 Inês: =think Verônica, [think]
565 Verônica: [some(hh)ti]mes- @@@ sometimes
566 a::::::

```
567                (0.5)
568   Verônica:    don't kno:::w, I can't- I can't say all of them >but
569                sometimes< there are some transsexuals that don't
570                feel we::ll
571                (.)
572   Verônica:    right?
573                (0.6)
574   Inês:        °°(how?)°°
575   Verônica:    ah I don't know, they don't feel well,
576                (0.7)
577   Verônica:    <<to be:::>> >>to- to- to-<< to be the way
578                they are,
579                (0.3)
580   Verônica:    right?
581                (0.4)
582   Inês:        °°.hh ok that's good°°
```

Moments before Inês' question in line 539, Verônica has been telling her that in contrast to transsexual people, travestis usually work in the sex industry (see Kulick 1998). So Inês inquires whether this would be the only way to draw differences between the two groups. Verônica recognises that this is but one feature that sets travestis apart from transsexual people,[10] and then claims that travestis do not usually wish to undergo sex reassignment surgeries whereas transsexual people do (lines 546-555). Compared with the consultation on 24th February, Verônica's answers now echo the identity models Inês had constructed in the previous meetings. The repetition of linguistic items that constitute these models intertextually contribute to building this series of consultations as a socialization trajectory during which as a speaking subject, Verônica learns how to ventriloquize the model of "true transsexual". Note, however, that Verônica's turn has several hedging strategies – prefaces ('`>generally travestis< that's what I heard right`') as well as disturbances such as truncated words ('`well general-`'), inhalations ('`.hhh well`'), and vowel elongations ('`the travesti::::`'). Such phenomena indicate that (i) this is still an interactionally delicate topic (Silverman and Peräkylä 1990) and (ii) that she epistemically distances herself from the information being conveyed. Although Verônica does not cite the source of her knowledge ('`that's what I heard`'), analysis of her interactional history with Inês shows that this element of differentiation has been used repeatedly by the psychologist in previous consultations. The interactional patterns of previous consultations also happen in this one: Inês repeatedly projects discursive positions and footings as teacher and judge of Verônica's identity performance via the design and content of her questions and their sequencing. For example, in line 564, Inês closes an IRE sequence by motivating her interlocutor with '`think Verônica, [think]`'.

In May, then, the client starts to reentextualize the identity signs to which she has been exposed since her first consultation at the PAIST. But Inês is not satisfied with Verônica's answer and goes deeper into the matter of what makes travestis and transsexual people different (at least for the purposes of the Brazilian trans-specific health program). Between lines 556 and 561, the psychologist inquires about the reasons why travestis do not want to have the surgery while transsexual people do '`if <<apparently>> >they are similar<<`'. This question presupposes the category differentiation Inês made on 24th February and repeated on 9th March: travestis use their penises and do not reject their body morphology whereas "true transsexuals" do not identify with this part of their bodies and need to extirpate it surgically. In her turn in lines 568-70, Verônica repeats the kind of epistemic distance she had produced before: '`I can't say all of them >but sometimes< there are some transsexuals that don't feel we::ll`'. But although

[10] Inês, however, does not challenge this view, which reflects common sense understandings of travesti life in Brazil. As a matter of fact, many travestis work in the sex industry, but others have a multitude of ways to earn a living, prostitution being but one alternative (see Kulick and Klein 2010).

Verônica now repeats signs of identity she did not use in her previous consultations, her answer does not meet the psychologist's diagnostic agenda, and in line 574, Inês incites her to elaborate. So Verônica has not reentextualized one of the central discourses that Inês has been teaching her – she hasn't done her homework, as it were. But even though she does not use the appropriate diagnostic language, Inês accepts her answer (line 582). Using at least some of the identity signs the psychologist has socialized her into (lines 546-555), Verônica shows in this third consultation that her understanding of different identity categories has begun to be challenged by the medical discourses that the psychologist has been exposing her to.

