The Role of Narrative in Constructing an Advocacy Coalition:

The Case of São Paulo's Non-discrimination Policy

By

Jacob Reed Longaker

Submitted to the graduate degree program in Political Science and the Graduate Faculty of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

_____

Chairperson Gary M. Reich

_____

Donald P. Haider-Markel

_____

Alesha E. Doan

Date Defended: March 27, 2013

The Thesis Committee for Jacob Reed Longaker

certifies that this is the approved version of the following thesis:

The Role of Narrative in Constructing an Advocacy Coalition:

The Case of São Paulo's Non-discrimination Policy

_____

Chairperson Gary M. Reich

Date approved: March 27, 2013

Abstract

The Brazilian LGBT movement has transformed in role from a social movement fragmented by diverse interests to a policy actor with a clear agenda. To understand this transition, we study the case of non-discrimination policy 10.948 in Sao Paulo, Brazil. We combine insights from scholars working in the tradition of narrative policy analysis (NPA) with the empirical lens of the advocacy coalition framework (ACF). We hypothesize that coalition interaction in policymaking facilitates the construction of narratives that shape, and are shaped by, core beliefs and policy core beliefs. We find that, consistent with ACF, non-discrimination policy results in the development of a distinct advocacy coalition held together by a shared belief system. Importantly, and unforeseen to ACF, this belief system is discursively produced as a shared narrative by the advocacy coalition. The narrative is characterized by a deep core belief commitment to equality and several policy core beliefs. Our findings suggest that narrative plays an important and overlooked role in strengthening the glue of advocacy coalitions.

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

"Still present in our memory is the death of Edson Neris da Silva at the Plaza of the Republic in February of 2000, when a group of skinheads condemned to death and executed with cruelty a person who committed the crime of walking in public while holding the hand of his partner."

–   Renato Simões (PT-SP) 10/09/2001, 66th Session, São Paulo State Assembly.

Introduction

On October 9, 2001, the first state level non-discrimination policy in Brazil was proposed in the Legislative Assembly of São Paulo State by Renato Simões of the Workers' Party.[1] Simões argued for the extension of basic rights to the historically excluded LGBT group and appealed to São Paulo to take the lead in the battle for social equality (Simões 2001).[2] After passing unanimously, it was signed into law on November 5, 2001 by Governor Geraldo Alckmin as Law 10.948/01.[3] In addition to prohibiting discrimination based upon sexual orientation, 10.948 guarantees the right to demonstrate affect in public places and expressly protects homosexual, bisexual, and transgender persons against any discrimination (physical, verbal and psychological) in public places, services, businesses and housing (Diário Oficial Executivo 2001; Law 10.948/2000, Appendix B)**.**[4]

Ten years later, the issue of discrimination still dominates the agenda of the Brazilian lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) social movement (Freire and Cardinali 2012).

---

[1] The proposal was a direct result of the murder of thirty five year old, openly gay Edson Neris da Silva on February 5, 2008, by eighteen young members of the nationalist group Skinheads of ABC (Carrara 2009; França 2008). The group's name (Skinheads of ABC; Carecas do ABC) refers to greater metropolitan region of São Paulo, comprised of three cities: São Andre, São Bernardo do Campo, and São Caetano do Sul.

[2] For full text of the proposal (PL667/2000) translated to English, see Appendix A. For full text of the law (L10948/2001) in Portuguese, see Appendix B. The content of the proposal and the law are the same, save for an additional section in the proposal titled "Justification."

[3] Despite receiving unanimous support, only six months later a bill (PL 492/02) was introduced in the Assembly that would revoke the non-discrimination law, with several proposals aimed at repealing the legislation and a series of rebuttals from those who support non-discrimination measures.

[4] These measures are enforced through a system of warnings and citations upon the third violation, establishments lose their license to function. As such, the law is considered strictly administrative; that is, it does not impose criminal penalties for discrimination. The ability to do so rests with the federal government; criminal penalties are not under the jurisdiction of state governments (Diário Oficial Executivo 2001).

1

The LGBT movement, in turn, has successfully created a broad based coalition of policy actors to advocate on behalf of its cause. The effects of these advocacy efforts are apparent through the level of attention allocated to non-discrimination policy on behalf of local, state, and federal governments in Brazil. Nearly half of all state governments currently prohibit discrimination based upon sexual orientation (de la Dehesa 2010). At the federal level, proposals to criminalize homophobia have circulated Congress since 2001. And in 2004, the Lula administration developed the national program Brazil Without Homophobia in close consultation with actors from the LGBT movement nationwide (Conselho Nacional de Combate à Homofobia 2004).

The recent success of the LGBT movement in placing non-discrimination policy on the policymaking agenda at various levels of government should not be dismissed lightly. In the early 1970s, the Brazilian LGBT movement emerged as a radical identitarian movement advocating a counter culture of sexual liberty with little interest for institutionalized politics (Facchini 2005; Green 1999; MacRae 1990). By the 1980s, the concomitant advent of democratization and HIV/AIDS profoundly destabilized the movement. On one hand, the 1988 Constitutional Congress denied the inclusion of sexual orientation as a protected category in the new document, while the HIV/AIDS epidemic resulted in increased societal intolerance to gays and lesbians and a decrease in movement activity (Trevisan 2011). During the 1990s, the movement began to regain traction through campaigns advocating pride, visibility, and an end to homophobic violence. But these changes compromised the organization of the movement, as differences in tactics, goals, and identity threatened to dissolve the movement into an "alphabet soup" of actors (Facchini 2005).[5] Disagreements involve central questions such as the nature of

---

[5] The "alphabet soup" metaphor refers to the proliferation of acronyms intended to capture the multiplicity of subjectivities represented by lesbians, gays, bisexuals, and transgenders (LGBTs) under one coherent banner (Facchini 2005).

political subjectivities based upon sexual identity, the role of hierarchical national organizations in the articulation of movement interests, the merit of autonomy vs. engagement with political parties and the state, and the allocation of resources, both monetary and political.

In the process, the movement has transformed from functioning as strictly an autonomous social movement, working from outside of the established boundaries of the political process, to one that is increasingly recognized as a policy actor per se. As a policy actor, its agenda is centralized on ending homophobia and discrimination through the creation of public policies (Freire and Cardinali 2012; Mello, Brito, and Maroja 2012; Ramos and Carrara 2006). It is evident that the movement has been able to overcome earlier fractures to advocate collectively in favor of public policy goals. It is not clear, however, *how* this process has occurred.

To understand the causal mechanisms of this transition – from inchoate social movement to concerted policy actor - we look to theories of public policy that focus on the importance of coalitions in the policy process. The Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF) hypothesizes that complex policy issues will see the emergence of two or more distinct advocacy coalitions formed upon the basis of shared belief systems and non-trivial levels of cooperation over a ten year period (Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith 1993). However, the ACF does not adequately account for how belief systems are sufficient to overcome problems associated with collective action (Schlager and Blomquist 1996; Schlager 1995). We believe that part of the answer lay in the strategic construction of narrative by advocacy coalitions.

Conceptually, narrative has been largely ignored by policy studies in ACF (McBeth et al. 2011). To explore the importance of narrative in advocacy coalitions, we study the case of non-discrimination policy 10.948 in Sao Paulo, Brazil. This provides an opportunity to examine how narrative enables actors with divergent interests and backgrounds to come together as a coalition.

3

We combine insights from scholars working in the tradition of narrative policy analysis (NPA) with the empirical lens of the ACF. We develop a framework whereby coalition interaction within the realm of policymaking facilitates the construction of narratives that shape, and are shaped by, core beliefs and policy core beliefs.

The paper proceeds as follows: first, we survey the role of narrative in public policy studies, paying specific attention to possibilities for its conceptual incorporation in the ACF. Next, we provide a broad overview of LGBT politics in Brazil, focusing on the problem of discrimination and the social movement as a policy actor. After introducing our research methods, we provide the results of content analysis on fourteen narratives for evidence of shared belief systems. We find that, consistent with the expectations of ACF, non-discrimination policy results in the development of a distinct advocacy coalition held together by a shared belief system. Importantly, and unforeseen to ACF, this belief system is discursively produced. It manifests empirically through the production and reproduction of a shared narrative articulated on behalf of the advocacy coalition. The narrative is characterized by core belief commitments to equality and policy core beliefs in regards to causes of the problem, seriousness of the problem, implementation, solutions, and overall evaluation of the policy. Our findings suggest that narrative plays an important and overlooked role in strengthening the glue of advocacy coalitions.

Narrative in Public Policy

Narrative remains relatively poorly incorporated in mainstream theories of the policy process. This is partly due to epistemological and methodological disputes over the appropriateness of post-empiricist versus empiricist and qualitative versus quantitative methods in policy studies (DeLeon 1998a; DeLeon 1998b; Lin 1998). Even within narrative analysis, approaches differ in

their commitment to post-empiricist school of thought. The most stringent, characterized by the works of Fischer (1998) and Hajer (1993), adhere to a strictly constructivist view of the world, whereby fact, reality, and scientific truth are created through the linguistic inscription of meaning, legitimacy, and authority (Carver 2002; Hajer 2002). Thus, from an epistemological position, these scholars reject the view that language is as a neutral medium for describing reality (Hajer 1993, 44). These works question the appropriateness of positivist methods in light of a large body of literature claiming that science is subject to interpretation "against a range of explanations and understandings that themselves are products of other interpretations" (Fischer 1998, 133).

For example, the process of problem definition is itself an exercise in social construction, whereby conditions such as acid rain are interpreted in a multitude of ways, irrespective of consensus within the scientific community (Hajer 1993). These differences depend upon the strategic use of language and narrative by coalitions to define conditions as political problems. As Hajer writes, "to be sure large groups of dead trees as such are not a social construct; the point is how one makes sense of dead trees. In this respect, there are many possible realities" (Hajer 1993, 44). Language thus shapes our understanding of reality by providing a coherent set of symbols that assign meaning to observed phenomena; in turn, our ability to express reality (and assign meaning) is circumscribed by the limits of language. Policy analysts must understand the way in which language is used strategically by actors and coalitions to position themselves in relation to problems, opposition coalitions, cultural values, and competing definitions (Hajer 1993). This work adheres to the post-empiricist tradition and favors interpretation through inductive methods over generalization and prediction through deductive methods (Jones and McBeth 2009).

A less dogmatic approach to narrative analysis is less skeptical of the basic tenants of social science and can be seen in the works of Roe (1994) and Stone (1989; 2002).[6] These authors place narratives and stories at the heart of policy analysis. While Roe (1994) focuses on the structure of narratives, Stone (1989; 2002) emphasizes the importance of story content.[7] Stone's (1989) work on the agenda setting process posits that conditions are defined strategically as problems through the deliberate assignment of causation, blame and responsibility through the use of socially constructed narratives (Stone 1989, 282). These narratives are characterized by the use of literary devices, such as characters, plots, and metaphors, and illuminate the values of the protagonist. Narratives contain "causal stories" that are influenced by behavioral assumptions of target group (Schneider and Ingram 1993). Furthermore, target social constructions influence which causal story dominates public discourse, with institutions such as law and science arbitrating a 'tug of war between political actors" (Stone 1989, 293). The most powerful causal stories "portray a political problem so that one's favored course of action appears to be in the broadest public interest" (McBeth et al. 2007).

This debate highlights important epistemological and methodological questions, but excessive concern can stymie the production of research in policy studies. As DeLeon (1998a; 1998b) eloquently argues, the best of work combines both qualitative and quantitative approaches. Moreover, work in the qualitative tradition is both empiricist and post-empiricist (Lin 1998). The former identifies causal relationships to predict phenomena while the latter uncovers causal mechanisms to interpret phenomena (Lin 1998). This tension is perhaps best evidenced by the absence of constructivism in the 1999 edition of Sabatier's influential *Theories*

---

[6] By the basic tenants of social science, I refer mainly to the positivist criteria of deduction, reliability, validity, generalization, and prediction. For a thorough review of this debate in narrative analysis, see Jones and McBeth (2009).
[7] For an example of narrative policy analysis in the tradition of Roe (1994), see Newton's work on immigration policy (2005).

of the Policy Process under the rationale that constructivist theories do not offer "clear concepts, testable hypotheses, and falsification" and do not contribute to the accumulation of empirical knowledge (Jones and McBeth 2009, 331; Sabatier 1999).

In light of this position, it is no surprise that research in the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF) places little attention on role of narrative and discourse in policy change. To the contrary, we believe that the inclusion of narrative within the ACF provides additional explanatory power to the framework in regards to coalition behavior. Furthermore, we believe that narrative can be fruitfully incorporated with both conceptual clarity and testable and falsifiable hypotheses. To assess this possibility, we next provide an overview of the ACF and potential for narrative within the framework.

Advocacy Coalition Framework

The ACF hypothesizes that complex policy issues will see the emergence of two or more distinct advocacy coalitions formed upon the basis of shared belief systems (Sabatier and Weible 2007). These coalitions are characterized by non-trivial levels of cooperation over a ten year period. Members of these advocacy coalitions will be drawn from the policy subsystem, an informal and geographically restricted network of actors involved in the policy making process (Sabatier and Weible 2007). These participants may be lawmakers, bureaucrats, activist groups, interest groups, scientists, researchers, journalists, skilled policy entrepreneurs, and leaders (Mintrom and Norman 2009; Mintrom and Vergari 1996; Sabatier and Weible 2007; Schorn 2005; Weible 2005; Weible 2006). While members of an advocacy coalition should show high levels of intragroup interaction, competing coalitions should not show much intergroup interaction (Sabatier and Weible 2007).

The hallmark of the ACF is a three tiered belief system theorized to provide the basis for advocacy coalitions.[8] According to Sabatier and Weible (2007), "deep core beliefs involve very general normative and ontological assumptions about human nature [and] the relative priority of fundamental values such as liberty and equality" (Sabatier and Weible 2007, 194). Core beliefs provide the basis for an advocacy coalition's existence. At the next level are policy core beliefs, characteristics that represent desired policy outcomes based upon core beliefs. Thus, policy core beliefs translate deep core beliefs into policy prescriptions (i.e. a claim of equality embedded in a policy proposal). At the outermost level are secondary aspects, thinner beliefs that may be subject to change during compromise and bargaining. To identify a belief system, it is sufficient to measure core beliefs and policy core beliefs (Sabatier and Weible 2007, 195; Weible 2005; Weible 2006). Due to the nature of the core beliefs that characterize advocacy coalitions, ACF expects a non-trivial degree of cooperation to characterize each coalition (Sabatier and Weible 2007; Weible 2006; Weible 2005). Extensive cooperation between actors of an advocacy coalition results in firmer belief systems and indicates a mature advocacy coalition. The degree of cooperation can help determine the success of a policy initiative. Competing coalitions, however, should engage in minimal levels of cooperation, due to a demonizing effect of opposition termed the "devil shift" (Sabatier and McLaughlin 1987; Sabatier and Weible 2007).

