
Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository

10-23-2019 3:15 PM

Death of the Clinic: Trans-Informing the Clinical Gaze to Counter Epistemic Violence

Diana E. Kuhl, *The University of Western Ontario*

Supervisor: Dr. Wayne Martino, *The University of Western Ontario*

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Education

© Diana E. Kuhl 2019

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd>



Part of the [Adult and Continuing Education Commons](#), [Bioethics and Medical Ethics Commons](#), [Child Psychology Commons](#), [Counselor Education Commons](#), [Early Childhood Education Commons](#), [Educational Psychology Commons](#), [Feminist Philosophy Commons](#), [Interprofessional Education Commons](#), [Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Studies Commons](#), [Medical Humanities Commons](#), [Other Feminist, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Commons](#), [Other Psychology Commons](#), and the [Theory and Philosophy Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kuhl, Diana E., "Death of the Clinic: Trans-Informing the Clinical Gaze to Counter Epistemic Violence" (2019). *Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository*. 6679.
<https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/6679>

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarship@Western. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository by an authorized administrator of Scholarship@Western. For more information, please contact wlsadmin@uwo.ca.

Abstract

This case study research (Patton, 2002, 2014; Flyvberg, 2006) has grown out of an awareness of deep resistance from the *psy disciplines* to trans-informed epistemologies as a source of legitimate knowledge (Tosh, 2015, 2016; Winters, 2008). It focuses on examining how the closure of *The Gender Identity Clinic* (GIC) for Children and Youth at the *Centre for Addiction and Mental Health* (CAMH) in Toronto, Ontario, Canada, signaled a paradigm shift from the ‘treatment model’ to the ‘affirmative model’ with respect to clinical approaches for supporting trans and gender diverse children and youth. As such the case study involved tracing the significance of the clinic, including key figures and the clinical literature that flowed from it, and interviewing activists and academics who worked to challenge the pathologizing literature and praxes. Grounded in a critical approach to research known as bricolage (Kincheloe 201, 2005; Kincheloe & Berry, 2004) this case study was concerned to ensure that “lived experience was allowed to sit at the table of official meaning-making” (Kincheloe & Berry, 2004, p. 11), drawing “paradigmatic and textual analyses” into dialogue to examine “the various dynamics that shape what is called empirical knowledge” (Kincheloe & Berry, 2004, pp. 22, 7). This research applied multiple theoretical lenses including Foucault’s (1977, 1980, 1984, 2003) theorizations on power-knowledge and the clinical ‘gaze’, Stryker’s (2006) theorizations on (de)subjugated knowledges, and theorizations on epistemic injustice and violence (Fricker, 2007; Namaste, 2000, 2009; McKinnon, 2017; Teo, 2010, 2011). The conduct of the research entailed employing both ethnographic (Patton, 2002, 2014) and genealogical methods (Foucault, 1980, 1984); emerging as two case studies; one a *micro-*

genealogical case study, and the other, a genealogically informed *ethnographic case study*. Though focused on the *psy disciplines*, this study raises important questions for educational research, which has privileged a ‘psychologized’ view of childhood (Teo, 2015), methodologism (Teo, 2017), and which has disciplined and erased gender and sexual diversity in schools (Martino & Cumming-Potvin, 2018). Ultimately, this research illuminates a legacy of harm while also documenting an epistemic insurrection required to trans-inform the clinical gaze.

Keywords

epistemic justice, epistemic violence; gender and sexual diversity, transgender, critical psychology, bricolage, genealogy, micro-genealogy

Lay Summary

This case study involved interviewing activists, scholars and clinicians who challenged the view that childhood gender diversity was a disorder in need of correction. It examines the significance of the former gender identity clinic for children and youth at the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, and how its closure marked a shift in thinking within psychology and allied disciplines. It highlights a legacy of harm with respect to treatment models which were indistinguishable from reparative therapies. It also makes clear that psychology and related fields have relied too heavily on methodology and have failed to consider the role and importance of philosophy of science in shaping their own views and the views of others, and how this has the potential to cause harm. It makes clear that ideas can contribute to violence, and that the idea that science is objective and value free is contrary to the history that this case study reveals. It holds implications for the importance of training programs for clinicians, allied health professionals and educators who receive little if any education and training related to how philosophy and personal bias are deeply embedded in science. It also documents how trans people have worked to establish authority over their own lives, free of the discourse of pathology.

Acknowledgments

I must begin by acknowledging the perseverance of trans people in the face of the epistemic violence and injustice that they have been subjected to. This dissertation cannot begin to recognize the depth and scope of contributions which have paved the way for the trans activism and scholarship which emerged to transform the clinical landscape and established the legitimacy of trans voices over their own lives. To the participants who shared your time, your insights, your experiences, your expertise and your voices with me, I am humbled by your generosity in contributing to this study. To Lynn Conway, and Andrea James, the depth and scope of your advocacy is historic, and when I began this project, I never imagined that I would have the privilege of your contributions. To Arlene Lev, your work was one of the first voices that I encountered from within the psychology disciplines, and your voice has been integral to transforming how childhood gender diversity is understood. To the participants who shared their time and voices with me, yet who are not named in this thesis, words cannot express how much your support and guidance have meant to me, and to this project.

To my advisor, Dr. Wayne Martino, I don't even know where to begin as you have done so much for me. Your advocacy, your guidance, your time, your expertise, your depth of scholarship, your sense of ethics, your compassion, have changed my life. You have now seen me through both my master's thesis and this dissertation. For eight years you have been a constant amidst the sea of upheaval and challenges. There simply are no words to reflect what an extraordinary human being you are, and how much you mean to me. As

proud as I am to see this dissertation to completion, it is tinged with sadness at the prospect of no longer being your student.

To my committee member, Dr. Jemma Tosh, when I reached out to introduce myself to you and say how much I appreciated your work, I was met with generosity and support that I never imagined. Your time, your insights, your kindness, and the depth of your scholarship have had a profound impact on me, and I am eternally grateful to you. To Dr. Jenny Ingrey, your insight, and feedback have been invaluable to me. You have pushed me to be critically reflexive about my positionality and the work that I am doing, and I believe this thesis reflects that. To my external examiner, Dr. Miguel Roselló-Peñaloza, it was such a privilege to have you come to Canada to examine my thesis, and your detailed and thoughtful feedback is so appreciated. Your work has been invaluable to me. To my Western University examiners, Dr. Pam Bishop, Dr. Jason Brown, Dr. Treena Orchard thank you for your time, your questions, and your feedback. It was a privilege to hear your perspectives on the work.

To my partner Alex, who for nearly a quarter of a century has supported and encouraged me in so many ways. From listening patiently about theory, methodology and epistemology for more than I am sure you wanted to, for lifting me up with words of support when I felt that I was in over my head, to financial support when my funding ran out, to driving Duke to dog day care so that I could concentrate without interruption, to IT support to, to driving me places I needed to be because you know how nervous I get driving in traffic, to sacrificing vacations and social time while I was committed to this

journey. There is simply too much for me to list, and simply no way to express my gratitude for who you are and all that you do. I love you.

To my son Max, when I sat down to write acknowledgements, I realized that I have been in grad school for half of your life. I know it has been hard some days. You have been listening to me talk about epistemology, theory and writing a thesis (now two of them), more than I am sure you ever wanted to. I had struggled so much in elementary and high school that no one, myself included, would have thought that a PhD would be part of my future. I know you say that you don't want to do a PhD right now, but you are far smarter than I am, and there is nothing you can't do. This would not have been possible if it were not for you. You are wise beyond your years with a heart of gold just like your dad. I love you.

To my mom, thank you for encouraging me to be who I am, and to persevere. To my dad, our numerous debates have no doubt contributed to my ability to be a good critical thinker. To my sister, thank you for always listening and for helping me get here.

To my friends who took the time to attend my defense, Jenny Kassen, Jo Ann Iantosca, Kenan Omercajic, thank you so much. Your support and encouragement over the years has all contributed to this thesis in different ways. You are such good people.

To my friends Rhonda, Gudrun and June, thanks for always checking in to see how I was doing. Doing a PhD can be pretty isolating at times, and be it walks, coffee, or apple crisp, you always went out of your way to be a support.

To my SIFN, ICQI, activist and online friends, thank you for the friendship and community that has helped tremendously when sometimes the world feels like it is a constant stream of bad news. It is so good to know there are folks working to make a difference.

Last but certainly not least, to trans, non-binary and gender diverse folks who make this world a better place simply by your existence. I am so glad to know and have learned so much from you.

Table of Contents

Abstract	i
Acknowledgments.....	iv
Table of Contents	viii
List of Appendices	xii
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Emergence and Relevance of this Research	6
1.2 Background	12
1.3 Centering Epistemological and Methodological Concerns.....	14
1.4 Conceptual, Theoretical, and Methodological Framework.....	25
1.5 Epistemological, Theoretical Lenses	28
1.5.1 Trans Epistemologies.....	30
1.5.2 Foucault.....	33
1.5.3 Stryker.....	38
1.5.4 Fricker	43
1.5.5 McKinnon	46
1.5.6 Namaste.....	51
1.5.7 Teo	52
1.6 Conclusion	54
Chapter 1	57
2 Literature Review	57
2.1 Introduction.....	57
2.2 Critical Reflections on Guidelines for Conducting Literature Reviews	58
2.3 A Brief Etiology of the Pathologizing Literature Related to the Clinic	63

2.3.1	Money	63
2.3.2	Green.....	70
2.3.3	Zucker	73
2.3.4	‘The Handbook of Pathologization and Treatment’ (aka) Gender Identity Disorder and Psychosexual Problems in Children and Adolescents	75
2.3.5	Maternal ‘Psychopathology’	77
2.3.6	‘Treatment’ Success and Maternal Responsibility	86
2.4	Shifting the Gaze – Introducing Theorizations on Epistemic Injustice and Epistemological Violence	90
2.5	The Extant Critical Literature	92
2.5.1	Tosh.....	93
2.5.2	Winters.....	94
2.5.3	Pyne.....	96
2.5.4	Bryant.....	97
2.5.5	Roselló-Peñaloza.....	101
2.6	Conclusion	103
Chapter 2	105
3	Methodology	105
3.1	Introduction.....	105
3.2	Bricolage	105
3.3	Case Study	106
3.4	Genealogy	109
3.4.1	‘Archival’ Research	116
3.4.2	Discourse Analysis.....	121
3.5	Ethnography	124

3.6	Procedures	131
3.7	Participant Sample	133
3.8	Evaluative Framework	136
3.9	Conclusion	136
Chapter 3		138
4	The Case within the Case: A Micro-Genealogy of Epistemic Violence against Trans Women	138
4.1	Introduction	138
4.2	Conceptual Framework	139
4.3	The Emergence of the Case within the Case	142
4.4	Micro-Genealogy	152
4.5	Epistemic Injustice	155
4.6	Gaslighting	161
4.7	Epistemological Violence Enacted by the Psy Disciplines (EV)	165
4.8	Epistemic Violence (Namaste)	175
4.9	Conclusion	179
Chapter 4		182
5	Mounting an Epistemic Insurrection	182
5.1	Introduction	182
5.2	Methodological Considerations	186
5.2.1	Ethnographically Informed Research	187
5.3	Participants	196
5.4	Problematizing ‘Trans-affirmative’	200
5.5	Cyber Communities as a Path to (De)subjugation	204
5.6	Insiders and Allies in the Academies	213

5.7 Education	220
5.8 ‘Treatment’ and Reparative Therapies.....	226
5.9 Policies and Legislation	236
5.10 Conclusion	245
Chapter 5	247
6 From Epistemic Violence to Epistemic Justice: Reflections on the Death of the Clinic.....	247
6.1 Introduction.....	247
6.2 Reflections on Bricolage.....	248
6.3 Reflections on this Research.....	257
6.4 Implications of This Research	264
6.5 Conclusion	268
References.....	270
Appendices.....	290
Curriculum Vitae	301

List of Appendices

Appendix A: Letter of Information to Participants.....	290
Appendix B: Ethics Approval.....	299
Appendix C: Ethics Approval Extension.....	300

Trans-Informing the Clinical Gaze

1 Introduction

This *case study* research (Patton, 2002; 2014, Flyvberg, 2006) has grown out of an awareness of deep resistance from the *psy disciplines* to critical, voice informed epistemologies as a source of legitimate knowledge for understanding and supporting trans and gender diverse children (Tosh, 2015, 2016, and Winters, 2008). Focused on examining how the closure of The Gender Identity Clinic (GIC) for Children and Youth at the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health (CAMH) in Toronto signaled a paradigm shift from the ‘treatment model’ to the ‘affirmative model’ with respect to clinical approaches for supporting trans and gender diverse children and youth, this case study involved tracing the significance of the clinic, including key figures and the clinical literature that flowed from it, and interviewing activists and academics who worked to challenge the pathologizing discourses that dominated the clinical literature and to ‘trans-inform’ the clinical ‘gaze’. It also involved examining power relations and epistemological issues imbricated in the clinic’s history, and its eventual closure.

Grounded in a critical-hermeneutic, and emancipatory research approach to qualitative inquiry known as *bricolage* (Kincheloe & Berry, 2004, Kincheloe, McLaren & Steinberg, 2011; Rogers, 2012), this case study was concerned with a “double ontology of complexity” (Kincheloe, McLaren & Steinberg, 2011, p. 170), whereby “lived experience is allowed to sit at the table of official meaning-making” (Kincheloe & Berry, 2004, p. 11), and “paradigmatic and textual analyses” (Kincheloe & Berry, 2004, p. 22) are drawn into dialogue to examine “the various dynamics that shape what is called empirical

knowledge” (Kincheloe & Berry, 2004, p. 7). In a concerted effort to “explore what has been dismissed, deleted, and covered up, [*bricoleurs*] bring to the surface the ideological devices that have erased the lived worlds and perspectives of those living at the margins of power” (Kincheloe and Berry, 2004, p. 20). In extension, this research drew on a vast body of literature with respect to epistemologies, theories and methodologies, and examined a complex body of historical and contemporary clinical literature with respect to the imbricated status of how gender and sexual diversity have been framed in the clinical literature with a specific emphasis on childhood.

Given the focus on examining the etiology and effects of the pathologizing clinical literature, Foucault’s theorizations on power-knowledge and the clinical gaze figure prominently (1977/1995, 1980, 1984, 2003). However, as this research both examined the pathologizing literature, *and* how trans-affirmative activists and scholars whose experience and views had been excluded or marginalized in the psy disciplines, this research also drew on Foucault’s (1980) notion of subjugated knowledges, as advanced by trans scholar, Susan Stryker (2006), whose theorizations on the *(de)subjugation* of trans knowledge and experience illuminate the possibilities for mounting an epistemic insurrection, and advancing notions of trans-epistemologies.¹² Yet given that bricolage rejects the notion of a singular theory as a lens for analysis and instead aims to “develop

¹ Given the complexity surrounding what constitutes ‘trans-epistemologies’ this is examined in a subsequent section.

² According to McAvoy (2014) “The psy disciplines are those fields of knowledge associated with mind, mental life, and behavior. Most typically, the psy disciplines include psychology, psychiatry, psychoanalysis, and psychotherapies, but extend more broadly to a wide range of applied areas such as developmental, educational, and occupational psychologies, and encompass academic and practitioner spheres” (p. 1527). Further discussion of this is presented later in this chapter.

new ways and methods of exposing social, cultural, political, psychological, and educational forces not at first glance discernible” (Kincheloe, 20015, p. 346), this research drew on multiple theories and methodologies to meet “the demands of the task at hand” (Kincheloe, 2005, p. 325). Though different theorizations are woven through this thesis, in *The Case Within the Case: A Micro Genealogy of Epistemic Violence Against Trans Women* (Chapter 4), specific theorizations on epistemic injustice (Fricker, 2007), gaslighting as epistemic violence (McKinnon, 2017, 2019), and Teo’s (2011, 2010) theorizations on epistemological violence in psychology are each employed in response to what participants deemed a significant event, and what illuminated a case of epistemic violence. Likewise, in Chapter five, *Mounting an Epistemic Insurrection*, while Stryker’s (2006) theorizations on (de)subjugated knowledges figure most prominently, additional theoretical and epistemological discussion is woven throughout. Similarly, this eclectic approach which “refuses standardized modes of knowledge production” (Kincheloe, 2005, p. 325) examined extant critical literature such as Tosh (2015, 2016), and Winters’ (2008) critical historical analyses of pathologization of gender variance, and the resistance to trans-informed scholarship by the *psy disciplines*, but it also involved examining the etiology of pathologizing literature and the transcendence of affirmative literature.³

Just as *bricolage* recognizes the limitations of monologic theory, it also recognizes the constraints of methodological rigidity on the knowledge produced (Kincheloe & Berry, 2004). In response, this research, though framed as a paradigmatic case study (Flyvberg,

³ Note: Literature by Tosh and Winters, along with other relevant scholars and publications are outlined in the literature review section of this thesis.

2006; Patton, 2002, 2014) employed an eclectic yet purposeful re-fashioning of methodologies which resulted in two distinct yet deeply connected case studies. Chapter four, *The Case Within the Case: A Micro Genealogy of Epistemic Violence*, emerged in response to participant feedback. This chapter focused on a critical pre-cursor to the death of the clinic and warranted a detailed examination of the discourses of ‘truth’ and ‘power’ that were weaponized against trans women in an academic journal, while simultaneously revealing the growing awareness of such practices and resistance to it. Likewise, in Chapter five, *Mounting an Epistemic Insurrection*, though ethnographically informed (see Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, 2011; Patton, 2002, 2014) by a community of trans activists and scholars who worked to trans-inform the clinical gaze, drew on Tamboukou’s perspective on interweaving ethnographic and genealogical analyses to illuminate “technologies of resistance” (Tamboukou, 2003, p. 198) identified by participants as integral to facilitating a paradigm shift.⁴

Though *bricolage* has been criticized for such complexity and has been “typically excluded from the canon of official research” (Kincheloe & Berry, 2004, p. 12), to adhere to the ‘canons’ when this inquiry is centered upon illuminating the marginalizing and reductionist effects of such epistemological and methodological rigidity, would be disingenuous and counter-intuitive. This is not to say that the “impudent” (Kincheloe & Berry, 2004, p.4) nature of *bricolage* reduces its rigor. On the contrary, to employ *bricolage* involves becoming “knowledgeable of multiple research methodologies”

⁴ My envisioning of *micro genealogy*, and the revisioning the possibilities for genealogical and ethnographic encounters is discussed in subsequent sections of this thesis (both the methodology chapter and within chapters four and five).

(Kincheloe & Berry, 2004, p. 4) and “making sophisticated epistemological decisions” (Kincheloe & Berry, 2004, p. 13). *Bricolage* is also unabashedly political in its aim to “remove knowledge production and its benefits from the control of elite groups” (Kincheloe & Berry, 2004, p. 15), which is why this research aimed to both elucidate the experience of activists and scholars working to transform the pathologized view of childhood gender variance, and to illuminate the intersections of epistemology, privilege and disciplinary power as oppressive regulatory forces.

Overall, this case study research raises important questions surrounding the current state of research in the psy disciplines, and its implications and relevance for educational research which has marginalized philosophical issues (Scott & Usher, 2011), privileged a ‘psychologized’ view for understanding childhood (Teo, 2015), endorsed methodologism (Teo, 2017) and which has actively *disciplined* and erased gender and sexual diversity in schools (Martino & Cumming-Potvin, 2018).⁵⁶ Ultimately, this research illuminates a legacy of harm while also documenting an epistemic insurrection required to trans-inform the clinical gaze. It centers specifically on the *event* of the closing of the Gender Identity Clinic at CAMH in Toronto to generate productive insights into the epistemological violence that was enacted and the significance of the long history of trans activism leading up and contributing to its closure.

⁵ Teo (2017) writes that methodologism “refers to the primacy of method” (p. 105) and discusses how it has come to represent “a methodological theory of truth: True is what you find when you follow the standard quantitative methods in psychology” (2017, p. 105).

⁶ The notion of ‘discipline’ refers to Foucault’s (1977/1995) discussion of discipline as a complex “political anatomy” (p. 138) that traverses disciplines, such as the psy disciplines, education and penal systems, and involves “a whole set of assessing, diagnostic, prognostic, normative judgements” (p. 19) which are also dispersed into society and circulate as a complex apparatus that is both deployed and interiorized. It is the formation, deployment, and circulation of technologies of knowledge/power.

1.1 Emergence and Relevance of this Research

For Scott and Usher, discussion of ontological, epistemological and axiological considerations has become supplanted by focusing on research as a *technology* for eliciting data, and that educational research is frequently understood in the following way:⁷

- nomothetic statements about educational activities, structures and systems are possible;
- educational disputes can be settled by empirical enquiry;
- the values, preconceptions and epistemological frameworks of the researcher are irrelevant to the design of the research and are certainly not reported in the research text.
- it is possible to develop theory about education which is superior to practical knowledge; Practice is therefore understood as the efficient

⁷ While Scott and Usher employ the term technology which makes clear the influence of Michel Foucault's theorizations on 'technologies' (see Foucault, 1988) they are not explicit in establishing this connection. They write: "We begin by problematizing the idea of research as a 'technology', a set of methods, skills and procedures to be implemented. Research is understood as a social practice, in which relations of power are ever-present. This is contrasted with positivist/empiricist research, which may be understood as having the following characteristics: determinacy (there is a certain truth that can be known); rationality (there are no contradictory explanations); impersonality (the more objective and the less subjective the better); and prediction (research is the making of knowledge claims in the form of generalizations from which predictions can be made, and events and phenomena controlled)" (2011, p. 2). Foucault's deployment of the term is discussed in the theoretical section of this chapter.

application of theoretical knowledge which has been constructed by professional researchers;

- there is a correct method for collecting educational data. If this is not followed, then conclusions drawn from the data may be unsound. (2011, pp 1-2).

They suggest that because “philosophical issues tend not to occupy a prominent place in books on educational research” (2011, p. 9), the field has come to privilege “naïve objectivism” (p. 94).⁸⁹ However, they add that “philosophical issues constitute what researchers 'silently think' about research” (p. 10), and the widely held view that “researchers’ values, conceptualizations and knowledge frameworks should not (though they frequently do) enter into the collection of data” (p. 94) “neglects, indeed acts to conceal, those epistemological and ontological relations that underpin all types of research activity” (1999, p. 2). They add that this erasure is paradoxical in that “even when researchers are not conscious of working within the general parameters of positivism, the latter still exert a powerful influence” (p. 9), and one that “we simply cannot dismiss from our epistemological endeavours but must try to understand its effects” (p. 2). This awareness of the repression of the role of values in educational research, combined with a lack of epistemological awareness and epistemological

⁸ Note: Scott and Usher’s use of “naïve objectivism” is most likely drawn from Sandra Harding’s (1991) *Rethinking standpoint epistemology: What is "Strong Objectivity"?*, however their use of the term does not specifically cite Harding.

⁹ Research by Koro-Ljungberg, Yendol-Hoppey, Smith, and Hayes (2009), has illuminated concerns regarding a lack of epistemological awareness specifically among graduate students in teacher education. See *(E)pistemological Awareness, Instantiation of Methods, and Uniformed Methodological Approaches to Educational Research*.

privilege, has been central to guiding this inquiry. Likewise, similar mechanisms that restrict and shape knowledge production in the psy disciplines, as well as their imbricated relationship to education requires explication.

While the use of the term *psy disciplines* may be viewed as problematic in terms of homogenizing a diverse array of disciplines and subdisciplines, I draw on McAvoy's definition of the term (2014). She writes:

The psy disciplines are those fields of knowledge associated with mind, mental life, and behavior. Most typically, the psy disciplines include psychology, psychiatry, psychoanalysis, and psychotherapies, but extend more broadly to a wide range of applied areas such as developmental, educational, and occupational psychologies, and encompass academic and practitioner spheres (p. 1527)

McAvoy provides a brief summary of the emergence of the disciplines in terms of their shared epistemic origin and function:

Borrowing from the natural sciences model, psychology and its related disciplines set out to establish scientific universal truths, to identify and apply normative measures to human behavior and experience, and to create order. The production and organization of psy knowledge promised a means to categorize, measure, and thus exert social control on individuals (p. 1528).

The function of the psy disciplines with respect to the exercise of control over individuals is reflected in what Rose (1979, 1996) termed the *psy complex*. According to McAvoy,

although related, the psy disciplines and the psy complex are not to be conflated. She writes:

a useful distinction is that the concept of the psy disciplines foregrounds the regimes of knowledge and expert practices; whereas the psy complex invokes a stronger recognition of interaction between the disciplinary expert knowledge regimes, and those subjected to, interpellated into and interacting with those disciplinary knowledges (p. 1528).

McAvoy highlights that knowledge produced within the psy disciplines is dispersed, interiorized, and circulates with authority precisely because of its “claim to being underpinned by an apolitical scientific paradigm capable of establishing truths about human nature and behavior” (2014, p.1528). Foucault refers to the imbricated relationship between the psy disciplines and the knowledge that flows from it as a ‘regime of truth’, he writes

These ‘general politics’ and ‘regimes of truth’ are the result of scientific discourse and institutions and are reinforced (and redefined) constantly through the education system, the media, and the flux of political and economic ideologies. In this sense, the ‘battle for truth’ is not for some absolute truth that can be discovered and accepted, but is a battle about ‘the rules according to which the true and false are separated and specific effects of power are attached to the true’... a battle about ‘the status of truth and the economic and political role it plays’(Foucault, in Rabinow 1991).

However, there are scholars situated within the psy disciplines who are committed to shifting “the gaze of the psychologist back on the discipline” (Parker, 2007, p. 1). Critical psychologists such as Ian Parker, encourage clinicians to raise questions about the theories and practices of the disciplines, and recognize that “past errors and crimes of psychology often appear to present day psychologists merely to be historical matters, [yet] the everyday practice of therapeutic, personnel and organizational psychology is still too often informed by those assumptions” (2007, p. 2). In loosely outlining what constitutes critical psychology, Parker asserts that:

Psychological theories do not come out of nowhere. They do not fall from the sky. And we can draw upon the variety of different theories about our own different psychologies to interrupt and subvert the dominant stories that are told by the academics and the professional psychologists, whether those are clinical, educational, forensic or organisational personnel (see, for example, Hansen, McHoul, & Rapley, 2003; Hook, 2007; Parker, Georgaca, Harper, McLaughlin, & Stowell-Smith, 1995). This means that critical psychology is the exploration of the way everyday ‘ordinary psychology’ structures academic and professional work in psychology and how everyday activities might provide the basis for resistance to contemporary disciplinary practices (2007, p. 3).

However, the view that “everyday activities” (p. 3) can provide a basis for resistance to and transformation of the psy disciplines requires some discussion. While Parker asserts that critical psychology “must include a practical political alliance with all those who

suffer psychology and who are starting to refuse the way they have been constructed as pathological” (2007, p. 13), such ally ship is fraught with gatekeeping and epistemic tensions, and while every day practices and such alliances are both necessary and have been instrumental in facilitating transformation, epistemological critique of the psy disciplines within and diffusing them into the public sphere is also essential. In contrast Teo’s focus on meta-theoretical and critical epistemological analyses overlooks the necessity of the relationships that Parker deems important. Ultimately, critical psychology is best understood as critical psychologies, where the task at hand is to ensure voice-informed epistemologies are privileged to the extent that they make epistemological critique a priority within the psy disciplines, and accessible to those outside of them.

Given that trans lives have been the subject of multiple forms of epistemic harm, inflicted through different paradigmatic lenses, critical psychology alone cannot address the full aims of my inquiry. As a result, the political and participatory intent of bricolage, which is informed by multiple theories, methods, and epistemological views, emerged as the essential, framework for this research. Through this process of examination and critique, three specific research questions were addressed:

- 1) How can a genealogically informed case study examining the significance of the Toronto CAMH Gender Identity Clinic (including key figures and the clinical literature that flowed from it) contribute to a deeper understanding of the etiology and effects of epistemological violence enacted against trans people?

2) How can an ethnographically informed case study examining how activists, scholars and clinicians were able to trans-inform the clinical gaze resulting in a paradigm shift with respect to how childhood gender diversity is understood illuminate both a legacy of harm and the practices of freedom from pathologization?

3) What are the pedagogical implications of this research with respect to how it can inform both research and praxes in the psy disciplines and education?

As I have emphasized throughout this introductory section, this research was born out of a necessity to continue to devote critical attention on the persistence and legacy of harm and violence enacted by the clinical establishment and within the disciplinary space of the academy against trans people. Such critical inquiry serves to highlight that complex questions require complex epistemological, theoretical and methodological engagement. As such, I was drawn to the potentialities of bricolage as a framework for generating important insights into enacting trans informed epistemic justice, and, although challenging, was necessary in terms of the aims and scope of this research. In the following sections I outline how this research emerged, and further highlight its political significance and relevance.

1.2 Background

In December of 2015, The Centre for Addiction and Mental Health (CAMH) in Toronto announced the closure of its Child and Adolescent Gender Identity Clinic (GIC). The clinic's closure came on the heels of an external review of its program and services which was prompted by concerns put forth by a coalition of activists, academics, former patients

and their families, who asserted (among other concerns), that the clinic, and namely its lead clinician Dr. Kenneth Zucker, was engaging in ‘reparative or ‘conversion’ therapies aimed at changing the gender identity of gender diverse children and youth (Ubelacker, 2016).¹⁰ Though the clinic and Dr. Zucker have publicly denied engaging in any form of ‘reparative’ therapy (Ubelacker, 2016), the report, described as “damning” (Ubelacker, 15, December, 2015a), outlined concerns with an endemic pathologized view of gender variance, and ‘treatment’ approaches that could not be distinguished from reparative therapy (CAMH CYF GIC Review, 2015).¹¹ Though the acknowledgment that Dr. Zucker’s approach could not be distinguished from reparative therapy was applauded by those who have advocated for the review, Dr. Zucker’s supporters, have taken aim at CAMH for “bowing to transgender activists” (Ubelacker, 2016), and have framed the closure of the clinic as an attack on ‘reason’ and ‘science’ (see comments by R. Blanchard in Ubelacker, 2016). In extension, by taking an *ethnographically informed* approach to interviewing trans-activists and scholars, examining *media discourses* centered on ‘the clinic’ as a site of epistemic controversy, and by conducting a *genealogical analysis* of the literature underpinning the ‘treatment’ approach to trans and gender diverse children, this research was concerned to offer an in depth critical analysis

¹⁰ In order to unpack the “tense and polarised positions in relation to his work” (Tosh, 2011, p 13), it is important to make clear that although Dr. Zucker’s work has been a significant focus of trans-activists and scholars, Dr. Zucker is certainly not alone in his views. However, as the head of the CAMH GIC (until Dec 2015) and as the most widely published clinical expert on trans and gender diverse children in the world (Tosh, 2015, Bryant, 2007), the work of other scholars and their associated influence are addressed in a literature review.

¹¹ Note: The CAMH CYF GIC review was initially posted for public access on the CAMH website but was removed following the retraction of a statement directed towards Zucker. For a discussion of this see article [online] in NYMAG by Signal (7 February 2016) <http://nymag.com/scienceofus/2016/02/fight-over-trans-kids-got-a-researcher-fired.html>

of how these intersecting influences have had a direct impact on how trans and gender diverse children are understood and supported in education contexts.

1.3 Centering Epistemological and Methodological Concerns

As a multiplicity of epistemologies (and their effects) are central to this inquiry, I should first dedicate some time to clarifying the meaning and significance of some terms, as well as making clear my own positionality. First, the views the researcher holds in relation to ‘truth’ and ‘reality’ (ontology), research approaches to how such ‘truths’ can be ascertained (epistemology), how one views the role of values and the role of the researcher in the process (axiology), and how research is written, including issues of representation and transparency (rhetoric) are reflected in the research traditions and methodologies that researchers employ (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005; Hays & Singh, 2012). Second, the choices that researchers make in relation to these questions typically locates their work within loosely defined communities of knowledge production that constitute an interpretive paradigm.

While it is important to recognize that my positionality is embedded in this research, addressing my positionality through a compartmentalized discussion of ‘who’ I am and how this impacts this research is a paradox; reflexivity and transparency are important as all researchers are embedded in the knowledge they construct and there are implications that result from this. However, ‘who’ I am, and how this may impact this research is not

something that can or should be addressed solely as a ‘section’ of this dissertation, and therefore I have woven in reflections throughout this dissertation.

My orientation to ontology is complex; I view ‘truth’ as subjective, contextual, and as shaped by both oppressive influences, and via agency. My orientation to epistemology is likewise both critical, and contextual. This entire thesis is premised upon elucidating the harm that has been enacted by rigid epistemological positions that attempt to erase the political dimensions of research and dismiss, while simultaneously making clear the importance of voice-informed, specifically in this research, trans-informed epistemological positions. This notion challenges compartmentalized understanding of epistemologies. While much attention is paid to problematizing positivism, and what are typically framed as positivist approaches to research (claims of truth that are often derived from quantitative approaches), I demonstrate how even what appears to be ‘positivist’ research can be transformed by infusing critical anti-oppressive voice informed epistemologies. To be clear, this is fraught with tensions and complexities, but as many participants have made clear, navigating this complex terrain is both important and possible.

Once again, examining these considerations from a perspective that considers paradox, different epistemologies are examined throughout this research. Feminist and queer epistemological are examined for their contributions and problematized for the harm that such contributions have had on trans people, including the exclusion and erasure of the voices and material concerns of trans people. Likewise, the psy disciplines which tend to be dominated by positivist approaches are also demonstrating new possibilities for such

research that are urgently needed. Consider Brown, Wiendels and Eyre (2019) *Social justice competencies for counselling and psychotherapy: Perceptions of experienced practitioners and implications for contemporary practice* which employs a mixed methods approach utilizing concept mapping and takes an ethical political stance which attends to the importance of clinician views with respect to social justice considerations with respect to serving marginalized populations.

Similarly, Turban, King, Sari, Reisner, Keuroghlian (2019) employ quantitative methods to investigate the prevalence of 'Psychological Attempts to Change a Person's Gender Identity from Transgender to Cisgender' (2019), yet they do so from the trans-epistemological stance that such practices are both unethical and harmful. These references are reflective of the complex landscape of research that is examined in this dissertation. With respect to axiology, I believe that values are both present and important in research. They can be the source of immense harm, and they are also important to creating trust, respect and openness with participants, as well as offering transparency from which research claims may be evaluated. My approach to rhetoric is likewise guided by ongoing explication of these dimensions in the research process, and ethical-political commitment to participants and to demonstrating the possibilities of critical-anti-oppressive, participatory, voice informed research.

Yet I recognize and make clear that I am a white, cisgender, researcher conducting research that attends to a legacy of violence that has been enacted against trans and gender diverse people. My lived experience as a cisgender person is inadequate, and potentially harmful as a result. As a conceptual framework for this research, bricolage

provides guidance that attends to this inadequacy. This research privileges trans-epistemologies, and trans voices, and I have sought guidance from trans activists, scholars and participants throughout this research. This is important because the notion of voice is itself a domain that requires some problematization. As discussed in Chapter 4, being trans, and holding a trans-epistemological stance are not necessarily the same. Although a limited corpus of research, research by trans people that *pathologizes* trans people is not trans-epistemological. Instead, it is premised upon investment in a pathology paradigm that negates and erases the legitimacy of trans voices outside of this paradigm. Trans people are taken as objects of inquiry and are examined and represented in the context of theoretical and epistemological views that run contrary to the aims of transgender studies and the trans-epistemologies (Nicolazzo, 2017; Nordmarken, 2014, 2019; Radi, 2019; Stryker & Whittle, 2006).

Though it is important to make clear that being a cisgender researcher requires problematization in this research, it is also important to note how my positionality is more complex than my cisgender status. As a woman, I have experienced and have insights into patriarchal systems and a legacy of pathologizing women and femininity. As a parent, I have recognized the gendered disciplining of children, from the normative gaze that restricts and judges a child's play preferences, friends and gender expression, and the way psy discourse on gender and sexuality permeates parenting and childhood. As someone who has clinical diagnosis, I also recognize the complexities of how diagnostic concepts have powerful reverberations on the self and how others interpret and respond to such classifications. Yet, as Namaste (2000, 2009) and Stryker (2006) make clear, while problematizing disciplines and diagnoses is of vital importance, theoretical

rejection of such concepts in their entirety in the absence of alternatives can erase the lived experience and material needs of real people.

My lived experience prompts critical reflection on gender, the psy disciplines, diagnoses and their complexities in a way that attends to the limits of my positionality and my commitment to address this. While this is a brief and partial discussion of my positionality, it is also important that researchers be transparent about their epistemological stance without demands for confessional disclosure. During this research I had many discussions with participants and trans and non-binary friends and colleagues about my positionality in relation to this research. We must also recognize that identity disclosures are not always desired, necessary or safe. Advice that was shared with me has helped me navigate these concerns that I shall pass along for consideration as follows: “you owe people some transparency and insight as to your relationship to this research, but you do not owe people your story’.

Returning to the complexities of paradigms, it is also important to be clear that there are vastly different and conflicting perspectives as to what defines a paradigm. While Scott and Usher identify three possible interpretive paradigms: *interpretive*, *critical theoretical* and *post-positivist/post-modern* (2011, pp 2-3), Denzin and Lincoln (2005) offer a more detailed analysis, and do not concur with Scott and Usher’s (1999) fusion of *post-positivist* and *post-modern* frameworks as reflective of a shared paradigm.¹² As well Scott and Usher’s assertions provide a narrow interpretation of ‘critical’ paradigms, erase the

¹² Denzin and Lincoln reference Scott & Usher’s 1st edition of *Researching Education: Data Methods and Theory in Educational Inquiry* (1999), however the discussion would also apply to the 2011 edition which outlines the same view as the previous edition.

vastness of post-structuralist approaches, and do not address the potential that each of these paradigms can in fact be quite blurred. For this reason, I draw on Denzin and Lincoln's views surrounding epistemologies and paradigms yet will do so with emphasis on the notion of the blurred nature of epistemological frameworks.¹³

According to Denzin and Lincoln:

At the most general level, four major interpretive paradigms structure qualitative research: positivist and post-positivist, constructivist, interpretive, critical (Marxist, emancipatory) and feminist-post-structural. These four abstract paradigms become more complicated at the level of concrete specific interpretive communities (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005, p. 22).

Denzin and Lincoln (2011) assert that *positivism* and *post-positivism* are “two positivist science traditions” (p. 8) with shared emphasis on the “discovery and verification of theories... [based on] traditional evaluation criteria like internal and external validity” (p. 8) and that both may employ a qualitative and or quantitative methods (Denzin and Lincoln, 2011). One such example is in relation to *case study research*, which although a common approach in qualitative research, crosscuts epistemologies and paradigms.

Yazan (2015) conducted an in-depth analysis of the epistemological underpinnings of some of the most notable contributories to *case study research* (Yin, Stake and Merriam),

¹³ Scott and Usher (2011) provide an explanation of *post-positivism* as critical of objectivist and scientific approaches to research, whereas Denzin and Lincoln (2005) assert that post-positivism, though aligned with an ontological view of multiple realities, is far more closely aligned with *positivism*, in terms of epistemology (the research process for obtaining the closest approximation of ‘truth’). They write: “critical realists [post-positivists] agree with the positivist that there is a world of events out there that is observable and independent of human consciousness. They hold that knowledge about this world is socially constructed” (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005, p. 13).

and makes the assertion that each approach is premised upon a different epistemological lens. Specifically, Yazan asserts that although Yin “seems to evade making statements about his epistemic commitments or his preferred epistemology that should lead the case study methodology” (Yazan, 2015, p. 137), his continual reference to illustrating the soundness of *case study* as a legitimate ‘scientific’ method by *contrasting it with the scientific method* and applying the same “yardsticks” (Yazan, 2015, p. 137), illuminates clearly positivist leanings. Yazan adds that in contrast, Stake and Merriam are both *explicit* in their adherence to constructionist epistemological stance (though Yazan suggests Stake’s approach has more ‘existentialist’ leanings (2015, p. 137).

However, while Yin’s approach may be framed as emanating from a *positivist* lens, it is important to note that his work is frequently employed by scholars and graduate students whose epistemological frame is explicitly *critical* and or *post-structural*.¹⁴ This is important as it illuminates how the apparent epistemological situatedness of methodology does not necessarily reflect a specific paradigm; rather it is the way that the researcher engages with a methodology that holds greater significance. This view is shared by Teo (2010, 2011, 2017) who holds that the scientific method is not in itself a problem in psychological research, rather it is the theoretical underpinnings, and or the absence of their articulation (particularly when claims are made that hold implications for those under study) that are the problem. Yet according to Teo, methodologism is pervasive in

¹⁴ Rezai-Rashti and Martino (2009) draw on Creswell (2007), Patton (2002), Stake (2000), and Yin (2009), in “*Black Male Teachers as Role Models: Resisting the Homogenizing Impulse of Gender and Racial Affiliation*” - yet the epistemological orientations are explicitly critical- feminist, critical-race, anti-oppressive and post-structural. For detailed use of Yin in a critical-post-structural orientated dissertation, see Castrodale (2015) “*Examining the Socio-spatial Knowledge(s) Of Disabled and Mad Students in Higher Education*”.

psychology and epistemological awareness tends to be quite limited and rarely transparent (Teo, 2017). While education research reflects greater diversity, both the psychologization of education (Teo, 2017) and policy demands surrounding what constitutes ‘truth’ and evidence, contribute to methodologism as well. According to a meta analysis of graduate theses by Koro-Ljungberg, Yendol-Hoppey, Smith, & Hayes (2009) education graduate students demonstrated little understanding of epistemologies and even less awareness of the relationship between epistemologies and methodologies in their theses.

Just how blurred the epistemological orientations of research communities is evident in examining both ‘trans-affirmative’ and pathologizing clinical literature, as *neither* ‘community of scholarship’ can be placed solely into one paradigmatic or epistemological frame. ‘Trans-informed scholarship’ is a loosely defined term that encompasses a diverse array of methodological approaches. Consider work by Olson, Durwood, DeMeules, and McLaughlin (2016) who undertook a quantitative analysis of the mental health of transgender children who are supported in their identities. The authors employ the *scientific method*, *do not discuss epistemology or theory*, yet make ‘truth’ claims about the interior psychological state of transgender children. Though on many levels this approach could be deemed *positivist*, their *implicit* epistemological stance towards trans lives (which is supportive of trans-identities, and premised upon,

though not explicitly articulated, on *trans epistemologies*) would be considered trans-affirmative scholarship.¹⁵

Though trans epistemologies and theory are difficult to define (Nicolazzo, 2017; Nordmarken, 2014, 2019; Radi, 2019; Stryker & Whittle, 2006), and there are 'rifts' and tensions within trans scholarship (Elliott, 2010; Radi, 2019; Stryker & Whittle, 2006; Tosh, 2015, 2016) within this emergent field of scholarship, the centripetal theme is that of the legitimacy of trans people as authoritative voices regarding their own lives, whereby questions of identity, embodiment and intelligibility are freed from the pathologizing literature that psy discourse has deployed to control, silence and erase them. Further discussion of trans epistemologies are discussed in the *Epistemological and Theoretical Frameworks* section of this chapter, but are briefly mentioned here to make clear that this is not an oversight, rather it was a decision to discuss trans epistemologies and theory together in part due to their imbricated status, and in part because trans epistemologies involved more than discussion in this dissertation, they involved ongoing deployment.

Returning to the notion of trans-affirmative clinical literature, while it certainly has emerged from within the psy disciplines, the epistemological frameworks for such research also demonstrates the blurring of epistemologies, so too does the pathologizing

¹⁵ While I would argue that affirmative work that emerges from what could broadly be defined as a positivist/post-positivist paradigm is possible, and is a notion supported by Teo's (2010, 2011) meta-theoretical discussion that the scientific method is not the problem, rather it is the interpretive lens of the researcher that is problematic, I would argue that the risk of harm resulting from lack of epistemological awareness is high in both quantitative and qualitative research where 'good intentions' can go awry without an in depth understanding of ontology, epistemology, axiology and rhetoric, and how ones positionality impacts the research.

literature. Yet this requires some elaboration. While direct epistemological discussion tends to be absent from such literature, the dominant epistemological frameworks for research in the psy disciplines, tends to be positivism/post-positivism (Teo, 2010, 2011, 2015, 2017). Yet upon examination of the research, while swathed in the discourses of positivism, i.e.: framing the research as ‘science’, discussion of typically quantitative approaches for eliciting ‘truth’, framing the research as ‘objective’, and representing participants as ‘objects of inquiry’, the pathologizing clinical literature masks the multi-paradigmatic claims and the personal bias of these researchers.¹⁶ While the blurring of epistemologies is not inherently problematic, lack of epistemological awareness and transparency is, in that it can lead to the construction and dissemination of problematic research that holds privilege vis a vis hierarchies of knowledge production and being framed as ‘science’.

This problem is evident in *In A Developmental, Biopsychosocial Model for the Treatment of Children with Gender Identity Disorder* (Zucker, Wood, Singh & Bradley, 2012), in which the authors propose a variety of influences on the etiology of gender identity ‘disorder’, including biological factors, psycho-social factors, social cognition, co-occurring psychopathology, and psychodynamic mechanisms. However, this model, which despite being a more recent publication, simply reiterates Zucker and Bradley’s (1995) work, *Gender Identity Disorder and Psychosexual Problems in Children and Adolescents* and draws on their clinical expertise and analysis of various ‘cases’ they have observed that support their hypotheses. Neither theory nor epistemology are

¹⁶ Psy discourse refers to the concepts and language that are diffused from the psy disciplines (see McAvoy, 2014).

discussed, instead, the notion that gender diversity, particularly claiming that a transgender identity is ‘abnormal’, is an assumed *de facto* position. Their assertions are framed as ‘science’, and in extension *positivist/post-positivist*, yet they engage with both *essentialist* and *constructionist* notions of gender (both in asserting that parental influence can contribute to gender ‘inversion’, and that ‘treatment’ can ameliorate the ‘problem’). Consider the following summary statement regarding psychosocial factors where they assert that “In our case formulation, parental neutrality or encouragement of cross-gender behavior is viewed as a perpetuating factor” (Zucker, et. al, 2012, p.377). While a mere brief example, it is important in that Zucker’s work, and that of clinicians and scholars aligned with the ‘treatment’ approach to childhood gender diversity, though clearly aligned with a *positivist* epistemology, and a belief in a notion of ‘truth’ achieved via the scientific method, have demonstrated little understanding of philosophy of science and the importance of articulating the philosophical, theoretical and methodological underpinnings of their research¹⁷.

With respect to my own epistemological orientation, I situate myself as aligning with *critical* and predominantly *post-structuralist epistemologies* (feminist, queer, trans, critical race, anti-oppressive), yet I am aligned with Foucault, in resisting being defined by an ‘ism’. According to Dreyfus and Rabinow, “Foucault was never a structuralist strictly speaking, or a poststructuralist” (1983, p. xxiv). That I have always found this space of seeming contradiction and possibility as reflective of my epistemological lens, it

¹⁷ In Ubelacker (23 January, 2016), “*CAMH Gender Identity Clinic Closure Sparks Protest*”, Zucker is quoted as unwilling to engage in critical dialogue surrounding his work, asserting instead that “science can do the talking”.

perhaps lends to my sense of alignment with *trans theory*, which (in addition to my concern for human rights, the well-being of children, and concern with a lack of criticality in the ‘psy’ disciplines) acknowledges that tensions some would argue are *incommensurable*, are in fact reflective of a deep and *holistic reality*. A specific example can be found in Francis’s (2010) *monoglossic* and *heteroglossic* notions of gender, which illustrate the paradox that *structural* and *post-structural* realities exist in complex tension. Further reflection on epistemological tensions and notions of ‘commensurability’ are discussed throughout this dissertation.

1.4 Conceptual, Theoretical, and Methodological Framework

As a conceptual framework for conducting qualitative research, the notion of *bricolage* is somewhat paradoxical. By resisting categorization, and by promoting creative, and often social justice-oriented research, *bricolage* has proven to be an effective means for challenging and expanding the boundaries of knowledge production and the governance of knowledge claims. Yet it has also been criticized for its perceived ambiguity, political orientation and focus on interdisciplinarity (Kincheloe, 2001; Rogers, 2012; Wibberley, 2012). As a result, making the decision to employ *bricolage* must then begin with being able to respond to the inevitable question posed by anyone unfamiliar with the approach: “what makes bricolage an acceptable format for academic work generally and in particular a PhD dissertation” (Wibberley, 2012, p. 6). To respond to this question, some historical framing of the term, variance in its uptake, and a clear explanation of my interpretive deployment of the concept and why it is the most appropriate approach to this research is necessary.

The term *bricolage* was introduced as a term to academic research by the French anthropologist Claude Levi-Strauss (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, Kincheloe, 2001, 2005, Kincheloe, McLaren & Steinberg, 2011). Lacking a precise English equivalent, *bricolage* refers to the assembled product of a *bricoleur*, which is loosely defined as a “Jack of all trades” (Levi-Strauss, 1962, p. 11), a ‘handyman’[sic], ‘quilt maker’, or ‘tinkerer’ (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, Kincheloe, 2001, 2005, Kincheloe, McLaren & Steinberg, 2011). The seemingly ambiguous and rudimentary nature of the term has been fodder for critics of *bricolage*, yet Levi-Strauss’s deployment of the term in his work *The Savage Mind* (Levi-Strauss, 1962), was far from mere ‘tinkering’. On the contrary, he was introducing a critical examination of knowledge production that implicated epistemic hierarchies of knowledge production, the researcher, and the cultural frameworks they employed, as embedded in the knowledge they produced (Levi-Strauss, 1962). He was also illuminating how colonization worked in tandem with discourses of objectivity had and had “been exploited to prove the intellectual poverty of Savages” (Levi-Strauss, 1962, p. 1).

From its inception, *bricolage* has been concerned with challenging epistemological privilege, dispelling the myth of ‘objective’ value free research, and advocating for alternate knowledges not to be dismissed as ‘primitive’ (Levi-Strauss, 1962). However, it is also important to note that Levi-Strauss’s work was firmly *structuralist* (O’Farrell, 2005), and though he raised important questions surrounding epistemic privilege, and what at the time was a dismissal of ‘primitive’ knowledges, his work was focused firmly on theorizing that all thought is premised upon a “demand for order” (Levi-Strauss, 1962, p. 6) and asserting that systematic observation, ordering of concepts and theorizing in

both science and in ‘primitive cultures’ resulted in “parallel modes of acquiring knowledge” (Levi Strauss, 1962, p. 9). However it would be over thirty years later, that the ‘nod’ given to *bricolage* by Denzin and Lincoln as a metaphor for the “blurred genres” moment in qualitative research in their 2nd edition of the SAGE handbook of Qualitative Research (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000, p. 3), that it would begin to emerge as a framework for qualitative research.

Though Denzin and Lincoln initially introduced *bricolage* as reflective of a diverse array of research practices that employed multiple qualitative methodologies, and by proposing that “There are many kinds of *bricoleurs* - interpretive, narrative, theoretical, political, and methodological” (2000), by the 4th edition (2011), a full chapter was dedicated to Kincheloe, McLaren’s and Steinberg’s conceptualizations of *bricolage*, which emphasized *each* of these elements as integral to conducting *bricolage* (Kincheloe, McLaren & Steinberg, 2011). Though they resist rigid definitions of *bricolage* they stress that the overarching consideration of “*bricolage* as emancipatory research construct” (Kincheloe, McLaren & Steinberg, 2011, p. 167) is what should guide the approach. They do outline that there are generally “two types of *bricoleurs*, (1) those who are committed to research eclecticism, allowing circumstance to shape methods employed, and (2) those who want to engage in the genealogy/archeology of the disciplines with some grander purpose in mind” (Kincheloe, McLaren & Steinberg, 2011, pp 168-169). This important reference to Foucauldian ‘genealogy/archaeology’ is significant, as it begs the question,

what distinguishes *bricolage* from Foucault's approaches?¹⁸ The answer lies in the fact that *bricolage* not only involves the use of multiple theories and methodologies (of which elements of genealogical analysis may be a key part), but for Kincheloe, "the act of understanding power and its effects is merely one part - albeit an inseparable part - of counter hegemonic action" (Kincheloe, McLaren & Steinberg, 2011, p. 169).

In the case of *bricolage*, the research is intended to be *participatory*, *voice informed*, and *self-reflexive* on the part of the researcher in a way that extends beyond a strict definition of Foucault's *genealogy*, (which although discussed in a subsequent section, would involve a *deeper historical analysis* than was proposed for this research). As theoretical and methodological presuppositions are embedded in the concept of *bricolage*, I will turn to the *epistemological*, *theoretical* (and subsequently methodological) frameworks employed in this research, with discussion of 'commensurability' interwoven throughout. Wibberley's (2012) question regarding the suitability of *bricolage* for a doctoral dissertation are addressed briefly in this chapter, but further discussion is presented in the final chapter of this thesis as it provides readers with the opportunity to consider this question in light of the full synthesis of the theories, methodologies, and results of this study.

1.5 Epistemological, Theoretical Lenses

It is important to acknowledge that part of the commitment of *bricolage* involves being reflexive about the notion of voice at every stage of the research process, including

¹⁸ Note: a brief discussion of archaeology and more detailed discussion of genealogy follow in the methodology section.

theoretical considerations. While this entire dissertation has been guided by trans-epistemologies, precisely what that means requires some nuanced discussion because of the complicated discourses that are employed in relation to scholarship that involves trans people. Terms like *trans-affirmative* and *trans-informed*, as discussed by participants in chapter five, are not necessarily reflective of a *trans epistemological* stance. Likewise, the theories, and methodologies employed in research that has critiqued the ‘treatment’ approach crosscuts paradigms and has been criticized for perpetuating harm as well (see critiques of queer and feminist analyses by Namaste, 2000, 2009; Tosh 2016). Similarly, ‘trans scholarship’ is not necessarily a reflection of the identity of the scholar, rather it is reflective of a trans-affirmative and/or a trans-epistemological stance. Lastly, as participants made clear, there are clinicians who are trans whose work is located within a pathology paradigm (see Chapter 4 discussion of Lawrence).

Specifically, what constitutes ‘trans affirmative’ scholarship and practice is further complicated by lack of a definitive body of work that defines trans epistemologies. While Susan Stryker’s work is not explicitly defined as ‘trans epistemology’ her discussion of what constitutes the field of transgender studies and her transgender theory have been influential to the growing body of work centered upon trans epistemologies. Stryker’s work is discussed, both in terms of epistemology and theory below. Likewise, while Michel Foucault’s work is difficult to define and certainly transcends disciplines today, it is worth noting that Foucault’s initial training was in psychology, and is informed by the synthesis of his professional, academic, and personal insights into the psy disciplines, and his critical methodological contributions (see O’Farrell, 2005). Other theorists are drawn from critical psychology, philosophy, gender studies, linguistics, education, allied health

disciplines, and beyond. This was to ensure that not only are these theoretical perspectives purposeful, they are employed in a commitment to interdisciplinarity, particularly given that the very notions of disciplinary rigidity, notions of ‘expertise’ and whose voices are valorized or excluded from knowledge production lie at the heart of this dissertation.

