



All Theses and Dissertations

2012-12-11

Designing Pre-Tests for an Intermediate-Level University Spanish Course

Carl D. Gutke

Brigham Young University - Provo

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Spanish and Portuguese Language and Literature Commons](#)

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation

Gutke, Carl D., "Designing Pre-Tests for an Intermediate-Level University Spanish Course" (2012). *All Theses and Dissertations*. 3470.
<https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/3470>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

Designing Pre-Tests for an Intermediate-Level
University Spanish Course

Carl D. Gutke

A thesis submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts

Rob A. Martinsen, Chair
Nieves Pérez Knapp
Cherice Montgomery

Department of Spanish and Portuguese

Brigham Young University

December 2012

Copyright © 2012 Carl D. Gutke

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

Designing Pre-Tests for an Intermediate-Level University Spanish Course

Carl D. Gutke
Department of Spanish and Portuguese, BYU
Master of Arts

Testing, at times, can be a complicated matter. It takes a lot of time, precision and trial and error to adequately create a valid and reliable test. When creating a test, we should be aware of the impact that it is going to have on our teaching and whether it will be positive or negative. The goal of this project was to create four good intermediate Spanish diagnostic pre-tests that could be taken at the Brigham Young University Humanities Computer Testing Laboratory. The purpose of these pre-tests was to ascertain the grammatical strengths and weaknesses of our Fall Semester 2012 Spanish 205 students' in regards to specific grammatical principles covered throughout the course. Then, the results could be used to determine how to best plan class time and promote good instructional decisions. This report covers the necessary steps it took to develop and validate said pre-tests and concludes with reviewing the results of the validity and reliability process and gives recommendations for future application of the pre-tests designed and implemented.

Keywords: second language assessment, testing, reliability, validity, Intermediate Level University Spanish Courses

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I think it very appropriate to thank my Committee Chair, Dr. Rob Martinsen, for his support, his understanding, and for the many hours he has dedicated to help me through this process. Thanks to Dr. Nieves Pérez Knapp for her ongoing smiles, encouragement and deep understanding of my personal situation. Also, thanks to Dr. Montgomery for her valuable insights on writing a professional document. Thanks to Jasmine Talbot, our Department Secretary, for helping me stay on top of all the deadline dates and for her positive attitude. Thanks to the Department of Spanish and Portuguese for believing in me and providing me with experiences to help me become a better person. Thanks to my many wonderful students over the last two and half years that have helped me to smile through it all and remind me why I started this journey in the first place. I would also like to thank my children for being strong and for uplifting me with hugs and loves when times were hard. I love each one of you. Thanks to my parents for encouraging me to get an education and strive to be the best I can be. Lastly, I would like to thank my dear, faithful wife for all of her support to help make this project a reality. Many times she has encouraged me to press forward despite the challenges it has presented and to continue to put my trust in God. Thank you Audrey Jo.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
KEY TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	vi
CHAPTER 1	1
INTRODUCTION	1
Spanish 205 Overview	1
Statement of General Issues.....	2
Purpose of Paper	4
CHAPTER 2	6
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	6
Computer-based Tests (CBT)	6
Computer-based Diagnostic Tests	7
Web-based Tests (WBT).....	8
Course Objectives	9
Using Pre-test Results in Conjunction with Course Objectives.....	10
Item Types	11
CHAPTER 3	15
Stages of Test Development	15
Stating the problem.....	15
Write Complete Specifications for the Test.....	15
Content.....	15
Structure, Timing, Medium/Channel and Techniques	16
Criteria Level Performance.....	16
Scoring Procedures	17
Write and Moderate Items	17
Moderating Items	17
Analysis of the Result of the Trial; Making any Necessary Changes.....	18
Process of Validating Test	19
Writing Handbooks for Test Takers, Test Users and Staff/ Train any Necessary Staff	19
CHAPTER 4	21

TEST RELIABILITY	21
CHAPTER 5	24
TEST VALIDATION	24
Content Validity.....	24
Face Validity.....	24
Criterion-related Validity.....	25
Predictive Validity	25
Test Dates and Course Group Information	25
CHAPTER 6	27
RESULTS OF VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY PROCESS	27
Validation.....	27
Evidence of Reliability	28
Recommendations.....	29
Conclusion	30

KEY TERMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Achievement Unit Exam – It is the actual Spanish 205 course unit exam taken by the students for a grade. The course consists of 3 chapters per unit, and 4 units per course. There are a total of 4 unit exams.

Computer-based Tests – Computer-based tests (CBT) are tests that are taken on a computer rather than with paper and pencil.

Computer-based Diagnostic Tests – Computer-based tests designed to diagnose test taker's knowledge.

Pre-tests – Multiple choice tests taken within the first week of each of the four units in the Spanish 205 course designed to diagnose students' grammatical strengths and weaknesses.

Web-based Tests – Web-based tests (WBT) are a form of a computer-based test in that they are taken on the computer, but, the computer needs a web-browser and connection to the Internet in order to download or access them.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Testing, at times, can be a complicated matter. It takes a lot of time, precision and trial and error to adequately create a valid and reliable test. When creating a test, we should be concerned with its backwash. “Backwash is the effect that tests have on learning and teaching” (Hughes 2003), and “‘good’ tests will promote ‘good’ instructional practices” (Bachman, 2000, p. 16). So when creating a test, we should be aware of the impact that it is going to have on our teaching and whether it will be positive or negative. The goal of our project was to create four good intermediate Spanish diagnostic pre-tests that could be taken at the Brigham Young University Humanities Computer Testing Laboratory; then, use the results to determine how to best plan class time around promoting good instructional decisions. This report will cover the necessary steps it took to develop and validate said pre-tests. The purpose of these pre-tests was to ascertain the grammatical strengths and weaknesses of our Fall Semester 2012 Spanish 205 students’ in regards to specific grammatical principles covered throughout the course.

Spanish 205 Overview

Spanish 205 is an Intermediate-Level University Spanish Course designed to develop students’ speaking, reading, writing and listening skills. In terms of grammar, it consolidates knowledge of grammatical principles covered in previous Spanish courses at Brigham Young University. When compared to other Intermediate Spanish Courses throughout the nation, our Spanish 205 is different in that it is a fifth semester course. Because of our unique make-up of

student body, it is important to outline some of the general issues that we deal with in regards to this course.

Statement of General Issues

Spanish 205 course objectives are as follows: 1) consolidate the student's understanding of the basic structures of the Spanish language, 2) improve oral and literacy language skills, 3) provide students with a moderate knowledge of the Spanish language and cultures, thus broadening their perception of humanity and its varied manifestations and 4) interpret and analyze a work of Hispanic literature. In regards to the Spanish 205 course, there are three main issues that indicated the need for unit pre-tests: 1) the wide range of knowledge and skills among students, 2) course pace in that it covers more grammar points in a semester than previous courses and 3) students' misconceptions regarding what they thought they had mastered, but may have not. Each of these issues is explained in greater detail below:

- I. Students' knowledge and skills: In previous 205 classes, there seemed to be a wide spectrum between students in regards to their grammatical knowledge that can be separated into three different categories: 1) novice 2) average and 3) advanced. The two sections that participated in this project were no different. These levels are also seen in other lower level Spanish classes because of the students' individual experiences, but it is believed that they are not as apparent as in the 205 level. For example, many BYU students have served missions for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, including those who registered for our Spanish classes. For instance, those with 2 years of service in a Spanish speaking mission where Spanish is the native language of those taught, are generally placed in our 321 courses. While those who end up coming to our 205 course, usually take the course because they

were sent to a pre-dominantly English speaking mission, but worked frequently with Spanish speakers living in the region. Similarly, some missionaries may serve for only 18 months. Missionaries with less exposure to Spanish, at times, take the 205 course so as to have more grounding in the grammatical aspects before moving on to 321. Another example skill level differences, is that in Spanish 205 there can be a higher frequency of Heritage Language Speakers taking the course who have had exposure to Spanish in the home, but have by-passed Spanish 101, 102, 105, and 106. Both of these groups then take Spanish 205 with students who are simply second language learners whose experience with Spanish consists almost exclusively of coursework.

- II. Faster course pace: This course covered most of the major grammar principles of Spanish in one semester. Also, there is only one unit exam every three chapters in comparison to one exam every chapter as is common in many courses. Because of this less frequent testing in Spanish 205, there tends to be more material covered before students receive feedback. In addition to that, the 205 course included a full eight days of class that were dedicated to a work of literature where-in no grammatical principles were covered. This therefore, compounded the lack of time available to dedicate to grammar review. The four pre-tests helped detract from the quicker pace by allowing the student to focus on their grammatical problem areas, and therefore, focus their energy on what they considered to be most important.
- III. Students' misconceptions regarding what they thought they had mastered, but may have not: At times it was manifest that some students grasped a grammatical concept very well. There were others who had not learned it in prior courses but should have,

or had simply forgotten it because of a lapse of time between Spanish 205 and previous courses. An example of that would be reviewing the preterit and imperfect. There were some students who struggled to differentiate between when and when not to use each, when others had already mastered it and were ready to move on.

Purpose of Paper

The goal of this paper is to outline the process followed in creating four valid and reliable pre-tests for Spanish 205. It followed seven of Hughes's (2003) Ten Stages of Test Development: 1) State the problem 2) Write complete specifications for the test 3) Write and moderate items 4) Analyze the results of the trial and make any necessary changes 5) Validate 6) Write handbooks for test takers, test users, and staff 7) train any necessary staff (interviewers, raters, etc.) (p. 58).

Calibration was omitted due to the absence of a 'writing' or 'oral' component and the *trailing of practice tests with native speakers* and the *trailing of practice tests on a group of non-native speakers similar to those for whom the test is intended* were omitted expressly for the need to strategically manage project time. This was done because the Director of the Humanities Testing Lab had strict deadlines to comply with and preferred that we send him each pre-test one week in advance to allow for sufficient time to process our request. Collaborating with the Director then became a higher priority, because without students' access to the pre-tests, our project would have been without purpose. Therefore, the bulk of the time was used making sure we got the tests in on a timely manner rather than trying to coordinate schedules with multiple native and non-native speakers. To compensate for that decision, we relied on one of our native Spanish Course Supervisor's fifteen plus years of experience in designing, developing and

revising tests to go over the pre-tests and make suggestions. Upon looking at the results of the students that piloted the test, the errors of all those involved, (designer, editor, computer data specialists etc.) were quite minimal and very few items needed correction.

