DOSSIER

THE DISPERSION OF SENSES ABOUT THE "ANTI-HOMOPHOBIA LAW" IN BRAZILIAN NEWSPAPERS:

an investigation based on Membership Categorization Analysis

JULIANA DEPINÉ ALVES GUIMARÃES
Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro (PUC-Rio), Rio de Janeiro - RJ, Brazil.

ABSTRACT – In 2001, Iara Bernardi, then Representative of the Labor Party (Partido dos Trabalhadores) in São Paulo, proposed Bill 122, known as the "anti-homophobia law", with the goal of including discrimination against sexual orientation or gender identity as identified in the criminal code (in particular, Law 7716 from 1989, also known as the Racism Law). This paper presents some of the conclusions I reached while doing my PhD research investigating the journalistic coverage of Bill 122 between 2001 and 2015; the year it was filed away. This investigation was conducted based on the methodological tools from the Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA). The result of the analysis brought four analytical patterns to light, which encompass the categorizations of membership used in journalistic discourses during that period for issues such as LGBT, Bill 122 itself, homosexuality and Brazilian institutions, in which, Brazil, the Congress and the State are categorized. For the purposes of the analysis, we applied the term "conservative" to the categorizations of Congress.
Key words: Homophobia. Law. Journalism. Discourse. Membership Categorization Analysis.

A DISPERSÃO DOS SENTIDOS ACERCA DA "LEI ANTI-HOMOFOBIA" NOS JORNAIS BRASILEIROS: uma investigação com base na Análise de Categorização de Pertencimento

RESUMO – Em 2001, a então deputada Iara Bernardi (PT-SP) propôs, na Câmara dos Deputados, o Projeto de Lei da Câmara 122 (PLC 122), conhecido como "lei anti-homofobia", com o objetivo de ampliar a Lei do Crime Racial (7716/89) para incluir a discriminação por orientação sexual ou identidade de gênero. Este artigo apresenta um recorte das conclusões de minha tese de doutorado, que investigou a cobertura jornalística sobre o PLC 122, entre 2001 e 2015, quando o Projeto foi arquivado, com base na Análise

de Categorização de Pertencimento (Membership Categorization Analysis). Em primeiro lugar, o artigo apresenta um panorama dos quatro padrões analíticos evidenciados pelo estudo, que englobam as categorizações de pertencimento utilizadas no âmbito dos discursos jornalísticos no período, acerca dos sujeitos LGBT, do projeto de lei em si, da prática homossexual e das instituições brasileiras, em que o Brasil, o Congresso Nacional e o Estado são categorizados. Para o exercício de análise, nos debruçamos sobre as categorizações do Congresso enquanto "conservador".

Palavras-chave: Homofobia. Projeto de Lei. Jornalismo. Discurso. Análise de Categorização de Pertencimento.

LA DISPERSIÓN DE LOS SENTIDOS ACERCA DE LA "LEY ANTI-HOMOFOBIA" EM LOS PERIÓDICOS BRASILEÑOS: una investigación basada en la análisis de pertenencia categorial

RESUMEN – En 2001, Iara Bernardi, diputada de Partido de los Trabajadores en São Paulo, propuso el Proyecto de Ley de la Cámara 122 (PLC 122), conocido como "ley anti-homofobia", con el objetivo de incluir la discriminación por orientación sexual o identidad de género en el Código Penal, específicamente la Ley 7716, de 1989, conocida como Ley de Racismo). Este artículo presenta un recorte de las conclusiones de mi tesis doctoral, que tuvo como objetivo investigar la cobertura periodística sobre el PLC 122, entre 2001 y 2015, cuando el proyecto fue archivado, con base en la Análisis de Pertenencia Categorial (Membership Categorization Analysis). En primer lugar, el artículo presenta un panorama de los cuatro patrones analíticos evidenciados por el estudio, que engloban las categorizaciones de pertenencia utilizadas en el ámbito de los discursos periodísticos en el período, acerca de los sujetos LGBT, del proyecto de ley en sí, de la práctica homosexual y de las instituciones brasileñas, en que Brasil, el Congreso Nacional y el Estado son categorizados. Para el ejercicio de análisis, nos ocupamos de las categorizaciones del Congreso como "conservador".

Palabras clave: Homofobia. Ley. Periodismo. Discurso. Análisis de Pertenencia Categorial.

1 Introduction

In 2013, the Secretary of Human Rights for the Federal Government (SDH) released a report stating that in 2012 there were 3,084 reports of violence against gays, lesbians, bisexuals and transsexuals in Brazil. It also drew attention to the fact that the real numbers were "much greater than what was released to the public" (Brazil, 2016). This is most likely due to a lack of information about where and how to report crimes, as well as a fear of reprisals.

We can say that the numbers of violence against LGBTs have been underreported, but the description of homophobia[1] has been getting a lot of attention in the media. We looked through back-

issues of *O Globo newspaper*[2] and found 54 pieces on homophobia from 2001. This number rose up to 300 from December 2009 to August 2011. From January 2010 to January 2017, that number reached 2,457.

Yet publications on homophobia have only been occurring recently. It was only in the 1990s that gays and lesbians achieved the right to marry or have common law status in the world, and laws to protect against discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity have only been in place for the last 25 years.

Bill 122/2006 was a first in Brazil. Referred to as PL 5003, it was presented at the House of Representatives in São Paulo, in 2001, by then federal congresswoman Iara Bernardi of the Labor Party (PT)[3]. The objective of this bill was to add sexual orientation and gender identity to the Racism Law (n 7.716/1989), which already punishes for discrimination against race, color, ethnicity, religion or national origin. It was approved by the House of Representatives five years after it was initially proposed in 2001 and then presented to the Senate where it became PLC 122. Since the Bill also includes punishment for homophobic slander, there are some religious leaders who are opposed to it (particularly the evangelical constituents, who are represented in Congress by more than 90 politicians). They are afraid that the sermons they give condemning homosexual practices would then be punishable. Through the use of bureaucratic expedients such as visa applications, evangelical senators like Marcelo Crivella and Magno Malta were able to delay the final voting on the Bill. As a consequence, it was filed away at the end of 2014 after already having passed through three legislative terms, a procedure which is compliant to the internal regulations of Congress.

In our doctoral dissertation (this article is part of it) we investigated discourse on PLC 122 produced in printed press on the basis that a traditional journalistic environment is the ideal place to investigate media processes for producing meaning on legislative proposals and legitimizing social processes of power relations within the media; a field for discussing and legitimizing definitions of reality (Braga, verbal communication, 2017). We mainly investigated discourse on PLC 122 in papers from five regions in Brazil, between August 2001 and January 2015. From the north there were *Diário do Amazonas* (AM), *O Liberal* (PA) and *Jornal do Tocantins* (TO). From

the northwest *A Tarde* (BA), *O povo* (CE), *Jornal do Commercio* (PE) and *Correio de Sergipe* (SE). From the mid-west there were *Correio Braziliense* (DF) and *Diário de Cuiabá* (MT). From the southeast *O Globo* (RJ), *Estado de São Paulo* (SP), *Folha de São Paulo* (SP) and *Estado de Minas* (MG). Lastly, from the south there were *Diário Catarinense* (SC) and *Zero Hora* (RS).

