

ALUNO:**MATRÍCULA:****AVALIAÇÃO:****VALOR:** 2.00 pontos**POLO - TLS:****DATA:****LOCAL:****LÍNGUAS:****MODELO:** SELEÇÃO PPGH UFPE 2022/2023 INGLÊS

INSTRUÇÕES DA AVALIAÇÃO

1. Esta prova possui 10 (dez) questões objetivas, podendo ser de múltipla escolha com 5 (cinco) alternativas (A,B,C,D,E,) ou com 2 alternativas (verdadeiro ou falso).
2. A duração da prova será de 120 minutos.
3. Todas as questões possuem o mesmo peso.
4. Não será permitido utilizar materiais de consulta como dicionários. Candidatos que utilizarem material de consulta serão eliminados.
5. Uma vez que o candidato finalize a prova, não será possível retornar ao ambiente de prova.
6. É possível avançar e retornar nas páginas da prova. Não há limite de tempo estabelecido por cada questão.

The next 5 questions are based on the text below.

Introduction

Six decades ago, the North American sociologist C. Wright Mills (1959) published a book which expressed a deep sense of concern about the direction which his field was taking. He argued that sociology was split between abstracted empiricism and grand theory. The former involved the endless production of detailed and curiously bloodless empirical descriptions of social life. The latter came in the shape of the application of grand theoretical schemes to all aspects of social life. Mills points out that slavishly following both these approaches was leading the field of sociology away from its subject matter. These twin obsessions meant sociologists rendered themselves unable to link personal issues with broader structural process. It also meant that sociologists had rendered themselves unable to make what are experienced as private problems into public issues.

If we fast forward and look at the state of organizational sociology today, we notice some similarities to those spotted by Mills. The foremost mission of most organizational sociologists today is to make a contribution to theory. This is supposed to be the obligatory passage point that anything that seeks to be counted as a valid piece of sociological knowledge about organizations must pass (Corley & Gioia, 2001). The mantra of contribution making is drilled into PhD students, conference attendees, budding journal contributors, and most others who might hope to be card-carrying organization theorists. The demand to make a theoretical contribution places two things at the forefront of knowledge-creation efforts. The first is theory: one must address and work with the relatively abstract body of knowledge that is developed for and by professional theorists. The second demand is making a contribution. This suggests that one should add to, expend, build up, or in some way argue existing parts of this body of abstract knowledge. The central task of any organization theorist should be identifying gaps within their field, developing knowledge which fills this gap, and by doing so make a palpable contribution to knowledge. Doing this kind of work means that the edifice of organization theory will slowly but surely become more sturdy, solid, and impressive. A contribution theory is another brick in the wall.

So if making a contribution to theory is so important, what exactly does this mean? There are many accounts of the kind of progressive theory-building that dominates our field (e.g. Bacharach, 1989; Shapira, 2011). A good starting point to understanding exactly what is meant by this progressive theory-building can be found in Whetten's (1989) pithy description. In this, he points out that budding organization theorists cannot just describe additional facts (the 'what'). They must posit a novel relationship

between facts (the 'how'), a novel explanation for why this relationship exists (the 'why'), and a novel account of which context these explanations apply to (the 'when'/'where'/'who'). What is crucial is not just the fact that one offers an explanation of why the relationship between facts exists, and what the boundary conditions are, but that these must be novel. For an explanation to be in some way novel, it must go beyond additional explanations insofar as it helps to explain additional facts or relations in a way which is either more accurate or more comprehensive than existing theories. To do this, you need to not only have an explanation and be able to demonstrate that it helps us to understand a phenomenon very well, you also need to have extremely good knowledge of existing theoretical explanations, and be able to show how in some ways yours is better. By doing this, it is possible to show how your theory makes a progressive contribution and extends existing knowledge of organizations.

