From the President

It has been my great honor to serve in this capacity throughout this year. I thank you for the opportunity to do so, and I thank you also for your patience as we adjusted to new challenges that this year has brought for everyone.

The loss of Dr. Kathy Charmaz affected us all, many of us deeply. We will grieve for some time still, both personally and professionally, and for the loss to future generations of young SI scholars who will never have the chance to know her. At conferences for years to come, we will miss her generous and incisive comments, and her warm, welcoming smile.

These are tumultuous and trying times. Many of us have spent the better part of the past year trying desperately to avoid a new, poorly-understood and often-serious disease. Some of us have lost loved ones to COVID, and live in fear for more loved ones each day. Some are worried about the economic impacts on our institutions, our retirement plans, or our families. Some of us are focused on the non-COVID crises that have been so painfully laid bare this past year: staggering inequality, horrific police brutality, pervasive toxic masculinity, to name just a few.

What's going on in our organization can't be extricated from what's going on in the world right now. We're exhausted, and we're afraid, and we're anomic: about race, about gender, about age, about everyday life, about academia. What used to be, what used to work, whether in our departments or at our conferences or in our households, is no longer a given. We're not sure which conversations we need to have, how to have them, or what they will do to us. Yes, the show must go on - but over the past several years, and most especially this past year, everything about the production, from the scripts to the actors to the theaters, has changed.

Over the last year, media outlets across the U.S. have featured lay essays on: the uniquely challenging situation of mothers during the pandemic, the experiences of dogs with their people suddenly home all the time, moral panics over masking and not masking, the relationship between physical isolation and social isolation, the impact of the pandemic on academia, class identities and markers in the Zoom era, and changing meanings of education for everyone. Journalists and bloggers and cable news pundits are grappling with these questions. Even more broadly, the world is pondering the unprecedented blurring of the private and the public, the social and emotional costs of long-term interaction when half of our faces are obscured, and changes wrought by the pandemic in and around gesture, tone of voice and embodied experiences.

These are quintessentially interactionist problems: structural power and macro dynamics manifested and enacted in our identities, played out on our bodies, performed and experienced through our emotions, and constructed, constituted and demonstrated in our interactions.

(Continued on page 2)
At the same time, we are in the midst of a new cultural reckoning around intersections among racism, masculinity, and heterosexuality. If there’s anywhere in academia where we shouldn’t ignore what we’re all going through, the sense we’re all making of this, the collective experience of the past few years and the differences among our individual and group experiences, it’s SSSI. If there’s any time not to ignore the challenges we face, in the whiteness of our legacy and our membership, in our dwindling appeal to a new generation of scholars who want, still and again, to change a world that hasn’t changed enough, it’s now.

SSSI has been my intellectual home since I found it, precisely because it felt like the fringe. We’re proud of our different approaches to sociology, and to credentialism, and to the hierarchies and status performances rampant in academia. And I’m proud of what I see as our rebelliousness and a bit of a tendency toward intellectual and social irreverence. I revel in the breadth of places and spaces and dimensions and meanings that we (and often only we) interactionists study. The reasons we’re not at the center of the discipline are the very things I cherish. But the fringes are also exactly where social movements are born. They are where the energy for social change has always been generated.

This is not to preach; I’ve completely ignored race in my own work, and failed to engage with intersectionality in gender. For years, I neglected race in my teaching. I took full advantage of the privilege to overlook these things; the privilege to spend my time thinking about whatever most interested me at the moment. I drew a firm line between scholarship and activism, and an even firmer line between symbolic interaction and everything else. I policed these lines rigidly, performing a stubborn, righteous gatekeeping that I know some of you have witnessed - or performed yourselves. I didn’t come to sociology to change the world. I came because it was fascinating.

I no longer believe that this serves us well, as an organization, as sociologists, or as citizens. I’ve come to see at least some of the ways that the very things that I’ve long loved about the Society are rooted in, and reflect, whiteness and white privilege. I’ve come to understand why some people who do interactionist work come to us once or twice and don’t return. And I’ve come to be much more troubled by the fact that many people do interactionist work and never even come to us in the first place. Crises have a way of putting things into perspective.

Many of you have had this perspective for quite some time. This year we’ve been continuing and developing the initiatives of the previous Executive Council. Toward these ends, we have concentrated our efforts on outreach, diversity and inclusivity, on the centralization, organization and continuity of records, and on transparency of our practices and processes. We’re actively trying to create more opportunities for us all to do the work together: to better understand, to resist and to uproot white supremacy, racism, sexism and heterosexism. We’re working to construct safer spaces for the tough conversations that need to be had - within our leadership, at our meetings, and in our journal.

The SSSI has long been my professional home. I don’t want us to lose our interactionist identity, our roots or our lens. I don’t want us to morph into another organization. But, as a reforming gatekeeper, I do believe we can - and should - draw on who we already are and what we already do, in order to face, understand, and help others understand some of the most pressing and crucial issues of our time.

- Staci Newmahr
SSSI President (2020-2021)
SSSI Organization Updates
Officers, Committees, & Upcoming Conference

1. After reviewing applications from a slate of impressive and highly-qualified candidates, we are also very happy to announce the appointment of the next editor of Symbolic Interaction: Lisa-Jo Van den Scott. We extend our deep appreciation to all the applicants for their engagement and commitment to the journal and to the Society. I’d also like to thank Eric Silva and the members of the Publications Committee, who worked through a good deal of material, tackled important issues in the process, and engaged in tough conversations around issues of diversity, equity and representation.