According to Azevedo (2006), family monopoly and cross ownership between communication mediums are some of the main features of Brazilian media. The states of Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo also have a high market concentration and advertising budget, as a result, the agendas from *Folha de S. Paulo*, the *Estado de S. Paulo* and *O Globo* tend to influence most of the other news vehicles from the other 15 state newspapers included in this study.

The selection criteria for all the newspapers included in our thesis (Guimarães, 2017) were carefully established. We first researched all the archived editions from the two most highly-circulated newspapers in the country; a collection of 54 papers in total between 2001 and 2015. However, we came across a few limitations. For example, *Extra*, the second largest circulated newspaper in Rio de Janeiro, did not have any online collections of printed editions at the time, and the section of the National Library[4] where they are filed was under construction and therefore inaccessible. *Supernotícia*, the newspaper with the largest circulation rate in the country at 249,297 copies[5] did not have any files available for review, not even in the National Library.

We disregarded all material produced by news agencies because most of them are copies of reports we had previously collected for our analysis. First, we collected all discourses on PLC 122 regardless of their position on it. There were many reports on the progress of the criminalization of homophobia in the Senate, but they did not mention the number of the proposal. After a first reading we were able to identify if the discourse mentioned the Bill or not. Moreover, PLC 122 was added to the Penal Code reform bill, and therefore was circulated with other proposals; we considered the discourses as joint processes.

After excluding repeated discourses or discourses from news agencies we were left with 619 journalistic items which included reports, reader letters, opinion pages, editorials and

interviews mentioning the Bill, which made up our *corpus*. Here is a breakdown of the number of journalistic items per newspaper:

Newspaper	Number of items	Newspaper	Number of items
Folha de São Paulo	146	*Diário Catarinense*	18
O Globo	118	*Zero Hora*	17
Correio Braziliense	100	*Diário do Amazonas*	14
O Estado de S. Paulo	76	*Diário de Cuiabá*	12
O Povo	30	*Jornal do Commercio*	8
O Liberal	29	*Correio do Sergipe*	2
A tarde	25	*Jornal do Tocantins*	2
Estado de Minas	22		

Table 1: Number of journalistic items per newspaper. Source: Guimarães (2017).

We investigated these discourses in light of methodological premises for *Membership Categorization Analysis* (MCA), which is presented in the second chapter. Data analysis revealed four standards of analysis for the following categories: LGBT subjects; the Bill itself; homosexuality and Brazilian institutions. This last category was divided into subcategories based on how Brazilian society defines homophobic crimes. Brazilian Congress labels it as "conservative" or "fundamentalist", and the state labels it as "secular".

A brief outline of the four standards is laid out in the third chapter, each one containing a discursive example. The following topic presents the application of the elements from the MCA methodological apparatus, particularly the discourses in the *corpus* that make reference to the "conservative" or "fundamentalist" categorizations in Brazilian Congress which, as previously stated, make up the fourth standard in the study.

2 Methodological presuppositions: membership categorization analysis

The methodological principles which guided our work are based on *Membership Categorization Analysis* (or MCA), theorized by Harvey Sacks in the 1970s. Some objects of interest in Membership

Categorization Analysis are the series of mechanisms people use to refer to one another and how they develop descriptions and select words. In short, MCA

> "[...] searches to understand when and how members make descriptions, ultimately trying to explain the devices or methods used to produce them. These devices, which operate through categorization and through speech, are reminiscent of machinery that make up a kind of generating matrix to help members make descriptions" (Sell & Ostermann, 2009, pp. 13-14)

According to Sacks' theory (1992), "categories" are terms like "adolescent-baby", "Jewish-Catholic", "man-woman", "bisexual-homosexual", "engineer-doctor", "communist-capitalist", etc. Once these categories have been established they can be included in "collections". For example, "adolescent-baby" would be included in the "stage of life" collection, "Jewish-Catholic" would be religious affinity, "man-woman" would be biological sex, "bisexual-homosexual" would be sexual orientation, "engineer-doctor" would be profession, and "communist-capitalist" would be political ideology.

These analytical premises were first defined in Sacks' lectures, *The baby cried* and *The search for help*, both published in 1972. Twenty years later, Gail Jefferson compiled Sacks' theories on MCA in a two-volume book called *Lectures on Conversation*. MCA is closely tied to Conversation Analysis, developed in the 1960s by Harvey Sacks, Emmanuel Schegloff and Gail Jefferson. Sacks studied how social actions are organized, how people understand each other and how social life organizes itself. Through his first work (an analysis of telephone conversations) he was able to "[...] show how the relationship between people and society was clearly demonstrated through their speech" (Psathas, 1995, p. 7).

Despite ACP being widely applied to conversations, Schegloff (2007) points out that in the beginning it was used to investigate a range of materials other than just conversations. For this reason we believe that categorization analysis can also be applied, *mutatis mutandis*, to printed discourse. For example, the article *The baby cried* was based on a story Sacks came across in a children's book called *Children tell Stories*, where a researcher asks a small child some questions, to which the child responds: "The baby cried. The mommy picked it up". Due to a set of rules of application associated to MCA (we will discuss these later) the children understood that the "mommy" in the sentence was the baby's mother, and she was not the

mother of a different baby, even though semantically speaking the baby could very well be from a different mother.

Based on these methodological premises we started our research by manually separating the excerpts of discourse from each journalistic item which made mention of the legislative proposal, in other words, *who* or *what* was being described and in what way. Then we analyzed which categories and categorizations were being repeated the most. The categories which were most recurrent in the 619 texts were LGBT subjects, Bill 122, homosexual practices and the institutions in Brazil.

An important element of MCA is *category-bound activities*. In the statement, "women drive poorly" the action of driving poorly is linked to the category of "women". In Schegloff's view (2007), categories are repositories of common sense which give us concrete consequences for determining one category over another when describing someone (or something). For Schegloff, selecting one category out of many possible categories is influenced by "how someone is understood, how they are treated, how the scenes in which they figure are grasped and whether or how another intervenes in them, and so on" (Schegloff, 2007, p. 475). Following this line of thought, Stokoe (2012) highlights that when people perform an act of categorization they are judging the world around them and reaching conclusions about issues. This is why, according to Stokoe, studies on issues such as gender, sexuality, ethnicity and identity could benefit from these methodological devices.

