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Abstract: This article reports on the implementation of diagnostic assessment in an advanced Spanish language program at the university level. Particular attention is given to the use of dynamic assessment practices as a way to assess language abilities, intervene in learning, and document learners’ growth. Dynamic assessment is conceptually based on sociocultural theory, specifically on Vygotsky’s notion of Zone of Proximal Development (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006; Minick, 1987). Assessment procedures conducted with third-year Spanish language majors are described with the purpose of illustrating the potential of dynamic assessment for second language learning contexts. Students took a five-part diagnostic test. Two parts of the test, the writing and speaking sections, were conducted following dynamic assessment procedures. A qualitative analysis of the results shows that dynamic assessment allows for a deeper and richer description of learners’ actual and emergent abilities, which enables programs to devise individualized instructional plans attuned to learners’ needs.
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Introduction

University second and foreign language programs have been increasingly concerned with the assessment of their language majors. While language proficiency assessment of first- and second-year university students has been the focus of many studies over some decades now, studies on the language abilities of advanced language learners have been limited.

This article reports on the implementation of diagnostic assessment to beginning Spanish language majors (third-year). The specific focus here is on the use of dynamic assessment (DA) practices as a way to measure language abilities, intervene in learning, and document learners’ growth. DA has been used as an alternative means of assessment in educational settings for several decades. Its conceptual basis is rooted in sociocultural theory, specifically in Vygotsky’s notion of Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). A fundamental difference with nondynamic types of assessment is the active role taken by the examiner during the testing situation. Discussions and applications of DA to second/foreign language contexts are yet scarce, but promising (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006; Poehner, 2007).
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This study frames the use of DA procedures into the larger context of language program evaluation through learners’ outcomes. First, the study presents previous models of assessment of language majors. Then the principles and procedures of DA are discussed, followed by a review of studies that have applied DA to second language (L2) contexts. Finally, the study describes and proposes a comprehensive plan for assessment in an advanced Spanish language program as a model to diagnose language ability. The introduction of dynamic procedures during the writing and speaking sections of the assessment receives special attention. In particular, the analysis shows that DA allows for a deeper and richer assessment of learners’ actual and emergent abilities, which enables programs to devise individualized instructional plans in accordance with learners’ needs.

**Assessment of L2 Majors, Why and How?**

There have been several reports on the assessment of the language proficiency of undergraduates, mostly concerning beginning- and intermediate-level learners completing general university language requirements (Chalhoub-Deville, 1999; Freed, 1984; Teschner, 1991). Studies of assessment of L2 majors within university programs have been rare. Liskin-Gasparro (1995) reported on plans for assessment of language majors at two institutions, as follows. A plan designed by the University of Iowa (the Iowa Model) proposed to conduct an oral proficiency test, to carry out a writing assessment based on two compositions, to hold exit interviews with graduating seniors, and to collect information by means of questionnaires to majors and alumni. The Bates Model proposed to conduct an oral exam and a written comprehensive exam, and to collect a portfolio from graduating majors. The portfolio would include a list of courses and syllabi, a personal statement, a journal created during a course or study abroad experience, a minimum of three course papers, and a video/audiotape illustrating oral skills at different points through the program. More recently, Mathews and Hansen (2004) described program assessment procedures used by a university language department. Their assessment, guided by the ACTFL proficiency guidelines and the National Standards, consisted of an oral proficiency test and a portfolio of the student’s written work.

In an ACTFL report on foreign language instructors’ preparation and the implementation of the 1996 National Standards for Foreign Language Learning, Glisan and Phillips (1996) called for university language departments to take responsibility for the development and assessment of a student’s oral proficiency in the target language. They urged departments to establish an exit oral proficiency exam, to align the curriculum with language and content goals, and to assess students’ proficiency at various points in the program so that students are aware of their progress and so that departments can assist students in strengthening their proficiency. Along those same lines, a number of recent publications have reported on program evaluation based on learners’ outcomes (Byrnes, 2002; Mathews & Hansen, 2004; McAlpine & Dhonau, 2007; Pearson, Fonseca-Greber, & Foell, 2006) and the achievement of advanced levels of language competence (Byrnes, 2006a, 2006b; Byrnes, Weger-Guntharp, & Sprang, 2006; Byrnes & Maxim, 2003). The assessment reported in this study represents an attempt to respond to this professional call. In articulating program goals and learning outcomes, our program sought to be consistent with nationally established standards for foreign language learning and foreign language instructor education standards as well as with campus-wide mission and principles for undergraduate learning. The article briefly describes curricular changes in the advanced Spanish language program carried out over the last years as well as efforts to move away from assessment based on individual course performance.

The Spanish faculty in our program approach assessment as a positive force...
within the advanced Spanish language program, leading to fruitful discussions among faculty on curricular and programmatic issues. Our approach to assessment seeks to engage program faculty in a collaborative assessment of majors and to create a symbiotic relationship between teaching and assessment as learners’ progress is assessed through the program in combination with multiple opportunities for learning. As a result of discussions on undergraduate learning among faculty over the last few years, undergraduate Spanish majors are assessed at entry and exit points of the program. Gathering data from students as they enter the program enables “programs and institutions to chart how well students learn and develop over time” (Maki, 2002, p. 10). A language diagnostic test, the entry exam for the major, given to students as they start their third-year course sequence, consists of the following:\(^2\)

- grammar/vocabulary test (traditional, nondynamic\(^3\))
- listening comprehension test (traditional, nondynamic)
- reading comprehension test (traditional, nondynamic)
- writing sample (dynamic)
- oral interview (dynamic)

The faculty collectively assesses the speaking ability of beginning majors, as evidenced in the recorded interview and the writing sample. Those students whom the faculty identifies as not reaching a level roughly equivalent to Intermediate Low proficiency level (as defined by ACTFL in Breiner-Sanders et al., 2000) or Certificado Inicial (as defined by Diplomas de Español como Lengua Extranjera [DELE]; Instituto Cervantes, 2002) are recommended to take the appropriate course of action: attending free tutoring sessions and conversation hours, participating in study abroad programs, etc.). Advisors are responsible for ensuring that their advisees follow up with recommendations. In their Capstone Experience, which is the exit course for the major, students create a portfolio showcasing their work in the major and develop an independent research project in a content area of their interest (literature, culture, or linguistics). The Capstone course includes the exit exam for the major.\(^4\) Both the portfolio and the original research are presented orally by the student and evaluated for discipline content knowledge and language ability by a faculty committee.\(^5\) The portfolio includes a reflective essay in which students self-assess their work. This practice engages students in the process by turning them into “agents” instead of subjects of the assessment process (Huot & Schendel, 2002).