We look forward to Dr. Van den Scott’s leadership of the journal, to the continued growth and success of Symbolic Interaction, and to supporting her in building a diverse team of Associate Editors, reviewers and authors.

2. We are pleased to officially announce the appointment of Stacey Hannem as SSSI Secretary.

3. We are currently seeking nominations for Treasurer. Because of border closures, non-profit regulations, and related banking concerns, nominees must live in the United States. Nominees need not be members of the Society, but the Treasurer must become a member at the time of appointment. Self-nominations are welcome, and confirmed nominations from willing individuals are preferred.

The position will begin immediately upon appointment, finishing the unexpired current term. The appointed Treasurer will then serve a full five-year term, commencing at the end of the completion of the annual meeting in August 2021 and ending at the completion of the annual meeting in 2026.

4. The SSSI also seeks volunteers for the Antiracism, Diversity and Representation Committee

The mandate of this committee is to identify concerns related to diversity and representation within the membership of SSSI and to propose and undertake efforts to address these issues. Specifically, the committee is tasked with creating proposals that will institutionalize our organizational commitment to antiracism and diversity, and foster a community and culture that is welcoming and inclusive of interactionist scholars of all backgrounds and identities.

The ADR Committee has been actively recruiting, and continues to seek new members. If interested, please contact Stacey Hannem (shannem@wlu.ca). They are currently working on creating and codifying grievance policies and procedures related to equity, diversity and representation, as well as related programming at the upcoming meeting.

Antiracism, Diversity and Representation Committee:

• Stacey Hannem, Chair - Wilfrid Laurier University
• Jasmón Bailey - University of South Florida
• Deveda François - National Louis University
• J. Sumerau – The University of Tampa

5. The newly appointed Nominations Committee:

• Chris Conner
• David Embrick
• Sam Hillyard

6. Our 2022 annual meeting is the Couch-Stone Symposium, and is planned to be paired with the Qualitative Analysis Conference, in Newfoundland, Canada.

7. The deadline for submissions for this year’s conference, “Socialization and Inequalities across the Life Course: New Directions for Interactionist Scholarship,” has been extended to April 2.
From the President of the European SSSI

Similar to the situation in the US, we had to cancel the conference in Pisa planned in 2020. This conference would have been a special conference celebrating ten years of European SSSI. It was postponed to 2021, but we also had to cancel this one. Our plan is to have the European SSSI conference in Pisa in 2022. The exact date has to be confirmed, but it probably will be around 1 July. We have decided not to organize an online conference. We are happy to participate in the SSSI conference in August this year.

Normally our board meets twice a year, but using Teams we are meeting more often. Since February we are meeting monthly, not only to discuss organisational matters but also to discuss substantive matters. We also intend to invite guests to present their work at our meetings. In our next meeting we have a presentation by Martina Cvajner who wrote an amazing ethnography called Soviet Signoras. She will give a talk at the meeting of 14 April at 14:00 UK time.

Her fieldwork lasted 15 years, in which she followed the lives of women who immigrated from former Soviet republics to work in Northern Italy as elder carer. She has been able to describe the perspective of the women in detail. Respect, pride, disgrace, self-worth and self-esteem are the core principles of their worldview. Because of their marginal position these women lack resources to sustain a positive sense of self. Consumption as in shopping and doing hyper-femininity are two ways in which they restore their (self-perceived) social degradation as ‘bum washers’. In many ways this book reminded me of Code of the Street of Anderson, which concerns a similar but of course different marginalized group trying to gain respect.

The European SSSI had also been involved in organizing summer schools on qualitative research and grounded theory method. We will have one in Kaunas (Lithuania) in the beginning of June. In general, the participants are PhD students from Europe, Asia and America.

A final focus of the European SSSI is publishing contributions presented in our meeting. In spring this year Pisa University Press will publish Dealing with Grounded Theory: Discussing, Learning, and Practice which contains publications of senior and junior academics on the practice of grounded theory method. We plan to publish a book on SI in Europe, which will be published next year.

- Thaddeus Müller

President of SSSI Europe

2020 Award Winners

The Society for the Study of Symbolic Interaction congratulates our 2020 award winners. We also extend our sincere thanks for all who participated in the award process, from nominations to conferral.

Herbert Blumer Award for Best Graduate Student Paper in Symbolic Interaction

“You Are First a Chinese Citizen, Then a Consumer: Presenting and Balancing Identities Online as Chinese International Tourists”
Fangheyue (Amber) Ma, Department of Sociology
University of South Florida

Early-in-Career Award

J. Sumerau, Associate Professor of Sociology
The University of Tampa

Charles Horton Cooley Award for Best Recent Book or Article in Symbolic Interaction

Situational Breakdowns: Understanding Protest Violence and Other Surprising Outcomes
Anne Nassauer, Assistant Professor of Sociology
Sociology Department, John F. Kennedy Institute
Freie Universität Berlin

The Helena Lopata Award for Excellence in Mentoring

Patrick Williams, Associate Professor of Sociology
Nanyang Technological University in Singapore

George Herbert Mead Award for Lifetime Achievement in Symbolic Interaction

Robert Dingwall, Professor, School of Social Sciences, Nottingham Trent University
Emeritus Professor and Founding Director, Institute of Science and Society, University of Nottingham
Kathy C. Charmaz
1939-2020

As many of you know, Kathy Charmaz, longtime member and major contributor to SSSI in numerous ways, died of cancer on July 26, 2020. She was very grateful to be able to die at home with her husband Steve, friend Fran Bendingfeld, and home hospice caregivers by her side. She was Professor Emerita of Sociology at Sonoma State University and former Director of its Faculty Writing Program.

