



CÁTEDRA SALCEEK INGLÉS NIVEL III

MODELOS DE EXAMEN FINAL
LIBRE / REGULAR

EXAMEN DE INGLÉS NIVEL 3

DIVISION OF LABOR AND SOCIAL INTEGRATION

Durkheim first mentions the concept of anomie in *The Division of Labor in Society*, but he develops the idea more completely in *Suicide*. The concept has been widely used by sociologists since. To understand the term, it is necessary to start with its context. Durkheim attempts to explain the function of the division of labor, and makes the observation that it creates social cohesion. The industrial revolution, of course, produced great tension and turmoil, and Durkheim recognized this. He resolved the contradiction by developing the notion of *anomie*.

Anomie is usually translated as normlessness, but it is best understood as *insufficient normative regulation*. During periods of rapid social change, individuals sometimes experience alienation from group goals and values. They lose sight of their shared interests based on mutual dependence. In this condition, they are less constrained by group norms. Normative values become generalized, rather than personally embraced.

The developments in the division of labor associated with industrialization facilitated anomie. As work becomes routinized, broken down into dull, repetitive tasks, workers lose the sense of the irrole in production, and are less committed to the process and the organization. As a result, the norms of the work place exert less influence on their activity.

Not all a social behavior is anomic, however. Durkheim identified another form, which he called egoism. When the coercive influence of the social values and norms is lessened, excessive individualism can be the result. When individuals disregard norms in favor of their own interests, cohesion is impossible. The individuals themselves, Durkheim noted, often suffer too. Such self-centeredness is highly destructive to the individual's well-being.

Anomic Division of Labor

Whereas Marx saw social conflict as inherent in the manner in which labor was organized in capitalist societies, Durkheim believed that diminished solidarity was a pathological condition. He believed that modern societies would need to develop new means of reinforcing social norms and a shared sense of affiliation. Drawing on Alexis de Tocqueville's analysis of American society, Durkheim suggested that social cohesion could result from action of occupational groups.

Occupational groups could replace the normative functions that were once exercised by institutions such as religion, local community, and the family. Relations between occupational groups would be economic, in the sense that they would have to work together to reach agreements about the conditions of labor, wages, etc. Relations would also be political. These groups would function like political parties. Durkheim distrusted mass democracy and worried about an increasingly bureaucratized state. He felt that occupational groups ought to participate in government, thereby checking the excesses of individual passions, on the one hand, and oppressive bureaucracy on the other.

Occupational groups would also function as social organizations. Since they are based on the similarity of labor, Durkheim thought that individuals within them would naturally have shared interests and a sense of collective identity. Flowing from this, they could organize leisure activities and other social interactions, giving individuals a sense of belonging in the ways that primary affiliations, such as kin and religion used to.

Responda las siguientes consignas **utilizando únicamente la información suministrada en el texto:**

- 1)¿Qué se señala sobre el concepto de anomia en el primer párrafo?
- 2)¿Qué factores contribuyeron a la anomia? ¿Cómo lo explica el texto?
- 3)¿Cuáles son las consecuencias del individualismo para la sociedad y para el individuo?
- 4)Compare el enfoque de Durkheim con el de Marx según el texto.
- 5)¿De qué manera se vincula a los grupos ocupacionales con la política?
- 6)¿Qué se señala sobre la función social de los grupos ocupacionales?

The Continuing Relevance of C. Wright Mills: His Approach to Research and What We Can Learn From It

John E. Miller

Irving Louis Horowitz, his biographer, called him “the greatest sociologist the United States has ever produced,” but many of his colleagues at Columbia University considered him shallow and dangerously simplistic and others thought him to be embarrassingly naïve and believed his work grossly distorted reality. A man of large ambitions and huge energy, C. Wright Mills elicited highly charged reactions, both positive and negative, in his admirers and his detractors. He had little use for the academic prose style of most of his fellow sociologists and played the role of synthesizer, social theorist, radical social critic, and committed polemicist in his own spirited and inimitable way. Though admired by and serving as an inspiration to many of his fellow sociologists, Mills was largely ignored by his discipline as a whole, aside from the work he did on social stratification. His influence, however, extended to many investigators in related disciplines in the social sciences and humanities. Unconstrained by disciplinary boundaries, Mills made all social inquiry his domain and plugged into increasingly ambitious projects during his all-too-short career. Through it all, he left much behind to teach historians and all students of place and region. My intention here is not to recount his Midwestern roots or the larger story of his career, delve into the many controversies surrounding it, or engage in explorations of his personality.

