I am excited and honored to serve as Chair of the Medical Sociology section. My sincere gratitude to Brea Perry and Danielle Bessett, outgoing Chair and Secretary-Treasurer, respectively. They have led our section with creativity, good cheer, and awe-inspiring organizational ability.

The 2019 annual meeting in New York was a tremendous success, thanks to the contributions of our Section officers, session organizers, presenters, and enthusiastic audience members. The fact that our sessions were so well-attended while the temptations of Manhattan were just feet away is a testament to the importance of the work we do as medical sociologists.

Brea assembled a fantastic slate of sessions, a lively reception, and a celebratory dinner to honor our section’s award winners. A sincere ‘thank you’ to our session organizers. Speaking to the overall conference theme of “Engaging Social Justice for a Better World,” Tiffany Joseph assembled the session “Health Equity, Social Justice, and Social Movements.” Joanna Kempner brought together scholars to discuss “DIY Medicine: Hacking Health, Opting Out, Self-Medicating, and Consumer Resistance,” Adam Lippert organized a panel on “Health in Social Context: The Role of Work, School, Family, and Community,” and Corinne Reczek organized a co-sponsored session with the Sociology of Sex and Gender section on “Gender, Sexuality, and Medicine.”

(continued)
Notes from the Chair (continued)

A special thanks to William McConnell for the mammoth task of organizing 21 roundtables, and to Brea Perry for taking the helm of our Business Meeting, Awards Ceremony and Leo G. Reeder Address. We are grateful to the 2019 Reeder Award winner Stefan Timmermans for his engaging, enlightening and entertaining lecture.

Let’s also extend our gratitude to our outgoing section council members, who worked hard all year to recruit members, guide section policies and activities, select award winners, and do all the invisible work that keeps our section so vital. Thank you to Julia Bandini, Courtney Boen, Claire Decoteau, Tania Jenkins, Katrina Kimport, Ophra Leyser-Whalen, Cathy Liu, Jane McLeod, Lauren Olsen, Jen’nan Read, and Sara Rubin. I’m delighted that Evan Roberts will continue his fantastic work as newsletter editor. Evan welcomes news about your latest publications, professional achievements, and job announcements. Gratitude to our listserv manager Lilla Pivnick, who keeps us in the know about all things medical sociology. Please continue to send section-related announcements to Lilla (lilla.pivnick@gmail.com) or to me (carrds@bu.edu).

I’m happy to welcome our new council members Alexandra Brewer, Patricia Homan, Kimberly Huyser, Margot Jackson, Jennifer Karas Montez, Hedwig Lee, Andrew London, Theresa Morris, Megan Reynolds, Mieke Beth Thomeer, and Jessica West. I look forward to working with our new members, as well as continuing members Aalap Bommaraju, Robyn Brown, Shannon Monnat, Pat Rieker, and Miranda Waggoner.

The 2020 annual meetings in San Francisco will be here before we know it. We are fortunate to have seven sessions rather than our usual six next year. Our section day falls on the final day of the conference, meaning that we will have a “bonus” session, co-sponsored with Evolution, Biology and Society (EBS). Speaking to the annual meeting theme of “Power, Inequality, and Resistance at Work,” Wen Fan will organize a session on “Health and the Workplace.” Our panels will also focus on timely topics including “Health and Health Care among Sexual Minorities” organized by Eric Wright, “Violence and Health” co-organized by Michael Esposito and Hedy Lee, and “Expanding Diversity of Biosocial Research: Opportunities & Challenges,” co-organized by Jacob Cheadle and Bridget Goosby (see below for details). I’m particularly excited about an invited panel entitled “25 Years of Fundamental Cause Theory” organized by Jeremy Freese, in which we celebrate the 25th anniversary of Link and Phelan’s path breaking article. We will also have a session for the award ceremony and Reeder Award address, and a session for the roundtables and business meeting. Thanks to everyone who suggested topics for the 2020 annual meeting. I wish we could accommodate all of your creative ideas!
Notes from the Chair (continued)

Some slight changes are under foot in our session, as we strive to celebrate our members and our scholarship, while at the same time using our resources most efficiently given the high and rising costs of annual meetings in locales like New York and San Francisco. The small-group dinner for award winners will now be a thing of the past, but we look forward to honoring our colleagues at our annual awards ceremony and our annual reception. The book raffle also will be undergoing transformation. The raffle took a tremendous of effort on the part of raffle chair Sara Rubin and her predecessors, while yielding modest returns. We will still welcome your book donations, and will distribute them to student members eager to read your work – yet without the added effort of hawking raffle tickets. We have several new ideas for fundraising and our newly created Development committee will be hard at work making sure we have the resources needed to sustain the programming that we so value at our annual meeting.