I will not attempt to carefully limn Kathy’s long and distinguished career here. An ambitious and thoughtful invited article about Kathy’s legacies will appear in Symbolic Interaction in 2021. Though I will mention major honors Kathy was awarded, I do not list them all as these too have been detailed elsewhere.2

What I will do is first give a brief sense of her early background including some key issues I believe made a difference in her life, and then spend the bulk of this obituary on why and how I think Kathy was a very late intellectual bloomer who contributed exceptionally powerfully to the interactionist tradition. I will argue that she became increasingly strong in her voice and incisive in her ideas as she freed herself of constraints that were both external and internal and flourished vividly as a scholar for the last twenty years of her life.3 What I find most extraordinary about this— that I had not realized until her death—is that this era of stunning productivity and intellectual self-confidence happened from when she was sixty til she died at eighty.

Early Years:4

Kathy was born in Wisconsin to Robert and Lorraine Calkins but soon moved to Pennsylvania where she spent her early life, following her father’s job opportunities as a civil engineer. While growing up, she was exposed to chronic illness, disability, and economic instability in her family, leading to her bachelors’ in fine arts and occupational therapy (OT).

Graduating from the University of Kansas in 1962, she followed her then fiancé to San Francisco where she worked in OT for several years. She later noted,

“I became interested in teaching occupational therapy students and one of my interests was—as I saw the students as being very open, but not really knowing much about ethnicity, race, income disparities—to tell them more about that. Not that I knew a lot, but I was sensitive to those issues... (Charmaz & Keller 2016).”

Her new career plan allowed her to go to San Francisco State University for an MA in Sociology, as there were no graduate training programs in OT then so other Masters degrees were acceptable.

---

1This photo was taken at meetings of the British Sociological Association where Kathy gave the invited Plenary Address, “The Power and Potential of Grounded Theory for Medical Sociologists,” Medical Sociology Annual Conference, University of Leicester, September 5, 2012.


3This theme, which can only be sketched here, will be further elaborated in my contribution to Kathy’s Festschrift to appear in Studies in Symbolic Interaction, likely in 2022 or 3.
But instead she became a “sociologist by accident” (Charmaz 2012b: 52). At SF State, she fell in love with social theory, including symbolic interactionism, received some qualitative training (quite rare at that time), and did an ethnography of a rehab unit for her master’s thesis (Charmaz 1969; see also Charmaz 2000b).

Kathy then became quite daring, given her past and future job prospects, and in 1968, she entered the brand new Doctoral Program in Sociology at the University of California, San Francisco (UCSF). She was a member of the first cohort in this new and highly innovative program. Here is a quite snazzy picture of Kathy and that cohort! Kathy (2012b: 59) wrote that the Program “surpassed my hopes about what graduate school could be,” and spent pages of her autobiography discussing it. She (2012b: 60) also wrote of first meeting Anselm: “The conversation that Anselm and I began that Fall day in 1968 continued until the night before he died in 1996.”

Kathy penned the following account of this new Program for our recent co-authored article on Anselm:

“In the 1940s, Chicago graduate students learned qualitative research through oral traditions largely combining immersion in the field with individual mentoring. Strauss had not found this approach helpful, and felt he lacked methodological grounding, so addressed the problem head on….Through his work, what had been available only to an elite few became widely accessible to diverse scholars…[T]he Doctoral Sociology Program he founded at the University of California, San Francisco (UCSF) in 1968 [helped make] him a pioneer….Significantly, after his initial solo research efforts [which he did not see as successful]….developing knowledge meant collaborative projects and products. He participated in collaborative working groups for decades (e.g., Strauss et al., 1964, 1985), and elaborated upon such approaches across his career (e.g., Wiener, 2007). He imparted major lessons in how to work collaboratively rather than competitively, still a central feature of the unique doctoral program he created.

Strauss also elaborated upon this collaborative working group approach in UCSF’s qualitative research training, which goes well beyond the typical single course emphasizing data collection. Moreover, Strauss inverted the usual model of graduate education, initially exposing students to extant theories and substantive findings, and only later engaging in research. Instead, the program began with in-depth field research and qualitative analysis, immediately teaching students how to theorize data from their own empirical studies (Charmaz & Clarke 2019: 10-11, emphases added).  

5This picture was likely taken early 1970s. We used it as the cover of the Program for the 50th Anniversary Celebration of the UCSF Doctoral Program in Sociology, where Kathy was also a keynote speaker.

research. Instead, the program began with in-depth field research and qualitative analysis, immediately teaching students how to theorize data from their own empirical studies (Charmaz & Clarke 2019: 10-11, emphases added).”

UCSF students soon became quite aware of how different their training and doctoral experiences were. And I can attest that they remain distinctive if also changed. Typically, thanks to extensive, still usually collaborative, research experiences usually involving publications, new grads more closely resemble assistant professors at the end of step 1 progress.

