総合人間科学研究科 社会学専攻

社会学(75分)

- 1. 以下の概念について、それぞれ 150 字から 200 字程度で説明しなさい。
 - ア. 再帰性
 - イ. 都市的生活様式
 - ウ. 監視社会
 - エ. メリトクラシー
- 2. 以下の $a\sim c$ の問いから 1 つを選び、500 字から 1,000 字程度で論じなさい。 (どの問いを選択したかを冒頭に記すこと。)
 - a. 近代家族の成立とその揺らぎについて具体的事象を挙げながら論じなさい。
 - b. 「p値ハッキング (p-hacking)」の概念に触れながら、量的社会調査の方 法の特徴と限界について述べなさい。
 - c. 社会運動に関する社会学理論を紹介しながら、現代の社会運動の特徴について論じなさい。
- 3. 社会関係資本 (ソーシャル・キャピタル) の概念を用いる理論的枠組みは、現代日本の社会現象を理解するうえでどのように適用できるだろうか。 具体的な例を挙げながら 500 字から 1000 字程度で論じなさい。

総合人間科学研究科 社会学専攻

英語(45分)

次の文章を読んで、以下の問いに答えなさい。

The idea of development in the social sciences has more often been dealt with as a broad, panoramic view of social origins and stages than as the complex and subtle theory of the source and mechanism of change that it is in substance. We are familiar enough with the former: Comte's law of three stages, Hegel's tracking of the idea of freedom in time, Marx's iron sequence of epochs from primitive communism through slavery, feudalism, and capitalism to socialism, Lewis Morgan's evolution of kinship types; Tylor's, Gomme's and Frazer's vistas of religious origins and sequences, Spencer's encompassment of human society in space and time into inexorable progress from the homogenous to the heterogeneous, Durkheim's stages of mechanical and organic solidarity, and so on. All of this is indeed developmentalism, and the sheer size of the canvas in each instance is doubtless sufficient to make this aspect the most memorable in our overview of the idea.

But developmentalism is nevertheless much more than this—much more than origins and stages, whether unilinear or multilinear—and it is a serious mistake to suppose that, because developmentalism in this macro-sense fell into disrepute, it is absent from the scene today. All that has happened is that the focus has changed. Like modern biology, the social sciences have simply turned attention from the longer vistas of change and succession that captured the minds of nineteenth-century thinkers to the shorter-run mechanisms of change that the evolutionary process reveals; so, I think it may fairly be concluded, has sociology. Although there are interesting signs at the present time of a revival of interest in the larger patterns of the changes through which civilizations go (I think of some of the recent work of Eisenstadt and Parsons as examples), the bulk of work done in sociology during the past several decades on the problem of change has been directed to aspects of the problem not unlike those which have () the attention of a molecular biologists and geneticists. It is—or has been—not so much the larger forms of change as the possible internal mechanisms of change in social groups and social systems that dominate. Functionalism, which has been erroneously charged with insensitivity to the problem of change, can in fact be seen as a post-developmentalist effort to combine both the statics and dynamics of social behaviour in a single theory, I say 'postdevelopmentalist' rather than non—or anti—developmentalist, for it is in light of the

continuation of certain vital assumptions of developmentalism, but without the superstructure that these assumptions carried in the nineteenth century, that the functionalist treatment of change can best be understood.

Before analysing the perspective of developmentalism, a few general background observations will be useful. First, I should stress that throughout the chapter, the words develop and development are used in their intransitive construction rather than in the transitive sense that is today, especially in the wide literature of the new nations, more common. Admittedly there is close relation between the two. When we speak of developing something—a plant-type, a human voice or the civil service of a new nation —we presumably are seeking to make actual or (b) what is potential, and not supplanting the old by something totally new as one does in replacing a piece of furniture. We may not go so far as did some of our nineteenth-century predecessors—Marx, for example—in assuming that what we are developing (trans.) would develop (intrans.) if we just left it alone and allowed indefinite time. But we nevertheless assume some kind of potentiality, some kind of process operating autonomously, however faintly, when we propose to develop a system or thing. Still, there are differences between them, and hence I stress that what I am concerned with is the first and oldest, the intransitive, use of development.

Second, I shall use develop and development as synonymous with evolve and evolution. There may be differences in the context of modern biology, and even of the social sciences, that are significant for certain purposes, but not here. It is worth noting that throughout the nineteenth century, development, evolution and also progress were). This was true in biology as in sociology. Darwin, for example, made little use of the word evolution; much more of development and especially of progress. It was characteristic that Darwin wrote, towards the end of The Origin of Species, the following summation: 'And as natural selection works solely by and for the good of each being, all corporeal and mental endowments will tend to progress towards perfection'. The word *progress* is here used in part evaluatively but in large part in the neutral sense of step-by-step advancement that is contained in the Latin progredior and that we find throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. _②That is, progress refers to a slow, gradual and cumulative type of change, akin to what the physician has in mind when he speaks of the natural progress of a fatal disease. All three words—development, evolution and progress—come historically, as I shall indicate in a moment, from the Greek doctrine or concept of physis.

Third, it is important to stress that the idea of social development, awes little or nothing to the currents of thought which flowed in the nineteenth-century study of organic evolution. Least of all does the idea of social development owe anything substantive to Darwin's great work, *The Origin of Species*, published in 1859. No doubt some of the prestige of that work was reflected in one way or another in nineteenth-century studies of social development, of social evolution, and it is true that Darwin's phrase, 'survival of the fittest', was directly transferred by some social scientists to the industrial scene as) of the competition that had been, since the eighteenth century, assumed to be a natural and proper part of the economy. But all of this notwithstanding, it is important to remind ourselves that the major expressions of developmentalism in the social sciences—those of Comte, Marx, Spencer, among others—had appeared before Darwin's work. More to the point, these expressions proceeded, not from the study of biological evolution found in the pre-Darwinian works of Lamarck, Erasmus, Darwin, and others, but from a line of interest that goes a long way back in Western social thought and includes the seminal eighteenth-century works of Rousseau (such as his Discourse on the Origin of Inequality, a remarkable piece of social evolutionism), of Adam Smith (I am thinking particularly of his essay on language here), and of Condorcet, to mention but three. What the eighteenth century called 'hypothetical' or 'conjectural' or 'natural' history was not history at all as this word was understood by historians like Gibbon, Robertson and Voltaire, but rather development, as this word was to be understood in the century following.

(Nisbet, R., 1986, The Making of Modern Society, Wheatsheaf Books, pp.33-35.)

1. 空欄(a)から(d)に当てはまる最も適当な語を次のリストから選び、 それぞれ記号で答えなさい。

【リスト】

ア. justification イ. synthetic ウ. transgression エ. inaugurated オ. dependent カ. interchangeably キ. elicited ク. coalesced ケ. vigorous コ. chronically サ. tenacious シ. precursor

- 2. 下線部①と②を日本語に訳しなさい。
- 3.「development」という概念は社会理論においてどのように位置づけられるか。本文の内容をもとに 200 字程度で述べなさい。