3 An overview of the analytical standards

Our analysis identified the four most recurrent analytical standards for membership categorization as used in newspaper discourse: LGBT subjects, the Bill, homosexuality and Brazilian institutions. Before giving examples of these we would like to point out that the naturalist point of view was used for researching data. We did not create categories *a priori* and then look for statements that matched them, quite the opposite, we first read all the available discourses which mentioned the Bill and then found the recurring categories that made up our four standards. For our thesis we selected excerpts of journalistic discourses from each standard and then applied the MCA methodological presuppositions to them. Due

to its micro sociological nature, the MCA is able to provide a detailed, qualitative study of events. Our research consisted of two stages: the first was a thorough, quantitative search for general categorizations; the second was a qualitative investigation of the intricacies of building membership categories. As mentioned in the Introduction, the discourse analysis is on the definitions of "conservative" or "fundamentalist" as made by Congress.

Three membership categorizations for LGBT subjects repeated the most. They were social minorities, victims of crimes and parts of a community. The discourses surrounding these categorizations defined them as "movement", "activist", "protestor" or "campaigners".

The categorization of LGBT as a social minority was the third most recurrent categorization in the analysis, present in close to 21% of the collected journalistic pieces and mostly written by journalists and LGBT rights supporters in civil society and politics. For example, the agents added homophobia to the list of hate crimes, alongside racism. To a lesser degree, homophobic crimes were compared to domestic abuse and prejudice against Jewish people, all punishable by the Maria da Penha Law[6].

Here is one example:

> **01.**
> Some people believe it is freedom of expression when certain religions describe **homosexuals** as perverse, sick and lacking morals. According to this line of **reasoning**, it would also be freedom of expression to say that **people of African descent** are an inferior race, or that **Jewish** people lie about the Holocaust. (Safatle, 2012, October 16. Emphasis added)

Crime statistics were released for subjects categorized as victims of homophobic crimes, and the Bill was repeatedly defined as an effective instrument for reducing violence. This is the second most recurrent topic in the *corpus*, present in about 25% of journalistic material. Most of the discourses appear in factual reports with a number of categorizing agents, predominantly leaders of LGBT rights associations and specialists in general.

> **02.**
> Beto de Jesus, who was secretary of Ilga for Latin America and the Caribbean for eight years, said that the LGBT community faces the challenge of overcoming violence. "People on the outside looking in say that everything is ok, but you can't say that when **every 36 hours** a homosexual is **killed** in a hate **crime**" (Brunelli, 2012, June 10. Emphasis added)

Lastly, LGBTs were also categorized as a social movement and as being "militants", "protestors" and "activists". The most recurrent theme in which this type of categorization appeared in was in politics: mainly in the form of collective actions in favor of criminalizing homophobia like the *LGBT Pride Parade*, and reactions from other LGBT groups on actions – or a lack of them – from public power in relation to their demands. The most recurrent discourses were factual. In politics, the electoral dispute of 2014 was also present, especially on the candidates and supporters' opinions of Bill 122. A third excerpt below demonstrates this type of categorization in our *corpus*:

> **03.**
> **Protestors** [*LGBT Pride Parade participants, the main topic of the report*] supported the fight against violence and stated that 2,582 homosexuals have been killed in Brazil over the last ten years. (Motta & Gares, 2007, October 15. Emphasis added.)

The second analytical standard encompasses the categorizations around the Bill itself[7]. First off, the Bill was categorized as a kind of "censorship" or a threat to freedom of expression and belief. These were the most recurrent categorizations throughout the *corpus*. Slang terms like "gay gag" and "gay dictatorship" were systematically used to describe Bill 122. These discourses were delivered mostly by evangelical constituents in Congress, claiming that religious leaders could be imprisoned if they preached, from the Bible, that homosexuality was a sin. It is worth mentioning that there was not a lot of variety in terms of the types of religions represented by the newspapers – then senators Marcelo Crivella, Magno Malta and pastor Silas Malafaia made up 72% of the discourses opposed to the Bill.

We would like to highlight that Marcelo Crivella was senator at the time the Bill was going through the approval process, and is now the mayor of Rio de Janeiro. Magno Malta is still a senator. They make up the evangelical constituents in Congress, a group that defends the interests of the churches and, at the time of writing this article, was comprised of 93 federal congressmen and 3 senators. Even though he is not a politician, Pastor Silas Malafaia does have a certain influence on public opinion: he runs support campaigns for candidates and is a televangelist whose programs are broadcast in Brazil, the United States, Europe and Africa. Malafaia also has a YouTube channel, a Twitter profile with 1.3 million followers and a Facebook page with more than 2 million "likes".

We offer the following example:

04.
Despite the good intentions of those who thought of it, the use of this proposal [*Bill 122*] to defend the rights of a portion of the population does not mitigate its **authoritative** and **anti-constitutional** slant. It advances on the constitutional guarantees of the whole population under the pretext of promoting the rights of one group of society. (MOREIRA, 2011, May 29. Emphasis added.)

You might say that the low number of people invited by the newspapers limits the reasoning of categorizations and discursive constructions regarding Bill 122, which might weaken the discussion in public arenas established by media. Additionally, even though most opponents to Bill 122 twist its wording by saying it criminalizes the opinions of priests and pastors[8], the journalistic discourse barely mentioned any misinterpretation in the wording or contextualized religious opinions. However, discourses from pastors and representatives of the church within this analytical standard appeared to preach the "gospel" only to converts instead of addressing the issue in a public debate where logical discussions and arguments could be made and many points of views could be expressed.

The second topic in this standard categorizes Bill 122 according to principles from the Democratic State of Rights, especially those of citizenship and human dignity. There were more opinion articles (columns, interviews and reader letters) rather than factual ones. Only Senator Marta Suplicy, one of the politicians who is more committed to the Bill's approval, categorized Bill 122 in progressive terms in three different discourses (two articles and one interview). The factual reports had more LGBT rights defenders such as association leaders and activists.

The following excerpt is an example of this:

05.
The new **law** is established to guarantee the rights of everyone, to fight **discrimination** and **intolerance** of sexual orientation or gender identity and to criminalize homophobia so as to guarantee **equal** opportunities and defend the **rights** of **individuals** and of **collectives.** (Brito, 2012, May 13. Emphasis added)

The third analytical standard covered categorizations of homosexuality. We would like to state here that the term

"homosexuality" was naturalized in discourses from journalists, columnists and readers. The same occurred with the term "sexual orientation". There was a visible lack of recurrent categorizations for transgender identities or bisexuality.