Assessment is an important component of world language programs because it allows both student and instructor to ascertain current student understanding of the concepts being taught, as well as facilitate the teaching of such. Furthermore, testing is an essential function of assessment as it helps teachers to identify specifically whether language objectives are being met. Consequently, the ability to design, administer, and interpret tests is an integral skill that all world language educators must possess.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Computer-based Tests (CBT)

A computer-based test is one that is taken on a computer rather than with paper and pencil. What are the advantages of a computer-based test in comparison with one of pencil and paper? Some advantages are:

1) computers are much more accurate at scoring selected-response tests and reporting scores than human beings 2) they can give immediate feedback and 3) diagnostic feedback can be provided very quickly to each student on those items answered incorrectly if that is the purpose of the test (Brown, 1997, p. 47).

Chalhoub-Deville (2001) states that “an examination of the changes brought forth by L2 (second language) CBT shows that technology has been intended primarily to help make assessment more efficient and serviceable” and that “CBT allows, among other things, more flexible and individualized test administration, tracking of student performance, immediate test feedback, new item/task types, and enhanced test security” (p. 96).

Contrarily, with CBT there was a margin for cheating that could have arisen (Brown, 1997), but this was of no concern to this particular project because if the computer-based test is considered to be a *low-stakes* test then, “learners have no or little incentive to cheat on this type of assessment instrument since cheating would not be in their best interest” (Roever, 2001, pp. 90-91).

Computer-based Diagnostic Tests

Once the value of a computer-based test was established, we needed to go one step further to determine the benefit of a computer-based diagnostic test. “The purpose of a language diagnostic test is to identify specific areas of strength or deficiency of language learners, most commonly with respect to grammatical concepts of the language” and that the language diagnostic tests can be useful in “order to “polish” their linguistic skills” (Larson and Hendricks 2009 p. 309).

Diagnostic tests can serve different purposes, such as in the example of DIALANG, which consists of an online language assessment system that tests up to 14 European languages. This assessment is based on the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) and is the first significant testing system that focuses on diagnosing language skills and providing feedback to users (Alderson and Huhta, 2005). It is noteworthy to mention, that the test is free of charge. This is a wonderful tool for FL students that want to assess their language skills. This particular assessment was not used for this project so as to be able to focus on the specific grammatical principles covered in Spanish 205, rather than all of the grammatical principles as a whole throughout the Spanish language.

A computer-based diagnostic test can be provided on the hard-drive of a computer, through computer software designed specifically for testing, or via the World Wide Web.

Web-based Tests (WBT)

Web-based tests are a form of a computer-based test in that they are taken on the computer, but, the computer needs a web-browser and connection to the Internet in order to download or access them. We therefore need to ask the question, “Why use a web-based test instead of a non-web-based test?” The primary reason is convenience. The Spanish 205 students took their pre-test exams at the testing center by reserving a time slot. This was due to the sheer number of students serviced on campus. The student therefore needed to be present at the testing lab in order to take the four pre-tests. This was also in part due to the need for proctoring the test in order to reduce cheating. Normally, this would not have been a concern if we were not going to analyze the results, but, since it was necessary to ensure reliability; the choice was made to have the tests proctored. In regards to our future desires, with a low-stakes pre-test as mentioned previously, there would be no advantage to the student cheating on one that was web-based as it would not count on their grade. Therefore, providing a web-based pre-test that can be accessed at any time of the day and anywhere there is a connection to the internet, and that could be corrected automatically and show the students their results upon completion, would make it a very convenient test. This, in essence, is our ultimate goal for our Spanish 205 students. The following reference sustains the idea of web-based tests:

Test takers can take the WBT whenever and wherever it is convenient, and test designers can share their test with colleagues all over the world and receive feedback. The use of scoring scripts for dichotomously-scored items can make the test completely independent of the tester and increases flexibility and convenience for test takers even further (Roever, 2001, p. 88).

Further support indicates that, “The added benefits of web-based adaptive placement tests include, among other things, instantaneous placement feedback to the examinees; shorter, more

focused tests; and access to the tests from virtually anywhere in the world where there is an internet connection (Larson and Hendricks 2009 p. 310). In conjunction with that, “WBTs are particularly appropriate for any assessment in the service of learning, where assessment serves to give learners feedback on their performance and provides them with a gauge of how close they are to reaching a pre-specified learning goal”(Roever, 2001, p. 90). This is particularly important to the aims that this project has in helping a student gauge how close they are to knowing the grammatical concept. One challenge of web-based tests is that they cannot be taken unless one has access to the Internet, and in some countries this option is not readily available. This challenge would be overcome for our purposes by providing students access to the internet on campus through the Humanities Learning Resource Center if for some reason they do not have a personal computer or internet at home.

So now that we have determined the practicality of an online computer-based diagnostic test, what then do we do with the test results once a Spanish 205 student takes it? As soon as we know what the “...persistent errors are and that they are shared by most of the students in the class it is useful to bring the problem to the learner’s attention” (Lightbown and Spada, 1999, p. 167). This is where the instructor should use those results to determine how to best plan class time or alter instructional practices by looking at the syllabus and the grammatical concepts being taught, and then determine how much time and practice should be dedicated to the students’ deficiencies.

Course Objectives

Once we chose the type of test we wanted to design, in this case a computer-based diagnostic test, it was crucial that the test adequately measured the course objectives.

Instructional objectives describe the goals that you as a teacher aim for when teaching.

On the one hand, they provide direction for planning appropriate instruction, and on the other hand, they provide the basis for determining whether you have achieved what you set out to accomplish (Genesee and Upshur, 1996, p. 15).

During the process of developing a test we needed to consistently ask ourselves, “Is this something that the student should know at this point in the course?”(Ory and Ryan, 1993, p. 4).

So, what should Spanish 205 students know? The Spanish 205 objectives as outlined by the course syllabus are the following:

- Consolidate the student’s understanding of the basic structures of the Spanish language.
- Improve oral and literacy language skills.
- Provide students with a moderate knowledge of the Spanish language and cultures, thus broadening their perception of humanity and its varied manifestations.
- Interpret and analyze a work of Hispanic literature.

For the purposes of this project, we focused strictly on the first objective which is to “consolidate the student’s understanding of the basic structures of the Spanish language.” The pre-test then became a ‘tool’ to help determine what a student understood in regards to grammatical concepts. For our particular pre-tests, the following objective was used: “Students will use their results from each pre-test taken to determine individually what specific grammar principles they want to review for each respective unit exam”. Upon students’ completion of the pre-tests, their results were sent to the instructor to review the scores and then instructors were encouraged to plan lessons according to overall grammar deficiencies as needed.

Using Pre-test Results in Conjunction with Course Objectives

The results of the pre-test would ideally be automatically viewable to both student and professor via e-mail or online. This specific task was not accomplished at this time. For our particular purposes for this project, once the pre-test was taken, the results were sent to a

computer where the instructor had access to print them out, verify the scores, and then distribute them to students for review. Students also had access to each pre-test key in a word document through BYU's Learning Suite where they could download it or refer to it as needed. By having the pre-tests results, an instructor could determine where each individual student's strengths and weaknesses were, as well as collectively as a class, and then prioritize teaching objectives for that unit according to them. Having outlined the aforementioned, the pre-test then was very important in determining how much time should be spent on the individual objectives of the unit. When looking at the pretests' results, did the pre-test automatically increase all students' scores? No, but it did provide an avenue for the student to diagnose individual problems and dedicate more time to their mastery.

Item Types

How should item types be constructed? "Constructing language tests means selecting a task or tasks that will elicit the kind(s) of language skills you are interested in assessing" (Genesee and Upshur, 1996, p.186). In regards to the pre-test, as mentioned previously, we were interested in assessing the students' knowledge of grammatical concepts. When selecting a test, it should be determined which method for your particular test is the most effective according to objectives and resources. For our pre-tests, we chose to use *closed-ended response multiple choice cloze task items* because doing so allowed for less spelling errors by providing multiple choice items. Another reason for so doing, was that the pre-tests could be corrected easily as items were objective. They also allowed for flexibility through the capability of assessing each grammatical concept randomly at least 6 times to assure mastery of the concepts. The following

are some helpful guidelines to evaluate reliable, close-ended test items. They are listed under two categories: 1) the stem and 2) the response alternatives.

The stem

1. Is the stem simple and concise?
2. Are there unnecessary double negatives or other complex wordings in the stem?
3. Does the stem assess what it is supposed to?
4. Are there inadvertent cues to the right answer?
5. Is the stem a verbatim repetition of material taught in class? If so, is this desirable?

The response alternatives

1. Are the distractors of the same grammatical and semantic class as the correct response?
2. Are the response alternatives grammatically compatible with the stem?
3. Are all the alternatives equally attractive?
4. Are the distractors informative?
5. Are the alternatives equally difficult, complex and long?
6. Is there more than one correct alternative?
7. Does the wording of the alternatives match the stem?
8. Can the correct response be derived from common knowledge?
9. Are the alternatives suitably simple?
10. Can the answers to any items be derived from other items?
11. Do any of the alternatives refer to other items? (Genesee and Upshur, 1996, p. 187)

The downside of multiple choice items is that:

If there is a lack of fit between at least some candidates' productive and receptive skills, then the performance on a multiple choice test may give a quite inaccurate picture of the candidates' ability. A multiple choice grammar test score, for example, may be a poor indicator of someone's ability to use grammatical structures. The person who can identify the correct response... may not be able to produce the correct form when speaking or writing (Hughes, 2003, p. 76).