I look forward to working together and to getting to know you in the coming year. I welcome your

Call for Papers: 2020 ASA Annual Meetings

We will have an exciting set of topics lined up for the 115th Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association in San Francisco on August 8-11, 2020. Paper submissions will open November 1, 2019. The deadline to submit is Wednesday, January 29, 2020. Our “section day” is scheduled for Tuesday August 11. Because we are on the final day of the meeting, we get a bonus session, which will be co-sponsored with the section on Evolution, Biology, and Society (EBS). Thank you to our organizers, who will be assembling these sessions, and to your members who are submitting their work!

1. Health and the Workplace.

Open session organized by Wen Fan, Boston College (wen.fan@bc.edu).

The linkages between employment and health are complex, with health shaping the kinds of work one can do, and work conditions – ranging from physical hazards to microaggressions to lack of health care benefits – can undermine emotional and physical well-being. The dynamics among patients, health care providers, and institutional practices also bear on the quality of care delivered. The papers in this session explore how health shapes and is shaped by ‘power, inequality and resistance’ in the workforce.

2. 25 Years of Fundamental Cause Theory.

Invited session organized by Jeremy Freese, Stanford University (jfreese@stanford.edu).

In 1995, Bruce Link and Jo Phelan published their influential article on “fundamental cause theory,” arguing that socioeconomic disparities affect nearly all health outcomes and are resistant to change because interventions intended to improve population health disproportionately benefit those with the most economic, social, and political resources. In this session, presenters will discuss empirical and theoretical work that critiques, extends, and advances FCT.
Call for Papers: 2020 ASA Annual Meetings (continued)

3. Health and Health Care among Sexual Minorities.
Open session organized by Eric Wright, Georgia State University (ewright28@gsu.edu).

In recent decades, scholarly research on LGBTQI health has moved beyond HIV/AIDS and mental health, and now explores the distinctive risk and resilience factors of sexual minorities. At the same time, interpersonal and structural discrimination shape access to and the quality of care received in health settings. The papers in this session explore the health, health behaviors, and health care encounters of LGBTQ persons, and policies that affect the health of sexual minorities.

4. Violence and Health
Open session organized by Michael Esposito, University of Michigan (espsosm.@umich.edu) and Hedwig Lee, Washington University (hedwig.lee@wustl.edu).

The escalating number of mass shootings in the United States triggers debates as to whether gun violence is a public health problem. Gun violence is just one of multiple forms of aggression that shape the health of individuals worldwide, including intimate partner, state-imposed, self-inflicted (suicide), workplace, sexual, structural, and other forms of violence and aggression. The papers in this session examine the complex linkages among violence, health care, health, and health care policy.

5. Expanding Diversity of Biosocial Research: Opportunities & Challenges.
Open session organized by Bridget Goosby, University of Texas-Austin (bgoosby@prc.utexas.edu) and Jacob Cheadle, University of Texas-Austin (j.e.cheadle@utmail.utexas.edu).

The use of biological data in sociological research has diversified greatly over the years to the point where various measures can now occupy different places in our theoretical models. With this diversity, social scientists are now studying how "what is under the skin" (e.g., genetics, microbiome, etc.) affects a range of outcomes and how social conditions “get under the skin” (e.g., epigenetics, HPA-axis, inflammation, etc.) to affect health and behavior. New techniques using signals "measured on the skin" (e.g., neuroimaging, electrodermal activity, sleep) are shedding light on how different bodily systems function in response to social circumstances. At the same time, critics question the underlying meaning and interpretations of such measures and raise concerns about biological essentialism and the representation (or lack) of marginalized populations in this research. The papers in this session demonstrate the promises and limitations of biologically-oriented data for understanding how social circumstances affect population health.

6. Roundtables.
Organized by Elizabeth Luth, Weill-Cornell Medicine (eal2003@med.cornell.edu); Lindsay Stevens, Princeton University (lms5@princeton.edu).

7. Awards Ceremony and Reeder Lecture.
Organized by Deborah Carr, Boston University (carrds@bu.edu).
Student section

Interview with 2019 Reeder Award winner Stefan Timmermans

We are Wan-Zi Lu (left) and Emily Parker (right), this year’s student editors of the Medical Sociology Newsletter. Wan-Zi is a PhD candidate in sociology at the University of Chicago, and Emily is a PhD candidate in Policy Analysis and Management at Cornell University.

For our first student column of the year, we spoke with 2019 Reeder Award winner Stefan Timmermans.