The first topic in this standard addresses statements where homosexuality was categorized as an "option", a "preference" or a "behavior". These three terms represent a voluntary and individual dimension of homosexuality. This categorization was performed systematically by opponents to the Bill, as evident in the following excerpt:

06.
It is a semantic error to state that all and any demonstration against homosexual activities means homophobia, culminating in violence or inciting violence. It is one thing to respect the **options** and **preferences** that each one of us has, but another very different thing to impose these options and preferences on those who do not share them. (Santos, 2011, May 13. Emphasis added)

In the second topic we find categorizations of homosexuality as sin, an anti-natural practice, or associated to the creation of a "third sex". The discourses were once again mostly from evangelical constituents in Congress:

07.
Senator Magno Malta will resign from legislative office if parliament creates a law against homophobia. He stated: "If Bill 122, which encourages the creation of a **third sex**, is approved I will resign from office with dignity as a Christian" (Cunha, 2011, June 15. Emphasis added)

The last analytical standard combines discourses that cover discursive statements about individuals or specific sexual preferences, or bills, and addresses institutional categories and how it merges with the issue.

With this in mind, Brazil or the federation units were firstly categorized according to a certain kind of homophobia *ranking* where the number of crimes per location was categorized as "champions" / "first place" / "second place". The main categorizing agents are journalists using indirect discourses, citing surveys and statistics released by third party groups and LGBT rights organizations.

The following excerpt is an example of this categorization:

08.
The statistics [on homophobic crimes] are only based on data and events which the press has mainly released in newspapers, and complaints that the GGB itself receives. It is clear that

there are many cases which were not included in the survey which ensures that Brazil continues **to lead** the **ranking** as the country with the most homophobic-related homicides". (Amaral, 2011, June 2. Emphasis added)

The second topic has Brazilian Congress as a category. Examples of this analytical standard will be analyzed in detail in the next topic which focuses on the study of discursive excerpts from our *corpus* based on methodological premises from Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA).

Secularism was the theme of the third topic in our last analytical standard which groups together categorizations on the Brazilian state. Apart from the readers, the categorizing agents were specialists, editorials, political candidates and leaders of LGBT groups.

> **09.**
> "We need to put the pressure on Congress to approve the law for criminalizing homophobia; it has been in process since 2011 and currently remains idle in the Senate due to pressures from religious extremists. We are a **secular state**". Cláudio Nascimento, coordinator for the Homophobia-free Rio program, said that the fight against prejudice is also intended to protect gay families. (Ramalho, 2013, June 29. Emphasis added)

The following topic deals with the analysis of excerpts from the *corpus* taken from the analytical standard for categorizations of the National Congress as "conservative" or "fundamentalist".

4 Investigating the data in light of membership categorization analysis (ACP)

As explained in the previous topic, the standard discourses on categorizations of Brazilian institutions were not the most recurrent data; however, they did present a wealth of analytical possibilities since they demonstrated many elements of the methodological device from Membership Categorization Analysis. The sub recurrences include categorizations of society, of Congress and of Brazilian states. The terms "conservative", as well as "fundamentalist" and "extremist", are used mainly to describe Congress and its stance on LGBT rights in general, including the "anti-homophobia law". Journalistic discourse within this scope also makes repeated use of a passive lexicon (i.e.: "blocked", "hindered", "shelved" or "inactive") to describe the Bill's progress in Congress.

A few examples from the *corpus* are presented below, followed by an analysis of the excerpts.

10.
Even with a 46% reform rate in the 2006 election, and 195 new members of congress, **conservatism** is still **predominant** in the House. **Moral issues** like legalizing abortion, same-sex marriage, criminalizing homophobia and legalizing prostitution have led to some **polemic** debates, but **progress** has been **slow.** (Braga, 2008, January 6. Emphasis added)

11.
Cláudio Nascimento, coordinator for the Homophobia-free Rio program, said that the fight against prejudice is also intended to **protect** gay **families**. "Gay **families** have been one of the main **victims** of **prejudice**", he stated while speaking about a bill prohibiting discrimination against homosexuals which is currently **inactive** in the **Rio Assembly**. (Ramalho, 2013, June 29. Emphasis added)

12.
Of course **barbarism**, in the form of **fanatic zealots** or **fundamentalists**, uses all types of sophism to try and **declassify** this bill. (Cícero, 2009, November 28. Emphasis added)

13.[9]
Senator Marta Suplicy (PT-SP), introducer of the bill for criminalizing homophobia, told Globo that she intends to use this quieter time, away from elections, to discuss and approve the **polemic** bill. She believes **the world moves at a faster pace** than **National Congress does**.
[...]
Why do you think that the bill will be approved?
MARTA: There is a different mix of people in the Senate nowadays. **Two-thirds** of it are **new senators**. And the **world** is **changing** quickly. Brazilian legislative houses have **regressed** because not much has been done. While the **Legislative Branch** continues to **act scared** and **frightened**, **the world has been taking** some big steps forward. The **Judiciary Branch** has accepted marriage and child adoption, and the **Executive Branch** has requested that the Federal Revenue Service accept joint declaration of income. (Farah, 2011, March 6. Emphasis added)

14.
Even though the cause [homosexual] relies on Parliament to support LGBT citizenship and has more than 200 members of congress committed to it, proposals on the issue **have not advanced** in congress. Two years ago Congresswoman Fátima Bezerra (PT-RN) introduced a bill to create a National Fight against Homophobia Day. "It is a simple idea with an educational purpose, yet not even this bill has made any **progress**", she stated. "The political environment is not in favor of it, so much so that the bills have been **blocked** in committees for a long time. Congress appears to be **impervious** to this issue", she said. (Foreque, 2009, March 22. Emphasis added)

15[10].
At the time of the *LGBT Pride Parade in Copacabana* there was a group of ten evangelicals supporting LGBTs called Jesus Cures Homophobia.

> **Not all** evangelicals are **fundamentalists**. We are here to **apologize** for what the **church** has done and show everyone that the **evangelical constituents** do not **represent** us – claimed pastor José Barbosa Junior, group leader. (Vanini, 2015, November 16. Emphasis added).

The excerpts above make repeated mention of the terms "conservative", "fundamentalist" or "extremist" to describe parts of Congress or the Legislative Branch. Common sense tells us that these references were made by members of the evangelical constituency who actively protest LGBTs. It is interesting to note that the enunciators do not need to identify the conservative political representatives in order to see that the group which they belong to is morally opposed to the rights of sexual minorities and gender. The title of example 14 encapsulates this: "Congress is more conservative than Lula", a generalization about the institution.

That leads us to think about the concept of metonymy, a figure of speech which is "a thing or concept is referred to by the name of something closely associated with that thing or concept" (http://www.wikipedia.org). There are many types of metonymy. The type used in propositions like "Congress is conservative" (repeatedly mentioned in this topic) is from "part of the whole". In other words, even though not all members of Congress disapprove of rights for lesbians, gays, bisexuals and transsexuals, the conservative ones contribute to the institution's image on a whole. This is how we are able to find statements like the one above that describes Congress as being more conservative than ex-president Lula.