In other words, Hughes is suggesting that even though a student does well on a non-oral exam, it doesn't indicate that they will do the same on one that focuses on oral speech. This is true. In regards to our particular needs in the Spanish 205 class, we were more concerned with diagnosing whether the students knew the answers to the test questions, rather than producing it orally. Other potential problems for multiple choice items are: 1) guessing may have considerable but unknowable effect on the test scores 2) the technique severely restricts what can

be tested 3) it is very difficult to write successful items 4) backwash may be harmful and 5) cheating may be facilitated (Hughes, 2003, pp. 76-78). In regards to number one and number five on the pretests, if they had been taken online or not analyzed for reliability and validity, there would have been no concern as to whether the student had cheated or guessed. This is because the test was to only benefit the student in preparing for the achievement unit test that counts toward the grade. That being said, it is important to mention for our intent and purposes that the test was proctored on campus so as to discourage cheating and therefore allow us to determine reliability and validity of pre-tests. Furthermore, we were not concerned with number two (restricting what can be tested) because we *wanted* to restrict testing grammatical competence via multiple-choice. This allowed us to focus on certain topics and in turn diminished concerns with number three, which maintains that it is very difficult to write successful items. With respect to number four, the effect the test has on teaching (or in other words “backwash”), was believed to be positive in that upon receiving the results of the pre-tests, the instructor and student were made aware of problem areas that needed to be addressed throughout the unit. There could have been negative connotations in that the student were disheartened by the results, but, better it happened during the pre-tests that were for diagnostic purposes only, rather than the actual unit tests that counted on the students’ grades.

All things considered, the *closed-ended response multiple choice cloze task items* were the easiest to correct, they allowed for little error, they enabled the computer to give feedback to the student, and, for future purposes, they can be done online to avoid taxing the testing center.

Going back to Hughes’s (2003) comment and seeing how it interfaces with Spanish 205, he poses a question that is valid in that even though the students may answer the question correctly, “can they produce it in speaking?”. Freeman and Freeman (1998) reiterate this by

indicating that “lessons should have meaning and purpose for students now” (p. 26). So if a substantial part of the Spanish 205 course objectives and grading system were based on producing the language orally, how much was a grammar test benefitting students other than knowing random facts? It is important to state that the Spanish 205 course focused on all grammatical aspects of learning Spanish—reading, writing, listening and speaking. Nonetheless, this paper focuses on the testing of grammatical principles such as verb conjugation, vocabulary etc. but, in reality, a comprehensive unit exam still serves as the best way to assess that students’ overall grammatical knowledge. Once we have determined the type of test and the items we want to incorporate, we then need to establish its reliability.

CHAPTER 3

Stages of Test Development

Stating the problem

There were 4 pre-tests (one per unit) and each unit comprises 3 chapters in consecutive order from the textbook *Conexiones*, 4th edition (Zayas-Bazán 2010). The test was diagnostic in nature and offered at the BYU testing center to be taken before each unit with the purpose of allowing Spanish 205 students to determine their knowledge level in regards to the grammar principles to be discussed respectively. The pre-test was designed and tested through our Humanities Testing Computer Lab. It was decided to make the test available there so that we could have a controlled environment where all students could take the test in the same place and have the same amount of time to do it. It would also facilitate minimal of any cheating on the test, not that it would affect the student's grade, but that it would allow us to better monitor to reduce the risk of cheating and therefore skew the test results. It is important to note that during this project, we only looked at the validity and reliability of the unit 2 pre-test in comparison with the unit 2 achievement exam.

Write Complete Specifications for the Test

Content

Grammar principles taught in *Conexiones* 4th edition (Zayas-Bazán 2010) See appendix Table 1.

Structure, Timing, Medium/Channel and Techniques

Test Structure: The test was divided up into the individual grammar principles as mentioned in the content section for each unit. It was also a split-half test with the odd items forming part “A” of the test and evens forming part “B”.

Number of Items: There were between 3 to 5 odd numbered grammar items and 3 to 5 for the evens which totals 6 to 10 items for the pre-test. Each section had roughly 8 to 10 grammar principles so on average between 24 to 55 questions per section x three sections/chapters = 72 to 165 questions per pre-test. Bear in mind that there were no reading, listening or writing exercises on the pre-test so 72 to 165 multiple choice questions can be answered fairly quickly. Since there were 4 units, there were a total of 4 pre-tests. Each pre-test was equivalent to one unit and each pre-test was taken within the first week of each particular unit.

Medium Channel: Humanities Computer Testing Lab.

Timing: Under an hour.

Criteria Level Performance

There is no pass or fail. The test is strictly diagnostic in nature to help students know their own weaknesses. Taking each pre-test will be required as part of the course syllabus and will count as 10 points for each test taken.

Scoring Procedures

The computer corrected students' answers and sent the results through a data base to be viewed by the professor. Tests were then printed out and given to each respective student so they could keep them in their personal records.

Write and Moderate Items

Writing Items

Hughes (2003) suggests that one write the test “through the eyes of the test takers and imagine how they might misinterpret the item” (p. 63). The following are guidelines by Hughes (2003) to help the test be more reliable and were covered in the “Test reliability” section:

- 1) Take enough samples of behavior
- 2) Exclude items that do not discriminate well between weaker and stronger students
- 3) Do not allow candidates too much freedom
- 4) Write unambiguous items
- 5) Provide clear and explicit instructions
- 6) Ensure test is well laid out and perfectly legible
- 7) Make candidates familiar with format and testing techniques
- 8) Provide uniform and non-distracting conditions of administration
- 9) Use items that permit scoring which is as objective as possible
- 10) Provide a detailed scoring key
- 11) Identify candidates by number not name

Moderating Items

The Spanish 205 supervisor looked at the first and second drafts of each pre-test and suggested improvements. Some questions (original states English but I have changed the word to Spanish where italics are indicated) suggested by Hughes (2003 p. 64) to guide in this process are:

1. Is the *Spanish* grammatically correct?
2. Is the *Spanish* natural and acceptable?
3. Is the *Spanish* in accordance with specifications?
4. Do the items test what it is supposed to test?

5. The correct response cannot be obtained without the appropriated knowledge of grammar (other than random guessing).
6. Is the item economical?
7. (a) Multiple choice— Is there just one correct response?
(b) Gap filling—Are there just one or two correct responses?
8. Multiple choice— Are all the distracters likely to distract?
9. Is the key complete and correct?

Some good pointers on common test-assembly problems to avoid are:

- Are there misspelled words?
- Are their typographical errors?
- Is there an item that has been split between two pages?
- Is the exam format consistent throughout the exam?
- Are there many format errors?
- Is there ample blank space for constructed response items?
- Are directions provided throughout the exam? (Ory and Ryan, 1993, p. 78).

Analysis of the Result of the Trial; Making any Necessary Changes

To determine reliability for this particular pre-test, the split-half method was used. This method consisted of dividing the pre-test into two equal halves and then calculating the students' scores for each half of the test. After that, a correlation was done to provide a *coefficient of internal consistency* to see how closely related students' scores on half "A" are with half "B" (Hughes, 2003).

Effort was made to discover misinterpretations, unanticipated but possibly correct responses, and other indicators of faulty items. The ones that were found were modified or dropped from the test. This process was attended to by the Spanish 205 course supervisor who has had many years' experience in developing Spanish language tests. Feedback was received and implemented. After changes were made they were resubmitted to the Supervisor for a second review and finalization and then sent on to the Humanities Testing Lab director to load them onto the computers.

Process of Validating Test

It is believed that the Spanish Humanities Testing Center Diagnostic Pre-test was valid in that it adequately measured the students' grammatical knowledge, ability and skills by providing multiple, independent questions about the same grammar concepts covered during the course. The results showed consistency when comparing scores between the unit pre-test and the actual unit test. For this particular project, only the unit 2 pre-test and the unit 2 achievement exam were analyzed. It was also predicted that the scores of those who took the pre-test at the beginning of the unit would do better on the unit test than if they had not taken the pre-test. Once both tests were taken, we compared their results and determined that the scores on the unit test indeed were higher. It is felt that the students took advantage of the pre-test to help them diagnose their strengths and weaknesses, the appropriate duration (not too short or long) and the computer's ability to score the results objectively. Collaboration took place with the Director of the Humanities Computer Lab to ensure that the test looked like a genuine test to give it more face validity. It was also ensured that the questions were written appropriately so as to test the content that we desired to test. All reliability issues under the section of "test reliability" and all test item issues under the section of "test items" were addressed as adequately as possible to increase the all four pre-tests' validity although only the pre-test for unit 2 was analyzed.

Writing Handbooks for Test Takers, Test Users and Staff/ Train any Necessary Staff

Instructors were sent e-mails that contained the answers/ key for the pre-test. Instructors were then instructed to upload the pre-test answers to Learning Suite in their respective course materials and then inform their students so they can access them. At that point they were asked to inform students that the test would be taken in the Humanities Computer Testing Lab and that

the dates for the test could be found in their respective course syllabus. It was left up to the instructor as to how much time should be dedicated in class to review results or if the students would only have the sole options of accessing it online university's course management system. The instructor was also responsible for letting the students know and that they (the students) were the ones to determine how to use their test results in preparation for the actual Unit 2 exam. Students should have been informed that if they have any questions regarding the process, that they speak with their respective Spanish 205 course instructors. Once students went to the lab, sat down at the computer to take the test, and opened it for review, they were given sufficient instructions to know how to complete it. Once the test was complete, the computer corrected students' answers and sent the results through a data base to be viewed by the instructor. The instructors could then print out the results and hand them out to their students so they could keep them in their personal records. Once the test becomes web-based and available remotely, no tests will be needed to be printed out and students will get their results immediately after completing it.

CHAPTER 4

TEST RELIABILITY

What is test reliability? If a test is reliable, it will measure consistently what it intends to measure. Unreliable tests can result from two origins 1) The features of the test itself along with the interaction of the test taker with it and 2) the scoring of the test (Hughes, 2003, pp. 3-4). To determine reliability for this particular pre-test, the split-half method was used. This method consisted of dividing the pre-test into two equal halves and then calculating the students' scores for each half of the test (Hughes, 2003, p. 40). After that was done, a correlation was run in Excel to provide a *coefficient of internal consistency* to see how closely related students' scores on half "A" were with half "B". In order to determine what constituted these two halves, grammatical points from the unit test exam were chosen to ensure that they were distributed equally throughout both halves of the pre-tests. Each grammatical point was roughly compromised of at least 6 questions so as to enable three questions on part "A" and three on part "B". This number varied depending on the grammatical concept. i.e., it was easier to elicit more examples for the subjunctive than it was with diminutives.