Kathy received her PhD in 1973 with a dissertation on chronic illness which ultimately, with considerable further research, became her still most famous medical sociology book, Good Days, Bad Days: The Self in Chronic Illness and Time (Rutgers University Press, 1991). Building on her ethnographic masters’ thesis, it centered on transformations of self engendered by different chronic conditions, their limitations and affordances interpreted from an interactionist perspective informed especially by Mead.7 Kathy was especially entranced both by stories people told and the silences they maintained, researching and writing on disclosure and self in chronic illness for decades (e.g., Charmaz 2002; Vann-Ward, Morse, & Charmaz 2017), and linking the power of stories to theorizing in social justice studies (Charmaz 2016). In 1992, Good Days, Bad Days was awarded the Charles Horton Cooley Award from the Society for the Study of Symbolic Interaction and the Distinguished Scholarship Award from the Pacific Sociological Association.

A much less positive experience with Anselm happened when Kathy was leaving the doctoral program. He suggested to her that as “she could not write—she may as well teach.” This critique had two major consequences in Kathy’s life. First, without strong sponsorship and facing a challenging job market, she had to settle for comparatively minor positions, ending up as Assistant Professor of Sociology at Sonoma State College in 1973. She took this job in part to fulfill her agreement with her new husband Steve Charmaz “to find a job within 50 miles of the [San Francisco] Bay Area” (Charmaz 2008: 171). She remained at Sonoma for the rest of her career. That department had no graduate programs or students and was for decades riven by major conflicts while it struggled for funding within a state system under financial and scholarly siege.8

In her brief autobiography (Charmaz 2012b: 63-67), Kathy described her years at Sonoma as needing to be “survived,” with faculty layoffs and threats of more often hanging over the campus. I too spent some years there and Kathy did not exaggerate. It was a harrowing, relentlessly challenging, and too often demeaning place to work.

Kathy and Steve bought a small home in Santa Rosa, and once her position became permanent and tenure-track, she began moving up the career ladder, becoming Full Professor by 1981, and Professor Emerita upon her retirement in 2016. At Sonoma State, she made important contributions in sociology, social theory, gerontology, and research methods.

Kathy later related that “other people [too] said: ‘You’ve got to do something about your writing!’ because I wrote like social scientists do, with passive verbs, prepositional phrases,” etc. (Charmaz & Keller 2016: para. 30). Taking their and Anselm’s critiques to heart in a second way, c 1980 Kathy began working intensely on improving it, taking courses and seeking critiques until actually becoming an excellent writer and teacher and mentor of writing. She then created professional development courses and workshops in writing for junior faculty researchers at Sonoma State and for sociology grad students at UCSF and others nationally and internationally.

Despite dwelling for most of her career in a department without graduate students, Kathy became perhaps equally well known as among the most available and remarkable mentors especially but not only in qualitative methods and medical sociology in the ASA, the Society for the Study of Symbolic

7 For her later reflections on this work, see Charmaz (2009b).
8 In California, state colleges and universities were initially highly tiered, with UCs having master’s and doctoral programs in most departments, while state colleges had neither. Gradually, some state colleges became universities with Masters’ degrees in limited subject areas, currently expanding. Sonoma State College became a University in 1978. As far as I can tell, there are still no degree-granting graduate programs in the Sociology Department at Sonoma State.
Interaction, the Pacific Sociological Association and far beyond. She mentored others’ grad students and junior faculty internationally, appropriately winning several outstanding mentorship awards.

I want to offer my own story of her sponsorship. While I was teaching at Sonoma in Women’s Studies in the late 1970s, Kath (whom I had met earlier) invited me to spend one night a week at her and Steve’s home as my commute was very long. Then, when I was searching for a doctoral program in sociology, she not only loaned me Discovery of Grounded Theory, but wrote me a letter of recommendation to the UCSF Program which offered just what I sought—qualitative, medical, and women’s health. Once I began the Program, she organized a writing group with Leigh Star, Anna Hazan, a Berkeley alum, me and herself—to support all our publishing. Sustained and multi-faceted mentorship indeed!

Accomplishments and Recognition:

Kathy C. Charmaz was known and widely recognized internationally as an interpretive and theoretically-oriented medical sociologist, as a pragmatist interactionist who wrote ambitiously about the tradition, and as the scholar who developed and widely taught constructivist grounded theory (CGT) as a method of interpretive qualitative inquiry. People flocked to the many talks and workshops she offered in each of these areas each year all over the world. Kathy served as Editor of Symbolic Interaction, President of the Society for the Study of Symbolic Interaction, President of the Pacific Sociological Association, and served on the Editorial Boards of 23 journals in qualitative inquiry and medical sociology. She published 14 books, 63 chapters, 33 articles, 16 encyclopedia entries, and over 30 book reviews, while very actively mentoring in the U.S. and internationally. She was a frequent invited guest professor at universities in Australia, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, the Netherlands, Austria, New Zealand, and Japan.

Her many accomplishments were also widely recognized. Kathy received the Lifetime Achievement Award in Qualitative Inquiry from the International Congress of Qualitative Inquiry in 2018, and the Leo G. Reeder Award for Distinguished Contributions to Medical Sociology from the Medical Sociology Section of the ASA, 2017. She won the George Herbert Mead Lifetime Achievement Award from the Society for the Study of Symbolic Interaction in 2006, made Distinguished Professor by Sonoma State University in 1998, and received several outstanding mentorship awards, including from the Society for the Study of Symbolic Interaction.

A Career in Late Bloom:

Throughout her career, from its earliest to its last days, Kathy’s pragmatist interactionism informed and infused her work—from her sociology of health, illness and death, to social psychology, to her constructivist grounded theory, and of course her work on interactionism per se. Unlike many senior scholars, Kathy Charmaz’ productivity did not flag later in her 50 year career, it intensified. Even more amazing, the intellectual, especially philosophical depth of her work continued to deepen. Kathy did not really hit her intellectual stride until the last two decades of her life, from c2000-2020. She was 60 when this era began and 80 when it ended with her death, definitely a late blooming in a long and productive career.

