*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

UFRGS
UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO RIO GRANDE DO SUL

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO RIO GRANDE DO SUL
INSTITUTO DE LETRAS
DEPARTAMENTO DE LÍNGUAS MODERNAS
COMISSÃO DE AVALIAÇÃO DE PROFICIÊNCIA DE LEITURA EM LÍNGUA ESTRANGEIRA

INSTITUTO DE LETRAS UFRGS

LÍNGUA INGLESA

CAPLLE

2018.2

INSTRUÇÕES:

1. Antes do início da prova, solicita-se desligar os telefones celulares.
2. Verifique se o caderno contém 7 páginas numeradas. Caso contrário, solicite ao fiscal a substituição do mesmo. Rubrique todas as páginas.
3. Escreva suas respostas à tinta (preferencialmente, com caneta esferográfica de tinta azul). **Todas as respostas devem ser escritas em língua portuguesa**.
4. Atenha-se ao conteúdo dos enunciados, escreva com caligrafia legível e certifique-se de ter respondido a todas as perguntas.
5. É facultativo o uso individual de dicionário em papel.
6. O candidato poderá rabiscar, riscar ou anotar somente no caderno da prova.
7. Não é permitido o uso de *notebook* ou *palmtop* ou qualquer outro aparelho eletrônico.
8. A duração da prova é de 2 horas e 30 minutos.
9. Nenhum candidato poderá entregar a prova antes de haver decorrido uma (1) hora do início da mesma.
10. Ao candidato não é permitido levar consigo nenhum material escrito ao deixar a sala da prova.
11. Serão considerados aprovados os candidatos que demonstrarem proficiência, com aproveitamento igual ou superior a 70% de acertos.

Nome Completo

Assinatura (conforme documento de identificação)

Curso (CPG/PPG) – caso seja aluno da UFRGS

Texto A **Do Rocks listen?**

The Cultural Politics of Apprehending Australian Aboriginal Labor *

It is as if "the *reality* of the mode of production enters the scene at the moment when someone is discovered who invents the *theory* of it"

-Jean Baudrillard, *The Mirror of Production*

ONE HOT, STICKY November day in 1989, a large part of the Belyuen Aboriginal community was gathered on the coast of the Cox Peninsula, across from the Darwin Harbour, to participate in one of the last days of the Kenbi Land Claim. Five of us—myself, Marjorie Bilbil, Ruby Yarrowin, Agnes Lippo, and Ann Timber—stood back from the hustle of microphones and notepads and the hassle of nonstop questions from government officials for as well as against our side. The other four women ranged in age from 38 to 70 (I was 27) and came from a variety of **Dreaming** (totemic) backgrounds. We stood listening to Betty Billawag describing to the land commissioner and his entourage how an important **Dreaming** site nearby, Old Man Rock, listened to and smelled the sweat of Aboriginal people as they passed by hunting, gathering, camping, or just mucking about. She outlined the importance of such human-**Dreaming**/environmental interactions to the health and productivity of the countryside. At one point Marjorie Bilbil turned to me and said, "He can't believe, eh, Beth?" And I answered, "No, I don't think so, not him, not really. He doesn't think she is lying. He just can't believe himself that that Old Man Rock listens."

This scene in a variety of forms and settings has been repeated over and over since I first met the people living at Belyuen in 1984. Whether on sacred site registrations, ethnobotanical surveys, tourist excursions, or in my own classroom—here I use a similar story to illustrate the concept of cultural hegemony—questions always turn to a matter of belief: does the judge, the ethnographer, Belyuen people, or I believe that **Dreamings** listen, smell, talk, or, more generally, intentionally act and react to the presence of humans nearby? And they turn to issues of value and evaluation: what political or economic weight should these beliefs be given, and in what social realm should they be assessed? Are Aboriginal people working, in the commonsense meaning of that word, when they talk to local **Dreamings** or when they sit and relax, talk, play cards, or sleep on a beach? And how should this work be stacked up against the kind of labor that produces the Australian gross national product?