Another way ensure test reliability was, to have more items on the test and to make them independent of each other so as to give the test-taker a "fresh start" (Hughes 2003). For example, the individual pre-tests were created and then divided into sections that covered each grammatical principle. Next, they were sent on to the Director of the Humanities Computer Lab who randomized the questions so as to not allow the student to associate groups of questions with any particular grammatical concept. After the tests were completed, the computer re-compiled the answers and matched them up with the original sections so the instructor could review them in class with the students without difficulty. Multiple samples of a grammatical

principle throughout the pre-tests also avoided basing the student's knowledge on one item, instead of representing their knowledge as whole. This better helped to see if a student had actually mastered the specific grammatical principle or not. In addition to that, clustering pinpointed specific sections that needed extra attention as it was quite common to see where a student answered the majority of the questions wrong. To further increase reliability, care was taken to not make the test so long that the student became bored or lost interest and therefore did not represent their true ability. The Spanish 205 pretests were designed to 1) be long enough to solicit multiple samples but maintain student interest and, 2) exclude items that did not discriminate well between weaker and stronger students and, 3) did not allow candidates too much freedom (there wasn't too much of a concern here with multiple choice items but this could be a problem for other types of items such as essay questions) and, 4) avoid writing unambiguous items—for the pre-tests much care will be taken to make sure that there is only one correct answer and, 5) provide clear and explicit instructions—if the test-taker were to be confused as to what was being asked of him/her, it could have created problems with reliability and, 6) ensure test was well laid out and perfectly legible—the Spanish 205 supervisor reviewed test for errors and, 7) Make candidates familiar with format and testing techniques—information was provided in class as to its format and, 8) use items which permit objective scoring as possible— *close-ended response multiple choice cloze task items* were chosen for that purpose and, 9) provide a detailed scoring key—a document was created that provided a key with the answers to each question and, 10) identify candidate by number, not name— this is applicable more for subjectively graded tests.

Another issue with reliability was how guessing may have had considerable but unknowable effect on the test scores. The best way to avoid this was to provide multiple,

independent samples. This pre-test accomplished that by randomly placing three to five questions for each grammar principle. If all the students were to guess on the pre-test while taking it, then neither they nor the instructor would know what the grammatical problem areas are. This particular problem could not be remedied unless we had asked the student he had guessed and then correcting them. Not only is this not practical, but there is no way to determine if they are saying the truth.

CHAPTER 5

TEST VALIDATION

A valid test is one that tests what it purports to test. So, if the pre-tests purports to test grammatical principles and actually does that, then it is more valid. “Quantitative and qualitative validation of WBTs does not differ in principle from validation of other types of tests” (Roever, 2001, p. 86). Mackey and Gass (2005) explain various types of validity: content, face, criterion-related and predictive validity and each will be briefly discussed as to how it applies to this project.

Content Validity

“The extent to which a test or measurement device adequately measures the knowledge, skill, or ability that it was designed to measure” (p. 352). So, the question is, “Did the pre-tests really test a students’ grammatical competence in regards to the grammar covered in the Spanish 205 class?” Grammatical competence was assessed because all of the grammatical concepts taught during the course have been compiled and were included on the test. See Table 1.

Face Validity

“A test is said to have face validity if it looks as if it measures what it is supposed to measure” (Hughes, 2003, p. 33). Face validity also “hinges on the participants’ perceptions of the research treatments and tests” (Mackey and Gass, 2005, p. 107). Basically, in regards to these particular pre-tests, they did appear to test the grammar principles covered in the Spanish 205 textbook.

Criterion-related Validity

This “refers to the extent to which tests are comparable to other well-established tests of the construct in question” (Mackey and Gass, 2005, p. 108). In this case, the other well-established test that we are comparing the pre-tests to is unit 2 exam that has been used over the last three years. Upon taking the pre-tests and unit tests, students’ results were analyzed and it was determined that test results were similar between the two assessments. Since they were comparable, it was probable that the pre-test assessed students’ skills in a way similar to the unit exam with respect to grammatical points used.

Predictive Validity

This “refers to the use that one wants to make of the measure. If there is predictive validity, the measure can predict performance on some other measure” (Mackey and Gass, 2005, p. 363). For this project we predicted that the test would diagnose students’ grammatical competence in regards to the grammar principles covered in the course. We also predicted that those who did well on the pre-test when administered at the beginning of the unit, would also do well on the achievement unit test. Student’s pre-test were compared to their post-test scores to determine whether the prediction was valid or not. These results will be reviewed in further detail in the next section.

Test Dates and Course Group Information

Two groups formed part of the validation study: Group 1 consisted of fourteen students in the Spanish 205 section 001 and took the pre-test during fall semester 2012 on September 18th and 19th. Next, they took the actual Unit II exam on October 8th and 9th of the same year. Group 2

consisted of twelve students in the Spanish 205 section 006. This section was given the pre-test and unit exam simultaneously on October 8th and 9th and was allowed an additional hour to complete both tests.

CHAPTER 6

RESULTS OF VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY PROCESS

Validation

Concurrent validity is the “degree to which the results on the test agree with those provided by some independent and highly dependable assessment of the candidate’s ability” (Hughes, 2003, p. 27). Concurrent validity is established when the new test and the criterion are administered at about the same time. The criterion, in this case, was the unit exam. For our purposes, we compared the results of the pre-test that was administered at the same time as the unit exam (the criterion) in order to establish concurrent validity. There are standard procedures for comparing sets of scores which generate what is referred to as a ‘validity coefficient’ which is a mathematical measure of similarity. “Perfect agreement between two sets of scores will result in a coefficient of 1. A total lack of agreement will give a co-efficient of zero” (Hughes, 2003, p. 28). When the analysis was performed a validity coefficient of .83 was attained. To understand better what a coefficient means in terms of a level agreement between two sets of scores it is suggested that we square the co-efficient. By so doing we get 0.69. If this is regarded as a proportion of one and converted to a percentage, we get 69 percent. This means that the scores on the unit 2 pre-test predicts 69 percent of the variation on scores on the Unit 2 exam (Hughes 2003).

This begs the question; does a coefficient of .83 or 69% indicate a satisfactory level of concurrent validity? A co-efficient between .90 to 1.0 is suggested for discrete point grammar tests thus predicting between 90-100 of the variation on the Unit 2 achievement exam scores.

It is important to note, however, that the Unit 2 achievement exam tested different types of language skills and this may explain the slightly lower validity co-efficient here. The first section was comprised of listening comprehension with true/false items; the second focused on vocabulary by utilizing multiple choice items to select the best possible answer; the third consisted of specific grammatical skills that solicited fill in the blank or multiple choice answers; the last section consisted of a writing element asking the student to use the grammar and vocabulary learned throughout the unit to detail their personal information. The combination of the different language skills found on the unit test was not considered to be a problem due to reasonably high the higher co-efficient rating of .83 which explained 69 percent of the variation of the scores. Had the percentage been lower than 65 it would have been necessary to compare the scores of the pre-test to only scores on the portions of the unit achievement exam specifically testing grammatical knowledge.

Evidence of Reliability

The pre-test was designed to have an even number of questions. In order to determine reliability, the split test method was used; this method took all the odds of the pre-test and compared them to all of the evens. To give more detail, each grammatical principle that was tested had the same amount of even questions in comparison with the odds. So, when we tested the grammatical principle of the *imperfect* for example and there were eight questions in all, question one would be very similar to question two, and question three similar to four and so on

up to question eight. By using the split-half test method, a reliability coefficient of .83 was attained. As a side note, I recognize that it is peculiar that the validity co-efficient and the reliability co-efficient came out identical. However, this is merely coincidence and does not, to my knowledge reflect an error calculation and this co-efficient, likewise with the validity coefficient mentioned in the previous section, indicates that the designed pre-test is reasonably reliable. Nevertheless, as also mentioned previously, it is important to note that the reliability increases the closer you get to 1. Hughes (2003) explains “that a test with an ideal coefficient of 1 is considered to be a test which would give precisely the same results for a particular set of candidates regardless of when it happened to be given” (p. 39). He also indicates that a good test of grammatical structures, such as in the case of a pre-test with multiple-choice items, is usually in the .90 to .99 reliability coefficient range.

So, in essence, the data is implying that the pre-test is coming up short .07 points in order to reach the ideal .90 to .99 coefficient range. With regards to reliability coefficients, Hughes further explains that the reliability coefficient that is to be sought will depend most particularly on the decisions that are to be taken on the basis of the test. In this case, it seems that because this is not a test that will be used as college entrance exams or for other high stakes decisions, that a reliability coefficient of .83 on the pre-test is adequate. This is especially true in that the main purpose of the pre-test is to help students be aware of their particular grammatical weaknesses.

Recommendations

It is recommended that the pre-tests designed for Units 1, 2, 3 and 4 for the Spanish 205 course at BYU be used for their original purpose of making it available online. This is so the

student can take it whenever it is convenient and also receive immediate feedback on items answered. It is also recommended that for future similar projects sufficient time be factored in so as to facilitate the validation process. Because of the need to prioritize time, certain stages of test development, such as using native speaker and a control group of students with the same skills as the pre-test taker group, would have helped so as to avoid potential errors or confusion. These types of errors were surprisingly minimal. Also, since the Unit 2 pre-test was only compared to the overall Unit 2 achievement test which included a listening and writing component, a more acute focus could be put on specifically analyzing the grammar portions and omit the others. This would take a much more significant amount of time to analyze these items as you would need to look at over 200 questions and compare them individually. It was also found that the computer generated errors on the assumption that they were somehow plugged into the test- key correction process erroneously, not because the computer was wrong. That is yet to be determined.