By the 1990s, Kathy noted “The postmodern critique of qualitative research had weakened its legitimacy and narrative analysts criticized grounded theory methodology for fragmenting participants’ stories. Hence, grounded theory methodology was beginning to be seen as a dated methodology and some researchers advocated abandoning it” (Charmaz & Keller 2016: para. 38). Obviously, Kathy disagreed.

Circa 2000, building upon yet also challenging Straussian grounded theory, Kathy began a new field of endeavor—developing constructivist grounded theory (CGT) which became the second heart of her career and which she continued to refine for the rest of her life. In the years before Anselm’s death in 1996, she began formulating and applying a deep understanding of the challenges posed by poststructuralisms and interpretivism not only to positivist approaches to qualitative inquiry, but also to what she saw as partial and naïve constructionist approaches (Charmaz 1995). She was, of course, mostly concerned with grounded theory but also more broadly.

Significantly, elucidating these critiques while both Glaser and Strauss were alive indicated Kathy’s willingness to question their ultimate authority and trust her own judgments. Barney’s critiques of CGT were and continue to be searing, and she assuredly felt their sting, but continued to remain in some de-
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degree of conversation with him. To my knowledge, Anselm offered no critiques of her CGT, having increasingly moved towards explicit constructionism himself (e.g., Strauss 1987). Had he lived, I suspect Anselm would have been supportive of CGT. For example, he and I had one conversation about what became situational analysis a week or two before he died, and he was excited by my ideas about bringing social worlds/arenas theory together with aspects of GT.

I am reminded of the dedication page of Strauss and Corbin’s (1990, 1998) Basics books which asserts, “If the artist does not perfect new vision in his process of doing, he acts mechanically and repeats some old model fixed like a blueprint in his mind”—John Dewey, Art as Experience, 1934, p. 50.” In response to Glaser’s (1992) adamant policing of GT, Strauss and Corbin (1994:283) also noted that “no inventor has permanent possession of the invention—certainly not even of its name—and furthermore we would not wish to do so.”

Next, this initial move of Kathy’s with her 1995 article was consolidated in her paper titled “Grounded Theory: Objectivist and Constructivist Methods” (Charmaz 2000a) which began with her detailed critiques of Glaserian objectivist GT. She then described her own distinctively constructivist rather than constructionist position. To Kath at that time, constructionists were inadequately reflexive, too often assuming others’ words and worlds were constructed but not necessarily their own as well. Reflexivity was from the outset and remains fundamental to CGT.

Somewhere c2000-2002, Kathy and I had an important if not momentous phone call in the history of our relationship. She wanted me to know that she planned to write her own book on GT as she was worried that I was planning to do one as well. I took a deep breath and said I was working on an extension of GT but that it was quite different from GT, and I did not think we would be in any kind of direct GT competition with hers. I then published my first situational analysis (SA) paper (Clarke 2003) and our differences were confirmed and clarified.

After this crucial and awkward but open conversation, we followed separate but quite parallel paths in our development of new methods, each of us deeply respecting and appreciating the innovations the other was making. From then on, we also began writing collaboratively---on GT and SA as part of “The Second Generation of Grounded Theorists” (Morse et al. 2009, 2021), co-editing a four volume SAGE Benchmark Series (Clarke & Charmaz 2014), for an encyclopedia (Clarke & Charmaz 2019), and about Anselm (Charmaz & Clarke 2019). Our collaborations were the smoothest, most seamless and trustworthy of my career.

From 2000 on, Kathy began distinguishing her constructivist approach from others’ in GT, especially those of her primary GT teacher in grad school, Barney Glaser (Charmaz 2011b). In their place, she posited the centrality of interactionist constructivist interpretive sociology in the qualitative endeavor, including the centrality of her teacher Anselm Strauss’s own legacies in GT (e.g., Charmaz 2005, 2006, 2007, 2009a; Clarke & Charmaz 2019). As a deeply committed interactionist, Kathy Charmaz was especially intrigued with the theoretical promise offered by CGT, and she wrote and taught seminars about using GT analytics in interpretive theory-building (e.g., Charmaz 2015).

But first and foremost, Kathy emphasized the need for deep reflexivity as integral to GT, requisite to provoke researchers to examine their taken-for-granted assumptions and hence better understand the positions and perspectives of others (Charmaz 2016). She also called this “developing methodological self-consciousness” and “reflexivity of a depth researchers may not routinely undertake” (Charmaz 2017: 36). This deep reflexivity was, I believe, Kathy’s key pathway for researchers toward grasping constructivism in practice, and she relentlessly emphasized its import.

Kathy’s exemplars of good CGT vividly demonstrated how it was taken up across many disciplinary boundaries and transnationally. For example, Linda Belgrave and Kathy (2014) wrote about “Studying Illness, Death, and Dying through Constructivist Grounded Theory” illustrated with works by many other scholars. And in her last CGT paper (2021) “The Genesis, Grounds, and Growth of Constructivist Grounded Theory,” Kathy really wowed me, coming up with fresh arguments and ideas and citing a slew of brand new works as exemplary of current and future directions in CGT research. She found time to

9Kathy was defending Strauss’s contributions and interactionist legacy against claims by Barney Glaser that he and he alone had “really” created and since developed the only “pure” version of GT (e.g., Glaser 1992, 1998).
read, write and mentor by working day and night, often seven days a week!