Rather, it is to provide enough details of his life and thought to enable us to understand how his career might provide a model for how historical research can be practiced by students of place and region—whether of the Midwest or any place else. Mills is not the perfect guide, as would be true of anyone else whose career we might investigate. He had his foibles, deficiencies, failures, and missed opportunities. He was not particularly interested in regionalism as a historical/sociological phenomenon, preferring to cast his net more widely at the national and even international levels. But in his enthusiasm, his vision, his ambition, his creativity, and his work ethic, he provided an inspirational example of what investigators are able to accomplish if only they are willing to imagine broadly and work energetically. My purpose here is to describe and comment on some of his most important ideas, concepts, approaches, goals, and methods in such

a way that they might serve as a list, a toolkit, a recipe, or a guide for approaching our own work. My own initiation to

Mills occurred in 1962, when I was a freshman political science major at the University of Missouri, six years after the appearance of *The Power Elite*. The professor in our Introduction to American Government class assigned the book supplementary to our large textbook, and I found it fascinating. Later on, in graduate school, I read more Mills on my own and was especially taken with *The Sociological Imagination* and the essays collected in *Power, Politics, and People*, especially those relating to the sociology of knowledge. I set aside a special place in my intellectual toolkit for the sociology of knowledge and “social epistemology” after that. I also picked up *The Causes of World War III* and *Listen, Yankee* in cheap paperback format when they came out because they were inexpensive, I had been a college debater interested in issues of war and foreign policy, and I found Mills’s prose to be especially readable. He has been a person of interest to me ever since.

Mills was a Texas native, around 6’ 2” tall and weighing more than 200 pounds. Loud, brash, self-centered, flamboyant, and egotistical, he was also enthusiastic, committed, idealistic, hopeful, and often generous to others. Outfitted in camping boots and motorcycle helmet or scruffy cap, carrying a knapsack full of books, and displaying a purposeful mien, he exuded a sense of patience and restless activity. “Twelve books, scholarly essays, journalistic articles, two houses and a solid substantial cottage on an island in a Canadian lake were the fruit of twenty years of hard work, toil, and trouble,” observed his graduate school mentor and later writing partner, Hans Gerth. At Columbia, he became a legend in his own lifetime. A former student of his recalled that his most frequent word of advice was, “Take it big, boy!” It was a philosophy “he not only preached but applied to everything from eating and drinking to writing.” Andrew Jamison and Ron Eyerman contended that “almost single-handedly in the 1950s, Mills would try to keep alive what he later called the sociological imagination in countering the drift toward conformity, homogenization, and instrumental rationality: in short, mass society.” According to his longtime neighbor and friend, the novelist Harvey Swados, Mills possessed “a poetic vision of America; an unlovely vision perhaps, expressed with a mixture of awkwardness and brilliance, but one that did not really need statistics about trespassing or the findings of research teams in order to be apprehended by sensitive Americans as corresponding to their own sense of what was going on about them.”

Most of his contemporaries and readers thought of him first of all as a Manhattanite or, beyond that, as a wild-eyed rebel out of Texas. But if spending two years in Madison as a graduate student at the University of Wisconsin makes one a Midwesterner, he was also a Midwesterner. The city was the home of “Fighting Bob” La Follette, Wisconsin’s progressive Republican governor, United States Senator, and 1924 presidential candidate on the national Progressive party ticket. His sons, “Young Bob” and “Phil,” carried on the family tradition in the U.S. Senate and in the governor’s chair during the 1930s, around the time that Mills was living in Madison. Although the young Mills appears to have been intensely focused on his academic interests at the university, immersion in the progressive atmosphere of Madison—the home of the La Follettes, economist John R. Commons, philosopher Max Otto, political scientist Harold Groves, and other similarly committed progressive activists and thinkers—could only have inclined him further toward the kind of left-wing political views he later became identified with.

