



Pró-reitoria de Pós-Graduação

e

Curso de Licenciatura em Letras: Línguas Adicionais

Teste de Proficiência em Inglês

14 de dezembro de 2016

Número conforme Edital 359/2016:

O objetivo deste teste é comprovar sua proficiência em leitura e compreensão de textos em língua inglesa. Para tanto:

- 1) Leia atentamente os textos e as questões referentes aos textos;
- 2) Baseie-se somente no texto para responder as perguntas;
- 3) Utilize somente dicionário **impresso**.

Antes de começar o exame, certifique-se de que:

- 1) Desligará seus equipamentos eletrônicos;
- 2) Escreverá com caneta azul ou preta;
- 3) Utilizará somente as folhas de rascunho fornecidas;
- 4) Ao final da prova, entregará ao examinador a prova e as folhas de rascunho.

Leia os dois textos de referência e depois responda aos questionamentos que os seguem. São 5 (cinco) perguntas relativas ao primeiro texto e 5 (cinco) perguntas relativas ao segundo. Cada questão poderá ser pontuada em até 1 ponto. São 10 pontos ao total.

A duração da prova é de 03 (três) horas.

Texto 1:

Why Bilinguals are Smarter?

Speaking two languages rather than just one has obvious practical benefits in an increasingly globalized world. But in recent years, scientists have begun to show that the advantages of bilingualism are even more fundamental than being able to converse with a wider range of people. Being bilingual, it turns out, makes you smarter. **It** can have a profound effect on your brain, improving cognitive skills not related to language and even shielding against dementia in old age.

This view of bilingualism is remarkably different from the understanding of bilingualism through much of the 20th century. Researchers, educators and policy makers long considered a second language to be an interference, cognitively speaking, that hindered a child's academic and intellectual development.

They were not wrong about the interference: there is ample evidence that in a bilingual's brain both language systems are active even when he is using only one language, thus creating situations in which one system obstructs the other. But this interference, researchers are finding out, isn't so much a handicap as a blessing in disguise. It forces the brain to resolve internal conflict, giving the mind a workout that strengthens its cognitive muscles.

Bilinguals, for instance, seem to be more adept than monolinguals at solving certain kinds of mental puzzles. In [a 2004 study](#) by the psychologists Ellen Bialystok and Michelle Martin-Rhee, bilingual and monolingual preschoolers were asked to sort blue circles and red squares presented on a computer screen into two digital bins — one marked with a blue square and the other marked with a red circle.

In the first task, the children had to sort the shapes by color, placing blue circles in the bin marked with the blue square and red squares in the bin marked with the red circle. Both groups did this with comparable ease. Next, the children were asked to sort by shape, which was more challenging because it required placing the images in a bin marked with a conflicting color. The bilinguals were quicker at performing this task.

The collective evidence from a number of such studies suggests that the bilingual experience improves the brain's so-called executive function — a command system that directs the attention processes that we use for planning, solving problems and performing various other mentally demanding tasks. These processes include ignoring distractions to stay focused, switching attention willfully from one thing to another and holding information in mind — like remembering a sequence of directions while driving.

Why does the tussle between two simultaneously active language systems improve these aspects of cognition? Until recently, researchers thought the bilingual advantage stemmed primarily from

an ability for *inhibition* that was honed by the exercise of suppressing one language system: this suppression, it was thought, would help train the bilingual mind to ignore distractions in other contexts. But that explanation increasingly appears to be inadequate, since studies have shown that bilinguals perform better than monolinguals even at tasks that do not require inhibition, like threading a line through an ascending series of numbers scattered randomly on a page.

The key difference between bilinguals and monolinguals may be more basic: a heightened ability to monitor the environment. “Bilinguals have to switch languages quite often — you may talk to your father in one language and to your mother in another language,” says Albert Costa, a researcher at the University of Pompeu Fabra in Spain. “It requires keeping track of changes around you in the same way that we monitor our surroundings when driving.” In a study comparing German-Italian bilinguals with Italian monolinguals on monitoring tasks, Mr. Costa and his colleagues found that the bilingual subjects not only performed better, but **they** also did so with less activity in parts of the brain involved in monitoring, indicating that they were more efficient at it.

The bilingual experience appears to influence the brain from infancy to old age (and there is reason to believe that it may also apply to those who learn a second language later in life).

In a [2009 study led by Agnes Kovacs](#) of the International School for Advanced Studies in Trieste, Italy, 7-month-old babies exposed to two languages from birth were compared with peers raised with one language. In an initial set of trials, the infants were presented with an audio cue and then shown a puppet on one side of a screen. Both infant groups learned to look at that side of the screen in anticipation of the puppet. But in a later set of trials, when the puppet began appearing on the opposite side of the screen, the babies exposed to a bilingual environment quickly learned to switch their anticipatory gaze in the new direction while the other babies did not.

Bilingualism’s effects also extend into the twilight years. In a recent study of 44 elderly Spanish-English bilinguals, scientists led by the neuropsychologist Tamar Gollan of the University of California, San Diego, found that individuals with a higher degree of bilingualism — measured through a comparative evaluation of proficiency in each language — were more resistant than others to the onset of dementia and other symptoms of Alzheimer’s disease: the higher the degree of bilingualism, the later the age of onset.