On 9th June, the changes in Verônica's language use and identification as a trans person become more drastic. It is in this consultation that we can clearly see her own understanding of her body and subjectivity getting eclipsed by the medical discourses that pathologise transsexuality. Not does Verônica reentextualize the DSM diagnostic criteria for GID, but, most importantly, she also applies them to herself. This adoption of a language she did not use in her consultation on 24th February is proof of the efficiency of her interactional socialization into the metapragmatic model of "true transsexual", which shapes the trans-specific healthcare practices currently in use in Brazil.

Verônica's fourth consultation: 9th June 2010

```
123   Inês:       o transexual >não é travesti<=
124   Verônica:   =não
125   Inês:       preste bem atenção, o transexual é diferente
126               de travesti,
127               (0.3)
128   Inês:       <travesti> ele s:::- ele- ele- é:::: ele tem
129               um corpo de ho::::mem, ele gosta de homem no
130               caso MAS gosta de vesti de mulher, porque
131               vestir se de mulher é:::: faz com que eles
132               se sintam diferentes [dá um:::-]
133   Verônica:                        [mas tem] muitos
134               transexuais também [que-]
135   Inês:                          [tran]sexual não,travesti
((7 linhas omitidas))
144   Inês:       já o <transexual> é::: u- uma pessoa que
145               a:::cha- que sente >acha não< SENTE que
146               nasceu no corpo errado, <se sente mulher>
147               e- >não é só porque se veste de mulher< mas
148               se sente mulher e não gosta do corpo que
149               tem.
150               (.)
151   Inês:       no caso com o pênis, diferente do travesti,
152               o travesti nem pensa de fazê uma cirurgia de
153               tirá o pênis,
154   Verônica:   mas então o caso é o meu caso.
155   Inês:       qual é o seu caso?=
156   Verônica:   =esse que a senhora falô, que::- é::- assim
157               eu gosto de meu corpo eu só não gosto do::-
158               é::- >no caso< do órgão genital que eu tenho
159               (.)
160   Verônica:   por quê? porque isso me incomo::da e além de
161               me incomodá::: muitas vezes me prejudica
162               de eu ficá com o ca::::ra >entendeu?<
163   Inês:       entendi
```

```
123   Inês:       a transsexual >is not like a travesti<=
124   Verônica:   =nops
125   Inês:       pay close attention, a transsexual is different
```

126 from a travesti,
127 (0.3)
128 Inês: <travestis> they s- they- they- a::: they have a
129 ma:::le body, they like men in this case
130 BUT they like to dress up as women, because
131 dressing as women a::: makes them to
132 feel different [it gives them-]
133 Verônica: [but there are] many
134 transsexuals also [who-]
135 Inês: [not] transsexuals, travestis
((7 lines omitted))
144 Inês: yet the <transsexual>> i:::e a- a person who
145 thi:::ks- who feels >they don't think< they FEEL
146 they were born in the wrong body, <they feel like
147 women> and- >not only because they dress up as women<
148 but they feel they are women and they dislike the
149 body they have.
150 (.)
151 Inês: in this case the penis, differently from travestis,
152 travestis don't even think of having the surgery to
153 take the penis off,
155 Verônica: but so this is my case.
156 Inês: which is your case?=
157 Verônica: =this is just mentioned, tha::t- a:: like
158 I like my body I just don't like the::-
159 a::- >in this case< the genital organ I have
160 (.)
161 Verônica: why? Because it bo::thers me and besides
162 bothering me many times it spoils my dates, get it?
163 Inês: I get it