Responda las siguientes consignas utilizando únicamente la información suministrada en el texto:

- 1) ¿Cómo era considerado C. Wright Mills por sus colegas y personalidades del mundo académico?
- 2) Explique brevemente los roles que asumió Wright Mills como sociólogo y cuál fue su legado en el campo de la Ciencias Sociales.
- 3) ¿Se encontraba C. Wright Mills restringido por limitaciones disciplinarias? (SI/NO- justifique)
- 4) ¿Cuál es la intención del autor al abordar este tema?
- 5) ¿Por qué el autor no considera a Mills el guía perfecto?
- 6) Explique brevemente cómo ocurrió la iniciación del autor a Mills.
- 7) ¿Cómo describe el autor a Mills en relación con sus rasgos de personalidad?
- 8) ¿Cómo fue considerado Mills en Columbia?
- 9) ¿Qué afirmaron Andrew Jamison and Ron Eyerman sobre Mills en los años 50?
- 10) ¿Estaba el joven Mills intensamente enfocado en sus intereses académicos? (SI/NO- justifique)

Trump Administration Has Executed more Americans than all States Combined, Report Finds

[Ed Pilkington \(The Guardian\)](#)

The execution spree was a first in US history and stands contrary to the declining trend in death penalty practices.

Donald Trump has added a morbid new distinction to his presidency – for the first time in US history, the federal government has in one year executed more American civilians than all the states combined.

In the course of 2020, in an unprecedented glut of judicial killing, the Trump administration rushed to put 10 prisoners to death. The execution spree ran roughshod over historical norms and stood entirely contrary to the decline in the practice of the death penalty that has been the trend in the US for several years.

The outlier nature of the Trump administration's thirst for blood is set out in the year-end report of the Death Penalty Information Center (DPIC). In recent years, the annual review has highlighted the steady withering away of executions, all of which were carried out by individual states.

That pattern continued at state level in 2020, heightened by the coronavirus pandemic which suppressed an already low number of scheduled executions. Only five states – Alabama, Georgia, Missouri, Tennessee and Texas – carried out judicial killings. And only Texas performed more than one, producing the lowest number of executions by the states since 1983.

States carried out seven executions to the federal government's 10. Despite the rash of federal killings, that still amounted to the fewest executions in the US since 1991. Against that downward path, the actions of the Trump administration stand out as a grotesque aberration.

"The administration's policies were not just out of step with the historical practices of previous presidents, they were also completely out of step with today's state practices," said Robert Dunham, DPIC executive director and lead author of its year-end report.

Part of the story was Trump's willful refusal to take the coronavirus seriously. Unlike death penalty states, the federal government insisted on proceeding with executions. As a result, there was an eruption of Covid-19 cases at the Federal Correctional Complex in Terre Haute, Indiana, which the DPIC report notes infected at least nine members of execution teams.

But the overwhelming story of the federal executions in 2020 was the disdain shown by the Trump administration towards established norms, and its determination to push the death penalty to the limits of decency even by standards that those who support the practice, there points out. Since Trump lost the election on 3rd November, the federal government has put to death three prisoners: Orlando Hall, Brandon Bernard and Alfred Bourgeois.

Orlando Hall, 49, was executed by the federal government in November 2020 after a 17-year hiatus on executions. He was sentenced to death for the 1994 kidnapping, rape, and murder of 16-year-old Lisa Rene—an honor roll student with dreams of becoming a doctor. The US Supreme Court sided with the Justice Department on Hall's execution.

Hall and several accomplices ran a marijuana trafficking operation in Arkansas in 1994, according to a Department of Justice statement. After a failed drug transaction involving \$4,700, they drove to Texas to the home of the man they believed had stolen their money.

The man's 16-year-old sister, Lisa Rene, was home and refused to let them inside, the state reports said. Although she had no connection with the drug transaction, the men broke in to the apartment, kidnapped her at gun point and fled in a car to an Arkansas motel.