Conclusion

I think that the greatest strength of the test is its face validity as we believe that the students are of the opinion that the pre-test is really testing their knowledge of grammatical principles. It is also believed that the students feel that knowing their results on the pre-tests helps them to know where to focus their efforts. This was determined by asking the students. Those in the two compared groups almost unanimously felt like the pre-test was helpful. The overall test results and comparisons gave us valuable information and support the opinion that the pre-test indeed was of value.

APPENDIX A

TABLE 1: Content of Pre-tests	
Unit 1	Unit 3
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Preterit tense 2. Imperfect tense 3. Preterit vs. imperfect 4. Uses of <i>ser</i>, <i>estar</i> and <i>haber</i> 5. Future tense 6. Subjunctive in noun clauses 7. Indirect commands 8. Direct and indirect object pronouns 9. Personal "a" 10. <i>Gustar</i> and similar verbs 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>hace</i> and <i>desde</i> in time expressions 2. <i>por</i> and <i>para</i> 3. Verbs that require a preposition before an infinitive 4. Comparisons of equality and inequality 5. Imperfect subjunctive 6. Conditional and conditional perfect 7. Indicative and subjunctive in <i>si</i>-clauses 8. Pluperfect subjunctive 9. <i>Se</i> with impersonal and passive constructions 10. Indefinite and negative expressions
Unit 2	Unit 4
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reflexive constructions 2. Agreement form and position of adjectives 3. Past participle 4. Present perfect indicative and subjunctive 5. Future perfect and pluperfect tenses 6. Comparisons with nouns, adjectives, verbs, and adverbs 7. Superlatives 8. Subjunctive vs. indicative in adverbial clauses 9. Formal and informal commands 10. Subjunctive with <i>ojalá</i>, <i>tal vez</i> and <i>quizá(s)</i> 11. Impersonal expressions (not part of the unit but tested in error) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Indirect speech 2. Relative pronouns <i>que</i>, <i>quien</i>, and <i>lo que</i> and relative adjective <i>cuyo/a(s)</i> 3. Relative pronouns <i>el/la cual</i> and <i>los/las cuales</i> 4. Sequence of tenses with the subjunctive 5. Uses of the infinitives and the <i>-ing</i> (-ndo) form of the verb 6. <i>Se</i> for unplanned events 7. Passive voice 8. Diminutives and augmentatives

APPENDIX B

Note: The current unit 2 achievement exam is not provided due to the fact that it is in current use for the Spanish 205 course.

Key for Span 205 Unit 1 pre-test

Information to the instructor: The pre-test is designed to help students diagnose where their strength and weaknesses are in regards to grammar principles that will be covered throughout the course. There are 4 pre-tests, one for each unit that should be taken by the student within the first two days of the new unit. This test was also designed to help instructors know students' current skills and facilitate adjustment of instruction as deemed appropriate. The test is multiple-choice with 4 possible answers and the student will be given one hour to complete it. Test item tally will vary depending on pre-test. The test itself randomizes the questions before students take test. Once the tests are completed by students in the Lab, results will be sent to the TA office as is the current procedure with the unit tests. Those results will show up back under the appropriate grammatical categories for the Instructor so they can be reviewed as a section in class.

Instructions given at the beginning of each pre-test:

The exam you are about to take is a Pre-Assessment measure for Spanish 205
If this is the right exam, click BEGIN. If this is the wrong exam, click STOP.

Instructions: This test is multiple-choice. Please select the best possible answer. Some of the options include an "X" indicating that nothing is needed in that space. To answer a question, click on the appropriate space, then type the letter that corresponds to the correct answer. You may change your answers as needed. Use the TAB key to begin and to move from space to space.

Preterit and imperfect tenses

Preterit p. 7

1. Ayer yo _____ con mi hermana por dos horas. a) habló b) hablaba c) estaba hablado d) hablé
2. El viernes pasado yo _____ con mi abuela por tres horas. a) conversó b) conversaba c) estaba conversado d) conversé
3. Yo _____ en México por tres semanas. a) estuve b) estuvo c) estaba d) fui
4. Yo _____ en Nueva York por cinco meses. a) estuve b) estuvo c) estaba d) fui
5. El viernes pasado yo _____ a tu casa. a) anduve b) ande c) andó d) andaba
6. Anteayer a las 8.00 _____ que habías llegado al museo. a) sabe b) sabía c) supe d) supiera
7. _____ al Presidente García el primer día de clases en BYU. a) Conoce b) Supe c) Conocía d) Conocí
8. Nosotros y ella _____ a tu madre ayer. a) conocemos b) conoció c) conocimos d) conocíamos

9. Ayer a las 7:00 cuando me llamó, de repente _____ la verdad. a) conocí b) supe c) sabe d) sabía
10. Ayer _____ que hacer mi tarea y la hice. a) tenía b) tuve c) tuviese d) tuviera

Imperfect p. 14

11. El verano pasado _____ en un maratón cuando me encontré con mi tía. a) corrí b) fue corriendo c) corría d) corrió
12. La semana pasada _____ la televisión cuando entró tu esposo. a) miraba b) estaba mirado c) miré d) fue mirando
13. Cada día de la semana (habitual) ella _____ en el zoológico. a) trabajó b) trabajaba c) trabajas d) trabajar
14. Cada semana (habitual) él _____ a la iglesia. a) iba b) fue c) fue yendo d) fui
15. La presentadora explicaba los estilos nuevos mientras los modelos _____ el almuerzo. a) comían b) comieron c) fueron comieron d) estuvieron comiendo
16. Ellos escuchaban la música mientras _____ la tarea. a) hicieron b) hacían c) hacer d) estaban hacían
17. Cuando _____ 12 años, jugaba beisbol después de la escuela. a) tuve b) tenía c) tenga d) he tenido
18. Cuando _____ en la secundaria, siempre iba a la escuela en autobús. a) estudiaba b) estudié c) he estudiado d) estudia

Uses of *ser*, *estar* and *haber* p. 45

Ser

1. Ellos _____ a) están personas felices b) están unas personas feliz c) son unas personas felices d) son feliz.
2. Los jugadores del equipo _____ muy famosos. a) fueron b) eran c) estaban d) estuvieron
3. La fiesta navideña en el año 2008 _____ a las 6.00 p.m. a) fue b) era c) eran d) son
4. Mi clase de Biología _____ a la 1.00. a) eran b) es c) está d) hay
5. Yo _____ una persona alta y flaca. a) estoy b) soy c) es d) estar
6. La gente de los Estados Unidos _____. a) son muy buenos b) son muy buenas c) es muy buena d) es muy bueno
7. La conferencia _____ en otro edificio. a) es b) está c) estaba d) hay
8. El partido de fútbol _____ en el estadio. a) está b) es c) serán d) estará
9. — Miguel, ¿qué hora es?
— _____ las 9.00. a) Es b) Son c) Están d) Será
10. — Clara, ¿qué hora es?
— _____ la 1.30. a) Son b) Serán c) Es d) Está
11. — ¿Eres tú?
— Sí, _____. a) yo soy b) soy yo c) es mi d) es yo
12. — ¿Quién es?

— _____ nosotros. a) Estamos b) Somos c) Eran d) Fuimos

Estar

1. Ella _____ embarazada de ocho meses. a) estaba b) era c) fue d) estuvo
2. Nosotros _____ muy cansados por haber jugado 3 horas. a) somos b) estamos c) estemos d) fuimos
3. El colegio _____ muy cerca de la parada del bus. a) es b) está c) hay d) será
4. La casa de mi abuela _____ en California. a) es b) está c) hay d) esté
5. —Hola tía, tanto tiempo sin verte.
—Sí Juan, tú _____ muy alto ya. a) eres b) sois c) estás d) seas
6. —Hola Margarita, tú _____ muy bonita hoy. a) eres b) estás c) sois d) seas
—Gracias, Juan.

Haber

1. ¿Cuántos televisores _____ en tu casa? a) son b) hay c) es d) hubo
2. ¿Cuántos hombres _____ que pagan lo debido? a) son b) hay c) habían d) hubo
3. _____ muchos chicos que asistieron al concierto. a) Habían b) Había c) Hubo d) Hubieron
4. ¿Cuántas personas _____ en la lista? a) hubo b) había c) habían d) hubieron
5. En el año 2020 _____ más problemas sociales. a) habrán b) será c) habrá d) hubiera
6. Dicen que _____ más divorcios en los años que vienen. a) habrán b) serán c) habrá d) hay
7. _____ dos partidos de fútbol anoche. a) Había b) Hubo c) Habrá d) Habían
8. _____ una reunión en la capilla ayer. a) Hubo b) Había c) Habían d) Era

Future tense p. 49

1. Ella _____ a las 8.00. a) venga b) vienes c) vendrá d) ir
2. Ellos _____ que comprar dos boletos para el viaje. a) tendrán b) tengan c) tiene d) tuvieran
3. ¿_____ ella aquí más tarde? a) Será b) Habrá c) Estará d) Está
4. Yo _____ el lunes. a) llegaré b) llegue c) habrá llegado d) llegar
5. Ella _____ que vengamos. a) quería b) queremos c) quiso d) querrá
6. Nosotros le _____ cuando venga. a) dijimos b) decimos c) diremos d) digamos

Subjunctive in noun clauses p. 59

1. Ella quiere que _____ un nuevo apartamento. a) buscamos b) buscásemos c) busquemos d) buscaran
2. Prefiero que la reunión _____ a las 3.00. a) empiece b) empieza c) empezaste d) empezara
3. Ella recomienda que nosotros lo _____. a) hagamos b) hacemos c) hiciéramos d) hacer

- Mando que ella _____ a las 7.00. a) viene b) venido c) yenga d) viniera
- Es importante _____ la. a) ayuda b) ayude c) ayudar d) que ayudar
- Era interesante _____ la canción para ellos. a) cantar b) cantaren c) hubieron cantado d) cantaron

Indirect commands p. 80

- No quiero cocinar la cena. Que lo _____ mis compañeras de cuarto. a) hacen b) hagan c) hayan d) han hecho
- Mi padre no quiere salir. Que _____ ellos primero. a) salen b) salgan c) saldrán d) saldréis
- No tengo tiempo para darte el dinero. Que te lo _____ Julieta. a) de b) da c) dé d) dar
- No puedo estar presente. Que _____ Miguel. a) este b) está c) esté d) estar

Direct and indirect object pronouns p. 88

- Ella me dio un lápiz. a) Se me dio. b) Me la dio. c) Lo me dio. d) Me lo dio.
- Mis padres nos regalaron una cama. a) Les nos regalaron. b) Nos la regalaron. c) La regalaron. d) Se nos regalaron.
- Mis amigos van a _____ a nosotros a la fiesta. a) invitarles b) invitarnos c) nos invitan d) invitar
- Voy a comer la galleta. Voy a comer _____. a) la b) lo c) se d) x
- Voy a darle a mi esposa un beso. a) Se lo doy. b) Se la doy. c) Le lo doy d) Me lo da.
- Mi padre me va a comprar una bicicleta. a) Se la compra b) Me la compra c) Le lo compro d) Se me compra.