In the following sections, I discuss the theorizations of Michel Foucault (1977, 1980, 1984, 2003), Susan Stryker, 2006, Miranda Fricker (2007), Rachel McKinnon (2017, 2019), Viviane Namaste (2000, 2009) and Thomas Teo (2010, 2011, 2017). Each provide a distinct lens for analysing the epistemic issues central to this dissertation, and in some instances, adding necessary layers to ‘trans-informing’ the clinical gaze. While this section provides an overview of their theorizations, their contributions are also discussed in subsequent sections of this dissertation in further detail. This is in part done to avoid a fragmented approach to theory and praxes when discussing and presenting findings, and to also provide transparency as to how choices of theorists were made in tandem with findings to illustrate the evolving process of bricolage from theory to methodologies.

1.5.1 Trans Epistemologies

While scholarship that explicitly aims to define trans epistemologies remains somewhat elusive (Nicolazzo, 2017; Nordmarken, 2014, 2019; Radi, 2019), the interdisciplinary field of transgender studies, makes clear that epistemological issues are central to any research that could be framed as trans-affirmative or trans-informed, though these terms should not be conflated and are discussed in subsequent chapters. According to Stryker

(2006) has woven together interdisciplinary scholarship and approaches that inform this field. According to Stryker:

Epistemological concerns lie at the heart of transgender critique and motivate a great deal of the transgender struggle for social justice. Transgender phenomena, in short, point the way to a different understanding of how bodies mean, how representation works, and what counts as legitimate knowledge. These philosophical issues have material consequences for the quality of transgender lives (2006, pp 8-9).

Trans scholar Blas Radi (2019) who discusses the emergent nature of trans epistemologies highlights some common themes that reflect the participatory and reflexive aims of trans epistemological contributions including “nothing about us without us” (p. 48), “raising the voices of trans* people” (p 48), not engaging in “epistemic objectification” (p.48), “epistemic othering” (p. 49) multivocality not totality (p. 49), understand the legacy of epistemic violence (p. 49). Trans scholar Sonny Nordmarken (2014) illuminates the importance of taking action by reversing the questions that trans people are subjected to in order to demonstrate their absurdity. They write:

If you are asking this question—why did you transition? —I encourage you to question yourself: Why do I not transition? Then, you might see the absurdity of the question. Obviously, you do not transition because it is not you. I transition because to transition is to be me (p.49).

Nordmarken makes clear that taking a reflexive stance, questioning and problematizing where our notions of gender come from, and questioning them, not trans people is also

central to enacting trans epistemologies. Sharing similar perspectives to Nordmarken, Nicolazzo (2017) also emphasizes the intersectional aspects of being trans as integral to the development of trans-epistemologies. How does race, disability and class intersect with gender to reflect the realities of trans material experience, needs and identities. Likewise, trans scholar Julia Serano makes clear that trans-misogyny and effemimania are endemic problems that unite the concerns that are the focus of trans, feminist and masculinities scholarship.¹⁹ However, I am also mindful that as Nicolazzo points out “the gazing cisgender eye” (2017, p.3) has been a constant source of harm, and in extension has been a constant source of reflection throughout this research.²⁰ And the notion of harm is central to the exigency of the focus on trans epistemologies. As Stryker discusses:

Those who commit violence against transgender people routinely seek to excuse their own behavior by claiming they have been unjustly deceived by a

¹⁹ Serano (2016) defines trans-misogyny as words and actions that “dismiss and deride femaleness and femininity” (xix) and she writes that ‘effemimania’ involves “our societal obsession with critiquing and belittling feminine traits in males. However, as I have argued in past chapters, effemimania affects everybody, including women. Effemimania encourages those who are socialized male to mystify femininity and to dehumanize those who are considered feminine, and thus forms the foundation of virtually all male expressions of misogyny. Effemimania also ensures that any male’s manhood or masculinity can be brought into question at any moment for even the slightest perceived expression of, or association with, femininity. I would argue that today, the biggest bottleneck in the movement toward gender equity is not so much women’s lack of access to what has been traditionally considered the “masculine realm,” but rather men’s insistence on defining themselves in opposition to women (i.e., their unwillingness to venture into the “feminine realm”)” (p.20, google play e-book).

²⁰ Note: It is important to make clear that Nicolazzo’s discussion of the harms associated with the “gazing cisgender eye” are constantly with me and are addressed in a subsequent section of this thesis. As well, while the preceding brief discussion of trans-epistemologies provides a glimpse into their complexities, they should be considered as a starting point only, not only in relation to the growing body of scholarship in this domain, but in the context of this research and my framework of bricolage, which aims to bring a vast body of scholarship and voices into dialogue, but in doing so cannot be an exhaustive discussion of this field. As well, also in relation to bricolage, my aim is to demonstrate the interweaving of epistemologies, theories and voices in the finding’s chapters, rather than to extricate or compartmentalize these interwoven domains.

mismatch between the other's gender and genitals. State and society do similar violence to transgender people by using genital status, rather than public gender or subjective gender identity, as the fundamental criterion for determining how they will place individuals in prisons, residential substance abuse treatment program, rape crisis centers, or homeless shelters. One important task of transgender studies is to articulate and disseminate new epistemological frameworks, and new representational practices, within which variations in the sex/gender relationship can be understood as morally neutral and representationally true, and through which anti-transgender violence can be linked to other systemic forms of violence such as poverty and racism. This intellectual work is intimately connected to, and deeply motivated by, sociopolitical efforts to stem the tide of anti-transgender violence, and to save transgender lives.

Thus, Stryker makes clear that epistemologies have a tangible impact on people's lives. Therefore, I have resisted comments that have encountered during my studies that suggested that epistemological concerns are abstractions that have little impact on people's lives. Clearly, they do as ontological and epistemological issues lie at the heart of how we are recognized to exist.

1.5.2 Foucault

Although the work of Michel Foucault is widely recognized for his influence with respect to queer theory (and epistemologies), his work has also been both influential to transgender studies (see Stryker, 2006) and to critiques of the psy disciplines, which

makes his work invaluable to this dissertation. To be clear, both the title of this dissertation and the critical interpretive lenses that it employs draw heavily on Foucault's notion of the clinical 'gaze'. Though the terms are most frequently cited in relation to Foucault's work *The Birth of the Clinic* (2012 [1963]), the term and the theorizations surrounding the notion of the clinical gaze actually emerged in his earlier work, *Madness and Civilization* (2013[1961]). In this work, Foucault's historical examination of the transformation from *madness* to *mental illness* illustrates the emergence of his key *concepts* and *methods*, which shift the focus from the *object* of study as an isolated phenomenon, to the formation of knowledge and practices surrounding it. Foucault illuminates the emergence of mental illness as a cultural construct imbricated with notions of *reason*, *norms*, *morality* and the *management of populations* through various 'scientifically driven' interventions; to *confine*, *exclude*, *treat*, and *prevent* deviation from culturally situated, hegemonic views.²¹

²¹ Although Foucault's explicit theorizations on 'technologies' emerged in greater detail in his later works (see Foucault, 1988) in *Birth of the Clinic* (1973/2003) he signals its complexity and links the concept to the psy disciplines as follows, he writes: "There is, therefore, a spontaneous and deeply rooted convergence between the requirements of political ideology and those of medical technology. In a concerted effort, doctors and statesmen demand, in a different vocabulary but for essentially identical reasons, the suppression of every obstacle to the constitution of this new space: the hospitals, which alter the specific laws governing disease, and which disturb those no less rigorous laws that define the relations between property and wealth, poverty and work; the association of doctors which prevents the formation of a centralized medical consciousness, and the free play of an experience that is allowed to reach the universal without imposed limitations; and, lastly, the Faculties, which recognize that which is true only in theoretical structures and turn know-ledge into a social privilege. Liberty is the vital, unfettered force of truth. It must, therefore, have a world in which the gaze, free of all obstacle, is no longer subjected to the immediate law of truth: the gaze is not faithful to truth, nor subject to it, without asserting, at the same time, a supreme mastery: the gaze that sees is a gaze that dominates; and although it also knows how to subject itself, it dominates its masters (p. 45).

At the heart of this critique is Foucault's challenge to the belief that the *human sciences*' embrace of *positivism* was indeed a progressive, humane or liberatory approach for understanding 'madness'. He writes:

The age of *positivism*, for over half a century, constantly claimed to have been the first to free the mad from a lamentable confusion with the felonious, to separate the innocence of unreason from the guilt of crime. Yet it is simple enough to show the vanity of this claim. (Foucault, 2013 [1961], p. 221-222)

That traces of Foucault's theorizations about the clinical 'gaze' and surrounding 'power/knowledge' emerge to varying degrees across multiple works and with some variance in approach is significant. Considering that Foucault's most explicit theorizations on Power/knowledge appeared in *Discipline and Punish* (1977/1995), which was published after *Madness and Civilization* and *Birth of the Clinic* (1973/2003) (in which the notion of the 'gaze' emerged), to draw on Foucault's theorizations in the context of this inquiry is not about proposing a full tracing of the emergence of either concept. Instead, it involves recognizing that both knowledge and power are imbricated concepts, yet Foucault's discussion of power/knowledge emerged in different ways and in different times in his work. What is important is to draw on the most appropriate analytic 'tools' to illustrate how they are central to explicating an understanding of the operation of knowledge/power relations that have been and continue to be exercised through the deployment of the clinical gaze and its impact on the lives and well-being of trans people.

Consider the following

There is no need for arms, physical violence, material constraints. Just a gaze.
An inspecting gaze, a gaze which each individual under its weight will end by interiorising to the point that he is his own overseer, each individual thus exercising this surveillance over, and against, himself (Foucault, 1980, p. 156).

This excerpt from an interview with Foucault, synthesizes the ‘gaze’, ‘power/knowledge’ and techniques of government, involving the “the reciprocal constitution of power techniques and forms of knowledge” (Lemke, 2001, p. 191) with succinct precision that is not necessarily typical of Foucault’s larger works.²² Thus I suggest that the ‘gaze’ serves as a metaphor for illustrating the etiology and effects of systems of knowledge production, that it reveals epistemological and disciplinary privilege, and it exposes the ways that knowledge/power circulates over and through bodies as a culturally embedded technique of government. I propose that in drawing on Foucault’s theorizations, as *bricoleur*, I must continually revisit the aims of this inquiry, examining theoretical pre-suppositions in tandem with the voices of activists and scholars, and remaining committed to drawing on the best possible sources to address the questions at hand.

²² For Foucault “The art of government,, is essentially concerned with answering the question of how to introduce economy - that is to say, the correct manner of managing individuals, goods and wealth within the family (which a good father is expected to do in relation to his wife, children and servants) and of making the family father towards his family into the management of the state” (1991, p. 92). The techniques of government cannot be reduced to a single form, rather they are contingent upon relations between the state and the individual. Yet, data constructed and compiled regarding the individual relied on “knowledge that was concrete, specific, and measurable in order to operate effectively. This enabled it to ascertain precisely the state of its forces, where they were weak and how they could be shored up. The new political rationality of bio-power was therefore connected with the nascent empirical human sciences. What was first a study of population, for instance, soon became political arithmetic. (Dreyfus, Rabinow, & Foucault, 1983. p. 137).

Though somewhat unorthodox, it is important to note that Foucault's challenge to positivism and the 'psy' disciplines, (and his methodology) was considered highly unorthodox at the time of his doctoral dissertation (on which *Madness and Civilization* is based), and that "The committee of academics who conducted the *via voce* examination for the major thesis expressed some surprise at the unconventional academic style in which it was written, while at the same time acknowledging its detailed, scholarly approach" (Oliver, 2010, p. 13). Both the 'surprise' and acknowledgement of his examiners surrounding his work foreshadowed the paradox of Foucault's influence. Though influential in the subsequent "growth of interest in marginal groups and experiences" (O'Farrell, 2005, p. 36) his work would also be "met with outrage by traditional psychiatrists with an entire conference being convened in 1969 to denounce its pernicious effects" (O'Farrell, 2005, p. 37). In this sense, not only do Foucault's *theorizations* illuminate issues relevant to the experience of trans informed activists and scholars who (among the variety of approaches to trans informed scholarship) have sought to problematize the notion of the psy disciplines as offering an objective, progressive, liberatory or humane approach for understanding gender variance, but Foucault's *experience* as a critical scholar who encountered organized hostility and resistance from the psy disciplines', mirrors some of the hostilities experienced by activists and scholars working to trans-inform the clinical gaze.²³

²³ Note: In 1969 an entire conference was organized by psychiatrists to 'deal with the problem of Foucault – see" (O'Farrell, 2005, p. 37). In 2008, an entire publication of the Archives of Sexual Behavior was dedicated to deal with the 'problem of trans women exercising to problematize the pathologizing construction of their identities in psychological literature' (see chapter 4).

Foucault's theorizations on the "insurrection of subjugated knowledges (1980, p. 81) is also central to this inquiry. However, given that his theorizations in this regard are imbricated in his genealogical methods which are discussed in the methodology chapter of this dissertation, and they are related to Stryker's theorizations on (de)subjugated knowledges (next section), I shall make a brief mention only. According to Foucault, for such an insurrection to have the force of weight to challenge the psychiatric establishment, the knowledge deployed to do so must involve the union of knowledge that emerges from those who have been the targets of the psy disciplines, in tandem with the development of scholarly knowledge of these relations "whose validity is not dependent on the approval of the established regimes of thought" (1980, p. 81). In this research, the activists and scholars who have worked to trans-inform the clinical gaze have done precisely this, by bringing lived experience and scholarly knowledge that exposes the power relations and falsity of claims that have been deployed to control, silence, and erase trans people. As a trans scholar, Stryker's discussion highlights precisely such an emergence.

1.5.3 Stryker

The beginning of Susan Stryker's chapter on (De)Subjugated knowledges in *The Transgender Studies Reader* (2006), begins with a recounting of her experience at a 'gay and lesbian' conference in New York almost twenty-five years ago. Stryker had walked to the microphone during the open floor of the conference to ask "Why was the entire discussion of "gender diversity" subsumed within a discussion of sexual desire—as if the only reason to express gender was to signal the mode of one's attractions and

availabilities to potential sex partners?” (p. 1), yet before she could pose her intended question:

a middle-aged white man on the other side of the auditorium reached the front of the other queue for the other microphone and began to speak. He had a serious issue he wanted to raise with the panelists, about a disturbing new trend he was beginning to observe. Transsexuals, he said, had started claiming that they were part of this new queer politics, which had to be stopped, of course, because everybody knew that transsexuals were profoundly psychopathological individuals who mutilated their bodies and believed in oppressive gender stereotypes and held reactionary political views, and they had been trying for years to infiltrate the gay and lesbian movement to destroy it and this was only the latest sick plot to. . . .(p.1)

Stryker continues:

in a fog of righteous anger, I leaned into the microphone on my side of the room and, interrupting, said, “I’m not sick.” The man across the auditorium stopped talking and looked at me. I said, “I’m transsexual, and I’m not sick. And I’m not going to listen to you say that about me, or people like me, any more.” We locked eyes with each other for a few seconds, from opposite sides of the auditorium filled with a couple of hundred gay and lesbian scholars and activists (and a handful of trans people), until the man suddenly turned and huffed out of the room. (pp.1-2).

This moment, which Stryker describes as “iconic” (p.2) for her, illustrates precisely the union of erudite and local knowledges that Foucault spoke of as necessary to lead an insurrection. Stryker makes clear that the pathologizing discourses that trans people have been subjected to are not who she is, not who trans people are, and she would not tolerate such discourses to dominate how trans people are spoken of. The growth of such moments to movements is further reflected in her narrative when she recounts that a decade later, she attended a conference hosted by the same organization which was dramatically different. She writes, “This one was called ‘Trans Politics, Social Change, and Justice.’ The room was filled with a couple of hundred transgender activists and academics, and a smattering of nontransgender gay, lesbian, bisexual, and straight people” (p.2). The transformation in the presence of speakers and attendees at the conference, along with the re-emergence of a familiar face highlights the growth of trans communities of knowledge speaking back within and to the academics. She writes:

Rather than struggling merely to speak and be heard during the closing plenary session, transgender voices engaged in a lively, sometimes acrimonious, debate. In the middle of a heated verbal exchange between radicals and centrists, a middle-aged white man patiently worked his way up the speaker’s queue to the microphone. It was Jim Fouratt, of course. He complained that a new transgender hegemony was marginalizing and erasing the experiences of people like himself, that a revisionist history of sexual liberation and civil rights movement was rewriting the past in an Orwellian fashion, and—he would no doubt have continued with a further list of similar grievances had not numerous members of the audience shouted for him to sit

down and shut up. He paused for a moment, gave up his struggle to be heard, and left the auditorium in a huff. (p.2)

Following her discussion, Stryker turns to Foucault and writes:

What Foucault describes as “a whole series of knowledges that have been disqualified as nonconceptual knowledges, as insufficiently elaborated knowledges, naïve knowledges, hierarchically inferior knowledges, knowledges that are below the required level of erudition or scientificity,” is precisely the kind of knowledge that transgender people, whether academically trained or not, have of their own embodied experience, and of their relationships to the discourses and institutions that act upon and through them. Such knowledge may be articulated from direct experience, or it may be witnessed and represented by others in an ethical fashion. In either case, Foucault contends, the reappearance “from below” of “these singular local knowledges,” like the knowledge of the psychiatrized or the delinquent, which have been “left to lie fallow, or even kept at the margins,” is absolutely essential to contemporary critical inquiry (p. 13).

Stryker’s account of her personal experience, presented as narratives, to illuminate the “renarration” (p.13) of trans history via the voices of trans people, is not only a powerful account of bringing Foucault’s theorizations to life, but speaks to the ethic of this study, which is premised upon ensuring that trans people’s voices are represented as “lived experience is allowed to sit at the table of official meaning-making” (Kincheloe & Berry, 2004, p. 11). To be clear, this is not a claim that this study provides trans people an

opportunity that they have not already seized for themselves, rather it is a recognition that a failure to acknowledge their work would be an act of erasure, which would add to a legacy of epistemic injustice. Furthermore, academia, particularly the psy disciplines have enacted a legacy of harm for which they must be held accountable. The clinic did not rise outside of the systems that continue to be valorised.

In drawing on Foucault again, Stryker makes clear the utility of his work for trans de-subjugation when she writes:

Foucault's vast philosophical-historical research project helps support the claim that attending to what we would now call transgender phenomena has been a preoccupation of Western culture since Greek and Roman antiquity. The regulation of homosexuality, hermaphroditism, gender inversion, and other forms of "social monstrosity" have figured prominently in the development of "regimes of normalization" whose latter-day descendants in the modern period remain decidedly active and robust. Transgender studies renarrates this considerable intellectual heritage. It calls attention to "transgender effects," those deconstructive moments when foreground and background seem to flip and reverse, and the spectacle of an unexpected gender phenomena illuminates the production of gender normativity in a startling new way. In doing so, the field begins to tell new stories about things many of us thought we already knew (2006, p.13).

While the growth of trans scholarship and theorizations have been transforming the academic landscape, is clear, that resistance to trans voices, and the very existence of

trans people persists in society, academia, and clinics. The authoritative voice that the psy disciplines have held over trans people has been slow to relinquish. In the following section I discuss how theorizations on epistemic injustice, and whose voice counts provide another lens for analysis surrounding the “tactics and strategies of power” (Foucault in Foucault & Gordon, 1980, p. 77) that trans people have been subjected to

1.5.4 Fricker

That experiences, and more specifically *voices*, in the form of *testimonials*, provide an important yet marginalized perspective in research speaks to the relevance of drawing on Fricker’s (2007) theorizations surrounding *epistemic injustice* (2007). According to Fricker, *epistemic injustice* is primarily comprised two forms of injustice: *testimonial injustice* and *hermeneutic injustice*. *Testimonial injustice* centers upon the notion that testimonial knowledge from marginalized groups is either dismissed or considered less valuable than *testimonials* (or other forms of knowledge) produced by those who hold privileged status via their particular (and often intersecting) group membership. In the case of activists and scholars, working to trans-inform the clinical gaze by drawing on *testimonial* knowledge from trans, queer and gender-diverse lives has been integral to their research, yet such testimonial knowledge holds relegated status in contrast to the dominant voices of a pathologized view of gender diversity produced by the ‘psy’ disciplines²⁴. In addition, it is important to note that although the psychologized and

²⁴ Note: Fricker frames the dismissal of testimonial knowledge on the part of the ‘hearer’ as *identity prejudice* which leads to an *identity-prejudicial credibility deficit* (2007, p. 4).

pathologized view of gender variance is heavily aligned with positivist epistemologies and adherence to the scientific method, consider that Dr. Kenneth Zucker at the GIC at CAMH, who has long been considered the “leading GIDC researcher in the world” (Bryant, 2007, p. 45), frames much of his insight surrounding gender diverse children as stemming from “clinical wisdom” (Zucker, 2006, p. 551) and engages in theorizing that cross-cuts epistemologies. As a an upper-middle class, cisgender, white male who is situated within the positivist discipline of clinical *psychology*, Zucker’s testimonial knowledge is sanctioned as more legitimate simply by virtue of his group membership, and returning to Foucault (1977/1995, 1980, 1984, 2003), the *power* endowed upon the clinical *gaze*. Not only does Zucker’s positionality hold greater influence in terms of his testimony, but both he, and a number of his colleagues, have vociferously discounted the notion of the *voices* they write about as being able to contribute to a non-pathological discourse on their *own* lives, because they are not *clinicians* (Bryant, 2007, Winters, 2008, Lev, 2013).

Discounting the legitimacy of trans voices via their situatedness outside of the ‘psy’ disciplines (though this is not always the case and will be addressed in a subsequent section) relates to Fricker’s second assertion surrounding *epistemic injustice*, that being the notion of *hermeneutic injustice*. This form of injustice refers to a form of ‘othering’, produced when the “capacity of the knower” (2007, p. 149) is hindered from access to non-marginalizing views. Returning to Zucker’s work, to provide an example, the pathologized view of gender variance has not only generated numerous harms, in terms of framing gender variance as *abnormal*, *irrational* and layered with *psychopathology*, but the dominance of such views has had devastating impact on how trans and gender

diverse individuals have understood themselves.²⁵ Zucker's work has consistently maintained a firm assertion that gender non-conformity, particularly among 'boys' (which has been the primary focus of his 'gaze') is both disordered and is heavily influenced by both child and maternal psychopathology (see Zucker & Bradley, 1995, p. 262). In essence, the dominant discourses of science create a *vacuum of knowledge* whereby gender diverse individuals are inundated with the dominant discourse of pathologization, where even discourses of resistance are often engaged in speaking back to the authors of pathology. Thus 'freedom' from marginalizing views of gender variance is extremely difficult as there is what Fricker (2007) refers to as a form of identity power in the sheer dominance of pathologizing views, and in a society that privileges such views via the prevalence of heteronormative and gender essentialist views.²⁶ This is echoed by Martino (2012) who urges "the necessity of embracing a transgender social imaginary, which refutes gender essentialism, as central to a political project of gender justice" (2012, p. 137), but who also recognizes the tremendous challenge of doing so when 'gendered person hood' is "governed by a neoconservative social imaginary that is more committed ideologically to recuperating gender binaries than dismantling them" (2012, p. 129). Though *testimonial* knowledge has been an important component of trans-informed scholarship and activism, epistemic harms cannot be ameliorated via testimony alone.

²⁵ Zucker's work has consistently maintained a firm assertion that gender non-conformity, particularly among boys (which has been the primary focus of his 'gaze') is both disordered and is heavily influenced by both child and maternal psychopathology (see Zucker & Bradley, 1995, p. 262).

²⁶ For Fricker, *identity power* is based upon "shared imaginative conceptions of social identity" (2007, p. 14), which in the case of gender rests largely on dominant essentialist and binary views of gender.

1.5.5 McKinnon

While sharing some similarities with Fricker, trans scholar Rachel McKinnon's (2017, 2019) theorizations illuminate the ways that the trans people are harmed via dismissal or minimization of their experiences. For McKinnon, this is a form of gaslighting, which "generally takes one of two forms: a psychological abuse form and a more subtle epistemic form" (2017, p. 339). In the first form, the intent is to not only diminish the status of the speaker via discourses of emotional instability and lack of objectivity, but to raise questions about and the 'sanity' of the speaker, and to evoke doubt in the speaker about their own 'sanity'. In the second form, McKinnon discusses how intent, need not be present for gaslighting to occur. She states that this form of gaslighting is:

where a listener doesn't believe, or expresses doubt about, a speaker's testimony. In this epistemic form of gaslighting, the listener of testimony raises doubts about the speaker's reliability at perceiving events accurately. Directly, or indirectly, then, gaslighting involves expressing doubts that the harm or injustice that the speaker is testifying to really happened as the speaker claims.

McKinnon problematizes "ally culture" (p.338) as rife with privilege, inaction and harm. For McKinnon, the notion of ally ship is premised upon the privilege that those claiming to be allies hold in relation to members of marginalized groups. Yet this privilege is rarely the target of critical reflection or action, and typically impedes what so called allies can recognize. McKinnon writes:

those who don't personally experience a category of harms are likely to underappreciate its severity. There is thus an important epistemic asymmetry between those with marginalized situatedness and their 'allies.' The marginalized people tend to be better epistemically situated to perceive harassment as harassment. (p.342).

For McKinnon, this lack of critical reflexivity regarding one's privilege and positionality can result in discourses of ally ship which are hollow, as the banner of 'ally ship' is worn in the place of any actual *action* and it can even be weaponized against marginalized folks when they raise concerns. She provides the example of a trans woman who shares her experience of being misgendered by a colleague with an 'ally' who responds by dismissing her observations and claiming that she must have misunderstood given the colleague's status as an 'ally'. In the scenario provided, further questioning resulted in the confidant becoming hostile at *their* perception being questioned; once again failing to recognize their positionality, privilege and how it dismisses, and even harms marginalized folks even further. For McKinnon, this is not isolated, and she cites both experience and research in making the assertion that so called allies "are often insensitive to constructive criticism and, moreover, often react negatively (often going on the attack) to such criticism" (p.343).²⁷ McKinnon initially framed such actions as *epistemic injustice*, but in her updated analysis she writes that a concern "with my previous work on gaslighting is that I simply didn't go far enough in explicating the

²⁷ McKinnon cites: Brown, K., & Ostrove, J. (2013). What does it mean to be an ally?: The perception of allies from the perspective of people of color. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 43(11), 2211-2222. doi: 10.1111/jasp.12172

epistemic harm that it causes. It's not simply a form of epistemic injustice, it's a form of epistemic violence (2019*, n.p).^{28 29}

McKinnon elaborates that the pervasive effects of gaslighting by so called allies in institutional settings often takes the form of mobbing which she distinguishes from bullying based on collective and systemic action (multiple instances of epistemic harm in workplaces, academic setting etc.) and *inaction* (failure to address the harms). She illuminates how the chronic effects of “betrayal of trust” (2019, n.p.) involving “smaller micro-traumas can accumulate to produce what’s increasingly called Complex-PTSD (abbreviated to C-PTSD or CPTSD)” (2019, n.p.). McKinnon sees the remedy, at least in part to focus on shifting from the notion of ‘ally’ as an identity to the requirement of action by ‘an accomplice’. She writes:

The Stonewall Riot was a riot against police violence and harassment of queer and trans people, which involved literal brick-throwing. Far more commonly, though, ‘throwing a brick’ is metaphorical. If someone says something racist, immediately calling that person out is ‘throwing a brick.’ It’s standing up for and with the marginalized and taking on considerable personal risk, in whatever form (economic, physical safety, social, political,

²⁸ Note: McKinnon’s updated work is entitled: Gaslighting as Epistemic Violence: ‘Allies,’ Mobbing, and Complex Post-

Traumatic Stress Disorder, Including a Case Study of Harassment of Transgender Women in Sport. The work is scheduled for inclusion in *Overcoming Epistemic Injustice* (Routledge) Lauren Freeman and Jeanine Weekes Schroer (eds.) with a publication date given for 2019 by the author who shared a pre-publication version with me.

²⁹ Note: page numbers not listed as advance copy provided to this researcher by the author

etc.). An accomplice is willing to lose friends over their being racist/sexist/homophobic/transphobic and so on (2019, n.p.).

Given the position of trust and authority awarded to clinicians and scholars in the psy disciplines, those who hold pathologized views of gender and sexual diversity and who dismiss or even mock the epistemic stance of trans people contribute to the gaslighting and mobbing that McKinnon outlines. Yet as evidenced in chapter four, *A Micro-genealogy of Epistemic Violence against Trans Women*, I make clear that clinicians engaged in multiple instances of gaslighting, and epistemic violence. Some of these instances are direct, overt, and I would argue are intentional (see Green, 2008), yet the number of scholars and clinicians who are more concerned with maintaining the authority of clinicians over trans people is also evidence of epistemic violence. Even those who appear to be levying some criticism and asserting some form of ally ship minimize the harm that has been enacted against trans people in general, and specifically the trans women whose activism made them targets of an entire special issue of the journal, *The Archives of Sexual Behavior*. Abramson (2014) outlines critical historical examples and the every day lived experiences from marginalized folks as integral to illuminating how gaslighting has been and continues to be enacted. In conducting a historical case study of epistemic violence in tandem with explicating the voices of trans women who have experienced gaslighting and epistemic violence I am privileging the voices of trans people, along side the scholarship of trans women to provide what Abramson (2014) frames as an important strategy of demonstrating epistemic violence through significant historical examples drawn into dialogue with the every day lived experiences of marginalized people.

McKinnon's work is therefore not restricted to the realm of theorizing, it demands ongoing radical reflexivity and action.³⁰ As a cisgender person working with trans activists and scholars I need to continually ask myself how my positionality can impede what I see, how it could contribute to harm and to take action to address this. Being a white cisgender academic, renders my ability to comprehend the experiences of trans people inadequate. I discuss this at different points throughout this thesis in order to illustrate that my positionality required ongoing critical reflection, input from participants, and that there is no end point to this process. I make clear that my conceptual framework of bricolage which is premised upon recognizing, and prioritizing the epistemic authority of trans people over their own lives is not a statement, but a commitment to praxes.

Ultimately, McKinnon's work makes clear that those in positions of trust and authority, and those who claim to be 'allies' must not only recognize the legitimacy of the epistemological stance of marginalized people about their own experiences, but they must demand that those who claim to support marginalized people must be willing to take action to support them, particularly in instances where doing so means taking an active ethical stance against those in positions of power.

³⁰ For discussion of radical reflexivity see:

Gemignani, M., & Hernández-Albújar, Y. (2019). Critical Reflexivity and Intersectionality in Human Rights: Toward Relational and Process-Based Conceptualizations and Practices in Psychology. *European Psychologist*, 24(2), 136-145. And

Gemignani, M. (2017). Toward a critical reflexivity in qualitative inquiry: Relational and posthumanist reflections on realism, researcher's centrality, and representationalism in reflexivity. *Qualitative Psychology*, 4(2), 185-198. doi: 10.1037/qup0000070

1.5.6 Namaste

Trans scholar Viviane Namaste's theorizations on the epistemic violence of erasure have had a profound effect on illuminating the role that epistemologies, and research methodologies have played in inflicting harm against trans people. According to Namaste (2000, 2009) "erasure" "refers to three mutually supportive social functions. First, erasure designates a social context in which transsexual and transgendered people are reduced to the merely figural: rhetorical tropes and discursive levers invoked to talk about social relations of gender" (pp. 51-52). Second, she illuminates how "transsexual and transgendered people are made invisible in research" (p. 52), drawing on the effects of erasure of trans people as 'category' of human being in relation to research that aims to examine issues such as health, housing and violence.³¹ And third, "'erasure' can refer specifically to the very act of nullifying transsexuality – a process wherein transsexuality is rendered impossible" (p. 52).

While Namaste engages with each of these aspects in detail, her sustained critique of the implications of queer theory on trans lives has been instrumental in shedding light on the ways that a post-structural epistemologies, though largely framed as anti-oppressive lens, can in fact contribute to oppression when notions such as queering identities, and resisting normative discourses and emphasizing the social construction of gender dismisses notions of embodiment thereby contributing to the erasure and invalidation of trans lives. In fact, her critique addresses the important contributions that various post-structural readings of gender and sexuality have made, particularly the notions of

³¹ Though Namaste's work as focused on adults, her theorizations of the violence of erasure hold significant implications for children, and their experiences in education.

disrupting gender binaries, and drawing on Foucault, speaks of the “contradictory possibilities engendered through the productive nature of power” (p. 17).³² Though critical of a preponderance of critique focused on the production of trans subjects in the *psy disciplines* for their representation, erasure and appropriation of trans identities, Namaste’s concerns are not a dismissal of their importance. As I highlight in the following section, while the focus is not on trans identities, Teo’s theorizations on epistemological violence in the *psy disciplines* illuminate the importance of such epistemic analysis and its erasure within mainstream psychology as a discipline.

1.5.7 Teo

The extent to which *psy disciplines* are culpable in constructing and perpetuating the marginalization of certain groups, and how this occurs is the focus of Teo's theorizations on *epistemological violence* and *hermeneutic repression*. For Teo, “epistemological violence refers to the interpretation of social-scientific data on the *Other* and is produced when empirical data are interpreted as showing the inferiority of or problematizes the *Other*, even when data allow for equally viable alternative interpretations” (Teo, 2010, p. 295). The assertion that ‘empirical data’ suggests, that trans and gender diverse children are ‘disordered’ and experience higher rates of psychological distress than their gender conforming peers (Zucker, Wood, Singh & Bradley, 2012, Zucker & Bradley, 1995), when interpreted as an a scientific ‘truth’ claim that *being* transgender is a ‘disordered’ or ‘abnormal’ psychological state, reflects a form of *epistemological violence* in that the

³² Namaste discusses Foucault’s notion of reverse discourse in which the production of identities such as ‘the homosexual’ eventually contributed to a counter-discourse, in which those who were constructed, and spoken of, would emerge to speak on their own behalf to challenge the pathologization of their identities (See Namaste, 2000, p 16-18).

basis for distress caused by society is repressed and medicalized discourse of pathology is highlighted (Teo, 2010). That the researchers' views are paradoxically invisibilized, yet presented as 'truth' by framing interpretations as 'scientific findings' illuminates the reciprocal relationship between *hermeneutic repression* and *epistemological violence*. For Teo, *hermeneutic repression* has come to be an endemic problem in 'mainstream psychology' (Teo, 2020) as a result of over-reliance on the scientific method, and lack of training in relation to the socio-cultural-historical situatedness of researchers, their chosen theories, and their epistemological and methodological frameworks (Teo, 2015). Harper, (2008), echoes Teo's concerns, but places specific emphasis on the virtual absence of qualitative approaches and the erasure of epistemological frameworks in *clinical psychology* (2008). While Harper does not engage in discussing epistemological violence or harm, his research examining what has been published in clinical psychology journals illuminates a discipline that adopted a "scientist practitioner model" (Harper, 2008, p. 438) to the exclusion of qualitative research and epistemological awareness with its necessity for addressing questions of the politics of knowledge production and its relevance for clinical practice. This narrowing of scope in training and education poses serious consequences for those under study, and for Teo, this lack of awareness and training holds the potential for the proliferation of epistemological violence.

Teo also illuminates issues of power/knowledge in that "EV [epistemological violence] executed by scientists cannot be countered by public rejection because the name of science has a higher status than theoretical critics expressed by a marginalized *Other*" (Teo, 2010, p. 299). This power/knowledge hierarchy raises important questions related to the fundamental scope of this research, given that eliciting the voices of activist and

academics engaged in trans-informing the clinical gaze involves explicating both the challenges faced by activists and academics situated outside of the *psy disciplines*, as well as illuminating the ways that trans-informed scholarship has managed to occur within them.³³ Thus drawing on Teo's work, is important to addressing the "double ontology of complexity" (Kincheloe, McLaren & Steinberg, 2011, p. 170), and whereby voice, disciplinary resistance and epistemological frameworks come into dialogue.

1.6 Conclusion

While Teo, and Fricker have provided detailed theorizations detailing what constitutes epistemological violence and epistemic injustice, Namaste's theorizations, though less explicit, are nonetheless integral in illuminating the harms associated with erasure of trans lives in 'certified knowledges'. Namaste (2009) asserts that amidst the theorizing about what constitutes gender, real lives are lost via their erasure as a 'category' of human being in relation to research related to health, housing and violence. She frames this erasure as 'epistemic violence' via the invisibilization of trans lives (particularly) in the sciences. Though Namaste has been understandably critical of non-trans scholars engaging in trans scholarship, as well as over emphasis on theorizing trans at the expense of the realities that trans people face, scholars such as Teo and Fricker illuminate how greater philosophical and theoretical training on the part of those situated within the *psy disciplines*, and beyond, is also essential in countering harms.

³³ It is important to note that trans-informed scholarship though largely situated outside of the 'psy' disciplines, is also emerging within them, and may even employ positivist-oriented methodology.

Likewise while discussing the legacy of pathologization that has flowed from the psy disciplines, and explicating the way that gender and sexual diversity have been both pathologized, and forcibly imbricated since the seventeenth century, (Foucault, 1978, Kuhl & Martino, 2018; Tosh, 2015, 2016;) rather than providing a detailed history of either, for each has been addressed through various lenses at length (Bryant, 2007; Sedgwick, 1991; Tosh, 2015, 2016; Winters' 2008), my intention is to take the cultural situatedness and politics of the discipline, and that of key figures who have been invested in the pathologization of childhood gender-variance, as the object of inquiry. In doing so, linkages between the two are examined as sharing similar roots; as being framed as 'problems', that through scientific examination, and the development of expertise, psychology could offer the hope of amelioration. This fixed clinical 'gaze' intent on the denigration of femininity emerged as a point of analysis in Foucault's *The History of Human Sexuality* (1978) which he illuminated as having eighteenth century roots premised upon the "hysterization of women's bodies and 'pathology' intrinsic to it" (Foucault, 1978, p. 104). That two-hundred years later, the psy disciplines continue to take specific aim at femininity expressed by boys as pathological, raises serious questions about the extent to which disciplinary doctrine of 'epistemological innocence' has been allowed to erase theoretical presuppositions that are neither scientific or 'neutral'.³⁴

In the following chapter I outline key literature that informed this thesis.

³⁴ To be clear, when I use the word 'boy' in this context, I am referring to the terminology employed in the clinical literature, because the notion of an actual trans-girl was virtually absent from it. It is also important to note that the literature is pathologizing, conflating, and erasing, in that the discussion of feminine boys, and trans and gender diverse children are typically presented by conflating these children and erasing and misgendering trans children (see Ansara & Hegarty, 2012).

Chapter 1

Challenging the Canons

2 Literature Review

Before one can engage successfully in the bricolage, it is important to develop a rigorous understanding of the ways traditional disciplines have operated. I maintain the best way to do this is to study the workings of a particular discipline. In the context of becoming a bricoleur, such a study would not take place in the traditional manner where scholars learned to accept the conventions of a particular discipline as a natural way of producing knowledge and viewing a particular aspect of the world. Instead, such a disciplinary study would be conducted more like a Foucauldian genealogy where scholars would study the social construction of the discipline's knowledge bases, epistemologies, and knowledge production methodologies (Kincheloe, 2001, p. 683).

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter I begin by outlining how guidelines for conducting literature reviews themselves reveal the multiple ways in which epistemologically focused, meta-disciplinary, and interdisciplinary analyses are discouraged, and how this research provides important insights into the problem of systemic exclusion and illuminates this problem as contributing to or constituting a form of violence. *Second*, I provide some historical context as to the emergence of the Toronto clinic as a site of epistemic controversy by discussing influences on the clinic's approach to understanding and 'treating' gender variance. *Third*, I discuss key themes that have emerged in my examination of specific literature that has flowed from the clinic, and *fourth*, I turn to key research that has challenged the pathologizing discourses emanating from it. *Lastly*, I provide a discussion as to how this review illuminates multiple gaps in the literature that

this thesis aims to address, specifically the insights gained in terms of how to recognize, and resist research practices and the uptake and dissemination of findings that contribute to epistemic injustice, or violence.

2.2 Critical Reflections on Guidelines for Conducting Literature Reviews

Conducting a literature review with the goal of identifying how my research responded to a gap in the literature’ was particularly daunting, given the complexity of my topic, research questions, and the theoretical and methodological framework. Guidelines for conducting literature reviews tend to emphasize narrowing of topic, examining literature that is epistemologically and methodologically aligned, and drawing on peer reviewed publications by experts in a given field (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2011; Greenwood & Levin, 2005; Onwuegbuzie, Leech, & Collins, 2012; Patton, 2002, 2014; Randolph, 2009; Rowley & Slack, 2004). Yet the process of hierarchizing sources, in terms of whose voice constitutes ‘expert’ status, and the virtual dictum that research should maintain disciplinary and epistemic boundaries is drawn directly from the authoritative systems which this research critically examines. Greenwood and Levin, in *Reform of the Social Sciences and Universities through Action Research* (2005) discuss how such compartmentalized practices to research are grown from the “internal ‘political economy’ of the contemporary research university” (p. 2005, p. 49), which perpetuates “the development of boundary maintenance mechanisms that serve to include, exclude, certify, and decertify practitioners” (p. 45). They add that within the social sciences, the emphasis on strict disciplinarity, and “the dominance of positivistic frameworks”

(Greenwood & Levin, 2005) has resulted in a fragmented approach to inquiry into ‘problems’ and requires questioning and crossing boundaries to effectively deal with real life concerns. Yet they add that this process is frequently met with resistance, if not outright hostility. Greenwood and Levin suggest that this is driven in part due to the epistemological orientation of the researcher, and in part due to self-interest, as “the bulk of external research money available to university social science is for positivist research on economic issues, demographic trends, and public attitudes” (2005, p. 53).

Given these challenges, I sought to examine how they are addressed within education; a field marked by diversity, both in terms of subject matter and epistemology.

Onwuegbuzie, Leech, and Collins’s work on conducting literature reviews in education provides some of the most detailed discussion as to both the purpose, and processes involved, yet they simultaneously illuminate similar concerns raised by Greenwood and Levin (2005), as to the restrictive nature of establishing such guidelines. While Onwuegbuzie, Leech, and Collins assert that “the literature review represents the most important step of the research process” (2012, p. 1) they add that guidance for conducting literature reviews is surprisingly scant (2012). They propose that a literature review is “a methodological process in its own right” (2012, p. 2), and that conducting literature reviews is not only a challenge doctoral students in writing dissertations, but frequently a problem that emerges in manuscripts submitted for peer review; so much so that it is one of the primary reasons why submissions are rejected for publication (2012). To address this need for further guidance, they provide both relatively broad, as well as methodologically specific guidelines. As a beginning framework, they emphasize that a literature review should:

distinguish what has been undertaken and what needs to be undertaken, identify variables that are relevant to the topic, identify relationships between theory/concepts and practice, distinguish exemplary research, avoid unintentional and unnecessary replication, identify the main research methodologies and designs that have been utilized, identify contradictions and inconsistencies, and identify strengths and weaknesses of the various research approaches that have been utilized (2012, p. 1).

Yet their emphasis on focusing on works that are methodologically and epistemological aligned, as well as maintaining boundaries by drawing on works that are situated within “the appropriate discipline” (2016, p. 27), a view echoed by Cohen, Manion and Morrison, (2011), is problematic. Given the mandate for *bricoleurs* to “move beyond the blinders of particular disciplines” (Kincheloe, McLaren & Steinberg, 2011, p. 168), and to take systems of knowledge production as the object of inquiry, guidelines that emphasize such boundary maintenance are counterintuitive.

Turning to Patton (2014) whose work on research methodology transcends disciplines, far more latitude is provided. He writes:

No rule of thumb exists to tell a researcher precisely how to focus a study.

The extent to which a research or evaluation study is broad or narrow depends on the purpose, the resources available, the time available, and the interests of those involved. In brief, these are not choices between good and bad but choices among alternatives, all of which have merit (2015, pp 584-585).

Patton also asserts that “sometimes a literature review may not take place until after data collection. Alternatively, the literature review may go on simultaneously with fieldwork, permitting a creative interplay among the process of data collection, literature review, and researcher introspection” (2014, pp 581-582). While Patton grants considerable latitude for conducting research, he also cautions that “doctoral students can be especially adept at avoiding focus, conceiving instead to propose sweeping, comprehensive studies that make the world work their field work oyster” (2014, p. 581), and that through the literature review process, “they soon generate a long list of things they'd like to find out.” (2014, p. 581). To balance the desire for flexibility with a need for focus, he urges continual reflection on the aims of the inquiry, the specific questions to be addressed, as well as pragmatic concerns that must be considered throughout the process.

Yet such freedom is not without significant challenges, and Patton’s minimization of the significance of epistemological issues and their links to methodology is troubling. He writes:

In short, in real-world practice, methods can be separated from the epistemology out of which they have emerged. One can use statistics in straightforward ways without doing a philosophical literature review of logical empiricism or realism. One can make an interpretation without studying hermeneutics. And one can conduct open-ended interviews or make observations without reading treatises on phenomenology (Patton, 2014, p. 371).

While indeed methods and epistemologies are not mutually exclusive, Patton's minimization of their complex and imbricated status is troubling. Though he provides latitude that seems to counter the restrictive emphasis on disciplinarity that Onwuegbuzie, Leech, and Collins advocate for, to encourage inquiry without a deep understanding of ontology, epistemology and their imbricated relationship to methodologies holds the potential for the very harms that this research addresses.

Lastly, while guidance on employing Foucault's genealogical methods is available both directly from his work, and from scholars who have taken up his methods, clear guidelines as to the process of conducting literature reviews when employing genealogy for dissertations and theses could not be located. A data base search for dissertations and theses employing Foucault methods resulted in considerable variance. While some dissertations generated themes of analysis at the literature review stage, others did not. Given that "genealogy consists in an examination of a large amount of texts concerning the topic" (Christensen, 2016, p. 766), the research process is an investigative one, and involves a detailed examination of works that may not be prescribed at the outset. Discussing the process of generating themes for analysis Christensen (2016) writes that "all texts must be analysed for the same three elements: power, knowledge and norms" (2016, p. 766). While Christensen's claims indeed reflect considerations for conducting a genealogical analysis, given that my research is guided by bricolage, and does not claim to be a full genealogy, not all texts can be examined in the same manner.

Thus, as the opening quote to this chapter by Kincheloe (2001) outlines, *bricolage* as a conceptual framework guides each step of the research process, including the literature

review. While indeed bricolage resists monologic, or compartmentalized approaches to inquiry, this resistance must not be conflated with ignorance. Through examining guidelines for conducting literature reviews, I have demonstrated my awareness of, and expectations for, conducting literature reviews, and have outlined the limitations such guidelines can impose. In extension, the following sections of this literature review draw on works that cross-cut disciplines, employ diverse methodologies, and illuminate the necessity of bricolage as a framework for examining the etiology and effects of epistemic violence in relation to trans and gender diverse children. It reveals the complexities of epistemic discourse on trans and gender diverse representation in clinical literature and highlights key contributions which have contributed to illuminating a legacy of harm. This literature review also makes clear that standardized notions of what constitutes a ‘proper’ literature review is itself an epistemological act, and one that requires problematization.

2.3 A Brief Etiology of the Pathologizing Literature Related to the Clinic

2.3.1 Money

Any discussion of the historical and epistemological roots of what would come to be known as the Gender Identity Disorders Clinic for Children and Youth at the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health (GID CY CAMH), must include discussion of the influence of Dr. John Money, who is often credited with “coining of the term ‘gender’ – or, more precisely, gender identity/role (G-I/R) – to refer to the multivariate character of the

‘totality of masculinity/femininity, genital sex included’ “ (Sullivan, 2015, p. 21)³⁵.

However, unpacking precisely what Money’s views were, and their reverberating impact on how gender and sexual diversity have been framed in psychological research, particularly with respect to children, is difficult, in that Money’s views were complex, conflated, imbricated, and frequently contradictory (Downing, Morland, & Sullivan, 2015, p. 6). Referred to as an “Ideological Octopus” (Downing, Morland, & Sullivan, 2015, p. 6) his work crosscuts disciplines and epistemologies. Though initially trained as a teacher, Money completed studies in philosophy and psychology, and completed graduate training focusing on developing surgical guidelines for intersex children while working in the “Psychohormonal Research Unit” (Downing, Morland, & Sullivan, 2015, p. 4), at Johns Hopkins University, yet he “did not train as a medical doctor, surgeon, or psychiatrist, as has sometimes been assumed” (Downing, Morland, & Sullivan, 2015, p. 4). As well, the scope and volume of Money’s work, which ranged from developing clinical and surgical guidelines, to his extensive theorizations on intersex children, gender roles, gender identity, sex, sexuality, sexual orientation, and his efforts to ‘map’ the

³⁵ Note: In his book *Gendermaps: Social Constructionism, Feminism and Sexosophical History* (1995), Money briefly credits Dr. Evelyn Hooker with having coined the term *gender identity*, when he wrote, “I first encountered the term *gender identity* early in the 1960's, in correspondence with Evelyn Hooker, Ph.D., famed for her research that discredited the official classification of homosexuality as a psychopathology” (Money, 2016 [1995], p. 14). However, Money goes on at length to discuss the significance of coining the term and suggests that it was he who coined the most developed conceptualization of the term in the acronym ‘gender-identity/role (G-I/R)’. He wrote: “In the grammatical construction of a sentence, gender identity and role as the subject require a plural very, thus destroying any semblance of a unified concept. To overcome this obstacle, in the later years of the 1970's I devised a singular noun by using and acronym, G-I/R, for gender-identity/role. (2016, [1995], p. 16) However, Stryker and Whittle (2006), and Tosh (2016) attribute the term to Dr. Robert Stoller, who established the Gender Identity Clinic at UCLA. Money in fact discusses Stoller’s use of the term (but not coining it) but is critical of its uptake as different from that his own conceptualization (see Money, 2016 [1995], pp. 14-16). p.

complexity of gender and sexual diversity, resulted in “more than five hundred articles and over forty books” (Downing, Morland, & Sullivan, 2015, p. 5).

Though the “view of Money as a constructionist, seems largely to be taken as gospel” (Sullivan, 20015, p. 19), this view stems largely from discussion surrounding the most publicized aspect of Money’s work; the case of David Reimer (Downing, Morland, & Sullivan, 2015, p. 5).³⁶ Money’s involvement with Reimer began as a result of Money’s work with intersex children, and the proposal that children whose genitalia did not subscribe to normative binary definitions, could receive ‘sex altering’ surgery and be reared to their newly assigned ‘sex’. Though not born intersex, Reimer, who “suffered complete ablation of the penis as a result of a circumcision accident” (Money, 1975, p. 65), was exploited by Money in order to demonstrate his theorization that gender identity/role (G-I/R), which Money postulated as an imbricated construct, and (indirectly) sexual orientation (privileging a heteronormative notion of sexual orientation) could be shaped through various forms of ‘treatment’.³⁷ While Money’s initial accounts of the ‘success’ of the case was postulated as evidence that “gender identity is sufficiently incompletely differentiated at birth as to permit successful assignment of a genetic male as a girl” (Money, 1975, p. 66), the portrait that he had painted of a child living happily in

³⁶ While represented in Money’s work anonymously, David Reimer has been referred to as Bruce (his given name at birth), Brenda (his assigned name while raised as a girl), and is referred to as Joan and John as a pseudonym in the first published clinical literature to illuminate David’s story from his perspective (see Diamond and Sigmundson, 1997). Reimer chose the name David himself when he publicly transitioned to male. Reimer shared in interviews with Colapinto (2013) that his choice of name was reflective of the biblical story of David slaying the giant and represented all that Reimer had overcome.

³⁷ Note: Despite Money’s public support for the delisting of homosexuality in the DSM, his attempts at forcing gender identity/gender role also involved imposing a heteronormative notion of sexual orientation, which involved abusive ‘therapy’ aimed at shaping sexual orientation through “sex rehearsal play” (See Colapinto, 2013; Downing, Morland & Sullivan, 2015; Tosh, 2016).

their newly assigned gender, was quite different from the trauma David Reimer would later publicly disclose (Butler, 2006, Colapinto, 2013; Downing, Morland, & Sullivan, 2015, Tosh, 2016).³⁸

For David Reimer, the accounts of his life reflected in Money's work were a falsehood that had been perpetrated against him, and one that he would come to learn from researchers Diamond and Sigmundson who had been skeptical of Money's claims and concerned that they had been deployed as evidence that guided clinical practice for countless other children (Colapinto, 2013, Diamond & Sigmundson, 1997). Reimer's story of forced gender assignment, abusive treatment at the hands of Money, and having always felt an internal sense of male gender, which he reclaimed in adolescence, led to an epistemological firestorm surrounding his life once again, but one that has vastly oversimplified and mis-represented John Money's epistemological views as social constructionist, and created a false binary between essentialist and constructionist views (Colapinto, 2013).³⁹

Though the initial published accounts of David Reimer's childhood transition were heartily embraced by many feminist scholars as evidence to support social constructionist

³⁸ Diamond and Sigmundson (1997), conducted an in-depth case study which involved interviews with David Reimer and other past patients of Money's that refute Money's long-standing claims of the success of the case, and his theorizations. Colapinto (2013) provides in depth interviews with David Reimer regarding the abuse he and his brother Brian endured under the context of 'therapy', including Money's repeated emphasis on forcing the siblings to simulate sex acts on one another.

³⁹ Detailed discussed of Money's 'treatment' in the context of clinical abuse is discussed in Tosh, J. (In press). *The Body and Consent in Psychology, Psychiatry, and Medicine: A Therapeutic Rape Culture*. London: Routledge.

theory of gender and to refute oppressive essentialist discourse that had long framed women's cognitive abilities, emotional regulation, and behaviours, as innate and generally lacking, this uptake of Money's work (and for some a later refusal to relinquish it, see Tosh, 2016) does not accurately reflect Money's views, slippery as they were. While indeed there are social constructionist aspects to Money's work, and Money himself claimed to be an 'interactionist' who was opposed to a false binary between nature and nurture (see Downing, Morland and Sullivan, 2015, p. 1), Money's views are largely weighted in normative, essentialist notions of sex and gender. However, Money was ambitious, and "sought to have a multidisciplinary impact on both theory and practice" (Downing, Morland & Sullivan 2015, p. 77), and for Money, intersex children presented a 'problem' to be solved, and a problem that would indeed have a multidisciplinary impact.⁴⁰⁴¹

However, because surgical procedures to 'feminize' children born intersex were less complicated than constructing a male penis and scrotum, Money supported a predominantly utilitarian justification for gender assignment. He writes:

⁴⁰ There are numerous accounts that Money had contentious relationships with anyone who disagreed with him. Gender scholars who did not concur with the totality of his work were excluded from citations, and in his 1995 book (see Dowling, Morland and Sullivan, 2015).