That these behind-the-scenes conversations inevitably return to questions of belief and value is striking in contrast to the singular absence of such questions in the legal scene. While the Commonwealth government has made Aboriginal cultural traditions the productive motor of indigenous land rights, it has splintered the referent of "the cultural" and sidestepped a direct confrontation over how to assess human-environmental interactions and cross-cultural notions of labor. The land commissioner listens to Betty Billawag in order to evaluate the cultural authenticity of her notion of human labor and the **Dreaming** environment. **In his effort to balance the beliefs of the Aboriginal community with the needs of the larger non-Aboriginal community, he does not critically interrogate the cultural beliefs that subtend and organize his own evaluative schema.** Not surprising. Those beliefs "went underground" long ago, as if they were themselves a **Dreaming**. In other words, the culture of progress, productivity, and political economy that subtends his evaluations remains, in the policy world, an unassailable totem. Again, not surprising; the cultural frameworks subtending political economy (not the disputable ways of assessing political-economic systems) were long ago transmuted into neutral, natural, and objective fact. Belief may be part and parcel of society and culture, but labor, ecology, and economic value refer to material conditions most accurately approached through a scientific paradigm. As Baudrillard (1975) noted, subaltern perspectives on labor, political economy, and the nature of human-environmental interactions are subordinate to the dominant perspective not only because they are popularly imagined as preceding it in social evolutionary time but also because they are represented as beliefs rather than a method for ascertaining truth.

Aboriginal traditions are legally productive not because they are "true" but because they are beliefs and thus part of the multiculturalism to which the contemporary nation-state can demonstrate a liberal reconcilement. But reconciliation with multiculturalism ends where a conceptual accommodation to a multieconomism would begin.

Put in a more obvious way, what the Commonwealth—through its courts and public realm (media)—is evaluating is not the verity of Betty Billawag's and other Belyuen Aborigines' descriptions, but whether or not their words represent the common beliefs of the community and, if they do, whether or not these beliefs can be said to reflect an evolving set of Aboriginal traditions. **The significance of culture is its presence or absence in the person and community and its positive relationship to traditions, not its positive or negative relationship to environmental or economic "facts."** Thus the real conflict over the grounds for assessing the value produced by human action in the environment is never addressed in formal legal venues although it may be tentatively raised in political settings. A full discussion is forever deferred to **second-level issues**: Are these beliefs sufficiently traditional? Are there a sufficient number of believers to constitute a community? How does the nation-state balance the economic needs of the entire nation with the cultural traditions and beliefs of a minority population? The cultural organization of Western disbelief—its deep disbelief that **Dreamings** can listen in anything but a metaphorical sense—forever eludes the grasp of liberal political-economic theory and the environmentalism that sprouts from it. The incorporation of some form of Aboriginal law into Commonwealth legislation merely serves to mask further the subterranean machinations of Western cultural notions of production, value, leisure, and labor, their subjects and objects, and the relocation of objectivity from the cultural to the ecological-economic realm. But such masking must occur in liberal democratic nations like Australia, where multicultural "rights" must be reconciled with economic and environmental "reality."

* Extraído e adaptado de: POVINELLI, ELIZABETH A. “Do Rocks listen? The Cultural Politics of Apprehending Australian Aboriginal Labor.” American Anthropologist, New Series, 97.3 (1995): 505-518. Disponível em: < https://www.sv.uio.no/sai/english/research/projects/anthropos-and-the-material/Intranet/economic-practices/reading-group/texts/povinelli-do-rocks-listen.pdf>. Acessado em 12/02/2019.

De acordo com o texto A, escolha a alternativa que contém a resposta correta nas questões que seguem.

- De acordo com o trecho contido entre as linhas 5–18, a autora

a) estava participando do encontro entre aborígenes e agentes governamentais como repórter.
b) relata o empenho dos agentes governamentais para atender as demandas dos aborígenes.
c) enfatiza a importância das mulheres aborígenes em negociações que tratam da questão da terra indígena.
d) sugere que os agentes governamentais não conseguem conceber que *Old Man Rock* possa ouvir os aborígenes.
e) relata a falta de disposição dos agentes governamentais para entender o pensamento aborígene.