The focus of this article is on the adaptation of DA procedures to the writing and speaking component of the entry test. DA has proven to be a powerful diagnostic tool with great potential for benefiting L2 learners and language programs.

**What Is DA?**

DA\(^6\) has developed as an alternative to “static” types of assessment, namely, standardized tests. It is not intended as a replacement for other types of testing but as a complement to them. First developed by Feuerstein in the early 1950s to estimate the learning potential of low-performing children (Feuerstein, Rand, & Hoffman, 1979), it has since been mainly applied to assessment of cognitive development potential by psychologists (Campione & Brown, 1987; Lidz, 1981, 1987, 1991; Lidz & Elliott, 2000).

DA practices are rooted in Vygotsky’s theory of cognitive development and his notion of ZPD (Minick, 1987; Vygotsky, 1978). Vygotsky’s proposals for the use of ZPD in assessment were based on his conception of ZPD as the place where learning occurs. In relating assessment and the ZPD, Vygotsky (Minick, 1987) called for a change from symptomatic assessment focusing on characteristic behavior of a particular stage in development to diagnostic assessment focusing on understanding behaviors and developing recommendations to foster development. Vygotsky hypothesized that
intervention would benefit learners with a broad ZPD—that is, with a high degree of readiness. The fundamental link between the notion of ZPD and DA procedures derived from it is given by the idea that assessment that is entirely based on what the child is able to do without help ignores important differences in mental functioning that come to light when the child’s interaction with an expert is analyzed (Minick, 1987, p. 120). For Vygotsky, the application of ZPD to assessment was a way to provide a more complete picture of the learner's actual stage of development and of the proximal phase. Central to the assessment is the analysis of the learner’s performance in social interaction with the assessor. Vygotsky was mostly concerned with qualitative assessment of psychological processes and the dynamics of their development. Minick (1987) pointed out that, with the exception of Feuerstein, applications of the ZPD to DA have had a tendency to produce quantitative measures of learning potential.7

Lidz defined DA as “an interaction between an examiner-as-intervener and a learner-as-active participant, which seeks to estimate the degree of modifiability of the learner and the means by which positive changes in cognitive functioning can be induced and maintained” (1987, p. 4). The goal of DA is to measure, intervene, and modify behaviors and to document the process of learning. Activity on the part of examiner and learner, and modifiability of behavior, are crucial in DA (Lidz, 1987, 1991). Thus, DA is above all social, interactive, and qualitative (Lidz & Elliott, 2000).

Recent DA procedures usually follow a test-intervene-retest format:

First stage: Test in order to establish the level of independent performance.
Second stage: Intervention in order to produce changes.
Third stage: Retest to assess the degree and nature of change.

A major focus of the proponents of DA is the ability to identify those students who are likely to experience difficulties and to provide rich descriptions of the abilities of these students so that remedial programs may be developed (Campione & Brown, 1987).

DA techniques provide learners with a “mediated learning experience” (Lidz, 1991, p. 14) in which, through social interaction, experiences are filtered, focused, and interpreted as needed by the learner. In mediated learning experiences the examiner may guide learners in highlighting important content, making connections, setting goals, planning, regulating and controlling behavior, etc. In sum, the examiner provides the learner with a scaffold (Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976) that may allow the learner to improve subsequent unassisted performance. A key element of successful mediation is “contingent responsivity” (Lidz, 1991, p. 85); that is, the ability of the mediator to respond to the learner’s behavior timely and appropriately. DA studies show that verbalization and elaborated feedback are two of the most powerful elements of mediated learning experiences.

There are two main outcomes of the use of DA procedures. On one hand, the picture that emerges of the ability of a particular learner is quite rich. DA seems to improve our understanding of what a learner is able to do in a particular learning/testing situation. Contrary to traditional, static, assessment, DA puts more emphasis on the process rather than on the product. On the other hand, from the DA experience one can derive “suggestions for intervention that appear successful in facilitating improved learner performance” (Lidz, 1991, p. 6). DA studies also indicate that mediation is associated with improvement in performance, particularly in learners experiencing difficulties.

There are some reasons why DA procedures have not been widely adopted in educational settings despite the appeal of providing such rich information on individual learners. One important reason is that DA procedures are ideally administered individually, which makes this type of as-
essment time-consuming. Elliott pointed out that, because of its qualitative nature, DA does not fit easily with Western conceptions of professional thought and behavior (2000, p. 715). Critics have mentioned that, although dynamic testing has suggested promising results, it has yet to demonstrate its advantages over traditional testing following professional criteria (Grigorenko & Sternberg, 1998; Sternberg & Grigorenko, 2002).

DA has only recently been applied to L2 learning situations. The following section provides an overview of studies that have been carried out from this perspective.

**DA in L2 Contexts**

Interaction has been identified as a powerful tool for L2 assessment (Chalhoub-Deville, 2003; McNamara, 1997; Shohamy, 1992; Swain, 2001). Swain (2001), for instance, maintained that examination of the content of students’ dialogues can provide testers with valuable information on the students’ ability. DA has been given increasing attention in the field of L2 learning in the last several years (see Lantolf & Poehner, 2004; Lantolf & Thorne, 2006; Poehner & Lantolf, 2005). Some of the features of DA have been recommended as part of L2 evaluation procedures in studies with a Vygotskian base. For instance, at a practical level, Machado de Almeida Mattos (2000) proposed the use of scaffolded collaborative interactions among learners as a preparation phase for oral tests. In what follows, I consider the few studies that have focused on DA in L2 contexts.

Schneider and Ganschow (2000) encouraged instructors to familiarize students with these strategies through dialogue, guiding students through self-discovery with assisting questions and other verbal and non-verbal hints.