Disponível em: <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/03/18/opinion/sunday/the-benefits-of-bilingualism.html> March 12, 2012. **Acesso em:** 05/11/2016.

Questão 1 – Retire do texto três argumentos que respondam a pergunta: Por que os bilíngues são mais inteligentes?

Questão 2- Escreva a quem ou a que expressões abaixo se referem no texto.

“ It can have a profound effect on your brain...” (linha 4)	
“ They were not wrong about the interference...(linha 11)	
“but they also did so with less activity in parts...” (linhas 46 e 47)	

Questão 3 – Segundo Albert Costa, pesquisador da universidade de Pompeu Fabra na Espanha, qual a principal diferença entre pessoas bilíngues e monolíngues?

Questão 4 – O que aconteceu com os bebês que foram expostos ao ambiente bilíngue no estudo realizado por Agnes Kovacs?

Questão 5 – Reescreva em português o segmento abaixo. Lembre-se de manter o texto claro em português, isto é, que faça sentido e esteja estruturalmente adequado.

“The bilingual experience appears to influence the brain from infancy to old age (and there is reason to believe that it may also apply to those who learn a second language later in life).” (linhas 49 e 50)

Texto 2:

Microbes 3, Humans 2

Edward O. Wilson

As a result of natural selection, species—or more precisely, the organisms composing species—generally perform brilliantly in the niche to which they are specialized. There are probably 10 million or more species alive on earth. Which are the best at filling their niches? All are, I guess. Consider this Zenlike question: Can a bird fly better than a fish can swim? Live species are by definition all successes, because the losers are extinct, having fallen victim to nature's equivalent of the Foreign Legion command, March or die.

Of course, success by organisms can ultimately be disastrous for their species. Browsing animals, like the American white-tailed deer, can be superlatively efficient and as a result wipe out the plants on which they depend, whereupon the species and the organisms it comprises plunge toward extinction. Or take the same principle in reverse: the most successful parasites are those that least harm their host. The champion human parasites may be the Demodex mites, microscopic spiderlike creatures that live unnoticed on the eyelashes and eyebrows of a large percentage of the human population.

That said, I am unwilling to give up entirely the quest for successful species. So let me use subjective, human-oriented criteria to pin some gold medals on members of the world's fauna and flora.

Most abundant. Bacterial species win this one easily. There are more *E. coli* and other intestinal bacteria in your colon at this moment than there are human beings who have ever lived.

Longest lived. All living species are in a dead heat, since all have descended from early forms of life that originated more than 3.5 billion years ago. When biologists speak of ancient forms and living fossils, **they** really mean certain combinations of traits that have persisted for relatively long periods of time in certain lines of descent, like modern horseshoe crabs and coelacanth fish. But the direct ancestry of human beings goes back just as far as these living fossils, the only difference being that the traits that distinguish *Homo sapiens* as a species are less than one-hundredth as old.

Most likely to survive. Without doubt, bacteria and allied organisms known as archaea win again, especially the species that use photosynthesis or inorganic chemicals to grow and reproduce. If every kind of plant and animal on earth were destroyed, these hardy organisms would carry on. Even if the earth's surface were blasted to a cinder, the inorganic-energy extractors and petroleum feeders would continue their lives many kilometers below the surface of the earth. Given a few billion years, they might give rise to new higher life forms on the surface.

Most social. As an entomologist, I will be accused of insect chauvinism, but I say ants, termites and honeybees with hands down. That is, **they** win if we use the following criteria: altruism, the complexity of anatomy, instincts devoted to social life and tightness of the bonds that turn colonies into virtual superorganisms.

Most intelligent. At last, a gold medal for humanity.

Most powerful. Human beings win again. Peering into the future and understanding how the world works, **we** have acquired the power of life and death over all other higher life forms. Whether we choose life for them and ultimately for ourselves is surely a valid criterion of success. To achieve that goal, however, requires wise management of the environment, and enterprise for which we have so far shown little dedication or talent.

Wilson, Edward O. "Microbes 3, Humans 2." *The Arlington Reader: Contexts and Connections*. Ed. Lynn Z. Bloom & Louise Z. Smith. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2008. 530-532. Print.

Questão 06: Que tipo de critérios o autor usa para distribuir as medalhas de ouro?

Questão 07: Cite no mínimo 8 (oito) palavras do texto que nomeiam organismos ou espécies da flora e fauna?

Questão 08: De acordo com o texto, qual é a profissão de Edward O. Wilson?

Questão 09: Reescreva, em português, o segmento de texto a seguir. Lembre-se de manter o texto claro em português, isto é, que faça sentido e esteja estruturalmente adequado.

“Most likely to survive. Without doubt, bacteria and allied organisms known as archaea win again... Even if the earth’s surface were blasted to a cinder, the inorganic-energy extractors and petroleum feeders would continue their lives many kilometers below the surface of the earth. Given a few billion years, they might give rise to new higher life forms on the surface” (linhas 38 a 44).

Questão 10: No modo como entende a relação entre seres humanos e preservação da fauna e flora do planeta, o que Edward O. Wilson argumenta no último parágrafo?
