

1. Record Nr.	UNINA9910453879403321
Autore	Epstein Steven
Titolo	Inclusion [[electronic resource]] : the politics of difference in medical research / / Steven Epstein
Pubbl/distr/stampa	Chicago, : University of Chicago Press, 2007
ISBN	1-281-95679-1 9786611956790 0-226-21311-0
Descrizione fisica	1 online resource (427 p.)
Collana	Chicago studies in practices of meaning
Disciplina	610.72
Soggetti	Medicine - Research - Social aspects - United States Human experimentation in medicine - Social aspects - United States Clinical trials - Social aspects - United States Minorities - Medical care - United States Health and race - United States Social medicine - United States Electronic books.
Lingua di pubblicazione	Inglese
Formato	Materiale a stampa
Livello bibliografico	Monografia
Note generali	Description based upon print version of record.
Nota di bibliografia	Includes bibliographical references (p. [311]-394) and index.
Nota di contenuto	How to study a biopolitical paradigm -- Histories of the human subject -- The rise of resistance : framing the critique of the standard human -- The path to reform : aligning categories, targeting the state -- Opposition to reform : controversy, closure, and boundary work -- Formalizing the new regime -- From the standard human to niche standardization -- Counts and consequences : monitoring compliance -- The science of recruitmentology and the politics of trust -- To profile or not to profile : what difference does race make? -- Sex differences and the new politics of women's health -- Whither the paradigm?
Sommario/riassunto	With Inclusion, Steven Epstein argues that strategies to achieve diversity in medical research mask deeper problems, ones that might require a different approach and different solutions. Formal concern with this issue, Epstein shows, is a fairly recent phenomenon. Until the mid-1980s, scientists often studied groups of white, middle-aged men—

and assumed that conclusions drawn from studying them would apply to the rest of the population. But struggles involving advocacy groups, experts, and Congress led to reforms that forced researchers to diversify the population from which they drew for clin