It is perhaps surprising that a theory predicated upon the importance of the subjective concept of "beliefs" eschews the role of narrative in public policy. Indeed, core assumptions of the ACF in regards to the role of information acknowledge, if not explicitly, a constructivist view of coalition politics. For example, information is subject to differences in interpretation based upon perceptual filters of coalitions, even in policy subsystems with stable institutional structures

---

[8] Fischer notes that this assumption (re)produces conceptual foundations in the framework that quite closely mirror epistemic commitments to Lakatos' view of science and research programmes (Fischer 2012).

(Sabatier and Weible 2007, 194). Researchers and scientists may arbitrate these disputes through appeals to science, but the authors recognize that "stakeholders often spin or even distort information to bolster their argument" (Sabatier and Weible 2007, 203). Finally, information and experience may lead to policy oriented learning, whereby coalitions alter objectives and strategies accordingly.

Narrative within the ACF

Recognizing these opportunities, a burgeoning literature within policy studies seeks to incorporate narrative policy analysis within the ACF (Jones and McBeth 2009; McBeth et al. 2005; McBeth et al. 2007; Shanahan et al. 2008). These scholars respond directly to the challenge posed by Sabatier to provide clear concepts with testable hypotheses that can be falsified by subjecting narratives to qualitative and quantitative analysis. Research shows that narratives structure, and are structured by, coalition belief systems (Jones and McBeth 2009; McBeth et al. 2005). Coalition narratives contain both the implementation strategies of ACF and the political strategies of Stone's causal stories (McBeth et al. 2007). Importantly, in cases of protracted policy disputes, these strategies are not related to core beliefs, but instead to perceptions as winning or losing coalitions. Finally, local and national media (re)produce narratives consistent with belief systems of their preferred coalition (Shanahan et al. 2008). In short, empirical work provides strong support for the inclusion of narrative within the ACF.

To contribute to this literature, we explore the role of narratives in an under developed assumption of the ACF: collective action. Schlager (1995) and Schlager and Blomquist (1996) pointedly critiqued early work in the ACF for the a priori assumption that coalitions exist based upon shared beliefs (Schlager 1995). In their view, the ACF failed to adequately account for how

belief systems are sufficient to overcome challenges well documented by literature on collective action and mobilization.

In recent years, considerable scholarly attention has been devoted to testing empirically the existence of shared beliefs between and amongst actors. Generally, this research falls within two camps and focuses on "coalition stability and structure as the outcome variables" through the use of questionnaires to provide evidence of causal relationships (Weible et al. (201, 355). The first vein of research focuses on testing for shared beliefs among policy actors, empirically measuring the hierarchical structures of beliefs compared with objective data on coalition structures (Pierce 2011; Weible 2005; Weible 2006). The second, and more recent, wave of research evaluates the alternative notion that actors within the policy subsystem cooperate based upon perceptions of influence among allies (Albright 2011; Henry 2011; Matti and Sandstrom 2011).Even so, research "still does not explain how coalitions overcome the free-rider problem of collective action to form and maintain coalition membership over time" (Sabatier and Weible 2007, 197).

This impasse is partly due to the methodological proclivity of scholars to search for causal relationships through quantitative methods. That is, we know that there is a *causal relationship* between beliefs and collective action, but we still do not understand the *causal mechanism* that facilitates this process. We believe that part of the answer lies in the strategic use of narrative by advocacy coalitions.

Contributions of the Study

This work expands the theoretical leverage of the ACF by incorporating narratives as a concept within the framework. We analyze narratives for evidence of belief systems and study the

relationship between narratives and belief systems to understand how coalitions overcome collective action problems. Rather than treating this as a clear linear relationship, we understand that narratives are formed in part by core beliefs, but can also crystallize policy core beliefs.[9]

Furthermore, this research expands the scope of ACF by applying the theory to Brazilian politics. Although work on ACF focuses primarily on U.S. politics, much research successfully applies the framework to the international context (Carvalho 2001; Kubler 2001; Sabatier and Weible 2007, 218-219). In his analysis of Swiss drug policy, Kubler (2001) argues that the ACF is appropriate for use in states with multi-party, proportional representation systems with federal structures. His prescriptions suggest that the ACF could be fruitfully applied to studies on Brazil. To date, the only published application of ACF in Brazil is Carvalho's (2001) analysis of environmental disputes in the 1988 transition to democracy.

Finally, we propose a systematic and rigorous application of the ACF to gay and lesbian politics. Sabatier (1998) suggests that the ACF could be applied to gay and lesbian politics. This may be surprising, in light of the importance placed on technical information in the original conception of the ACF, and its relative unimportance in gay and lesbian politics (Haider-Markel and Meier 1996). Thus, Sabatier instead emphasizes the model of the individual incorporated in the ACF, couched in bounded rationality, prospect theory, and cognitive dissonance (Sabatier 1998). These assumptions suggest that individuals are limited in their ability to process information, attribute importance to political losses at the hands of rivals, and filter information based upon pre-existing normative beliefs. Actors thus comprise "subsystems [which] seem to be characterized by well-defined coalitions driven by belief-driven conflict which resort to a wide

---

[9]Our epistemological disposition proscribes the temptation to outline a clear causal relationship between beliefs and narratives. At a theoretical level, we believe these processes to be mutually constitutive; that is, beliefs construct narratives, and narratives construct beliefs. At the empirical level, McBeth et al. (2007) find that strategies are not related to core beliefs.

11

variety of guidance instruments at multiple levels of government" (Sabatier 1998, 122-3). Of course, Sabatier notes the paucity of research in these areas and urges scholars to conduct empirical tests of the ACF in these types of policy domains.

Currently, the only scholarly piece conducted on LGBT politics using the ACF analyzed same-sex marriage policy change in Minnesota through archival methods (Dziengel 2010). Dziengel (2010) provides a descriptive account of coalition politics between iron triangles of actors who have been successful in preventing a state level ban on marriage. Unfortunately, this work does not clearly define and operationalize the primary concepts of ACF. As a result, belief systems are assumed to exist ipso facto, as are the coalitions themselves, without empirical tests to validate these conclusions. This shortcoming reminds scholars of the importance of conceptual clarity for research on understudied substantive areas to contribute to theory building of the policy process (Schlager 2007). It is to that task that we turn our attention next.

Discrimination of LGBTs in Brazil

Scholars reject the notion that Brazil represents a sexual paradise of free expression and blurred gender norms; rather, many recognize the inherent contradiction in the images of million strong gay pride parades and discrimination of LGBT persons in daily life (de la Dehesa 2010; Green 1999; Schulenberg 2010). The paradox could not be more profound.

Discrimination based upon sexual orientation remains pervasive. Reports by Congressional commissions and international NGOs estimate that one hundred gays and lesbians are murdered each year based upon sexual orientation (Conselho Nacional de Combate à Discriminação 2004; Mott 2000). The Grupo Gay da Bahia (GGB) reported that 190 LGBT persons were violently murdered in 2008 (Schulenberg 2010). One study conducted in Rio de

Janeiro revealed that 60% of LGBT persons experienced some type of discrimination due to their sexual orientation (Conselho Nacional de Combate à Discriminação 2004). In the same state, a hotline established for reporting discrimination or violence against gays and lesbians received more than 500 reports during the first 18 months of its implementation (Schulenberg 2010). More recent data confirms the trend: in 2011, there were 278 homicides nationwide due to homophobia reported in the year, with an average of 18.65 violations reported daily to organs related to the federal government (Calaf, Carvalho, and Rocha 2012). The same study reports that the state of Sao Paulo reported 1100 violations of LGBT rights (Calaf, Carvalho, and Rocha 2012, 75).

A 2010 nationally representative survey on attitudes of tolerance towards LGBT finds over 90% of respondents believe prejudice exists against LGBTs (Venturi 2011, 176).[10] Moreover, one in four respondents score positively on an index of homophobic attitudes, with 6% scoring as strongly homophobic; this is further subdivided into one in four women and one in three men (Venturi 2011, 181). Among these, respondents on both extremes of the age group (elderly and young) tend to hold more homophobic attitudes, as well as those who grew up in a rural setting and small towns with less access to formal education. Self identified evangelicals are two to three times more likely to hold homophobic attitudes than practitioners of spiritual or African religions. In a separate sample of 413 self identified gays or lesbians living in metropolitan areas, 53% reported discrimination at least once in their lifetime due to their sexual orientation or gender identity, with parents, classmates, friends, and colleagues as primary sources of discrimination (Venturi 2011, 182).

Given this situation, the passage of non-discrimination legislation and the criminalization

---

[10]Broken down by identity, the number of respondents believing prejudice existed for each is: lesbians (92%), gays (92%), bisexuals (90%), transsexuals (91%), and *travesti*s (93%) (Venturi 2011, 176).

of homophobia remain at the top of the LGBT agenda in Brazil (ABGLT 2006; de la Dehesa 2010; Freire and Cardinali 2012; Passamani 2009; Ramos and Carrara 2006; Schulenberg 2010). In pursuing policy change, the movement has engaged in what Rafael de la Dehesa terms an "early turn to the legislatures" (de la Dehesa 2010, 115). Accordingly, nearly one half of Brazilian states (12 of 26) and around one hundred cities provide some degree of protection for discrimination based upon sexual orientation (de la Dehesa 2010). A 2011 study of 5,564 municipal governments by the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics (IBGE) reported that 8.7% have programs related to combating violence against LGBTs, 1.4% have legislation directed related to discrimination, 1.8% have legislation recognizing LGBT rights, and 1.0% have legislation recognizing the use of social names by *trans persons* (Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística 2012, 97). Beyond this, substantial progress has been made in the areas of same-sex partnership recognition, HIV/AIDS treatment, and transgender rights (Freire and Cardinali 2012; Schulenberg 2010; Vianna and Carrara 2007).

Moreover, the 2011 Venturi study shows that a portion of the population believes that the government should be active in combating discrimination (Venturi 2011, 225). Of the general sample, 24% believed that the government should combat discrimination, while 70% claimed discrimination was a personal problem of those discriminated against. The subsample of gay and lesbian respondents expressed nearly opposite opinions, with 70% preferring government action and 26% claiming that it was a personal problem. When analyzing the types of action preferred by the government, the general sample expressed interest in legislation and laws (10%), programs, campaigns, and lectures (8%), and media propaganda (4%). The gay and lesbian subsample supported legislation and laws (33%), programs, campaigns, and lectures (31%), and media propaganda (9%). Clearly there is recognition, especially within the gay and lesbian

community, that the creation of public policies is an effective method by which to combat discrimination.

Of course, achieving public policy depends in part upon the ability of the social movement to engage the state as a policy actor. This transition requires the movement to overcome problems associated with collective action, as well as embracing more institutionalized tactics of engagement with democratic governments. As noted earlier, the Brazilian movement began during the period of the military dictatorship with the foundation of the gay militant group *Somos: Grupo de Afirmação Homossexual* in 1978 (Green 1999; Facchini 2005; Facchini and França 2009; MacRae 2005).[11] *Somos* emerged as a counter-culture group fiercely opposed to the authoritarian state advocating a strategy of cultural transformation from the margins to the center, reclamation of pejorative terms, and the opposition to hierarchical relations of power (Green 1999; MacRae 1990). From its inception, *Somos* experienced tension with the inclusion of lesbians (who eventually splintered off into the Grupo Lésbico Feminista[12]), engagement with political parties (such as the nascent Worker's Party), and other leftist groups (such as the feminist movement and Black movement) (Facchini and França 2009; MacRae 1990). On May 1, 1979, the failure of activists to collectively participate in the 120,000 person labor demonstration against the military regime splintered the nascent movement and resulted in the formation of *Outra Coisa*, comprised of activists staunchly committed to autonomy of the movement (Green 1999; 277).[13]

By the 1980s, democratization and HIV/AIDS profoundly destabilized the movement with a series of losses: the 1988 Constitutional Congress denied the inclusion of sexual

---

[11] Translation: SOMOS: Group of Homosexual.
[12] Translation: Lesbian Feminist Group.
[13] Translation: Something Else

orientation as a protected category in the new document, while the HIV/AIDS epidemic led to an increase in societal intolerance to gays and lesbians and a decrease in movement activity (Trevisan 2011). State responses to HIV/AIDS came slowly and unequally. While health policy today represents the most comprehensive and coherent set of public policies for LGBTs, attention to gay males leads to the invisibility, and vulnerability, of lesbians before the state (Almeida 2005; Mello, Perilo, de Braz, and Pedrosa 2011). Government response to HIV/AIDS also signaled the end of the era of the authoritarian state as the target of political *opposition* and the beginning of the era of the democratic state as the target of political *demands* (Facchini and França 2009).

During the 1990s, the movement began to regain traction through campaigns advocating pride, visibility, and an end to homophobic violence. The turn away from loftier strategies of social transformation, to more pragmatic solutions, saw the proliferation of activists and activist groups. The contemporary movement boasts an impressive array of interests and groups, from diversity within law, academia and labor, to strictly advocacy, HIV/AIDS, LGBT families, mothers and fathers of LGBTS, adolescents, blacks and other minorities. These are organized within an increasingly diverse set of institutional and organizational arrangements characterized by bureaucratic like specialization and expertise, following the contemporary model of NGOs (Facchini and França 2009).

But these changes jeopardized the organization of the movement, as differences in tactics, goals, and identity threatened to dissolve the movement into an "alphabet soup" of actors and paralyze collective mobilization (Facchini 2005). Regina Facchini identifies three specific lines of conflict within *CORSA*, one of the oldest organizations in São Paulo, Brazil [14] First,

---

[14] Facchini (2005) focuses primarily on the experiences of Cidadania, Orgulho, Respeito, Solidariedade e Amor

fragmentation occurs over differences in sexuality, and the linguistic and societal markers attached to certain terms. For students of LGBT politics, this is the familiar question of mobilizing an "alphabet soup" - lesbians, gays, bisexuals, *trans persons* – with extremely divergent sexual identities that cause hostility at once within, and between, each subgroup (Arantes 2010; Facchini 2005; Pinafi 2010). Second, disagreements over the proper level of action divides groups between internal projects focused on self acceptance and therapy, external projects focused on public policy, and engagement with HIV/AIDS (Facchini 2005, 218-48). Third, divergence in styles of activism separates local, state, and national groups, as some maintain the revolutionary aspect of the early movement and oppose hierarchical leadership/decision-making models that stymie creativity and collectivity (Facchini 2005). In light of this, a multiplicity of smaller interests is seen by *CORSA* as a more effective strategy for promoting LGBT rights in Brazil.

