

Proficiência | 2026 – 2

INGLÊS

INSTRUÇÕES:

- ☐ Esta avaliação tem um total de 17 questões, composta por 3 textos. Os itens estão divididos entre objetivos e discursivos.
- ☐ Não é permitido o empréstimo de nenhum material e também não está autorizado nenhuma espécie de consulta a meios eletrônicos.
- ☐ No final da prova, apenas entregue ao fiscal o cartão-resposta devidamente preenchido. Erros no preenchimento e/ou rasuras podem levar a anulação da questão.
- ☐ O tempo total de prova é de 2 (duas) horas já incluído o tempo para o preenchimento do cartão resposta.
- ☐ As questões discursivas devem ser respondidas em português. Use somente caneta esferográfica e escreva de forma legível. Respostas ilegíveis não serão aceitas.

1ª PARTE – Padrão Objetivo (6,0 pontos)

TEXTO I

The Dark City: Intersections of Nature, Race, and Class in Los Angeles Literature

This dissertation tracks the intersections and entanglements of nature, race, and class in Los Angeles literature through 1930s-1940s literary noir (environmental noir) and more contemporary climate fiction or “cli-fi” (California cli-fi). The project’s consideration of dual genres and periods generates a prismatic effect to perceive environmental patterns embedded in L.A.’s literature, and, in this way, it becomes clear that issues of race and class are entwined with the city’s environmental concerns. Environmental noir extends noir’s foundations to other texts not traditionally classified as noir, and ecocritical

readings of novels by Raymond Chandler, James M. Cain, and Chester Himes reveal interconnections between the destruction of L.A.'s environment and the social rot at the heart of the noir novel. Environmental noir's concepts of entangled environmental and social **devolution** link directly to cli-fi's project: showing the (imagined) impacts of anthropogenic climate change. With California cli-fi, this dissertation expands on 'traditional' climate fiction to incorporate narratives emerging from other types of apocalyptic or catastrophic events. **Thus**, in addition to Octavia Butler's *Earthseed* novels, this project considers "accidental cli-fi" texts that feature new California landscapes, ecosystems, climates, and human habitation **as the result of** nuclear war, earthquakes, and more fantastical ruinations of the region. Environmental noir and California cli-fi's shared concerns demonstrate the complex interplay between environment, race, and class in the "darkness" of L.A.'s noir and cli-fi literature, often located in moments of environmental, racial, and moral conflict or collapse.

Fonte:

<https://www.proquest.com/openview/c9263b11ea05adaaa851184dfa7f5c7f/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y>

QUESTÃO 1 – O objetivo desse texto é

- a) comparar a literatura da Califórnia com a de outras regiões.
- b) avaliar os efeitos das mudanças climáticas na literatura noir.
- c) investigar as convergências temáticas entre dois estilos literários.
- d) analisar as noções de natureza e classe na literatura contemporânea.

QUESTÃO 2 – Esse texto menciona os romances de Raymond Chandler, James M. Cain e Chester Himes com o intuito de exemplificar obras que representam a

- a) ficção climática da Califórnia e o noir ambiental.
- b) crise ambiental e social da cidade de Los Angeles.
- c) ficção climática contemporânea e o noir ambiental.
- d) questão ambiental e racial da cidade de Los Angeles.

QUESTÃO 3 – Esse texto cita guerras nucleares e terremotos para indicar

- a) eventos comuns em romances do noir ambiental.
- b) catástrofes possíveis devido a mudanças climáticas.
- c) acontecimentos típicos na ficção climática da Califórnia.
- d) passagens presentes nos romances *Earthseed* de Octavia Butler.

QUESTÃO 4 – As expressões “thus” e “as the result of” expressam nesse texto uma ideia de

- a) adição.
- b) contraste.
- c) comparação.
- d) consequência.

QUESTÃO 5 – Nesse texto, a palavra “devolution” expressa uma ideia de

- a) devolução.
- b) destituição.

- c) degradação.
- d) desvalorização.

TEXTO II



2025 CITY FACTS

POPULATION



**1
MILLION**

11th LARGEST CITY
in the U.S. by population

Fastest-growing large city in the U.S.