Personal "a" p. 89

- _____ me importa salir temprano. a) A b) A mí c) A mí d) Yo
- _____ te molesta cuando yo canto. a) A b) A tú c) A tí d) Tú
- Yo _____ mi mamá. a) amo a b) le amo a c) amo d) la amo
- _____ mi hermana. a) La quiero b) Le quiero a c) Quiero d) Quiero a
- Les fascinan a ustedes _____ todas mis chivas. a) a b) X c) hay d) está
- El granjero mató _____ la gallina. a) a b) X c) mí d) tú

Gustar and similar verbs p. 96

- A mí _____ comer tacos. a) me gustan b) me gustar c) me gusto d) me gusta
- A Rodrigo no _____ ganar dinero. a) se importa b) le importa c) lo importa d) se importante
- A ellos _____ mirar la televisión a) les gustan b) se gustan c) les gusta d) gustan
- A vosotras _____ jugar baloncesto. a) les encantan b) os encantan c) os encantáis d) os encanta
- _____ comer helado. a) Te encantas b) Te encanto c) Te encanta d) Te encantar

6. ¿_____ escuchar música? a) Se les encanta b) Les encantan c) Les encanta d) Se encantan
7. Nos va a _____ viajar a Europa a) fascinamos b) fascinar c) fascina d) fascinará
8. Te va a _____ comer uvas. a) interesar b) interesan c) interesarte d) interesa

Unit 2

Reflexive constructions p. 114

1. Yo _____ levantado antes de que llegara mi hermano. a) había b) haberme c) me había d) haber
2. Él dijo que nosotros _____ a las 5.00. a) habíamos levantado b) se habían levantado c) nos habíamos levantado d) nos habíamos levantando
3. Ellos _____ a las 11.00. a) se durmieron b) se durmieran c) durmieran d) dormirse
4. Había mucha enfermedad y los niños _____. a) les enfermaran b) les enfermaron c) se enfermaron d) se les enfermaron
5. Él quiere _____ a la 1.00 de la mañana. a) se acostar b) acostarse c) se acueste d) acuesta
6. Vamos a _____ las 6.00. a) levantarnos b) nos levantamos c) nos levantar d) levantarse

Agreement form and position of adjectives p. 125

7. Los hermanos son _____. a) buen amigos b) bien amigos c) buenos amigo d) buenos amigos.
8. Él es _____. a) una persona buena b) un persona buena c) un persona bueno d) lo bueno persona.
9. La familia González es _____. a) gente buena b) bueno gente c) buenas gentes d) buenos gentes.
10. Ellos son _____. a) hombres tenaz b) unos hombres tenaces c) un hombres tenaz d) unos hombres tenaz
11. Juana es mi _____. a) única tía justa b) único tía justo c) única tía justo d) único tío justo.
12. Ella es _____. a) una mujer bonito b) un mujer bonita c) un mujer bonito d) una mujer bonita

Past participle p. 129

13. La ventana está _____. a) rompió b) rota c) rompe d) romper
14. La tarea está _____. a) hecho b) hecha c) hizo d) haciendo
15. Hemos _____ a España dos veces. a) vuelto b) volviendo c) vuelta d) volver
16. ¿Qué te ha _____? a) decido b) dicho c) dice d) dijeron
17. Hemos _____ varias veces. a) caído b) caídos c) caímos d) cayendo
18. Vosotros habéis _____ muchos libros. a) escribiendo b) escribisteis c) escrito d) escritos

Present perfect indicative and subjunctive p. 146

19. Deseo tener éxito en mis estudios y hasta ahora _____. a) lo tenía b) lo tuve c) lo he tenido d) he tenido
20. Estoy contento de lo que _____. a) hemos hecho b) hubo hecho c) hubiéramos hecho d) hubimos hecho
21. Es cierto que _____ con Jeff. a) jugarnos b) hayamos jugado c) hubiéramos jugado d) hemos jugado
22. No es cierto que _____ a la clase. a) hayamos ido b) vamos c) hemos ido d) hubiéramos
23. Es dudable que _____ tan temprano. a) vienen b) vinieron c) han venido d) hayan venido.
24. No creo que _____ el tesoro. a) habían descubierto b) descubren c) hayan descubierto d) han descubiertos.

Future perfect and pluperfect tenses pp. 156-157

25. Antes de graduarme en el año 2015 yo _____ 25 años. a) habré cumplido b) he cumplido c) cumplirá d) cumplo
26. Antes de encontrar trabajo el próximo año, ella _____ a su casa para celebrar la navidad. a) habrá ido b) ha ido c) va d) fue
27. Antes de graduarme, mis abuelos ya me _____ chocolate. a) habían enviado b) había enviado c) han enviado d) enviamos
28. Cuando saqué el dinero del banco, yo ya _____ con tu madre. a) hablé b) he hablado c) había hablado d) hablaste
29. Cuando llegue tu madre tú ya _____. a) habrás comido b) has comido c) comerás d) comes
30. Antes del verano que viene ya _____ ocho partidos. a) hemos jugado b) jugamos c) jugaremos d) habremos jugado
31. Antes de llamar ayer, ya _____ lavado el coche. a) había b) ha c) habrá d) hubo
32. Antes de la clase vosotros ya _____ la tarea. a) habíais hecho b) hicisteis c) habéis hecho d) habías

Comparisons with nouns, adjectives, verbs, and adverbs p. 159

33. El cantante no tiene _____ experiencia como tú. a) tan b) tanta c) tanto d) tanta mucha
34. La profesora tiene _____ confianza en sus habilidades como el profesor. a) tanta b) mucha c) tanto d) tan mucha
35. Mi hermano regala _____ tu hermana. a) tantos coches como b) tan coches como c) tantos coches que d) tan coches que
36. Yo tengo _____ mi tío. a) tantas chimichangas como b) tantos chimichangas como c) tantas chimichangas que d) tantos chimichangas de

37. Miguel no es _____ José. a) tan guapo como b) tan guapo de c) tan guapo que d) tanto guapo que
38. Marisela no es _____ Gabriela. a) tan bonita como b) tan bonita de c) tan bonita que d) tanta bonita que

Superlatives p. 160

39. Ella es la _____ jugadora de todas. a) más mejor b) mejor c) mucha mejor d) más mejora
40. Ellos son los chicos _____ de todos. a) más peores b) peores c) muchos peores d) más peor
41. Nosotros somos los _____ de la clase. a) más mejor b) mejores c) muchos mejores d) más mejores
42. Soy la _____ (*oldest*) de mi familia a) más mayor b) mayor c) mucho mayor d) menos menor
43. Guadalupe es la estudiante _____ la universidad. a) más lista de b) más lista en c) más lista a d) mayor lista que
44. Juana y María son _____ la clase. a) los más felices de b) las más felices de c) las más felices en d) las más felices a

Subjunctive vs. indicative in adverbial clauses p. 179

45. Voy a salir cuando _____ mi amiga. a) venga b) viene c) se viene d) venir
46. Yo iré contigo con tal de que _____. a) me ayudas b) me ayudes c) ayudarme d) ayudándome.
47. Vamos a pagar antes de _____. a) salgamos b) salimos c) salir d) saldríamos
48. Quiero bajar diez libras con tal de _____ ponerme mis pantalones favoritos. a) poder b) pueda c) puedo d) me puedo
49. Cada día en cuanto _____ mi padre, comemos. a) regrese b) regresa c) haya regresado d) hubo regresado
50. Cuando mi madre regresa de su trabajo cada viernes a las 6.00 _____ de compras. a) vamos b) vayamos c) ir d) fuéramos
51. No lo haréis sin que _____ el gobernador. a) viene b) venir c) venga d) viniera
52. Tito compró los huevos para que _____ la torta. a) hicimos b) hacer c) hiciéramos d) hacemos
53. Terminaremos antes de que _____ tu madre. a) llegar b) llega c) llegue d) llegase
54. Saldremos en cuanto _____ los maestros. a) lleguen 2) llegar 3) llegan 4) llegasen

Formal and informal commands p. 191

55. —Oye, hija _____ paciencia. a) ten b) tenga c) tiene d) tengas
56. —Señor Pérez, _____ conmigo, por favor. a) viene b) ven c) venga d) va
57. —Perdí mi libro. _____ usted. a) Búscalo b) Búsquelo c) Búsquele d) Buscarlo.
58. — ¡ _____, clase! a) Escucháis b) Escuchad c) Escuchéis d) Escucha
59. —Oye tú, _____ de allí. a) sales 2) salga 3) sal 4) salid

60. —Jefe, ¿tenemos que venir a las 11.00?
 —Sí, ¡todos uds. _____ a las 11.00! a) venir b) vienen c) venid d) vengan

Subjunctive with *ojalá, tal vez and quizá(s)* p. 196

61. Ojalá que _____ ir. a) podemos b) poder c) podamos d) podéis
 62. Ojalá que _____ al partido. a) van b) vayan c) iban d) fueron
 63. No sé, tal vez Juan me _____ mañana. a) ayuda b) ayude c) ayudar d) ayudas
 64. Quizás yo _____ a Patricia a ir conmigo. a) invite b) invita c) invitar d) invitás

Impersonal expressions p. 62 (was added in error)