These observations apply to the broader Brazilian movement (Facchini 2005). Disputes over the exact nature of sexual identities – and whether or not gays, lesbians, bisexuals, and *trans persons* should be integrated under one banner, or segregated into separate social movements – remain common today. Indeed, the national movement adopted no fewer than eight unique variations on the contemporary acronym LGBT since 1993, illustrating the delicate nature of establishing a rhetorical symbol which fairly represents divergent subjectivities (Facchini 2009). The shuffling of these letters indicates political conflict over visibility, as between gays and lesbians - from GLBT to LGBT in 2008 to increase the visibility of lesbians - and inclusivity - where the T transitioned from simply *travestis* in 1995, to transgender in 1999, and now *travestis,*

(*CORSA*; Citizenship, Pride, Respect, Solidarity, and Love), a homosexual group turned NGO in Sao Paulo, Brazil. The original data collected by the researcher complements prior historical and sociological work conducted on the LGBT movement in Brazil. Through extensive interviews and participant observation, she presents a movement that confronts significant challenges to its mobilization and generalizes these trends to the broader social movement.

transsexuals, and transgenders in 2005.[15] These choices indicate conscientious choices on behalf of the movement to contend with tensions between groups and realize a more democratic structure of representation.[16]

Consideration of other factors, such as race, continues to exacerbate the divisions in the broader movement. . Moreover, disagreements over the appropriateness of umbrella organizations, such as statewide forums and (sub)national networks, jeopardize the effectiveness of mobilization. The emergence of the *ABGLT[17]*, as the dominant voice, along with a multiplicity of national networks creates a "delicate drama" over who speaks for, and whom is spoken for, the movement (Facchini 2009). For example, in 2012 Brazil witnessed the First National Seminar for Black LGBTs led by the National Network for Black LGBTs. The tactic of positioning ones organization as a better alternative to other organizations, within the same movement, may further destabilize the cohesion of a collective identity (Facchini 2005).

The tenuous relationship between an autonomous social movement and institutionalized political parties – problematic since the dawn of the movement in the late 70s - continues to challenge cohesion today. Indeed, as recently as 2002, the *APOGLBT*, responsible for organizing the several million strong annual São Paulo Pride Parade, suffered a serious rift when its then President ran for political office in the Chamber of Deputies (Santos 2006). Allegations of misuse of funds from corporate sponsors and an abuse of visibility by the event for personal gains created such a rift that an affiliate organization (*CORSA*) nearly collapsed because of an overlap in membership. The polemic problematized the movement's relationship with the municipal government and led to a general "isolation of groups of the Paulistano movement and

---

[15] For a detailed discussion of the chronology of these changes, see Facchini (2005) and Facchini (2009).
[16] Facchini (2009) also details conflict that arises between subjectivities self-determined by the movement and those imposed by the state (HSH, men who have sex with men) and the market (GLS, gay, lesbian, and ally *simpatizante*).
[17] Brazilian Association of Gays, Lesbians, Bisexuals, Transsexuals and *Travesti*s.

18

the difficulty to execute actions together" (Santos 2006, 38).

Finally, the movement still debates the importance of maintaining autonomy from the state. As the state becomes more involved with civil society, the discussion has shifted from primarily theoretical to one of instrumental consequences. For example, limited state funds for HIV/AIDS prevention creates a competition for financial resources between LGBT organizations (Facchini and França 2009). And the creation of bureaucratic entities to specific to the LGBT community engenders serious political conflict within members of the movement for a limited number of prestigious positions (Santos 2006).[18]

These factors lead to a movement that suffers from fragmentation and fragility, if the basis for such mobilization is to be identity. For Facchini and França (2009), this necessitates a reinterpretation of political subjectivities for identity politics in one of three ways: 1) denaturalizing identities through recognition of historical contingency and contextualization; 2) acknowledging separate interests and social inequalities that divide identities; or 3) abandoning the antithetical arrangement of equality and difference in favor of a politics of solidarity that emphasizes interconnectivity and intersectionality.[19] These academic prescriptions, unfortunately, do little in the way of proposing pragmatic solutions that can be translated from theory to praxis.

If identity is insufficient for overcoming collective action problems, then how can we explain public policy successes by the LGBT movement in contemporary politics? How do we account for the sustained advocacy efforts in combating discrimination on behalf of LGBT organizations? In spite of these very real divisions, both organizationally and tactically, we

---

[18] One such example is CADS - Coordenadoria de Assuntos de Diversidade Sexual (Coordination for Issues of Sexual Diversity) established in 2005 by the São Paulo municipal government (Santos 2006). The initial meeting between city and movement representatives resulted in an impasse, with no representative chosen to fill the position of Coordinator. Subsequent representatives have enjoyed only very brief tenures as Coordinator.
[19] These prescriptions find theoretical basis in the work of 1) Judith Butler; 2) Donna Haraway; and 3) Joan Scott and Avtar Brah, respectively.

hypothesize that the LGBT movement has achieved advocacy success via a coherent narrative that links deep core beliefs and policy core beliefs.

Research Design

To test our hypothesis, we analyze the case of São Paulo state non-discrimination policy 10.948 – a mature policy subsystem of ten years or more - through the lens of advocacy coalition framework, with specific attention to the role of narrative. This case provides a unique opportunity to examine how narrative enables actors with divergent interests and backgrounds to come together as a coalition in support of public policy.

We utilize elite interviews, treated as narratives, as our primary data source. This technique has two clear benefits: first, work in understudied policy subsystems using the ACF should begin with elite interviews (Weible and Sabatier 2006); second, narratives are particularly appropriate for exploring research questions related to formation of individual and group identity (Riessman 1993). Thus, interviews are an appropriate source of data for our hypothesis related to discursive production of belief systems in advocacy coalitions.

Data for this project was collected during two months of fieldwork in São Paulo in the summer of 2011.[20] In total, the data consist of narratives from fourteen semi-structured elite interviews, satisfying established saturation criteria for nonprobabilistic samples (Guest, Bunce, and Johnson 2006).[21] In total, the interviews provide 11.6 hours of data, with an average interview time of 50 minutes.[22] Interviews were supplemented by a number of informal and

---

[20] Part of the fieldwork coincided with national LGBT pride month. This coincidence guaranteed an elevated level of activity by actors in the policy subsystem. It also facilitated the building of rapport and access, both critical to qualitative fieldwork, to many state-level policy actors (Kleinman 2007).

[21] The saturation point for nonprobabilistic samples of interview data is generally accepted at twelve (Guest, Bunce, and Johnson 2006).

[22] Interviews were ordinarily conducted in office space, personal homes, or community centers. All interviews were

group respondent sessions (seminars, conferences, public debates, NGO meetings, etc) and general participant observation by the researcher. At all times, extensive field notes were recorded to inform the research beyond prepared interview questions.

We identified potential respondents for our semi-structured elite interviews prior to entering the field.[23] We selected final respondents as those actors with active participation in public conferences, forums, and events in support of LGBT pride month. As the interview process progressed, respondents indicated other potential interviewees, incorporating a basic snowball technique to broaden the sample, gain access, and build rapport among these elites (Kleinmann 2007).

Overall, the final sample of fourteen respondents represents a broad cross-section of the policy subsystem, consistent with the theoretical specifications of ACF. The sample includes academics, bureaucrats, activists, lawyers and politicians, many of which hold dual positions within the policy subsystem. Moreover, the interview sample includes lesbian, gay, bisexual, transsexual, *travesti*, and heterosexual identities.[24] In total, 6 of the 14 respondents identified with a feminine gender identity (lesbian, feminine *travesti,* transsexual, or transgender); 8 of the 14 respondents identified with a masculine gender identity (gay or male heterosexual). The age of respondents varied substantially in ranges of 18-24 (2), 25-40 (4), and 40+ (8). The sample also includes diversity in level of involvement within the policy subsystem, with two local level LGBT non-governmental organizations, four state level non-governmental organizations, and several actors involved in the national level Brazilian Association of Gays, Lesbians, Bisexuals,

conducted by the researcher in Brazilian Portuguese without the aid of a translator and recorded with a digital recording device.

[23] This process was done through analysis of documents made available by the Legislative Assembly of São Paulo State. Several of these documents provided insight as to the actors involved in supporting the non-discrimination law. These actors were recorded in a spreadsheet and contacted prior to arrival in the field.

[24] The Brazilian LGBT movement makes a conscious effort to achieve descriptive representation within public functions, such as state level or national conferences (Rodrigues 2011).

Transsexuals and *Travesti*s (ABGLT). Finally, respondents were overwhelmingly affiliated with

the Worker's Party (PT), consistent with previous literature on the LGBT movement in Brazil (de

la Dehesa 2010; Marsiaj 2006).[25]

It is important to emphasize the diversity within the sample of respondents for several

reasons. First, it captures the complex dynamics which could further divide and fragment

mobilization of the movement: respondents clearly come from diverse backgrounds, hold diverse

interests, and claim diverse identities. Second, the sample reproduces the expectations of ACF

when surveying a policy subsystem. While this study refers to the actors collectively as "part of

the LGBT movement," individual respondents affiliate themselves with various bureaucratic and

institutional arrangements while engaging in movement politics.

The interview questionnaire used in this research was created prior to departure for

fieldwork. Multiple questions were employed to measure the deep core beliefs and policy core

beliefs theorized to underpin belief systems (Sabatier and Weible 2007, 195). General questions

stimulated respondents to think about their core beliefs and more targeted questions prompted

respondents to think of individual aspects of the non-discrimination policy. Minor adjustments

were made throughout the fieldwork process to improve the reliability of responses in

subsequent interviews. The full questionnaire appears in Appendix C.[26]

---

[25] This is also partially an artifact of the snowball sampling technique, but does not detract from the substantive findings of the research.

[26] Perhaps the most challenging aspect of the interview process was to design questions that would provide data on belief systems, both in terms of deep core beliefs and policy-core beliefs. Previous research using survey methods typically asks respondents to rate their views, on a 1-7 scale, on a certain issue. Translating this measurement into an interview question about support for LGBT rights, non-discrimination policy, or equality in general presents two key challenges. First, survey style questions are inappropriate for the interview process. Asking a respondent "how important do you rate..." will not provide the level of precision guaranteed in a survey response. One can imagine a host of responses varying from "it's important" to "it's very important" that are necessarily subjective in their attachment of preferences. Moreover, this structure is inappropriate for an interview in a number of ways. Questions should be designed broadly to stimulate richer data. Questions should not employ the concepts of interest in the question, to avoid researcher imposed bias on the responses. In other words, the core beliefs and policy core beliefs of the respondents should not be primed by asking questions specifically focused on equality, equal rights, fairness,

We treat each interview as a narrative and content analyze the transcript in the original language. Content analysis is an appropriate method by which one can analyze textual data, such as governmental documents, public policies, legislative proposals, and interview transcripts (Riessman 1993; Weber, 1990). When applied to narratives, content analysis "is unobtrusive, allows for a reliability analysis, permits a longitudinal analysis, and is efficient and inexpensive" (McBeth et al. 2007, 93).

Content analysis proceeded in three parts.[27] First, individual interview questions were pre-coded based upon their conceptual focus, allowing for similar stimulae to be aggregated for a comparative analysis of responses. Next, an initial reading of the transcripts identified emergent themes in the narratives. These themes served as the basis for categories that represent one core belief and five policy core beliefs for the entire sample. Based upon these categories, a standardized coding schema was developed to ensure for the accuracy of results (Ryan and Bernard 2003; Weber 1990, 17). A second phase of content analysis used these categories to deductively code for the presence of each belief for each respondent. Categories are not mutually exclusive, as they represent beliefs held by actors in the policy subsystem. Categories identified from the content analysis are presented Appendix E. The themes characterizing each category are presented together.

Analysis

We first look to the content of the policy as a source for potential themes that may influence the narratives of subsystem actors. This is important because the public policy itself may provide an

---

etc. Belief structures must be identified inductively through analysis of responses on broader questions that thematically structure the interview.

[27] Content analysis was done using NVivo10 software.

organizational structure around which narratives are positioned. As mentioned in the introduction, the final text of the law 10.948 is the same as the original proposal, save for the absence of the justification. The law itself provides no indication of a narrative structure that could influence the discourse of subsystem actors: it simply supplies the juridical limits of the policy. However, in the justification provided by the original proposal (PL667/2000, Appendix A), Deputy Renato Simões makes brief overtures to the guarantee of constitutional equality, preventing discrimination, analogous minority situations, and societal change. He writes that the Constitution "ensured the explicit equality of all before the law" and it falls upon the government to "mak[e] explicit that discrimination is prohibited by law" through awareness and the construction of society that values the "recognition of individual differences" (PL667/2000, Appendix A). In the proceeding analysis, we find that these arguments reappear in the belief systems and narratives of the advocacy coalition.

This work analyzes interview data for the presence of deep core beliefs and policy core beliefs. Deep core beliefs are identified as ontological or normative values. Policy core beliefs are identified as policy specific beliefs that can be either normative or empirical in nature. According to ACF, the presence of one deep core belief and two to three policy core beliefs should be sufficient for identifying an advocacy coalition (Sabatier and Weible 2007). Our choice of interview data allows for an analysis of the discursive production of these beliefs, and hence, the role of narrative in holding together a historically divided advocacy coalitions.

We find that narratives contain one deep core belief related to equality and five policy core beliefs: causes of the problem, seriousness of the problem, implementation, solutions, and evaluations of the policy. These policy core beliefs consist of several subcategories that relate to the broader issue at stake and are thematically consistent with past work on belief systems in

ACF (Pierce 2011; Sabatier 1998; Weible 2005; 2006). In the analysis that follows, we present each belief with examples drawn from the narratives of this study. Response frequencies are available in Table 1 and noted in parentheses throughout the text.

Deep core beliefs

Sabatier (1998) suggests that deep core beliefs often surface in the form of the traditional left-right political divide, signaling fundamental differences in political values. At the broadest level, arguments for the equal rights (n=14) of LGBT persons in Brazil provide the glue for the members of this advocacy coalition. Thus, equality is identified as the deep core belief for this advocacy coalition. This study finds that, while the left-right scale provides a useful heuristic in understanding deep core beliefs, a closer look within a single coalition reveals considerable variation in the ideological source of these deep core beliefs.

This language differed slightly amongst respondents, suggesting divergent traditions of engagement with the political process. Some respondents made direct overtures to political liberalism, emphasizing the importance of guaranteeing individual rights, human dignity, and the choice to the good life. For example, one respondent, a middle-aged gay male, evoked Millsian notions of the harm principle in defense of sexual diversity, arguing that "so long as it does not cause harm to a third person……then the State does not have influence over [sexual orientation]. It's good old liberalism (laughing)" (Interview 03).

A second narrative took a more humanitarian approach, seeking to appeal to notions of a shared social fate. The rhetoric employed by these respondents draws upon the tradition of social democracy espoused by the Brazilian Worker's Party. These arguments intimately place the liberal individual as part of, not apart from, society and community. However, even those most

committed to a broader conception of social democracy nevertheless grounded their justifications in the language of human rights and equality. One respondent, a middle-aged transsexual woman, emphasized the importance to humanity in abiding by, and observing, an idea as abstract as individual rights: "I think that people, if they have a humanitarian sentiment…then they will be able to comprehend and live with the differences that exist…not only in discourse, but also in praxis…while there is not respect, rights will never be human" (Interview 01).