- De acordo com as ideias contidas no segundo parágrafo (linhas 19–29), é CORRETO afirmar que os Belyuen

a) contam as histórias de *Old Man Rock* apenas para que os agentes governamentais reconheçam o local como sítio sagrado.
b) impõem sua hegemonia cultural nas salas de aula.
c) não aceitam submeter suas crenças ao aval da ciência.
d) preferem falar sobre seus sonhos a trabalhar.
e) afirmam que os *Dreamings* podem ouvir, falar e reagir à presença humana.

- De acordo com o texto, o representante governamental para questões de terra

a) procura determinar até que ponto as crenças dos Belyuen são representativas da cultura.
b) não está interessado nas crenças dos Belyuen.
c) não possui um sistema de crenças próprio.
d) defende a soberania dos Belyuen em relação a sua terra.
e) avalia a capacidade dos Belyuen de produzirem na terra.

- Qual das afirmativas abaixo NÃO é mencionada no texto como um "*second-level issue*" (linha 63)?

a) O tamanho da comunidade.
b) A questão de se uma crença relatada é de fato representativa da comunidade aborígene a que se diz que pertence.
c) A questão do quanto se deve sacrificar os interesses econômicos de uma nação inteira em função de uma população minoritária.
d) A incapacidade da sociedade hegemônica ocidental de aceitar como fato os relatos aborígenes de que uma rocha possa escutar.
e) O ambientalismo derivado de uma teoria político-econômica liberal.

.

- Assinale a alternativa que melhor expressa a ideia principal do texto.

a) Os agentes do governo australiano não estão de acordo entre si sobre a legitimidade da demanda dos aborígenes.
b) Os aborígenes lutam para ter suas crenças e culturas respeitadas pelo governo australiano.
c) A necessidade de questionar pressupostos culturais não examinados da sociedade hegemônica.
d) A cultura Belyuen não pode ser jamais compatível com a cultura hegemônica tal como está constituída na Austrália.
e) Os Belyuen não se sentem respeitados em sua forma de organização do trabalho.

- A expressão "*Dreaming*" (ou "*Dreamings*") parece conter diversos sentidos no texto. Selecione a alternativa de tradução que NÃO poderia ser usada em nenhuma das ocorrências (linhas 11, 12, 15, 23, 27, 36, 40 e 66):

a) um totem.
b) um sonho.
c) uma rocha específica.
d) *Old Man Rock*.
e) uma característica na paisagem que percebe a presença dos aborígenes.

- Traduza para o português, de forma correta e fluente, os trechos que seguem:

a) *In his effort to balance the beliefs of the Aboriginal community with the needs of the larger non-Aboriginal community, he does not critically interrogate the cultural beliefs that subtend and organize his own evaluative schema.* (linhas 36–39)

……

……

……

……

b) *The significance of culture is its presence or absence in the person and community and its positive relationship to traditions, not its positive or negative relationship to environmental or economic "facts."* (linhas 58–60)

……

……

……

……

Texto B **Viewing eye movements during reading through the lens of chaos theory:**
How reading is like the weather

Do all readers read alike? Most educators would answer no. Even within a group of readers with similar proficiency levels there is variation and unpredictability in many aspects of the reading process. Differences can include the variety of ways readers approach the text, the types of oral reading miscues they make, the level of comprehension they demonstrate, the connections they make, and more. There is also intrareader variability in these aspects across texts and situations. A reader reading the same text at two different times would be unlikely to read in exactly the same way each time. Many literacy professionals might agree that no two reading acts are exactly the same; within the parameters of what is viewed as "reading" exist much inter- and intrareader variability and unpredictability. Few theoretical models of reading, however, emphasize this variability. Instead, aspects of reading that are not predictable and do not fit neatly into a model or theory are typically disregarded or ignored. **Such models** "appear to offer a more segmented and straightforward depiction of the elements and their interrelationships than may exist" (Tierney, p. 1176). Robinson and Yaden (1993) offered a similar critique in terms of literacy research, questioning research that is based on data that assume linearity and a direct relationship between a particular variable and the desired outcome. They argued that "reductionist models that center on only one aspect of the reading process may in fact present an invalid picture of what is actually taking place during reading instruction" (p. 20). A perspective on reading that takes such unpredictability and variability into account and allows educators and researchers to view and discuss reading processes in their entirety would be valuable. I argue that chaos theory can provide that perspective.

