



**UNIVERSIDADE DO ESTADO DO RIO DE JANEIRO**  
**PPLIN – Programa de Pós-graduação em Letras e Linguística**  
**EDITAL 2018.2 – MESTRADO ACADÊMICO**  
**ESTUDOS LINGUÍSTICOS / ESTUDOS LITERÁRIOS**

**PROVA DE SUFICIÊNCIA EM LÍNGUA ESTRANGEIRA (INGLÊS)**

**DATA: 28 DE JUNHO DE 2018**

**HORÁRIO: 9H ÀS 12H**

Nº de inscrição do[a] candidato[a]: \_\_\_\_\_

O presente instrumento de avaliação visa a avaliar sua capacidade de compreensão de textos acadêmicos escritos em inglês. Por isso, após ler as instruções com atenção, leia o fragmento em inglês. Em seguida, responda em português as questões sobre ele. No entanto, verifique se a questão exige que algum fragmento do texto seja copiado para complementar a resposta. Não adicione qualquer informação ou conhecimento teórico que você tenha sobre o assunto em tela à resposta em português. Utilize apenas informações contidas no fragmento. Bom trabalho!

**INSTRUÇÕES:**

- 1) Para fazer a prova escrita sobre conhecimento específico, o candidato usará este caderno de prova e as folhas CARIMBADAS que o acompanham.
- 2) O candidato deverá verificar, no caderno de prova, se: (i) a sequência de questões está correta; (ii) há imperfeições gráficas que possam causar dúvidas.
- 3) Qualquer irregularidade constatada deverá ser imediatamente comunicada à Comissão de Seleção.
- 4) Não será permitida a troca de material entre os candidatos e a consulta a equipamentos eletrônicos, tais como computadores, *tablets*, telefones celulares, etc.
- 5) O candidato deverá seguir, obrigatoriamente, as instruções das questões.
- 6) As respostas às questões da prova escrita deverão ser redigidas em língua portuguesa, com caneta esferográfica de tinta azul ou preta.
- 7) Ao transcrever as respostas às questões na folha de resposta, o candidato deverá identificar o número da questão a que está respondendo.
- 8) É permitido o uso individual de dicionário para consulta.
- 9) Este caderno de prova não será substituído, nem serão fornecidas folhas adicionais.
- 10) A interpretação das questões é parte integrante da prova, não sendo permitidas perguntas aos fiscais.
- 11) Ao terminar a prova, o candidato deverá entregar à Comissão de Seleção o caderno de prova completo, incluindo as folhas utilizadas para rascunho.
- 12) A prova terá a duração mínima de 1 (uma) hora e máxima de 3 (três) horas.
- 13) O candidato não deve se identificar em qualquer página do caderno de prova.
- 14) Os 3 (três) últimos candidatos da sala somente poderão entregar as respectivas provas e retirar-se do local simultaneamente.
- 15) O descumprimento de uma ou mais normas especificadas nesta instrução de prova e/ou no edital de seleção anulará a prova, e o candidato será eliminado do processo seletivo.

### Texto base para as respostas às questões de compreensão

#### **Academic Literacies approaches**

I will briefly review the recent academic literacies tradition in the UK as a frame from which to consider three case studies of the application of these approaches to practical programs of teaching in the UK and USA Higher Education systems. The notion of 'academic literacies' developed from the area of 'new literacy studies' (GEE, 1996; STREET, 1984) as an attempt to draw out the implications of this approach for our understanding of issues of student learning. Lea & Street, (1997) argued that educational research into student learning in higher education has fallen into three main perspectives: Study Skills; Academic Socialisation; and Academic Literacies (ACLITS). The study skills approach has assumed that literacy is a set of atomised skills, which students have to learn and which are then transferable to other contexts. The focus is on attempts to 'fix' problems with student learning, which are treated as a kind of pathology. The theory of language on which it is based emphasizes surface features, grammar and spelling. Its sources lie in behavioural psychology and training programmes and it conceptualises student writing as technical and instrumental. In recent years the crudity and insensitivity of this approach has led to refinement of the meaning of 'skills' involved and attention to broader issues of learning and social context, what we (LEA & STREET, 1998) have termed the academic socialization approach. From an academic socialization perspective, the task of the tutor / advisor is to inculcate students into a new 'culture', that of the academy. The focus is on student orientation to learning and interpretation of learning tasks, through conceptualisation for instance of a distinction between 'deep' and 'surface' learning (HOUNSELL, 1988). The sources of this perspective lie in social psychology, in anthropology; and in constructivist education. Although more sensitive to both the student as learner and to the cultural context, the approach could nevertheless be criticized on a number of grounds: it appears to assume that the academy is a relatively homogenous culture, whose norms and practices have simply to be learnt to provide access to the whole institution. Even though at some level disciplinary and departmental difference may be acknowledged, institutional practices, including processes of change and the exercise of power *do not seem to be* sufficiently theorised. Despite the fact that contextual factors in student writing are recognised as important (HOUNSELL, 1988;) this approach tends to treat writing as a transparent medium of representation and so fails to address the deep language, literacy and discourse issues involved in the institutional production and representation of meaning.