A third common tendency appealed to constitutional protections of equality and dignity. This type of rationale, while certainly couched in liberal rights, more forcefully emphasizes the importance of rule of law in democratic institutions. Equality becomes important because of constitutional guarantees, *not* because of a philosophical commitment to political liberalism: """… everyone ought to have the same rights. We are not all equal, like our Constitution says, we are different people. But, we out to have the same rights, you know? Everyone has the same rights and the same responsibilities. So, I do not see why a person should be excluded, or lose their rights, for having a different skin color, or sexual orientation…they do not stop being human, so they should have the same rights" (Interview 02). This discursive tactic in a developing democracy such as Brazil, potentially serves the strategic role of accessing, and reinforcing, institutional guarantees of equality.

One respondent used language that diverged significantly from the expression of deep core beliefs by other respondents. A search function in the interview transcript retrieved zero results for the use of terms such as *rights*, *equality*, or *human*. However, when the term *equal* was employed, the context referred to discrimination as originating out of a "fear of equality" by the heterosexual majority. A second instance referred specifically to a new tactic, by which the LGBT movement appropriated religious language to appeal to equality:: "when we say, 'love one

another as I have loved you', it is the word of Jesus, that was written in the Bible, and it wants to say this: that we are all equal, that we have only one Father, who is God" (Interview 14).[28] In this sense, appeals to equality are not based in secular liberal rights or legal arguments, but rather in a Lockean conception of natural rights as ordained by God.

The presence of equality as a deep core belief is important for several reasons. In a developing democracy such as Brazil, the concept of constitutionally guaranteed political equality dates back to as recently as 1988. Moreover, the early Brazilian LGBT movement employed a counter-culture, anarchist discourse that eschewed engagement with the state in favor of an agonistic position (Green 1999; MacRae 1990). Instead, narratives deployed a language of political liberalism that recognized the state as a legitimate democratic institution and the welfare of citizens as its primary concern. In light of the fragmented nature of the movement, it is surprising that the language of equal rights now serves as the deep core belief for members of the advocacy coalition.

Policy core beliefs

Causes of the problem

Narratives contained four main causal stories in regards to reasons for discrimination against gays and lesbians. These stories referred to structural causes (n=14), religious causes (n=14), conservative causes (n=13), and internalized causes (n=5) of discrimination, differentiated by their sources of power and objects of oppression

The consistency with which respondents identified structural causes, religious causes, and conservative causes is striking. While there is some conceptual overlap (religious

---

[28] John 15:9-17

fundamentalism implies a certain level of conservatism), there is also undoubtedly a difference that hinges on the ideological component of conservatism in the political climate. We begin to see the role of perceptual filters in the creation of causal stories. ACF assumes that members of the advocacy coalition use perceptual filters as part of the devil shift process and systematically conflate different phenomena under one larger umbrella, overestimate the power and of their opponents, and underestimate their own (Sabatier and McLaughlin 1987). We find evidence for this in the use of causal stories (Stone 1989; 2002) by members of the advocacy coalition.

Structural causes reflect a view that Brazilian culture and society is inherently homophobic, machista, and/or heteronormative. These causal stories described systems of power which structural societal relations: homophobia suggests an outright and irrational disdain and rejection of gays and lesbians; machismo refers to the patriarchal control and misogynistic treatment of women; heteronormativety establishes heterosexuality as the status quo against which all other sexualities are deemed inferior (Borrillo 2010).

Another narrative identified religion, specifically evangelicalism and/or Catholicism, as responsible for inciting violence against LGBTs. This violence occurs through the indoctrination of fundamentalist values and the explicit invocation of hateful rhetoric, mainly on behalf of religious leaders. Evangelical groups and strains of conservatism within the Catholic Church (though to a lesser extent) were seen as fundamentally at odds with the members of the policy subsystem supporting the anti-discrimination law. The difference in the perceived effects of these two groups correlates with perceptions of their political influence. For many, the evangelical movement aggressively seeks political power through the use of the pulpit, while the Brazilian Catholic Church is largely absent from contemporary politics.[29]

---

[29] The Catholic Church was placed on the sidelines of political conflict during the era of the military dictatorship

Of course, respondents were cautious against generalizing religion as a cause for discrimination, per se. Clearly, some members of the policy subsystem hold strong religious values and convictions themselves. But these values manifest in the tradition of liberation theology, popular in Latin America. Indeed, several respondents indicated their first political inclinations originated from experiences in ecclesiastical groups with the objective of establishing a Marxist class consciousness.[30]

The third category of conservative causes defines conservative values and conservative political positions. This category taps into the ideological differences between generally leftist members of the policy subsystem and their perceptions of the political environment as conservative. Moreover, narratives explained political backlash as "part of a conservative reaction that we are seeing in Brazil because the LGBT community is managing to secure its rights....[and] nobody believed that conservatives would sit quietly in their corner and accept that the LGBT community secured their rights" (Interview 12). Indeed, during the fieldwork, a proposal officially sanction heterosexual pride day passed the São Paulo State Assembly (Domingos 2011).[31] A second source of backlash was seen as the increased visibility of the LGBT movement, in that prompts organization on behalf of the conservative sectors of society. To counteract this, one strategy is "to bring the rest of society that is in the middle, that is not with us today, and is not with them, but is in the center, and bring this population to our side by saying… 'look, we are equal; we do not want any privilege like the conservative wing says. We want equal rights!'" (Interview 13).

Finally, internalized causes cited internalized homophobia by LGBTs as a source of self

---

(1964-1985).

[30] It is also important to note that, while not interviewed for this research, several clergy attended the Sao Paulo Municipal LGBT Forum, representing progressive 'open and accepting' denominations progressive 'open and accepting' denominations. Their participation is seen as a sign of progress by members of the subsystem.

[31] This proposal was vetoed by Governor Alckmin (Domingos 2011).

discrimination. Narratives illustrated that many gays and lesbians consider themselves deserving of punishment as transgressors of societal norms: "even homosexuals do not feel like they have the right to appeal to the law because a lot of homosexuals, to a certain degree, inside of themselves, internally, they think that they, quote unquote, deserve to be discriminated" (Interview 04). These arguments underscored the difficulty of self acceptance within the LGBT community that leads some to accept discrimination.

Seriousness of the problem

Narratives also included policy core beliefs related to the seriousness of the problem. Respondents indicated three evaluations that referred to different targets of discrimination within the broader LGBT community. The first emphasizes that discrimination affects all persons equally (n=10); the second that discrimination impacts trans-identified individuals more (n=6); and the third, that discrimination affects the economically disadvantaged more (n=4). Importantly, a policy core belief that focuses on the seriousness of the problem aids in the development of a shared fate that social movement scholars consider fundamental to identitarian politics (Weldon 2011; Williams 1998). The discursive reproduction of this shared fate is another step in solidifying the advocacy coalition around a cohesive narrative.

First, one common belief was that discrimination of LGBTs affects all persons equally within the LGBT community. Thus, lesbians, gays, bisexuals, and *trans persons* all confront a shared phenomenon that is discrimination. At times, this is broadened to a societal view that discrimination affects heterosexual quality of life as well because a "society that does not discriminate is better for everyone. It is more plural, more tolerant, and more inclusive" (Interview 03).

A second common theme in these narratives emphasized how marginalized transgender identities suffer an inordinate amount of discrimination in various facets of life, such as housing and employment. This is typically explained as a result of the visibility of their identity in the public sphere, contrasted with the ability of homosexual men to pass as heterosexual. For example, "*travesti*s and transsexuals [suffer most]because she changes her gender identity, she identifies with the feminine gender, so she will dress according to their feminine gender identity…and this becomes more visible to society, right? And it is where society will attack, where those with prejudice will strike" (Interview 01).Thus, visibility marks *trans persons* as targets of discrimination.[32] Second, discrimination manifests in a myriad of ways, including the violent attacks aimed at *trans persons* to the no less innocuous denial of work, especially in the private sphere. Third, pathways for coping with discrimination are through the public sector, and not the private sector. In essence, discrimination relegates *trans persons* to an inferior status as second-class citizens, subject to a life of existence without the guarantee of a life of equality and human dignity enshrined in the Constitution.

Finally, narratives also included the belief that discrimination is harsher for economically disadvantaged LGBTs. These evaluations emphasized the disparity between wealthy gays and lesbians, who with their economic resources avoid societal discrimination.[33] One respondent, a middle-aged Afro-Brazilian lesbian, provided an interesting account of discrimination which starts by asserting that discrimination affects all equally, but ultimately concludes that the poor suffer more: "you cannot even begin to compare [discrimination]. Women also suffer, so do blacks, and LGBTs, each one of these letters has its individual share of suffering. [But] I think

---

[32] While statistics are not available, the Grupo Gay da Bahia (GGB) claims that *trans persons* are victims of more outright violence in Brazil than gays, lesbians, and bisexuals combined (Mott 2011).

[33] Similar claims have been made in regards experience of some prominent Afro-Brazilians, who through the acquisition of economic power and social status, transcended societal racism directed at the broader group (Twine 2001).

that the poor suffer more [discrimination]. I think that it is a question of class because the poor have less access..." (Interview 10).One respondent, a middle-aged gay male, even drew a parallel between me (the researcher) to illustrate this point. He quite astutely mapped out the privileges afforded in Brazilian society based upon the intersections of race, class, and gender, offering that "as a member of a certain sector of society – middle class, white, educated, friendly, handsome…evidently, you will not experience open discrimination of someone saying, 'oh you are gay.' This type of thing is not going to happen. But if you were with your partner and wanted to buy a house together, well, then you would have a problem...." (Interview 08).

Implementation

Narratives also contained policy core beliefs about the implementation of the non-discrimination policy 10.948. Four categories showed preferences for improvements in institutional structures (n=12), propaganda campaigns (n=12), data collection (n=9), and collaboration with other social movements (n=8). Here we begin to see the advocacy coalition tackle some of the contentious issues that divided the movement in earlier eras, especially in regards to institutional structures and collaboration with other social movements. While there is no consensus on these issues, it is important to note their presence in the policy core beliefs for implementation of the current policy. For one, discursive commitment to the core belief of equality may mitigate the threat of coalitional breakdown. Moreover, narrative may prove a fruitful medium for addressing these concerns in a democratic manner and thus avoid the ideological debates that fragmented the earlier social movement.

First, narratives reflect a desire by respondents to see more institutional support to tackle shortcomings in the implementation of the non-discrimination law. For citizens to utilize the

state-wide law, they must travel to the capital city of São Paulo in order to file a complaint. Recognizing that the bureaucratic nature of this process deters many from pursuing litigation, respondents suggest the creation of localized reporting centers so that "people could go and be attended to by a lawyer, a psychologist, a social worker, and tell them their problems" (Interview 09).[34] Indeed, all members of the policy subsystem who actuate at primarily the local level expressed preferences for improved institutional structures. Local level NGOs frequently act as intermediaries who assist in the process of filing a complaint and attempt to move legal proceedings to a local level courthouse.

Second, narratives overwhelmingly indicated a preference for improvements in the dissemination of the law through propaganda campaigns. Members of the policy subsystem shared a general sense that the LGBT community, and broader public, is unaware of the non-discrimination policy. This unawareness contributes in part to low figures of utilization of the law. While data is not readily available to the public, the best estimates from interview respondents indicate that around 300 cases of discrimination have been reported and resolved in the ten years since the law was passed. For one middle-aged lesbian working in public health, her role as an activist concentrated on raising awareness about the existence of the non-discrimination law: "I am only doing the propaganda. Our objective is to divulge the law to the maximum that can be done with pamphlets [during]the month of diversity, the entire time…and always when I can, I go around speaking about it to those who do not know the law" (Interview 10).

Even so, members of the policy subsystem recognized that disclosure is a responsibility shared by both the social movement and the state. The social movement must maintain

---

[34] These are called *Reference Centers* (Centros de Referência).

nondiscrimination at the top of their agenda and "exercise[s] a certain vigilance as to the validity of the law, the legitimacy of the law, and the application of the law" (Interview 08).The state must also contribute financial resources and oversight to aid in this process. This complicated relationship reflects the corporatist quality of Brazilian politics.[35] For one heterosexual male respondent, the Sao Paulo state government has abandoned its obligation to fully incorporate non-discrimination into its agenda after policy adoption, claiming that "… violence still continues to be very strong...In these past ten years, are few cases were brought to the State for judgment. Moreover, the State [has] abandon[ed] its legal requirement to divulge the content of the law. So, in police stations, health centers, and schools that could all be a space for disclosing the law, the State has not invested in doing [this task] that the law requires" (Interview 07).

Several narratives drew parallels between a recent state wide ban on smoking in public spaces and the ten year old non-discrimination law. The anti-smoking law was accompanied by an aggressive media campaign and enforcement policy that blanketed the city; however, the first state financed propaganda campaign of the non-discrimination policy took nine years to occur. For example, one critique was offered by a middle-aged gay male who stated that the non-discrimination law "never was, and never had importance on the political agenda [of the government]. If it had been, you would have seen a campaign to create signs [that say you cannot discriminate] and put them in all [establishments]. The law was never at the top of the agenda, it was marginal" (Interview 03). Moreover, other respondents cited the national legislation, known as Maria da Penha, which criminalized domestic violence against women and was actively disclosed by the federal government.

Narratives included policy core beliefs in regards to improvements in data collection

---

[35] For a discussion of corporatism in Brazil, see Collier and Collier (1979).

techniques as a priority for improving implementation. Data collection on acts of discrimination of marginalized groups presents a number of quandaries familiar to researchers in the social sciences: victims of discrimination often do not want to be associated with, or do not identify with, an LGBT identity; in instances of homicide, families do not report the sexual orientation of the victim; police do not consider sexual orientation as a motive for violence, etc. One respondent, a middle-aged gay statistician, with intermittent participation in the movement, was actively working to compile a database of discrimination because there ought to be data, but I have never seen them published… it seems like…crimes related to homophobia…are rising. But it is unclear if they are rising because they are being reported more, or because the mechanism for reporting is clearer…or if this is a societal reaction to the greater visibility that LGBTs are obtaining." (Interview 04).Thus, data is seen as necessary to improve claims to legitimacy in the causal story at the heart of the coalition narrative. One respondent, a gay middle-aged lawyer, recognized the importance of harnessing empirical data in establishing a societal condition as a societal problem: "the level of violence is very high..with [data], it would be easier for us to understand the profile [of violence]. And it would also be possible to develop public policies. Currently, it is that thing where you do not know what came first - the chicken or the egg? You do not have public policies because you do not have [data]. And you do not have [data] because you do not have public policy! (laughing)" (Interview 11).This fundamental step in agenda setting, seen in the research of Rochefort and Cobb (1994) and Kingdon (1995), represents a certain paradox in public policy: without data, one cannot establish that a problem exists and acquire institutional support for a policy program; without a policy, one cannot collect the data on discrimination to assess the scope and magnitude of its impact.