According to Hall's attorneys, he never denied his participation in Rene's killing and showed remorse after receiving the death sentence. The attorneys say Hall did not receive a fair trial because of a racially biased prosecutor that prohibited Black jurors from serving and had inadequate assistance of counsel.

Brandon Bernard, 40, was executed by lethal injection at a federal prison in Terre Haute, Indiana, after the US Supreme Court rejected a last-minute appeal to stay the execution and Donald Trump did not publicly respond to calls for him to intervene.

Bernard was sentenced for a role in the 1999 killings in Texas of an Iowa couple whose bodies he burned in the trunk of their car after they were his accomplice, Christopher Vialva.

He directed his last words to the family of Todd and Stacie Bagley, the couple he and Vialva were convicted of killing: "I'm sorry," he said. "That's the only words that I can say that completely capture how I feel now and how I felt that day." He was pronounced dead at 9:27 pm eastern time, December 10th 2020. "Brandon Bernard was 18 when he committed murder," tweeted Julián Castro, the former housing secretary from Texas. "Since then, five jurors and a former prosecutor have said they don't support the death penalty in his case. Brandon will be the ninth person executed by the federal government this year. We must end this horrible practice."

Alfred Bourgeois, a 56-year-old Louisiana truck driver, was pronounced dead at 8:21 pm eastern time, December 11th 2020, after receiving a lethal injection at the federal prison in Terre Haute, Indiana. He was set to die for killing his two-year-old daughter. Bourgeois's lawyers alleged he was intellectually disabled and therefore ineligible for the death penalty. Several courts said evidence did not support that claim.

The last time a lame-duck president presided over an execution was in 1889, when the Grover Cleveland administration killed a Native American of the Choctaw Nation named Richard Smith. All three Trump lame-duck executions involved black men. As the DPIC review points out, racial disparities remain prominent in the roll call of the dead, as they have for decades, with almost half of those executed being people of color.

The review exposes other systemic problems in the Trump administration's choice of prisoners to kill. Lezmond Mitchell, executed in August, was the only Native American prisoner on federal death row. His execution ignored tribal sovereignty over the case and the objections of the Navajo Nation, which is opposed to the death penalty.

The subjects of the federal rush to the death chamber included two prisoners whose offenses were committed when they were teenagers. Christopher Valva was 19 and Bernard 18; they were the first teenage offenders sent to their deaths by the US government in almost 70 years.

The sharp contrast between the Trump administration's aggressive stance and the dramatic reduction in executions at state level is underlined by the annual review of the Texas Coalition to Abolish the Death Penalty (TCADP), also released on Wednesday.

Texas, traditionally the death penalty capital of America, carried out three executions this year, Cátedra Salceek - Nivel III - Modelos de Examen 9

Down from nine in 2019. The most recent was on 8th July. Billy Joe Wardlow was 18 in 1993 when he committed robbery and murder.

"The fact that state legislators, juvenile justice advocates, neuroscience experts and two jurors from Wardlow's trial had called for a reprieve based on what we know now about adolescent brain development make the circumstances of his arbitrary execution even more appalling," said Kristin Houle Cuellar, TCADP executive director.

There was some good news. In March, Colorado became the 22nd state to abolish the death penalty. Louisiana and Utah have not executed anyone in 10 years.

Joe Biden, the president-elect, has vowed to eliminate the death penalty. But until he enters the White House on 20th January, Trump remains in charge. Three more federal inmates are set to die - including the only woman on federal death row - before he is done.

Responda las siguientes consignas utilizando únicamente la información suministrada en el texto:

- 1) ¿A qué aspecto de la presidencia de Donald Trump refiere el artículo? Desarrolle.
- 2) ¿Qué conclusiones brinda el Informe Anual 2020 del Centro de Información sobre la Pena de Muerte? Desarrolle todo lo concerniente a este informe.
- 3) ¿Cuántos estados llevaron a cabo ejecuciones en 2020? ¿Qué cantidad de ejecuciones efectuaron esos estados y cuántas el gobierno Federal?
- 4) Explique los casos de Lezmond Mitchell, Orlando Hall, Brandon Bernard y Alfred Bourgeois.
- 5) ¿Por qué se hace referencia al año 1889? ¿Qué relación tiene con el presidente saliente, Donald Trump?
- 6) ¿Qué información se brinda sobre el caso de Billy Joe Wardlow?
- 7) ¿Qué buenas noticias se consignan hacia el final del artículo?
- 8) ¿Qué ha prometido el presidente electo, Joe Biden?