Introduction to chaos theory

In the early 1960s, meteorologist Edward Lorenz set out to determine why accurately predicting weather patterns was seemingly impossible. Building a computer model of the earth's weather, Lorenz used nonlinear differential equations to model mathematically generated visuals of weather patterns. Gleick (1987) described how Lorenz stopped one of his sequences in midcourse and then, instead of starting the same sequence over from the beginning, typed in the mathematical values from where he had left off. This would, he reasoned, cause the sequence to end up at exactly the same place as a previous sequence that used the same starting values. However, the sequence varied slightly during each iteration, until it was wildly different from the original. After some investigation, Lorenz found that the midpoint values he had used to restart the sequence, which were limited to three decimal places on the printout he had, were actually stored in the computer up to six decimal places. Thus, when he restarted his sequence with the three-digit value, he was, in effect, starting the sequence from a slightly different place, which produced much different results. This small difference in values was amplified and built on until the end result was far from the expected result. It was Lorenz's (2000) work that stimulated the

description of the “butterfly effect”; the famous question Lorenz posed was whether a butterfly flapping its wings in Brazil can influence tornado patterns in Texas months later (Lorenz, 2000). The technical term for the butterfly effect is sensitive dependence on initial conditions, and Lorenz’s (1963) early work with weather patterns is generally considered the birth of chaos theory (Gleick, 1987).

If chaos is the process, the product is best expressed as a self-similar fractal (Koehler, 1995). Coined by Mandelbrot (1983) to describe non–Euclidian shapes found in nature, fractals describe objects that may seem irregular in shape but actually have an iterative, self-similar design at many different scales. **A head of broccoli is a good example in that any one of the branches that make up the head retains its similarity to the head as a whole, yet each is unique in some respects. Fractals owe their unique shapes and descriptions to the type of attractors found in chaotic systems.** An attractor is a representation of influences that move the system toward a steady state; “roughly speaking, an attractor is what the behavior of a system settles down to, or is attracted to” (Crutchfield et al., 1986, p. 50).

Chaos theory describes systems that are rule governed but where the exact outcomes are almost impossible to predict. That is, they do not progress according to a linear process where a small change will produce a small and easily measured outcome. Instead they are nonlinear, and this nonlinearity is a necessary part of chaos (Lorenz, 1993).

A complete description of chaos theory would entail volumes; however, for the present purpose chaos is considered a nonlinear process that is sensitively dependent on initial conditions and exhibits self-similar fractal relationships. These three chaos theory principles of *sensitive dependence*, *fractal self-similarity*, and *nonlinearity* are used to analogically link chaos theory and reading processes as represented by eye movements.

I argue that when related to chaos theory as an analogy, the reading process demonstrates characteristics of sensitive dependence, fractal self-similarity, and nonlinearity. **Chaos theory suggests that reading is like the weather— we know the parameters that define most systems on a global level, but within those parameters it is not possible to predict the exact nature of the process on a local level.** This is important for several reasons, one of which is that it is not possible to predict what an individual reader will comprehend or do at any given point in time. From a pedagogical standpoint, this would seem to argue against predetermined, scripted reading agendas that rely on uniformity in reading readiness and progress across readers.