⁴¹ Note: The use of 'scare quotes around 'social constructionist' in relation to Money's theorizations and claims is intended to reflect the questionable claim that Money's epistemological stance surrounding gender was in fact social constructionist. While Money is frequently described as a 'social constructionist' Tosh asserts that interpretations of Money's epistemological as social constructionist are problematic and frames his approach as behaviorist. See *The (in)visibility of childhood sexual abuse: Psychiatric theorising of transgenderism and intersexuality*, chapter 2 in Tosh (in press).

The rationale for such a program is simple: it is possible, with surgery and hormonal therapy, to habilitate a baby with a grossly defective penis more effectively as a girl than a boy. Under hormonal replacement therapy at the time of puberty, the body develops as female. Vaginoplasty permits a normal sex life, whereas phalloplasty would not. Moreover, vaginoplasty requires only two surgical admissions, as against as many as a dozen or more for phalloplasty. Orgasmic response is not lost. Motherhood is achieved by adoption. The individual does not feel like a freak (Money, 1975, p. 66).

Yet Money's words reveal a multitude of discourses that have very little to do with the science; that to be a boy is to have a fully functioning 'normal penis', to be a girl is a consolation option, that 'normal' sex is premised upon penile-vaginal intercourse, that anatomy defines one's social role, and for those that rest outside of these boundaries in any way, medical intervention is necessary to right what has been deemed a *physiological wrong*. Money then extends the success of such a transition to psychological conditioning in the form of sex role education and familial (almost exclusively maternal) adherence to the treatment regime. He demonstrates this requirement when discussing accounts by David Reimer's mother in relation to the persistence of 'masculine traits' in David, then 'Brenda', when he wrote: "The girl had many tomboyish traits, such as abundant physical energy, a high level of activity, stubbornness, and being often the dominant one in a girls' group. Her mother had tried to modify her tomboyishness" (1975, p. 70), but draws on the mother's words surrounding her actions to address such problems. He quotes Reimer's mother as saying:

. . . of course, I've tried to teach her not to be rough.., she doesn't seem to be as rough as him.., of course, I discouraged that. I teach her more to be polite and quiet. I always wanted those virtues. I never did manage, but I'm going to try to manage them to- my daughter- to be more quiet and ladylike (1975, p. 70).

This narrative of what constitutes acceptable behaviour for a 'girl', and maternal responsibility for managing perceived transgressions is certainly not new, nor did it emerge with Money (for a detailed discussion of this narrative and its emergence in the 'psy' disciplines see Kuhl & Martino, 2018), yet the scale of Money's influence is significant. Textbooks across the sciences and humanities were re-written to include Money's 'social constructionist' account of gender development, surgical and psychological treatment protocols based on his work became the medical standard with intersex infants, and his work circulated in clinical psychology, and psychiatry, as newly established truths about gender, sexuality, 'treatment' and parental responsibility.⁴²

Though the reported 'success' of David Reimer's forced gender assignment, would eventually be discredited, and forced gender assignment of intersex children would no longer be the standard protocol, these shifts took place after years of being held as 'truths and 'best practices', and traces of Money's work proliferated across the sciences, social

⁴² Note: The discussion of 'social constructionist' to refer to Money's theorizations and claims is intended to reflect the questionable claim that Money's epistemological stance surrounding gender was in fact social constructionist. Tosh asserts that interpretations of Money's epistemological as social constructionist are problematic and frames his approach as behaviorist. See *The (in)visibility of childhood sexual abuse: Psychiatric theorising of transgenderism and intersexuality*, chapter 2 in Tosh (in press).

sciences, and humanities (Dowling, Morland and Sullivan, 2015).⁴³ Likewise, Money's epistemological stance, that privileged biological essentialism, yet invoked 'social constructionist' epistemology as a tool for governing behaviour had proliferated as well. Taking up Money's ideas on the malleability of gender identity, expression, and sexuality, a young medical student by the name of Richard Green would likewise have a profound impact not only on how gender and sexual diversity would be understood within the *psy disciplines*, but would invoke 18th century narratives surrounding 'hysteria' and homosexuality, and late nineteenth century theorizations that would also hold specific relevance for the childhood gender identity clinic at CAMH.

2.3.2 Green

As with John Money, Richard Green's philosophical views (in the context of philosophy of science), are somewhat paradoxical, in that his views are marked by a predominantly positivist epistemology, and essentialist ontology towards gender and sexuality, yet he invokes a social constructionist perspective to account for individuals who rest outside of dominant norms, and to justify notions of 'treatment' with respect to gender and sexual diversity.⁴⁴ Taking up Money's notion that unlike adults, gender non-

⁴³ While the protocols that Money established which led to forced medical interventions on intersex children are no longer *the* protocol, intersex children continue to be subjected to coercive and forced surgeries and treatments. See *The (in)visibility of childhood sexual abuse: Psychiatric theorising of transgenderism and intersexuality*, chapter 2 in Tosh (in press).

⁴⁴ Note: in Green's most influential book, *The "Sissy Boy Syndrome" and the development of Homosexuality* (1987), the word epistemology is never used.

conformity among children was a malleable concept, Green's work shifted focus to the 'problem' of effeminate behaviour in boys. In what was to be the largest study of its kind, Green undertook a longitudinal study that focused on "66 feminine boys and their families matched with a comparison group of masculine boys" (Bryant, 2007, p.2). Green met with both groups of boys and their families to establish a baseline for 'normal' boyhood (and family) behaviour. Green employed an essentialist notion of 'a normal boy, (as both stereotypically 'masculine' and 'heterosexual') and deployed a range of empirical tools that quantified his views of normalcy (frequency equals generalizability and 'truth'), and derived 'data' from interviews to support his views and validate the legitimacy and efficacy of treatment. And, just as Money had presented his approach to forced gender assignment and surgical interventions as a necessary, humane, response to prevent children from the harm of not being 'accepted' by society as a result of dominant notions of gender and sexuality being exclusively cisnormative and heteronormative, Green's work was premised upon such 'enlightened salvation'. Participants had to confess their deepest feelings about everything from toy choice, to how they felt about their genitals, for such deviance to be rooted out via a prescribed course of treatment to be implemented and monitored not only by Green, but by parents.

However, Green also turned his gaze heavily on the lives of parents. Compiling 'data' on everything from their childhood experiences, their education levels, their views on sex roles, their marital relations, to the degree of their engagement premarital sex, this data was in turn quantified to produce not only problematic children, but problematic parents;

particularly the problematic *mother*.⁴⁵ Green constructed an abject ‘other’, ignored his role in the construction and interpretation of instruments and data, engaged in direct harm (of families and children), and perpetuated harmful truths surrounding childhood gender-diversity and sexual orientation. Though Green did not explicitly premise his research on the ‘treatment’ of homosexuality, it is important to note that his work spans decades in which homosexuality was both listed, and later de-listed in the DSM as a mental disorder. Along with disparaging gender non-conformity Green, initially privileged heterosexuality as a positive outcome for participants in his study and he did not dismiss the notion of ‘reparative therapy’.⁴⁶ While Green would ultimately acknowledge that sexual orientation could not be changed, and would himself come to engage in advocacy for its delisting in the DSM, he persisted in viewing feminine behaviour among boys as both problematic and treatable. Sedgwick (1991), addresses the maneuvering that took place following the de-listing of homosexuality in the DSM, in which the appearance that gender and sexuality had been divorced in psychological discourse, gave rise to a new target in the form of the newly introduced diagnostic. She writes: “The same DSM-III that published in 1980, was the first that did not contain an entry for ‘homosexuality’, was also the first that did contain a new diagnosis, numbered (for insurance purposes) 302.60: ‘Gender Identity Disorder of Childhood’” (1991, p. 20).

⁴⁵ For a detailed discussion of the hierarchized pathologization of effeminacy in boys and its relationship to 18th and 19th century psychological discourses of hysteria, and their relationship to social control, see Foucault, 1978; Kuhl & Martino, 2018; Tosh, 2015, 2016.

⁴⁶ Specifically, in relation to parental discomfort with homosexuality and the ethics of ‘treatment’ Green writes “Who is to dictate that parents may not try to raise their children in a manner that maximizes the possibility of a heterosexual outcome?” (Green, 1987, p.260)

Accounts of Green's advocacy for its formal delisting, cloud his continued assertion that the expression of feminine behaviour by boys was problematic, and appeared, based on his theorizations and data, to be treatable. Sedgwick asserts that "revisionist analysts [such as Green] seem prepared to like some male homosexuals, but the healthy homosexual is one who (a) is already grown up, and (b) acts masculine, and if one was to be a "healthy homosexual" one was to be a masculine one" (Sedgwick, 1991, p. 19). While a more detailed discussion of the diagnosis of gender identity disorder follows in subsequent sections of this chapter, it is important to remember that gender and sexual orientation have been forcibly imbricated and hierarchized in psychological discourse since the 18th century (see Foucault, 1978; Kuhl & Martino, 2018; Tosh, 2015, 2016), with the most 'abject personage' of the psychological project being those who identify as transgender (Foucault, 1978; Kuhl & Martino, 2018; Stryker, 2006; Tosh, 2016). Taking up Green and Money's notion of the malleability of gender identity and expression, along with variants of their epistemological and theoretical positions, Kenneth Zucker would emerge as the leading expert in the world on the newly constructed diagnosis of gender identity disorder, extending the project of pathologization well into the 21st century.

2.3.3 Zucker

Just as Richard Green's life long association with John Money began while Green was a graduate student, Ken Zucker attributes his interest in Gender Non-Conformity among boys to having encountered the work of Richard Green while completing his master's degree in clinical psychology (Zucker & Bradley, 1995, preface). Though there are numerous contributors to clinical literature on childhood gender variance, Kenneth

Zucker would emerge as the leading ‘expert’ on childhood gender non-conformity in the world (Bryant, 2007; Ehrensaft, 2016; Tosh, 2015). Beginning his career at the Clarke Institute of Psychiatry, which was later reorganized into sub specialties, including the Gender Identity Clinic for Children and Youth at CAMH, Zucker has authored, or co-authored hundreds of publications, and has a citation index in the tens of thousands, and his book, *Gender Identity Disorder and Psychosexual Problems in Children and Adolescents* (1995), co-written with his colleague Dr. Susan Bradley, is listed as the most widely cited work on ‘gender identity disorder in children’.⁴⁷ (Bryant, 2007; Ehrensaft, 2016; Tosh, 2015, 2016). Dr. Zucker has also served as editor for *The Archives of Sexual Behavior*, a position that he took over from Dr. Richard Green, in 2001 (Zucker, 2017).⁴⁸ Yet the terminology that the authors employ in the title of the work cuts to the heart of the onto-epistemic controversy surrounding it; the view that childhood gender variance is ‘problematic’, and transgender children are ‘disordered’. In extension, no genealogically informed analysis centered upon the controversies of the clinic can occur without a detailed analysis of this work. In the following section I outline the structure of the book as well as illuminating key themes that emerged in examining it, as well as discussing

⁴⁷ According to Google Scholar, Dr. Zucker is linked to hundreds of publications and thousands of citations. His book, co-written with Dr. Susan Bradley is listed as the most commonly cited reference on childhood gender non-conformity in the world (see Google Scholar Citation Index).

⁴⁸ It is worth noting that a review of the publications listed on google scholar that Dr. Zucker has either authored, the most frequent publication source listed is *The Archives of Sexual Behavior*; a journal which Dr. Zucker serves as editor.

their epistemic underpinnings, and how the work is riddled with interpretive claims reflective of what Teo (2010, 2011) discusses as epistemological violence.⁴⁹

2.3.4 'The Handbook of Pathologization and Treatment' (aka Gender Identity Disorder and Psychosexual Problems in Children and Adolescents)

As the title of the work suggests, *Gender Identity Disorder and Psychosexual Problems in Children and Adolescents* (Zucker & Bradley, 1995), is presented as a 'scholarly' review of the "clinical and research literature" (p.1) on gender non-conformity and associated 'psychopathology' in gender non-conforming children and their families. Though published nearly twenty-five years ago, the work is considered reflective of the epistemic basis of 'treatment' up until the clinic's closure in 2015 (Ehrensaft, 2016), and as recently as 2011, the book has been recommended as "a classic in the field, never dated from its original publication" (Worenklein, 2011, p. 174).⁵⁰

The authors begin by presenting literature surrounding the 'phenomenology' (with no discussion as to the conceptualization of precisely what phenomenology is) of 'gender identity disorder' (GID). The 'literature' begins with a 'vignette' surrounding the authors' own clinical observations of a 'typical' boy who was referred to *their* clinic. The

⁴⁹ Though this work is co-written with Dr. Zucker's colleague, Dr. Susan Bradley, Dr. Zucker is listed as lead author, was director of the clinic, and is frequently cited as the most prolific author in the field and or the leading expert on childhood gender diversity in the world. For this reason, the preceding section outlines the significance of Dr. Zucker's work.

⁵⁰ A persistent focus on the 'psychopathology' of mothers of trans and gender diverse children is the basis for Owen-Anderson, A., Bradley, S., & Zucker, K. (2010). Expressed Emotion in Mothers of Boys with Gender Identity Disorder, *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 36(4), 327-345. doi: 10.1080/0092623x.2010.488115

child, a five-year-old boy named Max, was described as “thin, pale looking, though cute” (p. 12), and had “stereotypically feminine toy preferences, including female dolls, purses, and jewelry” (p. 12). He “refused to play T-Ball”, [sometimes] “sat to urinate”, and even “sporadically expressed a desire to be a girl” (p. 12). Moreover, the boy “was an extremely anxious, tense and inhibited youngster” (p.12), who “clung to his mother” (p.12). They go on to examine the notions of *identity statements, cross dressing, toy and role play, peer relations, mannerisms, anatomic dysphoria* and *rough and tumble play* (pp. 14-23) as (quantitatively validated) *signifiers* of a ‘problem’ with ‘cross gendered’ identification and behaviour.⁵¹

What is clear, is that although the direct narrative of the chapter and the vignettes that ‘illustrate the ‘phenomenology’ of ‘GID’, the ‘*clinical literature*’ that is presented is almost exclusively the authors’ *own* constructed recounts of ‘typical’ referred children. The accounts that focus on boys frame them with adjectives such as, *pale, anxious, weak, timid, emotional*, and in some instances, *psychotic*; in other words, they are framed (in the historical sense) *as hysterical*. They are also framed (frequently though not exclusively) as a point of parental concern, yet the trained clinician’s gaze reveals *indulgence* and *permissibility* on the part of the *mother* for failing to extinguish such behaviours. In further vignettes, the authors extend the notion as not only *permitting*, but *causing* the ‘cross-gendered behaviours’. In case example 4.2, (p. 72-74), the clinician’s

⁵¹ Orchard, Farr, McPhail, Wender & Young (2012) discuss how quantitative approaches in the psy disciplines tend to focus on "isolation of a single factor" (p. 352), to reduce explanations for a phenomenon in a manner that neglects the complexity and structural dimensions that interact and contribute to a phenomenon. Note: while the authors’ study examines the experiences of sex work, by conducting an ethnographic analysis, dominant discourses in quantitative literature are problematized.

gaze ‘reveals’ that the *mother’s stress* of dealing with a “precocious” (p. 72), yet “unhappy” (p.72) child, was exacerbated by the *absence of the father* who was frequently away from home. The clinicians, without explication, determined the extent of the mother’s stress to be significant to the point of *depression*, which was then framed as its own clinical diagnosis. The clinicians proposed that, in addition to addressing ‘the problem’ of cross gendered behaviour, treatment should focus on “the pathology of [the] mother-child relationship” (Zucker & Bradley, 1995, p. 74). They expressed both *concern* and *surprise* that the mother expressed “anxiety” at their treatment advice, particularly, the notion of “poisoning his doll house” (p. 74). They went on to discuss how such “parental ambivalence” (p.74) was an indicator that ‘treatment’ would likely be “unsuccessful” (p. 74) based on the *mother’s* unwillingness to follow through as directed. The authors were not only completely oblivious to *their own* quick judgments of the mother, the child, and their relationship, but that they so quickly framed the mother as the heart of ‘the problem’.

2.3.5 Maternal ‘Psychopathology’

The previous example which framed mothers as *culpable* for the ‘psychopathology’ of their gender non-conforming sons based on their *own* ‘psychopathology’ is far from isolated in the work. In fact, considerable space is dedicated to discussing *maternal psychosexual development* and maternal emotional *functioning* (Zucker and Bradley, 1995). With respect to maternal *psychosexual development*, though Zucker and Bradley suggest that their own review of the ‘research literature’ as well as their own clinical observations do not support an earlier hypothesis from their colleague, Robert Stoller,

that mothers of gender non-conforming boys were more likely to have had gender non-conforming childhoods themselves (1995, p.p. 230-233), they shift their focus slightly to attempt to explicate a linkage between maternal hostility to masculinity as a problematic influence. In case example 5.2, '*Jeremiah*', the authors assert that the boy's mother "strongly reinforced feminine behaviours by buying him dolls" (p. 90), and while the "father was very worried about his [son's] gender identity development" (p.90), the mother had:

stated that she would leave her partner if he continued questioning her about Jeremiah's cross-gendered behaviour. She indicated forcefully that it would not bother her in the least if Jeremiah developed a homosexual orientation. Asked how she would feel if he were to seek sex reassignment, she answered that this was fine with her, as long as he was happy. It was our clinical opinion that Jeremiah's mother had a great deal of ambivalence regarding men and masculinity and that it was probably very difficult for her to tolerate any signs of masculinity in Jeremiah (p. 90).

The assertion that *Jeremiah*'s mother could not *tolerate* masculinity in him as a result of her own ambivalence towards men and was therefore cultivating feminine behaviour in her son as a result of her own emotional functioning is both calculated, and absurd. Once again, based on limited information, the authors have asserted that gender non-conforming behaviour is a problem, and that a mother's willingness to support her child is indicative of underlying emotional problems, in this case deep seeded hostility towards men.

Similarly, in case example, 5.4, the mother of a boy referred to as *Carl*, was noted as having stated that “men have it easier than women” (p. 92), and this simple highlighted statement was followed by the assertion that Carl’s anxieties (which the authors assert is common to gender non-conforming boys) were due to both “parental quarrelling”, and “his mother’s professed resentment towards men” (p.92). This assertion comes even though the vignette also listed the boy’s fear of *spanking* from the father, which although unrelated to gender identity issues, could indeed be a source of *anxiety* for a child. Not only in the face of limited ‘evidence’, but at the erasure of alternate evidence, it is Carl’s mother’s “resentment towards men” that is postulated as the source of Carl’s anxiety.

In another case example (5.3), detailing a clinical interview involving a 5 year old boy referred to as *Trevor*, the authors’ quickly extend their diagnostic reach to *her*, this time with a particular specificity surrounding what will emerge as a recurrent theme of *borderline personality traits* (p.91).⁵² Though the authors also assert that Trevor’s mother did not meet the full diagnostic criteria (p.91), the significance is that Zucker and Bradley apply a pathologizing diagnostic term in *the absence of a diagnosis*, and based on such limited information, this represents a clear illustration of a bias against mothers and an omnipresent focus on pathology that cannot be overlooked. Not only are multiple case narratives sprinkled with the discourse of mothers of gender non-conforming boys having

⁵² Despite Zucker’s emphasis on the role of mothers in shaping their son’s feminine behaviours, he has also emphasized essentialist narratives. One such example is a study in which Zucker (and colleagues) examined physical attractiveness ratings of gender non-conforming boys and made the claim that “boys with gender identity disorder were rated as significantly more attractive than the clinical control boys on all five traits” (attractive, beautiful, cute, handsome and pretty), (Zucker, Wild, Bradley and Lowry, 1993). Thus he emphasizes gender identity and expression in the context of both social constructionism and essentialism.

'borderline traits', as was presented to be the case with Trevor's mom, but the examination of this apparent linkage has been the focus of Zucker's efforts to quantify this relationship in his own study (1995, pp.23-237).

Prior to any discussion of the Zucker's 'findings', it is important to note that the diagnostic criteria of a borderline personality disorder are incredibly *vague*. Consider the following diagnostic criteria from the DSM-IV (1994):

“A pervasive pattern of instability of interpersonal relationships, self-image, and affects, and marked impulsivity beginning by early adulthood and present in a variety of contexts, as indicated by five (or more) of the following:

- (1) frantic efforts to avoid real or imagined abandonment. Note: Do not include suicidal or self-mutilating behavior covered in Criterion 5.
- (2) a pattern of unstable and intense interpersonal relationships characterized by alternating between extremes of idealization and devaluation
- (3) identity disturbance: markedly and persistently unstable self-image or sense of self

- (4) impulsivity in at least two areas that are potentially self-damaging (e.g., spending, sex, substance abuse, reckless driving, binge eating). Note: Do not include suicidal or self-mutilating behavior covered in Criterion 5.
- (5) recurrent suicidal behavior, gestures, or threats, or self-mutilating behavior
- (6) affective instability due to a marked reactivity of mood (e.g., intense episodic dysphoria, irritability, or anxiety usually lasting a few hours and only rarely more than a few days)
- (7) chronic feelings of emptiness
- (8) inappropriate, intense anger or difficulty controlling anger (e.g., frequent displays of temper, constant anger, recurrent physical fights)
- (9) transient, stress-related paranoid ideation or severe dissociative symptoms

The diagnostic ambiguity of such concepts as *fears of abandonment*, *fluctuating mood*, *intense anger*, *unstable relationships*, and the reality that only *five* of the criteria need be met for an *official* diagnosis is disconcerting; the fact that the observation of *two* or more ‘traits’ observed by the authors leads to its codification in case examples, raises questions about the extent to which a pre-determined narrative dominates the ‘findings’. Though Zucker and Bradley refer to *Trevor’s* mom as having ‘borderline personality traits’, it is noteworthy that Trevor’s father’s *alcoholism*, his *erratic behaviour*, and his *unstable employment* are reflected upon as *data*, not *pathology*. As well, in terms of quantitative studies surrounding this apparent linkage between gender non-conforming boys and their ‘borderline’ mothers, with respect to one of Zucker’s studies, the authors assert that “though the vast majority of mothers in our study did not meet the diagnostic criteria for borderline personality disorder, they clearly showed difficulties in social adaptation and affect regulation” (p. 235). Yet, they go on to “estimate 20-25% of mothers of boys with gender identity disorder *had*, or *formerly had*, borderline personality traits” (p. 236). Thus, even in the face of their own data, which did not support the borderline hypothesis, the authors would not *relinquish* the notion, asserting ‘traits’ were either present, or *had been present* in the boys’ mothers. The notion that ‘struggling with, or having a fluctuating self-image’, as a point of diagnostic criteria is troubling, as such a claim is most likely indicative of the ‘average’ mother at some point in their lives, who must navigate a multitude of often competing and unrealistic narratives of who she *should* be. As well, precisely how he assessed ‘unstable relationships’, and what constitutes ‘anger’, and when it is deemed a permissible, non-pathological emotion (particularly for a *woman*) is noticeably absent from the discussion.

In the face of data that challenges his assertions, Zucker demonstrates a *refusal to abdicate authority* over his theorizations surrounding ‘pathological’ mothers. Ultimately, his summary of maternal ‘psychopathology’ asserts that “53% of mothers of gender non-conforming boys had two or more clinical diagnoses” (p. 236). Yet these ‘diagnoses’ (which include ‘clinical observations’ and maternal self-reports) are *depression* and *anxiety*; the two most common ‘psychiatric’ diagnoses. Zucker and Bradley then make the assertion that “maternal psychopathology was most strongly related to the tolerance or encouragement of feminine behaviour” (p. 237). In contrast, far less attention is paid to examining any ‘psychopathology’ in fathers. Though the authors assert a historical linkage between “deficient or pathological fathering in male homosexuality” (p. 239), it is done predominantly from the perspective that it is difficult for fathers to *tolerate* feminine behaviour in their sons. This view is reiterated and excused throughout the work; fathers’ actions are not framed as inherently pathological, rather their behaviour is justified as understandable, and the child is rendered problematic as a result of their behaviour. Though they draw on Freud’s assertion that the “the absence of a strong father not infrequently favours the occurrence of inversion” (Freud in Zucker and Bradley, 1992, p. 239), once again emphasizing the ways in which boys suffer when they grow up in households not representative of dominant gender norms; a view which re-invokes the failed mother narrative rather than engaging in a sustained critique of fathers.

Likewise, the authors’ choice to include Bieber and Bieber’s (1979) claims that they have “never met a male homosexual whose father openly loved and respected him” (p. 239), while potentially taking up criticism of fathers, is overshadowed by their choice to invoke the notion of the abject status of a feminine boy (see Kuhl & Martino, 2018). For context,

the study being cited frames homosexuality as arising from family dysfunction, particularly maternal psychopathology, and was a study that involved subjecting gay men to conversion therapy. The authors also claim that

Recent work in sexual identity, gender identity and gender role behaviour emphasizes the view that effeminate homosexuals and transvestites have, in early life, identified with the mother leading, in adult life, to an identification with women. According to the Bieber studies, homosexuals have a basically masculine identification but have a sense of impaired masculinity. This distinction not only influences psychotherapeutic strategy but may extend to decisions involving transsexual change (Bieber & Bieber, 1979, abstract).

Continuing in this vein of selective interpretation (and repression) in their analysis, though depression and substance abuse are mentioned in relation to fathers, no specific data regarding *diagnoses* are presented, thus the attention to fathers is presented as a general but inconclusive discussion of the role of the father that aims to rationalize and legitimate the father's responses to their child in relation to gender non-conformity.

What resonates loud and clear in their approach to examining parental 'psychopathology', is that the narrative of *hysterical* mothers, is postulated as the 'etiology' for 'anxious', 'insecure', 'feminine' 'sons' as in need of 'treatment', while fathers hold privileged status, largely free of 'culpability' for their actions. Such claims introduced by *Charcot* in the late 1800's and advanced by *Freud* in the early 1900's, are

part of a centuries long project of controlling and pathologization women, femininity and gender diversity.⁵³⁵⁴⁵⁵

Nowhere is this clearer than in Zucker and Bradley's summary of how their clinical observations and review of the extant research have "informed their model for understanding gender identity disorder in boys" (p.262), when they write

In summary, for boys our clinical model proposes that gender identity disorder develops from a state of inner insecurity that arises out of the interaction between a boy's temperamental vulnerability to high arousal and an insecure mother-child relationship (p.262).

For Zucker and Bradley, the 'problem' of feminine boys, rests squarely on the shoulders of their mothers.⁵⁶

⁵³ Foucault draws on Charcot's clinical notes surrounding the treatment of 'hysteria in boys' (as hysteria was a domain of women, Charcot's focus was clearly aimed at the expression of feminine traits, viewed as pathology in boys, which he viewed parents as cumbersome in achieving treatment goals. He wrote: "In the case of hysteria of young boys, what one must do is to separate them from their mothers. So long as they are with their mothers, nothing is of any use (*Charcot* in Foucault, 1978, p. 112; Kuhl & Martino, 2018; see also Tosh, 2016).

⁵⁴ The discourse of hysteria dates to ancient Greece and was postulated as a phenomenon "thought to be a consequence of not bearing children" (Tosh, 2016, p. 35). Shifts in discourse would result in claims of "excessive sexuality" (p.35), "witchcraft" (p.35) and "low social class" (p.36) as "causal factors for 'hysteria'" (p.36), until the clinical gaze of the 1800's emerged to pathologize women via psy discourse.

⁵⁵ Note: Showalter (1985) illuminates the social-political function of the psy disciplines proliferating in the era of Charcot and Freud when she writes "During the decades from 1870 to 1910, middle-class women were beginning to organize in behalf of higher education, entrance to the professions, and political rights. Simultaneously, the female nervous disorders of anorexia nervosa, hysteria, and neurasthenia became epidemic; and the Darwinian 'nerve specialist' arose to dictate proper feminine behavior outside the asylum as well as in, to differentiate treatments for 'nervous' women of various class backgrounds, and to oppose women's efforts to change the conditions of their lives. At the end of the nineteenth century, hysteria, the classic female malady, became the focal point for the second psychiatric revolution, the emergence of psychoanalysis." (p.18). However Showalter also makes clear that while women have long been targets of pathologization, the utility of the psy disciplines to respond to the 'problem' of 'male hysteria' in soldiers post world war contributed to the proliferation of Freudian psychoanalytic theory.

2.3.6 ‘Treatment’ Success and Maternal Responsibility

In their introduction to the discussion of ‘treatment’, Zucker and Bradley begin by asserting that “as the connection of gender identity disorder with later homosexuality became more apparent....concerns arose regarding the implications of treating children, particularly boys who might be ‘prehomosexual’” (1995, p. 265). The authors quickly respond that despite these ‘concerns’, of “occasional critics” (p. 266), they, and select colleagues, including Richard Green and George Rekers, view treatment as both therapeutic and ethical (p. 266).⁵⁷⁵⁸ They claim that treatment reduces *social ostracism*, and instead of directly targeting gender identity, treatment focuses *on underlying psychopathology*, which they assert can help *to prevent adult transsexualism*. They add, in their 1995 work, that although controversial, and not clearly supported by evidence,

⁵⁶ Tosh (2013) discusses the focus on maternal ‘psychopathology’ in Zucker and Bradley’s work and illuminates the extent of the pathologizing loops that mothers and their children are subjected to in relation to theorizing the ‘etiology’ of childhood gender diversity, including claims that mothers who have experienced sexual violence, who too critical, too permissive, to... contribute to gender identity ‘problems’ in children.

⁵⁷ One of the “occasional critics” Zucker references is Eve Sedgwick, whose work, *How to bring your kids up gay* (1991) became a rallying cry in the LGBT communities against the practice of reparative gender therapy, in part by explicating the practice was rooted in trying to ‘treat’ ‘pre-homosexual boys’.

The colleague Zucker and Bradley reference, George Rekers, has been a virulent advocate for reparative therapy and was on the Board of Directors for National Association for the Treatment of Homosexuality (NARTH); a right wing evangelical anti-gay, anti-trans organization listed as a hate group by the Southern Poverty Law Center. <https://www.splcenter.org/hatewatch/2016/04/07/anti-lgbt-hate-group-releases-anti-trans-position-statement>

⁵⁸ In Zucker & Bradley’s book, Zucker attributes his interest in Gender Non-conformity among boys as based on being introduced to the work of Richard Green, author of ‘The Sissy Boy Syndrome’ and *The Development of Homosexuality* (1987). Zucker has also maintained a career long adherence to the epistemological and theoretical views of gender non-conformity among boys espoused by Green. Green and Zucker have been the sole editors for the *Archives of Sexual Behavior* and, have co-published together on multiple occasions, and have been lifelong friends (see.

such treatment has been hypothesised as a preventative treatment for *homosexuality* (Zucker and Bradley, 1995).

Though the preceding section has focused primarily on themes that have emerged in Zucker and Bradley's 1995 work, in relation to mothers, given assertions from CAMH staff that Zucker did not engage in efforts at conversion therapy (for gender identity or sexual orientation), his ambivalence toward both is documented in his own work. Specifically in relation to homosexuality, while on the one hand Zucker suggests that he is "generally supportive of homosexuals" (2006, p.551), in his earlier work with Bradley (1995), they do suggest that "when an adolescent experiences undesired homoerotic attraction and wishes to function as a heterosexual, the clinician may work with the individual using the approach outlined by Masters and Johnson (1979) or Nicolosi (1991)" (Zucker & Bradley, 1995, p. 352). They also provide a case example (13.3), of a 'sensitive and anxious' 14-year-old named *Billy* who was uncomfortable with his "homosexual desire" (p.343) and wished to participate in treatment. They write

Although it was felt that Billy was most likely homosexual, he was suffering a trial of therapy because of his motivation to try to develop heterosexual interests and the family's marked difficulty in accepting the idea of his homosexuality. It was explained to him that he would have to work on developing heterosocial interests, as well as his skills in self-assertion to enhance his very low self-esteem. He had difficulty making a commitment to work on these areas; he alternated between being convinced that he was gay and could know nothing about it and feeling that he must be able to

change.....During this period he recalled an experience in childhood in which he had been beaten up by a girl in his neighborhood. This memory, coupled with an exceedingly high level of social anxiety prevented him from pursuing contact with women (p. 343-344).

The case narrative clearly suggests that Zucker and or Bradley *did* engage in attempting ‘conversion therapy’, which they frame as being at the youngster’s request (though there was clear pressure from the family). Yet they frame the ‘failure’ of treatment largely on, Billy’s lack of commitment to treatment, partly based on childhood trauma associated with having been beaten up by a girl, which the authors claim, impeded his ability to form relationships with women. Furthermore, their assertions that Billy was directed to working on developing “heterosocial interests” (p. 344), (as vague as the assertion may be) reflects disdain for boyhood femininity and homosexuality. The case example also presents Billy’s father as hostile and distant, his mother as passive and his sister as having taken on a “nurturing role” (p. 343), once again returning to Zucker’s Freudian discourse of the hostile father and the weak mother (or an overtly feminine influence) leading to sexual ‘inversion’. Not only do Zucker and or Bradley frame effeminacy as a problem in need of ‘treatment’, but the assertion that ‘trauma’ and family ‘psychopathology’ are linked to homosexuality *and* gender expression are clear. While the authors claim that attempts to change Billy’s sexual orientation are unlikely to lead to a ‘successful’ outcome, the case makes clear that it *was* a treatment goal, their etiological claims and ‘treatment’ approaches yoke gender and sexuality diversity together as imbricated ‘pathologies’.

Returning to the relationship between the mothers of gender non-conforming boys and ‘treatment’, Zucker and Bradley assert the importance of mother’s *establishing limits* with their sons in relation not only to *play* and *peers*, but in helping the boy “individuate from his mother” (1995, p. 276). They assert that “our view is that limit setting helps the child become less confused about his or her gender identity” (p. 282), and that (despite controversy) “there is no compelling reason not to offer treatment to a child with gender identity disorder... the youngsters we have evaluated are very troubled, as are their families.” (p.281). Their treatment also prescribes emphasizing same sex peer “play dates”, (p.279), masculine role modeling (p. p. 277), and giving approval “for any signs of masculinity” (p. 277). In essence, their treatment involves chastising *mothers* for permitting their sons to be ‘sissies’ based on their own desire for a close relationship with their sons that they likely do not have with their ‘distant’ or ‘absent’ husbands, and that mothers need to take an active role in teaching their boys to either ‘toughen up’, or recognize that he’ll end up miserable, and rejected by society.⁵⁹

Though my discussion of view of treatment may seem both crass and ‘commonsensical’, it is in fact well suited to describing the nature of Zucker & Bradley’s book. The efforts to swathe the work in clinical terminology, or as Winters (2008) asserts, their efforts to ‘blind [people] with science’ (2008), the work *is* laden with stereotypes and tropes about women, femininity, homosexuality and transgender individuals. When reduced to its simplicity, it becomes difficult to understand precisely how this work, and the attempts to

⁵⁹ Note: the use of the word ‘sissies’ in this sentence is in relation to Richard Green’s deployment of the term in his book *The ‘Sissy Boy Syndrome’ and the development of homosexuality* (1987), for a critique of this work and discussion of the deployment of the term as a slur, see Kuhl & Martino, 2018.

explain and ‘treat’ childhood gender diversity as they did, enabled them to exert their influence on such a large scale. Yet their work, particularly, Dr. Zucker’s work, is part of a larger narrative that has made this possible.

2.4 Shifting the Gaze – Introducing Theorizations on Epistemic Injustice and Epistemological Violence

According to Fricker (2010), *epistemic injustice* is primarily comprised two forms of injustice: testimonial injustice and hermeneutic injustice. *Testimonial injustice* centers upon the notion that testimonial knowledge from marginalized groups is either dismissed or considered less valuable than testimonials (or other forms of knowledge) produced by those who hold privileged status via their (often intersecting) group membership.

Hermeneutic Injustice refers to the harms resulting from the knower’s lack of access to ‘official knowledge’ that is not othering or, in the context of psychology, pathologizing.⁶⁰ Though Teo’s (2010), theorizations on epistemological violence are similar in terms of the harmful effects of knowledge produced, Fricker’s emphasis on *the role of the knower* is particularly relevant to Zucker’s work and understanding his disregard for the voices of those he asserts the right of privilege to speak about. Zucker and his colleagues have routinely discounted the notion of the voices they write about as being able to contribute to a non-pathological discourse on their own lives. Zucker frequently discounts criticism

⁶⁰ Fricker’s (2007) discussion of hermeneutic injustice is not focused on the psy disciplines, however the dominance of pathologizing clinical literature surrounding gender diversity influences the knowledge that trans and gender diverse people have had for understanding themselves. Seeing oneself represented by ‘expert’ discourse as a tangle of pathology can impact how knowers understand their own identities.

of such voices, stating that his ‘opponents’ are generally not clinicians (Bryant, 2007), and therefore their voices are not legitimate (Winters, 2008, Lev, 2013).^{61 62}

To what extent Zucker’s work has been taken up publicly is difficult to determine as his work is reflective of historical bias against women and gender and sexual diversity present to varying degrees in the broader public. However, as LGBTQ issues related to children, and particularly schooling, become areas of broader public and educational policy discourse, as Zucker, via his high-profile status as the leading clinical ‘expert’, is frequently called upon to explain a phenomenon unfamiliar to many. Just such an example can be seen in interviews with, or about Zucker and his work in the Articles by Margaret Wentz of the Toronto *Globe and Mail*. In discussing transgender children, Wentz presents Zucker as a compassionate expert much maligned by militant trans activists, indulgent parents, and confused young people “inflamed by half baked post-modern gender theory” (See *Transgender kids: Have we gone too far?* Wentz, 2014). She frames Zucker in the discourse of expertise and benevolence, parrots the pathologized view of children, misgenders a trans child, defames trans activists and trans affirmative scholarship, and asserts that ‘radical liberal’ views are contrary to science and harmful to

⁶¹ It is important to note that despite the closure of the clinic and the emergence of a paradigm shift with respect to childhood gender diversity, pathologized clinical representations along with notions of ‘attachment theories’ continue to proliferate and cite Dr’s. Zucker & Bradley’s work. See *The Sage Encyclopedia of Psychology and Gender* (2017).

⁶² Chapter four discusses the intense resistance by certain clinicians and scholars in relation to the legitimacy of trans people to speak about their identities.

children, and she does so to a potential audience of almost seven million readers (Bradshaw, 2015).⁶³

What is clear, is that to combat epistemic injustice in relation to gender sexual diversity and the historical framing of the *hysterical woman* and the *problematic mother*, the discipline has to make its history a critical and inclusive project, not emphasize its status, and theoretical and epistemological traditions, as demanding of respect and representing a hierarchy as to what constitutes ‘truth’. Discussion of scientist-practitioner models of clinical psychology should examine their goals and curricula to see whose voices are privileged, whose voices are absent, and how their ‘science’ represents these voices. Students should be as well versed in critical epistemologies as they are in the scientific method. They need to be given the skills to enable them to be self-reflexive, and equitable in critiquing how they know what they know, and to hold their peers accountable when their work fails to uphold these standards.

2.5 The Extant Critical Literature

While critical research on the historical pathologization of transgender and gender diverse children exists (Foucault, 1978; Kuhl & Martino, 2018; Pyne, 2014a, 2014b;

⁶³ The following are some of the articles that highlight Wente’s sustained focus on trans and gender diverse children from a stance that privileges pathologized discourse, misgenders trans children and promotes the myth that trans-affirmative approaches to trans children is unscientific and harmful.

Wente (2014a) Transgender kids: Have we gone too far?

Wente (2014b) The march of transgender rights

Wente (2016) Kids pay the price of transgender politics

Wente (2017b) Why are some gender activists denying science?

Wente (2017) Transgender kids: Who decides?

Wente (2018) Why the surge in gender dysphoria among teenage girls?

Tosh, 2011, 2015, 2016; Winters, 2008), as well as works that specifically engage with critically examining the ‘treatment’ approach to gender variance that has flowed from the clinic (Ehrensaft, 2016; Langer & Martin, Lev, 2013, Stryker & Whittle, 2006; Tosh 2011, 2015, 2016, Winters, 2008), the most comprehensive (and complex) critique of the pathologization of gender diversity related to the clinic that could be located was Dr. Jemma Tosh’s (2016) *Psychology and Gender Dysphoria: Feminist and Transgender Perspectives*. In the following section I highlight key findings from this critical literature and illuminate how it has informed my study.

2.5.1 Tosh

Dr. Jemma Tosh’s (2016) *Psychology and Gender Dysphoria: Feminist and Transgender Perspectives*. In this work, Tosh conducts a genealogical analysis of the diagnosis of gender dysphoria and takes aim not at those on who the diagnosis is applied, but by explicating the “tactics and strategies of power” (Foucault & Gordon, 1980, p. 77), that undergird the legacy of pathologization of women, femininity, and gender and sexual diversity. Drawing on Foucault, her analysis illuminates the ways in which religious discourses were transposed onto the psy disciplines as a mechanism of social control and regulation. She outlines the historical pathologization of gender and sexual diversity, as well as several key figures, including historical and contemporary theorists, and in doing so exposes the threads of misogyny that have run through the disciplines from their inception. Yet Tosh also Challenges, not only the way that positivist epistemologies have been deployed as Tosh also engages with issues of voice and representation and extends the same critical lens to calls for scholarship on transgender lives, to be the domain of trans-identified persons alone.

While concurring that trans-identified persons should not be subject to authoritative voices over their lives, Tosh illuminates the way that “exclusionary criteria would impose negative effects for those who identify as 'nonbinary, androgynous, and genderqueer” (Tosh, 20156, p. 124). Though Tosh’s methodology and research focus share much in common with this case study, and indeed, their work has been instrumental to it, there are also some key differences. First, while Tosh’s work is an explicit genealogy of the diagnosis of gender dysphoria, my research, though genealogically informed, is not a genealogy of a diagnosis, nor of the psy disciplines. Instead it is an examination of the ‘death of the clinic’ and involved a bricolage of ethnographic and genealogical approaches which was informed by participants in this study.

2.5.2 Winters

Dr. Kelley Winters’ book, *Gender Madness in American Psychiatry: Essays from the Struggle for Dignity* (2008) has also been instrumental for informing my understanding of not only the long and imbricated history of pathologizing gender and sexual diversity, but in illuminating the biases, politics, and personalities that have shaped psychological research, discourse and practice in this regard. Winters highlights the influence that Kenneth Zucker, along with a number of his colleagues from the clinic at CAMH, have had in the development and maintenance of diagnostic criteria for gender identity disorder of childhood.⁶⁴ She discusses how they have served as gatekeepers who have placed trans-identified children in a circular loop in which they must prove their

⁶⁴ Since the publication of Winter’s work, the DSM has removed gender identity disorder and replaced it with ‘gender dysphoria’. While this shift is viewed by some as a depathologizing effort, as the emphasis is on identifying the stresses associated with being a trans child, the requirement for diagnosis persists, as do the pathologizing views of trans-identities, held by key figures within the discipline.

‘pathology’ in order to access services to free them from it. She also illuminates the intense hostility and maligning language employed by key figures associated with the Gender Identity Clinic for Children and Youth at the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health towards trans people.

Winters makes specific reference to Dr. Raymond Blanchard’s comments that appeared in a newspaper article published by the Toronto Globe and Mail, in which he disparaged male to female transsexuals by stating “a man without a penis has certain disadvantages in this world and this is in reality what you are creating” (for original article, see Armstrong, 2004). She also details at length the opposition to voice informed perspectives and trans-affirmative research that does not employ the same epistemological lens as that of Dr. Zucker and his colleagues at CAMH, placing an impossible “burden of proof” upon those challenging pathologizing discourses (Winters, 2008, p. 101), and research, and framing such challenges as ‘unscientific’. Winters also outlines the vitriolic attack on trans-activists and scholars by supporters of Dr. Zucker’s views on childhood gender variance. Specifically she points to Dr. Alice Dreger, who is neither a staff member of the clinic, nor a clinician, but who has had a long association with Dr. Zucker, and has spoken publicly on many occasions against his critics, branding both activists, former patients and their families as psychologically unstable (see Winters, 2008, p. 108, and also, Wente, 2016, and <http://alicedreger.com/gendermad>). While Winters has illuminated the history, politics and many of the personalities associated with the legacy of pathologization and harm, her work does not engage in explicit epistemological critique, nor does it address (in detail) the role of trans-informed scholarship and activism in countering the pathologization that has flowed from the

clinic. My case study specifically investigates how activists and scholars have been able to facilitate a paradigm shift, as well as providing a theoretically and genealogically informed case example of epistemic violence that can serve to disrupt the myth of ‘science’ versus activism, that supporters of the clinic, or those hostile to trans people have purported.

2.5.3 Pyne

In terms of works that have engaged with the notion of a *paradigm shift* in psychology, Dr. Jake Pyne (2014) provides a brief discussion of the shift from “disorder to diversity” (Pyne, 2014, p. 2). However, his commentary occurred prior to the closure of the clinic, and does not engage in detailed discussion of epistemology. This is significant in that the effects of the closure of the clinic have played out in media discourses in ways that reflect an organized backlash against transgender scholarship, activism, and trans lives. A petition with over 500 signatures from clinicians and scientists protesting the alleged firing of Dr. Zucker, and blaming his (alleged) termination on “pressure from transgender activists” (Ubelacker 2016) and an attack on “reason” and “science” (Ubelacker 2016; also see Bancroft et al, 2016, Ubelacker, 2016, Wente, 2014a, 2014b, 2015, 2016) was formally presented to CAMH management, and discussion of it has circulated widely in newspaper articles, and on various forms of social media. Likewise, protection from so called ‘reparative’ approaches to gender variance (and sexual orientation) remains highly regionalized, and though not an expert on gender or sexuality, psychologist Jordan Peterson has garnered considerable media attention, and public support among conservative ideologues in his battle against human rights legislation aimed at including gender identity as protected grounds from discrimination (see Martino, Airton, Kuhl &

Cumming-Potvin, 2018; Murphy, 2016). Despite the shift from disorder to diversity that Pyne has outlined, the “Death of the Clinic’ provides a complex multi-dimensional analysis of the politics of pathology, epistemic considerations, and “technologies of resistance” (Tamboukou, 2003, p. 198) employed in facilitating the emergent, albeit tenuous paradigm shift.⁶⁵

2.5.4 Bryant

Lastly, only one dissertation case study which claimed to interview both critics and supporters of the psychiatric diagnosis of Gender Identity Disorder of Childhood (GIDC) could be located (Bryant, 2007). Initially Bryant’s dissertation, *The Politics of Pathology and the Making of Gender Identity Disorder* (2007) appeared to address some of the aims of my proposed inquiry, however, Bryant’s shift from illuminating the perspective of having been a childhood participant “in what remains one of the largest and best-known studies of gender variant boys ever undertaken” (Bryant, 2007, p.1), to mounting what appears to be a defense of GIDC clinicians and researchers as a group that has been unfairly maligned, results in a shift in focus that does not engage with the epistemic and critical analysis that is central to my inquiry.

⁶⁵ Note: Tamboukou does not explicitly state what ‘technologies of resistance’ are. However, the context of her use of the term is in relation to employing building on or modify approaches to Foucault’s methodologies. In the context of Tamboukou’s work technologies of resistance are implied to be a reversal, seizing or construction of acquisition of Foucault’s notion of technologies which are “hybrid assemblages of knowledges, instruments, persons, systems of judgement, buildings and spaces, underpinned at the programmatic level by certain presuppositions and objectives about human beings. One can regard the school, the prison, the asylum as examples of one species of such technologies, those which Foucault termed disciplinary” (Rose, 1996, p. 26). – Thus, in the context of this research, the technologies of resistance are the technologies that emerged to facilitate a paradigm shift, and the closure of the clinic.

Bryant begins the discussion of his theoretical framework by writing “my own organic analysis directed me to a set of scholarly literatures in Sociology, Gender Studies, and Science Studies that form the theoretical scaffolding for this project” (p. 17). He goes on to suggest that the work will involve:

a critique of, and a dialogue between, three bodies of literature: studies of the role of expert and lay knowledge in the construction of scientific controversy; historical studies of the relationship between medicine and gender/sexual deviance; and formulations of the relationship between gender and sexuality, especially in queer and transgender theory (Bryant, 2007, p. 17).

Bryant suggests that medical models (which he frames as “expert knowledge”) have become increasingly attuned to the role of “lay knowledge” in informing policy and practice. Yet much of the work contradicts this assertion. Bryant states he generated a list of names to interview based on the literature review and through 'snowball sampling'. He specifically mentions hopes to interview “Richard Green, Ken Zucker, Susan Bradley, Heino Meyer-Bahlburg, Susan Coates, George Rekers, Shanon Minter, Riki Wilchins, Justin Richardson, Ken Corbett” (p. 39). However, some of these individuals are later confirmed as interviewed while others are not. He states that he “conducted a total of eighteen interviews” and, that “all but four were audio recorded” (one participant declined) (Bryant, 2007, pp. 39-40). Bryant states that he was cautioned by others that he may have difficulty getting access to GIDC research-clinicians, yet he begins with outlining his surprise that it was activist Riki Wilchins who first declined being interviewed (pp. 39-40). Bryant then indicates that:

while a couple of GIDC researcher-clinicians declined to be interviewed, the real story of my interviews is that virtually all the people I contacted agreed to participate. This included several people I had been warned would be difficult to convince to talk with me (p. 43).

Bryant indicated that his positionality may have had something to do with the receptivity on the part of GIDC researchers to being interviewed as he “returned the favor of being able to interview people by answering questions interviewees had for me, including questions about my own personal history.” (Bryant, 2007, p. 44 [footnotes]). He adds that one GIDC researcher caught him by surprise. Bryant writes that:

While I generally did not disclose my personal biography to GIDC researcher-clinicians interview subject knew beforehand. Through personal and professional networks, Ken Zucker (Psychologist-in-Chief at Toronto’s Centre for Addiction and Mental Health [formerly the Clarke Institute for Psychiatry], Head of its Child and Adolescent Gender Identity Clinic [the largest facility of its kind in North America], Professor of Psychology at University of Toronto, and the most-published and considered by many the leading GIDC researcher in the world today) learned both about my experience in the Green study and about my dissertation research project. In what I can only think of as an unusual turn of events, Zucker made first contact with me. He emailed to tell me that he was interested in my research and was looking forward to meeting me. This kind of occurrence lent support to my strong suspicion that many of the people I was interviewing were at least as curious about me as I was about them (p.45).

This type of quid pro quo approach in which Bryant was subject to the clinician's gaze in order to gain access to participants raises concern about the re-subjectification of Bryant. As well Bryant appears to have recognized that access to these clinicians would be likely, if not contingent upon conveying a degree of empathy or understanding that *they* had been the recipients of ill treatment. He writes that he conveyed:

GIDC clinician researchers had sometimes gotten a "bad rap," that they had been imputed sometimes unfairly with mal-intent, and that critical analyses of GIDC usually paid little attention to the details of their positions. In retrospect, I believe that this approach (which was, in fact, an honest assessment on my part) worked to make GIDC researchers-clinicians feel that they would be treated fairly by me. (Bryant, 2007, p. 46).

The sense that Bryant seems to be privileging the voice of GIDC clinicians continues to emerge when examining how the interview data are presented. It is important to note that Bryant does not present interview data as cohesive *interviews*. Instead intermittent comments (predominantly Bryant's referencing an interview as opposed to large sections of transcribed interview data) are dispersed throughout sections of the dissertation, sometimes bearing names, sometimes not. Thus, it is not possible to know the full extent of who was interviewed. An electronic search revealed that Bryant uses the term *interview with author* in brackets each time he inserts narrative interview data. This is significant because the words only appear in the dissertation 11 times; on p. 87 in reference to Robert Stoller, on pp. 120, 121, and 181 in reference to Richard Green; on p. 165 Robert Spitzer; on p. 203 in relation to an unnamed APA subcommittee member from DSM-IV taskforce who argued against GIDC in children being grouped with

transsexuality in the DSM-IV; on p. 216 in relation to an unnamed GIDC clinician researcher who stated that “the Association for Gay and Lesbian Psychiatrists gets everything it wants” in relation to an unnamed GIDC critic (who now sees the issue as nothing but a “red herring”), and finally, on p.231, in relation to an unnamed GIDC clinician who simply does not employ the diagnosis. I was unable to locate any specific interview data from a non-researcher clinician except for the unnamed interviewee framed as a past critic who now sees the issue as a red herring (see also Bryant, 2006).

I found myself having difficulty reconciling how Bryant presents his positionality in this section of the work. Bryant places far greater emphasis on attempting to debunk the notion of GIDC researchers as ‘bad guys’ who have been given a “bad rap” (p. 46) than he does on examining any other perspective. Having reviewed the interview data, it is unclear if Bryant interviewed *any* activist/reformer/clinician who is critical of GIDC.

The only named activist in the work was Riki Wilchins, who Bryant states would not agree to a meeting. Ultimately, Bryant’s research, though framed as a study that examines debates surrounding gender variance, is focused on examining the views of those invested in the pathology paradigm contrasted with ‘activists’ which according to my research is a problematic conceptualization.

2.5.5 Roselló-Peñaloza

Well into the research process, I encountered the work of Clinical Psychologist, Miguel Roselló-Peñaloza, whose book *No Body: Clinical Constructions of Gender and Transsexuality- Pathologization, Violence and Deconstruction*. It is an incredibly

complex work that illuminates the effects of knowledge production, and dismisses the notion that ontology, epistemology, axiology, rhetoric, and the theories that we employ are mere abstractions. Instead, the work is a call to researchers, clinicians and institutions to address these neglected domains, and to be critically aware of their effects in research and praxes. In the preface to the book, Roselló-Peñaloza makes this clear when he writes that this book is not about “transsexuality” (p. xi) as a diagnostic category, rather it is about shifting the gaze onto the discipline. (p. xi). However, this work is not strictly a critique of the psy disciplines. Instead, it is an eclectic journey that requires that “we listen to the clinic’s mental health professionals’ narratives, attend classes taught in a medical school, review its manuals and scientific productions, and listen as well to what trans people who use its services allow us to hear” (p. xi). The work is intended to engage readers in “a reflexive process in which theory acquires meaning” (p. xi).