Kozulin and Garb (2001) reported on a small-scale study of text comprehension by at-risk EFL adult students in Israel. They assessed the students’ ability to learn and use reading comprehension strategies (which are the focus of the curriculum) following the test-teach-retest format. First, students were given a static test. Then the test was reviewed by instructor and students together, focusing on the strategies called forth by each item, process models, and transfer of strategies from one task to the next. A posttest served to assess whether students had benefited from the mediation. The results indicated that many students’ scores improved in the posttest, but not all. Kozulin and Garb devised a formula to operationalize student learning potential that differentiated between high and low learning potential students. They noted that some students with high and low learning potential obtained the same scores in the pre-test, showing that DA adds important information that remains hidden in static testing. It seems then that DA procedures are applicable and effective not only in the assessment of cognitive performance, but in other areas as well, such as the EFL context.

However, Kozulin and Garb noted some important limitations to their study. The first limitation concerns issues of reliability of learning potential assessment. They noticed that the results may not be generalizable to other situations because the mediation is dependent upon the context and quality of the interaction between mediator and student, which may vary with each intervention. The second limitation is the impossibility to control for content knowledge. Students with higher content knowledge would score better regardless of the effect of the intervention and strategies used. However, the results of the study have a high instructional value in the
identification of students in more need of individual instruction and the development of action plans according to individual students’ needs.

Poehner and Lantolf (2005) and Poehner (2007) have discussed the theoretical basis and methods of DA. Their specific classroom examples of DA make a convincing case for its pedagogical implications and its potential for contributing to our understanding of L2 development. Poehner (2007) illustrated “transcendence” in mediated learning experiences with advanced learners of French. Transcendence is defined as a method developed by DA practitioners in which there is collaboration with the learners on tasks with increasing complexity. Fourth-year university learners of French as L2 met outside class with a mediator for six weekly sessions in order to improve their speaking ability in French. They were asked to narrate in French a story they had watched on video. Mediating sessions focused on past verb forms and aspect. At the end of the program, the learners received the initial assessment, followed by two transcendence assessments consisting of a narration of a video clip of more difficulty than the previous one and a narration of a written text. Mediation during transcendence sessions, which was tailored to the individual needs of students, demonstrated differences between learners that were not apparent in assessment sessions, thus providing a richer picture of the level of development attained by the learners in the study. The analysis of interaction during mediating sessions highlighted that one of the learners had internalized her conceptual understanding of tense/aspect, through previous interactions, to a degree that allowed her to function almost independently in the transcendence session. Transcendence occurred not only in the performance of different tasks but also from one linguistic feature to another. In this particular case, one of the learners was able to transfer internalization of tense/aspect differences between passé composé and imparfait to the past perfect.

The present study can be classified as interactionist (Lantolf & Poehner, 2004), more in line with Feuerstein’s model of DA (Feuerstein et al., 1979) than with interventionist models. Results from DA may serve a multitude of purposes, from diagnosing difficulties learners are having and documenting learners’ progress, to evaluating teachers, schools, or programs (Lidz, 1991, p. 61). For this reason, DA emerged as an attractive means of assessment for our students and program. The assessment procedures described here go beyond measuring pre-established learning outcomes of language majors. They seek to act as a way to intervene in reaching those outcomes. Trial interventions are used during assessment by providing learners with contingent and gradual help (Aljaafreh & Lantolf, 1994). If an examiner determines that a learner is experiencing difficulty in reaching a desired outcome unaided, the examiner will estimate and provide the amount of help that the learner might need in order to reach that outcome (for example, by allowing the use of tools such as dictionaries or by providing feedback). It is our hope that DA will enable us to evaluate not only the knowledge and skills of our students more accurately, but also the degree of success of our program in enabling our students to reach expected learning outcomes.

Dynamic Assessment of Spanish Language Majors

Results of our attempt to assess the language ability of incoming Spanish majors are reported in this section. Because the entry exam was optional when data for this study were being gathered, only five students completed the entry exam at the time. Background information was gathered by means of a student profile questionnaire (see Appendix 1). Tests were given in the areas of grammar and vocabulary, listening comprehension, reading comprehension, writing, and speaking. Scores for each student are presented in Table 1.

Most students reached or surpassed the minimum required scores. For control purposes, a recent graduate was asked to complete the test as well. The assessment of
productive skills (writing and speaking) was dynamic in the sense that the test was immediately followed by mediated learning experiences geared toward gaining insights into the potential language development of these learners. We wanted to know if providing some mediating devices would result in higher performance in the tasks at hand. So we did not strictly follow the test-intervene-retest format, but we added an intervention and further opportunity to show what the learners are able to do or may be close to being able to do with the language. The protocol for the intervention was not rigidly pre-established in order to give the assessor flexibility to move the interaction as he or she saw fit in each particular case.

**Dynamic Assessment of Writing**

The writing test consisted of a prompt asking students to write about their past and present experiences with the language and their plans after graduating with a degree in Spanish. Students had 20 minutes to write without use of dictionaries, etc. Then, following Aljaafreh & Lantolf (1994), in the presence of the examiner students were asked to read their compositions to themselves and make any revisions needed. In a second phase of revisions, students received a dictionary and a reference grammar manual. They were then invited to consult these resources and make revisions if they wished. Finally, the examiner invited students to ask questions that they might have about the composition and make changes once again if they wished. Following are some examples of revisions that students undertook.

1. Trabajo en un restaurante y hay muchos hispanohablantes, creo más * que 60. [I work at a restaurant and there are many Spanish speakers, I believe more than 60.]

Revision: Trabajo en un restaurante *donde* [where] hay muchos hispanohablantes, creo más *que* 60.

Type of revision: Independent revision

---

### TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Listening</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>60% (30/50)</td>
<td>93% (14/15)</td>
<td>87% (13/15)</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>U: S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>74% (37/50)</td>
<td>80% (12/15)</td>
<td>87% (13/15)</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>U: S &amp; W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>92% (46/50)</td>
<td>93% (14/15)</td>
<td>97% (14.5/15)</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>Satisf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>94% (47/50)</td>
<td>80% (12/15)</td>
<td>93% (14/15)</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>87.5%</td>
<td>Satisf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>78% (39/50)</td>
<td>100% (15/15)</td>
<td>87% (13/15)</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>83.3%</td>
<td>Satisf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>98% (49/50)</td>
<td>100% (15/15)</td>
<td>100% (15/15)</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: W = Writing; S = Speaking; Satisf. = Satisfactory; U = Unsatisfactory.*
2. Realmente no tengo planes futuros *por después de graduarme. [I really don’t have future plans for after I graduate.]
Revision: Realmente no tengo planes futuros una vez que me gradúe [once I graduate].
Type of revision: Reference consultation

3. Saber hablar español es una aptitud muy importante *en esta edad. [Knowing how to speak Spanish is an important aptitude in this age.]
Revision 1: Saber hablar español es una aptitud muy importante hoy [today].
Type of revision: Reference consultation
Revision 2: Saber hablar español es una aptitud muy importante hoy en día [nowadays].
Type of revision: Examiner consultation

The number and type of revisions made in compositions are presented in Table 2.