65. Es dudable que _____. a) van b) irán c) vayan d) vais
 66. No es posible que _____ a la universidad. a) regrese b) regresara c) regresa
 d) regresase
 67. Yo creo que es importante que _____ bien. a) comen b) coman c) comed d)
 comemos.
 68. Pienso que es necesario que _____ mejor. a) entrenan b) entrenen c) entrenaron d)
 entrenar
 69. Creo que _____ importante estudiar. a) es b) sea c) ser d) son
 70. Es cierto que ellos _____ la verdad. a) sepan b) supieron c) saber d) saben
 71. No pienso que _____ mal. a) juegan b) juegen c) jugando d) jugar
 72. No es verdad que _____ a la iglesia. a) asistes b) asistas c) asististe d) asistir

Unit 3

***Hace and desde* in time expressions p. 215**

1. ¿Cuánto tiempo _____ que estudias español? a) hay b) hacía c) es d) hace
 2. ¿Cuánto tiempo _____ que no estudiaba italiano? a) hay b) hacía c) es d) hace
 3. ¿_____ cuándo son Miguel y José cuñados? a) Hace b) Hacia c) Desde d) Hay
 4. ¿_____ cuándo eres un aficionado de BYU? a) Hace b) Hacia c) Desde d) Hay
 5. _____ cinco años que practico al fútbol. a) Sobre b) Ha sido c) Hace d) Hacen
 6. _____ 10 meses que jugaba al golf. a) Hace b) Hacían c) Hacía d) Han sido

***Por and para* pp. 224-225**

7. Hay que entregar la tarea _____ el lunes. a) por b) para c) cuando d) en
 8. Nos pusimos de acuerdo _____ las 2:00 de la tarde. 1) por 2) para 3) de d) X
 9. Estoy trabajando _____ mi padre porque está enfermo. a) por b) para c) X d) mucho
 10. Mi hermana no puede ir, trabajaré (in her place) _____ ella. a) por b) para c) X d)
 mucho
 11. Trabajo _____ una compañía nueva. a) por b) para c) de d) a

12. Ella trabaja _____ MacDonalds. a) por b) para c) de d) a
 13. Te doy 5 dólares _____ tus pantalones. a) por b) para c) X d) en cuanto
 14. Le doy mi chaqueta _____ tu abrigo. a) por b) para c) X d) en cuanto
 15. Paso _____ Dunkin Doughnuts cada mañana. a) por b) para c) X 4) a
 16. Entró en la casa (*through*) _____ la ventana. a) para b) por c) hacia d) a
 17. Fuimos a visitar el asilo de ancianos _____ la tarde. a) por b) para c) hacia d) X
 18. Me levanto muy temprano _____ la mañana. a) para b) por c) hacia d) de

Verbs that require a preposition before an infinitive pp. 229-230

19. Ellos me obligaron _____ hacerlo. a) X b) de c) a d) en
 20. Tú la invitaste _____ venir. a) X b) a c) de d) en
 21. Me avergoncé _____ caerme. a) con b) a c) X d) de
 22. Ella se acuerda _____ que tenemos que irnos. a) X b) de c) con 4) en
 23. Insistimos _____ jugar a las 7:00. a) de b) en c) a 4) con
 24. Tardamos cinco horas _____ llegar. a) X b) a c) en d) con
 25. Puedes contar _____ . a) conmigo b) con me c) con mí d) con yo
 26. Nosotros soñamos _____ casas rosadas. a) de b) a c) en d) con

Imperfect subjunctive p. 248

27. Mis padres preferían que yo _____ mis quehaceres. a) hago b) hiciera c) hacía d) hice
 28. No asistía a la iglesia sin que me _____ mis padres. a) obligaron b) obligaran c) obligaba d) obligaban
 29. No me gustaba que ellos me _____ mal. a) trataron b) tratasen c) trataban d) tratasteis
 30. Les pedía a mis maestros que no me _____ tarea. a) dieron b) daban c) dieran d) diese
 31. Buscábamos una receta que no _____ cebollas. a) incluye b) incluía c) incluyó d) incluyera
 32. Dudaba que vosotros me _____ el dinero. a) dabais b) distéis c) dierais d) habían dado

Conditional and conditional perfect

33. Me _____ comprar los zapatos, pero no tengo dinero. a) gusto b) gustas c) gustaría d) gustarán
 34. Nos _____ comer en la cafetería. a) gustan b) gustar c) gustaría d) gustarán
 35. Ellos (*would prefer*) _____ venir a las 8.00. a) preferirán b) prefieren c) preferían d) preferir
 36. La señora (*would prefer*) _____ gastar todo su dinero en algo.) preferirá b) prefiere c) prefería d) preferir.
 37. Tú (*should polite*) _____ escuchar a tu madre. a) deberás b) debes c) deberías d) deber
 38. Vosotros (*should polite*) _____ ayudar a vuestra abuela. a) debéis b) deberéis c) deberíais d) deber

Indicative and subjunctive in *si*-clauses p. 263

39. *If I had \$100 dollars, then I would buy food.*
Si _____ cien dólares _____ comida. a) si tengo/ compraría b) si tuviera/ compraré c) si tuviera/compraría d) si tendría/ comprara
40. *If I were to study more, then I would get good grades.*
_____ más, _____ mejor notas. a) si estudiara/ sacaría b) si estudiaría/ sacara c) si estudio/ sacaré d) estudiaré/ voy a sacar.
41. Si no _____ más, _____ muy cansada. a) descansas/ estarás b) descansarás/ estás c) estás cansado/ estuvieras d) descansar/ estar
42. Si no _____ el helado del congelador _____ muy duro cuando lo sirvas. a) sacarás/ está b) sacas/ estará c) sacarías/ está d) sacar/ estar
43. Si hubiera sabido que te gustaba, te _____ preparado una hamburguesa. a) había b) haya c) hubo d) te habría
44. Si no hubiéramos comprado tantos alimentos, no _____ comido tanto. a) hayamos b) hubimos c) han d) habríamos
45. Nos habló como si _____ sido el rey. a) había b) hubiera c) ha d) haber
46. Era tan inteligente como si _____ una estudiante de BYU. a) fuera b) es c) era d) había

Pluperfect subjunctive p. 280

47. Dudábamos que los policías _____ con el traficante de drogas. a) hablaban b) han hablado c) hubieran hablado d) hablaron
48. Deseaba que el guardia no le _____ gritado al criminal. a) había b) ha c) hubiera d) hubo
49. Marta no podía creer que le _____ mandado un regalo. a) habíamos b) hubimos c) hemos d) hubiéramos
50. El hombre se alegraba de que su esposa _____ podido visitarlo. a) había b) hubo c) hubiera d) ha
51. La profesora temía que los estudiantes no _____ estudiado para el examen. a) hubieran b) habían c) hubieron d) han
52. Yo dudaba que tú _____ llamado a su tío. a) hubieras b) habías c) hubisteis d) hubiste

Se with impersonal and passive constructions p. 290

53. *It is said that one should study to do well on tests.*
_____ que uno debe estudiar para salir bien en los estudios. a) Dice b) Se dice c) Decir d) Dicho
54. *One can rehabilitate alcoholics with therapy and discipline.*
_____ rehabilitar a los alcohólicos con terapia y disciplina. a) Se puede b) Se pueden c) Nos podemos d) Poder
- Spanish is spoken here.* a) Hablar español aquí b) Se habla español c) Habla español d) Dicho español.
55. *Many things are learned here.*

_____ muchas cosas aquí. a) Se aprende b) Se aprenden c) Nos aprendemos d) Aprende

56. *We are looking for good employees.*

a) Se buscan buenos empleados. b) Se busca buenos empleados c) Poder buscar buenos empleados. d) Se buscamos buenos empleados.

Indefinite and negative expressions p. 293

57. No he pertenecido _____ a una pandilla. a) alguna b) algún c) nunca d) nadie

58. No le hablo del problema a _____. a) ningún b) alguien c) nadie d) nada

59. No tengo ni trabajo _____ dinero. a) ni b) ni algún c) ni alguno d) nada

60. Ellos no te hablaron _____. a) jamás b) también c) algo d) siempre

61. Quiero charlar con _____. a) nadie b) ninguno c) alguien d) algún

62. Quiero hablar bien de _____. a) alguien b) nadie c) ningún d) nada

Unit 4

Indirect speech p. 312

1. Anita: — Siempre entrevisto a los candidatos por la tarde.

Joaquín: — Anita dijo que siempre _____ a los candidatos por la tarde. a) entrevista b) entrevistó c) entrevistaba d) entrevistaste

2. Jorge: — Voy al supermercado los viernes.

Ana: — Jorge dijo que _____ al supermercado los viernes. a) va b) fue c) iba d) fuiste

3. Marisela: — Jugué fútbol con mi hermana ayer.

Miguel: — Marisela dijo que _____ con su hermana ayer. a) iba a jugar b) había jugado c) jugaba d) jugara

4. Marcos: — Quise ir a la fiesta la semana pasada.

María: — Marcos dijo que _____ ir a la fiesta la semana pasada. a) iba a querer b) había querido c) quería d) quisiera

5. Guadalupe: — Iré a la casa de mi abuela.

Franco: — Guadalupe dijo que _____ a la casa de su abuela. a) fue b) hubiera ido c) iba d) iría

6. Martín: — Comeré un bocadillo mañana.

Margarita: — Martín dijo que _____ un bocadillo mañana. a) comió b) hubiera comido c) comería d) coma

7. Anita: — He tenido muchas entrevistas.

Marcos: — Anita dijo que _____ muchas entrevistas. a) ha tenido b) había tenido c) tuvo d) tuviera

8. José: — He trabajado muchos años para tu papá.

Carlos: — José dijo que _____ muchos años para tu papá. a) ha trabajado b) había trabajado c) trabajó d) trabajara

Relative pronouns *que, quien, and lo que* and relative adjective *cuyo/a(s)* pp. 324-325 and *el/la cual and los/las cuales* p. 328