Asynchronous Video Interviews: The Tools You Need to Succeed

Peter Rubinstein/5th November 2020

Companies Are Increasingly Using Automated Video Interviews to Assess candidates. How do you get through this **potentially uncomfortable experience**?

It may not feel remotely natural to sit in front of a computer screen and talk about yourself to an artificial prompt – but that's exactly what many people could find themselves doing at their next job interview.

Since Covid-19 struck, hiring managers have had to think creatively about how to streamline their interview processes. With traditional face-to-face meetings on hold, the solution for some has come in the form of asynchronous video interviews, or AVIs, in which applicants film themselves answering a predetermined set of questions, with no human interviewer present.

In some cases, these recordings are evaluated by a hiring manager, in others artificial intelligence and facial analysis software are used to assess candidates. Companies report that this type of interviewing can make the hiring process more efficient, but for applicants this job screening method – which may feel like a one-way Zoom conversation – can be uncomfortable.

As the pandemic continues to prevent in-person meetings, job seekers in manufacturing, retail and other industries are more likely to find themselves chatting with a bot at their next interview.

Adapting to this format and understanding how to maximize the chance of a positive interview could be key to a successful job hunt.

Saving Time

Even before the pandemic, AVIs were being used as the first stage of recruitment in the healthcare, pharmaceutical, tech, business and finance sectors, according to Carlos Flores, career management specialist at Rutgers University in the US state of New Jersey. While exact statistics are hard to come by (AVIs have been adopted relatively recently by major companies and market reports don't distinguish between them and face-to-face video interviews), experts say that for larger organizations with a national workforce of lower-skilled positions, AVIs have become a convenient way to skim through hundreds or thousands of applicants at a fast rate.

Modern Hire, one of the leading interview technology companies, says it is used today by more than 700 businesses, including a third of Fortune 500 companies, who collectively have conducted over **10 million interviews** through its platform. Modern Hire, another interview technology platform, supported over 20 million assessments and interviews, and saw a **40% increase in users** in 2019. *The technology says it has allowed retail giants like Walmart to speed up its process.* Yet it wasn't long ago that the idea was unpopular. Around 2012, only about 10% of top-positioned businesses had adopted any form of video interviewing; the majority preferred an initial telephone assessment and an in-person interview to follow, says Janine Woodworth, director of strategic service at recruitment software provider Jobvite. But as technology matured and smart phone usage expanded – making it easier for candidates to use the software no matter their location – many companies are taking a second look at video interviewing as a whole, including the use of AVIs for initial screenings, Woodworth says. “They're able to get the assessments out more quickly to a wider range of candidates like that.”

A leading grocer in the southern United States, for instance, streamlined its hiring process during the pandemic by conducting as many as **15,000 AVIs per day**, according to HI revue CEO Kevin Parker. The grocer realized that its previous method of setting up in-person interviews was wasting too much time; arranging appointments, exchanging mails and rescheduling could take weeks. Allowing Candidates to apply on their own time, and skip the hassle of meeting a hiring manager in person, has made it possible for regional chain and even giants like Walmart to fill new roles in **a matter of days**.

One-way interviews

Hiring managers using this software may see multiple benefits, but for applicants using an Aciform the first time, the transition may feel strange.

One major difference is the timing of the interview itself. Rather than scheduling an appointment, the applicant can sit in front of their computer or phone to record their answers whenever they are free. If their day is filled with work, childcare or other duties, they can schedule the interview during a suitable break.