Aware that such claims regarding theory are often criticized as abstractions that hold little relevance to actual lives, Roselló-Peñaloza makes clear that this myth is also his target, and he makes clear that “knowledge permeates and signifies experiences of the regulation of gender and sex in people’s concrete and most material lives” (p. xi); and indeed it does. The introduction emphasizes that “words matter” (p. xv), and in particular that “the words that the psy sciences use certainly matter” (p. xvii). Specifically, Roselló-Peñaloza makes clear the power of the psy disciplines to signify whose lives count with respect to what researchers and clinicians “name within their field of expertise [thereby structur[ing] and transmit[ing] what the proper or healthy ways of being a persona are, and, by extension, also the unhealthy or undesirable ways” (p. xvii),. That the notion of who ‘counts’ is synonymous with who matters is no accident either, for the theories that

the psy disciplines construct do not exert the force that they do independent of the epistemologies that render their truth claims ‘science’ by numbers.

This recurring linkage of the multiplicity of ways that the psy disciplines, exert force that facilitates actual violence is aligned with the aims and scope of my research. This work also raises the extent of influence that has flowed from what Roselló-Peñaloza also recognizes as the invisible college (Ansara & Hegarty (2012). Located in Chile, and having conducted research in Spain, much of Roselló-Peñaloza work has previously been in Spanish. Yet the pathologizing theories that have flowed from the ‘invisible college’ and its historical affiliates dominate how trans people are understood, pathologized and subjected to what he terms ‘clinical violence’. While this work shares some common aims with my study in the examination of the psy disciplines and the construction of pathologized views of trans and gender diverse people which he argues must be problematized in terms of its framing as ‘science’, Roselló-Peñaloza work focuses on the harm that has been enacted in a specific adult clinical context. In contrast, my study while examining similar conceptualizations of violence draws on different theories, epistemological perspectives, and is focused on illuminating the emergence of a paradigm shift with respect to childhood gender diversity.

2.6 Conclusion

The choice of what to include and what not to include in a review of the literature that has informed my research was challenging, in that no guidelines exist to guide research informed by bricolage, and most guidelines that do exist are reflective of the systemic oppression of critical, and (necessarily) creative approaches to research. Likewise, while

considerable research exists on the historical and contemporary pathologization of childhood gender variance, none of these works illuminate the significance of the clinic as a site of epistemic controversy that has the potential to inform our understanding of the etiology and effects of epistemological violence and the paths to resistance from such harms. Ultimately, the works I have illuminated emphasize why the quilting together of research, which spans decades and disciplines, is essential to achieving a comprehensive understanding of the role that epistemology plays in shaping not only our understanding of human subjectivity, but human experience, in ways that academics, particularly those aligned with positivist epistemologies have largely ignored. The clinic as a site of epistemic controversy provides an extraordinary site for analysis of the implications of knowledge production on those under study and opens a window into transformative practices by listening to the experiences and insights of those who have recognized and resisted harmful narratives about identities.

Chapter 2

The Necessary Tools

3 Methodology

On the landscape of complexity, I am lost as a researcher if I do not possess an epistemological and ontological map to help me understand the nature of the territory I am exploring. To produce research that provides thick description and a glimpse of what could be, I need epistemological and ontological insights that alert me to the multidimensional, socially constructed, polyvocal, ever-changing, fractal-based nature of the social world. Such insights hold profound implications for research methods.
(Kincheloe, 2005, p. 333)

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter I provide a detailed discussion of the methodology and methods, procedures, and evaluative criteria for this research. As well, I interweave discussion as to how my approach is guided by both a belief in, and a commitment to, a degree of complexity, which requires careful analysis and decision making at each phase of the process. I illustrate how my choices are ontologically, and epistemologically informed, and how my approach, and the processes involved, are necessary for achieving the aims of this inquiry.

3.2 Bricolage

Employing *bricolage* as a necessary framework for achieving the aims of this inquiry is more than a methodological choice, rather it illuminates the imbricated relationship between ontology, epistemology, theory and methodology. According to Denzin and Lincoln (2005), “a basic dimension of an evolving criticality involves a comfort with the

existence of alternative ways of analyzing and producing knowledge (p. 319). Central to *bricolage*, this is not an easy task, for to engage with multiple theories and methodologies requires proficiency with, and the synthesis of, approaches that goes beyond mere research eclecticism. These are perhaps the greatest, and most legitimate criticisms of *bricolage*; that it is an approach that will lead to sacrificing depth for breadth, and without sufficient understanding of, and careful consideration in selecting the ‘tools’ to be employed, the work may illustrate an inadequate application of concepts and appear to be nothing more than a frenetic approach. Yet framing this research as a *case study* that employs multiple theories and methods including but not limited to, Foucauldian *genealogical analysis*, and his theorizations on power/knowledge, is not an attempt “to simply sprinkle all the right key words such as genealogy, power, discourse or panopticism at strategic intervals throughout one's text” (O’Farrell, 2005, p. 52). As I have already established in Chapter 1, Bricolage is first and foremost an epistemological choice.

3.3 Case Study

It is important to note that there are diverse approaches (and tensions surrounding) what constitutes *case study* research (Flyvberg, 2006; Patton, 2002, 2014; Stake, 2005; Yin, 2009). Deciding on how to approach case study has been the single most challenging methodological aspect of this inquiry. Having reviewed the differing perspectives of Patton, Flyvberg, Stake, Yin, and Yazan’s discussion of them (2015) I found myself having to make decisions about the strengths and limitations of each approach and continually asking how does this approach fit within my framework that is premised upon resisting monologic approaches and being committed to a “double ontology of

complexity” (Kincheloe, McLaren & Steinberg, 2011, p. 170), whereby “lived experience is allowed to sit at the table of official meaning-making” (Kincheloe & Berry, 2004, p. 11), and “paradigmatic and textual analyses” (Kincheloe & Berry, 2004, p. 22) are drawn into dialogue to examine “the various dynamics that shape what is called empirical knowledge” (Kincheloe & Berry, 2004, p. 7). I found myself concurring with Stake that case study “is not a methodological choice, but a choice of what is to be studied” (Stake, 2005, p. 443), yet also concurring with Yin (2009) that Stake's assertion that a case study be a “well-bounded, specific, complex, and functioning 'thing' (e.g., a person or a program) and not a generality (such as the relationship among schools or and education policy” (Yin, 2009, p. 22) which sets restrictive limits to the multi-perspectival aims of this inquiry.

I found that Patton's (2002) discussion of case study as “holistic and context sensitive” (p. 447), and as engaging with multiple units of analysis (p. 447) that can be *critical*, *ethnographic* and *narrative* (p. 447), as well as his assertion that “the term *case study* can refer to either the process of analysis, or the product of analysis, or both” (p. 447), provided a conceptualization of case study research that offered the greatest flexibility in approach. However, Patton's (2002) lack of specific attention to epistemological issues in framing case study research was an area that required seeking out additional views. For this, I turned to Flyvberg's Kuhnian inspired notion of the “*paradigmatic case*” (Flyvberg, 2006, p. 15). For Flyvberg, specific works of Michel Foucault represent “examples of paradigmatic cases, that is, cases that highlight more general characteristics of the societies in question” (Flyvberg, 2006, p. 16). However, what defines a *paradigmatic case* poses a significant challenge in that “the paradigmatic case transcends

any sort of rule-based criteria. No standard exists for the paradigmatic case because it sets the standard” (2006, p. 16). To try to define a *paradigmatic case*, Flyvberg turns to Foucauldian scholar Hubert Dreyfus for advice, to which Dreyfus provides a narrative analogy that raises a rhetorical question of ‘how would one define the works of the painter Cezanne’, to which Dreyfus responds “intuition” (Dreyfus in Flyvberg, 2006, p. 16). Though Flyvberg concurs with Dreyfus, he adds that researchers are also obliged to “be sensible to other members of the scholarly communities of which they are a part” (Flyvberg, 2006, p. 17), and therefore must “account, in collectively acceptable ways, for his or her intuitive choice, even though intuition may be the real, or most important, reason why the researcher wants to execute the project” (Flyvberg, 2006, p. 17).

Thus having examined different approaches to case study, drawing on a synthesis of Patton’s (2002) approach in light of Flyvberg’s conceptualization of a *critical paradigmatic case* (2006) I conceived and understood the ‘case’ at hand as entailing a detailed analysis of the experience of activists and scholars working to trans-inform the clinical gaze, through undertaking a *genealogically inspired analysis* of the ‘psy’ discourses surrounding both gender and sexual diversity, as well as issues of epistemological resistance and the *disciplining* of bodies. Such a methodological execution also involved the intertwining of an *ethnographic* approach aimed at privileging marginalized voices and perspectives of trans activists.

3.4 Genealogy

What is perhaps the most frequently quoted reference to Foucault's genealogy hints at the complexity that those who engage with genealogy will recognize as familiar. He writes

Genealogy is gray, meticulous, and patiently documentary. It operates on a field of entangled and confused parchments on documents that have been scratched over and recopied many times." (Foucault, in Bouchard, 1977, p. 139)

Those whose expertise in applying Foucault's methods like Nicolas Rose (1996) are also frequently cited to provide a succinct definition of the aims of Foucauldian genealogical analysis, which according to Rose involves taking "the interiorized totalized and psychologised understanding of what it is to be human as the site of a historical problem" (Rose, 1996, p. 18). Yet articulating what *genealogy* is, and how to engage in it is far more challenging than the frequently quoted brief definitions. Next to dealing with the definitional tensions surrounding case study, articulating the *what*, and the *how*, of *genealogy*, was the most challenging aspect of proposing it as a methodology.⁶⁶

However, I needed to take a step back and make clear that I did not undertake a full *genealogical analysis* of the 'psy' disciplines in relation to childhood gender diversity, nor did I conduct 'a genealogy' of the clinic. To do so would not have been possible given the stated aims of this research which was concerned to engage with multiple theories, facilitate participatory engagement in generating knowledge production and to

⁶⁶ This thesis utilizes the Canadian spelling psychologized, whereas Rose employs psychologized which is typically employed in Britain.

privilege trans voices and perspectives on the clinical gaze. Furthermore, the choice to employ elements of *genealogical* analysis did not come lightly, and felt was only possible after having read a wide range of Foucault's works, critiques surrounding them, and developing an understanding of the 'periodization' surrounding his works.⁶⁷ Having attended to these potential concerns what follows is a brief rationale for engaging with *genealogy* in terms of applying 'elements' of '*genealogical analysis*', which is both purposeful and informed.

Though Kincheloe, McLaren and Steinberg have made reference to 'archaeology/genealogy' in a conjoined manner (Kincheloe, McLaren & Steinberg, 2011, pp 168-169), and perspectives on the similarities of the two terms are the subject of much debate (see, O'Farrell, 2005, and Gutting 2005), the two terms are not interchangeable. Due to spatial limitations a detailed description of *archaeology* is not possible, however, understanding that *archaeology* was an earlier method employed by Foucault in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (1972), and that his engagement with this method was situated within more of a *structuralist* framework, prior his full engagement with theorizations on power/knowledge (that emerged most significantly in *Discipline and Punish*), is important (O'Farrell, 2005). In contrast, Foucault describes "three axes" (Foucault & Rabinow, 1984, p. 352) being possible for *genealogical analysis*, and having engaged with each of the different 'axes' (truth, power and ethics) in specific works, with varying intensity of focus given to each. He wrote:

⁶⁷ McHoul and Grace (2002) take issue with discussion of Foucault's work in terms of 'periodization'. However, a linear examination of Foucault's works can provide insight into the development of his theorizations and methods and can clarify common errors surrounding Foucault's terminology (as in the case of conflating *archaeology* and *genealogy*).

three axes are possible for genealogy. All three were present, albeit in a somewhat confused fashion, in *Madness and Civilization*. The *truth* axis was studied in *The Birth of the Clinic* and *The Order of Things*. The *power* axis was studied in *Discipline and Punish*, and the *ethical* axis in *The History of Sexuality* (Foucault & Rabinow, 1984, p. 352).

However, without a broad and deep understanding of Foucault's works, this compartmentalized and oversimplified view of each axis as distinct and reflected in separate works is erroneous. Foucault has made clear that these axes are *imbricated*, and his articulation of these axes is a matter of *emphasis* and not separateness. Consider the following:

Three domains of genealogy are possible. First, a historical ontology of ourselves in relation to *truth* through which we constitute ourselves as subjects of knowledge; second, a historical ontology of ourselves in relation to a field of *power* through which we constitute ourselves as subjects acting on others; third, a historical ontology in relation to *ethics* through which we constitute ourselves as moral agents (Foucault, 1980, p. 351).

Foucault also explicitly discusses how examination of each axis was with varying emphasis, and not explicitly articulated as genealogical analysis in one of his earliest works, *Madness and Civilization*. He explains that in this work his focus was:

first, [on] the formation of a domain of recognitions (*connaissances*) which constitute themselves as specific knowledge of 'mental illness'; second, the organization of a normative system built on a whole technical, administrative, juridical, and medical

apparatus whose purpose was to isolate and take custody of the insane; and finally, the definition of a relation to oneself and to others as possible subjects of madness (Foucault & Rabinow, 1984, p. 336).

An oversimplified view of Foucault's work, expectations for rigidly defined genealogical 'method', or criticism that Foucault was 'contradictory' are challenges that anyone employing Foucault may encounter. However, when faced with questions posed by those both unfamiliar with his work, and by those whose epistemological lens brings into view expectations that are incongruent with Foucault's complexity and resistance to being defined by the terms he sought to resist, I suggest that a deep understanding of Foucault's notion of the "insurrection of subjugated knowledges" (Foucault, 1980. P. 81) and its centrality to *genealogy* are key.

First, I must confess, my own early oversimplification of what Foucault meant by this term, emphasising a loosely imagined notion of privileging the voice of 'marginalized' individuals or groups. While this is indeed a component of Foucault's reference to the "insurrection of subjugated knowledges" (Foucault, 1980, p.81), what is central to Foucault's notion of genealogy is the *interplay* of two types of knowledges which he refers to as 'erudite' (scholarly, historical), and 'local' or 'disqualified', the latter of which Foucault provides the example of the "psychiatric patient" (Foucault, 1980, p. 81). While Foucault makes the notion of 'disqualified' or 'local' knowledges clear, what he means by 'erudite' requires some further explication. The term, though loosely framed as 'scholarly', is used by Foucault to refer not to "useless erudition" [monologic theory, science, and 'facts'] (O'Farrell, 2005, p. 87), but to speak of critical, historical,

philosophical study that focuses on “unearthing all of the knowledges rejected by these institutionalised disciplinary systems and examining the historical and sometimes quite scurrilous reasons for the rejection of some knowledge and inclusion of others”

(O'Farrell, 2005, p. 87). He wrote:

Let us give the term *genealogy* to the union of erudite knowledge and local memories which allows us to establish a *historical knowledge of struggles* and to make use of this knowledge tactically today. This then will be a provisional definition of the genealogies which I have attempted to compile (Foucault, 1980, p. 83)

Thus with the aims of this inquiry including critically examining the historical formation of ‘truth’ surrounding gender diversity, examining the systems of power that function to govern gender, examining the ways that trans activists and scholars have mounted an epistemic insurrection in relation to the domains of truth and power that have exerted a pathologizing force on their identities, my purpose and aims are clearly aligned with Foucault’s ‘method’.

In terms of commensurability of *genealogical analysis* in the context of this *bricolage* driven research, I would add that Foucault in many ways represents the original *bricoleur*, drawing on the tools at hand, focused on ‘paradigmatic and textual analyses’ and by emphasising the importance of ‘subjugated knowledges’ (Foucault, 1980, 1984). It is also important to note that both in the spirit of *bricolage*, as an approach that resists the imposition of pre-determined structures, and in the spirit of Flyvberg’s (2006) notion of a *critical-paradigmatic case study* as elusive to define, and very much an ‘intuitive’

process, Foucault employed *genealogy* in *Madness and Civilisation* prior to having mapped out precisely what he meant by the term. Yet such an approach is characteristic of Foucault's work. He wrote:

When I begin a book, not only do I not know what I'll be thinking at the end, but it's not very clear to me what method I will employ. Each of my books is a way of carving out an object and of fabricating a method of analysis. Once my work is finished, through a kind of retrospective reflection on the experience I've just gone through, I can extrapolate the method the book ought to have followed-so that I write books I would call exploratory somewhat in alternation with books of method (Foucault & Faubion, 2000, p. 240).

Ultimately, the purpose of my inquiry, and the suitability of Foucault's method, its linkages with specific notions of case study, and its commensurability with *bricolage*, illuminates that my choices are purposeful and well informed, and are rooted in a firm belief that the 'unconventional' can indeed be both scholarly and highly productive.

In terms of how I engaged with genealogical analysis in this dissertation, though a vast body of clinical literature was examined, both of the following chapters which present findings are influenced by participants' voices coming into dialogue with elements of genealogical analysis in different ways. In chapter four, given the specificity of the event that participants identified, a special issue of *The Archives of Sexual Behavior* which included a target article, 21 commentaries and a response by the author of the initial target article served as the archive for analysis in chapter four. Decisions regarding

methodology, and the emergence of this event are discussed in the results chapter in greater detail. This is done to illuminate the participatory and evolving nature of bricolage, rather than to compartmentalize theory, methodology, methods and findings.

Briefly, what emerged in Chapter four was what I termed a *micro genealogical case study*. During a review of methodological literature, publications that outlined such an approach could not be located. However, by looking at the nexus of knowledge/power that was encapsulated in the special issue of archives, I examined how the ‘truths’ that were postulated by those with pathologized views of gender diversity were indicative of the different forms of epistemic violence outlined in chapter one. This is aligned with Denzin and Lincoln’s (2005) view that “genealogy maps the complex and contradictory ways in which forces and processes come together to produce a certain set of effects. Foucault's genealogies are not histories of causes; rather they are histories of effects of consequences” (*ibid*, p. 647). As such, the micro genealogy is both a mapping of a case of epistemic violence, and the effects of the recognition of that violence, which served as an organizing force for activism and scholarship aimed at illuminating the harms association with the clinic’s pathologized view of childhood gender diversity.

While such a micro genealogical analysis of epistemic violence enacted by contemporary figures is likely to evoke discomfort, in that the claims of ‘violence’ tend to exist more in examination of works located further in history, yet provoking necessary discomfort by mapping out the history of the present is central to what Foucault understood to be the purpose of genealogy. According to Kendall and Wickham (1999), genealogy must be

understood as an approach that will evoke discomfort. Specifically, with respect to the psy disciplines he writes:

Genealogy has the same effect as a precocious child at a dinner party: genealogy makes the older guests at the table of intellectual analysis feel decidedly uncomfortable by pointing out things about their origins and functions that they would rather remain hidden. For example, Foucault's genealogy of psychiatry makes psychiatrists feel uncomfortable by pointing out that the origins and functions of this science are far from the noble enterprise dedicated to the service of humanity that the official histories would have us believe (Kendall & Wickham, 1999, p.29)

This notion of discomfort is particularly important to reflect on in light of a genealogical analysis of an 'event' in relatively recent history. Unlike genealogies which involve examining works whose authors are relegated to history, the works contained in the special issue of *Archives* include many contributors who are still living, and/or practicing in their fields. As genealogies are concerned to examine the nexus of truth and power (as well as ethics in the Foucauldian sense, see Foucault & Rabinow, 1984, p. 352), it is important for readers to reflect on their own orientations to truth, epistemologies, axiology and rhetoric, and consider how such views may be embedded in discomfort that may emerge with respect to disciplinary and paradigmatic criticisms.

3.4.1 'Archival' Research

While I have previously discussed the distinction between 'a genealogy' and a genealogically informed approach employed in this research, and further reflections are

woven into specific chapters for further context, the question of genealogy and its frequent relation, specifically in the context of Foucault's work is warranted. Archival research has typically been framed as involving the detailed examination of specific original documents 'archives' of historical significance (Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011). Given that Foucault's work emerged before the era of digital and internet-based research, archival tends to be emphasized in the context of examination of historical sources. However, the notion of 'archival research' in relation to Foucault's work has dual meaning, before his shift to genealogical approaches that explicitly discussed power, Foucault's discussion of 'the archive' in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* (1972), clearly points to the notion of power in relation to what constitutes 'the archive'. He writes that the archive:

defines the system of constructing possible sentences, and the corpus that passively collects the words that are spoken, the archive defines a particular level: that of a practice that causes a multiplicity of statements to emerge as so many regular events, as so many thing to be dealt with and manipulated, It does not have the weight of tradition; and it does not constitute the library of all libraries, outside time and place; nor is it the welcoming oblivion that opens up to all new speech the operational field of its freedom; between tradition and oblivion, it reveals the rules of a practice that enables statements both to survive and to undergo regular modification. It is the general system of the formation and transformation of statements (1972, p. 130).

For Foucault, ‘the archive’ “emerges in fragments, regions, and levels, more fully, no doubt, and with greater sharpness, the greater the time that separates us from it” (p. 130). While outlines his concern that there is an inability to effectively problematize current practices from the present, a notion that Teo reiterates is a problem within psychology (2017), nonetheless Foucault’s emphasis the notion of the archive is to conceptualize it as “the never completed, never wholly achieved uncovering of the archive forms the general horizon to which the description of discursive formations, the analysis of positivity’s, the mapping of the enunciative field belong” (1972, p.131).

In this sense my ‘archival research’ and the ‘archives’ that I examined were vast in that they dealt with sources covering inter-related and contested domains of knowledge that underpinned and empowered the clinic, as well as a multiplicity of sources that challenged it:

- Multiple versions of the DSM dealing with the pathologization of women, gender and sexual diversity, and specifically trans adults and children;
- Clinical literature from psychology, psychiatry, and social work, that contained studies, commentaries and layers of pathologizing claims.

My literature review which highlights the imbricated works of John Money, Richard Green and Ken Zucker, along with darting back and forth examining the literature that they cited, and then doing the same with respect to the literature that began to emerge challenging the clinic. Stryker (2006), Tosh (2015, 2016), Winters (2008), as well as those documents that existed ‘in between’ paradigms, where clinicians located within the psy disciplines began to push back against the pathologizing discourses. Some, such as

Isay (1999) whose initial focus was on the way that the diagnosis of gender identity disorder was a pathologization of feminine or gay boys, failed to recognize the harm being done to trans children, yet he established linkages to reparative therapy in relation to the clinic's 'treatment' approach to childhood gender diversity that would eventually lead to a specific focus of the harm of the 'treatment' approach to trans and gender diverse children (see Langer and Martin, 2004).

The notion of 'archives' also grew throughout this dissertation. The websites of Lynn Conway and Andrea James contained clinical literature, critiques of them, articles and information about and by trans women which challenged the pathologizing representation of trans women in the clinical literature, as well as mapping connections between key figures and highlighting the interconnected power relations of what would later be termed the invisible college (Ansara & Hegarty, 202). Newspaper articles addressing the controversy surrounding Michael Bailey's book, and the gender identity clinic for children and youth, revealing the conservative political relationships being cultivated by those who adhere a pathology model. Likewise, trans informed journalist accounts of the clinic such as Cristan Williams *The Rise and Fall of Disco Sexology*, which is an exhaustive compilation of interviews, investigative pieces examining the history and key figures of the clinic, up to and including discussion of its closure, were some of the necessary sources for this research.

Sometimes sources warranted extensive and detailed examination, such as the complete works of Ken Zucker and Richard Green. Other times I "considered entanglements between spaces, documents and subjects, both real and textual" (Tamboukou, 2013, p.

631) as I examined linkages between members of the ‘invisible college’ (Ansara & Hegarty, 2012; Pearce, 2016). I reviewed information shared with me including e-mails and exchanges on listservs. I engaged in ‘fieldwork’ along with my texts (as discussed in chapter 5, when I quoted and excerpts to Dr. Zucker at a conference, asking him if he still held the same view that mothers are the ‘cause’ of ‘gender identity disorder’ (See, Zucker & Bradley, 1995).

Tamboukou (2013) speaks to the “radically changing the nature of the archive, as well as the approaches to archival research” (pp 617-618), which aligns with my orientation to research via a bricolage which requires using the most appropriate theories, methodologies, and sources. She makes clear:

that while working in the archive, the researcher is always creating an archive of her own, which gradually becomes part of wider fields and bodies of knowledge. It is the researcher’s archive, or what I have called ‘the researcher’s cut’, that creates a unity, piecing together archival fragments, theoretical insights, spatio-temporal experiences and material conditions and limitations. This acknowledgement of fragmentation as a dynamic process derives from the thesis of flat ontologies and flat epistemologies or what Barad (2007) has theorized as intra-actions and diffractions (p.631).

Ultimately, I employed a vast and diverse array of sources as my ‘archive’, and just as Foucault asserted, “operated on a field of entangled and confused parchments on documents that have been scratched over and recopied many times” (Foucault, in Bouchard, 1977, p. 139), in order to establish an archive through this research which

illuminates the significance of the clinic, the harm that flowed from it, and the process that lead to its ‘death’.

3.4.2 Discourse Analysis

Just as discussion of what constitutes archival research in the context of Foucault, and this research bricolage, the way that the term is interpreted is contingent upon the various interpretations of Foucault’s work and the researchers themselves. Arribas-Ayllon and Walkerdine (2017) highlight this challenge, particularly for those new to this approach. They write:

It is customary to warn that there are no set rules or procedures for conducting Foucauldian-inspired analysis. To avoid formalizing an approach that clearly refuses formalization, we are also cautious about prescribing a specific way of using Foucault. Over the course of his writings, Foucault's ideas and methods had changed in relation to the problems he worked on: the exclusion of madness, the birth of clinical medicine, the disciplinary practices of the prison, the regulation of sexuality, the governmentality of society, and the ethics of subjectivity. As such, there is no consistent programme of work from which to extract a methodology (p.2).

Yet Arribas-Ayllon and Walkerdine, assert that despite the ‘gray’ nature of Foucauldian discourse analysis, challenges, diversity of approaches and lack of rules, there are the subject matter, specifically in the context of psychology can serve as a starting point. They write:

The relationship between discourse and psychology assumes a commitment to being critical of psychology as a body of knowledge, and it involves doing psychological research in a different way. In the first instance, discourse analysis is a method of exposing the historical conditions through which psychological knowledge has played a part in shaping the conduct of individuals in Western societies. But it is also a method of understanding the contemporary practices through which individuals constitute themselves as subjects of knowledge (p.2).

Arribas-Allyon and Walkerdine link Foucauldian discourse analysis to genealogy. Drawing on Nicolas Rose's genealogical work examining the psy complex (see Rose, 1979), they outline how "Rose begins with an event that breaks with the assumption that psychology emerged as a coherent discipline, animated by a general rational principle or by an underlying cause that could reconstruct a global history of psychology"(p.4). As the clinic, and the 'treatment' approach emerged as the leading approach to childhood gender diversity in the world, the notion that its rise was reflective of science, progress and homogeneity in terms of a unilateral embrace, was a target of my analysis. Like Rose, one of the aims of my research was "to understand how psychology participated in this project of administration by acting as a relay (*savoir*) between other forms of knowledge – political economy, the law, medicine, education" (p.4). Linking to Foucault's notion of the archive, the authors state that a starting point is to select a "corpus of statements about an object relevant to one's inquiry" (p. 7). They add that this corpus "should also include examples of how the construction of objects varies over time" (p.4). They add that this "is important to show how power/knowledge relations

operate within different historical periods, and within different disciplinary regimes. This is echoed by Fadyl, Nicholls & McPherson (2012) who reflect on their approach as follows:

Methodological principles relating to archaeology were used to make visible the elements of discourse and discursive formations (objects, subjects, concepts and strategies), and the ways in which they are formed and limited. These discourses were then analysed in relation to Foucault's notions of power-knowledge relations (disciplinary techniques, subjectivity and governmentality), utilising methodological principles associated with genealogy, and theory developed by Foucault and extended by other authors (p.482).⁶⁸

In the context of the corpus of statements outlined in the previous section, my 'archive' (or corpus) included interdisciplinary literature (psychology, psychiatry, social work) and spanned decades, including examination of multiple revisions of the same text (DSM). Yet in the micro-genealogy in chapter 4, my focus was strictly on the target article and commentaries contained in one issue. This was done because of the significance of the 'event' being examined which the texts contained illuminated. While employing such an approach may initially appear contrary to the 'tracing back' that is indicative of genealogical account, the special issue of archives is a unique example that provided a

⁶⁸ Though the authors reference archaeology specifically, the distinction between archaeology and genealogy, is primarily a difference between the explicit focus on power. Foucault shifted his approach from archaeology to genealogy as his theorizations on power/knowledge emerged in *Discipline and Punish* (1977) (for a discussion of this see, Kendall & Wickham, 1999; O'Farrell, 2005).

rare opportunity for the examination of the visibility, and shifts in power relations, as members of the invisible college laid forth their views, their alliances, and exposed their objectifying gaze as a political technology over trans representation. Yet I also examined the way that resistance emerged, commentaries that recognized the harm that had been enacted against trans women, challenging the alleged science, and problematizing the absence of trans-epistemology (Mathy, 2008). While eclectic and shifting approach; weaving my gaze back and forth between the discourses of power and resistance, took liberty with established notions of what discourse analysis ‘should’ look like, once again, may aim is to employ the necessary tools to achieve a task, not to attempt to conduct ‘a genealogy’, ‘a discourse analysis’ but instead to examine a significant event that marked the beginning of the end for the clinic.

3.5 Ethnography

Once again, it is important to be clear that this inquiry is not *ethnography* in the strictest sense. According to Patton (2002) “*ethnography* takes its central and guiding assumption that any human group of people interacting together for a period of time will evolve a culture” (p.81), and in this sense, activists and scholars working to trans-inform the clinical gaze, though intent on facilitating change, are comprised of a diverse group of individuals that do not necessarily reflect Patton's (2002) definition of ‘culture’. There was also a degree of *netnography* involved, as social media and digital communities have expanded the spatial dimensions of what constitute ‘communities’ (Bowler, 2010). Though *netnography* has been regarded with some suspicion in academic circles regarding the ‘authenticity’ of communities (see Bowler, 2010), such a stance is an ontological assumption surrounding legitimacy of whose knowledge counts that is

contrary to the tenets of bricolage, which include being collaborative, responsive, and open to participant feedback throughout the research process (Kincheloe, 2005, 2002, Kincheloe, McLaren & Steinberg, 2011). As well, though there are ethical concerns regarding *netnography*, Bowler (2010) and Kozinets (2002) assert that the same ethical guidelines for traditional ethnography apply in terms of *observation* of public and private domains. However, both urge caution in terms of what constitutes public versus private, suggesting that if there is any question as to what would be considered public, as in the case of publicly accessible social media posts, versus posts that require some form of membership in a group or forum in order to access/view, researchers should always lean towards caution.

Kozinets (2002) makes clear that researchers involved with any degree of ‘community engagement, must follow four ethical guide lines. He writes:

(1) the researcher should fully disclose his/her presence, affiliations and intentions to online community members during any research, (2) the researchers should ensure confidentiality and anonymity to informants, and (3) the researcher should seek and incorporate feedback from members of the online community being researched. There is an additional final procedure that is specific to the online medium. It involves taking a cautious position on the private versus- public medium issue. This procedure requires the researcher to contact community members and obtain their permission (informed

consent) to use any specific postings that are to be directly quoted in the research (Kozinets, 2002, p. 9).⁶⁹

Patton (2014) outlines seven ethical considerations for conducting internet based qualitative research, including asking questions and being reflexive surrounding: *intrusiveness, respect for privacy, sensitivity to vulnerability, potential harm, internet informed consent* (what is required, and how can it be obtained), *confidentiality*, and *intellectual property rights* (as in the case of participants who may refuse anonymity to maintain authority over their own voice) (pp. 764-765).⁷⁰ While Research Ethics Boards are becoming increasingly familiar with an expansion of research approaches and what constitutes a ‘community’ in a digital age, skepticism or concern regarding the ethics of digital research persist (Patton, 2014). However, as outlined by Kozinets (2002), Bowler, 2010, and Patton (2014), though individual Institutional Research Ethics Boards vary on their guidelines for conducting digital research, with the exception of the logistics of informed digital consent, participant ethical considerations are not dissimilar to

⁶⁹ I did not seek access or gain access to online forums for trans and gender diverse people as to do so would have posed ethical concerns for the privacy and well being of community members. Though numerous publicly accessible and open forums such as reddit include extensive discussion of clinical literature, I did not include any material derived from reviewing posts. However, the significance of cybercommunities is taken up by a participant in chapter 5.

⁷⁰ Note: *Western Education, Frequently Asked Questions - Ethics Review*, specifically addresses participant choice surrounding anonymity. While Section 12.1 of the Research Protocol Form indicates that researchers must ensure the confidentiality of research participants, it also states: “Participants may decide to give up their confidentiality by indicating their choice to do so on the consent form by initialing a statement to that effect. This is perfectly acceptable, and the participant can now be named in any reports pertaining to the research”. <http://www.edu.uwo.ca/research/faq.html>

traditional *in person* research. Further examination of such logistics will be addressed in the Research Ethics Proposal.

Similarly, what constitutes a ‘community’ is complex on many levels. While in my preliminary investigations some *media discourses* pointed to false dichotomies between *activism* and *science*, this research makes clear that not only is this a false binary, but it examines how this binary has been deployed by those who support pathologized views of childhood gender diversity in attempts to maintain knowledge hierarchies that they benefit from. As well, a ‘community’ of trans-informed activists and scholars may consist of individuals who are as trans, non-binary, gender queer, queer, gay, lesbian, neuro-diverse, or cisgender, but who all recognize the legitimacy of trans people to speak with authority about their own lives, and who recognize the falsity and harms associated with the pathologizing literature. Thus, traditional notions of culture and community are complex, but necessarily so in order to illuminate how diverse groups have come together to raise awareness surrounding pathologizing discourses and practices, but also to illuminate epistemic issues surrounding whose knowledge counts as evidence.

Yet it is also important to discuss potential concerns surrounding 'outsider' accounts of ‘cultures’, due to the legacy of harm associated with colonized views of the ‘*Other*’.

Though western views of gender, culture and science have dominated by “‘white’ western civility within professions dominated and defined by men” (Tosh, 2106, p. 29), disciplinary adherence within the human sciences to notions of ‘objectivity’ centered upon a “quazi-milaristic zeal to neutralize bias” (Sandelowski, 1993, p.1) has invisibilized the role of the researcher in perpetuating colonized views and resulted in

wide spread *rigor mortis*, not *rigour* in research (Sandelowski, 1993). Teo (2010, 2011, 2015) and Tosh (2015, 2016), discuss how clinical, behavioural, developmental, and educational psychologies are imbued with colonized views of ‘normality’, which raises questions about the *culture* of the psy disciplines as a point of examination, particularly given epistemic hierarchies and resistance to ‘outsider’ views.

There are also significant tensions in terms of defining a cohesive ‘trans-scholarship’ ‘community’, in that those invested who engage in trans-affirmative or trans-informed scholarship occupy a diverse range of views.⁷¹ This is particularly evident on the issue of *subject positions* and their associated relationship to research. Tosh (2016) discusses these tensions and specifically draws on the notion of ‘insider accounts’ by trans scholars as a site of tension that has particular relevance to any research that aims to bring an *ethnographic lens* to the inquiry. Tosh discusses that while some scholars embrace the importance of voice driven insider accounts, others have expressed significant concern that such accounts can lead to a voyeuristic form of trans-objectification (Tosh, 2016). Patton (2002) emphasizes that *ethnography* has been very much focused on the notion of ‘the other’ (Patton, 2002, p. 84), in a manner that has had objectifying and marginalizing effects. This relates to Levi- Strauss’s (1962) concern that discourses of objectivity were themselves ‘othering’ in that they erased the interpretive lens of the researcher and privileged the dominance of western colonized views.

⁷¹ Consider that Olson et al.’s quantitative analysis of the mental health of transgender children could be viewed as both ‘positivist’ (quantitative analysis to arrive upon a truth claim about the mental wellbeing of children) yet it is also indicative of a constructionist lens that recognizes that the external variable as to how children are treated directly impacts their mental health.

Thus it is important that I make clear that my focus is not on scholars and activists as *objects*, reflective of an objectified ‘other’, rather my focus is on making the *systems* of objectification the *object* of my inquiry, and doing so by drawing on their *expert* knowledge and experience, yet simultaneously recognizing the importance of approaching ‘communities’ (as loosely defined as they may be) as being mindful of Patton’s caution against objectification by adhering to the notion of “nothing about us, without us” (Patton, 2002, p. 335). This is particularly significant in relation to potential participants who identify as trans persons, given the legacy of harm associated with non-trans representation and erasure of trans lives. Hale’s (1997), *Suggested Rules for Non-Transsexuals Writing about Transsexuals, Transsexuality, Transsexualism, or Trans* ____, provides important guidelines for consideration that shift examination away from trans-identified persons as *objects*, to examination of the role of the researcher in writing about trans lives. Hale provides 15 suggestions, some of which can be summarized as considerations surrounding *humility* – recognizing that you are not the expert, *reflexivity* – asking yourself what power you hold, what is your positionality, why are you engaging research that involves and impacts trans communities, and what do your answers say about you, and *representation* - don’t objectify, homogenize or eroticise trans’ lives, *expertise* - don’t “uncritically” cite the ‘experts’ that have pathologized and marginalized trans lives, and don’t erase the expertise of trans persons, *voice* - whose voices dominate the research?, *collaboration* - involve participants at all phases of the research process, *criticism* - be open to it, refer to point number one, you are not the expert.

While Hale’s (1997) suggestions are explicitly offered for non-trans identified researchers researching trans lives, the themes expressed are aligned with the Kincheloe’s

(2005) 13 criteria for conducting and evaluating research employing *bricolage*, which is discussed in greater detail in the following section in terms of how approaches to interviewing are informed by different epistemological views, and employing a bricolage of approaches is an epistemologically informed decision. Yet in the same way that I drew on elements of genealogy, to construct a micro genealogical case study, my engagement with ethnography was also eclectic and participant driven. What emerged in Chapter five also involved bringing genealogical and ethnographic elements into dialogue. While this too is discussed in greater detail in Chapter five, for the reasons mentioned in the genealogical discussion above, my encounter with participants made clear that tracing how participants mounted an epistemic insurrection was genealogically influenced in that it too was an examination of the nexus of knowledge /power relations , though in this instance this knowledge was derived via the synthesis of emergent themes and reflection on theory as evident in participant voices.

Tamboukou & Ball (2003) discuss these genealogical-ethnographic encounters as challenging in terms of the depth of analysis involved, yet rich in terms of the knowledge that is produced as a result. They make clear that participants and researchers are embedded in regimes of truth and power relations, and orthodox views of genealogy or ethnography which oppose the fusion of these approaches are a precise example of power relations that need to be exposed. In terms of exemplars for genealogically informed ethnography, Tamboukou and Ball point to Martino (2003) who employs a Foucauldian genealogical analytic to examining researcher-subject relations via Foucault's theorizations. While Martino's account focuses on the role of the researcher in relation to participants, I have drawn on the same analytic lens and methodological considerations to

examine how participants facilitated a paradigm shift by turning their gaze onto the psychology disciplines. In this sense, the genealogical analysis is flipped to demonstrate the awareness of the tactics and strategies of power (Foucault, 190, 1984) to develop what Tamboukou terms “technologies of resistance” (2004, p.198).

3.6 Procedures

Interviewing

According to Patton (2014), “different inquiry traditions emphasize different questions and field work methods” (p. 947), of which he discusses and provides examples across the “12 qualitative inquiry traditions” (p. 947). Yet Patton also directly discusses how bricolage involves “combining old things in new ways, including alternative and emergent forms of data collection and combining inquiry traditions” (p. 369). Though Patton asserts that employing varied methods, including different approaches to interviewing is acceptable, he does highlight how critics of the approach suggest that it “lacks rigor, and therefore the credibility and validity, of systematic scientific inquiry” (p. 374). However, such criticism is an onto-epistemic stance that privileges the very notions that critical researchers employing bricolage aim to explicate; that scientific inquiry is neither neutral nor value free, and that hierarchies of knowledge and the hegemony of ‘science’ reproduce inequity. That said, Patton does suggest that the aims and scope of bricolage can pose challenges in terms of its manageability in terms of methodology and methods. Though I have previously outlined my methodological rationale as well as addressing such concerns, I will specifically address how a bricolage of interview methods is necessary and manageable, as well as specifically outlining my approach.

Patton lists three “variations in qualitative interview question formats” (2014, p. 953) including the *informal conversational interview*, the *interview guide* and the *standardized open-ended interview* (p. 953). He adds that “each approach has strengths and weaknesses, and each serves a different purpose” (p 953). In extension, my research draws on elements of each approach. According to Patton, “the strength of the informal conversational method resides in the opportunities it offers for flexibility, spontaneity and responsiveness to individual differences and situational changes” (2014, p.954). This flexibility is important given that potential participants are anticipated to be a diverse group of activists, scholars and potentially trans-identified individuals or their families who have had direct experience with the clinic. Not only does interviewing a diverse array of participants require approaches tailored to participants, but gaining access to participants who are weary of ‘researchers’ and their accounts of trans people, journalist required transparency regarding my own onto-epistemic views which both support gender and sexual diversity, and question the legacy of harm associated with pathologizing narratives that have dominated psychological literature on childhood gender diversity. While this stance may incur criticism for lack of ‘neutrality’, once again such criticism involves power relations and an epistemological stance that are being questioned. One of the essential tenets of bricolage involves such transparency and demonstrating willingness to listen to participants on their terms, based on what they choose, and to make clear that they have ownership over how their voices are collected and represented in research. That said, given feedback from colleagues situated within trans-activist scholarship, providing participants with a set of pre-determined questions may be a requirement for trust building and as a basis for providing transparency as to the

questions that will be posed. For this reason, an *interview guide* was developed, as well as a list of *standardized questions*, and the choice of interviewing approach, including the option of combining approaches (something Patton advocates for, see. 2014, p. 962) was extended to the participants.⁷²

In addition to a commitment to requiring multiple approaches to interviewing based on meeting the needs of participants (and thereby privileging *subjugated voices*), bricolage also involves *transparency* and *reflexivity* on the part of the researcher, and a commitment to exploring *interdisciplinary perspectives*, *engaging with multiple epistemologies*, and *exploring power relations associated with research practices* (Kincheloe, 2005), thus the complexity of the research also warranted multiple approaches. Furthermore, Patton (2014) highlights that questions can be categorized in terms of *experience and behavior*, *opinions and values*, *feelings*, *knowledge*, *sensory*, *background/demographic*, and *temporal* domains, which must be planned in *sequential order* (Patton, 2014, pp.968-974); multiple interview approaches are necessary to achieve both depth and breadth in terms of data elicited. Participants were given the option to engage in an informal conversational interview, review interview guide questions, and answer or not answer any questions that they choose (see Appendix).

3.7 Participant Sample

According to Patton (2002), “perhaps nothing better captures the difference between quantitative and qualitative methods than the different logics that undergird sampling

⁷² Research Ethics Requirements also indicated the need for an interview guide.

approaches” (p. 230). Specifically, unlike the emphasis in quantitative research on statistically significant numbers as a means to reduce bias, qualitative research “typically focuses in depth on relatively small samples, even singular cases ($N=1$), selected purposefully” (2002, p. 230). For this research, sampling strategies were selected based on *purposeful sampling*, and strategies included *snowball*⁷³ *sampling* (incrementally expanding peer referral) as a strategy for accessing “information rich key informants” (Patton, 2002, p. 237), and *opportunistic sampling* to increase flexibility and responsiveness to the research process as it unfolded (Patton, 2002, p. 244). Though the nature and focus of this research focused on depth and complexity over volume, and qualitative research does not prescribe or emphasize sample size (Patton, 2002), eleven participants engaged in interviews for this study. Patton highlights that although sample size is linked to the purpose of the inquiry and is highly context dependent, he adds that of “560 qualitative dissertations [analyzed], the smallest sample was a single participant used in a life history study. The largest sample was 95....The most common sample sizes were 20 and 30” (Patton, 2014, p. 703).

⁷³ Note: While Patton (2015) highlights that snowball sampling “involves asking a number of people who else to talk with” (p. 669 OLV), the University of Western Ontario Frequently Asked Questions regarding Research Ethics specifically states: “You may recruit participants using ‘snowball’ sampling (a technique for developing a research sample where existing study participants recruit future participants from among their acquaintances). However, in general, please note that while current participants may refer others to your study, you should not solicit the names of those potential participants from them. You should ask participants to mention your study to others and they can provide your contact information (such as a business card or letter of information) to them. If the potential participant is interested, they can then contact you”. See *Western Education, Frequently Asked Questions - Ethics Review* <http://www.edu.uwo.ca/research/faq.html> Also note: Opportunistic, Opportunity or Emergent Sampling is not addressed in the FAQ section.

Given the multiple lenses of analysis and the specificity regarding key informants, an estimate of 20 participants was sought, given the aims of the inquiry, methodology being employed, and the temporal limitations associated with this study. Given that considerable activism surrounding the clinic was public, a list of academics and activists, which in this instance constitutes expert knowledge, was publicly accessible. I also established networks that enabled access to trans-activists and scholars. A total of 11 participants engaged in interviews for this study, however it is also important to note, and is discussed in a subsequent section of this dissertation, that this study also involved contributions by individuals who did not engage in formal interviews, but who forwarded literature and shared insights which have been included where possible.

While some participants chose to have their name included in the study, multiple participants, as well as individuals who declined participation expressed fear regarding backlash from members of the ‘Invisible College’, or professional networks. Given the extent to which ‘fear’ of members of the invisible college were cited, this is addressed in detail in the conclusion chapter of this dissertation and in fact speaks to the central ethical and political concerns that are at the heart of this research project. As such, I have not included participant profiles in order to ensure as much anonymity as possible at the request of participants. Participants are identified by roles as opposed to pseudonyms to dispel the myth of a false dichotomy between ‘activists’ and ‘scholars’ or ‘clinicians’. Participants represent and come from a range of fields and arenas involving activist networks, academia, psychology, psychiatry and health and allied disciplines.

3.8 Evaluative Framework

Though I have briefly touched on the notion of evaluative criteria throughout this proposal, Kincheloe (2005), lists 13 considerations for conducting and evaluating *bricolage*, that are theoretically grounded and methodologically aligned. Specifically, Kincheloe asserts that to employ *bricolage* effectively one must be committed to *complexity, intersectionality, prioritizing subjugated voices, exploring power relations, ensuring transparency/reflexivity of the researcher, demonstrating a commitment to interdisciplinary perspectives, engaging with multiple epistemologies, and exploring research practices as both potentially oppressive and emancipatory*. This approach to research, ensures that the evaluation criteria guides all phases of the research process on multiple levels; an approach which extends far beyond notions of triangulation, and instead ensures validity by examining the work through a ‘crystal’ with multiple lenses (Denzin and Lincoln, 2011, p.5). Thus *bricolage*, though complex and fluid, is not without boundaries and frameworks. No new paragraph needed here. While I have touched on my own positionality briefly throughout this thesis, I have provided a more detailed narrative in the conclusion chapter for this thesis, along with discussion of the considerations listed above, and further themes, questions that emerged during the process of this research.

3.9 Conclusion

In this chapter while I have outlined why *bricolage* was a necessary framework for this thesis, along with the epistemological, theoretical and methodological implications, and the specific choices that I have made, it is important to emphasize that a fundamental aspect of *bricolage* is demonstrating the synthesis, of all that I proposed in tandem with

the voices of participants. For this reason, further discussion of epistemology, theory, methodologies, procedures and participants occurs in the ‘findings’ chapters. While I believe I have laid the foundation for answering Wibberley’s question: “what makes bricolage an acceptable format for academic work generally and in particular a PhD dissertation?”, it is important that readers of this thesis examine the work in completion, before evaluating themselves if indeed bricolage was indeed acceptable. Thus, I will specifically address this question in the conclusion chapter of this thesis.

Chapter 3

4 The Case within the Case: A Micro-Genealogy of Epistemic Violence against Trans Women

"Each society has its regime of truth, its 'general politics' of truth; that is, the types of discourse it harbours and causes to function as true; the mechanisms and instances which enable one to distinguish true from false statements, the way in which is sanctioned; the techniques and procedures which are valorised for obtaining truth; the status of those who are charged with saying what counts as true. (Foucault, in Rabinow 1984, p.73).

4.1 Introduction

In 2003, the launch of psychologist Michael Bailey's book, *The Man Who Would be Queen*, led to multiple investigations, media attention, and an entire special issue of the *Archives of Sexual Behavior* (2008) dedicated to profiling the controversy that surrounded the book. As part of a broader case study investigating the emergence of a paradigm shift with respect to how trans people are understood and represented in clinical literature, this controversy was identified as a significant event in terms of encapsulating the "tactics and strategies of power" (Foucault, 1980, p. 77), that were deployed to pathologize, dismiss and erase trans people whose lived experience challenged the narratives constructed about them under the guise of science. By conducting a *micro-genealogy* of this special issue of *Archives*, this chapter traces the significance of this controversy in terms of key figures, and draws on specific theorizations of epistemic injustice, and epistemic violence to demonstrate how harms were enacted under the

discourse of science. This research is significant in that it provides a collection of exemplars as to how harm was enacted, and it raises awareness regarding the significance of critical epistemological awareness as essential to preventing and ameliorating harm against those under study (Teo, 2010, 2015, 2017; see also Costa & Shimp, 2011; Fox, Prilleltnesky & Austin, 2009; Harper, 2008; Levitt, 2017; Parker, 2005, Tosh, 2016,).

As the opening quote from Michel Foucault makes clear, ‘truth’, how it is signified, who is permitted to speak it, the power associated with it, and the processes and effects of knowledge production are political, hierarchal and ethical questions that, upon examination, expose the myth of objective or value-free science. In this chapter, I aim to not only address these important issues, but to demonstrate how bricolage, as an epistemically focused, anti-oppressive, participatory framework for conducting research, led to the emergence of what can be framed as a ‘micro-genealogical case study of epistemic violence against Trans women’. I begin by outlining the conceptual framework of bricolage in the context of the emergence of this chapter. I then discuss how the participatory nature of bricolage led to the emergence of ‘the case within a case’, and how this in turn guided my theoretical and methodological choices for this chapter. I then turn to discussing multiple theorizations on epistemic harm and provide examples of their enactment in an academic journal. I conclude with a discussion of the implications, and potential applications in both research and praxes.

4.2 Conceptual Framework

As outlined in the previous chapter, the emergence of bricolage as a conceptual and methodological framework for conducting research has typically been conceptualized as

taking two distinct approaches; one being multimethodological, particularly in the context of employing creative and arts based approaches with ethnographic ones, and the other being genealogical, which has been met with skepticism as a result of its complexity, and which has generated few examples (Kincheloe, 2005; Kincheloe, McLaren & Steinberg, 2011; Lincoln, 2001). Yet Kincheloe not only proposed that a synthesis of both approaches was, not only possible, but advocated for their fusion as integral to participatory anti-oppressive research. He writes that “bricoleurs seek to better understand both the forces of domination that affect the lives of individuals from race, class, gender, sexual, ethnic, and religious backgrounds outside of dominant culture(s) and the worldviews of such diverse peoples” (2005, p. 344). This assertion is certainly aligned with Foucault’s genealogical aims which involved the interplay of two types of knowledges which he refers to as “erudite” (scholarly, historical), and “local” or “disqualified” knowledges, (Foucault, 1980, p. 81).

Though not specifically employing the terminology of bricolage, Tamboukou and Ball (2003) assert that the blurring of methodologies driven by the interplay of knowledges that Foucault advocated for, and which are aligned with like Kincheloe’s framework for bricolage (2001, 2005). They acknowledge that while ethnography and genealogy grew from distinct theoretical and methodological origins, they share much in common today. They “argue that both genealogy and ethnography:

- interrogate the validity and universal authority of scientific

knowledge

- adopt a context-bound critical perspective

- transgress closed theoretical and methodological systems
- point to the limits of dominant power/knowledge regimes
- recover excluded subjects and silenced voices
- highlight the centrality of the body in sociohistorical analyses
- restore the political dimension of research (2003, pp 3- 4).

Tamboukou and Ball provide key examples of such work and discuss *‘Researching Masculinities: The Implication and Uses of Foucauldian Analyses in Undertaking Ethnographic Investigations into Adolescent Boys’ Lives at School* by Martino (2003), as an exemplar of the “ethnography/genealogy encounter” (2003, p. 28). In this work, not only does Martino apply a Foucauldian genealogical analytic to an ethnographic study, but the critical reflexivity about his own positionality and his responsiveness to the significance of the interplay between theory, epistemologies, methodologies, axiology, rhetoric and participants, though not specifically framed as bricolage, demonstrates the complexities and possibilities of a kind of genealogical bricolage that Kincheloe advocated for. Likewise, while ethnography has tended to involve field work and genealogy archival analyses, Tamboukou discusses how “ethnographic practices have emerged to enliven the grey documents of genealogy, [and] enlighten and problematize our present” (2003, p. 31).

This discussion is relevant to explicating the ways in which a commitment to critical anti-oppressive, participatory, multi-perspectival, and epistemically focused research can result in both new insights and new forms of analysis. Unlike Foucault’s’ genealogical

analyses that focused on extensive archival research spanning centuries and drawing on historical documents and texts in order to trace how a particular discourse emerged from the heterogeneity from which it was drawn, (for an exemplar of such meticulous genealogical tracing, see Tosh's *Psychology and Gender Dysphoria: Feminist and Transgender Perspectives*, 2016), in the process of interviewing activist-scholars regarding the epistemic controversy surrounding The Gender Identity Clinic (GIC) for Children and Youth at the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health (CAMH), the events surrounding its closure, and the etiology and effects of disciplinary resistance to trans-informed scholarship, it became clear that while these events are central to this inquiry, another event emerged as significant and related as well. By listening to participants and reflecting on the aims and scope of my theoretical and methodological frameworks, it became clear that this event warranted an emergent approach I frame as a *micro genealogy*.⁷⁴

4.3 The Emergence of the Case within the Case

While different approaches to case study have been discussed in the methodology chapter of this thesis, a brief discussion is provided to demonstrate how the micro genealogy constitutes a 'case'. According to Patton (2015):

Case studies are often talked about as a product. The case study stands on its own as a detailed and rich story about a person, organization, event,

⁷⁴ Variants of the term micro-genealogy were used to conduct a data base search for previous use of this term. While the term appears in a small number of articles and theses, a review of those found did not include any explanation of the term beyond inference of a small-scale approach to Foucauldian inspired genealogy (Yoon, 2013), or unrelated use of the term, as in the case of genealogy being discussed in terms of tracing familial history.

campaign, or program—whatever the focus of study (unit of analysis). From this perspective, the prime meaning of a case study is the case, not the methods by which the case is created (p. 597.)