At the very beginning of this excerpt (and of the consultation, for that matter), Inês reviews what has been discussed so far with regards to the differences between travestis and transsexual people. Note that before on 5th May, Verônica had only partially replicated this discourse, and in lines 125-6, Inês projects the discursive position of a teacher whose pupils still needs some clarification about the subject matter: '`pay close attention, a transsexual is different from a travesti`'. So in this consultation, the psychologist rentextualizes the pedagogic-disciplinary discursive structure that has coloured her interactional history with Verônica so far. Her explanation of identity boundaries between travestis and transsexual people repeats the identity signs she has already established as valid to account for the difference. Combining commonsense knowledge about travestis with the pathologizing knowledge systems about transsexuality, Inês' turns in lines 128-132 and 144-149 set the background to Verônica's self-identification in lines 157-162. According to the psychologist, the defining element differentiating travestis and "true transsexuals" is the way they psychologically experience their body morphology: travestis are homosexual men who fashion their self-presentation to attract other men's sexual attention and do not wish to undergo sex reassignment surgery; "true transsexuals", on the other hand, '`FEEL they were born in the wrong body, <they feel like women> and- >not only because they dress up as women< but they feel they are women and they dislike the body they have in this case the penis`.'

By reviewing these elements of the identity models that she has been exposing Verônica to, acting as a teacher Inês sets the ground for Verônica to take the turn and self-identify with either of these categories. And this is what she does in line 155, affirming that '`so this is my case`'. As the psychologist has just discussed two different identity models, she asks for clarification: '`which is your case?`'. It is in Verônica's turn in lines 157-9 that we can see the solidification of the metapragmatic model of "true transsexual" starting to eclipse her understanding of her identity. Here

Verônica finally replicates the discourses that Inês has been teaching her since February and that until this moment, she has been unable to reproduce: '`I like my body I just don't like the::- a::- >in this case< the genital organ I have`'. In her first consultation at the PAIST, Verônica had used a different language to describe her relation to her penis:

Verônica's first consultation: 24th February 2010

```
217   Inês:       [alright but] doesn't it bother you to see like
218               the pe::nis?
219               (1.5)
220   Inês:       YOUR penis.
221               (0.9)
222   Verônica:   if it doesn't bo::ther me?
223               (.)
224   Verônica:   n::o:: not really
225   Inês:       you don't care about it,
226   Verônica:   no:::
227               (0.3)
```

By comparing Verônica's identity performances on 24th February and 9th June, the interactional analysis in this section shows how she has gradually and cumulatively learned to speak as a "true transsexual". In her interactional history with the psychologist, Verônica's language of the lifeworld – her own ways of understanding and describing her trans experience – has been slowly replaced by the discourse of medicine (Mishler 1984). This process of socialization into pathologizing discourses happens through intertextual links among a multitude of interactional events over many months. Via the identity signs that link these consultations to one another, Verônica becomes familiar with the language she is expected to use in order to project an identity performance which can meet the Federal Board of Medicine's requirements to diagnose "true transsexuals". In this scenario, the institutional demand for a diagnosis is an obstacle to agency. To gain access to trans-specific healthcare, trans speaking subjects must adopt a language that is not theirs, and as such they become subjugated to knowledge systems that homogenize the complexity of trans experiences. In this way, the need for a psychiatric diagnosis forces trans people to speak the language of medical institutions in order to have their gender identity legitimized and have their healthcare needs attended. In Goffmanian terms, the transsexual speaker is in this context the animator of a language that supports ontological and epistemological stances which do not necessarily reflect his/her lived bodily and subjective experiences. The *author* of their words lies elsewhere, but is still omnipresent in the consultations, constraining the clients' possibilities for social action.

Final remarks

This case study of Verônica's trajectory into "true transsexuality" illustrates how the imposition of a diagnosis in the Brazilian trans-specific healthcare program delegitimizes the multitude of voices that trans clients bring with them to the clinic. This demand imposes on the consultations between health professionals and trans people interactional structures and discursive positions in which professionals act as judges of clients' identity performances. By acting as they are institutionally forced to do, health professionals provide their interlocutors with a language that may fulfill the FBM's demands. The process of unlearning the forms of transsexuality that are not ratified within the SUS emerges from health professionals' question designs and sequencing, and, most importantly, from the lexical items they offer their interlocutors in the IRE sequence. So the interactional making of "true transsexuals" develops cumulatively in a series of interactions where gender clinic clients are socialized into the required metapragmatic model. The dynamics of subjectification that Foucault

discussed take place in the micro-details of clients' daily interactions: little by little the systems of knowledge that produced the "true transsexual" model become embodied in clients' identity performances, constraining their possibilities of action. In this sense, gender clinic professionals end up speaking by/for their trans interlocutors, diminishing their chances of agency and empowerment.