170,237

Population Change
2010–2020

2,690

Population Density
per Square Mile

1,306,400

Projected
Population by 2050



361 SQUARE MILES
Land area

LARGEST LAND USE

37.6%

(84,976 acres) Vacant,
Agricultural, Undeveloped

24.1%

Single-Family
Homes

HOUSEHOLDS



334,230

Total
Households

56.7%

Owner
Occupied

43.3%

Renter
Occupied

DEMOGRAPHICS

37%

White Alone

19%

Black

5%

Asian Alone

35%

Hispanic (all races)

4%

Other

3.8%
Unemployment
rate in Fort Worth
as of July 2025.
(Although it
fluctuates.)

AVERAGE WEATHER (2012–2022)



- Avg. Rainfall: 42 inches
- Avg. High Temperature: 77°F
- Avg. Low Temperature: 54°F
- Avg. Snowfall: 2 inches

AIRPORTS



- Dallas/Fort Worth International
(3rd largest in terms of passenger traffic)
- Perot Field at Alliance Airport
- Fort Worth Meacham International Airport
- Spinks Airport



Some current major projects include the \$700 million **Fort Worth Convention Center expansion** and the development of the Texas A&M–Fort Worth campus at the site of the **Texas A&M Law School**.

ATTRACTIONS

- Fort Worth Zoo
- Fort Worth Botanic Garden
- Kimbell Art Museum
- Amon Carter Museum of American Art
- Modern Art Museum
- Fort Worth Museum of Science and History
- National Cowgirl Museum and Hall of Fame
- Fort Worth Stockyards National Historic District
- Fort Worth Stock Show & Rodeo (oldest and largest public event in Fort Worth with over **1.2 million visitors** annually)



Fonte: <https://www.fortworthtexas.gov/about/fact-sheet>

QUESTÃO 6 – O objetivo desse texto é

- a) comparar Fort Worth a outras cidades nos EUA.
- b) apresentar informações sobre a cidade de Fort Worth.
- c) descrever as principais atrações turísticas de Fort Worth.
- d) investigar as principais mudanças na cidade de Fort Worth.

QUESTÃO 7 – De acordo com esse texto, a feira agropecuária de Fort Worth se destaca por ser

- a) a mais antiga do país.
- b) realizada em um rodeio.
- c) organizada por cowboys.
- d) o maior evento da cidade.

QUESTÃO 8 – De acordo com esse texto, 37.6% é a porcentagem referente à/ao

- a) quantidade de terras não urbanizadas.
- b) população vivendo em áreas agrícolas.
- c) número de famílias que moram em casas.
- d) volume de terras em áreas de grande extensão.

QUESTÃO 9 – No círculo da parte central do texto, o pronome “it” em “*Although it fluctuates*”, se refere à/ao

- a) ano de 2025.
- b) mês de julho.
- c) taxa de desemprego.
- d) cidade de Fort Worth.

QUESTÃO 10 – Nesse texto, a palavra “*current*”, em “*Some current major projects...*” tem relação com o conceito de

- a) lugar.
- b) preço.
- c) tempo.
- d) tamanho.

TEXTO III

Visiting a Farm: An Exploratory Study of the Social Construction of Animal Farming in Norway and the Netherlands Based on Sensory Perception