The third approach, the one most closely allied to the New Literacy Studies, we refer to as academic literacies. This approach sees literacies as social practices, in the way we have outlined above. It views student writing and learning as issues at the level of epistemology and identities rather than skill or socialization. An academic literacies approach views the institutions in which academic practices take place as constituted in, and as sites of, discourse and power. It sees the literacy demands of the curriculum as involving a variety of communicative practices, including genres, fields, and disciplines. From the student point of view a dominant feature of academic literacy practices is the requirement to switch practices between one setting and another, to deploy a repertoire of linguistic practices appropriately to each setting, and to handle the social meanings and identities that each evokes. This emphasis on identities and social meanings draws attention to deep affective and ideological conflicts in such switching and use of the linguistic repertoire. A student's personal identity - who am 'I' - may be challenged by the forms of writing required in different disciplines, notably prescriptions about the use of impersonal and passive forms as opposed to first person and active forms, and students may feel threatened and resistant - 'this isn't

me' (LEA, 2004). The recognition of this level of engagement with student writing as opposed to the more straightforward study skills and academic socialization approaches, or the focus on text types typical of the genre approach, comes from the social and ideological orientation of the 'New Literacy Studies'. Allied to this is work in Critical Discourse Analysis, Systemic Linguistics and Cultural Anthropology, which has come to see student writing as constitutive and contested rather than as skills or deficits. There is a growing body of literature based upon this approach, which suggests that one explanation for student writing problems might be the gaps between academic staff expectations and student interpretations of what is involved in student writing ( LEA, 2004; LEA; STREET, 1997; STIERER, 1997; STREET, 1995). The explication of the three models proposed by Lea and Street has been drawn upon very widely in the literature on teaching and learning across a range of HE contexts (see, e.g., Thesen and van Pletzen, 2006, on South Africa) and calls for a more in depth understanding of student writing and its relationship to learning across the academy; thus offering an alternative to deficit models of learning and writing based on autonomous models of literacy.

The ACLITS approach, then, is about *literacies*—plural, and deliberately so—in higher education, primarily. In the UK, literacy (singular) as been more traditionally associated with school and adult learning, rather than the university. Indeed, there is still a strongly held belief amongst most UK university teachers that literacy needs to be attended to before students embark upon higher education studies (a view that is shared by many— perhaps most—US university teachers). ACLITS is working to change that view of literacy by taking social practices approaches to multiple and plural literacies, often associated with 'New Literacy Studies' (cf. GEE, 1996; STREET, 1996), into actual practices in the university.

(Brian Street, 2010)

Responda quatro (4) dentre as questões apresentadas abaixo levando em consideração as orientações oferecidas na página anterior e as que se seguem. A questão de número 1 é obrigatória para todos. Escolha três (3) das questões restantes para completar a quantidade de questões a serem respondidas.

### Questão obrigatória:

1- O fragmento acima traz uma discussão na área de letramento. Considerando as questões abordadas indique [2,5]:

[a] a que tipo de letramento o autor se refere:

[b] o que autor se propõe a abordar com esse texto:

Fragmento do texto: I will briefly review the recent academic literacies tradition in the UK as a frame from which to consider three case studies of the application of these approaches to practical programs of teaching in the UK and USA Higher Education systems.

### Questões para escolha:

- 2- Indique como é denominada e explique como se caracteriza a primeira tradição ou abordagem de letramento mencionada pelo autor. [2,5]
- 3- Indique como é denominada e explique como se caracteriza a segunda tradição ou abordagem de letramento mencionada pelo autor. [2,5]
- 4- Indique como é denominada e explique como se caracteriza a terceira abordagem ou tradição de letramento mencionada pelo autor. [2,5]
- 5- Street apresenta algumas críticas à tradição que entende o letramento como socialização. Cite uma dessas críticas e transcreva o fragmento relativo a ela. [2,5]