

## Connections among Claims

Best suggests several connections between social problems that deserve additional research.

“New” social problems borrow *cultural resources* used to describe earlier ones.

Naming and classifying social problems are just the first steps in defining a problem’s scope. Later scope processes include *domain expansion*, *domain elaboration* and *diffusion*.

Domain expansion includes piggybacking new problems onto old names (e.g., post-traumatic stress disorder being applied to new problems or parental smoking viewed as a form of child abuse.)

Domain elaboration involves identifying new aspects of a problem (e.g., sexual abuse disrupting education or leading to drug use).

Diffusion involves problems moving geographically from one region or nation to another.

Claims about social problems establish orientations—what sort of problem is it?

Some set of advocates may assume *ownership* of a problem and become its authorities.

Advocates may engage in *rationale expansion*, changing the orientation of the problem to attract more support.

Advocates may also engage in *ideological extension*, assuming ownership of new problems and orienting them consistently with their existing ideology. However, advocates may also downplay their ideologies.

Different movements may share *master frames*, broad orientations shared by several movements (e.g., equal rights.)

There are few claims about *systems* of social problems. One exception is the problems of the inner cities.

Americans tend to ignore the history of social problems, including *cycles of concern* (e.g., the periodic fear of gangs) and *recurring issues* (e.g., repeated drug scares involving different drugs). However, advocates sometimes point out *ironic consequences* of previous social policies.