Fourth, preference for working in collaboration with other social movements suggested a

belief that discrimination affects marginalized groups in a similar manner. It also indicated a

desire to expand the scope of the conflict to include other identity-based movements that could

prove beneficial in coalition building (Schattschneider1975). One respondent, a middle-aged gay

educator, with a lifetime of experience in leftist social movements, lamented the insular nature of

identity movements that historically were very separated and individualistic" (Interview 08).

This results in an attitude whereby "participants say my [interest] is the LGBT question, so let's

leave racism to the blacks, feminism to the women, and this ends up with a very shortsighted

view." More narratives identified parallels to the sexism and racism confronting the woman's

movement and Afro-Brazilian movement. One NGO even incorporated the three forms of

oppression together as the slogan for their annual LGBT Pride Parade: "Our theme was [city]

without machismo, without racism, and without homophobia…we thought it would be

interesting to open the dialogue with these other social movements, because we understand that

our struggle needs to be united. It is not worth it to conduct your struggle separated and isolated.

The objective is the same; it is a struggle against intolerance, a struggle for human rights"

(Interview 12).

Solutions

Advocacy coalitions propose solutions to the problem at hand based on personal beliefs

ostensibly related to technical efficacy (Sabatier and Weible 2007). Scholars in narrative policy

analysis remind us that these solutions offer tools are based upon behavioral assumptions about

the policy targets (Ingram and Schneider 1990; Stone 1989). In our narratives, respondents

formulated alternative solutions to the problem of discrimination and advocated the use of

different tools to combat discrimination: a preference for the criminalization of discrimination

(14), pedagogical solutions (9), and legal solutions (10). In this section, narrative brings to light the behavioral assumptions behind proposed solutions and offers another point of convergence for actors working behind perceptual filters.

Respondents unanimously supported the criminalization of discrimination based upon sexual orientation (referred to colloquially as homophobia). As a rhetorical tactic, narratives cast the criminalization of racism and domestic violence as precedents for the criminalization of homophobia. This reflected the campaign to pass federal legislation (known as PLC122) as "a form of federalizing this [state] law, turning discrimination into a crime" (Interview 08). Currently, the policy imposes pecuniary measures that are seen as insufficient. For example, according to a white middle-aged gay respondent, "the punishments that you have are administrative. You pay a fine, or suspend, or close a business establishment. This would be very different to having a law where you could go to jail." (Interview 08).

Pedagogical solutions prioritized education about sexual diversity in public schools. One middle-aged gay lawyer advocated for public policies in education "to deal with the mentality of homophobia. You have to work with education, public education, private education, and school curricula in the choice of [educational] material. Teaching human rights, respecting differences, and dealing with the question of sexual rights, specifically as human rights" (Interview 11). Providing education and information to diminish discrimination can be seen as a capacity building tool, one which assumes that the propensity to discriminate is not an inherent characteristic of individuals; rather, it is a behavior that can be altered through pedagogical engagement with citizens. Indeed, a young gay activist argued in favor of targeting children at a young age "because [that is where] prejudice starts and bullying begins" (Interview 12).

Finally, members of the policy subsystem pointed to the importance of additional legal

solutions to combat discrimination. Legal solutions focused on the formulation of public policies to consolidate the legal rights of LGBTs. Issue areas for legal solutions spanned the gamut of possibilities, from stronger work protections, stronger discrimination protections, adoption for same sex couples, partnership rights, to mandated education about sexual diversity.

Evaluations

In their narratives, members of the policy subsystem provided candid evaluations about the success of the law 10.948 in achieving its goals. These sentiments were captured primarily through the question: "4. Do you think that the law accomplished its objectives?" Coding for this category resulted in three evaluations: positive, mixed, and negative, with response frequencies of 3, 4, and 7, respectively.[36]

Negative evaluations of the law focused primarily on the shortcomings already outlined in this research. Members of the policy subsystem cite problems in implementation, a lack of solutions, the pervasive nature of the problem, and the difficulty at attacking the causes of discrimination. Mixed evaluations balanced some of the benefits of the policy with these shortcomings. One interesting response is offered by a middle-aged heterosexual member of the Worker's Party. This narrative focused on the non-tangible returns from passing the non-discrimination policy, such as the mobilization and increased visibility of the movement, due to the existence of a legal channel through which demands could be pressed upon the state. In essence, the policy"…permitted organized groups to transform these denunciations into cases

---

[36] Responses were categorized as negative if they vehemently disagreed with the statement that the law accomplished its objectives and positive if they fully agreed. Responses that presented ambivalent positions were coded as mixed, positively evaluating some aspects while negatively evaluating others. This conservative approach to coding was done to err on the side of caution. The results presented in this section should be viewed tentatively, as respondents were not provided any strict criteria by which to measure success. Rather, they were free to employ their own standards in assessing the law

with large repercussion in public opinion. These cases [were] brought to the attention of the State [and] permitted the visibility of homophobia. [They] permitted [the movement] to show exemplary cases of problems that LGBTs deal with every day. And this has an important role in the creation of an awareness that homophobia exists and that it is a real problem in the lives of people" (Interview 07).

Respondents that viewed the law as successful in achieving its objectives looked past the shortcomings of its design and focused on positive outcomes. These members substantiated their claims with concrete examples of the law in action. Two of the three responses pointed to prominent cases of well known super markets being cited for discrimination and the broad repercussion this had in the news media. For example, one middle-aged lesbian who worked in the public bureaucracy offered an assessment, replete with statistical observations, that commercial establishment[s]…end up being obligated to educate their employees on how to deal with sexual diversity….on how to deal with lesbians, gays, principally *travesti*s and transsexuals. And that ends up being a very important step in education" (Interview 09). Another offered the somewhat solemn assessment that the law was the best the movement could hope for, all things considered:" I think that [the law] accomplished what was possible in that era, at the start of the 2000s. And the law achieved, and continues achieving this function, that is to say to society that this type of discrimination is not acceptable" (Interview 08).

Discussion

This research set out to understand several questions related to Brazilian LGBT. We asked *how* the Brazilian LGBT movement has been able to transition from its role as a radical social movement to a successful policy actor. We also asked *how* the movement has been able to

overcome challenges to collective action on behalf of sexual identity. The primary goal of this study was to outline the causal mechanisms by which these processes occur. To do this, we developed a case study of non-discrimination policy 10.948 using the advocacy coalition framework (ACF) tempered with insights from narrative policy analysis (NPA).

First, we tested narratives for the presence of belief systems that characterize the advocacy coalition framework. Consistent with ACF, we find that narratives contain deep core beliefs and policy core beliefs shared by members of the policy subsystem. Members of the advocacy coalition in favor of the law structure their narratives around a deep core belief reflecting commitment to equality. The left-right scale provides a useful baseline for understanding deep core beliefs, but a closer look at the variations within a single coalition reveals considerably more depth in these values. For this study, respondents differed in their engagement with liberalism, oscillating between social democratic and classical liberal traditions of thought. Thus, this research offers empirical evidence, through content analysis of narratives, of a distinct advocacy coalition in the non-discrimination policy 10.948 in Sao Paulo, Brazil.

Second, we showed that policy core beliefs further structure and different the internal beliefs of coalition members. While respondents were more or less unanimous in their identification of the primary causes of discrimination, they differed distinctly in assessments of the severity of the problem, preferences for implementation practices, solutions, and evaluations of the law. These variations are to be expected within an advocacy coalition, as policy core beliefs are more amenable to change and compromise than deep core beliefs.

In this case, advocacy coalitions provide a source of deep core beliefs and policy core beliefs for their members.[37] The alternative, that beliefs exist prior to coalition membership,

---

[37] We recognize the contention that core beliefs are normative and ontological in nature, and by some accounts,

seems less compelling in light of the empirical evidence of this study. Support for this account of the temporal sequence of belief systems comes from evidence of the dynamics of the gay and lesbian movement in historical context. First, in a developing democracy such as Brazil, the concept of political equality is relatively new. Second, the early Brazilian LGBT movement employed an agonistic discourse that discouraged moderate engagement with the state (Green 1999; MacRae 1990). As shown, work by scholars on the Brazilian gay and lesbian movement of the 1990s documented a loosely defined coalition fragmented by a number of differences that precluded the creation of a collective identity (Facchini 2005; Facchini 2009; Facchini and França 2009; Santos 2006).

It is important to emphasize once again that the sample of respondents in this study represented a broad subsection of society. For all intents and purposes, the sample differed significantly in terms of the traditional sociological demarcations, such as age, class, race, gender, sexual identity, and occupational profession. Thus, there is substantial evidence to suppose that collective action on behalf of these individuals should suffer many of the same difficulties that afflicted Facchini's movement of the '90s.

Instead, the Brazilian gay and lesbian movement circumvents these disputes through the discursive construction of shared belief systems. These belief systems manifest empirically through the production and reproduction of a shared narrative characterized by commitments to equality. This process aids in the development and crystallization of a collective identity. Thus, belief systems serve as the binding glue which holds this advocacy coalition, and larger social movement, together. This glue is reinforced through policy core beliefs. First, the identification

---

fixed at a young age (Sabatier 1998). However, we question the legitimacy of this assumption outside of the United States for the reasons outlined in the text. Thus, we view the consistency with which "equality" structured narratives as evidence of a more constructivist interpretation of core beliefs.

of causes of discrimination of gays and lesbians allows for the movement to identify a commonly perceived threat against which to organize. Second, assessments on the severity of discrimination emphasize that discrimination affects all members of the group equally. Taken together, policy core beliefs enable actors to strengthen the notion of a shared fate, which is key to identity movements, and also factors into the model of the individual proposed by ACF (Sabatier and Weible 2007; Weldon 2011; Williams 1998). Members of the policy subsystem continually fortify this shared fate through the narrative reproduction of these beliefs in everyday advocacy.

The narrative constructs a provocative causal story that defines discrimination as a social problem. It offers members of the policy subsystem a series critiques on the implementation of the current policy and solutions to these shortcomings. These stories conclude with candid evaluations as to the efficacy of the policy. Importantly, the narrative is flexible enough to allow for divergence between and among coalition members. This allows for members of the policy subsystem to emphasize aspects of discrimination that resonate with their personal experiences, while reconciling these differences within the shared narrative. For example, a *travesti* identified respondent may claim that discrimination affects *trans* persons disproportionately. This claim fits within the model of the advocacy coalition without unnecessarily dividing the LGBT movement into an alphabet soup of identitarian interests. One respondent even offered a candid assessment as to the ability of the movement to overcome these differences in opinion:

"J2: But even so, you have contact with these NGOs [with whom you disagree] and you continue working together. What is the commonality that you share with them that allows your partnership to continue?"

"R2: [We] speak a lot against homophobia, really. I think that discrimination is very strong in our society…since the homophobia is so strong, even if the entities within … LGBT Movement disagree - we have our divergences - we end up uniting because people are homophobic. So when we go to fight for more disclosure of the law 10.948, it is a shared agenda. To fight so that there is less homophobia in the state of Sao Paulo is a shared agenda between these groups. So, this brings everyone together [in spite of] those internal [disagreements] within the movement..." (Interview 02).

Conclusion

The Brazilian LGBT movement has been riddled with challenges to collective action since its inception. Differences in tactics, goals, and identity abound. In spite of these difficulties, the contemporary movement has engaged in a concerted effort to promote the passage of non-discrimination policies and, by all intents and purposes, succeeds in collective action.

This work sought to understand the causal mechanism by which the movement transformed from a social movement to a policy actor with a clear goal. To do this, we bridged work from narrative policy analysis (NPA) with advocacy coalition framework (ACF) and developed a framework whereby coalition interaction within the realm of policymaking facilitates the construction of narratives that shape, and are shaped by, core beliefs and policy core beliefs. We found that a cohesive narrative based upon belief systems is the causal mechanism that allows the advocacy coalition to function collectively. Thus, narrative explains the successful transition of the movement to a policy actor with a clear goal.

This transition marks an important phase in the development of the Brazilian LGBT movement. The sustained level of activity around non-discrimination suggests that the movement has finally managed to overcome problems associated with collective action and mobilization. A movement historically divided along the intersectional axes of class, race, gender, and sexuality has transitioned to policy actor. As a policy actor, it has coalesced around a powerful narrative in regards to non-discrimination policy, characterized by the belief systems of ACF. Thus, narratives, and the belief systems contained within them, serve as the binding glue which holds this advocacy coalition, and larger social movement, together. This process facilitates the development and crystallization of a collective identity.

Furthermore, this new narrative provides the foundation of advocacy efforts for equal

rights on behalf of the LGBTs in Brazil. Importantly, it provides justification for these demands through the appropriation of language that emphasizes democratic secular ideals. Such a transition marks an important step in the commitment to the principles of political liberalism in a developing democracy. In other words, debate in favor of LGBT rights occurs within a framework conditioned by the fundamental principles of secular liberalism. Thus, narrative of the advocacy coalition facilitates the possibility of consensus and minimizes the potential for antagonistic politics. In doing so, it provides an avenue for LGBTs to articulate demands for public policy that is amenable to democratic politics.

Of course, several questions remain to be answered. First, studies in ACF do not adequately specify the temporal process in the acquisition beliefs: do actors come into coalitions already possessing deep core and policy core beliefs? We recognize the contention that core beliefs are normative and ontological in nature, and by some accounts, fixed at a young age (Sabatier 1998). However, we question the legitimacy of this assumption outside of the United States for the reasons outlined in the text. Indeed, the majority of respondents in our study came of age under a military dictatorship, and thus had little socialization under political liberalism. Thus, we view the consistency with which "equality" structured narratives as evidence of a more constructivist interpretation of core beliefs, with narrative as a medium for transmission. More research is needed to determine the lagged effects of individual member involvement in coalitions and the acquisition of belief systems.

Second, our study is confined to a single policy subsystem related to non-discrimination policy in São Paulo state. The issue, however, has become national in focus, blurring the boundaries between distinct policy subsystems. This offers a distinct opportunity for future research to consider the diffusion of coalition beliefs across policy subsystems. Do advocacy

44

coalitions form in different regions of the country with a similar structure of core beliefs and policy core beliefs? Does the national movement manage to overcome collective action problems in the same way, or do divisions result in several competing advocacy coalitions along these historic fault lines?

Finally, we would like to note that we are optimistic in our conclusions that demands for LGBT rights occur within the limits of a democratic discourse. However, we are less optimistic in our view of the discourse employed by opponents to LGBT rights. An appropriate extension of this project would survey the belief structures of these opponents to identify a counter advocacy coalition.