Revisions dealt mostly with word choice, verb morphology, spelling, accents, and punctuation. Most revisions yielded improvements to the compositions. It is interesting to note that students seemed to have benefited equally from revising their compositions by themselves as from consulting language sources (dictionaries and grammar manuals). Students overall chose not to ask questions from the examiner. In the few cases that they did (three), the questions had to do with choice of words or idiomatic expressions. Perhaps, after two rounds of revisions, students felt pretty comfortable with the revisions they had previously made, or perhaps some modification to the procedure would have yielded more mediation opportunities. For instance, students may have been asked to read their texts aloud to the examiner and stop whenever they had a question. There was great variation in the number of revisions that students performed, as presented in Table 3.

If one considers these numbers in light of the evaluative scores obtained in students’ compositions (see Table 1), it is clear that fewer revisions were made by the students with the highest and the lowest score. One may interpret that the student with the highest score (S4) had very few revisions to make as the composition was of good quality, while the student with the lower score (S2) may have required more mediation than was provided during the procedure in order to make

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Revision</th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Reference Consultation</th>
<th>Examiner Consultation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>N = 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N = 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N = 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 26           N = 24     N = 3       N = 53

Note: The term positive refers to a revision in the composition that yielded an improvement either in grammatical correctness, register, or lexical appropriateness and sophistication. An equal revision does not produce a change in the composition in terms of grammatical or lexical appropriateness, or in terms of error correction. For example, the learner may substitute an inappropriate word for another inappropriate word. A negative revision occurs when an appropriate form is substituted by an inappropriate lexical term or grammatical form.
improvements to the composition. In any case, the intervention phase would call attention to S2 as a student in need of extra help.

Dynamic Assessment of Speaking

To test the speaking ability of incoming majors, students were requested to hold a 10- to 15-minute oral interview with the examiner. The test was divided into four sections (see Appendix 2).

In the first section (2 minutes), the examiner asked some personalized questions about the student’s interest and experience with the target language, travel experience, etc.

In the second section, the student was given a picture story and asked to narrate the story in the past, beginning with “Yesterday. . . .” The picture narration task was done in three phases. In the first phase, the student narrated the story without any help. During the second phase, if necessary, the examiner provided some guidance in the form of hints, direct instructions, or appropriate vocabulary that might improve the student’s performance of the task in a retry. Finally, if a third phase was needed, the examiner would narrate the story and ask the student to narrate it again. The first phase seeks to discover what learners are able to do unaided (actual level of language development). The second phase is designed to provide the learner with scaffolding that may serve to focus attention on aspects of the task that may be improved. The third phase is intended for learners that may not benefit from the mediation provided in the second phase. It is based on the role of imitation in learning (Lantolf & Thorne, 2006) and the assumption that one can only imitate what is in the process of being acquired—that is, what is within one’s ZPD (Minick, 1987).

In the third section, students were asked to take the role of one of the characters in the story and say something appropriate to the situation.

Finally, in the fourth section students were given a choice of two topics and had to develop a three-minute monologue on one of the topics. The topics were accompanied by some guiding questions that required some level of abstraction. If a student seemed unable to sustain a three-minute monologue on the topic, the examiner would guide the student with some further questions.

Oral interviews were videotaped and scored using rubrics that included the following areas: pronunciation, fluency, grammar, vocabulary, content, and comprehensibility. The interviews were also evaluated considering descriptors of the ACTFL proficiency guidelines. Results were reported in two ways. A score was given based on what the student was able to do with the help provided. In addition to a numerical score, a qualitative report was also provided. With Aljaafreh and Lantolf, we believe that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Equal</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3

Number of Revisions per Student
a learner who is able to produce a particular structure as a consequence of more strategic (i.e., implicit) forms of regulation (e.g., the collaborative frame) is developmentally more advanced than one who needs direct and explicit feedback for the same property. This means that linguistic forms alone do not provide us with a full picture of a learner’s developmental level. It is essential to know the degree to which other-regulation, or mediation, impacts on the learner’s production of the particular form. (1994, p. 480)

In order to illustrate the intervention phase of dynamic assessment, two sample protocols of the procedure for section 2 of the oral interview with the student (S) and Examiner (E) are presented below:

**Protocol 1: Narration Task -S3-**

1. S- Bueno, los, los Ruiz llegaron al aeropuerto de Barajas y entonces se fueron al Hotel Gijón para encontrar su dormitorio y después te-tenían mucha hambre entonces se fueron al restaurante. Ah, después de comer se fueron al Prado probablemente para ver la sala de Velázquez, para ver las pinturas y después de ver *estes pinturas...* ellos se fueron a otro lado del Prado y joh, no! Ellos se fueron a probablemente Toledo porque *vean la casa de El Greco y después probable tomaban el tren a Segovia y en Segovia hacen, hacían...fotos las *fotas de, yo no sé la palabra pero se...el acueducto y entonces van a Pamplona para el siete de julio y corren con los bu...corren con los toros, que es muy peligroso, y ellos probablemente alquilan un coche para ir a Barcelona, que es, y allá probablemente ellos van a, ellos van a...lav- bañarse y tomarse el sol y entonces ellos van a , se van a Lladró, yo no sé para qué pero algo y.. entonces la familia van a Granada para ver la Alhambra, que es *una palacio, que es un palacio moro y después el esposo baila probablemente las sevillanas o, quién sabe, otro baile en Españ...

2. E- Está familiarizado entonces con todos esos...

[You are familiar with all those...]

3. S- sí, sí

4. E- Lugares...Este, ¿Puedes imaginar qué le está diciendo el señor Ruiz a la señora Ruiz en el momento en que llegan a Barajas? ¿Puedes tomar el papel del Señor Ruiz?

[Places...Can you imagine what Mr. Ruiz is telling Mrs. Ruiz at the moment they arrive at Barajas? Can you take Mr. Ruiz’s role?]