While Kathy’s CGT made explicit and implicit feminist assumptions (Charmaz 2006b, 2012a), it was the potential of CGT for critical inquiry generally and for social justice studies specifically that were most important to Kathy across her last era of endeavor (e.g., Charmaz 2005, 2011a, 2016, 2017a,b, 2020a; Charmaz, Thornberg, & Kean 2018; Belgrave, Seide & Charmaz 2021).

In this series of articles, not only did Charmaz present an ever deepening grasp of how CGT can be used to further broadly critical and social justice goals, she also offered an incredible level of specificity of precisely how CGT can be used in such research. For example, in “The Power of Constructivist Grounded Theory for Critical Inquiry,” (Charmaz 2017a), Charmaz asks ‘How does pragmatist philosophy inform CGT?’ She then discusses early pragmatists’ commitments to social justice, but goes much further, specifying sixteen different ways in which pragmatism and CGT are comparable vis-à-vis issues pertinent to social justice! Her responses to the subsequent query ‘Why use CGT in critical inquiry?’ are equally specific (Charmaz 2017a: 37-40). Combining community-based participatory research with CGT is one such innovation (e.g., Duckles, Moses & Moses 2019) and linking CGT with intersectionality theory is another (e.g., Kassam et al. 2020).

Kathy’s last methods paper on social justice research and critical inquiry focused on the public sphere and was titled, “With Constructivist Grounded Theory You Can’t Hide” (Charmaz 2020). For this, she innovatively sought out reflections on using CGT from four scholars who had done so and read 40 CGT studies on research in the public sphere! She also spends pages usefully detailing specific “methodological moves in CGT” that were especially useful! But most of all this paper confirms the profound consequences and utility of the intensive reflexivity Kathy built in to CGT to provoke researchers themselves.

Kathy brought to these articles the very powerful sophistication and nimbleness that very few except the creators of a method have of its capacities, affordances and the kinds of analytical work different strategies within it can accomplish. When I read her earlier articles, I was very impressed, but I have grown ever more awed over the years as she was able to further elaborate and deepen the philosophical underpinnings and critical scope of CGT and, most of all, specify new strategies for enhanced reflexivity and provide fresh examples.

CGT is today a major research method in qualitative inquiry internationally and across disciplines and professions in both the social sciences and humanities. Charmaz published two award winning editions of her Constructing Grounded Theory: A Practical Guide (Sage, 2006, 2014) translated into Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Polish, Portuguese, Turkish and Persian. Charmaz also co-edited with Tony Bryant two very ambitious Handbooks of Grounded Theory (Sage, 2007, 2019) involving scholars from many countries. Bryant (e.g., 2017) and others sustain and strengthen Kathy’s CGT legacies.

Last but far from least, I want to discuss here Kathy’s many contributions to interactionism. I noted above that interactionism pervaded all areas of her work, but she also focused directly on it across her specialties of health and illness, and methods. One example is her lovely article with Linda Belgrave (2015) on “George Herbert Mead: Meanings and Selves in Illness.” A major one is the textbook in sociological social psychology by Kathy Charmaz, Scott Harris, and Leslie Irvine (2019) The Social Self and Everyday Life: Understanding the World through Symbolic Interactionism. As always, Kathy made sure this was a very accessible and lively text with lots of interesting empirical research illustrations of the theoretical arguments.

Perhaps Kathy’s major direct writings about interactionism concern its futures, about which she has written for many years. In her 2000 Presidential Address to the Pacific Sociological Association, she noted that “The twenty-first century is a time to look back to the classics and build on them, not ignore them,” and innovatively for SI raised the global economy and capitalism, as well as the dominance of transnational corporations as issues of concern (Charmaz 2000b: 534). In 2012, Kathy published on the “Multiple Futures of Symbolic Interactionism: Time for the Past and the Future” (Charmaz 2012c: 15), also looking in both directions and noting, “Rather than foreseeing a future for symbolic interactionism, I foresee multiple futures reflecting divergent paths of its development.” Where we have been will shape where we go.

In 2020, Kathy returned to political economy
Kathy C. Charmaz  
1939-2020

By the time her invitation to contribute to the new Routledge International Handbook of Interactionism arrived, Kathy was already ill. I had said that it would be wonderful if she could contribute and she invited Linda Belgrave and Kikie Seide to join her. Their collaboration produced a very powerful paper I read just as I finished this obituary (Belgrave, Seide & Charmaz 2021). It follows the arc of Kathy’s arguments in her social justice writings, linking the potency of pragmatism’s progressive potentials to two research methods: CGT and SA. Both have already demonstrated how their intentionally built-in capacities to do structural interactionist research can be used toward “an expanded definition of symbolic interactionism.” The goal is to generate more critical and social justice oriented research that addresses the key issue of our day—racism. To that end, the article also calls for us to include W.E.B. DuBois in the “dead white male” pragmatist pantheon whose precepts inform our projects, powerfully rupturing its whiteness. A lovely quote summarizes the imbricativeness of theory and research for interactionism (Belgrave, Seide & Charmaz 2021:405):

“All of this said, we do not aim to reify theory. For pragmatists, “the value of theories or beliefs rests on effective practical application” (Charmaz 2014: 263). Strauss ties this all together: “If you do agree that research should address social issues – and not merely arouse the appreciation of your disciplinary colleagues – then you will understand that a theory of action ought to have research implications” (1993: 51)."