Therefore, this metonymical process is not practical for individual categorization of any group: Jayyusi (2015) pointed out that communities which are *not* organized around moral foundations can defend themselves from generalizations by alleging that the action of a particular subject is not representative of the whole. When a group is organized around moral issues the activity (or even the discourse) of an individual "[...] is not here being treated as something arising uniquely from that person's individual biography, history, character or personality, or from a specific situation in which he became embroiled" (Jayyusi, 2015, p. 48). Conversely, that specific action represents the personality and activities of the group as a whole. Evangelical constituents are an example of an openly organized group based on moral

issues – as written in a report published by *Terra Notícias*, "[...] its members specialize in fighting bills that propose to extend the rights of homosexuals, the right to abortion and to promote sexual education in schools " (Struck, 2016, May 7). When talking about morals we are talking about that "which characterizes good manners and good conduct in accordance with social precepts established by society or by a particular social group" (*Hoauiss Dictionary*). For instance, evangelical politicians define homosexuality as sinful and unnatural. Excerpt 10 is quite interesting because when the journalist mentions conservatism in the House, he lists abortion, prostitution, same-sex marriage and criminalizing homophobia as moral issues even though they could also be categorized, *a priori*, as "progressive" or "human rights", for instance. One could see the journalist's reference to the evangelical constituents as being his own categorization of the issues. We label this phenomenon in our thesis (Guimarães, 2017) as "discursive impregnation". For instance, in the analytical topic of homosexuality categorizations, journalists start their discourses using "homosexuality" as a standard term, but they go on to use the expression "homosexualism" when mentioning citations or religious values.

Applying Jayyusi's theory on the actions of members from morally organized groups representing the whole, it is uncommon that enunciators who refer to opponents of Bill 122 also refer to the acts of specific parliament members. Conversely, they call Congress "conservative" or "more conservative", highlighting an increased use of the attribute of conservatism in legislature in function of these subjects' actions.

Continuing with the evangelical constituents, it is interesting to note that the only unifying element of their group is their ideological position on these moral issues. For example, the mechanism of "political party" membership categorization is not a prerequisite to belonging to or claiming to belong to the evangelical constituency, neither is "geographic origin". Its members "need not be spatially bounded or localized in their operations" (Jayyusi, 2015, p. 50), since the "operation of the transitivity convention allows them to extend their operations and concerns spatially" (Jayyusi, 2015, p. 50). The only important collective is the reference to religion.

As demonstrated through our research (Guimarães,

2017), evangelical constituency showed itself to be a much more organized and cohesive group during the process of Bill 122 than the supporters of sexual minorities were. One example of this is the amendment to Bill 122, presented by Marta Suplicy in 2011, which proposes to make religious temples exempt from being punished for homophobia. At the time, there was a disagreement among the main representatives of LGBT rights in the media. According to Toni Reis, the president of the Brazilian Association of Gays, Lesbians, Bisexuals, Transvestites and Transsexuals (ABGLT), the amendment was not perfect but it was worthwhile to have at least some sort of a law. Julio Moreira, the president of the Rainbow group, thought the amendment presented by Marta detracted from the character of the proposal, thereby trivializing other items in the Bill.

Over time, members of the evangelical constituency have been able to successfully establish slanderous terms against LGBTs like "gay dictatorship/gag" and "homosexual empire", not to mention a number of homogenous arguments about how the Bill infringes on freedom of expression and religious belief. Yet, by the same token, in the second stage of the study (GUIMARÃES, 2017) where we looked at reports published between the end of 2014 and July 2016 (we call this period the "post-argumentative stage"), there were at least eight states in 2015 that removed the terms "gender identity" and "sexual orientation/diversity" from their Municipal and State Education Programs[11] due to pressure from religious groups.

Along the same lines of logic as Jayyusi, Sacks (1992) also addressed the issue of category representativeness. Even though Congress is a constitutional category, it is inferentially rich. In our daily lives we accumulate knowledge by making inferences. For example, when we think of "priests", we assume they have never been married, that they are disciplined, etc. We do the same thing with institutions like the "Catholic Church" and the "Armed Forces", just to name a few. In Brazil, the "Congress" and its houses (the "Legislative", the "House of Representatives" and the "Senate") are inferentially rich in knowledge and common sense experiences.

Since political representatives from the evangelical constituency consider themselves members of a morally organized group, their opponents are able to categorize them using equally moral

predicates like "extremists", "fundamentalists" and "zealots"[12] (see examples 11 and 12). These predicates make a derogatory reference to religious belonging and make reference to blindly following scripture and adopting a violent and intolerant behavior. It is worth noting here that the mechanisms of membership categorization used to criticize the evangelical constituency lay at the crossroads between politics and religion. A democratic state which includes more diverse social sectors in its decision-making processes – such as minorities – is defined as "good" politics; conversely, "bad" politics would be defined as those who want to colonize the public sphere according to their personal religious interests.

It is also important to remember that categorizations are irremediably connected to the context in which they are used in. Jayyusi states that, "situatedly, it is the task at hand that provides the relevance (for use) of any feature from the category-concept" (Jayyusi, 2015, p. 62).

In other words, parliament members can be morally categorized in a negative way based on a number of predicates: "corrupt", "ignorant" and "absent", among others. However, what is in play in the examples above are the rights of LGBTs; they are subjects that are systematically defined as "abominations" by certain religious entities. "Fundamentalist" is an important attribute in the categorization employed by these groups' supporters since opposition to the religious representatives (who would like to "declassify" [12] and "exert pressure" [11] as well as be "impervious" to LGBT demands [14]) operate according to religious ideologies. Using the predicates "fundamentalist", "extremist" or "fanatics" diminishes the political authority of the parliament members to whom they refer to because they attribute strictly religious – and radical – predicates to members of political categories.

Example 11 talks about enlightening the "family" collective. As we have seen in other analytical standards in our thesis (Guimarães, 2017), the evangelical constituents repeatedly refer to homosexuals as "threats to the family", an argument that religious leaders base on the fact that homosexuals and lesbians cannot procreate biologically. This is what is known as a disjunctive categorization. Jayyusi (2015) describes disjunctive category sets as those that involve an "alternative characterization of the same person" (Jayyusi, 2015, p. 123). Here, categorization is rejected or not requested by the categorized subject. Dupret also addressed the issue of category

disjunction when he said, "the use of disjunctive category pairs is frequently made through selecting one or two categorizations which the categorized person would not recognize" (Dupret, 2008, p. 308).