5. S- Sí, sí

6. E- y decir qué diría

(and say what he would say)

7. S- Por fin estamos en España, ¡qué bien! Debemos ir a nuestro ah hotel para encontrar nuestro cuarto.

[We are finally in Spain, great! We should go to our hotel to find our room.]
8. E- Empezaste la historieta en el pasado y luego a mitad de camino te pasaste.

[You started the story in the past and then, halfway you switched.]

9. S- sí sí
10. E- al presente.
[to the present]

11. S- sí, sí, yo oí
[yes, yes, I heard]

12. E- ¿Quieres intentarlo otra vez usando el pasado? Y me puedes preguntar. Si hay un verbo que no recuerdas, está bien.

[Do you want to try again using the past? And you can ask me. If there is a verb that you do not remember it's OK.]

13. S- sí, sí, entonces, ¿desde el principio?
[yes, yes, from the beginning?]

14. E- quizás desde el medio
[perhaps from the middle]

15. S- con el pasado, sí, sí
[in the past, yes, yes]

16. E- ¿Tú te diste cuenta que hiciste el cambio?
[Did you realize that you made the switch?]

17. S- Sí, sí, yo oí. Bueno, ellos estaban en Toledo, ellos estaban mirando la casa del Greco, y probablemente compraban...muchos...muchos espadas

[Yes, yes, I heard. Well, they were in Toledo, they were looking at the Greco’s house, and they were probably buying many...many swords.]

18. E- espadas

19. S- Espadas en en Segovia también, en en Toledo. Y después ellos...tomaron el tren a Segovia y en Segovia tomaron las fotos del acueducto y después se fueron a Pamplona para correr con los toros y ah el el esposo casi murió y entonces alquilaron un coche para para conducir a Barcelona, que *es seiscientos kilo- kilómetros desde, de Pamplona, entonces, ellos van a Porcelana Lladró, yo no conozco este lugar.

[Swords in in Segovia too, in in Toledo. And then they...took the train to Segovia and in Segovia they took pictures of the aqueduct and then they left for Pamplona to run with the bulls and ah the the husband almost died and then they rented a car to to drive to Barcelona, which is 600 kilometers from, from Pamplona, then they go to Porcelana Lladró, I do not know this place.]

20. E- Es un tipo de cerámica que es famosa, entonces, mira, tienen regalos

[It is a type of ceramic that is famous, then, look, they have presents.]

21. S- oh, entiendo, OK sí, ellos compraron algunos regalos, que están allá, que son muy famosos y después se fueron a la Alhambra para ver los arquite-, arquitecto moro, y...leones, pienso que, qué son, yo no sé.

[oh, yes, I understand, OK, yes, they bought some presents, that are there, that are very famous and then they left for la Alhambra to see the architect, the Moorish architect and... lions, I think that, what are they? I don’t know.]

22. E- sí, hay una sala en el en el Palacio de la Alhambra que se llama el Patio de los Leones

[yes, there is a room in the Alhambra Palace that is called Patio de los Leones]

23. S- leones sí

24. E- porque tiene una fuente y la fuente está apoyada en figuras, en estatuas de leones

[because there is a fountain and the fountain is held by figures, statues of lions]

25. S- Sí, y después de esto ellos van a, ellos fueron a un café para bailar y es probable que *es un baile que es gitano, es gitano.
[Yes, and after this, they go to, they went to a café to dance and it is possible that it is a gypsy dance, gypsy.]

26. E- baile flamenco
27. S- baile flamenco y el esposo bailaba, pero la mujer no bailaba, tal vez ella bailaba después, pero ahora no.

[Flamenco dance and the husband was dancing but the wife was not dancing, perhaps she was dancing later but not now.]

There are not many errors (*) in S3's speech. He shows good command of preterite past forms, and there is some evidence of aspect control (tenían hambre -turn 1-). In the middle of the narration (turn 1), S3 switches from past to present forms, a phenomenon that has been observed among both native and nonnative speakers in similar tasks (Liskin-Gasparro, 2000; Salaberry, 1999). The assessor pointed out the switch (8) and invited S3 to repeat the narration using past forms. This would provide S3 with another chance to demonstrate control of past tense and aspect, which he did. In fact, the learner was aware of the switch even before it was pointed out by the assessor in turn 11. S3 was also able to add some more details and to demonstrate a wider range of lexical terms, such as espadas (17). The degree of help required by this student to demonstrate his potential was considerably low. The assessor responded to the learner by providing the minimal amount of help needed to perform the task in a satisfactory manner.

Following DA procedures (Lidz, 1991, p. 158) the numerical score is accompanied by a qualitative assessment report that includes the examiner's observations during the oral interview and assessment of the student's strengths and weaknesses as well as specific recommendations for improvement.

Sample Speaking Assessment Report

Name: S3

Background Information:

S3 is a beginning major. He has successfully completed one of the gateway courses to the major (writing). While in High School, he participated in a seven-week study abroad program in Spain. He has some outside experience with Spanish since he is involved in church activities with native speakers weekly. His motivation to learn Spanish is self-rated as very high.

Assessment Results:

S3 is able to converse quite naturally. He shows good comprehension of questions with no lapse between question and response. He is very fluent and uses gestures appropriately. He is able to provide main information and volunteers supporting details. He can sustain a monologue on abstract topics and shows good control of grammar and vocabulary to communicate his ideas across. Although he does not show much sophistication in vocabulary, he is able to circumlocute and explains his meaning easily when lacking vocabulary. He resorted to L1 only once during the oral interview. With intervention, he was able to demonstrate good command of verb morphology in the past, and some command of aspect. Scarce attempts of complex syntactical structures with subjunctive were unsuccessful. There were very few errors, which were self-corrected in some cases. The weakest areas in S3’s oral performance are a heavy influence of L1 in pronunciation and use of non-native expressions and unsophisticated vocabulary. S3 is enrolled in a pronunciation course, which may help in the first area. Overall, S3 demonstrates a level of oral expression that is adequate or above expected for entry-level majors.

Recommendations:

No particular course of action is required, however, S3 would benefit from making an effort to improve his vocab-
ulary range and from participating in weekly conversation hours that would give him opportunities to engage in sustained oral practice.

In contrast to the previous protocol, the following second example of the interaction illustrates a substantially higher degree of help provided by the assessor to a different learner.