In this sense the epistemic violence enacted within the special issue of *Archives* constituted a bounded unit for analysis, and *micro-genealogy* was employed as the methodology employed for investigation. Throughout this research I have discussed various stages of the emergence of this research, my approaches to analysis (genealogical, ethnographic, archival, discourse analysis; each in the context of bricolage as a guiding framework) and I have revisited these complexities in this chapter to illuminate their implications, emergence and deployment. In the process of interviewing activist-scholars whose work has focused on illuminating the harms associated with the pathologized view of childhood gender diversity that had dominated the clinical literature until recently, participants were asked questions from a structured interview guide (see Appendix), but all were offered the unstructured option of sharing information that they felt was most important to the study.⁷⁵

Most participants opted to answer specific questions as well as engage in unstructured interviews. What emerged was a clear consensus that the spatial and temporal dynamics of what constituted ‘the clinic’ extended far beyond an easily defined construct. The

⁷⁵ Throughout this chapter I have hyphenated the words *activist-scholar* to denote the imbricated status of scholarship and activism. The term activist has been disparaged and deployed to dismiss knowledge produced outside of academia., yet the depth and scope of knowledge that trans people hold (both from personal experience and from extensive engagement with the clinical literature that has pathologized, and held power over access to gender affirming care) traverses domains of knowledge that required recognition for their dual expertise.

network of actors with links to the clinic can be best described as what has been termed an “Invisible College” (Ansara & Hegarty, 2012; Pearce, 2016; Quiñones-Vidal, López-García, Peñaranda-Ortega and Tortosa-Gil, 2004). While Quiñones-Vidal et al. describe the concept broadly as networks of authors who have “a direct link with each other and an indirect connection with their partners’ collaborators” (2004, p. 442), Ansara & Hegarty (2012) discuss the invisible college specifically in the context of networks of authors connected to Dr. Kenneth Zucker, the former director of the Gender Identity Clinic for Children and Youth at the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health (CAMH). The focus of their statistical analysis was aimed at illuminating networks of clinicians engaged in “Pathologising and Misgendering” (2012, p. 143) trans and gender diverse children in their publications. Ansara & Hegarty found that co-authorship was central to the networks of the invisible college, and more specifically they “assessed membership in the invisible college around Kenneth J. Zucker through co-authorship” (2012, p. 145).

Pearce (2016) provides a detailed summary of the *invisible college*. She writes:

The invisible college consists of a network of collaborating authors who work to maintain their collective academic profile through co-authorship, peer-reviewing one another’s articles, and editing relevant journals. This has enabled authors such as Zucker to represent forms of cisgenderist, ethnocentric ‘aversive conditioning’ – such as ‘restricting the gender expression’ of children (Ansara & Hegarty, 2012: 139), or ‘shaming’ children and parents into pursuing conformity (Pyne, 2014) – as good practice. In this way, Zucker – a co-author of DSM-5 and the Version 7 WPATH Standards of

Care – maintained both his academic position and his role as head of a Toronto gender clinic for many years, in spite of numerous allegations of unethical or abusive behaviour being made by academics, activists and former patients (Tosh, 2011; Pyne, 2014; Zinck & Pignatiello, 2015) (Pearce, 2016, p. 24)⁷⁶

While a detailed discussion of specific membership in the invisible college extends beyond the scope of this chapter, one of the central themes surrounding the invisible college is the volume of literature about trans and gender diverse children in the Journal, *Archives of Sexual Behavior*. According to journal's description, *Archives* is:

The official publication of the International Academy of Sex Research, is dedicated to the dissemination of information in the field of sexual science, broadly defined. Contributions consist of empirical research (both quantitative and qualitative), theoretical reviews and essays, clinical case reports, letters to the editor, and book reviews.

(<https://link.springer.com/journal/10508>)

Both the International Academy of Sex Research (IASR) and the Archives of Sexual Behavior were founded by Dr. Richard Green in 1970, with Green serving as editor until

⁷⁶ Dr. Zucker sued CAMH over factual errors contained in the publicly posted external review which is referenced (Zinck & Pignatiello, 2015). A settlement was reached for which Dr. Zucker was issued the following public apology.

"CAMH apologizes without reservation to Dr. Zucker for the flaws in the process that led to errors in the report not being discovered and has entered into a settlement with Dr. Zucker that includes a financial payment to him," <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/camh-settlement-former-head-gender-identity-clinic-1.4854015>

Dr. Ken Zucker assumed the position in 2001 (Green, 2009; and <https://www.kenzuckerphd.com/professional>).⁷⁷ Dr. Green's study of childhood gender expression and asserted linkages to sexual orientation which would come to be his most widely known work, *The "Sissy Boy Syndrome" and the Development of Homosexuality* (1987), had considerable influence on Dr. Zucker's work, and is acknowledged in the preface to Dr. Zucker's book, *Gender Identity Disorder and Psychosexual Problems in Children and Adolescents* (1995), which was co-written with his CAMH colleague, Dr. Susan Bradley. Both works are premised upon a pathologized view of childhood gender diversity, both in terms of gender expression and identity, as well as asserted linkages to sexual orientation as being a primary factor in understanding, and predominantly dismissing, trans identities (Kuhl & Martino, 2018, Tosh, 2015, 2016). Green and Zucker's influence on clinical knowledge produced about trans and gender diverse children, and the role of *Archives* in disseminating a pathologized view of childhood gender diversity is significant (Hegarty & Ansara, 2012; Kuhl & Martino, 2019; Tosh, 2015, 2016).

One issue of *Archives* in particular, was identified by participants as encapsulating the intense focus on trans people as objects of pathologization in which their voices, their concerns, their insights, and certainly their criticisms of their representation and its deleterious effects, were met with a level of resistance that required explication. What

⁷⁷ According to the International Academy of Sex Research (IASR) website, with respect to membership, "The process is initiated by a current member who nominates the prospective member", "applications are reviewed quarterly by the Membership Committee", and "membership is by election". Other criteria for membership include content, type and number of publications expected. Student applicants "must be nominated by a member of the Academy, typically their academic mentor, who will serve as their sponsor" (<http://www.iasrsite.org/becoming-a-member>).

was framed as a special issue dedicated to providing a “a legitimate forum to address controversial scientific and ethical issues” (Zucker, 2008, p. 1, see also, Zucker, 2003, p. 400), began with the launch of a book by Dr. Michael Bailey, entitled, *The Man Who Would be Queen: The Science of Gender-Bending and Transsexualism* (2003). The book is largely premised on Ray Blanchard's theory on autogynephilia which proposes that trans women, specifically trans women who are attracted to women, are not trans women, rather they are mentally disordered men whose motivation for gender transition is based on sexual arousal not gender identity. Coupled with offensive language, questionable 'data' and serious ethical concerns surrounding Bailey's conduct with the trans women represented in the book, *The Man who Would be Queen*, or TMWWBQ, understandably evoked concern within trans communities, particularly trans women who recognized the harm that the book posed via its intended target audience.⁷⁸ Published by Joseph Henry Press, a division of The National Academy of Sciences, whose “goal of making books on science, technology, and health more widely available to professionals and the public” (research.amnh.org), asserted that Bailey’s book was “based on his original research”, “grounded firmly in science”, and implied that the book will be of interest to “parents, friends, and families that seek answers to confusing and complicated questions” <https://www.nap.edu/catalog/10530/the-man-who-would-be-queen-the-science-of-gender>. Given the power associated with science as authoritative voice of ‘truth’, framing Bailey’s work under the guise of scientific expertise holds implications for those Bailey

⁷⁸ For critical analyses of Blanchard’s ‘theory’ see Winters (2008) Autogynephilia: The Infallible Derogatory Hypothesis <https://gidreform.wordpress.com/2008/11/10/autogynephilia-the-infallible-derogatory-hypothesis-part-1/>

claims to hold expert knowledge of (See Teo, 2010, 2017). Yet the promotional description for the book leads with “Gay. Straight. Or Lying” (<https://www.nap.edu/catalog/10530/the-man-who-would-be-queen-the-science-of-gender>); a tabloidesque signpost for book’s tone and content, and why the book raised such concern among trans women with respect to their representation in the book, and the potential harm that could result.

Dr. Julia Serano’s commentary provides a summary that captures the content of the book, and why its promotion to the public as ‘science’ was viewed as harmful to trans women. She writes

Bailey’s book (1) is highly pathologizing, reducing trans womanhood to the status of a paraphilia, (2) encourages readers to think of trans women as either “homosexual” or “autogynephilic” men, thus fostering the idea that our female gender identities are not to be taken seriously, (3) routinely and extensively sexualizes trans women and encourages a largely trans-ignorant lay audience to do the same, and (4) he positions himself as an authority on transsexuality and repeatedly claims that trans women whose experiences and perspectives contradict his “expert opinion” must be purposely trying to deceive or mislead others (2008, p. 492).

When news of the book reached Dr. Lynn Conway, professor Emerita of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science at the University of Michigan, and a member of the National Academy of Engineering, she reached out to her friend, trans activist and social media expert, Andrea James, to discuss her concerns about Bailey’s book and the

potential harm it posed with respect to how trans women are represented as a tangle of pathology as told by a supposed ‘expert’

(<http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/TS/Bailey/Timeline/Overview%20of%20Bailey-investigation%20timeline-spreadsheet.pdf>).⁷⁹⁸⁰ Conway and James shared their concerns via a number of online formats with trans women, including a diverse array of professionals, scholars and activists.

⁷⁹ Both Conway and James have compiled extensive digital archives surrounding what is framed as “the Bailey Affair” – writing on behalf of the trans women who were involved in raising concerns about Bailey’s book, Conway writes: “The historical sequence of events in the Bailey case (TBC) is likely to be of considerable interest to research ethicists, academic offices of research integrity and IRB rules overseers, as well as to students and scholars of the history of science
<http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/TS/Bailey/Timeline/Description%20of%20Bailey-investigation%20timeline-spreadsheet.htm>

James’s site, formerly tsroadmap.com, is now available as <https://www.transgendermap.com/?s=bailey>

Michael Bailey has posted his own account of the controversy surrounding the book, including <http://faculty.wcas.northwestern.edu/JMichael-Bailey/controversy.htm>

⁸⁰ Note: It is difficult to reduce Conway or James to a singular professional descriptor/title.

Conway is “a famed pioneer in microelectronics chip design”, women in STEM, and has received multiple honorary doctorate degrees, and awards for her contributions in the realms of science and technology as well as her trans activism. See, <https://womeninstem.ingeniumcanada.org/portfolio-item/lynn-conway/>, <https://news.engin.umich.edu/2018/10/computing-pioneer-to-receive-honorary-um-doctor-of-science-degree/>, <https://www.uvic.ca/universitysecretary/senate/honorary/>

Likewise, while James is a self-described “consumer activist”, the scope of James contributions is broad. In 2016 James was honored by Huff Post Queer Voices for having “*played a significant role in the ongoing fight for trans and queer liberation*”. The author goes on to assert that James is “*may not have a name as instantly recognizable as Laverne Cox or Caitlyn Jenner, but there are few activists who have done as much to connect, educate and help the trans community as this writer, producer and educator has over the past several decades*” (See Nichols, 2016) https://www.huffingtonpost.ca/entry/andrea-james-trans-pioneer_n_5776965be4b04164640fc212?guccounter=1

As awareness of the book grew, so did public condemnation of it from within and outside trans communities, as well as from some of the trans women whose lives Bailey claimed to represent in the book, and which would lead to multiple formal complaints filed against Bailey including ethical and sexual misconduct (Carey, 2007, Dreger, 2008; McCloskey, 2008). Concerns were also raised regarding Bailey's discussion and promotion of his 'research' in academic contexts. Dr. Joan Roughgarden, Professor Emerita of Biology at Stanford University wrote a detailed account of being present at a lecture given by Bailey to Stanford University's psychology department faculty and students entitled "Gender Nonconformity and Sexual Orientation" (2004", p. 8) in which Bailey "began by evoking laughs from the audience with photographs of gender-variant children" (p. 8), followed by a series of exercises in which Bailey proceeded "to train the audience in their "gaydar" (p.8) by asking them to listen to audio recordings and "to guess who was gay and who was straight" (p.8). Roughgarden's account also details her concern with the "loud applause and no sign of dismay at the unprofessional spectacle that had just occurred" (p.8), which prompted her to write a formal complaint about the content and tone of the lecture, as well as a letter to the National Academy of Science in response to Bailey's book (2004).^{81 82}

⁸¹ Bailey disputes Roughgarden's account of his lecture, and posts commentary from Dr. James Cantor, to dispute Roughgarden's claim regarding the tone of the lecture. Cantor claims that he as a gay man was not offended by the lecture, and that the "laughter was actually an affectionate recognition of the truth". It is relevant however that Cantor shares Bailey's views with respect to trans women and Blanchard's nosology of autogynephilia, is a member of the International Academy of Sex Researchers and is on the editorial board for the Archives of Sexual Behavior. See both Bailey's discussion of Cantor's comments, <http://faculty.wcas.northwestern.edu/JMichael-Bailey/controversy.htm> a list of Cantor's publications <http://www.jamescantor.org/downloadables.html> and the Archives Editorial Board members <https://www.springer.com/psychology/sexual+behaviour/journal/10508?detailsPage=editorialBoard>

Yet the events surrounding the Bailey controversy also extend far beyond the scope of this chapter, and are were addressed by a group of concerned trans women who organized a panel at the 2008 National Women's Studies Association Conference entitled: “The Bailey Brouhaha: Community Members Speak Out on Resisting Transphobia and Sexism in Academia and Beyond” can be accessed via Dr. Conway’s archives.⁸³

(http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/TS/News/US/NWSA/NWSA_panel_on_resisting_transphobia_in_academia.html)

My focus is not on the events, rather it is on the ‘event’ that emerged in response to the controversy in the form of the special issue in the Archives of Sexual Behavior. The special issue involved a target article entitled *The Controversy Surrounding The Man Who Would Be Queen: A Case History of the Politics of Science, Identity, and Sex* (Dreger, 2008), followed by “23 published commentaries” (Zucker, 2008, p. 1) and “a reply from Dreger” (p.1). Upon reviewing the target article, commentaries and editorial, it became clear that this special issue was not only historically significant in terms of participant reports as to its’ mobilizing effect with respect to trans activism, but it encapsulated epistemic controversy in terms of whose voice counts as legitimate in terms

⁸² A separate lecture by Bailey in 2011 was also the source of controversy as a result of a “demonstration, which featured a naked woman ‘being repeatedly sexually stimulated’ by a device he called a ‘fucksaw’ in front of students. Bailey’s conduct with respect to Separate investigations” see https://www.huffpost.com/entry/northwestern-university-p_n_830423

⁸³ Dr. Conway’s archives contain links to the conference papers, as well as discussion of efforts to silence the panel.

of knowledge of trans identities and experience and could serve as the basis for a micro-genealogy.

4.4 Micro-Genealogy

While Michel Foucault never wrote a prescriptive guide to his genealogical approach, what he did write, along with those who have written about it has resulted in a paradox; it is an approach that has been constituted with both methodological specificity and ambiguity (Christensen, 2016; Kendall & Wickham, 1999; Koopman, 2013; O'Farrell, 2005; Tamboukou & Ball, 2003). There is no doubt why his famous quote that begins with, "genealogy is gray, meticulous, and patiently documentary" (Foucault, 1977, p. 139), is so frequently cited, for it captures precisely this paradox (Christensen, 2016).

While a discussion of the nuances of genealogy extends beyond this chapter and has been addressed in different sections in the dissertation, this summary from Foucault provides a useful snapshot which applies specifically to how I conceived of my particular case. For Foucault:

a genealogy should be a kind of attempt to emancipate historical knowledges from that subjection, to render them, that is, capable of opposition and of struggle against the coercion of a theoretical, unitary, formal and scientific discourse. It is based on a reactivation of local knowledges- of minor knowledges, as Deleuze might call them-in opposition to the scientific hierarchisation of knowledges and the effects intrinsic to their power: this, then, is the project of these disordered and fragmentary genealogies (Foucault, in Foucault & Gordon, p. 85)

Having discussed genealogical approaches in the context of bricolage, I will turn to outlining the specifics of how I have approached this analysis as a form of *micro-genealogy*.

As Genealogies are concerned with examining truth, power and ethics, a micro genealogy is fundamentally concerned with these domains of inquiry. What I suggest distinguishes this micro-genealogy is largely a matter of scope. The Special Issue of *Archives*, although significant, is a snapshot of a long and complex history of pathologization and resistance; both in terms of resistance within the psy disciplines to voice informed epistemologies, and in terms of resistance that is “in accordance with the logic of standpoint theories, as it could be said that trans* people are experts in their own lives” (Radi, 2019, p.45; Stryker, 2006). A micro-genealogy in this instance is focused on examining the nexus of truth power and resistance, via specific theorizations on variations of what can be broadly framed as theorizations concerned with *epistemic injustice*. According to Polhaus:

Epistemic injustice refers to those forms of unfair treatment that relate to issues of knowledge, understanding, and participation in communicative practices. These issues include a wide range of topics concerning wrongful treatment and unjust structures in meaning-making and knowledge producing practices, such as the following: exclusion and silencing; invisibility and inaudibility (or distorted presence or representation); having one's meanings or contributions systematically distorted, misheard, or misrepresented; having diminished status or standing in communicative practices; unfair differentials in authority and/or epistemic agency; being unfairly distrusted; receiving no

or minimal uptake; being coopted or instrumentalized; being marginalized as a result of dysfunctional dynamics; etc. (in Kidd, Medina & Polhaus, 2017, pp.24-25).

While Polhaus provides a conceptual overview of what constitutes epistemic injustice, the concept has been taken up by scholars across a diverse array of disciplines and involves considerable variation in their specific theorizations on epistemic harms.

I first encountered a variant of the term in 2012, in the context of Dr. Thomas Teo's work in critical psychology, which aims:

to challenge the idea that science is devoid of politics, value-free or value neutral, an idea which is contrary to evidence, and is more often based on philosophical or historical ignorance, or unawareness of the real historical and current interconnections of psychology and politics Teo, 2017, p.

I gradually began to encounter the work of a number of scholars who had developed or extended related theorizations, and by 2017, *The Routledge Handbook of Epistemic Injustice* was published and celebrated as “one of the most important and ground breaking subjects to have emerged in philosophy in recent years” (Kidd, Medina & Polhaus, 2017, p. 3). This work, along with the others I had encountered, made clear the significance of these frameworks for analysis. Most importantly, during interviews with participants, the recruitment poster and letter of information provided to participants included the words ‘epistemic violence’ in the study title. While some participants were familiar with the terminology, I provided participants with an explanation of the concept, most of whom responded that such concepts were helpful in that they provided

frameworks and language for illuminating key aspects of their work; specifically, the harms that have been enacted against trans people as a result of how they have been written about, or erased from ‘official’ knowledge about their own lives. Thus, this micro-genealogy not only emerged because of the identification of key events identified by participants, but in consultation with them about the methodologies and theorizations that I employed. In the following section, I introduce various theorizations which broadly constitute epistemic injustice, and provide examples drawn from the commentaries in the special issue of *Archives*, to demonstrate how specific forms of epistemic harm were enacted.

4.5 Epistemic Injustice

In the introduction of *Epistemic Injustice: Power and The Ethics of Knowing* (2007) Dr. Miranda Fricker outlines two conceptualizations of epistemic injustice; *testimonial* injustice and *hermeneutical injustice*. She writes:

Testimonial Injustice occurs when prejudice causes a hearer to give a deflated level of credibility to a speaker’s work; hermeneutical injustice occurs at a prior stage, when a gap in collective interpretive resources puts someone at an unfair disadvantage when it comes to making sense of their social experiences (2007, p1).

Both *testimonial injustice* and *hermeneutic injustice* can be located throughout the special issue of *Archives*, however I will begin by addressing testimonial injustice because it prefaces the entire issue beginning with the editorial by Dr. Kenneth Zucker.

In his editorial Dr. Kenneth Zucker, introduces the special issue as part of a “newly spawned tradition” (2008, p. 1) of presenting “peer-reviewed target articles on controversial topics, followed by peer commentaries, and a reply by the target article author” (p.1). This celebratory tone is echoed by his assertion that “a scholarly journal is a legitimate forum to address controversial scientific and ethical issues rather than leaving the complexity of the attendant discourse to ‘the street’” (Zucker, 2008, citing Zucker 2003, p. 400). To assert that the journal, rather than “the street” (p.1), is the “legitimate forum” (p.1) for addressing the controversy is problematic on multiple levels. First, it implies that the journal holds what Fricker describes as “epistemic trust” (Fricker, 2007, p. 2); a notion which, given the scope of the journal, involves greater value being placed on knowledge produced by those located within, ‘the field of sexual science’ rather than with those trans people who are the object of the clinical research establishment and the invisible college (see <https://link.springer.com/journal/10508>).

While the special issue included commentaries from individuals outside of what can be described of *the invisible college*, in this instance clinicians and researchers aligned with the aims and scope of the journal, framing the journal “as a legitimate forum to address controversial scientific and ethical issues rather than leaving the complexity of the attendant discourse to ‘the street’” (Zucker, 2008, citing Zucker 2003, p. 400), de-legitimizes lived experience of trans people in the context of what Fricker terms a “credibility deficit” (2007, p. 17).⁸⁴ Given that the notion of a *credibility deficit* is central

⁸⁴ I am employing the term *invisible college* in a broader scope than Hegarty & Ansara (2012) which specifically discusses the notion around co-publication with Dr. Zucker, which is more akin to Pearce’s (2016) expansion of the term to include networks of academics and clinicians who have made mutually

to Fricker's theorizations on *Testimonial injustice*, this form of injustice specifically relates to the dismissal of, or diminished value awarded *experiential* knowledge drawn from members of marginalized groups. Although no elaboration is given, Zucker's reference to "the street" (2008, p. 400) appears to suggest that that knowledge gained from *personal* experience sometimes referred to as 'street smarts' cannot offer a legitimate critique of the theories, methods and clinical judgements of those located within the privileged *academic space that the journal represents*. This is an important distinction because while there are commentaries from trans women in the special issue, contributions such as those by Lawrence (2008) are written as members of *the invisible college*, and are not framed as experiential or *testimonial* knowledge, but as a clinician with a shared epistemic view and specific alliances. For example, when Lawrence writes "It is widely accepted that transsexualism represents a fundamental disorder in a person's sense of self" (2008, p. 458), she is invoking the authoritative discourse of the DSM and is not privileging the legitimacy of trans women to speak for their own lives. Thus, Lawrence's contribution cannot be deployed to silence claims that the special issue was riddled with *testimonial injustice*, because despite Lawrence's status as a trans woman, her commentary is drawn from her positionality as a member of the *invisible college*, and the theories, methods, power and politics associated with such an alliance.

constitutive relationships such as serving on editorial boards and editing and peer reviewing one another's articles. I would add that membership in the invisible college is complex and malleable and even involves coalitions between clinicians and academics with different ontological and epistemological views regarding trans people (for a discussion of this see Lane, 2011 *Trans, science and society: The politics of knowledge of the brain sex theory of trans*).

The target article entitled *The Controversy Surrounding the Man Who Would Be Queen: A Case History of the Politics of Science, Identity, and Sex*, written by historian, bioethicist and author Dr. Alice Dreger (2008) also deploys an authoritative stance that disparages ‘the street’ (2008, p. 367). Dreger asserts that her “scholarly history” (p.367) demonstrates that “the story of the controversy over *The Man Who Would Be Queen* is significantly more complicated than the on the street, ‘good versus evil’ cartoon versions of it, and that matters for many people, individually and collectively (2008, p. 367). Yet the emphasis throughout Dreger’s account is clearly an attempt to exculpate Bailey, and to indict his critics. This view is shared by psychologist Dr. Margaret Nichols who begins her commentary with the following:

Dreger describes herself as an historian, a bioethicist, and a “‘queer activist.’” In this essay, she fails at all three. She has described the Bailey controversy myopically, without placing it in its larger sociocultural context. She ignores the history of queer activism and its relationship to psychiatry. She is particularly oblivious to changes in the emerging transgender movement. The transgender community, and the professionals who work within it, are in the midst of a revolution, but Dreger hasn’t noticed. Under a veneer of neutrality, Dreger has aligned herself with the conservative rearguard of professionals, not realizing that changes in the field are already rendering much of that rearguard obsolete. Shocked by some of the tactics, she has missed the symbolic significance of the uproar over TMWWBQ (2008, p. 476).

While there are layers of epistemic injustice woven throughout Dreger's account, it is the exemplar of *hermeneutical injustice* that I shall turn to. According to Fricker (2007), this form of injustice occurs when the "capacity of the knower" (2007, p. 149) is hindered from access to non-marginalizing views, and overcoming such injustice comes as members of marginalized communities begin to share and develop new knowledge about their experiences, which lead to epistemic and political action. Fricker provides the women's movement as an example. She writes:

If we look at the history of the women's movement, we see that the method of consciousness raising through 'speak outs' and the sharing of scantily understood, barely articulate experiences was a direct response to the fact that so much of women's experience was obscure, even unspeakable, for the isolated individual, whereas the process of sharing these half-formed understandings awakened hitherto dormant resources for social meaning that brought clarity, cognitive confidence and increased communicative facility (2007, p. 148).

So, while Dreger's account is problematic on many levels, trans women did not have access to 'official knowledge' outside of the discourses that the psy disciplines demanded in order to be authorized via a clinician's reading as *being* trans (see Prosser, 1998; Rowe, 2014). If a trans person's experience and self-understanding were outside of the trope of the "credible trans trajectory (Rowe, 2014, p. 209), trans people faced the threat of having their identities delegitimated, which in many instances would restrict access to

medical care as well as juridical recognition with respect to their identities. According to Nichols:

Twenty-five years ago, there was no trans community; indeed, “transgender” is a word invented by activists. FTM transsexuals were considered rare and the postoperative MTF transsexual’s sole goal was to fit into society and “pass” as a genetic female. Transsexuals stayed away from transvestites, most were deeply closeted, and few (except the drag queens) wanted to affiliate with gays. Since the early 1990s, there has been a profound paradigm shift among trans people themselves. Whereas before, trans identities were limited, discrete, and categorical, i.e., one was a transvestite, a transsexual, or a drag queen, now there is truly a “transgender continuum” that encompasses a multitude of identities and lifestyles (2008, p. 477).

Thus, thirty years ago, trans women, didn’t have access to non-pathologized clinical representations of their identities or experiences. This is significant because while trans women like Conway, James and McCloskey resisted the pathologizing narratives shaped by Blanchard, the harm that such theories have caused trans women who didn’t resist pathologizing narratives because they believed the discourse of ‘science’ that they had access to is a form of *hermeneutical injustice*, whereby ‘official knowledge’ did not provide a means of understanding oneself outside of the discourse of pathology.

Yet through community building and activism, the sharing of alternate knowledges, both from the standpoint of trans people, and from critical awareness of the history and politics of psychology, and more specifically the emergent awareness of and as yet

unnamed *invisible college*, trans activists began to provide the cognitive resources to mount what Medina (2017) terms an “epistemic insurrection” (p.118). Medina frames such insurrection as a form of “*hermeneutical resistance* aimed at disrupting complicity with hermeneutical injustices and at facilitating the articulation of resistant meanings and alternative rhetorical spaces” (p. 119). Such resistance required very activism that Conway and James engaged in; challenging the pathologizing narratives about trans people, privileging the narratives shared among actual trans people whose lived experiences were not reflected in the pathologizing literature written about them, and examining the “‘general politics’ of truth” (Foucault, 1984, p.73) that is hidden under the discourse of science.

Hermeneutical injustice does not emerge independent of power relations, rather it exists because “it serves the interests of the socially powerful to maintain ignorance or a mis-interpretation of certain social experiences” (Anderson, 2017, p. 298). That Dreger and Lawrence would attempt to raise questions about the credibility of critics of Blanchard’s theory, or Bailey’s book, by claiming that James supported Blanchard’s theory previously is intimately tied to the power relations that Dreger and Lawrence are deeply invested in; power relations related to another form of epistemic injustice known as *gaslighting*.⁸⁵

4.6 Gaslighting

According to McKinnon (2017), while the origins of the term gaslighting can be traced to a similarly named play in which “the protagonist engages in psychological warfare on his

⁸⁵ In Dreger’s article, she claims that Lawrence showed her an e-mail from Andrea James that expressed support for Blanchard’s theory. James explained that this was a misrepresentation of the actual conversation, which had been a private exchange between herself, and Lawrence, who is a clinician.

wife with the aim of having her hospitalized for mental instability””(p. 339), the concept has emerged to be understood as “taking two forms: a psychological abuse form and a more subtle epistemic form” (p. 339). While definitions of both these forms of gaslighting vary (see Abrasmson, 2014; Davis & Ernst, 2017; McKinnon, 2017; Riggs & Bartoholomaeus, 2018; Stark, 2019) I will draw on McKinnon’s work to outline instances of what can be framed as gaslighting trans women in the special issue of Archives for two primary reasons. *First*, McKinnon’s theorizations on gaslighting offer the most comprehensive and detailed discussion of gaslighting in relation to trans people, *second*, McKinnon’s work illuminates the way that ‘ally ship’ is a problematic construct that benefits the ally more than those they ally is claiming to support, and *third*, but not least, prioritizing McKinnon’s scholarly expertise and positionality as a trans women, is consistent with an ethical political commitment “to centering the experiences, concerns and perspectives of trans and non-binary people, given their specific embodied standpoints” (Martino, Kuhl & Omercajic, in press).

McKinnon’s (2017) theorizations expanded on Fricker’s (2007) framework for epistemic injustice which focused on illuminating the ways in which the perspectives of members of marginalized groups are dismissed or diminished as having a “credibility deficit” (p. 340) based on their identity. For McKinnon, allies “expressing doubts that the harm or injustice that the speaker is testifying to really happened as the speaker claims” (p. 338), constitutes more than epistemic injustice, it is a form of gaslighting, and in a recent update to her earlier work, is framed as epistemic violence (McKinnon, in press). McKinnon provides an example that illustrates the different ways in which an ‘ally’ engaged in dismissing the experience of a trans woman who shared that she was

repeatedly misgendered by a colleague. First, the ‘ally’ suggested that perhaps the trans woman did not hear the colleague’s comment accurately, Second, they went on to list accolades and credentials to demonstrate the ‘status’ of the colleague as an ‘ally’, and third, when presented with further evidence as to the frequency of the colleague’s actions, the ‘ally’ responded with further dismissal, stating “You say that he’s done it before, and maybe he has, but I’ve never heard him do it before” (McKinnon, 2017, p. 339). In each of these exchanges the trans woman’s testimony is framed as lacking credibility, suggesting that the trans woman was over-emotional, and that her perceptions were questionable as a result. According to McKinnon, “one common stereotype of trans women is that they are overly emotional particularly if they’re on estrogen-based hormone replacement therapy” (2017, p. 340). Such stereotypes deployed to delegitimize and raise questions about the trans woman’s ‘rationality’ in contrast to the ‘reasoned’ perspectives of ‘allies’ speaks to the sometimes subtle, sometimes overt gaslighting that marginalized folks experience from supposed ‘allies’.

Among the *Archives* commentaries, *Lighten up Ladies* (2008), by Dr. Richard Green, stands out as an example of the type of gaslighting outlined by McKinnon. Green’s choice of title invokes the stereotype of emotionality in trans women and is deployed as a technique to raise doubt about the validity of their perceptions and to dismiss the legitimacy of their concerns. This theme is reiterated throughout his admonishing and condescending commentary, with Green proposing that *he* is able to offer what a “rational critique” (p. 451), would look like. Not only does Green assert that he, unlike the ‘emotional trans women’, can offer a ‘reasoned’ perspective, but the commentary is strategically littered with barbs directed at the trans women that illustrates the “circle of

hell” (McKinnon, 2017, p. 340) that they are often placed in. He frames the controversy having emerged when “ablated sex parts hit the fan” (p. 451), and quipped that it “brought a smile” (p. 452) to his face thinking of the potential income that could be generated by developing “a new Monopoly game for gender dysphorics, beginning with the ‘Get Out of Male free’ card” (p. 452). Green also closed his commentary with a quote he prefaced as a “gender ironic admonition” (p.452) directed towards the trans women that challenged Bailey’s unscientific and harmful book with “have you no decency sir?” (p.452).

Not only did Green frame the trans women as emotional and therefore dubious complainants, but his word choices are a clear signalling of the pathologizing theory at the heart of the controversy; the view that trans women are not women, and instead are ‘deluded’ men. This is the distinction between testimonial injustice that Fricker outlines, and gaslighting as McKinnon does. While both Fricker and McKinnon’s work illuminate testimonial injustice in terms of the diminished credibility applied to the speaker based on their positionality, gaslighting involves evoking doubt about the ‘sanity’ of the speaker. While Green’s commentary illuminates the deployment of tropes and inuendo, Dr. Anne Lawrence’s commentary entitled *Shame and Narcissistic Rage in Autogynephilic Transsexualism* (2008) is a direct and detailed attempt to frame these women as pathological. While such attempts at pathologization could be framed as a form of gaslighting which contributes to the epistemic violence that McKinnon outlines, Lawrence’s commentary provides insights into another form of epistemological violence specific to the psy disciplines.

4.7 Epistemological Violence Enacted by the Psy Disciplines (EV)

According to Critical Psychologist Thomas Teo, “what psychologists define, research, and conclude, contributes, once disseminated to the public, to the co-construction of the very identities of subjects, a process which can not be conceptualized adequately without a concept of power” (Teo 2017, p. 27). Yet Teo makes clear that critical reflexivity about the role of psychologists in the construction of data, the interpretation of findings, and the philosophical and historical dimensions of research have been virtually erased from disciplinary training, despite “psychology’s problematic historical record regarding marginalized groups in terms of knowledge and treatment” (Teo, 2017, p. 219). Teo attributes this lack of awareness in contemporary psychology in part to “the retreat of the philosophy of science” (Teo, 2017, p. 117) during the mid twentieth century. For Teo, this retreat was driven by “the assumption of a hierarchy of sciences with physics on the top and the humanities at the bottom” (Teo, 2017, p. 43). In order to bolster disciplinary status as a science, “which not only implies higher status but also greater access to financial resources” (Teo, 2017, p. 43; see also Greenwood & Levin, 2005), discussion of ontology, epistemology, axiology, rhetoric, along with reflection on history, culture, power, and the hermeneutic dimensions of research were “discarded by positivism as meaningless and neglected by the discipline” (2017, p. 2).

Teo frames the resulting methodologism, which “refers to the primacy of method” (2017, p. 105), as producing “a methodological theory of truth: True is what you find when you follow the standard quantitative methods in psychology” (2017, p. 105). For Teo, this “naïve empiricism is guided by implicit assumptions that psychologists hold, including

the idea that empirical research is mirroring an outside world, that studies can be conducted minimizing bias, without preconceived notions or values, or that methodology is neutral” (2017, p. 105).⁸⁶ Accordingly, this naïve empiricism, lack of epistemological awareness and a-historical stance have contributed to what Teo terms *epistemological violence*. For Teo, “epistemological violence refers to the interpretation of social-scientific data on the Other and is produced when empirical data are interpreted as showing the inferiority of or problematizes the Other, even when data allow for equally viable alternative interpretations” (Teo, 2010, p. 295).

Teo discusses how the interpretation of the researcher and their implicit bias can frame the same data differently; in once instance as epistemological violence, and another which is not. He writes:

to interpret the empirical difference, namely the underrepresentation of women faculty at elite universities in the United States, as indicating that women are less intelligent than men, is an epistemologically violent interpretation of empirical data. To interpret the same difference of the same empirical study as indicating that women are oppressed at elite universities also should be identified as a problem of underdetermination and

⁸⁶ Note: Teo discusses major contributories to disrupting the notion of a value free ‘objective science, and alludes to the influence of feminist scholars in his deployment of the term “naïve empiricism” he writes; “Keller (1985), for instance, developed the concept of dynamic objectivity that is based on connectivity, understanding, experience , and empathy in the process of knowledge-making, employing subjectivity in order to increase objectivity; Harding (1991) developed the concept of strong objectivity , which includes an analysis of small and large background beliefs in society, history, and research as well as the standpoint, voice, and perspective of the marginalized, in order to achieve greater objectivity. Both feminist epistemologists reject the notion that the severance of the “object” from the “subject” produces more objectivity, an idea that is historically and culturally contingent” (Teo, 2017, pp 187-188).

representation, but such a proposition would not be epistemologically violent to women (2010, p. 299).

And adds:

If interpretations are beneficial to the Other, then they may still be underdetermined by the data, but they may not lead to harm. On the other hand, some actions have harmful consequences for the Other. In such cases, communities of the negatively constructed Other should be the source for establishing the criteria for harm (2010, p. 299).

Yet eliciting responses from communities, drawing on social epistemologies, engaging in critical reflexivity regarding the social location of researcher, has run counter to disciplinary training which has involved a continuous supply of new objects of inquiry by offering the promise of expertise to respond to the ‘problems’ they *construct*. Thus, an important first step in preventing epistemological violence involves looking to history to “figure out how blatant misjudgments in the human sciences, including psychology, were possible while the knowers convinced themselves that their accounts were value-neutral and objective” (Teo, 2017, p. 147).

While it is important to note that the commentaries included in the special issue of Archives are precisely that, commentaries, and not empirical studies, Dr. Anne Lawrence’s *Shame and Narcissistic Rage in Autogynephilic Transsexualism* (2008) provides an example that demonstrates much of what Teo’s discussion of epistemological violence in psychology entails, and more. Lawrence’s commentary is not a defense of Bailey’s book, rather it is an attempt to apply a diagnostic lens to the unnamed, yet

clearly identified, trans women who came forward with concerns about Bailey and his work, which frames their identities, and their responses, as imbricated pathologies.⁸⁷

Lawrence writes:

In this essay, I argue that much of the MtF transsexual campaign against Bailey can be understood as a manifestation of narcissistic rage. It is no coincidence, I believe, that most of Bailey's principal opponents fit the demographic pattern associated with nonhomosexual MtF transsexualism (see Lawrence, 2007). I propose that nonhomosexual (i.e., presumably autogynephilic) MtF transsexuals are probably at increased risk for the development of narcissistic disorders—significant disorders in the sense of self—as a consequence of the inevitable difficulties they face in having their cross-gender feelings and identities affirmed by others, both before and after gender transition. As a result, many autogynephilic transsexuals are likely to be particularly vulnerable to feelings of shame and may be predisposed to exhibit narcissistic rage in response to perceived insult or injury. It is not hard to understand why Bailey's book was experienced by at least some nonhomosexual MtF transsexuals as inflicting narcissistic injury and why this led some of them to express apparent narcissistic rage. I propose that narcissistic disorders in autogynephilic transsexuals are important and

⁸⁷ While Lawrence's commentary does not specifically name the trans women who came forward with concerns about Bailey, Lawrence links their identities to internet sites that they operate; sites which are discussed and linked to their authors in Dreger's piece.

probably common phenomena, which deserve more extensive study than they have thus far received (2008, pp.457- 458).

Once again, while Lawrence's commentary is not an empirical study, given Lawrence's positionality as a clinician, applying diagnostic concepts to identifiable trans women is egregious on multiple levels. First, as a clinician, Lawrence's commentary holds a certain power associated with science that Teo outlines is central to the concept of *epistemological violence* (2010, 2017; see also, Serano, 2008). For a clinician to frame identifiable trans women in the context of multiple 'mental disorders', holds the potential for serious harm given the stigmatizing effects of mental health diagnoses.

Teo, outlines precisely such power when discussing how knowledge produced in psychology can be harmful. He writes:

"Interpretations have an impact on people and they have practical and ethical consequences. If I were to choose an interpretation that suggests small-eared individuals to be less empathic than large-eared individuals – and this choice is made in the context of an existing social division – then consequences are implied" (Teo, 2010, p. 301).

Yet, Lawrence's 'clinical interpretation' of the trans women who expressed concern with Bailey's book follows this path explicitly; interpreting data in a way that holds the potential for harm when other clear explanations exist. Bailey's book holds the potential for serious harm with respect to how trans women are understood, given that the book was framed as 'science' yet targeting a lay audience. It also holds implications for all trans women, who deal with the effects of such pathologizing and delegitimizing

discourses framed as ‘science’. Consider the impact of Lawrence’s ‘truth’ claims and the harm her ‘clinical interpretation’ could evoke by framing the trans women who raised concern about Bailey’s book. She writes:

“It is certainly not difficult to find evidence of narcissistic personality traits, including a sense of entitlement, grandiosity, and lack of empathy (APA, 2000), in some of Bailey’s principal MtF transsexual opponents. Perhaps the most obvious of these is a sense of entitlement, the belief that one is deserving of special treatment. This is evident, for example, in their outrage that Bailey described them in a way they felt was inconsistent with their identities and in their belief that Bailey had an obligation to address what they believed to be evidence for a “third type” of MtF transsexual. A sense of entitlement is also evident in the demand some of them made that the Harry Benjamin International Gender Dysphoria Association conduct an investigation of Bailey. The grandiosity of some of Bailey’s opponents comes across most clearly in the Internet sites that some of them maintain, which contain, for example, claims of their supposed ability to pass undetected (in “deep stealth”) as natal woman, despite the presence of many unmistakably masculine features, and reports of their discovery of supposed facts about transsexualism that have escaped the notice of other researchers for decades. Their lack of empathy is most apparent in their utter disregard for the feelings of the persons they attacked, with the attack on Bailey’s children providing perhaps the most egregious example” (Lawrence, 2008, p 459).

Yet it is the *hermeneutic surplus* that Lawrence applies along with her attempts to publicly diagnose identifiable trans women as ‘narcissists’ and ‘autogynephiles’ that are truly egregious.

Teo attributes such problems in the interpretation of data to a disciplinary failing. He writes:

It appears to me that the discipline is lost when it comes to the interpretation of data. Interpretation is left to the hermeneutic competence of the individual researcher, who might not be aware of the role of understanding in interpretation and of his/her own hermeneutic deficits. In the context of scientific racism, sexism, and classism, I suggest that the methodological part is only secondarily responsible for biased research and that the larger part is a result of the hermeneutic deficit combined with the worldviews and ideologies of researchers. This hermeneutic deficit appears when the epistemological, the ontological, and indeed, the ethical meaning of studying group differences is not understood and when rules, criteria, and guidelines for valid interpretations are not provided by the discipline (Teo, 2017, p. 27).

Yet Lawrence *elects* to interpret events in accordance with a pre-determined narrative in which her professional position, and that of her colleagues are vindicated, while the trans women who have shifted the gaze onto the purveyors of trans pathologization, are not only dismissed, but further pathologized. Lawrence’s hyperbolic account that frames Bailey’s critics in the context of narcissism, is an interpretive choice that by her own

admission is not based on evidence.⁸⁸ Consider an alternate reading of Lawrence's claim that "a sense of entitlement is also evident in the demand some of them made that the Harry Benjamin International Gender Dysphoria Association conduct an investigation of Bailey"(p.459), in which it is not *entitlement*, but *positionality* as academics, and in Dr. Conway's case, as a member of the National Academy of Sciences, that enabled them to engage in advocacy and exercise their voices in ways that the women that they were advocating for would not have been able to. Hidden from Lawrence's account are serious ethical concerns, specifically claims that Bailey engaged in sexual relations with at least one of the trans women he represents as 'research' subjects in the book; claims which Bailey has denied; both the sex, and that his book was in fact research (see Dreger, 2008).

Likewise, Lawrence's claims that Bailey's critics reacted to his book because they "fit the demographic pattern associated with nonhomosexual MtF transsexualism" (2008, p. 460), once again raises ethical questions about clinicians engaging in public attempts at diagnosing trans women via a category that erases their identities as a sexual 'paraphilia'(see McCloskey, 2008), but it also involves a refusal to acknowledge that Conway, James and McCloskey have not simply rejected Blanchard's theory, but they have repeatedly made clear that their 'demographic patterns' are not as Lawrence's claims them to be (see McCloskey, 2008; Dreger, 2008). As well, Conway's website, which Lawrence claims to have drawn her interpretation from, contains detailed autobiographical information that contradicts Lawrence's assertions. Conway writes:

⁸⁸ Lawrence (2008) writes: "I propose that there are good theoretical and clinical reasons for believing that narcissistic disorders are prevalent among nonhomosexual MtF transsexuals. At present, however, there is little solid empirical evidence to support this belief" (p.460).

Although I was born and raised as a boy, all during my childhood years I felt like, and desperately wanted to be, a girl. During my teen years and college years I longed to grow up to become a woman, and I passionately wanted to have boyfriends as a woman. While growing up I experienced terrible trials because of my cross-gender identity, and yet I also knew incredible joy when accepted by others as a girl (see <http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/RetropectiveT.html>).

This is but one example drawn from extensive autobiographical accounts that simply do not reflect Lawrence's claims. Likewise, McCloskey's (2008) commentary addresses inaccurate readings of her book, *Crossing: A memoir* (1999), and James has also rejected claims made by Lawrence (see Dreger, 2008).

It is also important to note that the forced imbrication of gender and sexuality that has been a consistent thread in how trans people have been understood and represented in clinical literature, is now viewed differently in official guidelines. In 2015, the American Psychological Association published *Guidelines for Psychological Practice With Transgender and Gender Nonconforming People*, which explicitly addresses the conflation between gender identity and sexual orientation. They write:

The constructs of gender identity and sexual orientation are theoretically and clinically distinct, even though professionals and nonprofessionals frequently conflate them. Although some research suggests a potential link in the development of gender identity and sexual orientation, the mechanisms of such a relationship are unknown (2015, p. 835).

Ultimately, the *hermeneutic surplus* that has framed trans women as a tangle of pathology is not, as Dreger and Zucker have claimed a matter of scientific debate, it is an act of epistemological violence that has led to *actual* harm against trans people. While Lawrence's commentary was employed to demonstrate Teo's theorizations on epistemological violence, it is important to note that examining certain other commentaries, and certainly Bailey's book, would result in similar findings. This view is likewise shared and summarized by neurobiologist, and trans man, Dr. Ben Barres who writes:

Bailey chose to present the information in his book in the most sensationalist, insensitive, misleading, and humiliating way possible, utterly denying transgendered people the respect they are due as human beings. This is not simply a harmless academic debate. The welfare of a whole group of people is at stake. It is one thing to defend responsible free speech, but it is quite another to defend overt bigotry. Are transgendered people low socioeconomic liars and shoplifters especially suited for work in the sex trades? Such claims, under the guise of high quality science, engender and maintain the oppression, ostracism, and violence that transgendered people face (2008, n.p.).

As Dr. Barres makes clear, knowledge produced under the guise of science can have a tremendous impact on how trans people are understood. The representation of trans women in Bailey's book is both egregious and contrary to current clinical understanding of transgender people.

4.8 Epistemic Violence (Namaste)

According to Namaste, the epistemic violence of erasure occurs in multiple ways, the first, is rooted in the deployment of "rhetorical tropes" (2000, p.52) whereby trans identity is theorized not from a trans-epistemological stance but is taken as an 'object' for theorization. In *Undoing Theory: The "Transgender Question" and the Epistemic Violence of Anglo-American Feminist Theory* (2009) Namaste critiques how feminist and queer theory, with emphasis on the work of Judith Butler, have appropriated trans identities and used them as an object of inquiry. Although Namaste discusses the feminist and queer theory as relevant to trans people, in that trans women are marginalized by patriarchy, misogyny and gender norms, she also makes clear that such academic theorization is exploitive and harmful by erasing the material realities of trans people's experience and identities. This relates to the next form of epistemic violence which is Namaste's (2000,2009) theorizations on the epistemic violence of erasure. When trans people's lives are absent or dismissed in research and discourse in ways that result in existential harm, such as not erasing the specific experiences of trans women, trans women of colour, and sex workers. When trans people are erased in this manner there is no allocation of resources or prioritization of their actual needs or the threats that they face. Lastly, Namaste makes clear that the third form of epistemic violence of erasure is "the very act of nullifying transsexuality" (p.52). Woven together,

these three meanings of erasure support and sustain one another: the reduction of transsexuals to the figurative dimensions of discourse preempts the possibility of transsexuality subjectivity; the exclusion of transsexuals from the institutional world reinforces a conception of that world that

proposes the existence of only non transsexual men and non transsexual women; and the act of invalidating the very possibility of transsexuality bolsters rhetorical operations that exclude literal transsexual bodies while reinforcing institutional practices that do not consider the needs of transsexual and transgendered people (p.52)

It is important that as a cisgender researcher, I address both substantive and linguistic questions that problematize my positionality considering Namaste's theorizations. First, Namaste is critical of research that linguistically homogenizes 'trans people' and she makes a distinction between 'transsexual' and 'transgendered' women. It is important to note that Namaste's work, was written almost two decades ago, and transgender as a linguistic representation of diverse gender identities, expression, and experiences has come to be the most widely preferred terminology by trans people (see Stryker, 2006). As well, guidelines established by trans people regarding the use of language to describe their identities explicitly states not to use the term transsexual.⁸⁹ While some trans people do embrace the term Transsexual to define their identity, unless a participant

⁸⁹ Guidance for Language From the 519 Media reference Guide (2106)

Transsexual (adj): A term derived from a medical diagnosis which pre-dates "Gender Identity Disorder". While this term is embraced by some gender variant peoples as an identity, this term is also rejected by others and should therefore be used with informed caution. The key objections to this term are similar to those objections discussed in "Gender Identity Disorder" and "Disorders of Sexual Development", i.e. that this pathologizes something that is innate. Furthermore, there is a linguistic objection in that the embedded suffix "sexual" creates confusion. It falsely implies that trans issues are issues of sexuality and not of gender & sex. As always, use the terms preferred by the individuals, and do so in an unqualified manner.

- Transsexualism (n): Defamatory and obsolete medical diagnosis of gender variant people. DO NOT USE.
- Transvestism (n): Defamatory and obsolete medical diagnosis of crossdressing. DO NOT USE.
- Transvestite (n): Defamatory and obsolete medical term for someone who cross-dresses. DO NOT USE.

For the full reference guide see <http://www.the519.org/news/media-reference-guide-discussing-trans-and-gender-diverse-people>

explicitly requested to be represented employing the term, which no one did, as a cisgender person I need to make clear that my use of 'trans people' has been guided by current guidelines established by trans people regarding their representation, and is not as a cis person homogenizing and erasing trans identities. With respect to Namaste's discussion of the appropriation of trans identities, although I have problematized my positionality in the beginning chapter of this thesis and have revisited throughout to demonstrate ongoing reflexivity, it is important to reiterate that this is a conversation that I have had with participants who are trans or non-binary as I was deeply concerned that my positionality and analysis could be interpreted as exploitive. There may be readers of this thesis that feel this way, and it will be important to listen to their voices should that criticism arise. For now, I can only assert that trans people have never been the object of inquiry for this dissertation, and reiterate that the commitment to participant authority over their representation, as well as seeking their guidance with respect to ethical representation of trans people, makes clear my efforts to ensure that my 'cis-ness' has not resulted in a work that they feel harmed by, and has shown necessary 'brick throwing' to stand up against the harms that have been enacted against them.

Returning to Namaste's theorizations of epistemic violence in the context of the special issue of *Archives*, the instances of epistemic violence are exponential. Blanchard's (2008) commentary, illustrates multiple dimensions of epistemic violence by both objectifying and pathologizing trans women via his attempts to advance his 'theory' of autogynephilia, and via his attempts to de-legitimize 'the feminine essence theory'; a theory that while not universally embraced by trans women, and has been problematized by trans women (see Serano, 2008, 2016), has for some trans women been a non-pathologized

conceptualization of their identities. While Blanchard's pathologizing theorizations have been discussed previously and do not warrant further attention, his sustained objectifying gaze, and efforts to dismiss and pathologize trans women demonstrate the weaving together of each the forms of erasure that Namaste elucidates. His article also illuminates gaslighting (McKinnon, 2017) in that he draws on quotes from his previous work which attempts to frame trans women who don't agree with or precisely fit his theorizations as either in denial or dishonest; an interpretation which simultaneously illustrates Teo's theorizations on epistemological violence (2010,2011) in that Blanchard interprets 'data' vis a vis the voices of trans women that do not fit his theorizations in a way that ignores other potential non-pathologizing explanations, the obvious one being that these women knew more about their identities, history and experiences than he does. Likewise, Rind's (2008) commentary parrots Blanchard's attempt to erase the potential for trans women to have agency surrounding their identities, but Rind's commentary also illuminates the 'institutionalization of trans erasure' that Namaste also highlights. Rind who applauds Bailey for standing up to "politically correct rubbish, motivated by self-serving identity politics and injurious to reality by distorting and suppressing the truth" (p. 481). Rind's indignation against 'political correctness' erases trans women as having any legitimacy to speak about their own lives. While not specific to Namaste's theorization, it is important to note that Rind's attempt to exculpate Bailey and 'science' is itself premised on political claims, which Rind ignores. Rind cites conservative commentators to wage an assault on feminism and launches a tirade against the ills of feminism; how he, Bailey and 'science' have been harmed by it. Yet the controversy surrounding Rind, specifically concerns regarding his 'scientific' and ethical claims suggesting that the impact of sexual

violence against minors is overstated, although too extensive to address here, is important to draw attention to.⁹⁰

4.9 Conclusion

In this chapter I have addressed how the concept of bricolage as an epistemically focused, anti-oppressive, and participatory framework for conducting research led to a significant event for analysis. I have also demonstrated that Foucault's genealogical methods, focused on the formation of truth, the nexus of knowledge and power, and the ethics of how subjects of official knowledges engage in resistance, was possible within the context of this event, and warranted a scale and event -specific approach I termed micro-genealogy. Through employing this methodological approach, I was able to provide detailed examples of multiple forms of epistemic violence were enacted in the *Archives of Sexual Behavior*. In focusing on this event as a genealogical exemplar, my aim has been to expose a specific instance of the extent to which the lack of epistemological awareness and hermeneutic training within the psy disciplines has masked the interpretive role of the researcher and its pernicious effects in perpetuating epistemic violence against trans people under the guise of 'science'.

While gains have been made in terms of de-pathologization movements and trans-affirmative care (see APA, 2015), without an infusion of critical approaches guided by epistemic discussion and analyses the potential for harm to occur as a result of knowledge produced about trans people or other marginalized groups remains present. Shifts that

⁹⁰ For a detailed discussion of the controversy surrounding Rind and his work, see the Leadership Council on Child Abuse and Interpersonal Violence <http://www.leadershipcouncil.org/1/rind/cont.html>

have occurred in psychological representation of human experience and subjectivity have not come from within the discipline; rather “it has taken social and intellectual movements to challenge the standard narratives and self-misunderstandings of psychology as a value-neutral, natural science” (Teo,2017, p. 219). The events that transpired and the discourses revealed in this case problematize not only the epistemological hierarchies of the psy disciplines and specifically the epistemic violence that has flowed in the clinical literature surrounding trans people, particularly trans women, but it makes clear the importance of critical education surrounding epistemologies. As clinical social worker and trans woman, Robin Mathy highlights the way in which knowledge of epistemology, gender and positionality drawn from outside of ‘science’ are integral to ethical representation. She writes

In post-modern scholarship, legitimate claims to epistemic authority and a right to be heard are based primarily upon the first-person narratives of the oppressed, in this case transgender women. Neither Dreger nor Bailey are members of this oppressed group, and neither have first-person narratives that can make a legitimate claim to an epistemic authority that would help one understand the intense furor over TMWWBQ and Bailey’s unethical behavior in this case (2008, p. 464).