When they begin, they are prompted with a series of questions, often displayed in plain text and somewhat condescending, such as: "Introduce yourself, and tell us a bit about your background and experience" or "Describe your most recent holiday, and what made it special". Depending on the platform and the position they're applying for, they might also be asked to perform small exercises or play a game –activities that can test their ability to multitask or brainstorming the fly.

traditionally favoured telephone screening followed by an in-person interview.

When candidates submit their interviews, their recordings are processed in one of two ways. The hiring manager can opt to receive the videos directly and evaluate them without the use of any further technology, or they can be run through a complex AI system which assesses facial and linguistic information to determine how well candidates compare to previous successful hires.

There are challenges; AVIs can vary in the amount of time allotted for each answer, and not every program will give candidates unlimited preparation time or allow them to re-record a section they are unhappy with their first attempt. Applicants also won't be able to ask any questions about the company they're applying to, unlike a standard interview, and poor internet connections or blurry webcams can cause trouble for applicants wanting to make a good impression. Then there's the fact that candidates don't know exactly how their interviews will be evaluated. "I think it makes them lose confidence as a result of the experience because... there's too much unknown," says Kyra Sutton, professor of human resource management at Rutgers.

Recording a video monologue can be particularly hard for some candidates who are not speaking in their native language. Sutton's international students have told her that, when preparing for an interview, they worry they could be penalized for mispronouncing a word or bungling their grammar. And when it comes to how the interview is assessed, there is the issue of algorithms tainted with the same **pre-existing hiring biases** as their human counterparts.

Showing Your Best Self

Yet if this kind of recruitment method becomes more widespread, understanding how to speak well into the void could become elemental successful job hunt.

Experts say that before pressing the record button, it's important to plan for questions that could come your way. There's no room for improvisation or pleasantries during an AVI, and answers need to be efficient and to the point.

"You have to be more prepared and comfortable before you start," says Christoph Hochenberger-founder of AI-driven recruitment platform Retorsion. Just like in a standard interview, being confused by question or not having much to say can reflect poorly on a candidate. And because of the highly structured nature of AVIs, candidates won't be able to ask for clarifications.

Speaking at a slow and even pace into a camera can be difficult, Hochenberger says. The best way to sound natural is to imagine someone sitting across from you; smile often and make steady eye contact. **Proper aesthetics matter**. Advisements, and anything distracting in the background may catch the eye of a human evaluator. "I would try to be in front of a neutral background," he says. "and would wear something that's appropriate for the job."

Perhaps most importantly, Hochenberger says, candidates should be themselves. Trying to squeeze into many references to your qualifications or keywords that applicants think might win favor can appear insincere and harm your overall performance. Applicants should assume their recordings will be judged by a fellow human, he says, and apply the same courtesy as in a normal conversation.

By staying calm in front of the camera and embracing the one-sided nature of the format, job seekers give themselves the best chance of success. "It's a monologue rather than a dialogue," says Hochenberger.

Responda las siguientes consignas **utilizando únicamente la información suministrada en el texto:**

- 1) ¿Por qué el autor usa el adjetivo **uncomfortable** en el copete en la frase "**potentially uncomfortable experience**"? ¿A qué se refiere? ¿Qué describe?
 - 2) Describa la nueva metodología de entrevista de trabajo que se aplica a partir de la situación de pandemia (COVID-19).
 - 3) ¿Cuál sería la principal ventaja de esta nueva metodología? ¿Qué cifras se mencionan en el 6to párrafo del texto?
 - 4) ¿Cuál era el método tradicional preferido por las empresas? ¿Qué ocurrió después? ¿Qué ejemplos se mencionan en el primer párrafo de la segunda carilla? Desarrolle.
 - 5) En la sección **One-way interviews** se da una descripción más detallada de esta nueva metodología. Desarrolle.
- Cátedra Salceek - Nivel III - Modelos de Examen14
- 6) ¿Cuáles son los desafíos que presenta esta nueva metodología de entrevista laboral? ¿Qué recomiendan los expertos para tener una entrevista laboral asincrónica exitosa?
 - 7) ¿Cuáles son las conclusiones finales de Cristoph Hohenberger en los últimos dos párrafos?