In this way, the demand for a diagnosis frames the Brazilian trans-specific healthcare program within institutional practices of disciplinary panoptism (Foucault 1975). Gender clinics discipline (and punish) performances that contradict the "true transsexual" model; health professionals know it all, see it all, hear it all. In the micro-details of their talk, they impose "legitimate" ways of performing transsexuality with clients who must learn what and how to speak in order to be classified as "true transsexuals" and to have their healthcare provided. Here, the institutional requirement of a diagnosis engenders interactional processes which intertwine the government of the others and the government of self (Foucault 1997). Health professionals shape clients' understandings of their bodies and identities; clients, in turn, learn how to monitor their identity performances so that they may be diagnosed as "true transsexuals". By merging Foucault's genealogical approach to the emergence of knowledge systems and to the categorization practices that they make possible with Goffmanian interactional analysis, the discussion in this paper contributes to our understanding of how macro-sociological phenomena – the pathologization of transsexuality – constrain the micro-details of intersubjective relations.

The interactional analyses in this article indicate that in contexts where transsexuality is pathologized and, as a consequence, homogenized by biomedical discourses, transsexual people cannot speak. Who speaks, instead, is the DSM, since trans clients are expected to ventriloquize the knowledge systems that made the emergence of this diagnostic manual possible. The possibility of agency, however, may be glimpsed in the attempts to depathologize transsexuality that transsexual activists are engaged in (see Misé and Coll-Planas 2010). The international movement Stop Transpathologization aims at debunking the necessity for trans people to receive a diagnosis in order to have their healthcare needs attended.[11]. To depathologize implies valuing trans people's multiple ways of understanding their lived body and subjective experiences. Clinically, this would allow for the "circulation of transsexual narratives that make other experiences of transsexuality visible" (Red Latinoamericana de Hombres Trans en el Activismo 2009: n.p). As the analysis of Verônica's trajectory into "true transsexuality" suggests, the current model of trans-specific healthcare in Brazil is trans-oppressive, obliterating alternative ways of living one's identity. The depathologization of transsexuality would, in contrast, foster more trans-positive and trans-affirmative healthcare practices in which the client's voice may be heard for what it stands for. By not framing trans-specific healthcare within pathologizing knowledge systems, gender clinics would hear clients speak their own language, which would allow for consultations in which they are treated as autonomous people, not as voiceless patients.

---

[11] For a more detailed account of the movement's agenda see http://www.stp2012.info/old/en.

References

American Psychiatric Association. 1994. *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders*, 4th ed. Washington, DC:American Psychiatric Association.

Benjamin, Harry. 1999[1966]. *The transsexual phenomenon.* Dusseldorf:Symposium Publishing.

Bento, Berenice. 2006. *A Invenção do corpo: Sexualidade e gênero na experiência transexual*. Rio de Janeiro:Garamond.

Billig, Michael. 1999. Conversation analysis and claims of naivity. *Discourse and Society,* 10(4), 572-576.

Borba, Rodrigo. 2014. Sobre os obstáculos discursivos para a atenção integral e humanizada à saúde de pessoas transexuais. *Sexualidad, Salud y Sociedad*, 17, 66-97.

Borba, Rodrigo; Ostermann, Ana Cristina. 2007. Do bodies matter: Travestis' embodiment of transgender identity through the manipulation of the Brazilian Portuguese grammatical gender system. *Gender and Language*, 1(1), 131-147.

Brasil. 2010. Conselho Federal de Medicina. Resolução 1.955 de 18 de agosto de 2010. *Diário Oficial da União*, 170, 109-110.

Butler, Judith. 2004. *Undoing gender.* New York:Routledge.