**PROTOCOL 2: NARRATION TASK -S2-:**

1. S- En el *primer*, a las . . . siete ella . . . come con amigas, . . . en el segundo a las . . . siete y quince ella está leyendo el periódico y a las siete y veinticinco ella va a estudiar, va *a escuela*, a las siete y media va *a escuela* y a las siete y media también caminando por la calle . . . Va a la *parada del autobús* y a las siete y . . . veinticinco está esperando con sus amigas a la *parada*, ah a las siete y cuarto? está en la clase de biología y hablando con sus amigas, a las ocho y nueve menos cinco . . . está estudiando con un amigo, a las nueve está en la clase de economía . . . y a las diez, creo que está *cansado*, ah está bebiendo *un* bebida y a las diez y media está en la biblioteca hablando con su familia y a las dos y media, no, a la una y media . . . está comiendo mucho y a las tres hasta seis y media está *ir de compras* o trabajando, no sé

2. E- Ir de compras, ¿qué crees tú que va a hacer después de, de las compras?

3. S- Después de . . . sale con sus amigos?

4. E- Ok, ¿Adónde crees que podría ir?

5. S- (does not comprehend)

6. E- ¿Adónde crees que podría ir?

7. S- cine, casa de unos amigos

8. E- Posible, muy bien. Te, te había dicho, quizás no oíste, que empezaras la narración con ‘ayer’ la palabra ‘ayer’ porque fue el día de ayer y este, bien, me has narrado lo que hace en el presente, ¿crees que podrías ahora hacerlo en el pasado?

9. S- Ayer Carla . . . ah . . . *comió* *comió* con sus con su familia o . . . familia a las siete y a las siete ella . . . leyó el periódico y a las siete y . . . veinticinco ella . . . ah . . . salió * para escuela, ah, a las siete y media ella . . . llegó a la *parada* del autobús y . . . esperó con . . . sus amigos a la *parada*

It is possible, good. I I had asked you, perhaps you did not hear, to start the narration with ‘yesterday’ the word ‘yesterday’ because it was yesterday and, good, you have told me what she does, in the present, do you think you could do it now in the past]

9. S- Ayer Carla . . . ah . . . *comió* *comió* con sus con su familia o . . . familia a las siete y a las siete ella . . . leyó el periódico y a las siete y . . . veinticinco ella . . . ah . . . salió * para escuela, ah, a las siete y media ella . . . llegó a la *parada* del autobús y . . . esperó con . . . sus amigos a la *parada*)

*yesterday Carla . . . ah . . . I ate, ate with her with her family or . . . family at seven*
and at seven she . . . read the paper and at seven . . . twenty-five she . . . ah . . . left for school, ah, at half past seven she . . . arrived at the wall of the bus and . . . waited with . . . her friends at the wall]

10. E- ¿Pared o parada?

[Wall or stop?]

11. S- parada

[stop]

12. E- ¿Sabes qué es ‘pared’?

[Do you know what ‘pared’ is?]

13. S- . . . wall

14. E- Aha, es una palabra muy parecida, ¿verdad?

[It is a very similar word, isn’t it?]

15. S- Ah, a las ocho . . . ah . . . es-estaba en la clase de biología y a las nueve menos cuarto, sí, ella estudiaba con un amigo, a las nueve estaba en la clase de econo- economía y a las . . . diez ella . . . bebió . . . una bebida y creo que caminó por la biblioteca y a las . . . diez y media ah estaba en la biblioteca * a leer un libro, a las once y media * jugué al * tenis, * tenis?

[Ah, at eight . . . ah . . . she was in biology class and at quarter to nine, yes, she was studying with a friend, at nine she was in economics class and at . . . ten she . . . had a drink and I think she walked to the library and at half past ten ah she was at the library to read a book, at half past eleven she played tennis, tennis?]

16. E- tenis

17. S- * tenis

18. E- tenis

19. S- tenis . . . a las

20. E- ¿jugué o jugó?

21. S- jugó

22. E- aha

23. S- a las a la una ella regresó a casa y . . . a la . . . una y media ella . . . * comí y . . . a las . . . tres hasta seis y media ella fue de compras

[at one she returned home and at . . . half past one she . . . I ate . . . at . . . three until half past six she went shopping]

24. E- es difícil leer el reloj

[it is hard to read the clock]

25. S- sí

26. E- Sin números, ¿verdad?

[Without numbers, right?]

27. S- Sí

28. E- Muy bien. Aquí está en una tienda, ¿qué crees tú que está comprando?

[Good. Here she is at a shop, what do you think she is buying?]

29. S- pantalones

[pants]

30. E- pantalones y esta esta persona, ¿quién piensas que es? Bueno, ella es la cliente

[pants and this person, who do you think she is? Well, she is the client]

31. S- (?) trabajadora

[worker]

32. E- Ya, probablemente es la empleada de la tienda, ¿verdad? la dependienta, y están hablando. ¿Puedes tomar ahora el papel de Carla? Imaginate qué es lo que le está diciendo a la empleada de la tienda.

[Yes, she is probably the shop assistant, right? the salesclerk, and they are talking. Can you take the role of Carla? Imagine what she is telling the shop assistant.]

33. S- * ¿Cuántas cuestan?

[How much is it?]

34. E- ¡otra vez?

[again]

35. S- * ¿Cuántas cuestan?
36. E- Aha, ¿cuánto cuestan los pantalones? Muy bien. Y aquí dijiste, ¿qué fue lo que hizo?

[How much are the pants? Very good. And here you said, what did she do?]

37. S- *Comí

[I ate]

38. E- ¿Comió o comió?

[I ate or she ate]

39. S- comió

[She ate]

40. E- Comió, ¿verdad? Vale. ¿Hiciste ejercicios de este tipo en tus clases?

[She ate, right? Did you do this type of activity in class?]

41. S- Algo, es posible.

[Some, perhaps.]