Prior to this year’s Reeder Award ceremony, the medical sociology section’s graduate students were given the opportunity to participate in a meet-and-greet with Dr. Stefan Timmermans, organized by the section’s student representatives, Aalap Bommaraju and Julia Bandini. Graduate students were able to ask questions, workshop research ideas or issues, and Dr. Timmermans also offered words of wisdom. We then spoke with Dr. Timmermans to ask for more general advice for graduate students in medical sociology, including adopting research practices, following researchers’ passion, and pursuing topics in medical sociology.

Here are some of the highlights:

On research, Dr. Timmermans’ main piece of advice was to “play to the strengths of your methods.” He encouraged graduate students to learn and be aware of what different methods can offer. For instance, while quantitative approaches can show us which causes are important, ethnographic methods allow for researchers to “follow the flow of information as it travels” over places and across time, which enables us to understand social mechanisms and meaning-making processes. In the end, “no one method does it all, nor is one better,” which is why playing to the strengths of different methods is important.

For graduate students entering the field, one challenge is to gain trust from medical experts and professionals. Dr. Timmermans noted that our unique contribution as sociologists is to provide insight and identify confounding factors that may be particularly helpful for developing patients-centered care.

(continued)
Interview with 2019 Reeder Award winner Stefan Timmermans

In the field, Dr. Timmermans also suggested students put in face time to become familiar with clinicians, be a positive presence, and offer support in order to gain rapport within the research setting. These strategies not only overcome the challenges of fieldwork but also create a mutually beneficial research partnership.

One piece of advice Dr. Timmermans imparted was to follow consistent working habits and protect your time for writing and reading. To prioritize time for engaging with theories, for instance, he used to schedule “meeting with Bourdieu” and “meeting with Foucault” so that “whatever people bring up to you would not be as important as meeting with those people.” When students asked how he planned his research agenda, Dr. Timmermans noted that he resisted the temptation to only work on projects that vary little from his previous research, and “there is never an easy research project.” Over the years, he has been driven by a central interest in analyzing “bad deaths.” Dr. Timmermans said, “I encountered different opportunities related to my interests, and the research agenda is slightly planned, slightly serendipity.”

Graduate students also raised the question about how to connect medical sociological topics to general sociological interests, especially when the topics include many technical or medical terms that are unfamiliar to a broader audience. He advised that we could use conversations with people as focus groups or testing ground on how to best frame the research and see what piques others’ interests. Dr. Timmermans pointed out that sometimes a shortage of technical terms could also make the readers feel that the language is too simple. Thus, it is essential to “find the middle ground” by taking into account what is both necessary for the argument and for reaching the broader audience, and researchers should strike a balance between the two aspects.

Meanwhile, Dr. Timmermans emphasized the uniqueness of medical sociology. First, as compared to medical research that primarily aims to improve health, medical sociologists have the liberty to explore outside the specific goal of generating improvement and examine alternative explanations that shape the medical outcome. He additionally pointed out that medical sociologists study people in their “existential moments of life and death,” and therefore, “it is a privilege to learn about high-stakes decisions and actions.” But such privilege comes with “a responsibility to bring the existential residue of life and death to the forefront.”

The final message that Dr. Timmermans wanted to pass along to graduate students: “do things that you enjoy.” As scholars of medical sociology, we know that life is finite. Find topics that you are truly passionate about, even if they are not a popular or trendy topic. Ask yourself, at the end of the day, “would you still be interested in doing this research if you were not being paid?” Passion for your research is the metric that Dr. Timmermans believes will drive a successful career, both for our own good and the good of medical sociology as a field.

We are grateful that Dr. Timmermans generously shared his experience and suggestions for students at different stages in their graduate programs. In the coming issues, we hope to find ways to connect graduate students in the section and address what interests the community. Thus, we invite you to send us your thoughts and suggestions about what topics to explore to Wan-Zi wanzilu@uchicago.edu and Emily eap249@cornell.edu.
Differential Privacy in the 2020 Census: Implications for Researchers

Beginning with the 2020 Decennial Census, the U.S. Census Bureau will implement new methods for disclosure control in public use data products, including the aggregated tabular data and microdata. This new approach, termed differential privacy, involves “jiggering” Census data by introducing mathematical noise in the form of a “global privacy loss budget (\( \varepsilon \))”. This total loss budget will be allocated at different geographic levels (e.g., national, state, county, enumeration district, census block). It is not yet clear what will be the overall value of \( \varepsilon \), which geographic units will be “jiggered”, or how \( \varepsilon \) will be distributed across the levels.