The Social Construction of Animal Farming

Over the last decade, there has been an increasing interest among rural sociologists in the social and cultural meanings of rurality, nature and – more recently – animals in modern society. By now it is generally accepted that these understandings and relations change over time and are context and place specific. This interest coincides with the cultural turn in rural. Although the cultural turn in rural studies paid much attention to the social construction of nature, the social construction of rurality and human–animal relationships, it has somehow by-passed the agricultural sector (Morris and Evans, 2004). The present study contributes to this field by exploring the social construction of animal farming and its embeddedness in the construction of nature, rurality and human–animal relations. The theory of social constructivism has been widely applied since Berger and Luckmann (1967) first wrote about it, and has been interpreted in many different ways. Generally speaking, the theory departs from the idea that phenomena are socially constructed and that they would be different if constructed in another society, with different values, needs or interests (Boghossian, 2001). More recently, social constructivism has been criticized for focusing on the social and cultural meanings of phenomena and ignoring the influence of materiality – how material or physical characteristics contribute to the construction of a phenomenon and its meaning and have, as it were, their own role to play. The present study attempts to address this critique by confronting the respondents directly with the materiality of animal farming. We asked the respondents to notice and consciously experience the material world through sight, smell and noise, and to reflect upon these material experiences while forming an opinion. During the analysis, we aimed at getting insight into the (selective) process of sensory experience, evaluation and mental perception or image construction, in order to better understand their construction of animal farming. In summary, this study aims to contribute to recent debates in rural sociology in two ways: 1. it studies how material experience and mental perception interact in the construction of an evaluative image of animal farming; and 2. it explores the social construction of animal farming as embedded into the construction of nature, rurality and human–animal relationships.

The Social Construction of Nature

Recent social theory departs from the idea that nature is socially constructed and constituted symbolically rather than objectively given (Greider and Garkovich, 1994; Eder, 1996; Macnaghten and Urry, 1998). The way in which nature is perceived depends on its historic, geographical and social context and is culturally defined (Eder, 1996). There is no one singular nature, only natures (Macnaghten and Urry, 1998). In the past, nature was often depicted as wilderness, a dangerous place or an intimidating force that needed to be tamed (Short, 1991). Modern day society conceptualizes nature in several ways. On the one hand, nature is considered as ‘Arcadia’ (van Koppen, 2000) – a realm of purity and moral power, to be enjoyed or worshipped (Eder, 1996). At the same time, nature is seen as being under threat from modern society’s **drive** to control and dominate nature (Eder, 1996) and to use it as a production resource (van Koppen, 2000). With new technological developments, domination all too easily turns into exploitation and (potentially) destruction (Macnaghten, 2006). Nature therefore needs to be protected and preserved, ultimately in order to safeguard the future of humanity. Farming plays an important role in both these conceptualizations of nature. It figures as

a threat to nature because of the negative effects of modern production methods (Eder, 1996; Franklin, 1999). But farming may also figure as part of nature and its preservation, especially when traditional and 'natural' production methods are employed (Macnaghten, 2004). In the latter concept, the traditional farm is an important element of the countryside and natural rural landscape, and therefore part of the rural idyll and pastoral myth.

The Social Construction of Rurality

Social understanding of 'the rural' changes over time and place. Compared with urban areas, the countryside may be pictured as remote, backward and unsophisticated but also as honest and authentic, safe and clean. While social perceptions of the rural idyll are persistent, their precise interpretation varies according to time and place. In general, the rural idyll only acquires meaning in contrast to an un-idyllic other one (Short, 1991), and 'the concept can be used as an ongoing point of reference to less complex ways of simpler and more honest endeavour, and keying into fundamental human desires to sustain some harmony with nature and community' (Short, 2006, p. 146). Farm life is part of this romantic picture representing the good and traditional way of life in which people live in harmony with each other, with nature and with animals. Farmers are not so much producers in this pastoral myth but act more as proverbial shepherds, watching over and caring for their animals. After World War II, farming became increasingly mechanized and rationalized and anti-idyllic images of animal farming came into being (Bell, 2006). Since then, 'the pastoral myth has been sullied by the use of pesticides, and fertilizers and by the emergence of factory farming systems where cows never feel grass beneath their feet and hens live and die in small cages in sunless rooms lit only by electric light' (Short, 1991, p. 38). With modernization, farming became the offender instead of the defender of idyllic traditions and one could even say that the idyll has 'been turned against' farming (Short, 2006, p. 143). Increasingly, citizens have become concerned about damage to the environment, the destruction of cultural landscapes, the loss of farming traditions and about food safety and animal welfare. However, the rural idyll appeared remarkably persistent, in the sense that people seem willing to 'forget' or 'close their eyes' for the production-side of farming in favour of the idyll (Franklin, 1999), and over the last decades the countryside became disconnected from agricultural production (Frouws, 1998).