This kind of progressive development of theory certainly has its pay-offs. It allows researchers to go beyond detailed empirical description. It provides researchers with a means of developing a body of knowledge that provides an account of not just the facts, but how they are connected, why, and the limits of the explanation. It provides the basis for progressive research that allows us to accumulate evidence, elaborate ideas, but also attract resources (Pfeffer, 1993). This recipe for developing knowledge about organizations certainly has some strength, but many organization theorists have started to voice their concerns about it. Critics have pointed out that the obsession with creating theoretical contributions has produced knowledge which is irrelevant to many pressing organizational issues (Hambrick, 2007), overlooks many important empirical phenomenon that do not neatly fit within a theory (Helfat, 2005), is conveyed in an obtuse and inaccessible style (Grey & Sinclair, 2005), lacks an important moral dimension (Ghoshal, 2005), and produces increasingly uninteresting ideas (Alvesson & Sandberg, 2011). Some suspect that one of the primary reasons for this dire situation is that in its search for a semblance of scientific rigour, organization theory has become completely disconnected from the broader audiences it was originally established to address (e.g. Bartunek, 2003; Hambrick, 1994).

SPICER, André. Organization studies, sociology, and the quest for a public organization theory. In: ADLER, P.; GAY, P.; MORGAN, G.; REED, M. (ed.). The oxford handbook of sociology, social theory, and organization studies: contemporary currents. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.p. 709 - 710.

Questão 1 - 0,2 ponto

In the statement "They must posit a novel relationship between facts (the 'how')", the word 'posit' could be replaced by, without change in the meaning, with any of the words below, EXCEPT:

- a) fabricate
- b) put forward
- c) assert
- d) postulate
- e) set

Questão 2 - 0,2 ponto

The sentence (3rd paragraph, line 14) "To do this, you need to not only have an explanation and be able to demonstrate that it helps us to understand a phenomenon very well, you also need to have extremely good knowledge of existing theoretical explanations, and be able to show how in some ways yours is better." is suitably rewritten, without any noticeable change in meaning in the alternative:

- a) In order to achieve this, you ought to propose a new segment of your research and jeopardize the hypothesis in a categorical way, making a point to show how up-to-date and faulty your research is.
- b) Theoretical explanations are the foremost embodiment of a research and as such, must be detailed in their demonstrations to aid the reader in the overall comprehension of a new hypothesis.
- c) Not only must theorists keep abreast of the times in matters of latest conjectures in the field, but also postulate why their theories are to be, par excellence, considered, which implies going beyond clear reasoning and the display of evidence.
- d) The ultimate foundation of a theoretical explanation takes into account the opportunity for errors and the discernment in hindsight, offering just enough information to draw forth undeniable improvements to the scientific field.
- e) As thereto indicated, there is evidence to acknowledge contributions to work with novelty by rendering theories more testable, and by directing explanations to indicate the frailty of a novel research.

Questão 3 - 0,2 ponto

It can be inferred from the 4th paragraph what is written in the alternative:

- a) Despite the reformative factors, this progressive approach to organization research lacks awareness and applicability.
- b) The progressive contributions do not have to amount to anything in terms of relevancy to the organization studies due to its misplaced targeted audience.
- c) Most contributions are out of touch because they support an older way of thinking, pushing empirical details to the current agenda.
- d) The criticism of the compensations is fair in its purpose of identifying what's working in the development of theory. However the critique is clear: the results are fruitless.
- e) The inaccessibility of this new set of theorists is commendable, but the accurate researches prove that there is room for improvement.

Questão 4 - 0,2 ponto

After reading the text, which five key words would you choose as the best to mark it for further research?

- a) empirical research, sociology, grand theory, moral dimension, organization
- b) organizational issues, empirical phenomenon, scientific rigour, organization.
- c) C. Wright Mills, sociology, evidence, resource, organization theorist, critics.
- d) empirical research, empirical phenomenon, empirical detail, progressive theory-building.
- e) contribution theory, organizational sociology, organization studies organization theory, public organization theory.

Questão 5 - 0,2 ponto

Which of the alternatives below best paraphrases the text?