She adds

Simply put, much of the furor over TMWWBQ had to do with a white, heterosexual, upper-middle class male exerting the power and privilege of his class to invalidate the lived experiences and identities of an entire group of

oppressed people about whom he has no first-order knowledge. Perhaps worse, Bailey rejected the first-order epistemic authority that Kieltyka proffered repeatedly, hoping to “educate” him. Instead, like many white, heterosexual, upper middle-class men of privilege and power, Bailey humored Kieltyka and wrote his book as the authority about a subject with which he has had no first-order, lived experience. In doing so, he maligned and humiliated an entire group of oppressed people, notwithstanding the few self-identified autogynephiles who agreed with his views (and even here the operative word of importance is self-identified).(p.464)

While the scope of the articles, and events surrounding the Bailey controversy and special issue of Archives, my specific focus on explicating the epistemic injustice and violence that was enacted resulted in not being able to address some important observations that also emerged. Because of their significance, they are addressed in the final chapter of this thesis. In the following chapter, I focus specifically on the participant voices to illuminate how the dominant pathologizing discourse would be supplanted by precisely the ethically informed, and epistemologically grounded insights that Mathy, Conway, James and McCloskey, the participants in Bailey’s study, and all trans women are entitled to.

Chapter 4

5 Mounting an Epistemic Insurrection

What types of knowledge do you want to disqualify in the very instant of your demand: 'Is it a science'? Which speaking, discoursing subjects-which subjects of experience and knowledge-do you then want to 'diminish' when you say: 'I who conduct this discourse am conducting a scientific discourse, and I am a scientist'? Which theoretical political avant garde do you want to enthrone in order to isolate it from all the discontinuous forms of knowledge that circulate about it? (Foucault, in Foucault & Gordon, 1980, p. 85)

5.1 Introduction

In December 2015, following an external review of its programs and services, The Centre for Addiction and Mental Health in Toronto announced the closure of its Gender Identity Clinic for Children and Youth (Ehrensaft, 2016). Given that the clinic was both a beacon of controversy for years, while home to the leading expert on childhood gender diversity in the world, the significance of the closure of the clinic cannot be overstated. In extension, examining the events surrounding metaphorical ‘death of the clinic’ emerged as an opportunity to conduct what Flyvberg (2006) describes as *paradigmatic case study*. Although such case studies resist succinct definition Flyvberg suggests “this is often a sign that the study has uncovered a particularly rich problematic” (2006, p.21). He adds that a *paradigmatic case study* can illuminate complex epistemological issues in a singular *critical case*, which is significant for “the force of example” (p. 12) and of “strategic importance” (p. 14). Flyvberg adds that such cases should also ask “who will want to learn about a case like this, and in this kind of detail?” (p.22).

In responding to this question, my orientation to research prompts reflection not only on who this research is for, but who this research has been constructed *with*. The ethical and political dimensions of bricolage as advocated by Kincheloe (2005) demand that “lived experience is allowed to sit at the table of official meaning-making” (Kincheloe & Berry, 2004, p. 11) and “paradigmatic and textual analyses” (Kincheloe & Berry, 2004, p. 22) are drawn into dialogue to examine “the various dynamics that shape what is called empirical knowledge” (Kincheloe & Berry, 2004, p. 7). This commitment then involves epistemic, theoretical and methodological choices that diverge somewhat from Flyvberg’s caution against the imposition of theory. While Flyvberg points to specific works by Foucault as exemplars of paradigmatic case studies, he does not reflect on the significance and complexity of theorization in Foucault’s work, which involved simultaneously problematizing monologic theory and advancing new theoretical tools for analysis.

As the opening quote from Foucault signals, posing questions surrounding the politics of ‘truth’; how it is constituted, who holds the power to speak it, and how it functions to create and maintain “regimes of truth” (Foucault, 1984, p.73) is complex and requires different lenses of analysis. Yet it also makes clear that Foucault’s theorizations on power/knowledge, and the clinical gaze (1961, 1963, 1980) are intended to be driven by an “insurrection of subjugated knowledges” (Foucault, 1980. P. 81). For Foucault, this insurrection must not be oversimplified to strictly focus on notions of ‘voice’ coming from those marginalized by what constitutes official knowledge, instead Foucault sees this insurrection as requiring the interplay of what he terms as ‘erudite’ (scholarly, historical), and ‘local’ or ‘disqualified’, the latter of which Foucault provides the example

of the “psychiatric patient” (Foucault, 1980, p. 81). In this sense to mount an epistemic insurrection, these ‘disqualified’ knowledges require significant knowledge about what has been written about them, they must understand and expose the politics of knowledge production, and they must accumulate and deploy knowledge gained from lived experience that challenges dominant pathologizing discourses.

Trans scholar Susan Stryker (2006) frames this as “(de)subjugated knowledges” (p. 1) and highlights such knowledge as central to the emergence of transgender studies as an interdisciplinary area of research. For Stryker:

What began with the efforts of emerging and marginally situated scholars and activists such as ourselves to be taken seriously on our own terms, and not pathologized and dismissed, has helped foster a sea-change in the academic study of gender, sex, sexuality, identity, desire, and embodiment. Histories have in fact been rewritten; the relationships with prior gay, lesbian, and feminist scholarship have been addressed; new modes of gendered subjectivity have emerged, and new discourses and lines of critical inquiry have been launched. Academic attention to transgender issues has shifted over the span of those ten years from the field of abnormal psychology, which imagined transgender phenomena as expressions of mental illness, and from the field of literary criticism, which was fascinated with representations of cross-dressing that it fancied to be merely symbolic, into fields that concern themselves with the day-to-day workings of the material world.

“Transgender” moved from the clinics to the streets over the course of that decade, and from representation to reality (2006, p.2).

Stryker’s reference to knowledge of Trans people moving from ‘the clinic’ and ‘the streets’ as a point of celebration, stands in stark contrast to the disparaging pronouncements levied against ‘the street’ by those invested in the psy pathology paradigm. Stryker reveals the interplay of precisely the types of knowledges that Foucault spoke of and signals the extraordinary knowledge that Trans people have about the systems that have pathologized them, “tactics and strategies of power” (Foucault, 1980, p. 77) deployed against them, and how to reframe and reclaim them.

In asking how trans-affirmative activists and scholars were able to facilitate a paradigm shift with respect to how childhood gender diversity is understood within the psy clinical establishment, specifically examining the events surrounding, and significance of, the metaphorical death of the clinic, I was tasked with gaining access to a very specific yet heterogeneous group of activists and scholars. In the following section I will briefly discuss how my approach although not a full ethnography or genealogy, demonstrates the possibilities of genealogically informed ethnographic work. Genealogically, this work involved examining a large amount of texts with respect to how trans people have been constituted in clinical literature and making clear the networks of actors with shared epistemic frameworks, professional associations, and specific technologies employed to exercise authority over trans representation in clinical literature and disrupting the notion of an objective neutral science. While this approach is inline with Foucault’s genealogical methods (see Foucault, 1977, 1980, 1984; Kendall & Wickham, 1999, Tamboukou &

Ball, 2003) of examining the historical formation of truth and power, in the spirit of bricolage, and through the themes that emerged during interviews with participants, this chapter also constitutes a form of *flipped genealogy*; illuminating how formerly disqualified knowledges were able to mount an epistemic insurrection via the establishment of *Cyber Communities of de-subjugation, Insiders and Allies in the Academies, Critical education, Policies and Legislation*, to depathologize trans identities. I will also dedicate considerable discussion to the participants who contributed to this study, as gaining access to participants, building trust, ensuring their authority over representation, and making clear the power dynamics involved with challenging the pathology paradigm, reveals a great deal about the importance of bricolage as a framework for epistemic justice, and how rigid conceptualizations of research can lead to rigor mortis, not rigour in research (Sandelowski, 1993).

5.2 Methodological Considerations

While the framing of this research as a *paradigmatic case study* has been discussed in the methodology chapter of this thesis and further addressed in the introduction to this chapter, it is important to address “that categorical question of any case study: What is this a case of?” (Flyvberg, 2006, p. 23) is not as neat or prescribed as some methodologists suggest. For Flyvberg, paradigmatic cases “develop a metaphor or establish a school for the domain which the case concerns” (2006, p.34). In this instance, the *death of the clinic* is both a metaphor and the case for analysis. Yet while the metaphorical death of the clinic did indeed serve as a case for analysis, the complexities surrounding what defines a paradigm, what defines the spatial and temporal boundaries

of ‘the clinic’, what defines ‘trans affirmative’, and what defines ‘death’ are wrought with tensions and complexities that generated further questions.

5.2.1 Ethnographically Informed Research

In *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research Methods* (2005) Denzin and Lincoln assert that “Always respecting the demands of the task at hand, the bricolage, as conceptualized here, resists its placement in concrete as it promotes its elasticity” (2005, p.324). Yet the fluid and responsive nature of bricolage has at times been misunderstood as lack of rigor, or a rejection of methodology (Kincheloe, 2005; Rogers, 2012; Wibberly, 2012). However, I concur with Denzin and Lincoln that “the combination of multiple methodological practices, and empirical materials, perspectives, and observers in a single study is best understood, as a strategy that adds rigor, breadth, complexity, richness, and depth to any inquiry” (2005, p. 5). My choice to employ ethnographic elements as opposed to claiming to conduct a full ethnography is both informed and purposeful. According to Patton (2015) “Ethnography, the primary method of anthropology, is the earliest distinct tradition of qualitative inquiry. The notion of culture is central to ethnography. *Ethnos* is the Greek word for “a people” or cultural group” (p.249). He adds that

While traditionally ethnographers have used the methods of participant observation and intensive fieldwork to study everything from small groups to nation states, what it means to “participate” or be in the “field” has changed with the advent of the Internet and social media. Nevertheless, whether doing ethnography in virtual space, a nonliterate community, a multinational

corporation, or an inner-city school, what makes the approach distinct is the matter of interpreting and applying the findings from a cultural perspective (p. 250).

However, defining culture in the context of this research poses some challenges. While this is addressed in greater detail in the participants section of this chapter, the boundedness of participants is based on their engagement in scholarship and activism centered upon illuminating the pathologizing discourse that flowed from the clinic. Some participants knew one another, and openly remarked “*the only reason I agreed to an interview was because (name withheld) told me I should speak with you*”, while other participants did not share having knowledge of other participants. This does not necessarily mean that participants did not know one another in some capacity, as this was an avenue that could not be openly explored for reasons of confidentiality. Given the focus of the research on *Trans-Affirmative Activism and Scholarship*, demographic information about participant genders was not collected. However, while some participants reported being Trans as significant in guiding their engagement in Trans activism and scholarship, others indicated that they were not Trans and discussed this in relationship to their positionality. Yet to reject this diverse group of participants as not comprising a ‘culture’ or ‘community’ would fail to acknowledge the ways in which each of these participants shared a commitment to illuminating and countering the pathologizing discourses about trans people that flowed from the clinic, and how they all came forward to share their voices for this study. This is important because it stretches the boundaries of notions of culture, while making clear that participants were unified in their commitment to a common goal.

As already outlined in the methodology chapter, it is also important to emphasize that my approach is guided by Tamboukou's (2003) *Genealogy/Ethnography: Finding the rhythm*; an approach which involves negotiating and synthesizing elements of both methodologies in response to the research process. During a genealogical research project, Tamboukou recognized the need to shift her focus to draw on ethnographic tools. Though Tamboukou focused on the use of existing ethnographies, I was conducting interviews with participants whose insights made clear that an ethnographically informed micro-genealogy was warranted, as discussed in the previous chapter, and that a genealogically informed approach to ethnography was warranted especially given the concerns about the historical legacy of epistemological violence that are at the heart of my research. Tamboukou describes the synthesis of approaches as follows:

Thinking of and with music, what I have therefore suggested is the need to find a rhythm for a musical piece of genealogy and ethnography to be composed while performing together. Genealogy, I have suggested, turns the analyst's attention to specific regimes of truth that may elude the knowledge terrain of the ethnographer, but yet they are part of the scientific discourses through which she recognizes the objects of her ethnographic inquiries and analyses their emergence, constitution, and function. However, to follow the genealogical imperative of leaving aside causality, to stop asking why and start asking how, the analyst needs descriptions both of the past and the present. While the grey documents can offer glimpses of the past, ethnographic approaches can effectively illuminate the present. While genealogy traces the black squares in the 'order of things' (Foucault, 1970),

accommodates the invisible, creates uncertainty, and points to exclusions, ethnography scrutinizes the visible. The rhythm of their sounding together resonates with the contrast between visibility and invisibility, the sayable and the unsayable, pointing to what has been hidden or muted and what has been allowed to emerge or sound (2003, p.211).

Finding this rhythm does not result in a singular approach, nor is it determined at the outset of the research process. Though it is important to demonstrate that one's approach to conducting research is informed by frameworks, theory and methodologies, an ethical commitment to voice informed epistemologies requires critical reflexivity, revision and representation guided by those one claims to write *with*, and not *about*.

It became clear during the research process that participants were speaking to issues that were aligned with genealogy's demands to examine the formation of regimes of truth. For this reason, while looking for emergent themes in the participants voices, I was also specifically guided by Tamboukou's use of Foucault's genealogical notions of *descent* and *emergence*. According to Tamboukou, "*Descent* moves backwards revealing numberless beginnings and multiple changes, while *emergence* is about the entry point of the event on the historical stage' (2003, p. 199). While the previous chapter focused on *descent*, by being guided by participant voices to examine a case of epistemic violence which multiple participants revealed was a precursor to *the death of the clinic*, this chapter focuses on *emergence*, and specifically what Tamboukou, describes as

“technologies of resistance” (p. 198), that emerged to respond to problematize the clinic.⁹¹

While Foucault’s work has focused on problematizing the psy disciplines and using genealogical method to illuminate the closure of the clinic as a significant event in which power relations and the formation of truth shifted, this chapter flips genealogy in a sense to highlight how participants engaged, disrupted and even reclaimed elements of these systems. In listening to participants, the mechanisms for which truth and power have functioned to oppress trans people are brought to the surface, as are the key methods with which they have been able to facilitate shifts in these domains.

Lastly, with respect to how this work is ethnographically informed, it is important that I speak to the role and positionality of the researcher in the conduct of research, a matter which I touched on in Chapter 1. Although traditional positivist approaches to ethnography, in which a researcher claims to be a distant neutral observer tasked with extricating the truth about an object of inquiry would be antithetical to this research.

While there are vastly different approaches to discussion of the positionality of the researcher, and I have outlined my epistemological orientation in chapter one of this thesis, it is important to reflect on my positionality through this thesis. While I have made clear that I am not Trans, and this holds significance for this research, my positionality in relation to the notion of ‘community’ in this research is complex. While my aim has been to prioritize the voices of trans participants, and to prioritize the work of trans scholars,

⁹¹ Rabinow’s discussion of Foucault’s theorizations on bio-power outline how “A new set of operations, of procedures-those joinings of knowledge and power that Foucault calls “technologies”-come together around the objectification of the body” (Rabinow in Foucault & Rabinow, 1984, p. 17). In this sense, the activists and scholars who worked to trans-inform the clinical gaze, did so by engaging with these systems, not by replacing or extinguishing them. This is significant as it makes clear that the death of the clinic was a polymorphous event that involved the very systems that gave rise to it.

the diversity of those engaged in what is loosely defined as trans-affirmative activism and scholarship brings together a heterogeneous web of people engaged in activism and scholarship centered upon supporting the trans people. According to Valentine “Despite the assumption of a transgender community . . . rather than a pre-existing community, there are a variety of dispersed places which are brought together *by* ‘transgender’ into an idea of community.” (Valentine, 2007, p. 72; see also, Nordmarken, 2019).⁹² Yet the legacy of epistemic harm against and exploitation of trans people by those who are not trans is part of a violent history which continues to the present.

Early in this research, a blog post was shared with me was the most powerful representation of the effects of this exploitation and pathologization. It is necessarily scathing, particularly for cis gender folks like myself, who claim to be involved in trans affirmative scholarship and activism. It has spawned considerable reflection and discussion and has generated further inquiry. While I am unable to share the blog in its entirety, the following excerpts provide important insights. The anonymous blog post is entitled *Fuck You and Fuck Your Fucking Thesis: Why I Will Not Participate in Trans Studies*. While the canonical thinking surrounding academic research led me to numerous informal sources where the consensus appeared to be that that theses should not contain blog posts and or quotes longer than a few lines because it can reflect poorly on the doctoral candidate’s ability to draw on, synthesize and summarize scholarly sources, such claims lie at the heart of the exclusionary and oppressive practices which I aim to both illuminate and resist. I have included a large excerpt from the blog below which I deem

⁹² Note, the use of the specific shortened quote by Valentine can be found in Nordmarken (2019) *Queering Gendering: Trans Epistemologies and the Disruption and Production of Gender Accomplishment Practices*

necessary to illuminate the politics and ethics of the researcher positionality as it was exposed for me during the research process. Written as a letter to Grad Students soliciting research participants, it begins with:

Dear Mr. or Ms. Grad Student, I am sorry to report that I will not participate in your study as a data point. I don't understand what you're trying to accomplish. I don't trust you. I don't like you. I don't care if you succeed. In fact, I kind of think you suck. Here's why:

What do you think you're going to do for me? For us? For trans women? Do you think it makes a difference if you study the menstruation needs of trans guys? Or you study trans people's partners' self-declared sexual orientation? How about sexual practices and HIV? How about trans culture and SM, would that change my life? Would that change anyone's life, except maybe to get you a few dates with some svelte transguy? Oh and a book contract, you might get a book contract. And your thesis getting approved could very well land you a post-doc or a teaching position somewhere, certainly aim you for a career... fuck you.

I'm sure you have self-serving justifications. Everybody has self-serving justifications, its how us humans get through the day. But I don't care what they are. You aren't the first, hell you're probably not the first this week, and you probably won't be the last to try to convince me that this particular topic, this particular project, this very one that you thought of, will change the world and make things better. Hell, I've probably helped as many non-trans

people finish grad school as I've seen trans women friends commit suicide- let me think about that for a minute, both number in the dozens... and how many people have I seen go through grad school openly as trans women? None. Wait, no, one. No, two. Three? No, just two. Am I supposed to ignore that imbalance and keep pushing you wankers along? Let me tell you something: trans people have already been studied. We've been interviewed, sampled, tested, cross-referenced, experimented upon, medicated, shocked, examined, and dissected post-mortem. You've looked at our chromosomes, our families, our blood levels, our ring fingers, our mothers' medicine cabinets, and our genitalia (over and over again with the genitalia- stop pushing condoms on us, dumbass, we know what they're for.) You've watched us play with dolls, raise children, fall in love, look at pornography, get sick, die, and commemorate ourselves. You've listened to our ears. You've listened to our fucking ears! But you've never listened to our voices and you need to do that now. ("Anne" - <https://tagonist.livejournal.com/199563.html#/199563.html>)

While the methodology chapter of this dissertation cites Trans Scholar Jacob Hale's (1997), *Suggested Rules for Non-Transsexuals Writing about Transsexuals, Transsexuality, Transsexualism, or Trans ____*., 'Anne's' evocative account of the frustration with cisgender academics and its circulation among trans people in online spaces makes clear that over twenty years after Hale's guidance was published, trans people continue to be failed and harmed as a result of the way that cis people have represented, erased or exploited them, and her voice needs to be shared. Anne's words were a constant source of reflection throughout this thesis.

I eventually comprised a letter to Anne, though it is one that I have no idea will ever reach her:

Dear Anne,

Your words were with me throughout this study. I don't think there was a day that went by that I didn't ask myself, should I be doing this study? I do not yet have an answer. Some days my thoughts are a firm "no", that the significance of the clinic, the violence enacted by it needs to be authored by trans people. Sometimes I remind myself that that is precisely who is guiding this thesis; from the epistemological framework, to the participants, to the citations I have employed. Then it feels like I am justifying my positionality and I find myself answering the question with "no" again. Then I am reminded by Trans people that they are fed up with 'allies', who do nothing, so I think "yes", I can't just sit on my ass while Trans folks are being subjected to violence, so I organize, protest, and write some more. I wonder if my biography would make a difference to you. Probably not. It shouldn't, or should it? What about the folks in my study? Some of them are not trans, but they have trans family and friends that they love deeply. Some of us are older, some of us are younger. We are an eclectic group. Should I say "us" and "we?". Fuck! I am not a participant in my own study, but I have gotten to know some participants quite well. We've stayed in touch throughout the research process. Our circles intersect. I sit with their voices too. I'm not looking for a pat on the back. I will make mistakes. I need to be accountable.

I know that likely rings hollow, but I am listening, and I wanted you to be heard.

Diana

My letter to “Anne” is informed by autoethnographic lens which according to Ellis “starts with personal experiences and studies ‘us’ in relationships” (p. 13). According to Ellis, for too long notions of the distance between researchers and participants, began with “efficacious advice; researchers could leave our fieldwork sites without regret and write without remorse because we were not committed to doing something with and for the community” (p.10). Ellis argues that traditional approaches to research such as this fail to address “relational ethics” (2007, p. 4). Navigating these complexities, making them transparent, and signalling their importance both conceptually and methodologically was deeply influenced by “Anne’s” voice. The fragmented and compartmentalized way that we understand and represent people in research causes egregious harm. Researchers need to think and feel deeply about the epistemic practices and contributions they make, and to listen deeply to those who we have the privilege of learning from.⁹³

5.3 Participants

While I have included some demographic information about participants, it is important to note that categorization is paradoxical; being problematic and yet necessary, blurred, yet distinct, an important signifier with respect to positionality, yet in no way a clear

⁹³ Note: The discussion of the blog post *Fuck you and Fuck your Thesis!* is part of a collaborative paper in progress.

indicator of one's positionality, and even of one's contribution to this study. A total of eleven (N=11) people participated in interviews. It is important to note, that the inclusion of the work of specific scholars critical of the clinic is not a reflection of their participation in this study. Given the public status of a number of trans-affirmative activists and scholars, a letter of information and invitation was sent to individuals who did not participate in this study. While some of these individuals simply did not respond to my invitation, others responded to provide a reason as to why they would not participate. As well there were individuals who reached out to inquire about the study who did not participate, and individuals who did not participate yet shared resources in support of the aims of the study. Even though the study stipulates that participants may choose to withdraw their participation at any time, that they may contact the researcher throughout the process to discuss their contributions, and review and request edits prior to any publications, or formal submission of the thesis, *fear of being found out* and *fear of reprisal* for being involved with a study that was critical of the clinic was cited as a reason. Such fears were also expressed by a number of people that did participate and steps at ensuring their comfort throughout the research process took various forms.

While the letter of information for this study specified that participants would be asked for no more than one hour of their time and would take place via telephone if participants lived more than one hour from the researcher's location, some participants wanted to meet with the researcher either in person or via a method of communication of their choosing, prior to agreeing to participate in a study. Arrangements were made to meet with participants in person whenever possible, and communication was often ongoing, as participants were advised to feel free to get in touch with the researcher at any time to

discuss the project and their contributions. Some participants communicated frequently, and the volume of time spent in communication would be difficult to gauge, but certainly involved far more than the initial one hour interview. As well, due to the nature of my involvement with trans activism and scholarship, I also encountered and came to know many trans-activists and scholars at conferences, and via online networks, and have developed professional relationships with many of them. Once again, this is not an indication that they participated in this study, but it speaks to the complexities of doing this type of research as someone who is researching trans affirmative scholarship and activism while simultaneously involved in it. The clearly delineated sanitized notions of researcher and participant are far more like the methodologies we employ and the knowledge we construct; complex and blurred.

While participants were asked about their professional roles, and or how they came to be involved in trans activism and or scholarship, most cited activism, scholarship and professional and personal identities as imbricated. In terms of professional roles, participants represented the fields of psychology, psychiatry, counselling and psychotherapy, health and allied disciplines, law, ethics, and media, and most participants specifically identified as being both activists and academics, or activist-academics, while not all participants addressed this issue. Participant requests for anonymity varied with some requesting that their name not be shared, others requested that neither their name nor their specific professional role be shared, yet others requested to go on record with their name, role and specific contributions. Participants were all provided with the opportunity to review, edit and withdraw their contributions, and were also provided with the opportunity to see how the researcher framed their contributions. This was important

because some participants discussed instances of researchers and journalists presenting themselves as being supportive of trans people while constructing narratives about them that revealed otherwise.

Likewise, while participants were not asked about their gender or sexual orientation, most, but not all, discussed their own, and how it informed their engagement with trans-activism, scholarship, professional practice and how these categories overlapped. In terms of diversity of participants, they identified as trans, non-binary, cisgender, queer, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and once again, some did not disclose this information.⁹⁴ While gender and sexuality are separate constructs, how they have been understood has been forcibly imbricated by the psy disciplines, via a shared legacy of pathologization. Yet this shared legacy of pathologization was also cited as contributing to a sense of community and organized resistance whereby members of different marginalized groups have worked together against the systems that have enacted harm against one another. Yet to be clear, there are also some tensions within these loosely defined ‘communities’.⁹⁵⁹⁶ While discussing the history and complexities of these tensions extends far beyond the scope of this chapter, it is relevant because the false binaries that have been promoted by the members of the *invisible college*, condemning the clinic’s closure as “bowing to

⁹⁴ No activists or scholars self-identified as a person of colour, which given the limited representation of people of colour in academia is a concern which must be recorded. Similarly, participants did not discuss disability, however this may or may not reflect whether people who identify as disabled in some way contributed, rather it is a statement of what was and what was not discussed.

⁹⁵ See Tosh’s (2016) *Psychology and Gender Dysphoria, feminist and Transgender perspectives* for an in-depth discussion of the feminist and Queer erasure of trans people

⁹⁶ See Nordmarken (2019) *Queering Gendering: Trans Epistemologies and the Disruption and Production of Gender Accomplishment Practices* for what Nordmarken frames as two trans paradigms.

transgender activists” (Ubelacker, 2016), and suggesting that the clinic’s closure was an attack on ‘reason’ and ‘science’ (see comments by R. Blanchard in Ubelacker, 2016), simply do not reflect the reality of the diverse array of scholars and activists, all of whom completed graduate and or post-graduate education, and most of whom come from the same disciplines as those attempting to levy criticism against them. Even the broad categorization of *trans-affirmative* activists, scholars, and professionals, that I had employed in my recruitment materials to encapsulate a group of loosely defined individuals with shared goals of supporting and depathologizing trans people, emerged as a significant point of discussion, and diversity. While some participants embraced and utilized the terminology of *trans-affirmative* scholarship and or practice, one participant provided such a profound critique of the term, that I felt that it warranted dedicated space for discussion because of its significance and implications for. As a result, I will address this prior to discussing the themes that emerged in participant interviews.

5.4 Problematizing ‘Trans-affirmative’

During interviews, more than one participant indicated that the term *trans-affirmative* was problematic. Criticisms were not the construct of the *gender affirmative model* “which is now practiced by the majority of North American gender Clinics” (Newhook et al, 2018, p. 10, see also, Ehrensaft, 2016). This model which contrasts with the former dominant model practiced at the Gender Identity Clinic for Children and Youth at

CAMH, is described by one of its most notable proponents, psychologist Diane Ehrensaft, as follows⁹⁷:

Many of us have banded across disciplines and across countries to shape what is now known as the gender affirmative model. We have also organized an international gender affirmative consortium under the auspices of Gender Spectrum, open to professionals of all disciplines who work with or advocate for gender-nonconforming and transgender children and youth and share our basic philosophy. Our model stretches and grows as we grow, but the basic premises remain in place:

- Gender variations are not disorders; they are not pathological.
- Gender variations are healthy expressions of infinite possibilities of human gender.
- Gender presentations are diverse and varied across cultures, requiring cultural sensitivity to those variations.
- Gender involves an interweaving of nature, nurture, and culture—no one of these stands alone in shaping gender.
- A person's gender may be binary; a person's gender may be fluid or multiple.

⁹⁷ The model employed at the Gender Identity Clinic for Children and Youth at CAMH has been described as model as “therapeutic” in Zucker, Wood, Singh & Bradley 2012) *A Developmental, Biopsychosocial Model for the Treatment of Children with Gender Identity Disorder*. However, as a result of the model's emphasis on gender diversity as disordered and in need of ‘treatment’ I have framed the model as the ‘treatment model’

• If people suffer from any kind of emotional or psychiatric problem connected to their gender, this is most likely because of negative reactions to them from the outside world. • If there is gender pathology, we will find it not in the child but in the culture (otherwise known as transphobia) (Ehrensaft, 2016, p. 21)

Instead the discourse of ‘*trans-affirmative*’ by those with limited understanding of what the model entails, and even by those who hold pathologized views of trans people but have co-opted the term for professional gain was cited as problematic.⁹⁸ According to one participant:

There’s a difference in the way that people are talking to the people that they want to get money from and get services from. It’s - ‘Oooh, I’m affirmative, I’m soooo Affirmative’, and that goes on their website, so people see them, but yet when they write papers, they’re using objectifying dehumanizing language. You know, like I say, to people in my training, let’s say you have a new colleague and her name is Anne, and I’m introducing you to Anne. Tell me what you think if I introduced her this way: ‘Hi, this is Anne who’s a triple D cup size’, you know, breasts, I’d be in trouble for sexual harassment, because that’s not acceptable behavior. Why is it okay for you then, to

⁹⁸ Although not specifically addressed by participants, early use of the terminology of ‘affirmative approaches’ does not necessarily reflect the *affirmative model* today. Bryant (2007) discusses how some proponents of early affirmative approaches expressed sentiments that were affirmative of feminine gender expression, but not transgender identity, and were based on the notion that ‘treatment of GIDC’ was homophobic, rather than transphobic. However, as understanding of childhood gender diversity rooted in an affirmative practice grew, the views of clinicians have also undergone significant shifts.

describe people, as 'Hi, this is the FTM pre op transsexual'. It's not, it's no more acceptable (psychologist).

The use of pathologizing language when writing about and discussing trans people was noted as something that persists even among those claiming to be trans-affirmative. As well, the issue of *co-publication with members of the invisible college* was raised as deeply problematic. To paraphrase one participant, “you’re not trans-affirmative if you are writing with folks who view trans kids as disordered”.

While most concern with the language of ‘*trans-affirmative*’ was centered upon the co-option of discourse, one participant expressed concern that the notion of trans affirmative does not go far enough in supporting trans and gender diverse children because it allows clinicians to simply focus on their practice in isolation, rather than being engaged in necessary activism to address the political and social systems that contribute to the harms trans people experience:

I think it's, it's, it's an unfortunate word, it's a placeholder because if I say I'm being affirmative, I'm still not challenging the oppressive system that makes you even need me to affirm you in the first place, then that is a problem.

While for some It's a failure to dig deep enough, for others it is therapeutic masturbation, it means I'm not willing to put myself out there to do anything to help you, but it is beneficial for me to call myself trans affirmative

(psychologist)

As noted in both participant quotes, the identification of *financial implications* as problematic in relation to the discourse of ‘*trans-affirmative*’ is significant. Even

clinicians engaging in *actual* affirmative work in accordance with the affirmative model are still beholden to systems where funding is premised upon notions of *treatment/disorder*. On the other hand, policies and legislation aimed at preventing professionals from engaging in attempts at so-called conversion or reparative therapies, and ambiguity surrounding whether, or not, the so called ‘therapeutic’ approach employed at the Toronto clinic constitutes reparative or conversion therapy, can result in professionals engaging in semantic games of truth surrounding what constitutes ‘affirmative approaches’ in order to maintain practice.⁹⁹ As both policies and legislation and reparative and or conversion therapies emerged as significant themes in participant interviews, they are discussed in subsequent sections in greater detail.

5.5 Cyber Communities as a Path to (De)subjugation

One of the themes that emerged from participant interviews was the significance of the internet for trans people to connect with and share knowledge with one another. This is echoed by Stryker (2006), who writes that:

The growth of home computer use in the 1990s, and the encouragement of many trans women at the forefront of information technology and Internet development, was crucial to the development of a new, geographically dispersed, diverse trans community in the 1990s (Whittle, 1998). Online, this newly formed community was able to discuss its experiences of fear, shame, and discrimination, and, as a result, many community members developed

⁹⁹ The external review of the Toronto clinic in 2015 included the statement by the reviewers that "we cannot state that the clinic does not practice reparative approaches (if not outright therapies) with respect to influencing gender identity development (Zinck & Pignatiello 2015, p. 22)

newly politicized personal identities. This new politicization forged a determination to change the world, by every means possible, for the next generation of trans youth” (Stryker, 2006, xii).

One participant, Andrea James, who was instrumental in the emergence of these *cyber communities*, discussed not only how they emerged, but how literature that flowed from the clinic was a significant focus of discussion for decades:¹⁰⁰

I got involved in activism almost as soon as I transitioned. It was really at that sort of dawn of the commercial internet and so this is the mid 1990s, and when I first got internet in 1995 I very quickly found small online communities of transgender people who were trying to help each other out. The main one that I was using a design was AOL. And at the time, you could get kicked off of AOL if you set up a chat room with the word transgender or transsexual, so even early on we realized that we were going to have to do a lot of work around educating people and making places online that we could you know, be safe, and talk about things that matter. At the time there were other bulletin boards and it was use-net and some other places where conversations were happening and that eventually sort of coalesced on Usenet groups group called Support SRS and SOC support transgender and that was much more free-wheeling than most places. There wasn't a lot of

¹⁰⁰ For discussion of James’ role as an icon of trans activism see https://www.huffingtonpost.ca/entry/andrea-james-trans-pioneer_n_5776965be4b04164640fc212

civility, but it was very informative. Despite the Wild West attitude. But in those two groups very quickly in the mid 90s there sort of became a lot of discussion about the Clarke Institute. The Clarke Institute in Toronto had become already known as Jurassic Park because of their regressive policies and procedures for trans people. I believe, at the time they were turning down about 90% of applicants. So in order to get government funded healthcare, you had to jump through the hoops, which means the people there had pet theories and had certain answers they wanted to hear from their patients, and so people learned what those were and to say whatever they needed to in order to get health care. So that started producing a lot of flawed science, and they had been working on this, centered intellectually around the Archives of Sexual Behavior, which is a journal which started in 1971, and in the very first or second issue, the editor in chief said that his stated goal was the prevention of transsexuals and he had been doing a lot of work around reparative therapy for gay children (Andrea James).

The reality that trans people are well versed in the clinical literature that has been written about them is well documented (see Namaste, 2000; Prosser, 1998; Rowe, 2014; Stryker & Whittle, 2006; Serano, 2008, 2016; Tosh, 2016). Cyber communities provided a space where trans people from around the world could connect with others to support and learn from one another about being trans, while simultaneously learning and sharing the clinical expectations imposed on them to be *read as trans* to be granted access transition related services. Vivanne Namaste's study which involved interviewing trans people accessing services at the Adult Gender Identity Clinic at the Clarke Institute (later named

the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health), revealed that trans people were afraid to resist the narratives that the clinic constructed about them because the it was more akin to a juridical process than health care; if they failed to be read in the manner that the clinic established, they were not granted the diagnosis necessary for accessing transition related medical services (see also, Rowe, 2014).

Namaste's study also made clear that government policies in Ontario which established the GIC as the sole authority for granting the diagnosis required to access funded medical services, placed clients in an incredibly vulnerable position. Not only were clients at risk of being denied services if they failed to meet the demands of 'truth' that clinicians established, but they were also vulnerable to clinician's demands that they be research subjects and undergo examination without consent. When confronted with the issue of consent, clinic staff asserted that it was unnecessary, because clients were not involved in "experimental treatment" (Namaste, 2000, pp 223-224). Namaste discussed how clients also shared that they experienced sexism and harassment at the clinic, but they felt powerless to do anything about their experiences (this is echoed by participants in Rowe's study as well, see Rowe, 2014). According to Namaste (2000), this created a "circular loop of psychiatric assessment and the provision of health services to TS/TG people" (p. 192). Trans people were trapped in a clinical fishbowl in which they were beholden to speak narratives that erased their actual voices.

As cyber communities grew, so did knowledge of the role of the Clarke Institute in producing pathologizing literature, how its key figures worked to establish new diagnostic concepts to pathologize trans women who did not fit the narrative they were

asked to portray; concepts which simultaneously prevented trans women from accessing the obligatory diagnosis they needed to access surgeries, while subjecting them to the diagnosis of *autogynephilia*, coined by former Clarke Institute Psychiatrist Ray Blanchard.¹⁰¹ Blanchard's construction of autogynephilia, as a sexually motivated mental disorder, to be considered a 'paraphilia' (for a detailed discussion of this diagnosis see Tosh, 2016, p. 67-68), holds significant consequences for trans women. Not only can it impact access to services, but framing trans women in this manner makes them vulnerable to violence because the psy disciplines frame the knowledge they produce as 'science', which according to Teo, "has a higher status than theoretical criticism expressed by a marginalized *Other*" (Teo, 2010, p.299). As outlined in the previous chapter, the emergence of a book which, among numerous other criticisms, was premised upon Blanchard's construct of autogynephilia, coincided with the growth of cyber communities which brought together the 'erudite' and 'subjugated knowledges' that Foucault, and later Stryker (2006) outlined as essential to challenging the misrepresentation, and governance of people whose gender the psy disciplines had rendered pathological.

According to James:

so autogynephilia which is the paraphilia that Blanchard created, it became a huge topic of conversation and around that time there was a guy at

¹⁰¹ This is not to suggest that all trans women who did not fit rigid diagnostic criteria for the diagnosis as a 'true transsexual' received the diagnosis of autogynephilia. Instead it is to make clear that the research dynamic of the clinic privileged clinicians whose careers were intimately linked with their research projects and establishing taxonomies of pathology.

Northwestern University named J. Michael Bailey, who really wanted to popularize these ideas for, I believe very personal reasons. So, he published something on the web, I forget what exactly it was called, but it was something like 'men trapped in men's bodies' or if something very much to that effect, and it eventually became the book "The man who would be queen" published in 2003. The difference between the version that he published in 1999 on the web, and the book that ended up being published by the national academy of sciences, was that he added a framing device, of a child, who he called Danny Ryan, who he supposedly saw get cured of gender identity disorder in children. And that was what really, I think got people upset, because people had written to him when he when he first published the 1999 thing, I had myself you know, it was fairly civil, and said, this is inaccurate and inflammatory and lurid, and it was very vivid description descriptions. And so when it came out in 2003, he was doing a book tour and he was going from place to place, and the place where it came to my attention was he was at Stanford University and he presented to a bunch of graduate students and faculty in the psychology department. This sort of Jerry Springer like performance but he's using a bunch of images and videos young children, young children without their knowledge, and he's openly mocking them in these lectures. So, you know, he'll play a clip of a little kid saying, "I hate my hair" and then wrapped a towel around pretending to have long hair, and saying, "I wish I were a girl" and everybody laughed. Then, you know, Joan Roughgarden, who was a tenured professor at Stanford attended it and

reported back, and so that was really, I think a tipping point that this needed to end.

James discussed how Bailey's mocking of children while an audience of psychologists and psychology students laughed, coupled with the harm that Bailey's claims of seeing gender identity disorder in children 'cured' posed for trans kids, pushed her to employ the tactics Bailey had used, by *flipping the gaze* onto Bailey's then adult children:

So I took some pictures of them at age of the kids he was mocking and I said - "how would you feel if somebody did this to your kids?" and put quotes from his book underneath them and people went crazy, I mean like to this day, people still talk about it, and they don't remember why I did it, they just say 'oh they attacked Bailey's children, 'oh that's terrible!', without even acknowledging or talking about the fact that's exactly that's exactly what he was doing to these trans kids, and that's exactly what he was doing to me. By making it a very personal thing, it really threw them off and made it into a much bigger story, and you know, a lot of people were very upset with my tone, the tactics, but it was also a real moment of coalescing.

James's adds that she and Professor Emerita of Computer Science and Engineering, Lynn Conway, whose role as a trans woman in academia and expertise in the sciences made her both an important figure in online communities, and in formalizing efforts to address the harm that Bailey's book posed:

So, Lynn Conway and I worked very closely to coordinate efforts. We reached out to all the people we could find who were portrayed in the book, a lot of

them were very upset about how they were portrayed. And eventually got Northwestern and investigation, and their investigation was really just to cover their butts they didn't really find him, you know, that he had done anything wrong, but it's certainly had an effect on his reputation and it certainly galvanized the community that Zucker, CAMH, Blanchard, Bailey; all those people were public enemy number one for trans people.

As a result of their efforts to raise concerns about the harm the book posed, research ethics and the promotion of unscientific concepts and data about trans people resulted in what is outlined in the previous chapter as a significant event, which illuminated the “use of suppression tactics by supporters of the dominant networks” (Lane, 2011, p. 81).

According to James:

In 2008, Zucker devoted an entire issue of Archives of Sexual Behavior to defending his ideology and attacking his transgender critics. And they got a lot of traction out of that, the main piece in that was a target article ended up being part of a book in which I am like the central villain. It was actually a good thing, because it really made people in sexology choose a side. It sort of became a dividing line.

The commentaries attacking James, Conway, Deidre McCloskey, and ‘trans activists’ revealed a multiplicity of forms of epistemic violence which was discussed in the previous chapter, however it exposed the centrality of epistemic issues, including the false binary of ‘science’ versus ‘activism’:

And so they started trying to undermine their critics by saying ‘well you can’t believe trans people. I mean, we’re scientists, they’re mentally ill liars’. So once the activism movement started, then they started pitting science versus activism, and they claimed to hold the science, and everybody who’s attacking what they are saying is an enemy of science, or an anti-science ideologue, and of course within the trans movement, most of the people who were fighting the Clarke Institute ideologies were some of the most prominent scientists in the world, not just because they’re transgender, you know, Ben Barres, one of the foremost neuroscientists in the world, Joan Roughgarden, an evolutionary biologist, Julia Serano, a biologist, Lynn Conway, one of the world’s pioneers in computer science. Diedre McKloskey, one of the world’s foremost economists, and the list goes on and on. So, it was very galling for them to claim that they were scientists and that we didn’t know what we were talking about, and that we were too biased to be able to talk truthfully about our bodies.

Both James and Conway had previously established websites that were sources of support and information for trans people in relation to transitioning, sharing information about trans people’s successes to counter pathologizing narratives, and which specifically engaged with critiquing the epistemological, theoretical, ideological and political dimensions of ‘sexology’. Conway’s site in particular established an extensive archive of summaries and links to the pathologizing clinical literature as well as citing emerging clinical literature that challenged the pathology paradigm. Though not explicitly framed as such, Conway’s site also made mapped out networks which were later termed the

Invisible College (see Ansara & Hegarty, 2012). As a central figure in utilizing cyber communities for the dissemination of de-subjugated knowledges, Conway's contributions also signal the next significant theme that emerged in participant narratives, that of *Insiders and Allies in The Academies*.

5.6 Insiders and Allies in the Academies

Among the themes that emerged in participant narratives, the significance of trans people and allies speaking from *within* academia, psychology and allied professions was significant in contributing to raising awareness of the politics of pathology that was central to dominant discourses in academia surrounding trans people. According to Stryker (2006):

In the 1990s, a new scholarship, informed by community activism, started from the premise that to be trans was not to have a mental or medical disorder. This fundamental shift was built upon within academia, and enabled trans men and women to reclaim the reality of their bodies, to create with them what they would, and to leave the linguistic determination of those bodies open to exploration and invention. To this extent, trans studies is a true linking of feminist and queer theory.

Stryker and Whittle further elaborate on the proliferation of Transgender Studies as:

an interdisciplinary field that draws upon the social sciences and psychology, the physical and life sciences, and the humanities and arts. It is as concerned with material conditions as it is with representational practices, and often pays particularly close attention the interface between the two. The

frameworks for analyzing and interpreting gender, desire, embodiment, and identity now taking shape in the field of transgender studies have radical implications for a wide range of subject areas (2006, p.3).

Most participants spoke of how their positionality informed their engagement with trans scholarship, each in different ways. One participant, Clinical Social worker and Family Therapist Arlene Lev, discussed the emergence of their involvement with trans-affirmative activism and scholarship as related in part to their own experiences as related to their intersecting identities and experiences.¹⁰²

So, I'm lesbian identified, and my early work and identity was through feminist work. I wanted to work with lesbian, gay clients and at the time I was really told that this was going to ruin my career, but I began working with women and lesbians and gay men. I had two clients come to see me and that was sort of pivotal, today we would refer to them as a trans masculine and trans feminine person. So what became very clear to me from, when I began to do research into what was known about trans people, you know, all of that background in reading the clinical stuff was that everything that had been said about gay and lesbian people, which was a story I knew really well, a story that I understood academically...you know, on how gay men were gay because their fathers were not strong and their mothers, well, you know the story. And I said, oh my god - they're recycling this story! They are recycling

¹⁰² See also Lev (2013) *Gender Dysphoria: Two Steps Forward, One Step Back*, for her discussion on how her positionality and experiences informed her practice and writing.

the same story. So that's kind of how I came to this work and how that journey began. And what happened was a lot of people began to come to me, because in their words, I was gay positive, so that meant that I would be positive about gender, which I don't necessarily think was true, but that was in their minds how they saw that (Ari)

Lev added that as a result of her experiences working with “hundreds of trans people, their partners, their children, and their extended families” (2013, n.p.) trans adults and children, it became clear that their pathologized representation in clinical literature created a vacuum of what could be considered affirmative resources for clinicians and families. Along with her practice, Lev addressed this gap, by building on nascent affirmative care of lesbian and gay people, to create an affirmative care for trans people as the concept that trans people were not mentally ill did not exist in academia at the time. Lev began publishing multiple books, numerous book chapters, journal articles, and engaging in critiques of the dominant literature on children, which flowed predominantly from Dr. Ken Zucker. Lev writing, practice, activism, teaching, and involvement with The World Professional Association (WPATH), and The American Psychological Association (Division 44), have contributed to the proliferation of an affirmative discourse which countered the pathology paradigm.

While echoing the significance of an increasing presence of LGBTQ+ clinicians in the psy disciplines and organizations like the American Psychological Association, one psychologist that I spoke with cautioned that the while the influence of insiders and allies within the American Psychological Association has been significant in facilitating a shift

in towards affirmative approaches, the American Psychiatric Association, which is responsible for the DSM, is a far more conservative organization and lacks the diversity of the *psychological* counterpart. Yet it is the American Psychiatric Association which is responsible for the inclusion of diagnoses in the DSM. They added that the influence of specific individuals within organizations is also a paradox; it has been beneficial to advancing affirmative approaches, yet trans and gender diverse children and adults are vulnerable the views of those who hold positions of power within these organizations:

The American Psychological Association, it's different because there's more people from more diverse backgrounds that are on leadership and leadership positions. And I know from my own experience of dealing with them, there was more cultural diversity, there was more gender diversity, there were more people with various kinds of lived experience. I still think that American Psychological Association has a long way to go, but it has been an easier place for people to break into than the American Psychiatric Association. I think the issue is access; who has access to membership whose voices are allowed to be part of the conversation. So, these are people driving us. And I think people forget, this is a hugely important message. It is also specific people within the American Psychiatric Association who are responsible for the DSM five having a problem that it has now. The psychiatric APA had its handpicked committee of people trying to make sure that gender was pathologized in the DSM five and succeeded in getting Transvestic fetishism in there even though that's extremely backwards, you know. I think and they are going to try to get ROGD in there. So, people better really watch out

because, well, I mean, why wouldn't they try to get ROGD in there? I mean, this is the thing, you know, this is how they got all these other things in, and I think people need to be alert, you know, this is where being affirmative doesn't quite cut it. You need to be actively vigilant, anti-oppressive, you know (psychologist).

While the participant identified representation as significant in facilitating a shift, the distinction between psychology and psychiatry also brought to light epistemological considerations. While there are numerous reasons for lack of trans representation in psychiatry, the legacy of pathologization among them, the dominance of the medical model has left psychiatry without a sense of epistemology. Markvoa and Berrios (2012) advocate for “a new epistemology of psychiatry” (p. 224), that must “give an account of the object and context of inquiry, the role of the interlocutor (i.e. the clinician or meaningful other), and the manner in which these components interact” (p. 224), the general lack of epistemological awareness and emphasis on methodology is a barrier to this.

This is echoed by Teo (2017) who cites *methodologism*, as rampant in psychology as well. Another participant, also a psychologist, emphasized the significance of advancing critical epistemologies and qualitative research methodologies in psychology and allied disciplines as central to working to expose the myth of ‘objective science’ in psychology with respect to trans people, and to trans-inform the clinical gaze. One participant discussed how the quantitative hegemony required advancing epistemic issues within a quantitative in order to be able to speak from a position of ‘authority’.

I had to learn the language of people with hierarchical authority in order to challenge some of the things that were being done. But that wasn't my natural language. I had to learn it. And then ironically, I went from being perceived as you're an angry screaming activist and we don't take you seriously because you don't have enough letters after your name, to when I did to being told you're just an academic You don't get it. (Psychologist)

Another participant made clear that psy disciplines are not simply lacking in critical epistemological perspectives and qualitative research, but that they are met with hostilities:

The hostility between qualitative and quantitate methods within psychology is a clear example of how threatening predominant perspectives view those who centre the voices of those who are oppressed - often the ones under our study.

With the predominant perspective of positivism, objectivity, and statistical analyses, we often found that the response was one of 'neutrality'. Individuals tended to hide behind the protection of, 'I was just doing what I was trained to do' or the fact that harmful perspectives seemed validated by numerous professional positions and memberships - so it was kind of circular. They must be right because they are in a position of influence, but they are in a position of influence because everyone assumes, they are right. Hiding behind the myth of objectivity, many psychologists we spoke to argued that discussion of politics and ethics was not their role - that they were to follow guidelines and do as they were trained. Also, the power imbalance between

researcher and researched within this perspective, meant that the voices of those being studied were not valued (or believed) as much as those that had the stamp of 'science' attached - i.e. randomised controlled trials and significant statistical analyses, meaning that critical feedback often got missed or ignored in place of following the 'norms' of psychology (psychologist).

Another participant identified the importance of epistemological discussion as central to dispelling the myth of so-called objective science, and for making clear the role of the pathology paradigm as a source of harm against trans people:

So, I like to switch the lens back on the people who are actually constructing the categories, you know, let's look at epistemology. Let's look at ontology. Let's look at how these categories that have set up that the construction of the categories themselves is contributing to marginalization. And that's why I don't work within the discrimination paradigm. Because I think before you can even get to discrimination, you'd have delegitimation, you have construction of categories that then can be used as a basis of discrimination (psychologist).

Shifting the gaze onto the pathologizing literature, and the producers of it, was also identified as significant in making clear the distinction between *trans voices*, and *trans epistemologies*. While the notion of voice is considered important to critical anti-oppressive research, being trans is not an automatic reflection of alignment with the affirmative model. As also discussed in the previous chapter, Dr. Anne Lawrence who is

trans, promotes a view of trans as disorder, albeit advocating for ‘compassion’ (see Lawrence, 2008). The lack of epistemological discussion in the psy disciplines leads to the conflation between being trans, and trans-informed epistemologies. While trans-epistemology is a complex, heterogenous and still emergent field, a central unifying view is that the body is not an object of inquiry, subjected to theorizations that aim to extricate or erase notions of ‘truth’, rather it is a site of contingent knowledges, histories and agency which is guided by trans people as legitimate sources of knowledge about their own lives (Nicolazzo, 2017; Martino, Kuhl & Omercajic, in press; Martino, Kuhl & Pyne, 2019).

It is of considerable significance that the significance of insiders and allies in the academy, occurs in tandem with discussion of epistemologies. The messages of epistemological privilege, lack of epistemological awareness and training signal the next theme, that of *Education*.

5.7 Education

Education was frequently represented in participant narratives. Yet precisely what is meant by education and how participants discussed it is complex and multi-dimensional. Participants specifically cited different levels and forms of education (higher education, disciplinary specific education, public schools, and religious education*) as significant in terms of production and or dissemination of knowledge about trans people.¹⁰³ In the following sections I address ‘education’ as a complex domain, that has contributed to

¹⁰³ The specific reference to religious education is complicated and is specific to the Ontario context. Trans-affirmative education within religious schools was made possible via legislation, but participant discussions also revealed the deployment of pathologizing literature within religious education.

both freedom from pathologization, while also implicated as a site for the proliferation of harmful and inaccurate discourses about trans people under the guise of ‘science’.

Education sessions delivered to teachers, school staff, students and even parents were frequently cited by participants as important for supporting trans and gender diverse youth. One participant, participant, a psychiatrist, whose work has included providing guidance and support to schools (students, parents, staff) when a child transitions, asserted that education sessions that prompt participants to reflect on their own understanding of gender, where it comes from, what it means to them and shifting the focus on reflecting on their own misunderstandings have been vital:

For me the school stuff is really vital because you know its not just the kids who respond wonderfully at the school. I mean, ironically, all the teachers and the principal and parents are quite anxious about roll outs. The first one they did. They had a whole team of therapists ready to de-brief these 8 year old's and, you know, they said. "So what have you just learned in the last little while?" and somebody said well Johnny's now Joanne or whatever and then the next person put their hand up and said, "Well, my dog had puppies in the holidays" and basically you know they weren't interested and they said "well we knew this anyway," so you don't want all of this. When the therapist redirected them to ask more about what they had learnt about Joanne, they said "she is friendly..., she likes yellow..., she" fun to play with...etc.". All of the children correctly gendered her without fault. Its all gone really well and you know its really the adult population who weren't

given the understanding about gender who really struggle with the issues.