Regardless of these limitations, we see significant import for future considerations based upon our research. The success of the LGBT movement in placing non-discrimination policy on the policymaking agenda at various levels of government is remarkable. As a marginalized group, LGBT interests were historically excluded from consideration in the political sphere, rarely championed by traditional channels of representation, such as legislators, political parties, and interest groups and are rarely the targets of beneficial of public policy (Schneider and Ingram 1997; Strolovitch 2006; Williams 1998).

However, research suggests that the transformation of social movements to policy actors engenders representation that is not predicated upon notions of descriptive, electoral, or substantive representation (Weldon 2011). Representation occurs discursively through the development of a group perspective grounded in shared experience that is later articulated as narrative in the public sphere. The articulation of this perspective by policymakers writ large suggests the representation of group interests, even in the absence of policy change. In short, marginalized groups achieve discursive representation (Dryzek and Niemeyer 2008). Our study

provides the foundations for such a hypothesis to be explored in Brazil.

References

Albright, Elizabeth A. 2011. "Policy Change and Learning in Response to Extreme Flood Events in Hungary: An Advocacy Coalition Approach." *Policy Studies Journal* 39 (3): 485-512.

Almeida, G. Da Silva. 2005. "Da Invisibilidade à Vulnerabilidade: Percursos do 'Corpo-lésbico' na Cena Pública Face a Possibilidade de Infecção por DST e AIDS." Ph.D. Dissertation, Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro.

Calaf, Priscila Pinto, Gustavo Carvalho Bernardes, and Gabriel dos Santos Rocha. 2012. "Relatório sobre Violência Homofóbica no Brasil: ano de 2011." Secretaria de Direitos Humanos, Brasilia, Distrito Federal, Brasil.

Carrara, Sério. 2010. "Políticas e Direitos Sexuais no Brasil Contemporâneo." *Bagoas: Revista de Estudos Gays* 4 (5): 131-147.

Carvalho, Georgia O. 2001. "Metallurgical Development in the Carajas Area: A Case Study of the Evolution of Environmental Policy Formation in Brazil." *Society and Natural Resources* 14: 127-143.

Carver, Terrell. 2002. "Discourse Analysis and the 'Linguistic Turn'." *European Political Science* 50-53.

Collier, Ruth Berins, and David Collier. 1979. "Inducements versus Constraints: Disaggregating 'Corporatism'". *American Political Science Review* 73 (4): 967-986.

Conselho Nacional de Combate à Discriminação. 2004. *Brasil sem Homofobia: Programa de Combate à Violência e à Discriminação contra GLTB e Promoção da Cidadania Homossexual*. Brasília: Ministério da Saúde.

de la Dehesa, Rafael. 2010. *Queering the Public Sphere in Mexico and Brazil: Sexual Rights Movements in Emerging Democracies*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

deLeon, Peter. 1998a. "Introduction: The Evidentiary Base for Policy Analysis: Empiricist Versus Postpositivist Positions." *Policy Studies Journal* 26 (1): 109-113.

deLeon, Peter. 1998b. "Models of Policy Discourse: Insights Versus Prediction." *Policy Studies Journal* 26 (1): 147-161.

Diário Oficial Executivo. 2001. "Lei N. 10.948, de 5 de Novembro de 2001." *Diário Oficial Executivo, Seção 1* 111 (209): 2.

Dryzek, John, and Simon Niemeyer. 2008. "Discursive Representation." *American Political Science Review* 102 (4): 481-493.

Dziengel, Lake. 2010. "Advocacy Coalitions and Punctuated Equilibrium in the Same-Sex Marriage Debate: Learning from Pro-LGBT Policy Changes in Minneapolis and Minnesota*". Journal of Gay & Lesbian Social Services* 22: 165-182.

Facchini, Regina, and Isadora Lins França. 2009. "De Cores e Matrizes: Sujeitos, Conexões e Desafios no Movimento LGBT Brasileiro." *Sexualidade, Salud y Sociedade: Revista Latinoamericana* 3: 54-81.

Facchini, Regina. 2009. "Entre Compassos e Descompassos: Um Olhar para o 'Campo' e para a 'Arena' do Movimento LGBT Brasileiro*." Bagoas: Revista de Estudos Gays* 3 (4): 131-158.

Facchini, Regina. 2005. *Sopa de Letrinhas?: Movimento Homossexual e Produção de Identidades Coletivas nos Anos 90*. Rio de Janeiro: Garamond.

Fischer, Frank. 1998. "Beyond Empiricism: Policy Inquiry in Postpositivist Perspective." *Policy Studies Journal* 26 (1): 129-146.

Fischer, Frank. 2003. *Reframing Public Policy: Discursive Politics and Deliberative Practices.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fischer, Frank. 2012. *The Argumentative Turn Revisited: Public Policy as Communicative Practice*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Folha de Sao Paulo. 2012. "Assassinatos de homossexuais batem recorde em 2011, diz entidade." http://www1.folha.uol.com.br/cotidiano/1071307-assassinatos-de-homossexuais-batem-recorde-em-2011-diz-entidade.shtml

França, Carlos Eduardo. 2008. "O Linchamento de Edson Neris da Silva: Reelaborações Identitárias dos Skinheads "Carecas do Brasil" na Sociedade Paulista Contemporânea." Masters Thesis, Universidade Estadual Paulista.

Freire, Lucas, and Daniel Cardinali. 2012. "O Ódio Atrás das Grades: da Construção Social da Discriminação por Orientação Sexual à Criminalização da Homofobia." *Sexualidad, Salud y Sociedad: Revista Latinoamericana* 12 (December): 37-63.

Green, James N. 1999. *Beyond Carnival: Male Homosexuality in Twentieth-Century Brazil*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Guest, Greg, Arwen Bunce, and Laura Johnson. 2006. "How Many Interviews are Enough? An Experiment with Data Saturation and Variability." *Field Methods* 18 (1): 59-82.

Haider-Markel, Donald and Kenneth J. Meier. 1996. "The Politics of Gay and Lesbian Rights: Expanding the Scope of the Conflict." *Journal of Politics* 58 (2): 332-349.

Hajer, Maarten A. 1993. "Discourse Coalitions and the Institutionalization of Practice: The Case of Acid Rain in Britain." In *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning*, eds. Frank Fischer and John Forester. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Hajer, Maarten. 2002. "Discourse Analysis and the Study of Policymaking." *European Political Science* 61-65.

Henry, Adam Douglas. 2011. "Ideology, Power, and the Structure of Policy Networks." *Policy Studies Journal* 39 (3): 361-384.

Htun, Mala, and Timothy J. Power. 2006. "Gender, parties and support for equal rights in the Brazilian Congress." *Latin American Politics and Society* 48: 83-104.

Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística. 2012. *Perfil dos Municípios Brasileiros*. Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística: Rio de Janeiro.

Jones, Michael D. and Mark K. McBeth. 2010. "A Narrative Policy Framework: Clear Enough to Be Wrong?" *Policy Studies Journal* 38 (2): 329-353.

Kingdon, John W. 1993. "Agendas, Ideas, and Policy Change." In *New Perspectives on American Politics*, eds. Lawrence C. Dodd and Calvin Jillson. Washington, D.C.: CQ Press.

Kleinman, Sherryl. 2007. *Feminist Fieldwork Analysis.* London: Sage Publications.

Kubler, Daniel. 2001. "Understanding Policy Change with the Advocacy Coalition Framework: An Application to Swiss Drug Policy." *Journal of European Public Policy* 8 (4): 623-641.

Lijphart, Arend. 1971. "Comparative Politics and the Comparative Method." *American Political Science Review* 65 (3): 682-693.

Lin, Ann Chih. 1998. "Bridging Positivist and Interpretivist Approaches to Qualitative Methods." *Policy Studies Journal* 26 (1): 162-180.

MacRae, Edward. 1990. *A Construção da Igualdade: Identidade Sexual e Política no Brasil da Abertura*. Campinas: Editora da Unicamp.

Marsiaj, Juan P. 2006. "Social Movements and Political Parties: Gays, Lesbians, and *Travestis*

and the Struggle for Inclusion in Brazil." In *The Politics of Sexuality in Latin America:A Reader on Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Rights*.eds. Javier Corrales and Mario Pecheny. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Matti, Simon and Annica Sandstrom. 2011. "The Rationale Determining Advocacy Coalitions: Examining Coordination Networks and Corresponding Beliefs." *Policy Studies Journal* 39 (3): 385-410.

McBeth, Mark K., Elizabeth A. Shanahan, Michael D. Jones. 2005. "The Science of Storytelling: Measuring Policy Beliefs in Greater Yellowstone." *Society and Natural Resources* 18: 413-429.

McBeth, Mark K., Elizabeth A. Shanahan, Ruth J. Arnell, and Paul L. Hathaway. 2007. "The Intersection of Narrative Policy Analysis and Policy Change Theory." *Policy Studies Journal* 35 (1): 87-108.

Mello, Luiz, Walderes Brito, and Daniela Maroja. 2012. "Políticas Públicas para a População LGBT no Brasil: Nota sobre Alcances e Possibilidades." *Cadernos pagu* 39 (julho-dezembro): 403-429.

Miles, Matthew, and A. Michael Huberman. 1994. *An Expanded Sourcebook of Qualitative Data Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mintrom, Michael and Phillipa Norman. 2009. "Policy Entrepreneurship and Policy Change." *Policy Studies Journal* 37 (4) 649-667.

Mucciaroni, Gary. 2008. *Same Sex, Different Politics: Success and Failure in the Struggles over Gay Rights*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Newton, Lina. 2005. "'It is Not a Question of Being Anti-Immigration': Categories of Deservedness in Immigration Policy Making." In *Deserving and Entitled: Social Construction and Public Policy*, eds. Anne L. Schneider and Helen M. Ingram. New York: State University of New York Press.

Passamani, Guilhereme Rodrigues. 2009. *O Arco-Iris (Des)Coberto*. Santa Maria, RS: Editora da Universidade Federal de Santa Maria.

Pierce, Jonathan J. 2011. "Coalition Stability and Belief Change: Advocacy Coalitions in U.S. Foreign Policy and the Creation of Israel, 1922-44." *Policy Studies Journal* 39 (3): 411-434.

Ramos, Silvia, and Sérgio Carrara. 2006. "A Constituição da Problemática da Violência Contra Homossexuais: A Articulação entre Ativismo e Academia na Elaboração de Políticas Públicas." *Physis: Revista Sáude Coletiva* 16 (2): 185-205.

Rawls, John. 1993. *Political Liberalism*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Riessman, Catherine K. 1993. *Narrative Analysis*. London: Sage Publications.

Rios, Rauger Raupp. 2009. "Developing Sexual Rights: Challenges and Trends in Latin America." *Institute of Development Studies* 37: 46-51.

Rochefort, David A. and Roger W. Cobb. 1994. *The Politics of Problem Definition: Shaping the Policy Agenda*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press.

Roe, Emery. 1994. *Narrative Policy Analysis: Theory and Practice*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

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

Sabatier, Paul A, and Hank C. Jenkins-Smith. 1999. "The Advocacy Coalition Framework: An Assessment." In *Theories of the Policy Process*, ed. Paul Sabatier. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 117-66.

Sabatier, Paul A. & Christopher M. Weible. 2007. The Advocacy Coalition Framework: Innovations and Clarifications. In *Theories of the Policy Process*, ed. Paul A. Sabatier. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Sabatier, Paul A. 1988. "An Advocacy Coalition Framework of Policy Change and the Role of Policy-Oriented Learning Therein." *Policy Sciences* 21 (2/3): 129-168.

Sabatier, Paul A. 1998. "The Advocacy Coalition Framework: Revisions and Relevance for Europe." *Journal of European Public Policy* 5 (1): 98-130.

Sabatier, Paul A. 1999. "Fostering the Development of Policy Theory." Chapter 10. In *Theories of the Policy Process*, ed. Paul A. Sabatier. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 261-276.

Sabatier, Paul A. 2000. "Clear Enough to be Wrong." *Journal of European Public Policy* 7 (1): 135-140.

Sabatier, Paul A., and Hank C. Jenkins-Smith, eds. 1993. *Policy Change and Learning: An Advocacy Coalition Approach*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Sabatier, Paul. A, and Susan McLaughlin. 1987. "The Devil Shift: Perceptions and Misperceptions of Opponents." *Western Political Quarterly* 40: 51-73.

Santos, Gustavo Gomes da Costa. 2006. "Estado, Projectos Políticos e Trajetórias Individuais: Um Estudo com as Lideranças Homossexuais na Cidade de São Paulo." Masters Thesis. Universidade Estadual da Campinas.

Schattschneider, E. E. 1960. *The Semi-Sovereign People*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Schlager, Edella, and William Blomquist. 1996. "Emerging Political Theories of the Policy Process: Institutional Rational Choice, the Poitics of Structural Choice, and Advocacy Coalitions." *Political Research Quarterly* 49 (September): 651-672.

Schlager, Edella. 1995. "Policy Making and Collective Action: Defining Coalitions within the Advocacy Coalition Framework." *Policy Sciences* 28: 243-270.

Schlager, Edella. 2007. "A Comparison of Frameworks, Theories and Models of Policy Processes." In *Theories of the Policy Process*, ed. Paul A. Sabatier. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Schneider, Anne, and Helen Ingram. 1990. "Behavioral Assumptions of Policy Tools." *Journal of Politics* 52: 510-29.

Schneider, Anne, and Helen Ingram. 1997. *Policy Design for Democracy* Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press.

Schorn, Mavis N. 2005. "Emergency Contraception for Sexual Assault Victims: An Advocacy Coalition Framework." *Policy, Politics & Nursing Practice* 6 (4): 343-353.

Schulenberg, Shawn. 2010. "Policy Stability without Policy: The Battle for Same-sex PartnershipRecognition in Brazil." In *Same-Sex Marriage in the Americas*, eds. Jason Pierceson, Adriana Paiatti-Crocker, and Shawn Schulenberg. Plymouth, UK: Lexington Books.

Shanahan, Elizabeth A., Mark K. McBeth, Paul L. Hathaway, and Ruth J. Arnell. 2008. "Conduit or Contributor? The Role of Media in Policy Change Theory." *Policy Sciences* 41 (2): 115-138.

Simões, Renato. 2002. 91ª Sessão Ordinária. Assembleia Legislativa do Estado de São Paulo.

Stone, Deborah A. 1989. "Causal Stories and the Formation of Policy Agendas." *Political Science Quarterly* 104 (2): 281-300

Stone, Deborah. 2002. *Policy Paradox: The Art of Political Decision Making, Revised Edition,* 3rd ed. New York: W.W. Norton.

Strolovitch, Dara Z. 2006. "Do Interest Groups Represent the Disadvantaged? Advocacy at the

Intersections of Race, Class, and Gender." *Journal of Politics* 68(4):894-910.

Trevisan, João Silvério. 2011. *Devassos no Paraíso: A Homossexualidade no Brasil, da Colônia à Atualidade.* 8th ed. Rio de Janeiro: Record.