In S2’s speech there are frequent pauses and hesitations along with several grammatical and lexical errors. It seems clear that S2 has problems completing the narration task. S2 also chose to narrate in the present. During the intervention phase, the assessor asked some questions inviting the student to add details to the story. For instance, the assessor asked what she thought the main character was going to do after shopping (2), where she thought the character could go (4 and 6), what she thought the main character was buying at the store (28), and who she thought the person in the store was (30). When the assessor offered a second opportunity to demonstrate ability to use past tense and aspect (turn 8), S2 showed that, although she can use past forms most of the time, she does not have full control of past verb morphology (*comí in turn 9, *juegué in turn 15). As the intervention moved along and it seemed that the learner was not able to regulate with the level of help provided, the assessor resorted to more direct strategies. In turn 10, the assessor pinpoints an error that had been repeated in turns (1) and (9), and that is the confusion between ‘pared’ (wall) and ‘parada’ (stop), two words with phonetic similarities. Given an option between the two (10), S2 does not hesitate to choose the right answer (parada), demonstrating in subsequent turns (11 and 12) through translation into the English equivalent that she understands the difference between the two words. The same technique was used in turns 20 and 38 regarding errors in preterite verb forms (*3rd person juegué and *3rd person comí). Although when given a choice of two verb forms the learner chose the correct form, she was unable to transfer the information (-ó ending for third person singular preterite forms) to the form ‘comí’ (22), an indication that the very direct instruction being provided was not having a positive effect.

The interaction shows other attempts of very direct instruction with doubtful benefits for this learner. For instance, in turn (15) the learner uses the word *tenís with incorrect stress on the last syllable. Immediately (16) the assessor repeats the lexical item with appropriate stress on the penultimate syllable, which is repeated by the learner with incorrect stress (18). It takes two repetitions (16 and 18) for the learner to notice the correction and repeat the word with penultimate stress. Similarly, in turn (33) the learner produces the question *¿Cuántas cuesta? with inaccurate gender and number in the interrogative pronoun. The assessor gives the learner an opportunity to rethink her choice by asking her to say the question again (34), but she does not modify her previous response. When finally the examiner repeats the question using the correct form (36), the learner does not show any sign of acknowledging the correction. Overall, the intervention in this protocol required the use of more explicit help than in the previous case with mixed results regarding the improvement in the performance of the task.

The final Speaking Assessment Report for S2 is as follows:
Name: S2  

Background Information:  

S2 is a beginning major planning to advance rapidly towards graduation. She has successfully completed three of required courses for the major (writing, conversation, and intermediate grammar). She has some outside experience with Spanish since she is very active in her church and interacts with native speakers from time to time. Her motivation to learn Spanish is self-rated as very high.

Assessment Results:  

During the oral interview S2 experienced some problems understanding simple questions from the examiner such as ‘Have you been in a Spanish-speaking country?’, but overall her level of both comprehension of the examiner’s questions and comprehensibility of her ideas is adequate. Her pronunciation is also adequate, although not free from L1 influence. S2 is currently taking a pronunciation course, which should be helpful in that respect. There are deficiencies in fluency, grammar and vocabulary. Her speech is jerky, with numerous pauses. The production of simple sentences is slow and difficult, there is not much evidence of ability to produce complex sentences. There are no attempts to use circumlocution when lacking vocabulary, instead, on occasions, L1 was used and there are some instances of inappropriate lexical choices. Intervention in Section Two of the oral test was helpful in some instances. For example, it showed some control of vocabulary that was not apparent without intervention such as the use of ‘pared’ for ‘parada,’ which turned out to be more a slip of the tongue than lack of lexical knowledge. However, for the most part intervention was not successful, particularly, it showed that S2 does not have full control of past verb morphology. S2 was unable to sustain a monologue on an abstract topic for more than a few seconds. The topic was brought to the personal level after a few sentences and eventually communication broke down.

Recommendations:  

S2 is recommended to take a course of action towards improvement of her oral skills. She would benefit from weekly sessions with a mentor, participation in weekly conversation hours, and participation in extracurricular activities involving the use of Spanish. The main focus should be on increasing vocabulary and control of language forms through participation in communicative situations. It is also recommended that S2 consider enrollment in a conversation course and/or a study abroad option. S2 should keep her advisor informed of her progress in the course of action.

In a traditional, nondynamic testing situation, both learners may have been evaluated as lacking control of verbal tense and aspect in the past. They may have been perceived as being at similar levels of language development. However, the use of mediation in the second part of the speaking test delved deeper into the language abilities of the two learners, revealing important differences. It became clear throughout the interaction with the assessor that S3 is indeed able to sustain narration in the past with only a few slips back into the present. On the other hand, the mediated interaction with S2 shows that her level of control of verbal tense and aspect, as well as her lexical repertoire, is lower than S3. For diagnostic purposes, the mediation phase of the assessment was crucial in order to provide a richer description of the learners’ abilities and thus design individualized plans of development according to the learners’ needs.
Conclusion
In second/foreign language programs, there has been a long tradition of language proficiency testing at the lower levels of instruction, particularly regarding the satisfaction of general college foreign language graduation requirements. However, reports on the assessment of language and content outcomes of graduating language majors are still rare. The assessment model described here seeks to act as a way of intervening in reaching expected learner outcomes.

For some time now, experts in L2 assessment have called attention to interaction as a powerful assessment tool (Chalhoub-Deville, 2003; McNamara, 1997; Shohamy, 1992; Swain, 2001). The interactionist approach to DA provides the conceptual basis and assessment procedures to give interaction a key role in assessment. The notions of diagnosis and follow-up are crucial to this approach of assessment, which differs from nondynamic means of assessment in terms of both objectives and assessment methodology. In terms of objectives, DA seeks to measure abilities achieved in the past, intervene in learning, and develop emergent abilities so that current learners' behaviors may be modified as a result of the intervention. DA is interested not only in the product of learning but also in documenting the process of learning while offering individual attention to learners. The analysis presented here is illustrative of the benefits of mediation during assessment, both for the pursuit of accurate assessments as well as for mediation's pedagogical implications. Differences in the written and oral texts produced by the learners in this study with and without mediation point at misrepresentation of the learners' abilities if one considers only the initial assessment. Although there are marked differences in terms of objectives and methodology between this study and Poehner's (Poehner, 2007; Poehner & Lantolf, 2005), there are evident similarities in the quality of the interaction. In both studies, as discourse unfolds, the mediator is able to gain a deeper understanding of the learners' capabilities. Notably, the mediator responds to learners' discourse by adjusting intervention to what is needed in each individual case in order to complete the task and show the full potential of the learners' ability. Both studies concur that traditional assessment of the learners' speech during narrative tasks—that is, assessment without mediation—would fall short of establishing important differences among the learner's level of performance in the given narrative tasks. Results from such small samples can only be suggestive, but there is little doubt that intervention during assessment results in rich information on the linguistic capabilities of learners, which may be used for the development of individualized instructional plans.