- a) According to the text, sociology is currently going through a cumbersome situation regarding its ideals of organization studies. In other words, the quest for an overly empirical research that amounts to factual progress within the field of science has subdued attempts to execute more liberal ideas. Facing strong opposition, C. Wright Mills had discerned upon close observation that the branches grand theory and empirical descriptions could never belong in the same research and they were fated to clash due to their very own nature. As foreseen, such reality has succumbed sociologist all over the world who experience difficulty to comprehend recent theories.
- b) If you wish to compose a summary of what organization studies in sociology, it will be by drawing conclusions from the text; we can undeniably agree upon the idea that it is the most successful social science. Organizations are a defining function of the modern world and this reflects on the theories which consolidate the field. There is a perfect synchronization between grand theory and empirical details combined to represent real issues in organizations, focusing on the connection between personal issues and broader structural processes.
- c) Sociology is presently dealing with a difficult predicament with its goals of organizational studies. The know-how indicated in the text goes against the idea of contribution to organization knowledge by corrupting the possibility for an explanation as of why the relationship between facts exists, and what the boundary conditions are and the idea of going to strictly show additional explanations.
- d) C. Wright Mills had long highlighted the struggles sociology could potentially experience with the empirical and theoretical extremes in research. This prediction has shown to be veracious in organization sociology in regards to the rise in progressive theory-building. The increase on that matter is a result of an urge to develop the field itself and solidify its benchmarks by corroborating theories and adding contributions. In spite of its strengths, there has been a significant amount of barren theories which, for the lack of relevancy to organization knowledge, poor empirical details, and most of all, disconnection to broader audiences, do not hold water.

e) Organization studies have not been productive since C. Wright Mills and his ideas permeating personal issues and private problems. Sociologists today opt for a less empirical description of important matters, rendering organization theories as mere mirror images of an actual structure. This occurs because fundamental rules are often deconstructed by new theorist who opine against updated conjectures in order to obtain a better status within the scientific field.

The next 5 questions are based on the text below.

History

We tend to think of history as a reconstruction of actual events as they unfolded in time, as distinct from a poet's or novelist's construction of a historical past, which may refer to real events and lives but is free to ignore or transgress available historiographic evidence in its pursuit of "higher truths." Apparently purged of any subjective elements, history appears as factual, objective, and neutral as any discipline in the sciences. In fact, historians often compare themselves to archeologists or anthropologists, excavating or uncovering various artifacts—documents, memorials, traditions, cultural practices, institutions—that contain vital information about the past.

In the terminology we've been using, then, history would seem to give us a stable, neutral "context" for interpretation. Perhaps the dictum of theorist Fredric Jameson, "Always historicize!," might solve all our problems when confronted by the difficulty or ambiguity of meaning. If no meaning can be determined outside of context, then history would seem to be that "meta-context" to which we could always refer when we hit a slippery patch on the superhighway of meaning. "History" could be that "context" that would finally determine meaning. Unfortunately, it's not quite that easy. History is indeed a context in which interpretation takes place, but history itself must always be interpreted. The critical theorist Walter Benjamin once noted that "the past can be seized only as an image which flashes up at the instant when it can be recognized and is never seen again" ("Theses on the Philosophy of History," 255).

The past, in other words, is not accessible to us as stories with their meanings already intact but as fleeting "images" to be deciphered. Benjamin reminds us that meaning doesn't simply emanate from random events; rather, it is the historian who not only assigns order and coherence to events but also renders them significant, or not. Because the meaning of these images from the past is not transparent or self-evident, reading history, then, requires something extra-historical: a politics or an ethics. But Benjamin's insight suggests something else at least as important: We have no access to the past that is unmediated. [...] We refer to mediation in the broader sense. The past is available to us only through representations—words, images, symbols—whether these derive from film, advertising, legal records, oral history, or personal recollections. We often assume that we can determine the "truth" of particular representations of the past by measuring them against "reality," but Benjamin is suggesting that we have no access to a past "reality" that is not already a representation. And try as we might to find one, there is no singular "true" or objective description of any historical context or any aspect of it. Rather, what we invariably

discover upon closer investigation are many different representations of past events and people. These may be "true" at the level of facts, but they offer at times radically different interpretations of the historiographic evidence they assemble to tell particular stories. Of course, historians aren't free to make up events and personalities as they go along, but they do make choices about the different meanings they assign to factual data.[...]