Jayyusi cites examples of disjunctive category pairs like "terrorist/revolutionary" or "doctor/butcher". Referencing Coulter (1979), Dupret (2008) presented the elements "belief" and "knowledge" as a disjunctive category pair. He cites other examples: vision/hallucination, ghost/illusion and ideology/science. This kind of categorization is mostly used to depreciate someone – for example, calling someone a "terrorist" while that someone categorizes themselves as "revolutionary" or calling someone "ignorant" or "deluded" while that someone calls themselves "religious".

Our analysis shows that LGBTs do not see themselves in the disjunctive categorization that some religious leaders see them. In other words, they do not see themselves as a threat to other people's families, nor to the continuation of the species. Discourse 11 is interesting in this aspect because Cláudio Nascimento inverts the categories of "offender" and "victim", labelling the "families" of homosexuals as "victims" of prejudiced people.

Religious leaders use disjunctive categorizations to demean homosexuals (let's not forget these are passive operations of re-appropriation that the disparaged subjects have reclaimed, as evident in Cláudio Nascimento's statement) and LGBT subjects do the same when they define evangelical constituencies as "fundamentalists". While religious leaders argue that their rationale for objecting to LGBTs is upheld by scripture, and frequently pit good subjects against bad subjects (the good being heterosexual family constituents and the bad being homosexuals who belong to or strive to belong to a "third generation", as outlined in our analytical standards in the previous topic), LGBT subjects also demean their religiosity when using terms like "fundamentalists". Curiously, the Associated Press establishes that no religious subject should be referred to as "fundamentalist" unless said subject identifies itself as such (Green, 2014, May 29). We assume this is due to the fact that the term carries a strong moral judgment with it which would compromise a journalist's objectivity. The two major evangelical denominations (the Igreja Universal do Reino de Deus and the Assembleia de Deus), which the majority of evangelical constituents belong to do not see themselves as fundamentalists. In fact, they state that they spread love. Yet, by

labelling these subjects as fundamentalists, enunciators of this analytical standard are literally challenging the very foundation of the doctrines they prescribe to – not to loving thy neighbor, but to radicalism and violence.

The beginning of the interview in Example 13 lays out the context: Senator Marta Suplicy is responsible for presenting the Bill for punishing homophobia, categorized by the journalist as "polemic". The journalist uses the phrase "she believes the world moves at a faster pace than National Congress does" but does not give any further details, which leads us to believe that it will be revisited in more detail during the course of the interview.

The journalist's question, "Why do you think that the bill will be approved?" might lead readers to assume that the senator expects this to happen. Then Marta says that there is a "mix" of different people in the Senate, two-thirds of which is composed of new members. This discourse establishes a relationship that associates "new" with the bill's approval, something that must happen because "the world is changing quickly". Continuing with this logic, the fact the bill has not passed until now must be because there is nothing "new" or nothing has "changed", which leads us to believe that, in this discourse, conservatism and inactivity are opponents to the Bill.

Discourse 13 also contains some *standardized collective relational pairs*; a classification developed by Jayysui (2015) based on Sacks' concept of *standardized relational pairs* (1992) in which the members are connected to one another through responsibility (e.g., father-son, professor-student). Summerville and Adkins (2007) state that the categories in standardized collective pairs are asymmetrical and mutually exclusive in certain uses. One example of this is "government-citizens" in the phrase "the government does nothing for its citizens". However, this asymmetry is not established *a priori* since "members from the first category, understood as 'stable', can be seen in other moments like members from the second categorization, known as 'occasioned'" (Summerville & Adkins, 2007, p. 16). One example from Brazil would be the pair "police-citizen", standardized by the fact they include mutual tasks and obligations. When stopped at a roadblock, we do not see the police as an everyday citizen, we see them as an asymmetrical category of power – the categories of "citizen" and "police" appear to be opposites in this situation.

Note the title of this report: "Police treat citizen as an enemy, like in the dictatorship, the colonel says" (Maranhão, 2014, April 9). Now look at the title of another report: "Doctor, professor and policeman suffer the most from stress" (Mendonça, 2010, October 21). Here, the police are described as members of the "general population" or "workers", there is no asymmetry between the categories. A common element in the dichotomies in standardized collective relational pairs is the inequality of rights or knowledge on the part of the members involved, as well as a ruling authority on the part of the first half of the pair, often relating to an institutional category.

Marta Suplicy's statement contains a standardized collective relational pair within it: "Legislative – the outside world" (you could think of the second half of the pair as being "society") In this discourse, the legislative space is separated from a "real" universe, as if it operated apart from it and impervious to "the way things are". In terms of LGBT rights, it is interesting to see Marta Suplicy define Legislature as a parallel reality and then put herself at odds with the institution (despite belonging to it) when she states that Legislature acts scared and frightened. It is worth remembering the situational character of category memberships – the senator is a political representative and was a key figure in promoting Bill 122, yet she was also responsible for helping the evangelical constituency remove religious temples from being punished for homophobic slander. However, she did not claim any responsibility for her own legislative activities regarding the difficulties faced by the Bill. She seems to situate herself more towards collective "society" through the use of phrases like "the outside world" than she does to the "parliamentary" collective.

Inside this asymmetry between "Legislature" and "world", *in loco*, there is a contrast between "scared" and "frightened", which are connected to the category of "Legislature", and to "taking some big steps forward" which is associated with "the outside world". Another word connected to Legislature is "regression". The following phrase is also worth mentioning: "the outside world has been taking some big steps forward". It describes the activities of Judicial and Executive powers around LGBT rights ("The Judiciary Branch has accepted marriage and child adoption, and the Executive Branch has requested that the Federal Revenue Service accept joint declaration of income").

Even though the Judiciary and Executive powers are institutional categories, just like the Legislative branch, Marta does not compare them to the "outside world" or society, quite the contrary, she inserts them into this world by saying they have been "taking some big steps forward". As a result, the Judiciary and Executive powers are not referred to as asymmetrical categories in regards to society, unlike the Legislative branch.

Our last example (15) draws attention to a principle element of social categories which is they function like repositories of knowledge, helping us organize our relationship with the world around us. Schegloff (2007) explains this property:

> Any attributed member of a category (that is, anyone taken to be a member of the category) is a presumptive representative of that category. That is, what is "known" about the category is presumed to be so about them. I say "known" rather than "believed", and refer to (common-sense) knowledge rather than 'stereotype' or 'prejudice' because, for members, this has the working status of 'knowledge' whatever its scientific status or moral/political character may be (Schegloff, 2007, p. 469).

Continuing with Schegloff, the "protection against inductions" as a corollary to the inferential wealth of categories:

> "[...] if an ostensible member of a category appears to contravene what is 'known' about members of the category, then people do not revise that knowledge, but see the person as an 'exception', 'different', or even a defective member of the category" (Schegloff, 2007, p. 369).