Endings and Beginnings:

While all these facts and figures about Kathy Charmaz are important, they do not convey the care and concern, the sensitivity and thoroughness with which she mentored so very many of us, other faculty and students alike. Being a colleague and mentee were very blurred. Reading and rereading our chapters, articles, and books, writing letter after letter on our behalves for jobs, to get into graduate programs, nominating us for awards—she always said yes. I suspect she died thinking of something she should do for yet someone else.

One of the great gifts I had from Kathy began early last summer when she called to ask if I would make sure certain audiotapes of interviews with Herbert Blumer got deposited with Anselm’s papers in the UCSF Library Archives. They had been done by various members of her cohort while they were all still in grad school at UCSF—likely in the very early 1970s! During the time of COVID, her husband Steve brought them to me on a chilly morning, and all bundled up we had coffee on my deck.

Then she called to gently ask, although it was a time in both our lives of getting rid of things, whether I would accept a small memento from her. I gladly said yes, knowing I would treasure whatever it was. And Steve soon delivered a precious gift indeed. Kath then asked for my help in obtaining addresses for other folks to whom she wished to send mementos and thanks to Google I was able to do so.

---

10 This picture accompanied a brief obituary of Kathy; see Social Science Space (2020).
11 Only one of these tapes was transcribed and one is missing. Eventually I will deliver all I have to the UCSF Archive with other original Strauss materials.
Soon after, I was emailing with Norm Denzin and mentioned that Kathy was in home hospice care. He emailed back and out of the blue offered to publish a Festschrift in her honor in Studies in Symbolic Interaction. I was really thrilled about this and, as you can imagine, so was Kath! Amazingly, she and I were able to plan this Festschrift together, making sure that all the mentees she wanted to contribute were willing and able to do so along with many colleagues. Kath of course regretted that there could not be an open invitation to contribute. At Kathy’s request, Tony Bryant and Linda Liska Belgrave are serving as co-editors. Kath also expressed her wishes about who would write the third edition of her Constructing Grounded Theory—Robert Thornberg. He very happily agreed to do it and was approved by Jai Seaman of SAGE Press.

While none of us knew this at the time, all these momentous decisions were taken during the week before Kathy died, on Sunday morning, July 26th, 2020.

Kathy Charmaz is survived by her husband Steve Charmaz, niece Michelle Harbeck, grandniece Liz Peterson, nieces Nancy Juarez and Linda Schmitt, and nephews Dave Harbeck and Bob Harbeck.

And Kathy is also survived by us, her deeply cherished friends and colleagues in the Society for the Study of Symbolic Interaction which was clearly at the center of her intellectual, professional and also personal lives. I can imagine her mentor into the SSSI Carl Couch grumpily intoning, “She was a damn good interactionist.”12 She really was, and we shall miss her so very much.

- Adele E. Clarke
Professor Emerita, UC San Francisco
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We know that many of you have been eagerly awaiting information about the awards this year. We thank you for your patience and understanding in these unusually challenging times. We especially thank everyone who has volunteered to squeeze even more time and energy out of their days in order to serve on these committees.

This year, we are honored to rename the Early-in-Career award in memory of our dear colleague, Professor Kathy Charmaz (1939-2020), whose scholarship and generous mentorship of young scholars will have a lasting impact on the field of symbolic interaction.

In addition, we are very pleased to announce the inaugural year of The Patricia Hill Collins Award for Intersectional Scholarship in Symbolic Interaction.

This award is given annually for an outstanding published work (article or book) that uses a symbolic interactionist lens to further intersectional analyses and/or address issues of equity, representation, or social justice. To be eligible for the award, the nominated publication should have a publication date in the three years prior to the date of the award (e.g. works published from 2018-20 are eligible to be nominated for the 2021 award).

With one exception (the Cooley Award), the deadline for nominations for all awards and submission of materials is April 15th.

**Herbert Blumer Award for Best Graduate Student Paper in Symbolic Interaction**
Chair: Fangheyue (Amber) Ma - ma2@mail.usf.edu
Committee:
♦ Baptiste Brossard - Baptiste.Brossard@anu.edu.au
♦ Joe Cleary - clearyjp@buffalostate.edu

**The Kathy Charmaz Early-in-Career Award**
Chair: J. Sumerau - jsumerau@ut.edu
Committee:
♦ Katie Cooper - scooper@ut.edu
♦ Lain AB Mathers - Lain.Mathers@indstate.edu

**Patricia Hill Collins Award for Intersectional Scholarship in Symbolic Interaction**
Chair: Stacey Hannem - shannem@wlu.ca
Committee:
♦ Kylan Mattias de Vries - devriek@sou.edu
♦ Watoii Rabii - wrabii@oakland.edu

**Charles Horton Cooley Award for Best Recent Book or Article in Symbolic Interaction**
Nomination deadline: April 15th. Books must be received electronically, by May 1st, 2021. Given different international regulations regarding quarantining books sent through the mail, please submit PDF copies of nominations to all committee members.
Chair: Anne Nassauer - anne.nassauer@fu-berlin.de
Committee:
♦ Elijah Anderson - elijah.anderson@yale.edu
♦ Sidsel Vive Jensen - SiJe@vive.dk

**The Helena Lopata Award for Excellence in Mentoring**
Chair: J. Patrick Williams - subcultures@gmail.com
Committee:
♦ Matthew Hughey - matthew.hughey@uconn.edu
♦ Trinh Luu - luuvinh1000e@n.us.edu.sg

