A. Reading Comprehension: 50%

The following passages are drawn from "Through Thick and Thin: Layers of Social Ties and Urban Settlement among Thai Migrants" written by F Kim Korinek, Barbara Entwisle & Aree Jampaklay, in *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 70, No. 5. (Oct., 2005), pp. 779-800.

All migrations eventuate in settlement for some. Several scholars have suggested that economic opportunities—manifested as lucrative, stable job opportunities, novel social roles, and consumer activity—serve to anchor rural–urban migrants in the place of destination, encouraging settlement, lengthening the duration of their stay, and lessening the odds of their return to their place of origin (Grasmuck and Pessar 1991; Hondagneu-Sotelo 1995; Lindstrom 1996; Reyes and Mameesh 2002). Others emphasize the role of human capital, suggesting that return migration is a socioeconomic process in which migrants are selected to stay or return on the basis of their skills, knowledge, expertise, and ability to use this capital in the destination context (Lindstrom and Massey 1994; Ramos 1992). Viewed from this perspective, migrants who return to their villages of origin after a brief stay are likely to be seen as unsuccessful or deficient, with the status and opportunities they obtained regarded as insufficient to maintain or advance their position in the competitive, demanding urban milieu.

An alternative view sees migrants as sojourners, emphasizing the temporary nature of their stay. For them, urbanward movement is a principal element of economic strategies adopted by rural households whose survival often hinges on migrant remittances (Stark 1991; Stark and Bloom 1985). Eventual return is expected, indeed anticipated, but in fact, not all migrants do return.

Regardless whether migration is individually motivated or part of a household strategy, in the process of securing economic benefits in the urban workforce,

migrants participate in social networks that may reinforce or detract from their tendency to settle in the destination. The social relations experienced by migrants in urban destinations may constitute a "pull" that precipitates migration, reinforces the length of stay, and potentially affects urban settlement (Massey et al. 1987; Pessar 2003), even for those who never intended to stay. This social relational "pull" exists in addition to the economic "pull" exerted through migrant wages and earnings in the destination. This is not to suggest that social factors trump economic factors, but rather that social elements associated with work roles should not be ignored because they may complement or eclipse their economic facets. For instance, although the pay associated with a factory job may be substantially less than that associated with a sales or service occupation, the opportunities to become friendly with diverse others in the workplace may be greater with the factory job. Economic factors and social factors may be closely intertwined because the workplace is a primary site for the formation of social relations. Depending on one's social location in the urban setting, the "pull" of social relations may either complement or counteract the economic "pull."

1. The main theme of the above passage is
1) to outline various explanations of migration process
2) to review the new-classical economic "push-pull" explanation of migration process
3) to analyze the migrants' urban experiences
4) to summarize the authors' findings of Thai migrants' experiences

2. In the above passage, which of the following is NOT mentioned to explain the migration process?
1) economic opportunities of the destinations;
2) human capital of the migrants;
3) economic strategies of the households;
4) institutional arrangements for migrants' resettlement

3. Which of the following is NOT the authors' argument?
1) Migrants' urban settlement should be analyzed both economically and socially.
2) Economic factors ultimately determine migration process.
3) Social dimension of the "pull" in the migration process should not be overlooked.

4. The paragraph that would follow the above passages would most probably
1) provide a typology of key actors determining migration process;
2) discuss the measurement of social embeddedness of migration process;

3) elaborate new-classical economic "push-pull" explanation of migration process;
4) summarize the critiques of the social embeddedness perspective in migration theory.

The following passages are drawn from "Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment," written by Robert D. Benford; David A. Snow, in *Annual Review of Sociology*, 2000, No. 26, pp. 611-39.

Within sociology, not only has the framing concept been applied most extensively to the substantive study of social movements and collective action, but interest in framing processes in relation to the operation of social movements has animated an increasing amount of conceptual and empirical scholarship. Evidence of this trend can be found (a) in recent edited volumes based on papers presented at social movement conferences (Johnston & Klandermans 1995, Larana et al 1994, McAdam et al 1996, Morris & Mueller 1992); (b) in the almost meteoric increase in articles, chapters, and papers referring to the framing/movement link since the mid-1980s, from only one such reference in the Sociological Abstracts in 1986 to 43 in 1998, with almost two thirds of the nearly 250 references during this period occurring since 1994; (c) in the parallel pattern of citations in the three core conceptual articles on framing and social movements (Snow et al 1986, Snow & Benford 1988, 1992) beginning with seven citations in 1990 and increasing to 106 in 1998, with more than half of the over 500 citations appearing after 1995; and (d) in a variety of recent critiques focusing on specific conceptual dimensions of the movement framing literature (Benford 1997, Fisher 1997, Hart 1996, Jasper 1997, Oliver & Johnston 2000, Sherkat 1998, Steinberg 1998, Williams & Benford 2000) or on its relationship to other perspectives (Goodwin & Jasper 1999, Meyer 1999). Clearly there has been a pronounced proliferation of scholarship on collective action frames and framing processes in relation to social movements within the past decade and a half, so much so, in fact, that framing processes have come to be regarded, alongside resource mobilization and political opportunity processes, as a central dynamic in understanding the character and course of social movements.