In example 15, the enunciator brings up this protection against induction when he states that the evangelical constituency does not represent him (he said this while still a pastor). It is interesting that he cannot completely escape the representivity of his category; he apologizes in the name of the "evangelical" category, and at the same time he tries to disconnect himself from the word "fundamentalist", often associated to the category he belongs to.

5 Final considerations

The printed press is a media form where interests from a range of social fields converge and are played out in a game of conflicts and negotiations. In his study on women's magazines,

Braga points out that there is no "discursive block" writing the voice of a periodical, but there is a multiplicity of voices that relate to one another in a "speech transaction" (Braga, 2016, p. 42). Since the Bill proposes a number of diverse topics about LGBT issues, many different fields are called into action providing a spectrum of both positions on non-hegemonic sexual practices and the foundations which the fields use to give their opinions and interpretations.

Each one of these fields has tried to pigeon-hole Bill 122 into their interests, rules and strategies. Members from the "evangelical constituency" called the legislative proposition a "gay gag". As these politicians expressed in their discourses, the Bill would apparently damage the principle of freedom of expression and religion; some religious leaders publicly stated that preaching against homosexuality would then become a crime.

We would like to think of journalists as agents that produce meaning since they interpret and write on situations and objects that act as references for how individuals think and judge (Soares, 2009). More than just "translators" of an objective reality, news agents are involved in a stressful process with other agents (politicians, people of faith, economists) and find themselves both in conflict and in compliance with certain situations in their attempt to establish interpretations of facts, people and objects.

As stated in the overview of our analytical standards, journalists have given the evangelical constituents a significant amount of space in which to express their opinions and arguments yet only three members from this group are responsible for 72% of the speeches opposed to the Bill. Even though many newspapers support the Bill in Editorials (institutional points of view from the vehicles), their speeches and the people they invite to speak show them to prefer a conservative and homogenous position.

We, therefore, saw a weakening in the power of journalism in the public sphere to use Jürgen Habermas' concept in *Mudança estrutural da Esfera Pública: investigações quanto a uma categoria da sociedade burguesa*, published in 1962. Habermas stated, "mass democracies can only reclaim continuity of the principles of the liberal constitutional state if they actually try to live the mandate of a public sphere which fulfills political functions" (Habermas, 1999, p. 441). The public sphere is essential towards democratic thinking due to the

fact it is not only a space for negotiating, for conflict and for building meanings between different social actors, but also because, within it, the actual relationship between subjects is continually changing, as well as the way these subjects see reality – which aspects should be kept, changed, contested (Pereira, 2011). In terms of how Bill 122 has been covered, journalism brought it to the forefront, but consulted the opinions of the same characters who share the same ideologies on homosexuals or on bills that suit their interest which ended up diminishing the complexity of the debate.

*This paper was translated by Lee Sharp

NOTES

1   We define "homophobia" according to Borrillo, D. (2010). *Homofobia: história e crítica de um preconceito*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica Editora: "Apart from being used to refer to a set of negative attitudes towards homosexuals, over time it has also been used as a discriminatory, prejudicial and violent term against LGBTs" (Borrillo, 2010, p. 8). The term is constantly changing, and is nowadays also used to define homotransphobia by including transsexuals, and lesbophobia which focuses not only on discrimination against sexual orientation, but also misogyny.

2   According to the largest circulation newspaper in the country as per the latest data from the National Association of Journals (ANJ) in 2015, an average circulation of 193,079 newspapers per year. Further on in the article we will provide more information on the newspapers that were researched.

3   The Labor Party was founded in 1980 through a left-wing movement in opposition to the dictatorship. Currently, it is the second largest party in the country with 1.5 million members. Two of its presidents were re-elected to office over the last four terms: Lula was elected in 2002 and re-elected in 2006; his successor, Dilma Rousseff, was elected in 2010 and re-elected in 2014. On August 31, 2016 Dilma Rousseff was impeached and subsequently succeeded by then vice-president, Michel Temer. Referring to Bill 122, politicians from the Labor Party had always showed a vested interest in approving the Bill. Some of them were: Iara Bernardi, the

politician who introduced the bill; Senator Fátima Cleide from Rondônia; Paulo Paim from Rio Grande do Sul and Marta Suplicy, currently with the PMDB party but at the time was a Labor Party representative in São Paulo.

4   The National Library, in the city of Rio de Janeiro, has an extensive collection of Brazilian publications, including magazines and newspapers from 1808 until today. This digitialized collection reached 14 million pages in 2017 (Paula, A. May 29, 2017. *The National Library has a collection of periodicals available.* National Culture Plan, Ministry of Culture. Access on January 27, 2018 at http://pnc.cultura.gov. br/2017/05/29/biblioteca-nacional-dis ponibiliza-acervo-de-periodicos/).

5   The most recent information from 2015 available on the National Association of Journals (ANJ) website during the data collection stage.

6   Officially Law 11.340, August 7, 2006. Punishments were increased for domestic abuse against women. The law got its name from bio pharmacist Maria da Penha Fernandes, who was shot in the back by her husband, leaving her paraplegic. Afterwards, she became a staunch activist for women's rights.

7   It is of note that when an enunciator states his or her position on the Bill by categorizing it as "liberal" or "dictatorial", they are implicitly categorizing the subjects who support and produced it. After all, a legislative proposal is an object produced by specific individuals with ideologies and particular interests, representing specific social categories.

8   Apart from the Bill punishing slander, in 2011 Senator Marta Suplicy presented an amendment to exclude religious discourse from punishment.

9   This was an interview with Marta Suplicy. The first paragraph was about the *lead*, followed by deletions and then Marta's response to the journalist.

10 This report is from the second stage of our doctoral research which refers to the period after Bill 122 was filed away (reports published on homophobia between January 2015 and July 2016), but we used it to complement the categorization analysis of parliament members as fundamentlists.

11 *De Olho nos Planos* defines the education plans as "legal documents for establishing goals to ensure that the right to quality in education moves forward in municipalities, states or the country over a period of ten years. They address both the educational service in municipalities, states, the country and private institutions acting on different levels and forms of education: from daycares to universities. This is about the main instrument of the policy for public education" (http://www. deolhonosplanos.org.br/planos-de-educacao/, access on January 27, 2018).

12 A group defined as "a Jewish sect and political party that triggered the Jewish revolt at the time of Tito. The zealots make up the radical wing of Pharisees and named God as the only leader, the lord of the Jewish nation, opposed to Roman domination" (*Houaiss* Dictionary).

REFERENCES

Azevedo, F. A. (2006, Apr/May). Mídia e democracia no Brasil: relações entre o sistema de mídia e o sistema político. *Opinião Pública*, 12(1), 88-113, doi: https://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0104-62762006000100004.