Vianna, Adriana, and Sérgio Carrara. 2007. "Sexual politics and sexual rights in Brazil: A case study." In *SexPolitics: Reports from the Front Line*, eds. Richard Parker, Rosalind Petchesky and Robert Sember.
http://www.sxpolitics.org/frontlines/book/pdf/capitulo1_brazil.pdf

Weber, Robert P. 1990. *Basic Content Analysis, Second Edition.* London: Sage Publications.

Weible, Christopher M. 2005. "Beliefs and Perceived Influence in a Natural Resource Conflict: An Advocacy Coalition Approach to Policy Networks." *Political Research Quarterly* 58 (3): 461-475.

Weible, Christopher M. 2006. "An Advocacy Coalition Framework Approach to Stakeholder Analysis: Understanding the Political Context of California Marine Protected Area Policy." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 17: 95-117.

Weible, Christopher M., and Paul A. Sabatier. 2006. "A Guide to the Advocacy Coalition Framework." Chapter 9. In *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis*, eds. Frank Fischer, Gerald J. Miller, and Mara S. Sidney. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Weible, Christopher M., Paul A. Sabatier, Hank C. Jenkins-Smith, Daniel Nohrstedt, Adam Douglas Henry, and Peter DeLeon. 2011. "A Quarter Century of the Advocacy Coalition Framework: An Introduction to the Special Issue." *Policy Studies Journal* 39 (3): 349-360.

Weimer, David L. 1998. "Policy Analysis and Evidence: A Craft Perspective." *Policy Studies Journal* 26 (1): 114-128.

Weldon, S. Laurel. 2011. *When Protest Makes Policy: How Social Movements Represent Disadvantaged Groups*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Williams, Melissa. 1998. *Voice, Trust, and Memory: Marginalized Groups and the Failing of Liberal Representation.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Yin, Robert K. 2003. *Case Study Research: Design and Methods, Third Edition*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Zafonte, Matthew, and Paul A. Sabatier. 1998. "Shared Beliefs and Imposed Interdependencies as Determinants of Ally Networks in Overlapping Systems." *Journal of Theoretical Politics* 10 (4): 473-505.

Zafonte, Matthew, and Paul A. Sabatier. 2004. "Short-Term Versus Long-Term Coalitions in the Policy Process: Automotive Pollution Control, 1963-1989." *Policy Studies Journal* 32 (1): 75-107.

Provides for penalties to be applied to the practice of discrimination on grounds of sexual orientation and other measures.

The Legislature of the State of São Paulo decrees:

Article 1 - Any and all offensive manifestation or discriminatory practice against any homosexual, bisexual or transgender citizen will be punished under this law.

Article 2 – For the purposes of this law, [the following] are considered to be detrimental and discriminatory acts to the individual and collective rights of homosexual, bisexual or transgender citizens:

I – to subject homosexual, bisexual or transgender citizens to any kind of violent action, embarrassing, intimidating or harassing, of a moral, ethical, philosophical or psychological order;

II – to prohibit the entry or stay in any environment or establishment, public or private, open to the public;

III – to practice selective service that is not properly determined by law;

IV - to omit, overcharge, or impede lodging in hotels, motels, boarding houses or similar;

V – to omit, overcharge, or impede the contract, purchase, acquisition, lease, or lending of movable or immovable property for any purpose;

VI – to practice, as the employer or his agent, acts of demission, directly or indirectly because of the employee's sexual orientation;

VII – to inhibit or prohibit the admission or professional access to any public or private establishment because of the sexual orientation of the professional;

VIII – to prohibit the free expression and manifestation of affection by homosexual, bisexual or transgender citizens, being that these expressions and manifestations and permitted to other citizens.

Article 3 – [Those] punishable are citizens, including holders of public office, civil or military, and any social organization or company, for profit or nonprofit, of private or public character, installed in this state, who act in intent against what this law provides.

Article 4 - The practice of discriminatory acts referred to in this law shall be determined in an administrative proceeding, which will start by:

I - complaint of the victim;

II – action or service by a competent authority;

III - announcement of non-governmental organizations for the defense of human rights and citizenship.

Article 5 - The homosexual, bisexual or transgender citizen who is the victim of discriminatory acts may submit their complaint in person or by letter, telegram, telex, via the Internet or fax to the competent state agency and / or non-governmental organizations for the defense of citizenship and human rights.

§ 1 - The complaint must be substantiated by description of the case or discriminatory act, followed by the identification of the complainant, ensuring, as provided by law, the confidentiality of the complainant.

§ 2 - Upon receipt of the complaint, it is up to the Secretary of Justice and Defense of Citizenship to promote the initiation of due administrative proceedings for the calculation and imposition of penalties.

Article 6 – The penalties that apply to those who commit acts of discrimination or any other act offensive to fundamental rights and guarantees of the human person shall be:

I - warning;

II - fine of one thousand (1,000) UFESP (tax units in the state of São Paulo);

III - fine of 3,000 (three thousand) UFESP (tax units in the state of São Paulo), in case of recidivism;

IV - suspension of state license to operate for thirty (30) days;

V - revocation of state license for operation.

§ 1 - The penalties mentioned in items II to V of this Article shall not apply to public bodies and companies, whose responsibles will be punished in the form of the Statute of civil servants.

§ 2 - The amounts of the fines may be increased by up to 10 (ten) times when it is determined that, due to the size of the establishment, the results will be innocuous.

§ 3 - When the penalty is imposed under paragraph V above, it shall be communicated to the authority responsible for issuing the license, who shall provide for its forfeiture, communicating, equally, to municipal authority for any action under its jurisdiction.

Article 7 - To the civil servants, who in the exercise of their duties and / or in public office, by act or omission fail to comply with the provisions of this law, will apply the appropriate penalties under the Statute of civil servants.

Article 8 - The Government will make available copies of the law to be posted in local establishments and readable by the general public.

Article 9 - This law shall enter into force on the date of its publication, repealing legislation to the contrary.

JUSTIFICATION

The Federal Constitution took care to expressly include, among the fundamental objectives of the State, the promotion of the common good, irrespective of origin, race, sex, color, age or any other forms of discrimination. Among the fundamental rights and guarantees, it ensured the explicit equality of all before the law, without distinction of any kind.

Despite such principles expressed in our Constitution, it is common knowledge that prejudice and discrimination - sometimes veiled, sometimes explicit - permeates the social imaginary. Present in various manifestations, it is often tolerated and treated just like a playful manifestation, without major consequences.

It is enough to consider that we have only recently incorporated into our legal system norms that criminalize the practice of discrimination because of race, color, religion, or ethnic origin. The prohibition of the practice, induction or incitement through the media or by publication only came to be expressly provided for in 1990.

It behooves us, therefore, before this context, to adopt efficient measures in order to change this practice so common that undeniably contributes to a culture of prejudice.

Normalization is included among these measures: making explicit that discrimination is prohibited by law, beyond constituting a guarantee to minorities, constitutes an important element of education and awareness.

Under this recognized discrimination against diverse minorities, there is discrimination and prejudice against homosexuals. Prejudice that reveals itself not only in acts of physical aggression - that make Brazil the world champion in murders of homosexuals - but also in access to jobs and public offices, in incitement and repression by organized groups etc. Discrimination and prejudice that reveal themselves not only the brutal murder of the youth at the Plaza of the Republic, as well as the "murder" of lesbian characters promoted by the author in a recent

telenovela.

The present project reproduces – with necessary adaptations – the municipal law #9789 of the 11th of May 2000, in Juiz de Fora, Minas Gerais. A similar project was presented on May 26, 1999 by State Representative Moema Gramacho (PT-BA), who had already noted that "it is up to public authorities to enable an environment that is respectful, healthy and prone to solidarity between the diverse manifestations of human sexuality."

We must therefore make society aware of the need to respect the citizenship of homosexuals, alongside other discriminated minorities. It takes a series of coordinated actions that aim to construct a national culture against discrimination and in favor of the recognition of individual differences.

That is why we hope to have the support of the noble peers of the House for approval of this proposal.

Sessions Room, in [signed and dated]

a) RENATO SIMÕES

Appendix B: Law 10.948/2001 (Portuguese)

LEIS

**LEI Nº 10.947,
DE 5 DE NOVEMBRO DE 2001**

Altera a denominação da Secretaria de Estado da Juventude e dá providências correlatas.

O GOVERNADOR DO ESTADO DE SÃO PAULO:
Faço saber que a Assembléia Legislativa decreta e eu promulgo a seguinte lei:

Artigo 1º - A Secretaria de Estado da Juventude, criada pela Lei nº 10.387, de 5 de novembro de 1999, passa a denominar-se Secretaria de Estado da Juventude, Esporte e Lazer.

Artigo 2º - Constitui o campo funcional da Secretaria de Estado da Juventude, Esporte e Lazer:

I - a formulação de políticas e a proposição de diretrizes ao Governo do Estado, voltadas à juventude, bem como aos esportes e lazer;

II - a coordenação da implementação das ações governamentais voltadas para o atendimento aos jovens e para os esportes e lazer;

III - a formulação e a execução, direta ou indiretamente em parceria com entidades públicas e privadas, de programas, projetos e atividades para jovens, bem como relativos aos esportes e lazer;

IV - o apoio a iniciativas da sociedade civil destinadas a fortalecer a auto-organização dos jovens;

V - a promoção e o incentivo de intercâmbios e entendimentos com organizações e instituições afins, de caráter nacional ou internacional;

VI - a promoção do desenvolvimento de estudos, debates e pesquisas sobre a vida e a realidade da juventude;

VII - a conscientização dos diversos setores da sociedade sobre a realidade da juventude, os problemas que enfrenta, suas necessidades e potencialidades;

VIII - a promoção de campanhas de conscientização e programas educativos, junto a instituições de ensino e pesquisa, veículos de comunicação e outras entidades sobre problemas, necessidades, potencialidades, direitos e deveres dos jovens;

IX - a difusão e a promoção do desenvolvimento dos esportes e do lazer;

X - a extensão das oportunidades e dos meios para a iniciação e a prática de esportes e lazer;

Artigo 3º - A Secretaria de Estado da Juventude, Esporte e Lazer tem a seguinte estrutura básica:

I - Gabinete do Secretário;
II - Conselho Estadual da Juventude;
III - Conselho Estadual de Desportos;
IV - Conselho de Orientação;
V - Coordenadoria de Programas para a Juventude;
VI - Coordenadoria de Esporte e Lazer.

Artigo 4º - A vinculação de entidades descentralizadas à Secretaria de Estado da Juventude, Esporte e Lazer, e correspondente complementação de seu campo funcional, o detalhamento da estrutura básica, as atribuições das unidades mencionadas no artigo anterior e as competências de seus dirigentes serão objeto de decreto.

Artigo 5º - Esta lei entra em vigor na data de sua publicação, ficando revogadas as disposições em contrário, em especial os artigos 2º, 4º, 8º e 9º da Lei nº 10.387, de 5 de novembro de 1999.

Palácio dos Bandeirantes, 5 de novembro de 2001
GERALDO ALCKMIN
João Cammez
Secretário-Chefe da Casa Civil
Antonio Angarita
Secretário do Governo e Gestão Estratégica
Publicada na Assessoria Técnico-Legislativa, aos 5 de novembro de 2001.

**LEI Nº 10.948,
DE 5 DE NOVEMBRO DE 2001**

(Projeto de lei nº 667/2000,
do deputado Renato Simões - PT)

Dispõe sobre as penalidades a serem aplicadas à prática de discriminação em razão de orientação sexual e dá outras providências.

O GOVERNADOR DO ESTADO DE SÃO PAULO:
Faço saber que a Assembléia Legislativa decreta e eu promulgo a seguinte lei:

Artigo 1º - Será punida, nos termos desta lei, toda manifestação atentatória ou discriminatória praticada contra cidadão homossexual, bissexual ou transgênero.

Artigo 2º - Consideram-se atos atentatórios e discriminatórios dos direitos individuais e coletivos dos cidadãos homossexuais, bissexuais ou transgêneros, para os efeitos desta lei:

I - praticar qualquer tipo de ação violenta, constrangedora, intimidatória ou vexatória, de ordem moral, ética, filosófica ou psicológica;

II - proibir o ingresso ou permanência em qualquer ambiente ou estabelecimento público ou privado, aberto ao público;

III - praticar atendimento selecionado que não esteja devidamente determinado em lei;

IV - preterir, sobretaxar ou impedir a hospedagem em hotéis, motéis, pensões ou similares;

V - preterir, sobretaxar ou impedir a locação, compra, aquisição, arrendamento ou empréstimo de bens móveis ou imóveis de qualquer finalidade;

VI - praticar o empregador, ou seu preposto, atos de demissão direta ou indireta, em função da orientação sexual do empregado;

VII - inibir ou proibir a admissão ou o acesso profissional em qualquer estabelecimento público ou privado em função da orientação sexual do profissional;

VIII - proibir a livre expressão e manifestação de afetividade, sendo estas expressões e manifestações permitidas aos demais cidadãos.

Artigo 3º - São passíveis de punição o cidadão, inclusive os detentores de função pública, civil ou militar, e toda organização social ou empresa, com ou sem fins lucrativos, de caráter privado ou público, instaladas neste Estado, que intentarem contra o que dispõe esta lei.

Artigo 4º - A prática dos atos discriminatórios a que se refere esta lei será apurada em processo administrativo, que terá início mediante:

I - reclamação do ofendido;
II - ato ou ofício de autoridade competente;
III - comunicado de organizações não-governamentais de defesa da cidadania e direitos humanos.

Artigo 5º - O cidadão homossexual, bissexual ou transgênero que for vítima dos atos discriminatórios poderá apresentar sua denúncia pessoalmente ou por carta, telegrama, telex, via Internet ou facsímile ao órgão estadual competente e/ou a organizações não-governamentais de defesa da cidadania e direitos humanos.

§ 1º - A denúncia deverá ser fundamentada por meio da descrição do fato ou ato discriminatório, seguida da identificação de quem faz a denúncia, garantindo-se, na forma da lei, o sigilo do denunciante.

§ 2º - Recebida a denúncia, competirá à Secretaria da Justiça e da Defesa da Cidadania promover a instauração do processo administrativo devido para apuração e imposição das penalidades cabíveis.

Artigo 6º - As penalidades aplicáveis aos que praticarem atos de discriminação ou qualquer outro ato atentatório aos direitos e garantias fundamentais da pessoa humana serão as seguintes:

I - advertência;
II - multa de 1000 (um mil) UFESPs - Unidades Fiscais do Estado de São Paulo;
III - multa de 3000 (três mil) UFESPs - Unidades Fiscais do Estado de São Paulo, em caso de reincidência;
IV - suspensão da licença estadual para funcionamento por 30 (trinta) dias;
V - cassação da licença estadual para funcionamento.