The purpose of this review is to evaluate this burgeoning literature in terms of two general questions. First, does this literature congeal or hang together in a fashion suggestive of a coherent perspective, or can such a perspective be stitched together from various strands of the literature in a way that adds to a more refined and integrated understanding of the relationship between framing processes and the operation of social movements? And second, does this evolving perspective enhance our understanding of social movements, casting analytic light on areas and aspects of

the dynamics of social movements that other conceptual schemes or perspectives have glossed over or ignored altogether? What, in short, can be concluded about the analytic utility of the framing literature for understanding the social movement processes it seeks to understand and illuminate, namely the generation, diffusion, and functionality of mobilizing and countermobilizing ideas and meanings? Our approach to addressing these questions is conceptually and theoretically developmental, and selective in terms of the literature we look at most closely. We proceed by organizing the review around four broad fundamental areas of concern that require both elaboration and synthesis if we are to address the above questions: (a) conceptualization of collective action frames and delineation of their characteristic features; (b) identification of framing processes relevant to the generation, elaboration, and diffusion of collective action frames; (c) specification of various socio-cultural contextual factors that constrain and facilitate framing processes; and (d) elaboration of the consequences or implications of framing processes for other movement processes and outcomes. At various points, we also seek to provide clarification of the linkages between framing concepts and processes and other conceptual and theoretical formulations relevant to social movements, such as ideology. We draw on and evaluate the literature in terms of how it informs one or more of these issues and, in the process, build our answers to the two general questions.

5. The main theme of the above passage is
1) to criticize the resource mobilization perspective;
2) to respond other's comments on the frame analysis
3) to give a brief introduction of this article
4) to elaborate the frame analysis perspective

6. According to the passage, we may expect to find in the following part of this article
1) a review of literature on collective action frame
2) an empirical research on collective action frame
3) a theoretical debate between the perspectives of frame analysis and of resource mobilization
4) the theoretical linkage between Goffman's frame analysis and the collective action frame.

7. Which of the following is NOT covered in the above passage?
1) the proliferation of scholarship on frame analysis of collective action
2) the differences between the perspectives of frame analysis and of resource

mobilization

3) identifying three core conceptual articles on frame analysis of collective action.

8. The paragraph that would follow the above passage would most probably

1) discuss the distinction among the notion of frame, schemas and ideology;
2) elaborate Snow's arguments on collective action frame;
3) criticize the frame analysis perspective;
4) review the conceptualization of collective action frame;

The following passages are drawn from *The Rule of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*, written by Pierre Bourdieu and translated by Susan Emanuel. 1996. Stanford University Press.

A number of the practices and representations of artists and writers (for example, their ambivalence as much towards the 'people' as towards the 'bourgeois' can only be explained by reference to the __9__, inside of which the literary (etc.) field is itself in a dominated position. The field of power is the space of relations of force between agents or between institutions having in common the possession of the capital necessary to occupy the dominant positions in different fields (notably economic or cultural). It is the __10__ between holders of different powers (or kinds of capital) which, like the symbolic struggles between artists and the 'bourgeois' in the nineteenth century, have at stake the transformation or conservation of the relative value of different kinds of capital, which itself determines, at any moment, the forces liable to be engaged in these struggles.

9. Which word best fits the underlined '9'?

1) space of hope
2) politics of identity
3) field of power
4) structure of feeling

10. Which word best fits the underlined '10'?

1) site of struggles
2) strength of alliance
3) agreements
4) stratification

B. Translating the following passages into Chinese:

The vast intensive and extensive growth of our technology – which is much more than just material technology – entangles us in a web of means, and means towards means, more and more intermediate stages, causing us to lose sight of our real ultimate ends. This is the extreme inner danger which threatens all highly developed cultures, that is to say, all eras in which the whole of life is overlaid with a maximum of multi-stratified means. To treat some means as ends may make this situation psychologically tolerable, but it actually makes life increasingly futile. (from Simmel, The Crisis of Culture) 25%

But in the same way that an animal colony in which all the members embody a common tissue constitutes a single entity, every aggregate of individuals who are in continuous contact form a society. Therefore, the division of labour can only be produced within a pre-existing society. That is to say, not merely must individuals be materially linked, but it is also necessary for there to be moral links between them.... It is certainly true that people think everything occurs as a result of freely negotiated private agreements. Thus, it seems as if there is an absence of any social action. But this is to forget that contracts are possible only where there already exists some juridical regulation and, consequently, a society. (from Dukheim, The Division of Labor in Society) 25%