All of which is to say that histories are narrated from a point of view; "important" events are chosen according to certain criteria; and those events are explained in terms of certain paradigms that promote particular visions of the past, present, and future. Because factual accounts of the past involve this process of selection and emphasis, they turn out to be interpretations, or constructions, of history rather than objective reconstructions of past realities.

NEALON, J.; GIROUX, S. S. The theory of the toolbox: critical concepts for the humanities, arts, & social sciences. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2012.

Questão 6 - 0,2 ponto

In the sentence "Apparently purged of any subjective elements, history appears as factual, objective, and neutral as any discipline in the sciences." (1st paragraph), the word 'purged' could be replaced without changes in meaning with any of the words below, EXCEPT:

- a) Cleansed
- b) Freed
- c) Exonerated
- d) Acquitted
- e) Stained

Questão 7 - 0,2 ponto

In the phrase "Of course, historians aren't free to make up events and personalities as they go along" (3rd paragraph), the words 'make up' could be replaced, without any change in meaning, with:

- a) Cosmetic
- b) Invent
- c) Copy
- d) Hide
- e) Replicate

Questão 8 - 0,2 ponto

The sentence "We often assume that we can determine the "truth" of particular representations of the past by measuring them against "reality," but Benjamin is suggesting that we have no access to a past "reality" that is not already a representation. " (3rd paragraph, line 10) is suitably rewritten, without any change in meaning, in alternative:

- a) As a rule, past events can be exemplified as the opposite of current day ideologies due to its different reality, making it extremely straightforward to comprehend.
- b) On most occasions, we are afraid of daydreaming about the unanswered questions of the past by simulating a reality based upon the present day while we forget that our own opinion has already been altered by the prejudice of the past.
- c) Reality is often romanticized by the artistry of the past and therefore cannot be attested as general truth in modern representations of life.
- d) More often than not we translate portrayals of the past by contrasting it to the idea of real life, however this procedure is counterintuitive since the knowledge of past cannot be judged as absolute truths, but it is in itself a rendering.
- e) By and large, we tend to view the past as a meaning for the future. We try to read the particular representations of the past as allegories to what might happen to our reality.

Questão 9 - 0,2 ponto

What can be inferred from the 2nd paragraph?

- a) History is by nature true to the reality of yore and by no means must be interpreted or contextualized.
- b) You should always go after the meta-context of history when you find yourself lost in the midst of particular past events.
- c) History is sensibly seen as actual and undeniable due to the lack of ambiguity in studies of the subject.
- d) History itself cannot be interpreted, but its tools are essential for the contextualization of the past.
- e) To articulate the past historically does not mean to recognize it "the way it really was".

Questão 10 - 0,2 ponto

All ideas below can be inferred from the text, EXCEPT:

- a) Interpretation in history is easily decided because the gathered information is unbiased.
- b) Media is one of the most useful representations of the past for history.
- c) All past is considered representations thus the idea that history interprets sources to make sense of the past.
- d) Interpretations can be more or less plausible, deep, or ingenious but not true to the exclusion of every other possible interpretation.
- e) The historian must interpret data by removing and retaining certain facts that follow a set of criteria.

FOLHA DE RASCUNHO

GABARITO

- 01. A
- 02. C
- 03. A
- 04. E
- 05. D
- 06. E
- 07. B
- 08. D
- 09. E
- 10. A

AVISO: O gabarito tem suas alternativas válidas para a versão modelo da prova, do qual é anexo. Para recursos, considerar o modelo de prova divulgado juntamente com o resultado. Durante a aplicação de prova, pode haver randomização da ordem das alternativas para cada candidato, com a finalidade de proteger o certame contra fraudes.