# ２０２１年度

## 大学院文学研究科博士課程前期２年の課程入学試験

## （　秋期・社会人特別選抜　）問題

筆記試験　<u>社会学</u>　専攻分野

試験開始の合図があるまで、この問題冊子を開いてはいけない。

受験記号番号

成績

２０２１年度

大学院文学研究科博士課程前期２年の課程入学試験

（秋期・社会人特別選抜）問題

筆記試験（　　社　会　学　　専攻分野）

次の英文は、**Prospects for the Sociological Study of Social Problems** と題する章の一節である。これを

読み、以下の問いに答えなさい。

Our chapter title might be understood in two ways. First, it could be interpreted as predicting the societal conditions sociologists – or people generally in society – will consider social problems in the future: we might describe a dystopian future in which all manner of problematic chickens come home to roost – an overpopulated, polluted world sweltering under rising temperatures, and so on. In comparison, we will follow a second interpretation of the chapter title: our focus will be on how social problems theory, and the sociological study of social problems, should evolve in order to be a sound basis upon which to study social problems in the future.

When we speak of social problems theory, (1) we mean something specific. Sociologists in particular, citizens in general, evaluate many specific conditions as "social problems," and sociologists often choose to study those conditions. For example, many people consider income inequality to be a social problem, and there is a large sociological literature examining the nature of income inequality, its causes and consequences, how various measures of income inequality show that there has been more or less income inequality at different historical moments, and so on. Such work might be published in the journal, *Social Problems*, and be cited in textbooks for social problems classes. However, our chapter is not concerned with such research because it does not show how it is that income inequality (or any other particular condition) is evaluated *as a social problem*, and therefore does not frame the topic within any theory of social problems.

Although sociologists have been speaking of "social problems" since the late nineteenth century, the concept of "social problem" has not been important to sociological analyses (Schwartz 1997). (2) That is, researchers have conducted countless studies of conditions evaluated as social problems, but the term has been applied to such a wide range of conditions – in our current era we hear about the social problems of racism, terrorism, unemployment and obesity – that it is difficult to imagine what the various phenomena called social problems have in common. This is why Malcolm Spector and John Kitsuse (1977) famously began *Constructing Social Problems* with the declaration: "There is no adequate definition of social problems within sociology, and there is not and never has been a sociology of social problems".

This was not a new criticism because there had been complaints about the utility of the social problems concept for decades (Case 1924; Fuller and Myers 1941; Blumer 1971). (3) The work of Spector and Kitsuse stands out, however, because they offered more than a comprehensive critique of the ways sociologists had failed to take the notion of social problems seriously: they also offered a detailed proposal for developing a theory of social problems. Their focus was on social construction and they argued that the only thing all of the diverse conditions described as "social problems" had in common was the subjective definition. What all diverse conditions shared was a common evaluation, an evaluation that the condition was a "social problem." Hence, Spector and Kitsuse (1977, 75) offered a definition of the concept of social problem: "we define social problems as the activities of

individuals or groups making assertions of grievances and claims with respect to some putative conditions." This definition shifted attention away from the diverse conditions labeled social problems and onto the processes by which people defined some conditions – and only some conditions – as social problems.

This perspective has led to hundreds of studies of different aspects of the social processes whereby some conditions are identified as addressed as "social problems." (4)Through the years, constructionism has evolved as the first coherent, elaborated theory of social problems, the first approach that tries to understand the definitional processes that all social problems have in common. In order to support our argument that the future of social problems theory most likely will continue to revolve around social constructionism, we will begin by discussing differences between theories attending to troublesome conditions in the environment and constructionist theories centering on subjective definitions. We will continue with describing two primary variations in constructionist frameworks and the theoretical issues raised by each of these. We then will identify a series of theoretical problems that require attention to move constructionist perspectives into the future.

It is most common for sociologists to examine the characteristics of particular conditions evaluated as "social problems." Theories focusing attention on conditions often are called (5)"objectivist" because they begin with assuming a reality (an objective nature) of troublesome conditions. There are multiple variants of objectivist conceptualizations of social problems: theories associated with structural functionalism, social disorganization, and value conflict were dominant when Spector and Kit-

suse were writing, while conflict, critical (including versions of Marxism and feminism), and postmodern theories are currently dominant. While very different from one another, these theories are similar in that each approaches social-problems-as-conditions in the social environment and each contains a vision of what conditions are morally preferred and which are morally intolerable. Such frameworks lead to empirical questions with seemingly objective (measureable) answers: Who or what is causing this condition? Who is harmed? What harm is created? How can the condition be eliminated and the harm ended?

In contrast, constructionist approaches bracket (ignore,(6) put to the side) objective conditions and conceptualize moral intolerability as a subjective evaluation, rather than as a characteristic of a condition. Most clearly, constructionists do *not* argue that there is something wrong with studying social conditions that are designated social problems; this is an appropriate and important focus for sociologists' energies. However, constructionists *do* argue that the only way to understand what all the phenomena called social problems have in common is to focus on the underlying definitional processes that lead some conditions – and only some conditions – to be evaluated and responded to as "social problems."

問1　下線部（2）を日本語に訳しなさい。

問2　下線部（3）を日本語に訳しなさい。

問3　下線部（4）を日本語に訳しなさい。

問4　下線部（1）の内容を、本文の記述に即して、詳しく説明しなさい。

問5　下線部（5）と下線部（6）の相違に留意しながら、あなたが関心を抱いている社会問題に対する

　　アプローチについて、あなたの考えを述べなさい。


【回答欄】

問1









問2









問3

問4

問5