Human-Animal Relationships

The relationship between farm animals and humans has been described as the oldest and most intimate of all society-nature relations (Buller and Morris, 2003), but it is also an ambivalent relationship (Eder, 1996). The ambivalence can be traced back to the two classical and dichotomous conceptualizations of nature described above: as being wild and to be controlled, and as vulnerable and to be protected (Eder, 1996; Macnaghten and Urry, 1998). On the one hand, farm animals represent the modernist conception of nature as wild and to be tamed, domesticated, husbanded and controlled (Buller and Morris, 2003). Using farm animals for human purposes is part of the desired and taken-for-granted dominance of humans over nature. In contrast, farm animals symbolize nature and 'the rural', which, in the post-modern romantic construction, need to be reified and protected (Eder, 1996). They embody rural traditions (e.g. traditional breeds) and colour and animate the landscape with their presence and diversity

(Yarwood and Evans, 2000; Buller, 2004). In this symbolic role, animals are seen as 'icons of nature and rurality' (Buller, 2004, p. 139), which should be looked after by caring farmers and should lead a good and happy life. But at the same time, farm animals are kept in 'factory farms', where they are turned into a means of production and become 'victims of a greedy, global economy' (Franklin, 1999, p. 3), just like nature. Consequently, farming practices are called into question, raising, for example, animal welfare issues. **Furthermore**, emotional and social ties with animals increased in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, which gave them a rather paradoxical position. This means that, due to increased empathy, we feel connected to farm animals, but use and eat them as meat at the same time. This instrumental value clearly distinguishes them from being human. **To summarize**, human–farm animal relations in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries are complex, ambiguous and even paradoxical. Societal values have shifted, in the sense that production and economic purposes of animal farming are no longer taken for granted. **Instead**, animal farming also reflects values of nature, culture, rurality and empathy towards farm animals. The present study tries to gain further insight in 'the complexities, paradoxes and messiness' (Jones, 2006, p. 197) of human–farm animal relationships by better understanding how citizens construct their image of animal farming. The present study therefore starts literally at the farm gate by taking people to an animal farm.

Fonte: <https://www.ijisaf.org/index.php/ijisaf/article/view/266> (adaptado).

QUESTÃO 11 – O objetivo dessa pesquisa é investigar

- a) o comportamento animal como construção social.
- b) aspectos sociais e materiais na criação de animais.
- c) visitas a fazendas como prática sociológica moderna.
- d) a relação entre cultura e natureza no meio acadêmico.

QUESTÃO 12 – De acordo com esse texto, após a 2ª Guerra Mundial

- a) a percepção idílica do trabalho rural perdeu força.
- b) a pecuária se tornou associada a um mito pastoral.
- c) o uso de pesticidas substituiu o maquinário agrícola.
- d) o trabalho mecanizado elevou o desemprego em fazendas.

QUESTÃO 13 – De acordo com esse texto, a relação humano-animal se alterou durante os séculos XX e XXI devido

- a) ao aumento da empatia com relação aos animais.
- b) à implementação de leis garantindo o bem-estar animal.
- c) à valorização do potencial econômico de animais rurais.
- d) ao crescimento do consumo de proteína de origem animal.

QUESTÃO 14 – Nesse texto, a palavra “*drive*” em “*modern society’s drive to control and dominate nature*” remete a uma noção de

- a) anseio.
- b) liderança.
- c) superação.
- d) veiculação.

QUESTÃO 15 – Nesse texto, as expressões “*furthermore*”, “*to summarize*” e “*instead*” expressam, respectivamente, ideias de

- a) adição, contraste e conclusão.
- b) contraste, conclusão e adição.
- c) contraste, adição e conclusão.
- d) adição, conclusão e contraste.

2ª PARTE – Padrão Discursivo (4,0 pontos)

QUESTÃO 16 – Considerando as informações apresentadas no Texto I, cite dois pontos em comum entre o noir ambiental e a ficção climática californiana.

QUESTÃO 17 – Considerando as informações apresentadas no Texto III, explique a(s) diferença(s) entre construtivismo social e experiência material.