Coupland, Nicolas; Garret, Peter; Williams, Angie. 2005. Narrative Demands, Cultural Performance and Evaluation:Teenage boys' Stories for their Age-peers. In.: Joanna Thornborrow; Jeniffer coates (eds.), *The Sociolinguistics of Narrative*, 67-88. Amsterdam:John Benjamin Publishing Co.

Fabrício, Branca. 2007. Co-participação tático-reflexiva: formas de (inter)ação na sala de aula de LE com potencial democrático. *Calidoscópio,* 5, 125-138.

Foucault, Michel. 1972. *The archaeology of knowledge*. New York:Pantheon Books.

Foucault, Michel. 1976. *The birth of the clinic*. London: Tavistock Publications.

Foucault, Michel. 1977. *Discipline and punish*. New York:Vontage Books.

Foucault, Michel. 2013[1979]. *Microfísica do poder*, 27th ed. São Paulo:Graal.

Foucault, Michel. 1982. The subject and power. *Critical Inquiry*, 8(4), 777-195.

Foucault, Michel. 1988. Technologies of the self. In.: Luthor H. Martin; Huck Guttman; Patrick H. Hutton (eds.), *Technologies of the self: a seminar with Michel Foucault*, 16-49. Anherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1988.

Foucault, Michel. 1997. *Resumo dos cursos do College de France – 1970-1982*. Rio de Janeiro:Zahar.

Foucault, Michel. 2009. *O governo dos vivos – Curso no Collège de France, 1979-1980*. São Paulo:Centro de Cultural Social.

Goffman, Erving. 1981. *Forms of talk*. Philadelphia:University of Pennsylvania Press.

Gomes de Jesus, Jaqueline. 2012. *Orientações sobre identidade de gênero:* Conceitos e Termos. 1ª ed. Goiânia:Ser-tão – Núcleo de estudos e pesquisas em gênero e sexualidade/UFG.

Hacking, Ian. 2004. Between Michel Foucault and Erving Goffman: Between discourse in the abstract and face-to-face interaction. *Economy and Society*, .33 (3), 277-302.

Heath, Rachel Ann. 2006. *The Praeger Handbook of Transsexuality: Changing gender to match mindset*. New York:Greenwood.

Heritage, John. 2010. Questioning in medicine. In.: Alice Freed; Susan Ehrlich (eds.), *Why do you ask? The function of questions in institutional discourse*, 42-68. Oxford:Oxford University Press.

Heritage, John; Watson, Rod. 1979. Formulations as conversational objects. In.: George Psathas (ed.), *Everyday Language*, 83-99. Nova York:Irvington Press.

Hird, Mira. 2002. For a Sociology of Transsexualism. *Sociology*, 36 (3), 577-595.

Jefferson , Gail. 2004. Glossary of Transcript Symbols with an Introduction. In.: Gene Lerner (ed.), *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation.* Amsterdam:John Benjamins

Kendal, Shari. 2008. The Balancing Act: Framing Gendered Parental Identities at Dinnertime. *Language in Society*, 37 (4), 539-568.

Koshik, Irene. 2010. Questions that convey information in teacher-student conferences. In.: Alice Freed; Susan Ehrlich (eds.), *Why do you ask? The function of questions in institutional discourse*, 159-186. Oxford:Oxford University Press.

Kulick, Don. 2000. Transgender and language. *GLQ:A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies*, 5(4), 605-622.

Kulick, Don. 1998. *Travesti: Sex, Gender, and Culture among Brazilian Transgendered Prostitutes.* Chicago:The University of Chicago Press.

Kulick, Don; Klein, Charles. 2010. Scandalous acts:The politics of shame among Brazilian travesti prostitutes. In.: David Halperin; Valerie Traub (eds.), *Gay shame*, 313-338. Chicago:University of Chicago Press.

Lima, Fátima. 2011. A invenção do dispositivo da transexualidade: produções de verdade e experiências trans. *Em Pauta*, 9 (28), 117-130.

Martínez-Guzmán, Antar; Íñiguez-Rueda, Lupicinio. 2010. La Fabricación del Transtorno de Identidad Sexual. *Discurso & Sociedad*, 4, (1), 30-51, 2010.