According to the Census Bureau, these new procedures are motivated by data privacy concerns. Census analysts argue that differential privacy is necessary due to the threat of database reconstruction – the ability to infer individual-level responses from tabular data (Abowd 2017). “The Census Bureau claims that the new system will be more open and transparent to users. But the new system will come with a significant trade-off in data accuracy, making the public data useless for many applications. Indeed, in its pure form, differential privacy techniques could make the release of scientifically useful microdata impossible and severely limit the utility of tabular small-area data” (University of Minnesota IPUMS 2019).

The first implementation of differential privacy will be in the 2020 Census, and the Bureau is considering implementation for the 2025 American Community Survey. Differential privacy has several implications for demographic, economic, and social research and for local policymakers and community-based organizations that regularly use these data for planning and funding justification. I summarize some major concerns below:

1. **Reduction in Microdata Utility**: Because the ACS microdata samples directly provide individual-level characteristics derived from real people, they in themselves represent a violation of differential privacy. As a result, guaranteeing differential privacy will mean simulating microdata rather than releasing the actual data derived directly from individuals. This modeled data will capture relationships between variables only if they have already been intentionally included in the model. “Accordingly, synthetic data are poorly suited to studying unanticipated relationships, which impedes new discoveries from differentially-private microdata” (Ruggles 2018:16).

2. **Loss of Data Tables**: The Bureau plans to release far fewer aggregate data tables than in the past, particularly at lower levels of geography (e.g., block, tract). For a full list of 2020 Census tables planned for release, see the Excel file on this site: https://www.census.gov/about/cac/sac/meetings/2019-09-meeting.html. Besides the obvious implications for research, there is concern that loss of data tables will make it more difficult, if not impossible, for federal agencies to make fair and accurate
Differential Privacy in the 2020 Census

decisions when Census data are included in funding formulas, competitive grants, and other programmatic operations and decisions. Public Census data are also essential to local governments for planning and to non-profit and community-based organizations for grant applications. The AI/AN community is at particular risk of losing access to essential data due to small population counts in many geographic areas. For example, it is not yet clear whether public users will have access to Summary File 1 tables which provide information for “American Indian and Alaska Native alone” or “in combination with one or more races.” (National Congress of American Indians 2019).

3. **Loss of Accuracy**: Because differential privacy will have a stronger influence at lower levels of geography and for small population groups (i.e., \( \epsilon \) will be larger), it will substantially decrease the accuracy of tabular data in places with small populations. This includes Census blocks and tracts but also counties with small population sizes (e.g., rural counties) and groups with small populations (e.g., racial/ethnic minorities).

4. **Unequal Access to Data**: Access to some Census data products may become restricted and available only through the Federal Statistical Research Data Centers (FSRDCs). This would have disproportionate negative impacts on early career researchers and those from universities without research data centers. There are currently only 29 FSRDC branches with fewer than 300 workstations. Capacity issues aside, high user fees will limit access for researchers without university or grant support. Moreover, the process of gaining access to RDC data is time consuming and arduous; it includes developing a research proposal for the Census Bureau to approve, obtaining Special Sworn Status via an FBI security clearance process, and completing data stewardship training. This process can take 6 months to a year. Users must be U.S. citizens or be a resident for 3 years. Approved proposals cannot be modified without going through additional review. The Census Bureau must review and approve any output before the user can remove it from the secured data enclave (e.g., for presentations, publications, or sharing with a dissertation adviser). In sum, FSRDCs are not a viable alternative to public-release microdata or Summary File tables.

Most of us would agree that data protection and confidentiality are important and should be taken seriously. But it appears that “differential privacy goes far beyond what is necessary to keep data safe under census law and precedent” (Ruggles 2019:406). At the very least, we should be discussing the potential consequences of differential privacy with our colleagues and working with our professional organizations to make sure there are Census data user representatives at the table in discussions about differential privacy implementation.

For a brief, albeit cheerful explanation of differential privacy rationale and procedures, see this Census Bureau produced video: https://bit.ly/2ocZhRT.

**Citations**


Teaching
Connecting with students when teaching online

When I teach I try to connect to the students, specifically through developing mutual respect, demonstrating to students that I care about how they’re doing in the class, and providing space for their questions and thoughts on the topics. This connection between myself as the instructor and the students—as well as between the students themselves—facilitates a positive learning environment. But developing genuine connections with students can be especially daunting in two settings increasingly common in our colleges and universities: large classes and online classes. Given the demographic and academic profile of the average online student compared to the average in-person student—more often non-traditional and at higher risk of not completing their degree or even the course—finding ways to connect with students in large online classes is especially critical. I often teach classes of 50 or more students online, including Sociology of Sex and Gender, Introduction to Aging, and Intimate Relationships and the Family, and I have found the task of connecting with students to require modified strategies compared to small in-person classes.

