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専門科目（社会学） 専攻分野

問 以下の英文を読み、次の問いに答えなさい。

(1) 下線部A、B、C、Dを和訳しなさい。

(2) 本文全体の趣旨を簡潔に日本語で要約しなさい。

(3) culture, ideology, strategic framingをあなた自身はどのような方法論的観点に立って分析しようと考えているのか、自分の立場を説明しなさい。

出典 Mayer N. Zald, 1996, "Culture, ideology, and strategic framing" D. McAdam, et al. eds., Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements: Political Opportunities, Mobilizing Structures and Cultural framings, Cambridge University Press.

Culture, ideology, and strategic framing is our broadest and loosest conceptual cluster. They are linked because they are the topics that deal with the content and processes by which meaning is attached to objects and actions. Roughly speaking, as we use the terms, culture is the shared beliefs and understandings, mediated by and constituted by symbols and language, of a group or society; ideology is the set of beliefs that are used to justify or challenge a given social-political order and are used to interpret the political world; frames are the specific metaphors, symbolic representations, and cognitive cues used to render or cast behavior and events in an evaluative mode and to suggest alternative modes of action. Although it has been common to see culture as a long-enduring set of symbols and beliefs, it is also possible to treat the emergence and creation of culture. Ideologies tend to be more complex and logical systems of beliefs than frames, though frames may be embedded in ideologies. Moreover symbols, frames, and ideologies are created and changed in the process of contestation.

In the recent development of social movement research, following the decade of the sixties, the systematic study of culture, ideology, and frames developed last, after the resource mobilization and political process approaches had already developed some momentum. However, a longer and more sociological view reveals a different and more composite process of differentiation and attention to the study of ideology and beliefs.

Before the advent of the discipline of sociology and especially the development of the Chicago School, the study of social movements was treated as part of political philosophy and the history of ideas. Historical studies of movements and revolutions often focused upon ideology and beliefs, especially the ideologies and beliefs of key historical actors – whether Martin Luther or Karl Marx, whether the philosophes or the political economists. However, the recounting of the ideas promulgated by key figures was typically treated developmentally, as a sequence of ideas in the heads of movement leaders, or in terms of historical diffusion, the spread of those ideas. The core elements of movement beliefs might be played out against the social situation and conditions in which the movement leader developed, but a kind
of determinism or epistemic realism guided the analysis. That is, ideas were treated as real in themselves; analysis of the play of ideas, the strategic understanding of the range of alternatives, the intricate analysis of metaphor and symbol, a differentiated view of the layers of audience reception, attention to the silences of ideas were beyond the reach of the traditional history of ideas.

That kind of intellectual history has continued and movements can still be described in terms of the careers, beliefs, and ideologies and critical events surrounding movement leaders. (It is not as if the transformation of academic studies leads to the total displacement of earlier modes of analysis.) The development of sociology, however, especially in America, led to a different approach to the study of collective behavior and social movements. Concerned with general patterns of social relations and behavior shaped by a profound concern for the social changes generated by industrialization and urbanization, Chicago sociologists, especially Robert Park and, then, Herbert Blumer, developed the field of collective behavior (including social movements) to examine the responses to social change that occurred outside of formal institutions and well-institutionalized processes. The key phenomena linked under this rubric were public opinion, fads and fashions, riots and panics, and social movements and revolutions.

Each of these phenomena has a cognitive or ideological component. For instance, public opinion involves attitudes and beliefs about shared objects. Even riots and panics, the phenomena with least apparent cultural and symbolic content, have cognitive and perceptual components in that they require social situations to be defined as threatening or as requiring very active physical behavior. Too, situations calling forth riots (e.g., bread riots, soccer riots) develop cultural traditions of patterned behavior. Moreover, Chicago sociology also gave birth to the important school of symbolic interactionism. Yet the dominant thrust of the study of collective behavior, as in most of sociology, was to focus upon structure and process, treating the content of ideology or beliefs as either outside the realm of analysis or as a constant.

The point may be overstated. After all, symbolic interactionists Ralph Turner and Lewis Killian (1957) treated emergent norms as one of the defining features in the transformation of random or disorganized responses to problems into collective and organized behavior. Similarly, Neil Smelser (1962) argued that different kinds of generalized beliefs were essential for each kind of collective behavior. Nevertheless, the analysis of collective behavior and social movements until very recently focused largely on structure and process.

In part, culture and ideology were downplayed because sociologists of those decades had few tools for analysis. Although symbolic interactionism asserted the centrality to social life of symbolic communication and shared meanings, it focused more on interaction and less on the content and force of symbols. Sociologists of social movements, preoccupied with distancing themselves from what were perceived to be the limits of the earlier tradition of collective behavior analysis, began to focus upon the organizational and political aspects of collective action, even though in other parts of sociology and social sciences a turn toward culture, frames, and symbols was beginning to occur. (See Zald in Morris and Mueller, 1992.) These developments have led to a revolution in our ability to analyze culture. We have had a major invigoration of our ability to analyze culture, to understand meaning, to dig beyond the surface rendering of language, representation, and metaphor.
The turn to culture and language in contemporary social science has several sources — the development of French structuralism, the growth of semiotics, the development of hermeneutics and discourse analysis, Gramscian Marxism, psychoanalytic theory, feminist theory, postmodernism, the analysis of accounts, and so on. However, four not entirely separate streams have had a direct impact on the study of social movements and on essays in this volume: (1) the depth analysis of culture and symbols that developed first in anthropology; (2) the analysis of frames and scripts stemming from the cognitive revolution in psychological social psychology and from Goffman's work in sociology; (3) the turn to dramatistic and rhetorical analysis; and (4) the analysis of culture as repertoires of action and as tool kits.