Amaral, S M. M. d. (2011, June 2). A medida capaz de reduzir a homofobia é a educação de crianças e jovens. *O Povo*, Opinião.

Braga, A. (2016). Corpo-verão [eletronic ressource]: *jornalismo e discurso na imprensa feminina*. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. PUC-Rio. Retrieved from http://www.editora.vrc.pucrio.br/media/CORPO%20VER%C3%83O%20download.pdf

Braga, I. (2008, January 6). Conservadorismo predomina na Câmara. *O Globo*, País, pp. 10.

Brasil. Secretaria Especial de Direitos Humanos do Ministério das Mulheres, da Igualdade Racial e dos Direitos Humanos. Relatório de violência homofóbica no Brasil: 2013. Brasília, DF: Special Secretary of Human Rights, Ministry of Women, Racial Equality and Human Rights, 2016. Retrieved from http://www.sdh.gov.br/assuntos/lgbt/dados-estatisticos/Relatorio2013.pdf.

Brito, C. (2012, May 13). *Respeito à diversidade*. Zero Hora, Artigos, pp. 16.

Brunelli, C. (2012, June 10). Brasil avança em mapa gay de direitos. *O Estado de São Paulo*, Cidades/Metrópole, pp. C7.

Cícero, A. (2009, November 28). Sobre a lei contra a homofobia. *Folha de São Paulo*, Ilustrada, pp. E16.

Cunha, A. (2011, June 15). Avisou. *Correio Braziliense*, Opinião, pp. 13.

Dupret, B. (2008). The Categories of Morality: Homosexuality Between Perversion and Debauchery. In: B. Dupret; B. Briskens & A. Moors (Eds.). *Narratives of Truth in Islamic Law* (pp. 289–324). London: I.B. Tauris & Co. Ltd.

Farah, T. (2011, March 6). "O Legislativo se acovardou e o mundo andou a passos grandes" (interview with Marta Suplicy). *O Globo*, País, pp. 4.

Foreque, F. (2009, March 22). Congresso é mais conservador que Lula. *Correio Braziliense*, Política, pp. 8.

Green, E. (2014, May 29). The AP's Style Guide for Religion, Metaphysics, and God's Existence. *The Atlantic* [online]. Retrieved from https://www.theatlantic.com/national/archive/2014/05/style-guide-for-religion/371813/.

Guimarães, J. D. A. (2017). *O campo jornalístico e a "lei anti-homofobia": uma análise das categorizações de pertencimento sobre o projeto de lei da Câmara 122 nos jornais impressos brasileiros*. Doctorate dissertation in Social Communication, Pontifícia Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro (PUC-Rio), Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil.

Habermas, J. (1999). Further reflections on the public sphere. In: C. Calhoun (Ed). *Habermas and the public sphere* (pp 421-462). Massachussetts: The MIT Press.

Habermas, J. (1984). *Mudança estrutural da Esfera Pública: investigações quanto a uma categoria da sociedade burguesa*. Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro.

Jayyusi, L. (2015). *Categorization and the moral order* [eletronic ressource], Routledge.

Maranhão, F. (2014, April 9). Polícia trata cidadão como potencial inimigo, como na ditadura, diz coronel. *Uol Notícias*. Retrieved from https://noticias.uol.com.br/cotidiano/ultimas-noticias/2014/04/09/como-na-ditadura-cidadao-e-visto-como-potencial-inimigo-diz-coronel-da-pm.htm

Mendonça, M. (2010, October 21). Médico, professor e policial são os que mais sofrem de estresse. *A Gazeta online*. Retrieved from

http://gazetaonline.globo.com/_conteudo/2010/10/680036-me
dico+professor+e+policial+sao+os+que+mais+sofrem+de+estres
se.html

Moreira, C. (2011, May 29). Liberdade de crença: um passo atrás?
Zero Hora, Artigos, pp. 19.

Motta, C. & Gares, D (2007, October 15). Parada Gay vira tribuna para
políticos. *O Globo*, Rio, pp. 11.

Pereira, M. A. (April, 2011). Internet e mobilização política – os
movimentos sociais na era digital. *Anais da Associação Brasileira de
Pesquisadores em Comunicação e Política (COMPOLÍTICA),* Salvador,
BA, Brazil, IV. Retrieved from http://www.compolitica.org/home/wp-
content/uploads/2011/03/Marcus-Abilio.pdf

Psathas, G. (1999). Studying the Organization in Action: Membership
Categorization and Interaction Analysis. *Human Studies*, 22, 139-
162.

Ramalho, S. (2013, June 29). No dia do orgulho LGBT, 'cura gay'
mobiliza Rio. *O Globo*, País, pp. 11.

Sacks, H. (1992). *Lectures on conversation*, Ed. G. Jefferson. Padstow,
Cornwall: Blackwell Publishing.

Safatle, V. (2012, October 16). Os novos reféns. *Folha de São Paulo*,
Opinião, pp A2.

Santos, U. (2011, May 13). Projeto de lei 122/2006: Homofobia ou
Heterofobia? *Correio de Sergipe*, Opinião, pp. A2.

Schegloff, E. A. (2007). A tutorial on membership categorization.
Journal of Pragmatics, 39, pp. 462- 82.

Sell, M. & Ostermann, A.C. (2009). *Análise de Categorias de Pertença
(ACP) em estudos de linguagem e gênero: a desconstrução discursiva
do homogêneo masculino*. Alfa, *53* (1), pp. 11-34. Retrieved from
http://seer.fclar.unesp.br/alfa/article/view/1675.

Soares, M. C. (2009). *Representações, jornalismo e a esfera pública
democrática* [online]. São Paulo: Editora Cultura Acadêmica, UNESP.
Retrieved from Available at: http://books.scielo.org.

Stokoe, E. (2012). Moving forward with membership categorization
analysis: methods for systematic analysis. *Discourse & Society,* 14(3),
pp. 277-303.

Struck, J. (2016, May 7). Fé e política: o avanço dos deputados
evangélicos. *Deutsche Welle*, Brazil. Retrieved from http://www.
dw.com/pt-br/f%C3%A9-e-pol%C3%ADtica-o-avan%C3%A7o-dos-
deputados-evang%C3%A9licos/a-19240829.

Summerville, J. & Adkins, B. (2007). Enrolling the Citizen in Sustainability: Membership Categorization, Morality and Civic Participation. *Human Studies*, 30 (4), pp. 429-446.

Vanini, E. (2015, Nov.16). Mesmo com chuva, 20ª Parada LGBT leva multidão a Copacabana. *O Globo*, Sociedade, pp. 18.

Juliana Depiné Alves Guimarães. PhD in Social Communication from PUC-Rio. She has produced works in the field of Communication, particularly in the areas of digital environments, journalistic discourse, minorities and social movements. E-mail: julianadepine@gmail.com