I’ll discuss three strategies, but note that my strategies may not work for everyone and there are many other methods (as well as often structural constraints that limit how well able to do this). I also direct people to resources from the Chronicle (https://www.chronicle.com/interactives/advice-online-teaching), Faculty Focus (https://www.facultyfocus.com/articles/online-education/ten-online-teaching-tips-may-not-heard/), and Inside Higher Ed (https://www.insidehighered.com/digital-learning/article/2017/11/15/peer-advice-instructors-teaching-online-first-time).

Introductions. In my online classes, I take care to introduce myself through a short video, so students can see what I look like, hear my voice, and see me as a person—not a disembodied figure behind a screen somewhere. I talk about why I first became interested in the topic of the course, showing them pictures from my own life. I then divide students into small discussion groups (8-10 students each), encouraging them to also share photos as a way to talk about their own interest in the course, and giving them very specific prompts (such as discussing the topic on the syllabus they’re most excited by). In these introductions, students discover similarities they share with me and with other classmates, and they become more invested in the course. I can also refer back to these introductions when grading papers or responding to students’ discussion board comments as a way of remembering who the student is and their interests and experiences.

Discussion Boards. A key part of learning—especially within sociology—involves discussing the material, connecting concepts to one’s own experiences or events in the world. Every week in my online classes, I provide two discussion boards: one with a very specific prompt and the other that allows for more free discussion. Some students prefer the very structured board with prompts, but others prefer a more free-flowing discussion, and providing both gives space to both types of students. Because I generally have a

Mieke Thomeer McBride
mthomeer@uab.edu
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teaching assistant, it’s easy to avoid these boards and allow the TA to be the one to read and grade. But I find that when I regularly log on, read comments, and contribute, the boards are more active than they would be otherwise. I enjoy logging onto these boards more than I do, say, Facebook, and I vary how involved I am depending on the demands of the week. I also take care to pay attention to who the active and inactive posters are, and to rearrange group members in order to facilitate the best dynamics. I then take comments from these boards that are particularly insightful and mention them in future week’s lectures—the same as I would do in an in-person class when a student says something thought-provoking. Students seem to have more comfort sharing personal stories, experiences, and opinions on online boards than they do in class, and these comments tend to be insightful and respectful of other students, especially when realize this is an active conversation we are all together engaged in.

Personal Stories, Pictures, and My Voice. In my in-person classes, I generally lecture for about two-thirds of the class and spend the rest of the time in discussion. I try to replicate this general pattern in online classes, using the same powerpoints as in my in-person classes but writing out my notes and then recording the audio of those notes. As one student told me this year, listening to the audio of my voice, rather than just having a lot of readings or notes, “It felt like I was in a classroom setting and not at Starbucks.” I record separate audio for each slide, making this easy to edit and change as I continue to improve and modify the course from year to year, and I use a Blue Snowball microphone for better audio quality. I also take care to type out and record the personal stories I would generally work in during in-person classes; for example, telling the story of the first time I had to clean a dead body when working at a nursing home during a discussion of death rituals. Because I include my voice—and occasional personal photo—in these powerpoints, I’ve been able to encounter students throughout the community, for example, in line at Target or at the Apple Store, who recognized me and introduced themselves. It’s startling to realize that without recording audio or including pictures, it would be easy for students to encounter me—and vice versa—and for us to never know.

I’d love to hear other pieces of advice for connecting with students in large online classes—or other class environments. Feel free to either email me (mthomeer@uab.edu) or send me a Tweet (@miekebeth), and I’ll be sure to share ideas on Twitter or in a future column.
The fall semester marks not only the beginning of a new academic year but also the time of year in which graduate students eagerly enter the job market for the first time and some faculty may look for new faculty positions. The first step in any job-seeking venture is to make sure one’s CV is accurate, well organized, and puts one’s best foot forward. We have included in this column a few tips to accomplish this task and also a few CV-writing resources.

The CV should be equal parts sales pitch and account of your life’s work. This is where you let all of your hard work shine! Make sure to highlight and place early on in your CV pertinent information for the hiring committee to see. Therefore, you should list any peer-reviewed publications early in your CV if you are applying to a research institution. If you are applying to a more teaching-oriented institution, then be sure to list early on, in addition to any peer reviewed publications, teaching experiences (courses taught with full responsibility, teaching assistant experience, guest lectures including class name and lecture title, and any teaching workshops you have attended). In either case, be sure to include other important information, for example a dissertation award, early on so that it receives attention. Limit the information you list in your CV to what is most important for the job to which you’re applying. Having too much unnecessary information could distract the hiring committee members. Avoid long, wordy paragraphs, which likely will not be read, and avoid insider jargon. Also, be sure you understand what NOT to include in your CV, including, for example, your age, marital status, or religion. Formatting of your CV is also important. Below we have included a reference to help with specific formatting issues, such as typical margins, spacing, and heading ideas.