**George Herbert Mead Award for Lifetime Achievement in Symbolic Interaction**
Mead award nominations should include a letter of nomination from a current member of SSSI, two letters of support, and a current CV. Nominators will be advised when the Award Committee has made a recommendation to the President, but the actual name will not be announced until the annual General Meeting and will subsequently be posted online.
Chair: Robert Dingwall - robert.dingwall@ntlworld.com
Committee:
♦ Ruth Horowitz - ruth.horowitz@nyu.ed
♦ Dirk vom Lehn - dirk.vom_lehn@kcl.ac.uk
Graduate Student Profile: Jelani Ince

Jelani Ince, PhD Candidate, Indiana University, Bloomington, is currently ABD plans to finish his dissertation in May 2021. Jelani’s dissertation employs the lens of cultural sociology and symbolic interactionism to understand the management of racial diversity in racially integrated organizations. He uses the case of a predominantly White, but racially mixed religious organization in St. Louis, MO to track how diversity mythologies come to ground in this organization and the various challenges that these mythologies create for members of different racial and ethnic groups. Jelani draws on symbolic interactionism to complicate research that presumes that intergroup contact and attitudinal changes will ameliorate the ‘race problem’ within predominantly White organizations.

Jelani’s teaching also incorporates symbolic interactionism to teach students that inequality is also a meaning-making process that involves people working in concert with, or against, one another in order to reproduce racial hegemony.

Jelani’s has a number of publications: “The Social Media Response to Black Lives Matter: How Twitter users interact with Black Lives Matter through hashtag use”, co-authored with Fabio Rojas and Clayton A. Davis in Ethnic and Racial Studies; "College campus activism: Distinguishing between liberal reformers and conservative crusaders" with Fabio Rojas and Brandon Finlay in Sociology Compass. He is also a recipient of a Ford Foundation Dissertation Fellowship, the Herman B. Wells Graduate Fellowship, and the Constant H. Jacquet Research Award.

Jelani hopes to work in an institution that is committed to undergraduate training and allows him the freedom to teach courses that concern his areas of interest: cultural sociology, race, racism and racial inequality, formal organizations, and social movements.
LaVerne (DeeDee) Couch, 91, died peacefully at home on Friday, February 26, 2021. There will be a memorial gathering in the fall.

DeeDee was a wife, mother of four, and long-time teacher at Riverside Elementary School. She was born to Louis and Bernadette (Boisvert) Heideman in Des Moines on Friday 13th, 1929. DeeDee always believed thirteen was her lucky number. She grew up in Des Moines and graduated from St. Joseph Academy in 1947.

DeeDee’s family included four children: two daughters, Susan Baumann and Rebecca Couch, both of Iowa City, and two sons, Steven Couch (Irina Ivanova) of Santa Clara, California, and Michael Couch of Cumming, Iowa. She was the proud grandma of five: Matt Baumann, Jon Baumann, Yuri Ivanov, Andrew Couch, and Carl Couch. In addition, she had four great grandchildren and five great-great grandchildren. Her joyful companion, Babe, was by her side until the end. She was preceded in death by her husband, Carl J. Couch, her sister, and two brothers.

DeeDee had an eventful life, living in many places. On September 20, 1947, she married Carl. DeeDee worked hard to put Carl through undergraduate and graduate school, having four children along the way. They then moved a number of times as Carl taught at four different universities over the years. The first teaching position was at Montana State University, which led to DeeDee’s love of the mountains.

Like many married women, DeeDee attended several different colleges, getting her B.A. in 1971. She then began teaching at Riverside Elementary School, finishing her career as a fourth-grade teacher. In later years, when she was about town, she often would run into her former students, who were always eager to visit with her.

DeeDee had numerous hobbies, including rock collecting, fishing, and being in the mountains. For many years, she and Carl had a cabin near Big Timber, Montana, where they entertained family members and friends in the summer. Her children and grandchildren have many stories of hiking the mountains, fishing poles in hand. DeeDee was an excellent bridge player and enjoyed games of all kinds, especially with her family. She was proud to be a Life Master in bridge. We miss her.

In lieu of flowers, memorials may be sent to the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, American Civil Liberties Union, and The Arthritis Foundation. To share a thought, memory or condolence with her family please visit the funeral home website at www.gayandciha.com.

Addendum by Joe Kotarba

Carl Couch was a major figure, both in the scholarly area of symbolic interactionism and in the good work of the Society for the Study of Symbolic Interaction (SSSI). When Carl died in 1994, Mrs. LaVerne (DeeDee) Couch continued their family’s support for the SSSI. Rose Jensen, Carl’s last Ph.D. student at the University of Iowa, sustained SSSI’s relationship with the Couch Family until her retirement in 2018. Joe Kotarba and Lisa-Jo van den Scott have represented SSSI ever since. We are most grateful to DeeDee Couch and her son, Michael, who have generously provided financial and moral support for our students who travel to and participate in our annual meetings.

If you would like to make a donation in Laverne Couch’s name, you may do so here: https://form.jotform.com/80153766064255
Don't forget to support the SSSI by joining the organization! Memberships include a year's subscription to the flagship journal—Symbolic Interaction—and start as low as $33.

The next issue of Notes will be in June 2021. Please direct any future announcements, updates, or additional content you would like to see in the next issue of Notes to William Force at wforce@wne.edu or Jacob Crawford at jacob.crawford@wne.edu by May 22, 2020.