*Seu modelo de prova está na página seguinte

Curso de Inglês Instrumental Online

preparatório para Provas de Proficiência do Mestrado e Doutorado com Certificado de Proficiência

SAIBA MAIS

UNIVERSIDADE ESTADUAL PAULISTA
"JÚLIO DE MESQUITA FILHO"
Câmpus de São José do Rio Preto

PROGRAMA DE PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO EM ESTUDOS LINGUÍSTICOS

PROCESSO SELETIVO 2011

PROVA DE PROFICIÊNCIA EM LÍNGUA INGLESA

Instruções:

a) Responda em português, na folha de respostas, às questões abaixo sobre o *Abstract* e parte da introdução do texto *The development of similarity: testing the prediction of a computational model of metaphor comprehension*.
b) Evite responder às questões apenas citando partes do texto ou traduzindo-as.
c) É permitida a utilização de um dicionário impresso durante a prova.
d) Enumere as questões respondidas na folha de respostas.

Questões:

1. De acordo com o texto, quais das afirmações a seguir são corretas, e quais são incorretas? No caso de afirmações incorretas, explique porque não são corretas: (6.0 pontos)

1.1. O processo de interpretação de metáforas por crianças mais novas consiste, na verdade, em erros linguísticos que as crianças cometem, pois ignoram os amplos sentidos das palavras.

1.2. Para que seja confirmado o teor metafórico de um enunciado, é necessário que a criança indique, por exemplo, semelhanças entre objetos dentre uma mesma categoria.

1.3. Estudos indicam que, quando crianças entendem uma metáfora porque possuem conhecimento conceitual sobre um determinado domínio linguístico, elas tendem a compreender outras metáforas no escopo desse mesmo domínio.

1.4. Segundo o estudo de Keil (1986), os domínios conceituais adquiridos pelas crianças, enquanto habilidades linguísticas e processuais, dependem direta e principalmente das faixas etárias das crianças.

1.5. Vosniadou e Ortony (1983) concluíram que crianças na faixa etária de três anos processam metáforas contidas em enunciados com significados semelhantes, mesmo que tais metáforas pertençam a categorias convencionadas como distintas.

1.6. O estudo de Marschark e Nall (1985) indica que, devido ao fato de ainda não possuírem o domínio de categorias conceituais claramente definidas, crianças

tendem a interpretar literalmente enunciados que adultos consideram como metafóricos.

2. Com base na investigação de Vosniadou e Ortony (1983),

2.1. constatou-se alguma diferença entre crianças da faixa etária de 3 a 6 anos, e adultos? Em caso afirmativo, qual diferença? (1.0 ponto)

2.2. o que se verificou sobre crianças a partir dos 4 anos de idade? (1.0 ponto)

3. Em termos gerais, o que os estudos realizados com base no modelo MPC evidenciam sobre a compreensão de metáforas por crianças? (2.0 pontos)

Texto adaptado de PURSER, H. R. M.; THOMAS, M. S. C.; SNOXHALL, S.; MARESCHAL, D. The development of similarity: Testing the prediction of a computational model of metaphor comprehension. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, v. 24, n. 10, p. 1406 – 1430, 2009.

Abstract

In this article an empirical study that tests a novel prediction generated by the Metaphor-by-Pattern-Completion (MPC) connectionist model of metaphor comprehension (Thomas & Mareschal, 2001) is presented. The MPC model predicts a developmental progression in the way that children process metaphors, from a preference for basic-level metaphors to a preference for subordinate-level metaphors. Preference for different kinds of verbal similarity statements was assessed for 73 children, aged 4-10, along with justifications. The prediction of the model was confirmed, providing evidence for the attendant assumption of the model, specifically that metaphorical comprehension is intimately linked to the emerging structure of semantic representations in children.

Introduction

Although developmental literature has documented many examples of younger children's figurative language (e.g., Billow, 1981; Winner, 1979), it has been claimed that children cannot understand metaphorical speech until they are relatively old (Inhelder & Piaget, 1964; Piaget, 1962). A possible reason for this view is that metaphorical proficiency relies on many component abilities, such as metalinguistic skill, semantic knowledge, and a capacity for communicative pragmatics (see Vosniadou, 1987). Setting aside the hypothesis that utterances appearing to be metaphors might, in fact, be linguistic errors such as overextensions of word meanings (e.g., Chukovsky, 1968), which can be ruled out by checking that the child knows the actual name of the object referred to (see Gardner, Winner, Bechhofer, & Wolf, 1978), one should be clear on how apparent metaphor in young children is interpreted. For an utterance to be deemed metaphorical, the child must point towards some similarity between objects in

different categories, and at the same time be aware on some level that the objects belong to different conceptual categories.

The notion that figurative language ability is constrained by conceptual knowledge is supported by evidence that children tend to produce metaphors in domains with which they are more familiar (Gottfried, 1997). Research in the closely related field of analogical reasoning supports this claim (Goswami, 1996), suggesting that limitations in reasoning are intimately tied to having the requisite knowledge to demonstrate this ability. Keil (1986) found that if children understood a metaphor from a particular conceptual domain, they tended to understand all the other metaphors tested from that domain, but metaphors from other domains would come to be understood at different times. Furthermore, there appeared to be a developmental progression in the kinds of metaphor that were understood, with those referring to animate/inanimate distinctions, such as 'the car is hungry', understood before those based on physical/non-physical distinctions, such as 'the idea is ripe'. Keil (1986) concluded that metaphor comprehension does not emerge as a specific linguistic or processing ability at a certain age, but instead develops on a domain-by-domain basis, reflecting the amount and quality of conceptual knowledge in the domains juxtaposed by the metaphor. Thus, the development of metaphorical cognition is placed within the context of conceptual development.

Using such a framework, Vosniadou and Ortony (1983) investigated the preference of 3-6-year-old children, and adults, for three types of similarity statement: literal ('a river is a lake'), metaphorical ('a river is a snake'), and anomalous ('a river is a cat'). The authors found that even the youngest children were able to distinguish literal and metaphorical statements from anomalous ones, suggesting that children as young as 3 years old consider both literal and metaphorical statements to be meaningful similarity statements, as distinct from anomalous statements. However, only participants aged 4 years old and upwards were able to distinguish further between literal and metaphorical comparisons.

In addition to this comparison task, a different group of participants undertook a categorisation task that tested knowledge of the categories to which the terms of the comparison task belong. It was found that only children aged 4 years and upwards demonstrated appropriate category knowledge. The authors concluded that while 3-year-olds process metaphors as meaningful similarity statements, they are not aware that the terms belong to different conventional categories. Thus, the study suggested that children do not understand metaphorical similarity until 4 years of age. Marschark and Nall (1985) have further related these findings to gradual formation of conceptual categories and suggested that because a young child's conceptual knowledge may not yet have clustered into clearly defined categories, a statement that is considered metaphorical by adults may be taken literally by the child. The instances in which young children appear to produce or comprehend metaphors may, in fact, reflect overlapping or poorly delineated conceptual categories.

[…]