



Realização:



MINISTÉRIO DA EDUCAÇÃO
UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO PIAUÍ – EDITAL 16/2017

EXAME DE PROFICIÊNCIA DE LEITURA EM LÍNGUA ESTRANGEIRA

DATA: 22/10/2017

HORÁRIO: das 8 às 11 horas

CADERNO DE PROVA

Idioma:

INGLÊS

Área de Pesquisa:

(4) LINGUÍSTICA, LETRAS E ARTES

LEIA ATENTAMENTE AS INSTRUÇÕES

- Esta prova é constituída de um texto técnico-científico em língua estrangeira, seguido de 5 (cinco) questões abertas relativas ao texto apresentado.
- É permitido o uso de dicionário impresso, sendo vedados trocas ou empréstimos de materiais durante a realização do Exame.
- As respostas deverão ser redigidas em português e transcritas para a **Folha de Respostas**, utilizando caneta esferográfica com **tinta preta** ou **azul, escrita grossa**.
- A Folha de Respostas** será o único documento válido para correção, não devendo, portanto, conter rasuras.
- Será eliminado o candidato que se identificar em outro espaço além daquele reservado na capa da **Folha de Respostas** e/ou redigir as respostas com lápis grafite (ou lapiseira).
- Nenhum candidato poderá entregar o Caderno de Prova e a Folha de Respostas antes de transcorridos 60 minutos do início do Exame.
- Em nenhuma hipótese haverá substituição da **Folha de Respostas**.
- Ao encerrar a prova, o candidato entregará, obrigatoriamente, ao fiscal da sala, o Caderno de Prova e a Folha de Respostas devidamente assinada no espaço reservado para esse fim.

Do Teens Read Seriously Anymore?

By David Denby February 23, 2016

A common sight in malls, in pizza parlors, in Starbucks, and wherever else American teens hang out: three or four kids, hooded, gathered around a table, leaning over like monks or druids, their eyes fastened to the smartphones held in front of them. The phones, converging at the center of the table, come close to touching. The teens are making a communion of a sort. Looking at them, you can envy their happiness. You can also find yourself wishing them immersed in a different kind of happiness—in a superb book or a series of books, in the reading obsession itself! You should probably keep on wishing.

It's very likely that teen-agers, attached to screens of one sort or another, read more words than they ever have in the past. But they often read scraps, excerpts, articles, parts of articles, messages, pieces of information from everywhere and from nowhere. It's likely that they are reading fewer books. Yes, millions of kids have read Harry Potter, "The Lord of the Rings," "The Hunger Games," and other fantasy and dystopian fictions; also vampire romance, graphic novels (some very good), young-adult novels (ditto), and convulsively exciting street lit. Yet what happens as they move toward adolescence? When they become twelve or thirteen, kids often stop reading seriously. The boys veer off into sports or computer games, the girls into friendship in all its wrenching mysteries and satisfactions of favor and exclusion. Much of their social life, for boys as well as girls, is now conducted on smartphones, where teen-agers don't have to confront one another. The terror of eye contact! Sherry Turkle, in her recent book "Reclaiming Conversation," has written about the loss of self that this avoidance creates and also of the peculiar boredom paradoxically produced by the act of constantly fleeing boredom.

If kids are avoiding eye contact, they are avoiding books even more. Work by the Pew Research Center and other outfits have confirmed the testimony of teachers and parents and the evidence of one's eyes. Few late teen-agers are reading many books. A recent summary of studies cited by Common Sense Media indicates that American teen-agers are less likely to read "for fun" at seventeen than at thirteen. The category of reading "for fun" is itself a little depressing, since it divides reading into duty (for school) and gratification (sitting on a beach towel), as if the two were necessarily opposed. My own observation, after spending a lot of time talking to teen-agers in recent years: reading anything serious has become a chore, like doing the laundry or prepping a meal for a kid brother. Or, if it's not a chore, it's just an activity, like swimming or shopping, an activity like any other. It's not something that runs through the rest of their lives. In sum, reading has lost its privileged status; few kids are ashamed that they're not doing it much. The notion that you should always have a book *going*—that notion, which all real readers share, doesn't flourish in many kids. Often, they look at you blankly when you ask them what they are reading on their own.

Of course, these kids are very busy. School, homework, sports, jobs, clothes, parents, brothers, sisters, half brothers, half sisters, friendships, love affairs, hanging out, music, and, most of all, screens (TV, Internet, games, texting, Instagramming)—compared with all of that, reading a book is a weak, petulant claimant on their time. Reading frustrates their smartphone sense of being everywhere at once. Suddenly, they are stuck on that page, anchored, moored, and many are glum about it. Being unconnected makes them anxious and even angry. "Books smell like old people," I heard a student say in New Haven.

Making the case that serious reading is one of life's great boons—that screen-bound kids are in danger of missing something tremendous—has become awkward, square-headed, emotionally difficult. The plea for beauty and moral complexity may sound merely plaintive. (Few of us are as fierce as the gentle Keats.) Novelists, poets, essayists, and university humanists, emerging from their proud corners, find it hard to talk of character, judgment, perceptiveness, wit, empathy, and other such virtues encouraged by serious reading. They are not salesmen, and they don't want to sound like William Bennett: such things, they believe, should be self-evident. Earlier ages (the Greeks, the Victorians, etc.) were convinced of the improving value of literature, but in the twentieth century the sophisticated position (Wilde, Nabokov, Updike, Vidal) was always that literature improves nothing, does nothing; it creates only delight. Among famous critics and scholars, Harold Bloom, in book after book, has argued for reading as the way to a developed self, but my guess is that he speaks to those who don't need convincing. If the rest of us give up on book reading without a fight, we will regret it, even be ashamed as the culture hollows out. I will put it tendentiously. Could a country that had widely read "Huckleberry Finn" have taken Donald J. Trump seriously for a second? Twain's readers will remember "the king" and "the duke." They know what a bullying con artist sounds like.

Lifetime readers know that reading literature can be transformative, but they can't prove it. If they tried, they would have to buck the metric prejudice, the American notion that assertions unsupported with statistics are virtually meaningless. What they know about literature and its effects is literally and spiritually immeasurable. They would have to buck common marketplace wisdom, too: in an economy demanding "skill sets"—defined narrowly as technical and business skills—that deep-reading stuff won't get you anywhere.

(Adapted from <https://www.newyorker.com/culture/cultural-comment/books-smell-like-old-people-the-decline-of-teen-reading>)

QUESTÃO 03 - No texto, afirma-se que a leitura de algo sério se tornou uma tarefa. Descreva os argumentos usados para justificar essa afirmativa. Indique qual, frequentemente, é a reação dos adolescentes quando lhes perguntamos o que estão lendo por escolha própria.

QUESTÃO 04 - Segundo o texto, o que acontece a partir dos doze anos em relação à leitura? Qual é a diferença entre meninos e meninas a partir dessa idade?

QUESTÃO 05 - O que o texto afirma sobre pessoas que leem por toda sua vida? Qual seria a importância da literatura mais profunda para a sabedoria do mercado estadunidense?