9. El libro ____ te di está en la mesa. a) cual b) lo que c) que d) quien
10. La casa ____ les compré, está en la avenida Vásquez. a) cual b) lo que c) que d) quien
11. La señora con ____ hablé ayer, no viene. a) cual b) que c) quien d) lo que
12. Ese es el estudiante a ____ entrevistaste. a) que b) lo que c) quien d) el que
13. El cocinero, ____ compra mucha comida, vendrá esta noche. a) quien b) a quien c) cual d) cuya
14. Mi madre, ____ es mi mejor amiga, sabe como siento. a) quien b) a quien c) cual d) cuya
15. No me gustó ____ te dijeron. a) que b) quien c) lo que d) lo cual
16. Eso es ____ vamos a hacer. a) que b) quien c) lo cual d) lo que
17. Los hombres, ____ casas estamos comprando, no tienen mucho dinero. a) cuyos b) cuyas c) cuales d) quienes.
18. María, ____ padre está deprimido, no vendrá mañana. a) cuya b) cuyo c) cual d) quienes
19. No sabemos ____ es esa pelota. a) quien b) lo cual c) la cual d) de quién
20. No nos dimos cuenta ____ son esas escrituras. a) quien b) los cuales c) de quién d) las cuales.
21. Le expliqué el procedimiento a la cajera del banco, ____ es sumamente competente. a) lo cual b) la cual c) de quien d) cuya
22. Acabo de encontrar el pago de la clienta, ____ se había perdido. a) el cual b) los cuales c) de quien d) cuyo

Sequence of tenses with the subjunctive p. 334-335

23. Hijo, queremos que lo ____ bien en tu viaje de esquí. a) pasas b) pasaras c) hubieras pasado d) pases
24. Hermana, sugiero que lo ____ otra vez. a) haces b) hicieras c) hubieras hecho d) hagas
25. Le he dicho que ____ paracaidismo. a) aprende b) aprendas c) haya aprendido d) aprenda
26. Te han dicho que tú ____ a la conferencia. a) vayas b) hubieras ido c) vaya d) ir
27. Preferirán que ____ las vacaciones explorando Macchu Pichu. a) pasamos b) pasemos c) hubiéramos pasado d) pasado
28. Aconsejará que ____ más. a) estudiemos b) estudiamos c) hubiéramos estudiado d) estudiaremos.
29. Dícales que ellos ____ más la natación. a) practican b) practiquéis c) practiquen d) practicando
30. Diles a ellos que no me _____. a) molestan b) molesten c) molestéis d) hayan molestado.
31. Es bueno que tú ____ a patinar. a) aprendes b) hayas aprendido c) ha aprendido d) aprender
32. Es malo que _____. a) hayan mentido b) hayan mentiendo c) mientan d) mentieron.
33. Dudé que él ____ jugando al baloncesto. a) fuera b) estuviera c) está d) estaba
34. Temieron que nosotros _____. a) venimos b) viniéramos c) hemos venido d) venir.
35. No había nadie que ____ patinar como ella. a) pudo b) podía c) pudiera d) puede
36. Ella no quería que ____ de casa. a) salía b) salió c) saliera d) sale

37. Nos gustaría que tú nos _____. a) acompaña b) acompañas c) acompañaras d) está acompañado.
38. Querría que el chico _____ más verduras. a) comiera b) coma c) comes d) está comiendo
39. Nos habría molestado si José no _____ a acampar con nosotros. a) vino b) vendría c) hubiera venido d) vendrá
40. Habría dudado si ella no te _____. a) hubiera llamado b) llamaste c) llamaba d) ha llamado.

Uses of definite and indefinite articles p. 356

41. Voy a terminar este videojuego para _____ lunes. a) el b) X c) los d) la
42. La tarea es para _____ viernes. a) el b) X c) la d) las
43. En _____ primavera tendré más tiempo para practicar el ajedrez. a) las b) la c) X d) nada
44. En _____ verano iremos a la playa. a) los b) el c) X d) un
45. _____ español es mi idioma favorito. a) X b) El c) Un d) La
46. Los estudiantes aprenden _____ español. a) el b) X c) la d) un
47. A ella le gusta hablar _____ chino. a) el b) X c) un d) la
48. _____ profesora Guzmán juega al golf. a) La b) X c) Un d) Una
49. _____ señora Vásquez no viene hoy. a) La b) X c) El d) Un
50. Le cae bien _____ don Gabriel. a) el b) X c) una d) un
51. Cuando _____ doña Luz viene, iremos. a) la b) X c) una d) el
52. Yo soy _____ católica. a) una b) X c) un d) una
53. Dicen que él es _____ doctor. a) un b) X c) un d) una
54. Hay _____ otro hombre aquí. a) un b) X c) uno d) lo
55. Ella es _____ otra buena mujer. a) una b) X c) un d) el
56. Hay _____ cierto juego de cartas que me gusta. a) un b) X c) uno d) una
57. _____ cierta mujer vino a verte. a) X b) Una c) Un d) Uno

Uses of the infinitives and the *-ing* (*-ndo*) form of the verb p. 360

58. _____ con fuego es peligroso. a) Jugando b) Jugar c) Juega d) Jugado
59. _____ la televisión es aburrido. a) Mirando b) Mirar c) Miro d) Mirado
60. *No smoking* a) No fumando b) No fumar c) No fumado d) No fuma
61. *No stopping* a) No parando b) No parar c) No parado d) No para
62. *We did the tour on foot.*
Hicimos la gira _____ a) caminando b) en pie c) caminar d) caminado
63. *She smiled as she threw the dice.*
Tiraba los dados _____. a) sonreír b) sonriendo c) sonrío d) mientras sonriendo
64. *It was an entertaining contest.*
Fue un certamen _____ a) entreteniendo b) entretenido c) entretener d) entretenía
65. *Bingo is a thrilling game of chance.*
El bingo es un juego de azar _____. a) emocionado b) emocionante c) emocionando d) está emocionando.

Se for unplanned events p. 377

66. *You dropped your microscope.*
_____ el microscopio. a) Se tu cayó b) Cayó tu c) Se te cayó d) Tuyo cayó
67. *It occurred to the researcher to grow stem cells in a new medium.*
A la investigadora _____ cultivar células madre en un medio nuevo. a) ocurrió b) le ocurrió c) se le ocurrió d) la ocurrió
68. *The ultrasound machines broke down on the technicians.*
A los técnicos _____ las máquinas eco cardiográfica. a) descompusieron b) les descompusieron c) se les descompusieron d) los descompusieron
69. *My dogs died on me.*
_____ los perros. a) Murieron en mí b) Murieron c) Se me murieron d) Les murieron
70. *My wallet got lost on me. (I lost my keys)*
_____ la billetera. a) Se perdió b) Se le perdió c) Le perdió d) Se me perdió
71. *The keys got lost on me (I lost my keys).*
_____ las llaves. a) Se me perdieron b) Se las perdí c) Perdí d) Me perdieron

Passive voice p. 386

72. La tecnología fue _____ el científico. a) explicada por b) explicado por c) explicando por d) explicada .
73. El libro fue _____ Juliana Graves. a) escrito por b) escrita por c) escribiendo por d) escribiendo para.
74. Las reglas fueron _____ la directora. a) dados por b) dada por c) dadas por d) dado
75. Los coches fueron _____ el mecánico. a) reparados por b) reparado por c) repararon por d) reparadas por.
76. *The steps to protect the earth were explained.*
_____ los pasos para proteger la Tierra. a) Fueron explicadas b) Se explicaron c) Se explicó d) Explicaran
77. *The crater was opened as a tourist attraction.*
El cráter _____ como atracción turística. a) se abrió b) fue abierta c) se abrieron d) abrió
78. La ventana _____. a) estaba cerrado b) estaba cerrada c) fue cerrado d) fue cerrada
79. El observatorio _____. a) está cerrado b) está cerrada c) fue cerrado d) fue cerrada

Diminutives and augmentatives p. 389

80. *The little house*
La cas _____ a) ota b) ita c) illo d) ito
81. *The little old man.*
El hombr _____ a) ito b) ocito c) ecito d) ita
82. *The big book.*
El libr _____. a) ito b) ocito c) ote d) sote
83. *What a big house.*
¡Qué cas _____ ! a) ita b) acita c) illa d) ota

REFERENCES

- Alderson, J. C., & Huhta, A. (2005). The development of a suite of computer-based diagnostic tests based on the Common European Framework. *Language Testing*, 22, 301–320.
- Bachman, Lyle. (2000). Modern language testing at the turn of the century: assuring that what we count counts. *Language Testing*, 17(1) 1-43. Doi:10.1177/026553220001700101
- Brown, James. (1997). Computers in language testing: Present research and some future directions. *Language Learning & Technology* (1)1, pp. 44-59.
- Chapelle, C.A., & Chung, Y., & Hegelheimer, V., & Pendar, N., & Xu, J. (2010). Towards a computer-delivered test of productive grammatical ability. *Language Testing*, 27(4), 443-469. doi: 10.1177/0265532210367633
- Chalhoub-Deville, M. (2001). Language testing and technology: Past and future *Language Learning & Technology* 5(2), pp. 95-98. Retrieved December 03, 2012, from <http://llt.msu.edu/vol5num2/deville/default.html> 12/03/2012
- Freeman, Y., & Freeman, D. (1998). *ESL/EFL teaching principles for success*. Portsmouth, N.H.: Heineman.
- Genesee, F., & Upshur, J. (1996). *Classroom-based evaluation in second language education*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hughes, Arthur. (2003). *Testing for language teachers*. Cambridge U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Larson, J., & Hendricks, H. (2009). A context based online diagnostic test of Spanish. *CALICO Journal*, 26(2), p-p 309-323.
- Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (1999). *How languages are learned*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.
- Ory, J., & Ryan, K. (1993). *Tips for improving testing and grading*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. (2005). *Second language research methodology and design*. Mahwah, N.J.: Routledge.
- Roever, C. (2001). Web-based language testing. *Language Learning & Technology*. Retrieved December 06, 2012, from <http://llt.msu.edu/vol5num2/roever/default.htm>
- Zayas-Bazán, E. & Bacon, S. & García, M. (2010). *Conexiones Comunicación y cultura*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.