Graduate students should be careful not to be overwhelmed by the CV-writing experience. Don’t be afraid to seek assistance. Ask faculty in your department to review your CV and suggest changes. Look at faculty CVs for ideas. Review the CVs of your department’s recent graduates to understand what worked for a peer. This exercise should also help lessen concerns about a “short” CV, which can be a worry for many graduate students, especially when comparing oneself to established sociologists in the field.

Some readers may be interested in non-academic positions, for example at a hospital or in a medical school. Candidates for a job in the healthcare industry might consider using a resume, which differs from a CV in that resumes tend to be shorter (1-2 pages) and geared to a specific job. When considering non-faculty positions, whether one submits a resume or CV, consider including side jobs, non-work activities that show an interest in the field, and service activities, which may be more valued than for those who apply for a
Career and Employment

Resources:

For academic positions:
- 8 Tips to Improve Your CV
- Your CV Should Inform, Your Cover Letter Should Persuade
- How to Write a CV for the Academic Job Market

For medical-field positions:
- UT Health Resume and CV Guide

For non-academic positions:
- Before You Write A Cover Letter for a Nonfaculty Job, Try This Exercise

For information on formatting:
- Dr. Karen’s Rules of the Academic CV
Carol S. Aneshensel, 1947 – 2019

Carol S. Aneshensel, Research Professor and Professor Emeritus in the Department of Community Health Sciences at the University of California, Los Angeles, passed away on June 14, 2019, in Santa Monica.

After receiving her Ph.D. from Cornell University, Carol’s first appointment was at the University of Minnesota, but she soon moved to UCLA where she would stay for almost 40 years. Carol quickly emerged as one of the pre-eminent researchers in stress research. As a member of the Consortium for Research in Stress Processes, she contributed to three volumes on central issues in stress research and helped sharpen the collective work of that group. She enjoyed a number of collaborations with prominent researchers in the sociology of health and mental health, most notably Leonard I. Pearlin. Carol and Len led two major studies concerning the stress of caregiving. Their investigation of the experiences of persons providing care to individuals with Alzheimer’s disease culminated in a highly regarded monograph, Profiles in Caregiving: The Unexpected Career, which provided a unique synthesis of the stress process paradigm with the life course perspective. A second study of caregivers to individuals living with HIV/AIDS further contributed to this synthesis. These are but two examples of her enduring contributions to the field.

Over the past decade, Carol’s research focused on the ways in which social inequality in neighborhoods affects the health of persons in middle- and older-age. Her work has always been a model of rigorous quantitative analysis in the service of precise theoretical thinking. Her well-received book, Theory-Based Data Analysis for the Social Sciences, provides a lucid model for the kind of approach that was a hallmark of her career.

Carol had a unique intellectual style: pairing clarity and vision is not an obvious combination, yet she regularly achieved both in her work. She did not suffer ambiguity gladly; she saw beyond the trends and inertial components of research agendas; she envisioned causation and explanation in original ways. Her work was ambitious, a few steps ahead of the cutting edge, but also pinpoint clear. Carol made essential distinctions among concepts that others had not even considered. Her work on the appropriate positioning of the role of stress in explaining health and mental health disparities had widespread influence across disciplines, but it also raised a difficult point: stick to one dependent variable at your own peril, with the accompanying risk of fundamentally misleading the field about the sources of health disparities. Research traditions sometimes get mired in hidden assumptions that are too easily accepted: Carol could see the role of these assumptions, and as a result make clear where the uncertainties and ambiguities in research were rooted. She had a distinct talent for this. When apparent conceptual or theoretical progress was not rooted in operational anchors, she was skeptical. Everyone, every research area, would benefit from her perspectives on research in general.
Carol was a strong advocate for the sociology of mental health as a distinctive field within sociology. With Jo C. Phelan, she edited the first edition of the Handbook of the Sociology of Mental Health, which was named the outstanding publication by the ASA Section on the Sociology of Mental Health in 2003. This was only one of the many awards that Carol received throughout her career. She was named a Dean’s Distinguished Scholar at the UCLA Fielding School of Public Health. She was recognized on the Institute of Scientific Information’s Highly Cited Researchers List. She received the Leonard I. Pearlin Award for Distinguished Contributions to the Sociological Study of Mental Health in 2004 from the ASA Sociology of Mental Health Section and the Leo G. Reeder Award for Distinguished Contributions to Medical Sociology from the ASA Medical Sociology Section in 2008. Both awards had special meaning for Carol. She collaborated extensively with Len Pearlin and, early in her career, she assumed leadership of a large study that had been launched by Leo Reeder after he was tragically killed in an airplane accident. Carol’s leadership and mentorship are models of academic service. She supervised countless theses and dissertations at UCLA. She was a regular participant in NIH grant review panels, bringing a sociological perspective to these processes. She served as Chair of the Sociology of Mental Health Section and held executive positions in the Medical Sociology and SALC Sections.