§ 1º - As penas mencionadas nos incisos II a V deste artigo não se aplicam aos órgãos e empresas públicas, cujos responsáveis serão punidos na forma do Estatuto dos Funcionários Públicos Civis do Estado - Lei nº 10.261, de 28 de outubro de 1968.

§ 2º - Os valores das multas poderão ser elevados em até 10 (dez) vezes quando for verificado que, em razão do porte do estabelecimento, resultarão inócuas.

§ 3º - Quando for imposta a pena prevista no inciso V supra, deverá ser comunicada a autoridade responsável pela emissão da licença, que providenciará a sua cassação, comunicando-se, igualmente, a autoridade municipal para eventuais providências no âmbito de sua competência.

Artigo 7º - Os servidores públicos que, no exercício de suas funções e/ou em repartição pública, por ação ou omissão, deixarem de cumprir os dispositivos da presente lei, serão aplicadas as penalidades cabíveis nos termos do Estatuto dos Funcionários Públicos.

Artigo 8º - O Poder Público disponibilizará cópias desta lei para que sejam afixadas nos estabelecimentos e em locais de fácil leitura pelo público em geral.

Artigo 9º - Esta lei entra em vigor na data de sua publicação.

Palácio dos Bandeirantes, 5 de novembro de 2001
GERALDO ALCKMIN
Edson Luiz Vismona
Secretário da Justiça e da Defesa da Cidadania
João Caramez
Secretário-Chefe da Casa Civil
Antonio Angarita
Secretário do Governo e Gestão Estratégica
Publicada na Assessoria Técnico-Legislativa, aos 5 de novembro de 2001.

**LEI Nº 10.949,
DE 5 DE NOVEMBRO DE 2001**

(Projeto de lei nº 277/2000,
do deputado Duarte Nogueira - PSDB)

Dispõe sobre a instituição do selo "Empresa Jovem Cidadão"

O GOVERNADOR DO ESTADO DE SÃO PAULO:
Faço saber que a Assembléia Legislativa decreta e eu promulgo a seguinte lei:

Artigo 1º - Fica instituído o selo "Empresa Jovem Cidadão", certificado a ser conferido, pelo Governador do Estado, às empresas que participarem do Programa Jovem Cidadão: Meu Primeiro Trabalho, sob a coordenação do Gabinete do Governador e executado pelas Secretarias da Ciência, Tecnologia e Desenvolvimento Econômico, da Educação e do Emprego e Relações do Trabalho.

Parágrafo único - O selo a que se refere este artigo será concedido por uma comissão composta por representantes do Gabinete do Governador e das Secretarias da Ciência, Tecnologia e Desenvolvimento Econômico, da Educação e do Emprego e Relações do Trabalho.

Artigo 2º - As empresas certificadas poderão utilizar, na identificação de seus produtos ou para fins publicitários, a reprodução do selo ora instituído.

Artigo 3º - A concessão do selo "Empresa Jovem Cidadão" terá prazo de validade determinado, sendo renovável, desde que a empresa certificada continue participando do programa.

Artigo 4º - O Poder Executivo regulamentará a presente lei no prazo de 60 (sessenta) dias, a contar de sua publicação.

Artigo 5º - As despesas decorrentes da execução desta lei correrão à conta de dotações orçamentárias próprias, suplementadas se necessário.

Artigo 6º - Esta lei entra em vigor na data de sua publicação.

Palácio dos Bandeirantes, 5 de novembro de 2001
GERALDO ALCKMIN
Teresa Roserley Neubauer da Silva
Secretária da Educação
Walter Barelli
Secretário do Emprego e Relações do Trabalho
Ruy Martins Altenfelder Silva
Secretário da Ciência, Tecnologia e Desenvolvimento Econômico
Gabriel Benedito Issaac Chalita
Secretário da Juventude, Esporte e Lazer
João Caramez
Secretário-Chefe da Casa Civil
Antonio Angarita
Secretário do Governo e Gestão Estratégica
Publicada na Assessoria Técnico-Legislativa, aos 5 de novembro de 2001.

**LEI Nº 10.950,
DE 5 DE NOVEMBRO DE 2001**

(Projeto de lei nº 427/2000,
do deputado Pedro Yves - PTB)

Autoriza o Poder Executivo a receber doações de obras e serviços de empresas e entidades de iniciativa privada para a construção de passarelas e trincheiras, em rodovias localizadas no Estado

O GOVERNADOR DO ESTADO DE SÃO PAULO:
Faço saber que a Assembléia Legislativa decreta e eu promulgo a seguinte lei:

Artigo 1º - Fica o Estado de São Paulo autorizado a receber doações de qualquer natureza, a título gratuito, de pessoas jurídicas de direito privado para a construção e/ou reforma de passarelas e trincheiras em rodovias sob a jurisdição estadual.

§ 1º - As doações recebidas pelo Estado não poderão ser utilizadas nas rodovias que estejam sob o controle de concessionárias.

§ 2º - O Estado poderá divulgar a razão social dos doadores nas construções ou reformas em que as doações forem utilizadas.

Artigo 2º - O Poder Executivo regulamentará a presente lei no prazo de 60 (sessenta) dias.

Artigo 3º - As despesas decorrentes da execução desta lei serão suportadas pelas dotações orçamentárias próprias.

Palácio dos Bandeirantes, 5 de novembro de 2001
GERALDO ALCKMIN
Michael Paul Zeitlin
Secretário dos Transportes
João Caramez
Secretário-Chefe da Casa Civil
Antonio Angarita
Secretário do Governo e Gestão Estratégica
Publicada na Assessoria Técnico-Legislativa, aos 5 de novembro de 2001.

**LEI Nº 10.951,
DE 5 DE NOVEMBRO DE 2001**

(Projeto de lei nº 556/2001,
do deputado Emídio de Souza - PT)

Dispõe sobre proibição de consumo de bebidas alcoólicas nas dependências do METRÔ

O GOVERNADOR DO ESTADO DE SÃO PAULO:
Faço saber que a Assembléia Legislativa decreta e eu promulgo a seguinte lei:

Artigo 1º - Fica proibido o consumo de bebidas com teor alcoólico no interior dos vagões e nas dependências das estações da Companhia do Metropolitano de São Paulo - METRÔ.

Artigo 2º - O desrespeito a esta lei autoriza o corpo de segurança do METRÔ a proceder à retirada do usuário.

Artigo 3º - As despesas decorrentes da execução desta lei correrão à conta de dotações orçamentárias próprias.

Artigo 4º - Esta lei entra em vigor na data de sua publicação.

Palácio dos Bandeirantes, 5 de novembro de 2001
GERALDO ALCKMIN
Jurandir Fernando Ribeiro Fernandes
Secretário dos Transportes Metropolitanos
João Caramez
Secretário-Chefe da Casa Civil
Antonio Angarita
Secretário do Governo e Gestão Estratégica
Publicada na Assessoria Técnico-Legislativa, aos 5 de novembro de 2001.

DECRETOS

**DECRETO Nº 46.247,
DE 5 DE NOVEMBRO DE 2001**

Dispõe sobre abertura de crédito suplementar ao Orçamento Fiscal na Secretaria do Governo e Gestão Estratégica, visando ao atendimento de Despesas de Capital

GERALDO ALCKMIN, Governador do Estado de São Paulo, no uso de suas atribuições legais,
Decreta:

Artigo 1º - Fica aberto um crédito de R$ 1.107.798,00 (Hum milhão, cento e sete mil, setecentos e noventa e oito reais), suplementar ao orçamento da Secretaria do Governo e Gestão Estratégica, observando-se as classificações Institucional, Econômica e Funcional-Programática, conforme a Tabela 1, anexa.

Artigo 2º - O crédito aberto pelo artigo anterior será coberto com recursos a que alude o inciso III do § 1º do artigo 43 da Lei federal nº 4.320, de 17 de março de 1964, de conformidade com a legislação discriminada na Tabela 3, anexa.

Artigo 3º - Fica alterada a Programação Orçamentária da Despesa do Estado, estabelecida pelo Anexo I, de que trata o artigo 5º do Decreto nº 45.623, de 10 de janeiro de 2001, de conformidade com a Tabela 2, anexa.

Artigo 4º - Este decreto entra em vigor na data de sua publicação.

Palácio dos Bandeirantes, 5 de novembro de 2001
GERALDO ALCKMIN
Fernando Dall'Acqua
Secretário da Fazenda
André Franco Montoro Filho
Secretário de Economia e Planejamento
João Caramez
Secretário-Chefe da Casa Civil
Antonio Angarita
Secretário do Governo e Gestão Estratégica
Publicado na Secretaria de Estado do Governo e Gestão Estratégica, aos 5 de novembro de 2001.

TABELA 1	SUPLEMENTAÇÃO		VALORES EM REAIS
ÓRGÃO/UO/ELEMENTO/FUNCIONAL-PROGRAMÁTICA		FR GD	VALOR
28000 SEC. GOVERNO E GESTÃO ESTRATÉGICA			

Appendix C: Semi-structured Interview Questions (English)

I would like to start with some general questions.
1. Could you describe your role as a member of ___ organization?
2. How did you become interested in politics and LGBT issues specifically?
3. What do you feel is the most important issue facing LGBTs today in Brazil?
4. What issues have you focused on most in the past year?

Now I would like to talk with you about Law 10.948, which prohibits the discrimination of gays and lesbians based upon sexual orientation.
1. What is your position in regards to this law? Could you justify your position?
2. After 10 years, do LGBTs still need this law? Is discrimination still a serious problem?
3. Have you been involved with this legislation in any way?
4. Do you think that the law accomplished its objectives?
5. How do you feel about attempts to repeal this legislation?

Now I would like to talk with you about some of the speech used in relation to the law.
1. How do you think the media presents discrimination of LGBTs? What is their tone and view? (Alternative: How do you think the media portrays discrimination of LGBTs?)
2. And politicians? What do they use as a basis to formulate their speeches about the law?
3. What about social movements?
4. And churches?
5. Has the social discourse changed since the passage of the law 10.948 in 2001? If so, who has been the largest force behind this change?

Now I would like to talk a little bit about the partnerships you have at X organization.
1. Could you identify about two organizations or actors in general that reflect your views on the discrimination of LGBTs? How do they approach the topic? Why do you agree with their approach to the topic?
2. Could you identify two organizations or actors in general that oppose your views on the discrimination of LGBTs? How do they approach the topic? Why do you disagree with their approach to the topic?
3. How frequently do you do you work together with organizations that share your views on the discrimination of LGBTs? How many times per month do you participate in any type of forum, reunion, conference, protest, or this type of event?
4. Have you ever participated in any kind of manifestation directly against organizations that oppose your views on the discrimination of LGBTs?
5. Who do you consider to be the most influential in passing a public policy for LGBTs in Sao Paulo? Why?
6. Who do you consider to be the most influential in blocking a public policy for LGBTs in Sao Paulo? Why?

To conclude, I have one more question.
1. If you needed to persuade someone to accept your opinion in relation to the discrimination of LGBTs, what would you say to them?

Appendix D: Semi-structured Interview Questions (Portuguese)

Primeiro, gostaria de começar com algumas perguntas gerais.
1. Você pode falar um pouco sobre seu papel n@ _____ (organização).
2. Como foi que você se interessou pela política, especificamente a política LGBTs?
3. Qual o maior desafio enfrentando a comunidade LGBT no Brasil hoje em dia?
4. Nas quais questões você tem focado mais neste ano?

Agora, gostaria de falar com você sobre a lei 10.948, que pune a discriminação contra os LGBT aqui em São Paulo.
1. Qual a sua posição em relação esta lei? Poderia justificar a sua posição? É uma lei necessária? É uma lei importante?
2. Você acha que os LGBT precisam desta lei? A discriminação dos LGBT é um problema ainda?
3. Voce tem atuado com esta lei em alguma maneira? E se tem, na qual capacidade, por quanto tempo, e para que fim?
4. Voce acha que a lei cumpriu seus objetivos?
5. O que você acha sobre as tentativas de revogar esta lei? Será que pode ser revogada pela legislativa?

Agora gostaria de falar um pouco sobre os discursos voltados à lei.
1. Como você acha que a mídia e imprensa expressam/apresentam a discriminação de LGBT? Qual o tom e olhar deles?
2. E os políticos? Onde eles buscam a base para seus discursos sobre a lei? O que eles usam como base para formular seus discursos sobre a lei?
3. E os movimentos sociais?
4. E as igrejas?
5. Como estes discursos sociais tem mudado desde a aprovação da lei 10.948 em 2001? Quem tem sido a maior força nesta mudança?

Agora gostaria de falar um pouco com você sobre as suas parcerias.
1. Você pode identificar duas organizações ou atores em geral que mais refletem sua opinião sobre a discriminação dos LGBT? Como eles abordam o assunto? Você concorda?
2. Voce pode identificar duas organizações ou atores em geral que mais se opõem à sua opinião sobre a discriminação dos LGBT? Como eles abordam o assunto? Você concorda?
3. Com que freqüência você trabalha junto com as organizações que refletem sua opinião sobre a discriminação do LGBT? (Quantas vezes por mês você participa num tipo de forum, reunião, conferência, protesto ou tal evento com o foco na discriminação dos LGBT?) Pode falar um pouco sobre estes eventos?
4. Com que freqüência você e suas parcerias coordenam eventos contra as organizações que se opõem à sua posição sobre a discriminação do LGBT?
5. Quem é que você considera ser mais influente no avanço políticas públicas contra a discriminação dos LGBT em São Paulo? Por que são influenciais?
6. Quem é que você considera ser mais influente no impedimento de políticas públicas contra a discriminação dos LGBT em São Paulo? Por que são influenciais?

Para terminar:
1. Se você precisasse persuadir alguém a aceitar sua opinião em relação à discriminação dos LGBT, o que você diria?

Appendix E: Coding Guidelines and Counts for Belief Systems

Belief type	Category	Subcategory	Search terms	Frequency (n=14)
Deep core beliefs	Equality		Equal, human, constitutional, rights	14
Policy core beliefs	Causes of the problem	Structural	Heteronormative, machismo, culture, society	14
		Religious	Fundamentalism, religion	14
		Conservative	Conservative	13
		Internalized	Internalized, intrinsic, coming out	5
	Seriousness of the problem	Affects all	LGBT community, heterosexuals	10
		Affects trans more	Transexuals, travestis	6
		Affects poor more	Poor, class, income, periphery	4
	Implementation	Institutional structures	Localized processes, centers, reporting	12
		Data collection	Data, cases, evaluation	9
		Propaganda campaigns	Divulge, disclose	12
		Work with other SMO	Feminist, black	8
	Solutions	Criminalization	Criminalize, PLC122, federal	14
		Pedagogical	Education, schools	9
		Legal	Litigation, laws, public policies	10
	Evaluations	Positive	-	3
		Mixed	-	4
		Negative	-	7

Note: Appendix E displays the coding guidelines for the belief systems in this study. Search terms are displayed along with raw counts for the number of respondents who expressed each belief during the interview.