* Extraído e adaptado de: PAULSON, ERIC J. “Viewing eye movements during reading through the lens of chaos theory: How reading is like the weather.” *Reading Research Quarterly* 40.3 (2005) 338-358. Disponível em: <https://ila-onlinelibrary-wiley.ez45.periodicos.capes.gov.br/doi/epdf/10.1598/RRQ.40.3.3>. Acessado em: 14/02/2019.

De acordo com o texto B, escolha a alternativa que contém a resposta correta nas questões que seguem.

- Qual das alternativas abaixo NÃO é mencionada no texto como um fator de variação e imprevisibilidade no processo da leitura?

a) As diversas formas que os leitores têm de abordar um texto.
b) Os tipos de erro na leitura oral que os leitores fazem.
c) Os diferentes níveis de compreensão dos leitores.
d) A variação entre diferentes leituras que um mesmo leitor faz de um texto.
e) As diversas interpretações literárias que certos textos permitem.

- A expressão “Such models” (linha 11) refere-se aos modelos teóricos que

a) enfatizam a variabilidade na leitura.
b) descartam os aspectos da leitura que não são previsíveis.
c) estudam a variabilidade entre as várias leituras de uma mesma pessoa.
d) integram os diversos elementos da leitura em um todo.
e) explicam por que duas leituras feitas por uma mesma pessoa não são iguais.

- Segundo o trecho contido entre as linhas 10 a 20, as teorias de leitura não conseguem enfatizar a variabilidade no processo de leitura porque

a) é impossível construir um modelo teórico sem antes analisar todos os fatores envolvidos na leitura.
b) é preciso primeiro construir um modelo teórico mais simplificado para compreender o processo de leitura e só depois elaborar modelos mais complexos.
c) as interações entre os diversos elementos requerem análises segmentadas.
d) partem do princípio de que a leitura é um processo linear.
e) tal modelo teórico não pode ser usado em sala de aula.

- Com base na descrição que o texto traz do "efeito borboleta" é possível afirmar que o meteorologista Edward Lorenz

a) estava estudando o efeito das borboletas nas alterações do clima nas regiões subtropicais.
b) percebeu que variações ínfimas nos dados númericos de uma equação diferencial não linear podem gerar diferenças extraordinárias no resultado final.
c) descobriu que o bater das asas de uma borboleta no Brazil pode influenciar os tornados no Texas mesmo muitos meses depois.
d) introduziu um termo técnico para a dependência sensitiva das condições iniciais.
e) desenvolveu meticulosamente a teoria do caos com o intuito de explicar os padrões climáticos.

- Assinale a alternativa que NÃO descreve um fractal, de acordo com o texto.

a) Fractais são o produto que melhor expressa o processo caótico.
b) Fractais são padrões não euclidianos que aparecem na natureza.
c) Fractais são repetições de um desenho em diferentes escalas.
d) Fractais são atratores de sistemas caóticos.
e) Fractais são formados por tendências à estabilidade em sistemas caóticos.

- Assinale a alternativa que NÃO pode ser usada para justificar a analogia entre a teoria do caos e a descrição do processo de leitura.

a) Assim como a teoria do caos, a leitura não pode ser descrita por nenhum modelo teórico pois é não linear.
b) A teoria do caos serve para descrever processos não lineares, como a leitura.
c) Assim como a teoria do caos, a leitura é um processo que depende de inúmeros fatores que tornam os resultados altamente variáveis ao final.
d) A teoria do caos permite olhar para o movimento dos olhos durante o processo de leitura como um fator não linear.
e) Ambos os processos não podem ser absolutamente controlados de modo a prever o resultado.

- Traduza para o português, de forma correta e fluente, os trechos que seguem:

a) *A head of broccoli is a good example in that any one of the branches that make up the head retains its similarity to the head as a whole, yet each is unique in some respects. Fractals owe their unique shapes and descriptions to the type of attractors found in chaotic systems.* (linhas 45–48)

……

……

……

……

b) *Chaos theory suggests that reading is like the weather— we know the parameters that define most systems on a global level, but within those parameters it is not possible to predict the exact nature of the process on a local level.* (linhas 61–64)

……

……

……

……