Carol was also a role model for younger sociologists and public health scientists. She was unstinting in providing assistance and advice to young scientists who were launching their careers.

With colleagues, she was supportive, easily helpful, but also carefully and appropriately critical, pushing everyone to think through their claims. She could be charmingly contrarian, but never without purpose. If someone claimed an idea was trivial, she could save it. If someone claimed something basic was missing, her response might be: prove it.

Most of all, Carol was one of the very best friends one can imagine. You knew where you stood with Carol. It would be difficult to claim she was easy-going, and this too was part of her contribution to our profession. When you were a friend, you were a good friend, a close friend, someone you could disagree with, but also knew that respect was there, allowing a safe zone for disagreement.

Nothing was more important to Carol than her family. Her face lit up every time she would talk about her daughter, Gay, and her son and daughter-in-law, Clayton and Jill. She was even more effusive about her grandchildren, Luke and Sadie.

Carol leaves a legacy of scholarship and mentorship, but most importantly, she leaves us with memories of many years of friendship and acts of kindness. One could not have a better friend and colleague.

Notes of condolence and remembrance to be shared with Carol’s loved ones can be directed to the Fielding School’s Department of Community Health Sciences, chsmemories@ph.ucla.edu.

William R. Avison        Blair Wheaton
Western University        University of Toronto
Section awards ceremony

The Section’s awards committees announced the following winners and honorable mentions for Section awards in Summer. Award winners were recognized at the ASA meetings in New York City in August.

**Patricia Homan wins Simmons Award for outstanding dissertation in Medical Sociology**

Dr. Patricia A. Homan, “Structural Sexism and Health in the United States”. Dr. Homan is currently an Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Florida State University and Associate, Pepper Institute on Aging and Public Policy, Florida State University.

Honorable mention: Josh Seim, “Working on the Poor: Ambulance Labor in the Polarized City”. Dr Seim is currently an Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Southern California.

**2019 Light Award**

Brian C. Kelly, Mike Vuolo, Laura C. Frizzell, and Elaine M. Hernandez won the 2019 Donald W. Light Award for Applied Medical Sociology for their article “Denormalization, Smoke-free Air Policy, and Tobacco Use among Young Adults” in Social Science & Medicine, August 2018.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2018.05.051

Mike Vuolo (The Ohio State University), Brian Kelly (Purdue University) and Donald W. Light at the Medical Sociology Awards Ceremony.

See more photos from the Awards Ceremony at https://flic.kr/s/aHsmGrop5G

Patricia A. Homan (Florida State) and Patricia Rieker (Boston), Simmons Committee Chair at the Medical Sociology Awards Ceremony.
**Section awards ceremony**

**Alexandra Brewer wins Louise Johnson Scholar award**

Alexandra Brewer, a doctoral candidate in Sociology at the University of Chicago, with a paper entitled “Moralizing the Opioid Shortage: Race, Pain, and Resource Scarcity in an Urban Hospital”

Alexandra Brewer (Chicago) and Danielle Bessett (Cincinnati) at the Awards Ceremony

**Laura Stark wins 2019 Freidson Award**


**Honorable mention: Emily Allen Paine**, a doctoral candidate in Sociology at the University of Texas at Austin, with a paper, entitled “Queering the Clinic: Constructing Gender & Sexuality in LGBTQ Healthcare”,


**Laura Stark (Vanderbilt) with Claire Decoteau**

**Hui Zheng and Claire Decoteau**
Section awards ceremony

Stefan Timmermans, 2019 Reeder Award winner

Stefan Timmermans was recognized for the 2019 Reeder Award and delivered a lecture following the awards ceremony. Timmermans was introduced at the Awards ceremony by Sara Shostak and Brea Perry.