These messages, they're not just helpful for transgender kids, they are helpful for all of the kids and the adults as well. (Psychiatrist)

Another participant, a psychotherapist, emphasized the importance of community as education, whereby being part of supportive communities where trans children were validated, supported and surrounded by other trans youth, the need for psychological discourse as a means to educate people about trans kids was not necessary:

There's a whole way that it creates a normalizing situation and it's fun. And if we can have things that kids like to do, like face painting and football, that is so much more important than finding counseling, they don't need counselling. They need each other. (Psychotherapist)

The idea of normalization and education was a paradox according to this participant. While just allowing kids to be kids, building community and stop focusing on clinical discourse about trans kids contributes to children's well being, and acceptance by their peers, a focus on disrupting the notion of 'normal' is central to their work with adults when delivering training sessions for educators, and health and allied professionals:

so, the trans 101 is about the notion of disrupting the idea of normal. And there's a section surprisingly enough, cis people seem to really enjoy it. I don't think it's ever bombed. I've done it many, many, many times and it's always worked. It's a series of pretty simple questions, which I could certainly send in slides, and people have to talk in pairs about these questions, which are very fundamental questions, and very simple questions about gender, but

just to get says people querying their own gender. They Love it! It is really hard to shut them up! Every time they have to move to a different partner and begin a different set of questions, they don't want to! [laughter] The conversations are quite lively and the room gets very loud, there's lots of energy in it, people cry, afterwards people have like of these really big revelations, like – 'Actually, it would be really difficult to tell my family – they would be so upset'. Hello. Yes. Good. Great. You got some of what that might be. So yes, having to disrupt the idea of normal is where you have to begin.

When asked specifically about trainings in school settings, this participant indicated that the trainings have strictly been for staff. They added that although teachers have been predominantly receptive, during those training sessions there was a tendency for them to invoke essentialist accounts of gender and to draw on examples from what the participant framed as 'the natural world' or the natural sciences:

So while I talk a bit about histories within trans communities, struggles, building alliances, the stuff that is much more alive, they often keep going back to the essentialist stuff, that there is actually a fish who... etc. etc.

They added that the notion of the 'norm', is so incredibly powerful, and there are so many ways that it needed to be disrupted not only in the disciplinary and *scientific* sense, but also the broader culture and with respect to being educated about the historical legacy of harm that has been enacted against trans people in the psy clinical and academic establishments. However, this participant expressed frustration with the discourse of

science and discussed having been present at conferences where Dr. Zucker discussed ‘Gender Identity Disorder in Children’ and the presentation while framed as ‘science’, was a spectacle based on a constructed ‘norm’ as a signifier illness:

So he shows this photograph, which is also confidential information, which he has no business showing it to the public, but anyway, he shows this photograph or one of his clients from the clinic. It's a seven, or eight year old's birthday party, there are maybe a dozen children who are dressed in identical pink dresses - and I do mean identical [emphasis]. And then the 'sick' child right, the child we're all worried about has a firefighter's uniform on. What Ken is trying to do with this picture is to demonstrate how sick this child is. I mean it's so obvious. It's so glaring. That problem is not the child dressed as a firefighter, it is how those little girls are being so strictly disciplined.

This promoted discussion as to the presence, or rather absence of psychologists at such trainings:

Out of hundreds of trainings, I've twice had psychologists be present. One of them was just kind of overtly hostile, and then there was this other one, and older white guy with terrible social skills who asked every offensive question he could possibly ask actually ended up being wonderful. It was glorious. So we would ask the rest of the group, through the whole process of disrupting normativity, and then we asked him how he would answer that question and

he had so much fun answering - yet very appropriately, very skillfully from several different directions (clinician).

That out of hundreds of trainings for educators, community services providers, and health professionals that only two psychologists were present, one of whom was ‘overtly hostile’ and another who had absolutely no knowledge of gender diversity, is noteworthy. While there are numerous possible reasons for this, hierarchical notions of whose voice counts in relation to what constitutes professional training places little if any priority on the delivery of training by those outside of specific professional communities. While professional learning requirements vary by region and discipline, self-governing bodies for psychology and medicine tend to have highly prescribed education requirements which can make it virtually impossible for community-based learning initiatives to be recognized as meeting continuing education requirements.

That education that comes from listening to the lived experience of gender diverse youth rather than clinical education about them was reiterated by a psychiatrist:

I've seen the families, you know, this child has been begging to wear a dress and be called another name, or wear boys clothes, then they go away on holiday and finally they give up and they let the child do what they like - with a bunch of kids that don't know - and they see their child blossom and you know acting on stage being themselves and the parents know in their heart that this is the right thing to do because they have never seen their child so happy, so confident, and so at ease in their own skin. And that's happened often before they come to me and they say 'now what do we do next?'

because you know we realize we can't force our child to conform because it is wrong for our child and of course then the other ones with that hasn't happened. And literally, you know, going from school refusal to all sorts of really awful things literally within an hour of seeing me having you know put things in place it all disappears. Now, in my mind, there is nothing that can do that other than stopping to poke these kids with sharpened sticks, you know, and you get a good result if you stop the torture. (psychiatrist)

That dominant clinical approaches to childhood gender diversity would evoke the parallel of torture was significant and illuminates another theme that emerged as central to facilitating a paradigm shift; establishing the link between the ‘treatment’ approach to childhood gender diversity, and its similarities to reparative or conversion therapies.

5.8 ‘Treatment’ and Reparative Therapies

The emergence of academic literature that sought to expose attempts by clinicians to extinguish childhood gender diversity makes clear the imbricated history of gender and sexuality in clinical discourse and praxes, and the shared etiology of so called ‘treatment’ approaches. The influence of Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick’s *How to Bring Your Kids up Gay* (1991) for making clear these linkages was both profound and problematic. Like other feminist and queer contributions that addressed gender and sexuality, is also subject to criticism for what has been framed as exploitation of trans experience for academic theorization, and for the erasure of the work of trans scholars and of trans materiality (see Gil-Peterson, 2018; Prosser in Stryker & Whittle, 2006; Stryker, 2008, 2017). Yet trans scholar Julian Gil-Peterson’s *Histories of the Transgender Child* (2018) frames the work

as paradoxical in that Sedgwick's excoriation of Richard Green and the infamous UCLA treatment program which aimed to examine the 'etiology' of, and to 'treat' what was "interpreted as proto-homosexuality or transsexuality" (Gil-Peterson, 2018, p. 232), illuminates an entangled history of a clinical gaze on childhood gender and sexuality and the behavioural and psychoanalytic roots for so called 'treatment' approaches to both, yet Sedgwick's emphasis on the suspect timing of the inclusion of "Gender Identity Disorder of Childhood" (Sedgwick, 1991, p. 20), and its relationship to "proto-gay children" (p.22) renders the history of *trans* children invisible (Gil-Peterson, 2019, p.302). Yet Gil-Peterson makes clear that Sedgwick's work holds historical significance and has had a prolific effect on illuminating key figures and the imbricated history of gender expression and sexuality in the clinical literature. Sedgwick's work also had a profound impact in terms of its reach, having been cited hundreds, if not thousands of times.¹⁰⁴

Following Sedgwick's work numerous critiques would emerge from within and outside of the psy disciplines (Bryant, 2007). Within the psy disciplines, Isay (1997), Menvielle (1998), Pickstone-Taylor (2003), and Langer and Martin (2004) outlined concerns aligned with Sedgwick that efforts aimed at the 'treatment' of childhood gender diversity targeted feminine gender expression and homosexual boys. Pickstone-Taylor (2003) specifically framed the approach employed at the Toronto clinic as "disturbingly close to reparative therapy for homosexuals" (p. 266), and Langer and Martin (2004) asserted that

¹⁰⁴ Eve Koslowski-Sedgwick's *How to Bring your Kids Up Gay*, shows citations numbering in the hundreds via google scholar, but this number does not account for works not captured in this measure including unpublished graduate theses, books, and news articles, as well as the vast readership the article has amassed.

“Treatment for GIDC bears striking resemblance to conversion therapies for homosexuality” (p. 18), a practice deemed “unethical” (p.18) by professional organizations. In response to Isay, Zucker (1999) took issue with Isay’s choice to submit his criticism in the form of a letter to the editor, stating that such matters were “better reserved for debate at clinical and scientific meetings and in our scholarly journals” (p. 7). Zucker also claimed Isay’s letter was “uninformed” (p.8), questioned his credentials to speak to the matter, and asserted that “Isay’s arguments are a cheap imitation of his predecessors.” (1999, p. 8). Yet despite referring to Isay’s work in such terms, Zucker and Bradley take issue with Pickstone- Taylor’s (2003) letter as “ad hominem” (Zucker & Bradley, 2003, p. 266), and dismiss Langer and Martin’s view dismissed as “liberal essentialism” (Zucker, 2006, p. 549).¹⁰⁵

That critiques of the ‘treatment model’ would be framed as personal criticism of Dr. Zucker and/or Dr. Bradley, negates the reality that it is virtually impossible to critique the model, without referencing their work, particularly Dr. Zucker’s work given the extent to which he is cited by both critics and supporters in relation to the ‘treatment model’ (Bryant, 2007; Tosh; 2015, 2016). While critiques of the ‘treatment model’ as a form of reparative or conversion therapy are indeed blurred with respect to gender and sexuality,

¹⁰⁵ Zucker’s (2006) *Commentary on Langer and Martin’s (2004) ‘How Dresses Can Make You Mentally Ill: Examining Gender Identity Disorder in Children’*, is marked by some ambiguity as to his etiological view of childhood gender diversity and transgender children. While he responds that “the analogy [to conversion therapy] is flawed because it confounds the timing of intervention” (2006, pp, 550-551), yet precisely what is meant by this assertion is not outlined. With respect to sexual orientation, Zucker writes in the article “In general, I am sympathetic to the perspective that sexual orientation, particularly in men, is largely stable by adulthood (Friedman & Downey, 2002); however, the extent to which sexual orientation is as stable in women is less clear (Diamond, 2005; Kinnish, Strassberg, & Turner, 2005). Even assuming that there is a sex difference in the fluidity of sexual orientation, I would argue that the appropriate comparison would be to examine the stability, or lack thereof, of GID in adulthood, not childhood” (p.551).

parsing the history and etiology of ‘treating’ homosexuality, feminine ‘boys’, and trans children is incredibly difficult, and the ‘treatment’ approach to ‘gender identity disorder’ employed at the clinic is steeped in the same psychoanalytic and behavioral views that emphasized ‘maternal psychopathology’ as a primary ‘cause’ (See Bryant, 2007; Kuhl & Martino, 2018).^{106 107} Yet the rebuttals that *clinicians* faced for criticizing the ‘treatment model’, which included calling into question their legitimacy to speak based on their credentials, criticism as to what constitutes an ‘appropriate’ forum, as well as framing their arguments as political, makes clear that adherents to the ‘treatment’ model have framed their critics in terms that they themselves do not acknowledge in their own work.¹⁰⁸¹⁰⁹ While it is not the focus of this dissertation to establish if the ‘treatment’

¹⁰⁶ According to Zucker and Bradley (1995) “gender identity disorder develops from a state of inner insecurity that rises out of the interaction between a boy’s temperamental vulnerability to high arousal and an insecure mother-child-relationship” (Zucker and Bradley 1995, 262). Given that clinician’s views can evolve, it is important to note that the notion of maternal psychopathology persists in Zucker and Bradley’s later works (see Owen-Anderson, Bradley & Zucker, 2010; Zucker, Wood, Singh & Bradley, 2012). In 2018, I also had the opportunity to specifically pose the question to Dr. Zucker at an event where he was speaking, as to whether or not his views had evolved with respect to the statement in his book citing maternal psychopathology as responsible for gender identity ‘disorder’, Dr. Zucker’s winding response regarding bio-psycho-social factors, continued to frame what he termed maternal psychopathology as a factor.

¹⁰⁷ In a 2018 interview, Dr. Zucker disputed claims that his clinical approach is analogous to reparative or conversion therapies and stated that he finds “the term conversion therapy is incredibly inflammatory”, See Hayes, 2018, <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/canada/toronto/article-doctor-fired-from-gender-identity-clinic-says-he-feels-vindicated/>

¹⁰⁸ See Ashley (2019a) Science Has Always Been Ideological, You Just Don’t See It, for a discussion of how supporters of the pathology paradigm persist in framing critics as ‘activists’ which negates the political and ideological dimensions of their own work, and dismisses current clinical perspectives on trans people and the voices of actual trans people. For context, see Bailey (2019) and Rind (2019) who frame their work as ‘science’, and trans informed and trans-affirmative positions as ‘activism’.

¹⁰⁹ Bailey (2019) refers to gender studies as “grievance studies” (n.p based on article publication online first)

approach constitutes conversion or reparative therapy, trans legal scholar Florence Ashley provides guidance as to trans reparative therapy.¹¹⁰ According to Ashley:

Trans reparative therapy, which refers to a range of practices seeking to discourage behaviours associated with a gender other than the person's gender assigned at birth and or promote gender identities that are aligned with their gender assigned at birth, are increasingly recognised as harmful and unethical. The leading trans health organisation worldwide, the World Professional Association for Transgender Health, affirms that "treatment aimed at trying to change a person's gender identity and expression to become more congruent with sex assigned at birth" is "no longer considered ethical" (2019b, p1).

Ashley also discusses what I have framed as the 'treatment model' in this dissertation as the 'psychotherapeutic approach'. This terminology emphasizes the basis of so-called treatment, which is rooted in psychoanalytic views and premised on the notion of trans and gender diverse people as disordered and in need of 'treatment'; treatment which discourages a trans identity as an outcome. Ashley's detailed analysis of the aims of the psychotherapeutic approach and the definitional frameworks of reparative therapy led them to arrive at the view that the approach does indeed constitute reparative therapy (Ashley, 2019). While it is important to include a brief discussion of conversion or

¹¹⁰ Ashley (2019I) states "I have opted to use the terminology of 'reparative therapy' over 'conversion therapy' because it is also common and better captures the theoretical underpinnings of reparative practices. By shifting our focus from attempts to change gender identity to attempts to fix trans and gender creative people, we better characterise the approaches at stake and avoid ongoing scientific debates about the nature of gender identity" (p. 19).

reparative therapy in this dissertation, the focus of this work is about the voices of people who have worked to illuminate the harms associated with the ‘treatment’ or psychotherapeutic model, and most participants made clear their views that the treatment model constituted reparative or conversion therapy, and those who did not, did not defend or deny that it was a form of such therapy, it was simply not explicitly discussed and named as such.

One clinician however was emphatic that the ‘treatment’ approach was reparative or conversion therapy and expressed that they had initially been surprised that there were not more past clients speaking out about their experiences at the clinic:

I couldn't understand why people weren't enraged about what was going on. I later learned that essentially what they say is that the people who've been through that program and been so traumatized and had such low self-esteem about themselves, found it very difficult to come out into the open and speak about their experiences - angry and as hurt as they might feel. This is really is quite tragic and also traumatic how it caused that much damage. That people couldn't actually come out and say this was just ridiculous, but I can understand how that sort of ‘therapy’ feeds into one self-doubt and low self-esteem, that if one is inundated with messages that there's something inherently wrong with themselves that can produce long term insecurity about speaking publicly. I felt very sad. It just says to me that transgender people are still trampled on and so dependent on these professionals that they can't

rise up and say, actually, you know what, if you support that, we are not going to go to you anymore (psychiatrist).

While this clinician's comments touch on some of the power relations that trans people faced in speaking out about their experiences, the extent to which trans people were so dependent on approval from the clinic for services in the Ontario policy context requires some further discussion. First, while indeed the egregious effects of the pathologization of gender and sexual diversity have been well established in both clinical literature and via the voices of people who have experienced 'therapies' aimed at framing their gender identity or sexual orientation as 'pathology', it is important to note that in the Ontario context, participants identified specific policies and legislation as having significant bearing on trans people being able to speak out against pathologized views of gender identity and expression. Both the adult and childhood gender clinics at CAMH have, at different points in the Ontario policy context been the sole gatekeepers for access to transition services (see Namaste, 2000; Rowe, 2014). As well, despite the incredible inequity in terms of power relations, specific criticism with respect to connections between reparative and conversion therapies and the 'treatment' model did begin to emerge from within, the psy disciplines, allied disciplines, and most of all from increasing awareness of the stories of trans people who recounted the harm they experienced as a result of attempts at 'treatment'. Academic literature, books, news articles, documentaries, public statements via social media, blogs and other forums would begin to open the black box of 'treatment' into the public domain. Professor Lynn Conway's archive of a vast collection of these diverse contributions, which along with her voice at numerous conferences, and profiled in news articles and programs, including

a CBS news piece highlighting her work which has amassed thousands of viewers, sounded the alarm that about the ‘treatment’ approach employed at the Toronto clinic and reparative or conversion therapies (see <http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/TS/News/Drop%20the%20Barbie.htm>), as did Activist Andrea James’s presence at conferences, in news media, via online communities, (see *Sexology’s War on Transgender Children* <https://boingboing.net/2015/06/11/sexologys-war-on-transgender.html>), and the *Trans Advocate*’s Cristan Williams’ in depth series *The Rise and Fall of Discosexology* (see https://www.transadvocate.com/part-i-the-rise-and-fall-of-discosexology-dr-zucker-camh-conversion-therapy_n_19556.htm). Though released after the closure of the clinic, Brynn Tannehill’s *Everything you Wanted to Know about Trans (but were afraid to ask)* (2018) details includes a vast collective of information centered upon the clinic, some of which was available as independent pieces prior to publication.

While this brief mention of key trans contributor’s feels like an injustice to the extraordinary work they have done, and most certainly excludes other significant contributions, they have been included for their intense and sustained activism centered upon the clinic, and for their extensive international reach. While trans scholars have produced critiques from within the academy (Pyne, 2014; Serano, 2007; Winters, 2008), the importance of the work done by trans people outside of the academy needs to be acknowledged. Raising the connection between the ‘treatment model’ employed at the Toronto clinic, has been a concern by participants with respect to fear of reprisal (legal, professional and personal). As a result, once again, while most participants were explicit in their view that the ‘treatment’ employed at the clinic constituted reparative therapy, the

decision was made not to include specific comments from participants with respect to this connection. Despite participants having the opportunity to review and sign off on all inclusions in this thesis, for those who wished to remain anonymous the fear of including information that would identify them was a constant concern.

As voices of people who have been harmed by such treatment has always been central to this research, I did feel that it was important to include the voice of a past client.

However, this inclusion is based on a public statement made in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, Standing Committee on Justice Policy, by a former client of the Gender Identity Clinic for Children and Youth, Erika Muse, who was not a participant in this study. I do not know, nor have I met Erika Muse, but her incredible courage in coming forward to speak publicly about her experience is a courageous and self-less act that I would like to acknowledge. Muse's explicit discussion of conversion therapy as she experienced it is of profound importance to the history of the clinic. The following is an excerpt of her statement.¹¹¹

The following statement was:

I came out as trans at 16. I immediately wanted to receive treatment because earlier treatment, such as puberty blockers and other hormonal interventions, means better outcomes for trans people.

¹¹¹ For a detailed interview with Erika Muse see https://www.transadvocate.com/part-v-interview-with-zuckers-patient-the-rise-and-fall-of-discosexology-dr-zucker-camh-conversion-therapy_n_19727.htm

I was told, according to everyone I talked to for health care in my region, that I had to see a specific therapist in order to receive treatment, that he was the only option available under OHIP coverage. From the beginning, seeing him didn't feel therapeutic. There was no focus on my current issues, what was affecting my health or any-thing that was affecting me. Instead, I was asked to tell intimate, personal details in front of classes of 20 students or more. It became clear that the therapist thought my social life was dysfunctional and fixing that would fix my identity. In turn I was denied the medication I asked for that was appropriate for my age, but I had to return for more therapy. In each appointment that I came to, he would comment on newly masculinized parts of my body that had been changing due to puberty—parts he could have stopped from developing had he given me care—then asked me how I could possibly pass as a woman in my future life. He would berate me for not meeting unknown expectations and excoriated my life at that point.

Sessions were not therapeutic, but abusive. They led to trauma about my body and a lack of faith in myself. I left feeling violated and hurt (Erika Muse in the Legislative Assembly of Ontario, June 3, 2015, p.63).

Muse's words are a powerful reminder of a system and a society that failed trans people repeatedly. As one participant stated:

Imagine if we had just listened to people. (psychiatrist)

In the following section I outline the final theme that emerged in participant interviews, that of policies and legislation, because as evidenced by participant discussion

surrounding reparative or conversion therapies, for far too long, too many of those in a position of privilege simply refused to listen. Ultimately, establishing protections for trans and gender diverse children and adults has taken many voices and many forms.

5.9 Policies and Legislation

The importance of policies and legislation aimed at protecting trans and gender diverse children and adults were identified as a significant factor in facilitating a paradigm shift with respect to how trans and gender diverse people are understood in the psy disciplines, and specifically related to the death of the clinic. Yet participants also made clear that policies and legislation do not emerge in isolation, and instead reflect multiple influences which both involve and transcend spatial, temporal, disciplinary and categorical boundaries and reveal a complex *transgender policyscape* (Martino, Airton, Kuhl & Cumming-Potvin, 2018). As well, participants also discussed significant gaps with respect to the application, enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of such protections, as well as their precarity in terms of political forces which reveal how “contestatory interpretive repertoires and regimes of truth” (Martino, Airton, Kuhl & Cumming-Potvin, 2018, p.17) have been forming alliances to undermine protections for trans people. In the following section I draw on participant interviews to illuminate these complexities and discuss their implications.

Professional organizations, in terms of policies and statements condemning attempts at reparative therapies, is complex and has happened in different stages, different regions, and has varied in terms of aims and scope with respect to sexual orientation and gender identity, and statements and policies that address adults and children (see Ashley, 2019;

Nugraha, 2017; also Human Rights Campaign's *Policy and Position Statements on Conversion Therapy* at <https://www.hrc.org/resources/policy-and-position-statements-on-conversion-therapy> and for a listing of nations around the world with 'conversion therapy' bans see <https://www.equaldex.com/>).¹¹² Likewise, legislation aimed at prohibiting attempts at conversion or reparative therapies is equally complex and even more fragmented based on the regional diversity, including municipal, state, provincial, and federal jurisdictions, as well as international variance. However, the scope of such a historical tracing extends far beyond the possibilities and spatial limitations of this dissertation and chapter. However, there is condemnation of such practices that specifically address reparative and conversion therapies targeting gender identity by major organizations that influence policy and practice within the psy disciplines, including *The American Psychological Association*, *The American Psychiatric Association*, *The Canadian Psychological Association*, *The World Professional Association Transgender Health*, *The World Health Organization* (Ashley, 2019). In addition, being transgender is no longer included as a mental disorder in the International Classification of Mental Disorders (ICD), and though the diagnosis of gender dysphoria persists in the DSM, an inclusion that remains highly contentious, the diagnosis emphasizes a state of distress, not a mental disorder (Ashely, 2019; Lev, 2013; Tosh, 2016).¹¹³ Thus professional organizations that hold significant influence around the world with respect to psy and allied professions have condemned attempts at reparative

¹¹² Some bans on attempts at so called conversion or reparative therapy specifically focus on sexual orientation while others address both sexual orientation and gender expression and or identity.

¹¹³ For a discussion of the recent ICD changes see Ashley (2019).

therapies aimed at changing sexual orientation and gender identity and expression. However, legislation that protects people from such harm is far more fragmented. In Canada, for example, legislation that protects people from reparative therapies at a national level does not exist, and though individual provinces have enacted various forms of legislation, the question of scope, interpretation and enforcement further blurs the efficacy and reach of such legislation. Nonetheless, in the Ontario Context, where the Gender Identity Clinic for Children and Youth was located, legislation was identified as significant in helping to facilitate a paradigm shift as to ‘treatment’ of trans children and youth.

Bill 77, introduced by former MPP Cheri DiNovo which became known as *The Affirming Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Act* in 2015, in fact involves amendments to the *The Health Insurance Act*, and *The Regulated Health Professions Act*, 1991, which outline the qualifications of who can provide health and therapeutic services and be reimbursed by the province of Ontario the Health for their services. This is significant on multiple levels, as public discussion tends to frame this legislation as making reparative therapy ‘illegal’, yet the scope of the legislation is in fact quite specific in terms of scope of professionals to which it applies, leaving investigation and leaving enforcement up to professional colleges based on individual complaints.¹¹⁴ While this legislation was deemed significant via participant responses, it was also identified as inadequate in terms

¹¹⁴ For letter from the former Minister of Health and Long-Term Care, Eric Hoskins, outlining reporting requirements to the College of Registered Psychotherapists of Ontario see https://www.rainbowhealthontario.ca/wp-content/uploads/woocommerce_uploads/2015/04/Ministers-Letter-re-Conversion-Therapy.pdf

of the scope of protection, and in terms of ambiguity in interpretation. With respect to youth under the age of 18, the legislation reads as follows:

“29.1 (1) No person shall, in the course of providing health care services, provide any treatment that seeks to change the sexual orientation or gender identity of a person under 18 years of age

Exception

(2) The treatments mentioned in subsection (1) do not include,

a) services that provide acceptance, support or under-standing of a person or the facilitation of a person’s coping, social support or identity exploration or development; and

(b) sex-reassignment surgery or any services related to sex-reassignment surgery.

(3) Subsection (1) does not apply if the person is capable with respect to the treatment and consents to the provision of the treatment (p.2).

Di Novo discussed how those advocating for the legislation felt that it would have an impact on the ‘treatment’ approach employed at the Gender Identity Clinic for Children and Youth in Toronto which was perceived by many past clients, professionals and community members as a form of reparative or conversion therapy. She stated:

From our point of view, they would have had to shut down the clinic because of the bill. But again, it wasn't just CAMH, it was across Ontario. We heard, when I was on the GSA committee, we heard from psychiatrists whose entire

practices were devoted to turning queer folks straight, mainly in Christian fundamentalist backgrounds. But again, I'm sure it's probably still going on because again it's about the enforcement of the law not its implementation.

That there was opposition to the legislation from religious communities as well as from within the psy disciplines, and that the legislation would still leave LGBTQ+ children and adults vulnerable to so called ‘treatments’ that would target gender expression and identity, and sexual orientation was made clear by multiple participants. DiNovo expressed surprise at concerns expressed regarding the legislation in terms of interpretation and enforcement coming from an organization of psychotherapists. She stated:

one of the surprises, I think, was the Canadian Psychological Association, or Ontario. You could probably look this up.

According to the proceedings from the legislative Assembly of Ontario June 3, 2015, representatives from the Ontario College of Registered Psychotherapists did voice their concerns¹¹⁵. While the College Registrar Joyce Rowlands stated that “intentional conversion therapy is unacceptable and cannot be tolerated” (2015, p.61), Rowlands also expressed concern that the legislation would have a “chilling effect on therapists, counsellors and other practitioners who work with young clients struggling with issues of sexual orientation or gender identity” (p.61) and that “we’re also aware of the debate

¹¹⁵ See Legislative Assembly of Ontario. Proceedings from Standing Committee on Justice Policy, Bill 77 An Affirming Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Act (2015). Minutes of Proceedings. 41st Legislature, 1st session

swirling around Bill 77 with regard to sexual orientation versus gender identity and wonder whether Bill 77, in the end, may do more harm than good, possibly by cutting off funding and services for those who need them” (p.61). Rowlands also stated that “we don’t think that there is a need for legislation. We already have the tools to do it” (p.61). To Rowland’s last comment, Di Novo, responded “I wish that was borne out in the experience of all the others who have testified today. I wish it was” (p.61). While Ms. Rowland’s comments expressed disdain for conversion therapy, the explicit discussion of how attempts to alter gender identity may be distinct from attempts at altering sexual orientation is a concern. That the bill specifically provides exemptions to clinicians surrounding the issue of informed consent, and “identity exploration” makes clear that the impact of the legislation with respect to what constitutes gender reparative therapy leaves considerable room for practices that past patients have deemed harmful, and that the ascendant affirmative model rejects, to continue.

Although I did not interview Dr. Zucker for this study, I did attend the 2018 Child and Adolescent Psychiatry Annual Conference, hosted by the Schulich School of Medicine and Dentistry of the University of Western Ontario, for which Dr. Zucker was an invited speaker. The conference which was aimed at Psychiatrists, Family Physicians, Pediatricians, Psychologists, Nurses, Social Workers, Researchers, Allied Health Professionals, Educators and Administrators was approved for continuing education credits for physicians.¹¹⁶ The speakers included Dr. Zucker, Dr. Zucker’s former PhD

116

https://www.schulich.uwo.ca/psychiatry/about_us/events/2018/2018_child_and_adolescent_psychiatry_annual_conference_registration.html)

student, psychologist Dr. Devita Singh, Psychiatrist, Dr. Scott F. Leibowitz, Physician, Dr. Robert Stein, and Trans Affirmative Sexual Health Educator, Victor Feuenkes. I had the opportunity to hear most of the speakers, except Dr. Stein, due to overlapping sessions. During his session, Dr. Zucker discussed Bill 77 and how clinicians might interpret their treatment approaches in the context of the legislation, and made clear that he believes his approach is acceptable with youth under the age of 18 via his interpretation of ‘gender identity exploration’.¹¹⁷ Likewise the external review of the clinic’s programs and services included a cautiously worded statement from the reviewers that “we cannot state that the clinic does not practice reparative approaches (if not outright therapies) with respect to influencing gender identity development” (Zinck & Pignatiello 2015, p. 22).¹¹⁸

I had the opportunity during the open floor to ask Dr. Zucker two questions, the first question involved reading an excerpt from his book co-written with Dr. Bradley. The question I posed was as follows:

Dr. Zucker, in your book you write “in summary, for boys, our model proposes that gender identity disorder develops from a state of inner insecurity that arises out of the interaction between a boy’s temperamental vulnerability to high arousal and an insecure mother-child relationship.” It’s

¹¹⁷ Based on my notes taken May 4, 2018 at the conference.

¹¹⁸ Though the initial report was removed from the CAMH website I had printed a copy the day it was posted. For a detailed discussion of the report, see a report by Cristan Williams at https://www.transadvocate.com/youre-very-wrong-about-trans-kids_n_21938.htm

on page 262. You mentioned that your thinking had evolved in certain regards, is this an area where your thinking evolved?

Dr. Zucker's self-proclaimed 'longwinded response' (his words) began with the statement that his colleague Dr. Bradley had written that chapter. Yet he went on to discuss attachment theory with respect to boys and mothers, emphasizing that according to the literature it was a factor, and to emphasize developmental and psychoanalytic perspectives that did not deviate from the statement made in the book. Theories which Dr. Zucker made clear do share a common history with research aimed at preventing homosexuality.¹¹⁹ My second question:

*Do you still advocate for giving approval for any signs of masculinity? In terms of treatment it prescribes emphasizing same sex peer play dates, masculine role modeling and giving approval for any signs of masculinity - is this still treatment?*¹²⁰

Dr. Zucker responded "under Bill 77 I guess what you would have to decide is would those kinds of behaviours count as an example of identity exploration?" (Zucker in

¹¹⁹ Dr. Zucker discussed the work of Dr. George Rekers, whose stated aim and life's work was to cure homosexuality. Though Reker's involvement with NARTH ended when Reker's was outed as having hired a male escort. <https://www.miamiherald.com/news/christian-right-leader-george-rekers-takes-vacation-with-rent-boy-6377933>.

¹²⁰ The question was based upon the following statements made in Zucker and Bradley's book

"Our clinic, for example, suggests that parents not allow cross-dressing, discourage cross-gender role play and fantasy play, restrict play with cross-sex toys, tell the child that they value him as a boy, or her as a girl, encourage same sex peer relations, and help the child engage in more sex-appropriate or neutral activities. Some parents especially the well-functioning and intellectually sophisticated ones, are able to carry out these recommendations relatively easily and without ambivalence. Many parents however require ongoing support in implementing the recommendations perhaps because of their own ambivalence and reservations about gender identity issues" (1995, p. 280).

conference notes, May 4, 2018). It appears that despite the legislation being applauded as a victory against conversion or reparative therapies, Dr. Zucker does not seem to count his approach as constituting them.¹²¹ As one participant stated:

Yeah, his private practice is huge. Parents are still going to him because parents who don't want their kid to be trans – know. Yeah, he's still working in Toronto. His private practice is thriving. I know, and somebody's paying them and I'm sure it's probably OHIP (clinician).

Another participant stated that they anticipated legalistic semantics surrounding what constitutes reparative or conversion therapy to follow the legislation. Their words were tinged with sarcasm, and filled with frustration:

so it's been criminalized, we can't do what we used to do, let's come up with a new way to legitimize what we used to do, let's call it something else. But let's continue to just determine for ourselves and for other people's lives, who gets to be who they say they are, and who we're going to privilege on, not who we're going to commit human rights abuses against by interfering with the right of the human right of a child to play to exercise, play, and freedom of their expression, their gender autonomy, the genital autonomy, the right to wear the clothes, they want to play with the toys, they want to self define, just

¹²¹ In a 2018 interview, Dr. Zucker disputed claims that his clinical approach is analogous to reparative or conversion therapies and stated that he finds “the term conversion therapy is incredibly inflammatory” (Hayes, 2018).

shift in self definition, you know, multiple times throughout their childhood and adolescence, if that feels right to them (psychologist).

Ultimately, though participants identified policies and legislation as important in contributing to a paradigm shift, and discussion of Bill 77 emerged frequently, with participants identifying a complex policyscape which coalesced to facilitate change in how gender and sexual diversity are understood, not Bill 77 alone.¹²² This view contrasts significantly with claims by supporters of the clinic who framed activist driven legislation as the basis for the clinic's closure (see Bradley, in Kay 2015; Blanchard in Ubelacker, 2016). Participants also frequently expressed concern that both the limited jurisdictional scope, and interpretive 'loopholes' surrounding Bill 77 make clear that LGBTQ+ adults, youth and children remain vulnerable to attempts at conversion or reparative therapies.

5.10 Conclusion

This chapter drew on interview data from participants to trace how a paradigm shift has emerged within the psy disciplines with respect to childhood gender diversity, while also making clear that this paradigm shift is complex and has emerged via the psy disciplines, trans specific activism, policies and legislation. In the spirit of bricolage, the focus has not been to narrow or to isolate phenomena but rather to shift the gaze onto knowledge production and to make clear the webs of complexity, the power relations involved, and above all, to privilege the voices of those who have been excluded from knowledge

¹²² For Policyscape reference see: Martino, Airtton, Kuhl & Cumming-Potivn (2018) Mapping transgender policyscapes: a policy analysis of transgender inclusivity in the education system in Ontario

construction about their own lives. It has not strictly been a theoretical examination of de-subjugation knowledges, it has been the witnessing of and a documenting of them.

Chapter 5

6 From Epistemic Violence to Epistemic Justice: Reflections on the Death of the Clinic

The subject should not be entirely abandoned. It should be reconsidered, not to restore the theme of an originating subject, but to seize its functions, its intervention in discourse and its system of dependencies. (Foucault, in Bouchard, 1977, p. 137)

6.1 Introduction

In this chapter I reflect on the specific role of bricolage in this research, and how it was a necessary framework for conducting this research. I discuss how my engagement with it involved ‘genealogical thinking’ at each stage of the research process, and resulted in a work that makes clear that ‘The Death of The Clinic’ was a heterogeneous event spanning decades, and that it involved activists, scholars and clinicians from around the world representing diverse experiences, located across diverse disciplines, and entailing diverse approaches to trans-informing the clinical gaze. I discuss how such complexity can pose challenges when conducting research, yet the ethical-political dimensions of bricolage were essential to the purpose, process and results of this research. I also make clear that while the clinic served as an initial point of examination, the results include a “genealogical diagnosis” (Koopman, 2013, p. 173) that examines the etiology of oppressive systems of knowledge production, while also mapping the complexities for what Foucault deemed a “curative science” (1977, p. 156). I also discuss possible future directions, and caution that while the ‘Death of The Clinic’ marked an historic paradigm shift, the systems that gave rise to the powers of the clinic continue to hold privilege, and

pose an existential threat to trans people and resist the “democratization of knowledge and power” (Kincheloe, 2008, p. 206).

6.2 Reflections on Bricolage

Returning to Wibberley’s question “what makes bricolage an acceptable format for academic work generally and in particular a PhD dissertation (2012, p. 6), while I will address the potential for bricolage beyond this thesis, in the following section I highlight how bricolage was deployed in this research.

First, by employing a genealogically informed approach to this research, each stage of this research was informed by Foucault’s genealogical methods (1977, 1980, 1984, 2003), those who have written extensively on genealogy (Kendall & Wickham, 1999, Koopman, 2013; May, 1993; O’Farrell, 2005; Sawicki, 1991), those who have written about genealogical approaches in the context of psychology and health care (Arribas-Ayllon & Walkerdine, 2017; Fadyl, Nicholls & McPherson, 2008; Hook, 2005; Parker, 2007; Powers, 2001; Nicholls, 2008) as well as the works of scholars who conducted genealogies of the emergence of pathologizing diagnoses (Tosh, 2016), those who ethnographic approaches were genealogically informed (Martino, 2003; Tamboukou, 2003; Tamboukou & Ball, 2003; Tosh, 2016), and scholars whose work advocates for genealogically informed approaches in the context of bricolage (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Kincheloe, 2001, 2005). In this sense, while this work is not ‘a genealogy’ in a strict sense given the diversity of theories, methodologies and approaches employed, it is a work that is guided by genealogical thinking throughout; from problematizing discourses and expectations regarding what constitutes ‘acceptable’ literature reviews, deployment

of theories, methodology, methods, and the elicitation and construction of data, to illuminating the “conditions of possibility” (Foucault, 1965/2005, p. xxiv) that led to the emergence of and eventual closure of the clinic. In this sense, while the death of the clinic was the initial target of examination, the bricolage of genealogical thinking and approaches employed resulted in a work that provides meta -epistemic, meta-theoretical and meta-methodological insights, yet also serving as an “epistemic tool that allows us access to our micropolitical world” (May, 1995, p.118). This is important because criticism that employing bricolage is an indicator that “you don’t know anything about research but have a lot to say about it” (Kincheloe, 2001, p. 680), fails to recognize that ‘having a great deal to say about research’ requires knowing a great deal about it. This is echoed by Kincheloe and Berry (2004) who respond to such criticism by asserting that:

There is an impudent dimension to the bricolage that says, ‘Who said research has to be done this way?’ Such impudence is based on a cynicism toward the notion that monological, ordered methods get us to the ‘right place’ in academic research. To say it once more with feeling: we should use the methods that are best suited to answering our questions about a phenomenon. For the bricoleur to use the means at hand, the methods that exist, demands that the researcher be aware of them. Such awareness demands that the bricoleur devote time for rigorous study of what approaches to research are out there and to how they might be applied in relation to other methods. Do not be deceived, this is no easy task that can be accomplished in a doctoral programme or a postdoctoral fellowship (Thomas, 1998).

Becoming a bricoleur who is knowledgeable of multiple research methodologies and their use is a lifetime endeavour (p. 4)

While Kincheloe and Berry make clear that the depth and complexity of knowledge and skills required to engage in bricolage are significant, and arguably difficult within the context of a doctoral thesis, I have detailed the extent of depth and complexity that I have engaged with throughout each stage of the research process. I did not, as O'Farrell cautions, "simply sprinkle all the right key words such as genealogy, power, discourse or panopticism at strategic intervals throughout one's text" (2005, p. 52). Rather I made clear that from literature reviews to methodologies to the data chapters, that the systems of knowledge production, the expectations surrounding what constitutes 'official knowledge' involved not simply citing the canons at each stage of the research process, but painstakingly sourcing the critiques of them, and extending my own. Even in the literature review, I was concerned to foreground the expectations for citing the canons and how conducting a 'a proper' literature has functioned to re-inscribe the power of the clinic and has excluded the very people whose lives were the targets of pathologization. In extension, while this dissertation 'has a great deal to say about research' such problematization was necessary to examine a phenomenon such as the clinic, which extends far beyond the boundaries of a singular institution.

The collaborative nature of this research is clear in the fact that chapter four, The case within the case: A Micro-genealogy of Epistemic Violence Against Trans Women, emerged directly as a result of listening to and engaging in dialogue with participants about their experiences, about what their thoughts on the theorizations on epistemic

violence, and what they would like to see as an outcome from this research. This also speaks to the importance of the specific sources I located which spoke to the possibilities and importance of weaving together genealogical and ethnographic analyses (Tamboukou, 2003). Had this dissertation strictly been ‘a genealogy’, the historical and archival emphasis that exemplify a complete genealogy, while important and addressed, would not have led to this development, and would have contributed to the exclusion of their voices about their history. Likewise, Chapter five, Mounting and Epistemic Insurrection, should not be measured as an ethnography, for it is not. While I addressed the complexity of notions of ‘culture’ in chapter 5, it is important to reiterate that the ‘culture’ of participants was never a target for analysis. Instead, the focus of chapter five was to illuminate the emergence of a paradigm shift via the voices of a heterogeneous group of experts. Once again, making clear that detailed methodological knowledge was required to achieve these aims; achievements that once again would not have been possible via a compartmentalized approach to genealogy and ethnography.

Returning to my research questions, a genealogically informed case study examining the significance of the Gender Identity Clinic at CAMH (including identifying key figures and clinical literature associated with it) made clear the emergence of the clinic, and its former director, Dr. Ken Zucker, as the leading expert on childhood gender diversity in the world, was a heterogeneous process spanning decades and involving networks of actors and systems. By employing the theorizations of epistemic violence, the tactics and strategies of power which coalesced around the clinic were made visible, including (but not limited to) the invisible college, the Archives of Sexual Behavior, the weaponization

of scientific discourse to shroud bias, the construction of a false binary between ‘science’ and ‘activism’, and attempts to de-legitimate trans voices via pathologization.

By conducting a genealogically and ethnographically informed case study examining how activists, scholars and clinicians were able to trans-inform the clinical gaze, cyber communities, insiders and allies in the academies, education, the 'treatment' – reparative therapy linkage, and a complex polycscape emerged in participant narratives as contributing to a paradigm shift with respect to how childhood gender diversity is understood and approached within psychology and the clinical field.¹²³ Yet participants also made clear that this paradigm shift is fraught with tensions, within and beyond the psy disciplines. Alliances between religious organizations that oppose gender and sexual diversity, conservative political groups, trans exclusionary feminist networks, supporters of the clinic, and governments whose base has responded to trans visibility and recognition with intense opposition have also coalesced in different ways which pose an existential threat to trans people. The clinic may have closed, but its zeitgeist continues to haunt trans people.¹²⁴

Bricolage, as I have employed in this thesis, is also an ethical political commitment to praxis which Tiernay & Sallee (2008) define as follows:

¹²³ For Polycscape discussion see Martino, Airton, Kuhl & Cumming-Potvin (2018)

¹²⁴ See article by Molina, 21 August, 2019, discussing the Ontario Provincial Government’s erasure of trans children from the previous Health and Physical Education, which the government promised to remove during their campaign, and illuminating the political targeting and erasure of trans students in the context of Ontario remains a concern. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/ottawa/mixed-reaction-ontario-sex-ed-curriculum-1.5254757>

Praxis refers to a particular philosophy used to guide and conduct research. Like action researchers, those who engage in praxis-oriented research involve the community or group under study in the research process. However, praxis is distinct in that its explicit goal is to empower marginalized peoples and help them challenge their oppression. Engaging in praxis is not a path for the hurried researcher interested only in quickly collecting and analyzing data. Praxis-based research is a long process that involves establishing mutually beneficial relationships between the researcher and members of the community of study. Though the effort and time investment may be great, the payoff has the potential to be huge. By engaging in collaborative research, researchers may help participants acquire the critical tools to transform their own lives (p. 676).

Feminist epistemologist, Dr. Heidi Grasswick, discusses the harm that scientific communities have enacted against marginalized groups via the knowledge that has been constructed about them and without them. She highlights the need for those who seek to work with marginalized groups to recognize the importance of earning epistemic trust. According to Grasswick (2017), “Well placed epistemic trust depends on the sincerity of the testifier toward a potential truster in a particular context, and a shared understanding of the goals of the particular epistemic enterprise that drive some of the decisions throughout inquiry” (Grasswick, 2017, p. 626).

Given the legacy of harm that has been enacted against trans people by the psychology disciplines and cisgender accounts and appropriation of trans people’s experiences,

building epistemic trust with trans activists and scholars required making clear my own engagement in trans activism and scholarship, and how it was guided by bricolage as a conceptual framework. While the concept was unfamiliar to most participants, sharing information about the ethical, political and participatory demands of bricolage was an important step in making clear the purpose and processes that guided this research. It required personal disclosure about why, as a cisgender researcher, I was doing this research - it involved making clear that I considered the legacy of harm enacted against trans people a form of epistemic violence and sharing and discussing the theorizations and methodologies that I intended to employ.

It also involved making clear that bricolage was participatory, both in terms of ensuring participants that they would have authority over their representation, but also making clear that despite the aims and scope of my proposed research, bricolage is also intended to be responsive, and as outlined in chapter 4, the collaborative shift that emerged in highlighting the ‘case within the case’ was of profound importance. This process took time. As initial invitations went out to potential participants, the silence was terrifying. I spent months checking my in box and seeing that being ‘nobody’ in terms of my limited scholarship and visibility in relation to trans activism and my rather limited number of publications undoubtedly evoked well-founded suspicion of my motives.

Social media played an important role in trying to fill in some unknowns about whether or not I warranted people’s epistemic trust. As awareness of the study proliferated on social media (I had REB authorization for a social media recruitment poster) one of the first questions I was asked by a potential participant was “Are you trans?” I responded

with an apology that I was not. My heart sank because I knew that for so many trans people this would be a red flag. As discussed in Chapter 5, in my reflections on the blog post: Fuck You and Fuck Your Thesis, I was aware that being a cisgender researcher conducting a study dealing with a legacy of harm against trans people was problematic. Yet I was also aware of the frustration of trans people with cisgender folks who remained silent when trans people have been under assault. However, in praxis-based research such as bricolage, it is fundamentally important that the research I was engaging in could offer something of value to the people that shared their voices with me, most importantly to trans and gender diverse people who have been to targets of so much harm.

While I have engaged in what could be termed trans-affirmative scholarship, though I explicitly aim for anti-oppressive scholarship, I do not consider myself a trans scholar. What I believe to have been able to offer is a work that problematizes not only the psy disciplines and a legacy of harm enacted by the clinic for trans and gender diverse people but which makes visible how a lack of epistemological awareness, epistemological hierarchies and methodologism have enabled epistemic violence against trans people. Despite the fact that the Canadian Professional Association for Transgender Health (CPATH) released Ethical Guidelines for Research Involving Transgender People and Communities on August 1, 2019, just a few weeks before the completion of this thesis, these guidelines while immensely important for trans community members, share much in common with the epistemological requirements of bricolage. However, given that such guidelines do not address the epistemological and methodological considerations bricolage attends to, and which this research has made clear, vis-a-vis epistemic violence, there are certain problematics that remain with respect to the need to understand the

effects of certain knowledge power relations and how they are enacted through the conduct of research. Such critical frameworks are necessary especially given the historical legacy of pathologization and the harm that it has enacted against trans people. In this respect, my research and my reflections on the role of bricolage are intended to illuminate the potential for bricolage as a framework for advancing epistemic justice,

While my commitment to and belief in bricolage has been unwavering, it has not been without challenges. The knowledge required to engage with bricolage in the context of this research has been vast, requiring a deep understanding of the psy disciplines (epistemologies, theories, methodologies, clinical literature, and key figures), critical, feminist, queer and trans epistemologies and history (given the imbricated legacy of pathologizing women and gender and sexual diversity), critical psychology (theories and methodologies), philosophy of science (ontology, epistemology , axiology and rhetoric), psy discourse in education, lack of epistemological awareness in education, and gender in education (from theories to policies and practice). Absorbing, critiquing and synthesizing this corpus of literature was not an easy task, nor was it done in isolation. Having the support of a diverse range of activists and scholars that I learned from and was able to engage in dialogue with was essential. Building epistemic trust requires openness, transparency, support networks, and a significant commitment in time, and to the people that were willing to share their time, experiences and expertise with me.

For this research, it was also important that I had sufficient understanding of the psy disciplines, which given my background in psychology (academically and professionally) was possible. Having completed extensive graduate coursework in educational

psychology, I recognized the extent to which a deeply psychologized view of children has proliferated in education (Teo, 2015). As well, having completed extensive coursework in gender theories, I have been able to bring these bodies of literature into dialogue. The most challenging aspect of bricolage, has been in the additional expectations that employing it has required, for unlike research that simply employs a specific theoretical or methodological approach, the extent of justification required was exponential; what is bricolage, why is it suitable, how is it being employed, why these methodologies, why that way, are questions to be anticipated. Balancing the expectations of what to cite, seemed at times to take precedence over just sharing what participants felt needed to be said. This was not the first time that I employed bricolage in a study, but the scale of this research was exponentially greater. While I would assert that bricolage was an essential framework for this thesis, Kincheloe's caution that engaging with bricolage would be challenging in the context of a doctoral thesis is an assertion that I would concur with, though would defiantly proceed with again.

In the following section engage on some important reflections regarding this research that are not directly related to bricolage, including the political landscape surrounding this research.

6.3 Reflections on this Research

Like Kincheloe and Berry, I viewed the notion of 'impudence' as an ethical commitment to challenging the authoritative voices and systems of knowledge production given my knowledge of the pathologizing clinical literature that underpinned and flowed from the clinic. Yet through the research process, my initial knowledge of the literature was

brought to life via the voices of people who have been targets of pathologizing literature, those who challenged it, and from observing the intense resistance to their voices by supporters of the clinic. I was not prepared for the extent to which fear of challenging authoritative voices and systems would emerge; both from participants, and myself. While not included as a theme in Chapter five because the focus was on how participant narratives illuminated specific themes as central to the paradigm shift which contributed to the death of the clinic, the notion of fear was certainly present.

A number of participants expressed concern that critiquing the clinical literature, key figures, and hierarchies of knowledge production would incite push back from supporters of the clinic, something that they knew to happen both via rebuttals of any criticisms in formal venues such as journals and via media and social media engagement that extended far beyond the clinic to a social conservative backlash against increasing recognition of the rights of trans people, particularly in the context of education. They were also aware of threats of and specific legal action targeting those who have been publicly critical of Ken Zucker, his ‘treatment’ approach, and for documenting reports of abuse experienced by past clients.¹²⁵ This concern was also identified as a reason for feeling unable to contribute to this study. Lack of resources required to defend oneself against potential

¹²⁵ Lynn Conway was threatened with legal action for publishing criticism of Dr. Zucker and specifically that an article posted on her website that contained a link to allegations of abuse by Dr. Zucker. See http://ai.eecs.umich.edu/people/conway/TS/News/US/Zucker/Kenneth_Zucker%27s_pattern_of_silencing_transgender_critics.html

Jake Pyne was subjected to legal action by Ken Zucker for an article he wrote in 2015. The outcome of the legal action was not made public, but the article which was central to the litigation remains posted, without revision or retraction from the original. See <https://www.thestar.com/opinion/commentary/2015/12/17/discredited-treatment-of-trans-kids-at-camh-shouldnt-shock-us.html>

legal action was part of this concern, but participants also identified knowledge of or experience with trolling and various harassing treatment by supporters of the clinic.¹²⁶

As highlighted in the previous section, the engagement by certain members of the invisible college with conservative media, and involvement in events and campaigns which promote transphobic views has proliferated since the closure of the clinic. Due to confidentiality it is not possible to discuss concerns in detail. However, the reality that participating in this study was a source of fear or concern for some participants because of fear of trolling, harassment and legal action was certainly omnipresent throughout this research, both for participants and for myself. Certain members of the invisible college regularly post (via their publicly accessible twitter feeds) articles, theses and dissertations that circulate to be mocked in conservative circles, and as noted in Alice Dreger's 'case history' in the special issue of *Archives* which was examined in chapter 4, clinicians had t-shirts made mocking Andrea James for posting her theorizations on the imbricated relations between clinicians to illuminate the power networks associated with the as yet unnamed notion of an invisible college.¹²⁷¹²⁸ The reality that clinicians would have t-shirts made to mock a trans woman no matter how they personally felt about Ms. James is deeply disturbing.

¹²⁶ To be clear, 'supporters of the clinic' does not necessarily mean current or past professionals associated with CAMH and refers to a heterogeneous group of individuals who have publicly espoused views that disparage or negate the existence of trans people and who have expressed support for the pathologized views of trans and gender diverse people that flowed from the clinic, and who frame trans activists and frame the views of trans-affirmative activists and scholars as an attack on reason and science.

¹²⁷ I have taken screen shots of publicly accessible tweets.

¹²⁸ See Dreger (2008).

Related to this theme, to which I will return momentarily, is the reality that given the vast amount of data accumulated it was not possible to include more detail from each participant, or as in the case of chapter four, include more data from the special issue of Archives which I examined in chapter four. During my interview with Lynn Conway, who has extraordinary depth of knowledge about trans history, clinical literature, epistemology and research methodologies, she asserted that the notion of the invisible college was far more complex than could be articulated in the scope of this thesis.¹²⁹ She outlined how Dr. Paul McHugh, former head of psychiatry at John's Hopkins University, has had a prolific influence on the promotion of anti-trans views as 'science'.¹³⁰ McHugh, a member of the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences, a division of which published Bailey's book, is cited by Bailey in reference to McHugh's claim that trans gender people are mentally ill. Bailey writes:

McHugh's concerns are worth taking seriously. Consider the case of the man erotically obsessed with having his leg amputated. Would it be advisable or even ethical to remove the leg? And McHugh is correct that interest in sex reassignment medicine has far exceeded interest in changing the minds of transsexual people so they do not want to change their sex (Bailey, pp 206-207).

¹²⁹ Note: Lynn Conway was among the participants who chose to be identified in this thesis.

¹³⁰ In 2017, American Human Rights Campaign launched a website "Debnking the Junk Science of Paul McHugh see <https://www.hrc.org/press/mchugh-exposed-hrc-launches-website-debunking-the-junk-science-of-paul-mchu>

While Alice Dreger's 'case history' (defense) of Michael Bailey attempts to create distance between Bailey and McHugh, citing instances where the two have disagreed (see Dreger, 2008), in 2018, The American College of Pediatricians, an official sounding organization with a small number of members which has been designated as a hate group by the Southern Poverty Law Centre, posted a letter to the Acting Attorney General of the US Department of Justice, the Secretary of health and Human Services and the Secretary of Education.¹³¹¹³² The letter which begins with:

Dear Mr. Whitaker, Secretary Azar, and Secretary DeVos,

We the undersigned medical, legal, and policy organizations and individuals applaud the Trump Administrations intention to uphold the scientific definition of sex in federal law and policy, such as that girls and women will regain their sex-based legal protection and the human rights of all will be preserved.

The letter goes on to include statements including:

Boys, for example are literally running away with state level championship titles in girls' sports because the identity as transgender.

And:

¹³¹ A pdf of the letter is no longer accessible on the American College of Pediatricians, however the letter content remains, both in the form of a press release and an i-petition which continues to list the letter and names of McHugh, Bailey, Bradley and other clinicians see <https://www.ipetitions.com/petition/uphold-the-scientific-defintion-of-sex>

¹³² Southern Poverty Law Centre Statement on The American College of Pediatricians <https://www.splcenter.org/fighting-hate/extremist-files/group/american-college-pediatricians>

Of greater concern, gender identity has been used to allow biological males in spaces previously reserved for women. As a result, girls and women are suffering sexual assaults at the hands of biological men in women's shelters, women's prisons, and even elementary school girls' bathrooms.