Mehan, Hugh. 1979. *Learning lessons*. Cambridge, MA:Harvard University Press.

Mishler, Elliot. 1984. *The discourse of medicine: Dialectics of medical interviews*. Harvard:Greenwood.

Missé, Miquel; Coll-Planas, Gerard. (eds..). 2010. *El género desordenado:Críticas en torno a la patologización de la transexualidad*. Madrid:Egales.

Newman, Louise. 2000. Transgender Issues. In.: Jane Ussher (ed.), *Women's Health: Contemporary International Perspectives*, 394-404. Leicester:BPS Books.

Red Latinoamericana de Hombres Trans en el Activismo. 2009. *Campaña Internacional de Despatologización de la Transexualidad*. Available at www.notiese.org/notiese.php?ctn_id=3298.

Schegloff, Emmanuel; Jefferson, Gail; Sacks, Harvey. 1977. The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language*, 53 (2), 361-382.

Silverman, David; Peräkylä, Ansi. 1990. AIDS counseling: the interactional organization of talk about "delicate" issues. *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 12 (3), 293-318.

Silverstein, Michael; Urban, Greg. 1996. *Natural histories of discourse*. Chicago:The University of Chicago Press.

Sinclair, John; Coulthard , Malcolm. 1975. *Towards an analysis of discourse: The English used by teachers and pupils*. London:Oxford University Press.

Speer, Susan. 2009. Passing as a transsexual woman in the gender identity clinic. In.: Margareth Wetherell (ed.), *Theorizing Identities and Social Action*, 116-138. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Speer, Susan. 2010. Pursuing views and testing commitments: The role of 'worst case' hypothetical questions in the psychiatric assessment of transsexual patients. In.: Alice Freed; Susan Ehrlich (eds.), *Why do you ask? The function of questions in institutional discourse*, 133-158. Oxford:Oxford University Press.

Speer, Susan. 2011. On the role of reported, third party compliments in passing as a 'real' woman. In.: Susan Speer and Elizabeth Stokoe (eds.), *Conversation and Gender*, 155-182. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Speer, Susan. 2013. Talking about sex with patients in the Gender Clinic:Implications for training and practice. *Health*, 17 (6), 622-639, 2013.

Stoller, Robert. 1982[1975]. *A Experiência Transexual.* Rio de Janeiro:IMAGO.

Stone, Sandy. 2007 [1991]. *The Empire Strikes back: The posttranssexual manifesto*. Available at http://sandystone.com/empire-strikes-back

Teixeira, Flávia. 2013. *Dispositivos de dor: saberes-poderes que (con)formam as transexualidades.* São Paulo:Annablume.

Vehvilainen, Sana. (2011). Identifying and managing resistance in psychoanalytic interaction. In. Anssi Peräkylä; Charles Antaki; Sana Vehvilainen; Ivan Leudar (eds.), *Conversation Analysis and Psychotherapy*, 120-138. Cambridge:CUP, p. 120-138

Wortham, Stanton. 2006. *Learning Identity: The joint emergence of social identification and academic learning*. New York:CUP.

Appendix

Transcription conventions have been adapted from JEFFERSON, Gail.(2004). Glossary of Transcript Symbols with an Introduction. In Gene H. LERNER, (ed.), *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*, 13-31. Amsterdam:Benjamins.

.	Falling intonation
?	Rising intonation
,	Continuous intonation
::::	Sound elongation
–	Abrupt interruption of talk
talk=	Latched talk
=talk	
talk	Emphasis
TALK	Louder voice
°talk°	Lower voice
>talk<	Faster talk
<talk>	Slower talk
ta[lk]	Overlapping talk
[ta]lk	
.hhhhh	Audible inhalation
hhhh	Audible exhalation
tal(hhh)k(hh)	Laugh while talking
@@@@@@	Laughing
(3.5)	Lapse of time in which no speaker takes the turn
XXXXXX	Inaudible speech
(talk)	Dubious transcription
((comments))	Transcriber's comments