Stefan Timmermans begins his Reeder lecture

Stefan Timmermans and Brea Perry

Sara Shostak.
Welcome to the fall issue of the Medical Sociology newsletter.

I am very pleased to be working with another fantastic group of columnists from the Section for the upcoming year.

My thanks to members who have sent in announcements and conference calls for papers. The newsletter is open to the entire membership, so please be in touch if you have something you would like to share.

---

Call for Papers

The Sociology of Health Professions’ Education Collaborative held its annual gathering of sociologists at ASA this past summer in New York City. Approximately 25 members gathered, from graduate students, to post-docs and faculty members, to discuss mutual interests in health professions and medical education.

Please take note: the SOC HPE Collaborative will be organizing another mini-conference at the Eastern Sociological Society Meetings in Philadelphia in 2020.

Our hope is to use this mini-conference to build on the growing momentum of interest and bring together a wide range of scholars at different career stages and institution types (i.e., those in traditional sociology departments and those working in health professions schools).

Those wishing to present papers should submit an abstract of 250 words to https://www.soc-hpe.com/ess-mini-conference.html by October 23, 2019.

If you have any questions, please contact one of the organizers:
Laura Hirshfield (lhirsh@uic.edu),
Tania Jenkins (tania.jenkins@unc.edu) or
Kelly Underman (kelly.underman@drexel.edu).

---

From the editor

Evan Roberts, University of Minnesota
eroberts@umn.edu @evanrobertsnz

The Sociology of Health Professions’ Education Collaborative held its annual gathering of sociologists at ASA this past summer in New York City. Approximately 25 members gathered, from graduate students, to post-docs and faculty members, to discuss mutual interests in health professions and medical education.

Please take note: the SOC HPE Collaborative will be organizing another mini-conference at the Eastern Sociological Society Meetings in Philadelphia in 2020.

Our hope is to use this mini-conference to build on the growing momentum of interest and bring together a wide range of scholars at different career stages and institution types (i.e., those in traditional sociology departments and those working in health professions schools).

Those wishing to present papers should submit an abstract of 250 words to https://www.soc-hpe.com/ess-mini-conference.html by October 23, 2019.

If you have any questions, please contact one of the organizers:
Laura Hirshfield (lhirsh@uic.edu),
Tania Jenkins (tania.jenkins@unc.edu) or
Kelly Underman (kelly.underman@drexel.edu).
Thank you!

Thanks to everyone who donated to the Section on Medical Sociology Fundraising Campaign. We raised a total of $2,600 for student awards! We appreciate your generosity to the Section.

Anne Figert
Brea Perry
Brian Kelly
Bridget Gorman
Bruce Link
Carol Lee
Claire Decoteau
Daniel Menchik
Dara Shifrer
David Takeuchi
Deborah Carr
Deborah Potter
Elizabeth Baker
Eric Wright
Hanna Grol-Prokopczyk
Hui Liu
Jan Thomas
Jane McLeod
Janet Hankin
Jason Houle
Joanna Kempner
Karen Kaiser
Kathy Charmaz
Kristin Barker
Laura Senier
Lijun Song
Louise Roth
Miranda Waggoner
Pat Rieker
Patricia Drentea
Russell Schutt
Savannah Larimore
Shannon Monnat
Stefan Timmermans
Tiffany Joseph
Weihua An

Note: Names are ordered alphabetically by first name

In 1989, the first drug-treatment court was established in Florida, inaugurating an era of state-supervised rehabilitation. Such courts have frequently been seen as a humane alternative to incarceration and the war on drugs. *Enforcing Freedom* offers an ethnographic account of drug courts and mandatory treatment centers as a system of coercion, demonstrating how the state uses notions of rehabilitation as a means of social regulation.

Situating drug courts in a long line of state projects of race and class control, Kerwin Kaye details the ways in which the violence of the state is framed as beneficial for those subjected to it. He explores how courts decide whether to release or incarcerate participants using nominally colorblind criteria that draw on racialized imagery. Rehabilitation is defined as preparation for low-wage labor and the destruction of community ties with “bad influences,” a process that turns participants against one another. At the same time, Kaye points toward the complex ways in which participants negotiate state control in relation to other forms of constraint in their lives, sometimes embracing the state’s salutary violence as a means of countering their impoverishment. Simultaneously sensitive to ethnographic detail and theoretical implications, *Enforcing Freedom* offers a critical perspective on the punitive side of criminal-justice reform and points toward alternative paths forward.

Kerwin Kaye is associate professor of sociology, American studies, and feminist, gender, and sexuality studies at Wesleyan University.

Publication announcements

Articles


Chrysler Building in New York City during the ASA 2019 Annual Meeting