The letter which misgenders trans people and frames them as both mentally ill and as posing a threat to girls, boys, and women, is signed by Paul McHugh, J. Michael Bailey, and former psychiatrist from the Gender identity Clinic for Children and Youth at the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health, Dr. Susan Bradley.¹³³¹³⁴ The deployment of clinical literature that is framed as a current reflection of clinical perspectives on trans and gender diverse children is cause for concern. In Canada, conservative catholic websites such as *Life Site News*, and *The Catholic Register* cite Dr. Zucker's approach to 'treating' transgender children, and frame trans people as mentally ill, which is not a reflection of current best practices to frame trans adults and children as mentally ill.¹³⁵¹³⁶ As well, resistance to supporting trans and gender diverse children in Catholic Schools

¹³³ Susan Bradley is co-author with Ken Zucker of *Gender Identity Disorder in Childhood and Psychosexual Problems in Children and Adolescents* (1995),

¹³⁴ For two discussions surrounding the letter issued by the American College of Pediatricians see article by Psychiatrist Jack Turban, as well as another By Alex Bollinger which specifically discusses Dr. Bradley and CAMH <https://www.psychologytoday.com/ca/blog/political-minds/201705/the-american-college-pediatricians-is-anti-lgbt-groupby> <https://www.lgbtqnation.com/2018/12/fake-medical-group-lobbying-trump-actually-hate-group-disguise/>

¹³⁵ See article by Liane Laurence, Thu Dec 14, 2017 <https://www.lifesitenews.com/tags/tag/kenneth+zucker>

¹³⁶ See article by Glen Argan, Nov 24, 2016 <https://www.catholicregister.org/opinion/columnists/item/23664-opinion-church-must-reach-out-on-gender-issues>

remains an ongoing concern, despite policy and legislation requirements for inclusive and affirmative school environments for trans students.¹³⁷

In my own community I became aware of a local catholic school planning to host an event with Dr. Leonard Sax. I had become familiar with Sax's conservative views regarding gender, authoritarian parenting, and as someone who blames teachers, parents and society for 'feminizing' boys, yet I discovered that Sax had begun to engage in interviews that disparaged trans children. In one video, Sax states "it is malpractice to put a boy in a dress, call him Emily and cut off his balls", and he goes on to laugh with the host and make ignorant, inflammatory and harmful claims about transgender children and cite Dr. Zucker as 'proof' that trans children are not trans, they are mentally ill, or victims of 'gender ideology'.¹³⁸ The event was cancelled, following public concerns, however other instances of anti-trans literature proliferating in schools has been brought to my attention via my activism in my community. These webs of relations between pathologizing and harmful views of gender being taken as current clinical view of trans students is deeply disturbing. Though the 'Death of the Clinic' was cause for celebration for trans people who have been harmed by pathologizing views, the media engagement and conservative uptake of clinical literature that is not best practice is cause for concern.

¹³⁷ See Caroline Alphonso, 25 Aug, 2019 <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/canada/toronto/article-toronto-catholic-district-school-board-deciding-whether-to-include/>

¹³⁸ See video of Leonard Sax discussing trans children and Dr. Ken Zucker <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=VMb2xafRMxU&t=589s>

6.4 Implications of This Research

The complexity and scope of this research point to a diversity of implications resulting from it. The lack of epistemological awareness in the psy disciplines (see Fox, Prillettensky & Austin 2009; Teo, 2010, 2011, 2017; Willig & Stainton-Rogers, 2008) is cause for concern given the extent to which examining clinical literature and knowledge claims in light of multiple theorizations on epistemic injustice violence (Fricker, 2007, McKinnon, 2017; Namaste, 200, 2009; Teo, 2010, 2011, 2017) revealed how discourses of 'objectivity' shrouded profound bias in line with the views of the researcher and was deployed to invoke an authoritative stance to “engender expertise and social status in researchers and practitioners who used these models” (Liebert, 2014, p. 1328) and to delegitimize or erase the voices of trans people who were the targets of inquiry and pathologization. Clinical psychology is dominated by a “Scientist-practitioner” (Harper, 2008, p.430) approach, which is “wedded to quantitative research methods drawing on an implicit naively realist epistemology, and yet on the other hand, many commentators note the similarities between the kinds of analysis undertaken in qualitative research and the judgements practitioners have to make” (p. 430). The quantitative hegemony in clinical psychology is so profound that a review of almost 500 publications from top ranked journals from the American Psychological Association (APA) found that “97.6 % solely used quantitative methods” (Harper, 2008, p. 433), and as recently as 2017, the APA Task Force on Resources for the Publication of Qualitative Research of the Society for Qualitative Inquiry in Psychology found that “Graduate-level education in qualitative methods is relatively recent and still rare within American psychology” (Levitt, Motulsky, Wertz, Morrow, & Ponterotto et. al., 2017, p. 3). some reviewers. The authors

add that this impacts publications further in that “some reviewers seek detailed information on investigators’ reflexivity (examining their own process of engagement) or ontological/epistemological framework, whereas others discourage the inclusion of this information. Authors are left uncertain and may be penalized for either inclusions or omissions. (p.5). Ponterotto, Kuriakose and Granovskaya (2008), discuss how despite strong qualitative foundations, emphasis on qualitative approaches in counselling and psychotherapy have declined tremendously and quantitative approaches have come to dominating these disciplines as well. A meta-analysis of over 350 publications in these domains "found that less than 5% of these studies relied on qualitative methods” (p. 457).¹³⁹ The authors also outlined how graduate programs in counselling and psychotherapy rarely required training in qualitative research, and little attention is paid to epistemological discussion, and of ‘interpretive’ paradigms employed, post-structural perspectives were scarce.¹⁴⁰ Brown, Wiendels and Eyre (2019) note that “Social justice has become increasingly recognized in the training of counsellors and psychotherapists”(p.1) however it is unknown to what extent epistemological considerations are understood and reflected. Given the pathologizing clinical literature examined in this study which places considerable emphasis on psychoanalytic theory, a

¹³⁹ Note Ponteretto et al (2008) discuss how the terms ‘counselling’ and ‘psychotherapy’ pose some challenges in terms of how they are deployed. While sometimes viewed as separate branches of psychology, their imbricated status in terms of defining programs, content, and publications led them to examine qualitative research in these domains collectively.

¹⁴⁰ Ponteretto et al. (2008) highlight that their research which examined the prevalence of qualitative research requirements in graduate programs in counselling and psychotherapy strictly focused on analysis of American graduate programs, which raises questions as to the extent of qualitative research training in counselling and psychotherapy around the world. They do state that qualitative research requirements is are noted as more prevalent in the UK.

question that emerges as to how psychoanalytic traditions continue to inform perspectives in counselling and psychotherapy, particularly with respect to attachment theory and gender (see Gergen, 2008).¹⁴¹ are informed with respect to gender and sexual diversity? As well, while social justice concepts may be emerging as relevant, given the prevalence and effects of what Teo (2010, 2011) discussed as a hermeneutic surplus in the clinical literature being framed as ‘objective science’ remains a concern.

Similar claims have been made regarding the limited prevalence and understanding of epistemological issues in graduate theses in education (Koro-Ljungberg, Yendol-Hoppey, Smith, & Hayes). Given participant emphasis on the importance of education for understanding and supporting trans and gender diverse children, this lack of epistemological understanding raises concern given the privileged status of psychologized views of childhood (Teo, 2017), and the status and discourses of evidence-based research (Biesta, 2007). As one participant asserted, their experience delivering training to educators surrounding gender and sexual diversity frequently involved educators seeking and privileging scientific discourses over the lived experiences of people. While a paradigm shift appears to have emerged in relation to how childhood gender diversity is recognized in organizations like the American Psychological Association and The American Psychiatric Association, resistance to trans equality and de-pathologization has not disappeared. As discussed in the previous section of this

¹⁴¹ Gergen’s (2008) discussion of attachment theory in relation to feminism in psychology in a positive light, suggesting “Often case studies are used to explicate issues of identity and the conflicts that arise between desires for connection and the societal requirements to be individuated. Through the stories of various clients, means for finding resolution through relational themes are examined” (p. 284), yet the interpretations of attachment theory have been central to the pathologization of trans and gender diverse children and their mothers.

chapter, conservative and religious groups are selectively invoking claims from ‘psychology’ which often include views that are not best practice, thus critical discussion of gender, epistemology, and social justice must work in tandem with a political commitment to critiquing knowledge and the systems of its production.

Participants also made clear that policies and legislation have proven to be a paradox. While of vital importance to facilitating shifts in to how trans and gender children are understood and supported, the psy disciplines coalesce with education and vice versa. Legislation introduced by the previous Ontario Liberal government which established inclusion of trans and gender diverse students in the Physical and Health Education Curriculum, became a political issue in the 2018, provincial election and Rob Ford, leader of the conservative party of Ontario promised to repeal the curriculum that conservative groups framed as ‘controversial’. After a year of public protest, much of the curriculum is to be reinstated, with the exception of discussing gender and sexual diversity in elementary schools until grade eight, in effect erasing trans and gender diverse children and their families as a result of public opposition to their recognition. Yet given Ontario Human rights Legislation which was also introduced by the previous government, tensions exist among school boards, educators and the public with respect to official requirements and protections for trans and gender diverse students, as well as trans and gender diverse educators, and educators who support their students and colleagues when government actions, policies and curriculum have created uncertainty. As opposition to trans recognition has employed outdated clinical literature that frames gender and sexual diversity in pathologizing terms, this research provides insight as to the importance of interdisciplinary dialogue that attends to the imbricated relationship

between psy discourse and education. As one participant, a psychiatrist stated, *“it’s really the adult population who weren’t given the understanding about gender who really struggle with the issues. These messages, they’re not just helpful for transgender kids, they are helpful for all of the kids, and the adults as well (Psychiatrist)”*

6.5 Conclusion

This research has been an extraordinary journey, both academically and personally. Having the opportunity to learn from and be welcomed so openly by such a diverse group of activists and scholars from around the world was beyond any expectation that I held as a cisgender researcher who lives in a small quasi rural environment that most people who I spoke with had never heard of. I was afraid of how I would be received when I started this research, and I have been afraid at times as to the potential backlash that it may evoke. Yet I have grown from their wisdom, insights and courage, and I hope that in some small way this dissertation gives back to them. I end this thesis with some trepidation, about what I have written, about what is next, and tinged with some sadness that I wasn’t able to say all that needed to be said, and more importantly, share all that participants trusted me with. I have such tremendous respect for the courage that the participants I got to know had in working to trans-inform the clinical gaze. I am reminded that ‘throwing a brick’ against the systems that have harmed trans people is not without

risk.¹⁴² The prospect of being trolled, harassed or sued is incredibly scary, and Lynn Conway cautioned:

They will pounce. You can predict they will pounce because their world is a bubble. You can almost predict what they will do. For so long they owned the territory in which you could publish. They had a lock on publishing, and they could discount anything anyone else published. That's over now, but that doesn't mean they aren't going to push back. They will, but we won (Lynn Conway).

The epistemic violence that trans people have been subjected to cannot be met with silence. This is my brick.

¹⁴² Throwing a brick refers to Rachel McKinnon's work on allies and epistemic injustice (2017)

References

- Anderssen, E. (2016, February 14). Gender identity debate swirls over CAMH psychologist, transgender program. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/toronto/gender-identity-debate-swirls-over-camh-psychologist-transgender-program/article28758828/>
- Arribas-Ayllon, M., & Walkerdine, V. (2017). Foucauldian discourse analysis. In C. Willig & W. Stainton Rogers, *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research in Psychology* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE.
- Ashley, F. (2019a). Science has always been ideological, you just don't see It. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 48(6), 1655-1657. doi: 10.1007/s10508-019-01519-7
- Ashley, F. (2019b). *Outlawing trans reparative therapy* (Master's Thesis). McGill University.
- Bailey, J. (2003). *The man who would be queen*. Washington, D.C.: Joseph Henry Press.
- Bailey, J. (2019). How to Ruin Sex Research. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 48(4), 1007-1011. doi: 10.1007/s10508-019-1420-y
- Bieber, I., & Bieber, T. (1979). Male Homosexuality. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 24(5), 409-421. doi: 10.1177/070674377902400507
- Blanchard, R. (1985). Typology of male-to-female transsexualism. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 14(3), 247-261. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/bf01542107>

- Bowler, G.M. (2010). Netnography: A method specifically designed to study cultures and communities online. *The Qualitative Report*, 15(5), 1270-1275.
<http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR15-5/kozinets.pdf>
- Bradley, S., Gillian, D., Olive, G., Chernick, A, & Zucker, K. (1998). Experiment of nurture: Ablatio penis at 2 months, sex reassignment at 7 months, and psychosexual follow up in young adulthood. *Pediatrics*, 102(1), 1-5.
- Brown, J., Wiendels, S., & Eyre, V. (2019). Social justice competencies for counselling and psychotherapy: Perceptions of experienced practitioners and implications for contemporary practice. *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research*. doi: 10.1002/capr.12247
- Bryant, K. (2007). *The politics of pathology and the making of gender identity disorder* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of California, Santa Barbara.
- Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2011). *Research methods in education* (7th ed.). New York: Routledge
- Colapinto, J. (2013). *As nature made him: The boy who was raised as a girl*. Harper Collins E-books.
<https://play.google.com/books/reader?printsec=frontcover&output=reader&id=wd633hMM2AAC&pg=GBS.PP1>
- Creswell, J., & Creswell, J. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (2005). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (2011). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Diamond, M., & Sigmundson, H.K. (1997). Sex reassignment at birth: Long-term review and clinical implications. *Archives of Pediatric Medicine*, 151, 298-304.
- Down, B., & Smyth, J. (2012). *Critical voices in teacher education*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Dreyfus, H., Rabinow, P., & Foucault, M. (1983). *Michel Foucault, beyond structuralism and hermeneutics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Elliott, P. (2010) Debates in transgender, queer and feminist theory: Contested Sites, Abington, Oxfordshire: Routledge
- Espelage, D. (2016). Sexual orientation and gender identity in schools: A call for more research in school psychology- No more excuses. *Journal of School Psychology*, 54, 5-8. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2015.11.002>
- Fadyl, J., Nicholls, D., & McPherson, K. (2012). Interrogating discourse: The application of Foucault's methodological discussion to specific inquiry. *Health: An Interdisciplinary Journal For The Social Study Of Health, Illness And Medicine*, 17(5), 478-494. doi: 10.1177/1363459312464073
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five misunderstandings about case-study research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(2), 219-245. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1077800405284363>

- Foucault, M. (1965). *Madness and civilization*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1977). Language, counter-memory, practice. In Bouchard, D, (Ed.),
Bouchard, D. & Simon, S. (Trans.). Ithica: Cornell University Press.
- Foucault, M. (1978). *Foucault's history of sexuality*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish*. New York: Vintage Books.(Original book
published 1977).
- Foucault, M. (2003). *The birth of the clinic*. London: Routledge.
- Foucault, M., Burchell, G., Gordon, C., & Miller, P. (1991). *The Foucault effect* (1st ed.).
Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M., Martin, L., Gutman, H., & Hutton, P. (1988). *Technologies of the self*.
London: Tavistock.
- Foucault, M., & Faubion, J. (2000). *Power*. New York: New Press.
- Foucault, M., & Gordon, C. (1980). *Power/knowledge*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M., & Rabinow, P. (1984). *The Foucault reader*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Fricker, M. (2007). *Epistemic injustice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gemignani, M., & Hernández-Albújar, Y. (2019). Critical Reflexivity and
Intersectionality in Human Rights: Toward Relational and Process-Based
Conceptualizations and Practices in Psychology. *European Psychologist*, 24(2),
136-145.

- Gemignani, M. (2017). Toward a critical reflexivity in qualitative inquiry: Relational and posthumanist reflections on realism, researcher's centrality, and representationalism in reflexivity. *Qualitative Psychology*, 4(2), 185-198. doi: 10.1037/qup0000070
- Gill-Peterson, J. (2018). *Histories of the transgender child*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Green, R. (1987). *The sissy boy syndrome and the development of homosexuality*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Green, R. (2008). Childhood cross-gender behavior and adult homosexuality. *Journal of Gay & Lesbian Mental Health*, 12(1-2), 17-28.
http://dx.doi.org/doi.org/10.1300/J529v12n01_03
- Green, R. (2008). The three kings: Harry Benjamin, John Money, Robert Stoller. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 38(4), 610-613. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10508-008-9392-3>
- Greenwood, D. & Levin, M. (2005) Reform of the social sciences and of universities through action research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed., pp. 163-177). Thousand Oaks: SAGE
- Gutting, G. (2005). *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault (2nd ed)*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hale, J. (1997). Suggested rules for non-transsexuals writing about transsexuals, Transsexuality, Transsexualism, or Trans _____. Accessed from:

<http://sandystone.com/hale.rules.html>

Harper, D. (2008). Foucauldian Discourse Analysis. In C. Willig & W. Stainton Rogers, *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research in Psychology* (pp 430-454), Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

Isay, R.A. (1999) Gender in homosexual boys: some developmental and clinical considerations *Psychiatry: Interpersonal and Biological Processes*, 62(2), pp 187-195.

Kay, B. (2015) Bill 77, the affirming sexual orientation and gender identity act, is a dangerous overreach. National Post - Tuesday June 2nd, 2015

Kendall, G., & Wickham, G. (1999). *Using foucault's methods*. London: Sage Publications.

Kidd, I., Medina, J., & Pohlhaus, G. (2017). *The Routledge handbook of epistemic injustice*. New York: Routledge.

Kincheloe, J. (2001). Describing the bricolage: Conceptualizing a new rigor in qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 7(6), 679-692.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/107780040100700601>

Kincheloe, J. (2005). On to the next level: Continuing the conceptualization of the bricolage. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 11(3), 323-350.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1077800405275056>

Kincheloe, J. (2008). Knowledge and critical pedagogy. Springer [ebook].

- Kincheloe, J., & Berry, K. (2004). *Rigor and complexity in educational research*. Maidenhead, England: Open University Press.
- Kincheloe, J., McLaren, P., & Steinberg, S. (2011). Critical pedagogy and qualitative research: Moving to the. Denzin & Y. Lincoln, *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed., pp. 163-177). Thousand Oaks: bricolage. In N SAGE.
- Koro-Ljungberg, M., Yendol-Hoppey, D., Smith, J., & Hayes, S. (2009). (E)pistemological Awareness, Instantiation of Methods, and Uninformed Methodological Ambiguity in Qualitative Research Projects. *Educational Researcher*, 38(9), 687-699. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0013189x09351980>
- Kozinets, R. (2002). The Field Behind the Screen: Using Netnography for Marketing Research in Online Communities. *Journal Of Marketing Research*, 39(1), 61-72. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.39.1.61.18935>
- Kuhl, D. (2016). [Review of the book, Psychology and gender dysphoria: Feminist and transgender perspectives by J. Tosh], *Psychology of Women Section Review*, 18(2), 94-96
- Kuhl, D. (2018). [Review of the book, Trans activism in Canada: A Reader, by D. Irving & R. Raj], *Journal of LGBT Youth*, DOI: 10.1080/193616532018.1434028
- Kuhl, D., & Martino, W., (2018) “Sissy” boys and the pathologization of gender non-conformity. In S. Talburt (Ed.), *Youth Sexualities: Public feelings and contemporary cultural politics*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger

- Langer, S., & Martin, J. (2004). How Dresses Can Make You Mentally Ill: Examining Gender Identity Disorder in Children. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 21(1), 5-23. doi: 10.1023/b:casw.0000012346.80025.f7
- Legislative Assembly of Ontario. Bill 77, *The Affirming Sexual Orientation and Gender Identity Act* (2015). Toronto.
- Lemke, T. (2001). 'The birth of bio-politics': Michel Foucault's lecture at the Collège de France on neo-liberal governmentality. *Economy And Society*, 30(2), 190-207.
- Lev, A. (2004). *Transgender emergence*. Binghamtpon, NY: the Haworth Clinical Practice Press.
- Lev, A. (2013). Gender Dysphoria: Two Steps Forward, One Step Back. *Clinical Social Work Journal*, 41(3), 288-296. doi: 10.1007/s10615-013-0447-0
/dx.doi.org/10.1080/03085140122085
- Levitt, H., Motulsky, S., Wertz, F., Morrow, S., & Ponterotto, J. (2017). Recommendations for designing and reviewing qualitative research in psychology: Promoting methodological integrity. *Qualitative Psychology*, 4(1), 2-22. doi: 10.1037/qup0000082
- Liebert, R. (2018). Psy Disciplines. In T. Teo (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Critical Psychology* (pp. 1527-1529). London, UK: Springer.
- Machi, L. & McEvoy, B. (2016). *The literature review: Six steps to success*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Corwin Press.

- Mathy, R. (2008). Cowboys, Shepherders, and The Man Who Would Be Queen: “I Know” vs. First-Order Lived Experience. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 37(3), 462-465. doi: 10.1007/s10508-008-9335-z
- Martino, W. (2003). Masculinities: The implications and uses of Foucauldian analyses in undertaking ethnographic investigations into adolescent boys' lives at school. In M. Tamboukou & s. Ball, *Dangerous Encounters: Genealogy and ethnography*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Martino, W. (2012). Masculinities as a basis for gender democratization: Toward embracing a transgender imaginary. In C. Grieg & W, Martino (eds.), *Canadian Men and Masculinities: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives*, 205-236. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Martino, W., Airtou, L., Kuhl, D., & Cumming-Potvin, W. (2018). Mapping transgender policyscapes: a policy analysis of transgender inclusivity in the education system in Ontario. *Journal Of Education Policy*, 34(3), 302-330. doi: 10.1080/02680939.2018.1478992
- Martino, W., & Cumming-Potvin, W. (2018). Countering heteronormativity and cisnormativity in Australian schools: Examining English teachers' reflections on gender and sexual diversity in the classroom. *Teaching And Teacher Education*, 74, 35-48. doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2018.04.008
- Martino, W., Kuhl, D. & Omercajic, K. (in press) The Epistemological Significance of Transgender Studies in the Academy (invited book chapter). In N. Niemi & M.

- Weaver-Hightower (eds.) *The International Handbook of Gender Equity in Higher Education*, Hoboken, New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Martino, W. & Pallotta-Chiarolli, M. (2003). *So what's a boy?*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- McAvoy, J. (2018). Psy Disciplines. In T. Teo (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Critical Psychology* (pp. 1527-1529). London, UK: Springer.
- McHoul, A., & Grace, W. (2002). *A Foucault primer*. London: Routledge.
- Menvielle, E. (1998). Gender Identity disorder. *Journal of The American Academy off Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 37(3), 243-244. doi: 10.1097/00004583-199803000-00001
- Money, J. (1975). Ablatio penis: Normal male infant sex-reassigned as a girl. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 4(1), 65-71.
- Money, J. (2016 [1995]). *Gendermaps: Social Constructionism, Feminism, and Sexosophical History*. London: Bloomsbury Academic Publishing.
- Nagoshi, J., & Brzuzy, S. (2010). Transgender Theory: Embodying Research and Practice. *Affilia*, 25(4), 431-443. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0886109910384068>
- Namaste, V. (2000). *Invisible lives*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Namaste, V. (2009). Undoing Theory: The Transgender Question and the Epistemic Violence of Anglo-American Feminist Theory. *Hypatia*, 24(3), 11-32. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1527-2001.2009.01043.x>

- Nicolazzo, Z. (2017). Imagining a Trans* Epistemology. *Urban Education*, 004208591769720. doi:10.1177/0042085917697203
- Nordmarken, S. (2014). Becoming Ever More Monstrous. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 20(1), 37-50. doi:10.1177/1077800413508531
- Nordmarken. (2019). Queering Gendering: Trans Epistemologies and the Disruption and Production of Gender Accomplishment Practices. *Feminist Studies*, 45(1), 36. doi:10.15767/feministstudies.45.1.0036
- Nugraha, I. (2017). The compatibility of sexual orientation change efforts with international human rights law. *Netherlands Quarterly Of Human Rights*, 092401591772465. doi: 10.1177/0924015917724654
- O'Farrell, C. (2005). *Michel Foucault* (1st ed.). London: SAGE. Retrieved from <https://play.google.com/books/reader>
- Official Report of Debates (Hansard). (2015). *Hansard*. Toronto: The Legislative Assembly of Ontario. 1st session, 41st Parliament, Wednesday 3 June 2015
- Oliver, P. (2010). *Foucault - The key ideas* (1st ed). McGraw-Hill Ryerson. Retrieved from <https://play.google.com/books/reader>
- Olson, K., Durwood, L., DeMeules, M., & McLaughlin, K. (2016). Mental health of transgender children who are supported in their identities. *PEDIATRICS*, 137(3), 1-8. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1542/peds.2015-3223>
- Owen-Anderson, A., Bradley, S., & Zucker, K. (2010). Expressed Emotion in Mothers of

- Boys with Gender Identity Disorder. *Journal Of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 36(4), 327-345. doi: 10.1080/0092623x.2010.488115
- Onwuegbuzie, A.J., Leech, N.L. & Collins, K.M.T. (2012). Qualitative Analysis Techniques for the Review of the Literature. *The Qualitative Report*, 17(56) 1-28.
- Orchard, T., Farr, S., Macphail, S., Wender, C., & Young, D. (2012). Sex Work in the Forest City: Experiences of Sex Work Beginnings, Types and Clientele Among Women in London, Ontario. *Sexuality Research And Social Policy*, 9(4), 350-362. doi: 10.1007/s13178-012-0097-y
- Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (1st ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.
- Patton, M. (2014). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE [e-book]
- Pickstone-Taylor, S. (2003). Children with gender nonconformity. *Journal of The American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 42(3), 266. doi: 10.1097/00004583-200303000-00005
- Pyne, J. (2014). The governance of gender non-conforming children: A dangerous enclosure. *Annual Review of Critical Psychology*, 11, 79-96.
- Radi, B. (2019). On trans* epistemology: Critiques, contributions, and challenges. *TSQ: Transgender Studies Quarterly*, 6(1). doi: DOI 10.1215/23289252-7253482
- Randolph, J. (2019). A guide to writing the dissertation literature review. *Practical*

Assessment, Research & Evaluation, 14(13), 1-13.

Rezai-Rashti, G., & Martino, W. (2009). Black male teachers as role models: Resisting the homogenizing impulse of gender and racial affiliation. *American Educational Research Journal*, 47(1), 37-64. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3102/0002831209351563>

Rind, B. (2008). The Bailey Affair: Political Correctness and Attacks on Sex Research. *Archives Of Sexual Behavior*, 37(3), 481-484. doi: 10.1007/s10508-008-9334-0

Rind, B. (2019). Sexual Science versus Progressive Advocacy: The Need for Resistance. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 48(6), 1649-1650. doi: 10.1007/s10508-019-01475-2

Rogers, M. (2012). Contextualizing theories and practices of bricolage research. *The Qualitative Report*, 17(48), 1-17.

Rose, N. (1998). *Inventing ourselves*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Rowley, J. & Slack, F. (2004). Conducting a literature review. *Management Research News*, 27(6), 31-39. doi.org/10.1108/01409170410784185

Sandelowski, M. (1993). Rigor or rigor mortis. *Advances In Nursing Science*, 16(2), 1-8. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/00012272-199312000-00002>

Scott, D., & Usher, R. (2011). *Researching education: Data, methods and theory in educational enquiry* (2nd ed.). London: Continuum. [Google books version]. Retrieved from <https://play.google.com/books/reader>

Sedgwick, E. (1991). How to bring your kids up gay. *Social Text*, (29), 18.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/466296>

Serano, J. (2016). *Whipping girl: A Transsexual Woman on Sexism and the Scapegoating of Femininity* (2nd ed.). Berkley: Seal Press.

Signal, J. (2016). How the fight over transgender kids got a leading sex researcher fired. *New York Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://nymag.com/scienceofus/2016/02/fight-over-trans-kids-got-a-researcher-fired.html>

Smith, J. (2006). Ex-gay reparative therapy: God, politics, and science. *Psycritiques*, 51(37). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0003604>

Spitzer, R. (2003). Can some gay men and lesbians change their sexual orientation? 200 Participants reporting a change from homosexual to heterosexual orientation. *Archives Of Sexual Behavior*, 32(5), 403-417.

Spitzer, R. (2012). Spitzer reassesses his 2003 study of reparative therapy of homosexuality. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 41(4), 757-757. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10508-012-9966-y>

Spivak, G. (2010). *Can the subaltern speak? Reflections on the history of an idea* (1st ed.). New York: Columbia University Press. Retrieved from <https://play.google.com/books/reader>

Stake, R. (2005). Qualitative case studies (3rd ed., pp. 443-466). Thousand Oaks: SAGE.

Tannehill, B. (2019). *Everything you ever wanted to know about trans (but were afraid to ask)*. London, UK: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

- Tamboukou, M. (2003). Genealogy/Ethnography: Finding the rhythm. In M. Tamboukou & s. Ball, *Dangerous Encounters: Genealogy and ethnography*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Tamboukou, M., & Ball, S. (2003). *Dangerous encounters*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Teo, T. (2010). What is epistemological violence in the empirical social sciences?. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 4(5), 295-303.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2010.00265.x>
- Teo, T. (2011). Theory and empirical research: Can scientific ideas be violent?. In P. Stenner, J. Cromby, J. Motzkau, J. Yen & Y. Haosheng, *Theoretical psychology: Global transformations and challenges* (1st ed., pp. 239-246). Concord, ON: Captus.
- Teo, T. (2014) *Encyclopedia of Critical Psychology*. New York: Springer [e-book]
- Teo, T. (2015). Critical psychology: A geography of intellectual engagement and resistance. *American Psychologist*, 70(3), 243-254.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0038727>
- Teo, T. (2017). From Psychological Science to the Psychological Humanities: Building a General Theory of Subjectivity. *Review of General Psychology*, 21(4), 281-291. doi: 10.1037/gpr0000132
- Teo, T. (2018). *Outline of theoretical psychology: Critical Investigations*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Teo, T. (2019). Beyond Reflexivity in Theoretical Psychology: From Philosophy to the Psychological Humanities. In T. Teo, *Re-envisioning Theoretical Psychology: Diverging Ideas and Practice* (pp. 273-288). Palgrave Studies in the Theory and History of Psychology.
- Terkel, A. (2015). Federal report calls for end to conversion therapy for LGBT youth. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/samhsa-conversion-therapy_us_561fb2eee4b050c6c4a47482
- Tiernay, W., & Sallee, M. (2019). Praxis. In *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods* (pp. 676-681). Thousand Oaks: SAGE.
- Tosh, J. (2015). *Perverse Psychology* (1st ed.). New York: Routledge. Retrieved from <https://play.google.com/books/reader>
- Tosh, J. (2016). *Psychology and gender dysphoria: Feminist and transgender perspectives* (1st ed.). New York: Routledge. Retrieved from <https://play.google.com/books/reader>
- Tosh (In press) *The Body and Consent in Psychology, Psychiatry, and Medicine: A Therapeutic Rape Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Tosh (In press). *Sexual abuse and surviving with(in) psychology: A personal and professional adventure in healing*. London: Routledge
- Ubelacker, S. (2015a). CAMH to 'wind down' controversial gender identity clinic services. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from

<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/toronto/camh-to-wind-down-controversial-gender-identity-clinic-services/article27766580/>

Ubelacker, S. (2015b). Gender identity debate swirls over CAMH psychologist, transgender program. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/toronto/camh-to-wind-down-controversial-gender-identity-clinic-services/article27766580/>

Ubelacker, S. (2015c). Ont. conversion therapy ban may see some gender identity clinics change approach. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved from <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/ont-conversion-therapy-ban-may-see-some-gender-identity-clinics-change-approach/article24943976/>

Ubelacker, S. (2016). CAMH gender identity clinic closure sparks protest. *The Huffington Post*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.ca/2016/01/23/group-protests-closure-of-youth-gender-identity-clinic-at-camh-director-s-removal_n_9061480.html

Wente, M. (2014). Transgender kids: Have we gone too far?. *The Globe And Mail*. Retrieved from <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/opinion/transgender-kids-have-we-gone-too-far/article16897043/>

Wente, M. (2016). Kids pay the price of transgender politics. *The Globe And Mail*. Retrieved from <http://www.theglobeandmail.com/opinion/kids-pay-the-price-of-transgender-politics/article28250068/>

Wibberley, C. (2012). Getting to grips with bricolage: A personal account. *The*

- Qualitative Report*, 17(25), 1-8. Retrieved from
<http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol17/iss25/2>
- Williams, c. (2019). Disco Sexology. *The Transadvocate*. Retrieved from
https://www.transadvocate.com/part-i-the-rise-and-fall-of-discosexology-dr-zucker-camh-conversion-therapy_n_19556.htm
- Winters, K. (2008). *Gender madness in American psychiatry*. Dillon, CO: GID Reform Advocates.
- Worenklein, A. (2011). A review of "gender identity disorder and psychosexual problems in children and adolescents", *American Journal of Family therapy*, 39(2), 174-175, doi: 10.1080/01926187.2.2011.552851
- Yazan, B. (2015). Three approaches to case study methods in education: Yin, Merriam and Stake. *The Qualitative Report*, 20(2), 134-152. Retrieved from
<http://www.nova.edu/ssss/QR/QR20/2/yazan1.pdf>
- Yin, R. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Zinck, S., & Pignatiello, A. (2015). External review of the gender identity clinic of the child, youth and family services in the underserved populations program at the centre for addiction and mental health [Report]. Toronto.
- Zucker, K. (1999). "Gender Identity Disorder in the DSM-IV [Letter to the Editor]." *Journal of Sex and Marital Therapy* 25(1): 5-9.

Zucker, K. (2003). The politics and science of “reparative therapy”. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 32(5), 399-402. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/a:1025691310172>

Zucker, K. (2006). Commentary on Langer and Martin’s (2004) ‘How dresses can make you mentally ill: Examining gender identity disorder in children’. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 23(5-6), 533-555.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10560-006-0074-5>

Zucker, K. (2009). The DSM Diagnostic Criteria for Gender Identity Disorder in Children. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 39(2), 477-498. doi: 10.1007/s10508-009-9540-4

Zucker, K. (2017), Editorial, *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 46(1). doi:10.1007/s10508-016-0933-x
Zucker, K., Blanchard, R., & Siegelman, M. (2003). Birth order among homosexual men. *Psychological Reports*, 92(1), 117-118.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2466/pr0.2003.92.1.117>

Zucker, K., & Bradley, S. (1995). *Gender identity disorder and psychosexual problems in children and adolescents*. New York: Guilford Press.

Zucker, K., & Spitzer, R. (2005). Was the gender identity disorder of childhood diagnosis introduced into DSM-III as a backdoor maneuver to replace homosexuality? A historical note. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy*, 31(1), 31-42.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00926230590475251>

Zucker, K., Wood, H., Singh, D., & Bradley, S. (2012). A developmental, biopsychosocial model for the treatment of children with gender identity disorder. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 59 (3), 369-397. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00918>

Appendices

Appendix A: Letter of Information to Participants

Project Title: *Death of the Clinic: Trans-Informing the Clinical Gaze to Counter Epistemic Violence*

Principal Investigator: Dr. Wayne Martino, Professor, Faculty of Education

Co-Investigator: Diana Kuhl, PhD student, Faculty of Education

Letter of Information

Purpose of this Letter of Information

The purpose of this letter is to provide you with information required for you to make an informed decision regarding participation in this research.

Invitation to Participate

My name is Diana Kuhl and I am a PhD student at the Faculty of Education at Western University. I am currently conducting research into the experiences of trans-affirmative activists and scholars whose work has centred upon challenging the pathologizing clinical discourse that has historically dominated psychological understanding of childhood gender diversity. Specifically, I am seeking activists and scholars whose work has directly engaged in illuminating concerns surrounding the *Treatment Model* approach for understanding childhood gender diversity that was employed at the (now former) Gender Identity Clinic for Children and Youth at the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health in Toronto Canada.

Purpose of the study

This proposed case study aims to investigate the experience of activists and scholars working to ‘trans-inform’ the clinical ‘gaze’, and to examining the etiology and effects of disciplinary resistance to trans-informed scholarship. This research is important given that the clinic has been a beacon of controversy for years surrounding its approach to

understanding and ‘treating’ childhood gender variance, while simultaneously situated in an internationally acclaimed teaching and research hospital, and headed by the most widely published clinical ‘expert’ on childhood gender non-conformity in the world. By interviewing activists and scholars engaged in raising questions about the clinic’s approach to childhood gender variance, much can be learned about the role of epistemology in terms of disciplinary resistance to voice informed scholarship, as well as the role of epistemology in perpetuating and/or ameliorating harm against marginalized groups.

1. Inclusion Criteria

Participation in this study is open to activists and scholars whose work has directly engaged in illuminating concerns surrounding the *Treatment Model* approach for understanding childhood gender diversity that was employed at the (now former) Gender Identity Clinic for Children and Youth at the Centre for Addiction and Mental Health in Toronto Canada.

All participants must be able to provide informed consent for participation in this study.

2. Exclusion Criteria

Individuals whose activism and scholarship has not centered upon challenging the *Treatment Model* for understanding childhood gender diversity, or anyone who is unable to provide informed consent would be excluded from this study.

3. Study Procedures

If you agree to participate in this study you will be asked to contribute no more than one hour of your time to either an in-person, or a telephone interview (based on your choice, and or geographical location if you live more than one hour outside of the city of London, Ontario). In person meetings will be arranged either at the Faculty of Education, or a location that meets your needs, and will be scheduled to according to your availability. Telephone interviews will be arranged at your convenience. Interview data will be audio recorded at your consent and discretion. Should you not wish to be audio-recorded you may still participate. In these instances, field notes will taken by the researcher which you may request to review or withdraw at any time during this study. Should you wish to

withdraw from this study, please contact the researcher at any time, and any data collected from you (consent forms, audio-recordings, transcripts and/or field notes) will be destroyed in accordance with university policies. Upon conclusion of this study, written dissemination of this research may occur in the researcher's doctoral thesis, and academic publications.

Possible Risks and Harms

There are no known risks to participating in this study.

Possible Benefits

If you choose to participate you will contribute significant knowledge about the role of trans-affirmative activism and scholarship in transforming how childhood gender diversity is understood within psychology. This is important given that *Treatment Model* had long served as the dominant model for understanding childhood gender diversity, and holds implications for research, policy and practice with children with respect to gender.

4. Compensation

No compensation of any kind is provided for participation in this research.

5. Voluntary Participation

Participation in this study is voluntary. You may refuse to participate, refuse to answer any questions or withdraw from the study at any time during the study period. You may also review transcribed data and provide input as to the written representation of your interviews. You may choose to ask that your interview data be edited or withdrawn at any time during the study period, and you may request to withdraw consent to participate at any time prior to the end of the study. Following completion of this study, written dissemination of this research may occur. If you chose to withdraw from the study, please contact the researcher to advise, and all collected data will be destroyed in accordance with Western University policy for the destruction of confidential data (including consent

forms, audio recordings, transcripts, and or field notes). You do not waive any legal right by consenting to this study. **Confidentiality**

All information collected for the study will be kept confidential. The information collected will be used for research purposes only, and neither your name nor information which could identify you will be used in any publication or presentation of the study results unless you provide written consent indicating your permission for the use of personal identifiers (including your name, professional role, direct quotes, or the combination of unidentified quotes and professional role) to be included in the dissemination of this research. All consent letters, master list, and interview data will be locked in a filing cabinet in the researcher's home office, and will be transferred to the Principal Investigator for the data retention period (5 years) post-study. You may either choose a pseudonym, or have one provided for identification purposes. Interview data will be transcribed by the researcher and all interview data will be kept separately from participant data. All files will be encrypted and password protected to ensure confidentiality. All participant data will be shredded or destroyed electronically as per university policy five years post publication. Representatives of the University of Western Ontario's Non-Medical Research Ethics Board may require access to study-related records to monitor the conduct of research. **Contacts for Further Information**

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant or the conduct of this study, you may contact the Office of Research Ethics, Western University at [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] If you have any questions about this study, please contact *Diana Kuhl* at [REDACTED] or *Dr. Wayne Martino* [REDACTED] (*Principal Investigator*).

6. Publication

The results of this study will be included in a doctoral thesis and may be submitted for scholarly publication. If the results of this study are published, your name will not be used without your written consent indicating your desire for your name or direct quotes to be attributed directly to you.

7. Consent

Informed written consent must be provided prior to participation in this study. Letter of Information and Consent forms will be forwarded to you for your review prior to participation in the study. Participants must indicate that they have read and understand the Letter of Information and Consent forms prior to participating in this study. Please be aware that consenting to the use of unidentified direct quotes, and or role identification, may make the participant identifiable in the dissemination of this research. Neither your name, your professional role, identifiable or unidentified quotes will be included in this research without your written consent. Should you wish to withdraw from the study, or withdraw your consent for the use of specific identifiers, including the use of your name, professional role, identified quotes, unidentified quotes, please contact the researcher to advise. All data previously collected, including consent forms, audio recording, field notes, and transcripts, will be destroyed in accordance with university policies regarding the destruction of confidential data.

This letter is yours to keep for future reference.

Consent Form

Project Title: *Death of the Clinic: Trans-Informing the Clinical Gaze to Counter Epistemic Violence.*

Study Investigator's Name: Dr. Wayne Martino (Principal Investigator), Diana Kuhl (Co-Investigator)

Do you confirm that you have read the Letter of Information [or the Letter of Information has been read to you] and have had all questions answered to your satisfaction?

☐ YES ☐ NO

Do you agree to participate in this research?

☐ YES ☐ NO

Do you agree to have your name used in the dissemination of this research?

☐ YES ☐ NO

Do you agree to be identified by your professional role [i.e.: Psychologist, Social Worker, Teacher] in the dissemination of this research?

☐ YES ☐ NO

Do you agree to be audio-recorded?

☐ YES ☐ NO

Do you consent to the use of personal, identifiable quotes obtained during the study in the dissemination of this research?

☐ YES ☐ NO

Do you consent to the use of unidentified quotes obtained during the study in the dissemination of this research?

☐ YES ☐ NO

Note: The option to provide full name, first name, or initials, is at the discretion of the participant. Consent forms will be stored in accordance with university policy, and stored separate from the data. You do not waive any legal right by consenting to this study

I have read the Letter of Information, have had the nature of the study explained to me and I agree to participate. All questions have been answered to my satisfaction.

Participant's Name (please print):

Participant's Signature:

Date:

Person Obtaining Informed Consent (please print):

Signature:

Date:

Interview Guide

Potential Interview Questions:

1. Can you tell me a little about yourself, and how you came to be involved in advocacy/activism/scholarship centered upon the clinic? [Demographics, Knowledge/experience/feelings] Note: participants will also be asked to advise as to their preference for gender pronoun in any written accounts of the interview.
2. How were concerns organized, and over what time frame did organized activism emerge centered upon the clinic? (Community, Conferences, Social Networking sites etc., over what time period) [Knowledge/Processes/ Timelines]
3. What are your thoughts/feelings/observations surrounding 'whose voice counts' in terms of challenging the pathologized notion of childhood gender variance? (how were experience based accounts treated/viewed in comparison to 'scholarly accounts' ? [Knowledge/Feelings/Observations]
4. What are your thoughts on how membership within a specific discipline, (education, psychology, social work, medicine, gender studies) influenced how concerns were received? [Knowledge/Feelings/Observations]
5. What kind of 'evidence' (if any) was sought throughout the process regarding challenges to the pathologized notion of 'treatment' ? (Types of studies requested, disciplinary origin of scholarship). [Knowledge/Experience]
6. What role do you feel incoming provincial legislation prohibiting 'reparative or conversion 'therapy' played in facilitating the review (and eventual decision to close the clinic?) [Knowledge/Opinion]
7. Transversely, what role if any do you feel that the inclusion of trans protections in Ontario Human Rights Legislation played in relation to facilitating the external review of the clinic?

8. What are your thoughts/feelings on the findings of the external review?
[Knowledge/ Feelings]
9. What are your thoughts/feelings on public discourse, media coverage and targeted backlash that suggested that trans-scholarship and activism is ‘unscientific’?
[Knowledge/ Feelings]
10. To what extent is public awareness of transgender persons influenced by psychological discourse? [Knowledge/Experiences]
11. To what extent have discussions surrounding ontology and epistemology been central to trans advocacy aimed at de-pathologization? Do you see these domains as significant in shaping clinicians, and or teachers? [Knowledge/Experience/Opinions].
12. What role can education (elementary, secondary, disciplinary training, ie: teacher education, social work education, psychology programs, play in improving how trans and gender diverse children are understood and supported?
13. What would be something you would like to see as an outcome from this study?
[Opinions/Feelings]
14. Is there anything that you would like to add, address?

Appendix B: Ethics Approval



Research Ethics

Western University Non-Medical Research Ethics Board NMREB Delegated Initial Approval Notice

Principal Investigator: Dr. Wayne Martino

Department & Institution: Education\Faculty of Education, Western University

NMREB File Number: 109718

Study Title: Death of the Clinic: Trans-Informing the Clinical Gaze to Counter Epistemic Violence

NMREB Initial Approval Date: October 26, 2017

NMREB Expiry Date: October 26, 2018

Documents Approved and/or Received for Information:

Document Name	Comments	Version Date
Western University Protocol		2017/10/09
Recruitment Items	Social Media Recruitment Poster	2017/10/09
Letter of Information & Consent		2017/10/25
Instruments	Interview Guide	2017/08/23

The Western University Non-Medical Research Ethics Board (NMREB) has reviewed and approved the above named study, as of the NMREB Initial Approval Date noted above.

NMREB approval for this study remains valid until the NMREB Expiry Date noted above, conditional to timely submission and acceptance of NMREB Continuing Ethics Review.

The Western University NMREB operates in compliance with the Tri-Council Policy Statement Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (TCPS2), the Ontario Personal Health Information Protection Act (PHIPA, 2004), and the applicable laws and regulations of Ontario.

Members of the NMREB who are named as Investigators in research studies do not participate in discussions related to, nor vote on such studies when they are presented to the REB.

The NMREB is registered with the U.S. Department of Health & Human Services under the IRB registration number IRB 00000941.



Ethics Officer, on behalf of Dr. Randal Graham, NMREB Chair or delegated board member

EO: Erika Basile __ Grace Kelly __ Katelyn Harris __ Nicola Morphet __ Karen Gopaul __ Patricia Sargeant __ Kelly Patterson ☒

Appendix C: Ethics Approval Extension



Date: 14 October 2018

To: Dr. Wayne Martino

Project ID: 109718

Study Title: Death of the Clinic: Trans-Informing the Clinical Gaze to Counter Epistemic Violence

Application Type: Continuing Ethics Review (CER) Form

Review Type: Delegated

Meeting Date: 02/Nov/2018

Date Approval Issued: 14/Oct/2018

REB Approval Expiry Date: 26/Oct/2019

Dear Dr. Wayne Martino,

The Western University Research Ethics Board has reviewed the application. This study, including all currently approved documents, has been re-approved until the expiry date noted above.

REB members involved in the research project do not participate in the review, discussion or decision.

The Western University NMREB operates in compliance with the Tri-Council Policy Statement Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (TCPS2), the Ontario Personal Health Information Protection Act (PHIPA, 2004), and the applicable laws and regulations of Ontario. Members of the NMREB who are named as Investigators in research studies do not participate in discussions related to, nor vote on such studies when they are presented to the REB. The NMREB is registered with the U.S. Department of Health & Human Services under the IRB registration number IRB 00000941.

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Daniel Wyzynski, Research Ethics Coordinator, on behalf of Prof. Randal Graham, NMREB Chair

Note: This correspondence includes an electronic signature (validation and approval via an online system that is compliant with all regulations).

Curriculum Vitae

Diana E. Kuhl, OCT, PhD

<u>Degree</u>	<u>Specialization</u>	<u>University</u>
PhD (2014-present)	Education Critical Policy, Equity and Leadership	University of Western Ontario
M.Ed. (2014)	Educational Psychology Western Ontario	University of
B.Ed. (1998)	Social Science and Spanish (I/S)	University of
Western		Ontario
B.A. (1996)	Multicultural Studies/Spanish	University of
Windsor		
Certificate (1996)	Spanish Language and Culture	Universidad de
Salamanca		

Doctoral Supervisor: Dr. Wayne Martino, The University of Western Ontario

Areas of specialization: Critical, feminist, trans, and queer theories, voice-informed epistemologies in research and praxes, qualitative research methodologies, activism and scholarship, conducting ethical research with marginalized groups, critical psychology, education policy, and special education.

Academic Publications

Martino, W., Kuhl, D., & Omercajic, K. (in press) The Epistemological Significance of Transgender Studies in the Academy (invited book chapter). In N. Niemi & M. Weaver-Hightower (eds.) *The International Handbook of Gender Equity in Higher Education*, Hoboken, New Jersey: Wiley-Blackwell.

Martino, W., Airton, L., Cumming-Potvin, W., & Kuhl, D. (2018) Mapping transgender policyscapes: A policy analysis of transgender inclusivity in the education system in Ontario, *Journal of Educational Policy*. DOI: 10.1080/02680939.2018.1478992

Kuhl, D. (2018). [Review of the book, *Trans activism in Canada: A Reader*, by D. Irving & R. Raj], *Journal of LGBT Youth*, DOI: 10.1080/193616532018.1434028

Kuhl, D., & Martino, W., (2018) "Sissy" boys and the pathologization of gender non-conformity. In S. Talburt (Ed.), *Youth Sexualities: Public feelings and contemporary cultural politics*. Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger

Kuhl, D. (2016). [Review of the book, Psychology and gender dysphoria: Feminist and transgender perspectives by J. Tosh], *Psychology of Women Section Review*, 18(2), 94-96

Kuhl (2014). Voices count: Employing a critical narrative research bricolage for insights into dyscalculia (unpublished master's thesis), The University of Western Ontario, London, ON. Supervised by Dr. Wayne Martino and Dr. Elizabeth Nowicki

Conference Presentations

Kuhl (2019) Panel Member: Ontology and epistemology in and praxes; Shifting the gaze: Bricolage as a form of epistemic justice, International Congress of Qualitative Inquiry (May 2019), University of Illinois Urbana- Champaign, USA

Martino, Pyne & Kuhl (2019), Trans and non-binary informed epistemologies in qualitative Research, International Congress of Qualitative Inquiry, University of Illinois Urbana- Champaign, USA

Kuhl (2019) Invited panel member for discussion of Miguel Rosello Penaloza's book "No Body": Clinical constructions of gender and transsexuality - pathologization violence and deconstruction" NY:Routledge International Congress of Qualitative Inquiry, University of Illinois Urbana- Champaign, USA

Kuhl (2018). Death of the clinic: Trans-informing the clinical gaze to counter epistemic violence, International Congress of Qualitative Inquiry (May 2019), University of Illinois Urbana- Champaign, USA

Martino, W., M. Pallotta-Chiarolli, A. Davies, & D. Kuhl (2018), Trans embodied epistemologies and 'doing justice' in the public sphere: On-line spaces of recognition, becoming and self-realization for transgender and gender diverse youth, International Congress of Qualitative Inquiry University of Illinois Urbana- Champaign, USA
February 2019 PhD Seminar Course, The significance of critical, feminist, queer and trans epistemologies in research

Invited University Lectures

March 2018 Qualitative Research Methodology PhD Course, Employing a multi-methodological qualitative approach: Using bricolage with marginalized communities

April 2017 Qualitative Research Methodology PhD Course, Understanding Epistemic Violence

June 2015 Faculty of Education Research Day, Approaches to Qualitative Data

Analysis – Ethics of Eliciting and Representing Data

Competitive Awards

Ontario Graduate Scholarship 15,000 (2016-2017)

Ontario Graduate Scholarship 15,000 (2015-2016)

Waldemar Bebris OGS Award 5,000 (2016-2017)

Dr. Allen Pearson award in Educational Leadership 1,500 (2017)

Graduate Courses Completed

9789 Qualifying Examination (completed April 2016)

9710 Epistemological Violence and the Pathologization of Gender Non-Conformity
(IRR)

9710 Foucault: Power/Knowledge in Education (IRR)

9711 Qualitative Research in Education

9715 PhD Seminar (Epistemology, Theory in Educational Research)

9629 Equity and Social Justice in Education

9651 Assessment in Regular and Special Education (Focus on Psychometric Assessment)

9526 Psychology in Education: Issues, Theories and Practices

9626 Gender Theories in Education: Implications for Policy, Pedagogy and Practice

9685 Qualitative Research in Educational Psychology (IRR)

9678 Diverse Traditions: Approaches to Educational Research

9657 Problems and Issues in Special Education

Teaching and Related Experience

2015 -2017 Research Assistant, for Dr. Wayne Martino, Principal Investigator
(SSHRC study), The University of Western Ontario, London, ON

2012-2013 Therapeutic Recreation Program Coordinator and Curriculum Developer
Lambton College, Sarnia, ON

2010-2013 Associate Faculty, Lambton College Sarnia, ON

Courses Developed

Developed the following courses, including course outcomes, unit objectives and
evaluation guidelines, for the postgraduate certificate program in therapeutic recreation at
Lambton College:

TRE-2003 Leisure Education & Counselling in Therapeutic Recreation

TRE-2013 Therapeutic Recreation Assessment

TRE-2023 Adapted Recreation & Program Planning

TRE-2033 Recreation Leadership

TRE-2043 Research in Therapeutic Recreation

TRE-2053 TR Practice & Portfolio Development

TRE-3000 Therapeutic Recreation Internship

Courses Taught

TRE-1003 Support Networks and Community Resources

PSY-1023 Interpersonal Communication

DDC-1043 Report Writing for the Developmental Services

MAN-1113 Human Relations

PED- 1073 Personal Wellness

ENG-1113 Communications I

ENG-2113 Communications II

ENG-2033 Communications II for Health Sciences

Mental Health and Social Services Related Employment Experience

2008-2010 Elementary Mental Health Education Program Coordinator, CMHA,
Sarnia

2001-2008 Vocational Rehabilitation/TR Specialist, CMHA, Sarnia

1999-2001 Caseworker, Lambton County Social Services

1998-1999 Parental Support Worker, Ministry of Community and Social Services

Volunteer and Activism

2018- present Founding Member, Sarnia Intersectional Feminist Network (SIFN)

2016 to present Book Reviews Editor, The Journal of Psychology Gender and
Trauma

2016 to present Advisory Board Member, Sarnia Speaks (Community based
mental health and anti-oppressive education forum)

2015 to 2017 Board of Directors, The Sexual Assault Survivor Centre Sarnia
Lambton