This study contributes to the emergent research on DA in L2 learning contexts. While recognizing that an interactionist approach to DA is labor-intensive, time-consuming, and, perhaps, difficult to carry out in large programs, the benefits for our learners and programs are attractive enough to merit more research for its potential in L2 learning. There is still much work to be done. Poehner's (2007) study on transcendence deserves further exploration. The effect of mediation on different tasks and by other means (computer mediation, etc.) is yet understudied. In our particular case, future areas of study include the expansion of mediation to other sections of the test, as well as longitudinal case studies of the effect of DA and individual learning plans on the language development of learners as they advance through the program.

Notes
1. An earlier version of this article was presented at the Annual Conference of the American Association for Applied Linguistics in Arlington, VA, 2003.
2. See Appendix 3 for minimum required scores on each section of the test.
3. Traditional or nondynamic test refers to the kind of assessment that seeks to mea-
sure the learner's current level of development when unaided in a testing situation. In comparison, DA is characterized by blending teaching and assessment. The examiner takes the role of an active participant by mediating the testing situation in order to gauge and advance the learner's level of potential development.

4. The exit exam is nondynamic. It is based on the learner's individual performance in the written work included in the portfolio and the oral presentation of original research.

5. Students are not required to take an official Oral Proficiency Interview or DELE exam. Their performance is judged by faculty using the ACTFL proficiency guidelines as a guide. Beginning majors (third-year) are expected to be able to speak and write at a minimum in a way similar to learners at the Intermediate Low level in the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines or the Certificado Inicial of the DELE exam. By the end of the program of study, majors are expected to be able to use the language with characteristics typical of the Advanced level of proficiency in the ACTFL guidelines or the Certificado Intermedio of the DELE exam.

6. For a review of the conceptual basis of DA and its different models, with particular attention to their relevance to L2 contexts, see Lantolf and Poehner (2004), and Lantolf and Thorne (2006).

7. Lantolf and Poehner (2004) make an important distinction between interventionist and interactionist DA. The interventionist approach is quantitative in nature, usually following a pretest/intervention/posttest format. By contrast, the interactionist approach is qualitative, focusing on interpretation of the instructional situation over statistical measures. Feuerstein's model of DA (Feuerstein et al., 1979) falls into this last category, whereas Budoff's model (Budoff, 1987) and Campione and Brown's (1987) are considered interventionist.

8. See Appendix 2 for a description of the diagnostic test.

9. Required minimum scores were 30 for grammar/vocabulary, and 10 for listening and reading.
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### APPENDIX 1

**Spanish Language Majors—Student Profile**

| Name: ____________________________________________________________ |
| Address: __________________________________________________________ |
| Phone: ______________ E-mail: ______________________ |
| Where did you learn Spanish? ___________________________________ |
| Have you lived in a Spanish-speaking country? How long? ______________ |
| How often do you use Spanish outside the classroom? ________________ |
| Where and with whom do you usually use Spanish outside the classroom? |
| How would you rate your Spanish in the following areas compared to the norm of an educated native speaker? ___________________ |
| Excellent | Good | Fair | Poor |
| Listening | Speaking | Reading | Writing |

List ALL Spanish courses taken: ____________________________________

Rate your degree of motivation to become proficient in Spanish:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>+5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How do you plan to use Spanish after you graduate? ____________________

Thanks for your cooperation.
# APPENDIX 2

## Diagnostic Test for Entering-Level Spanish Majors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. Composición (20 minutos). Expresión Oral (15 minutos)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gramática y vocabulario</td>
<td>50 puntos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprensión oral</td>
<td>15 puntos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lectura</td>
<td>15 puntos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composición</td>
<td>20 puntos</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Composición:** Escriba una composición en español de por lo menos 15 frases. Ganará el máximo número de puntos por la exactitud gramatical y léxica, la comprensibilidad, y la creatividad del ensayo.

**Tema:** Explique su trayectoria en el aprendizaje del español (cuándo se interesó por este idioma, cómo lo ha aprendido, etc.) y sus planes futuros una vez que se gradúe. Explique Ud. con detalles (cómo, cuándo, dónde, por qué, etc.)

**Procedimiento Para La Prueba De Expresión Oral:**

**A. Preguntas Personales** (2 minutos):

A seleccionar preguntas para iniciar una conversación:

- ¿Cómo estás?
- ¿Cómo te llamas?
- ¿Cuánto tiempo llevas estudiando español?
- ¿Dónde aprendiste español?
- ¿De dónde eres? ¿Cómo es? ¿Qué es lo que más/menos te gusta de tu ciudad/pueblo?
- ¿Has viajado a algún país de habla hispana? ¿Por qué no? ¿Qué te pareció?
- ¿Conoces a alguien que hable español?
- ¿Por qué te interesa el español?

**B. Descripción De Historieta** (5 minutos)

Basándose en un soporte visual, el/la estudiante describirá una historieta.

Primera etapa: descripción de la historieta sin ayuda del examinador.

Segunda etapa: en caso necesario, el examinador proveerá al estudiante con la ayuda apropiada para describir la historieta y le pedirá al/a la estudiante que la describa de nuevo.

Tercera etapa: en caso necesario el examinador describirá la historieta y le pedirá al/a la estudiante que la describa de nuevo.

**C. Situación** (2 minutos):

El examinador seleccionará una viñeta de la historieta y le pedirá al/a la estudiante que tome el papel de uno de los personajes en la viñeta y diga algo apropiado a la situación.
**APPENDIX 2. (Continued).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. Monólogo (2–3 minutos)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basándose en un soporte visual, el/la estudiante desarrollará un monólogo sobre un tema asignado.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primera etapa: monólogo sin ayuda del examinador.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segunda etapa: si es necesario, el examinador guiará al/a la estudiante con preguntas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Temas:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>La comida rápida.</th>
<th>¿Qué es la comida rápida? ¿Por qué piensas que es tan popular? ¿Cómo está afectando nuestra sociedad?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El ocio.</td>
<td>¿Es necesario tener tiempo libre? ¿Hay tiempo suficiente para el ocio en la sociedad moderna? ¿Qué efecto tiene el uso del ocio en la sociedad?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los viajes.</td>
<td>¿A qué lugares te gustaría viajar? ¿Es importante viajar? ¿Qué papel juega viajar en nuestra sociedad?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las compras.</td>
<td>¿Qué objetos son más codiciados en nuestra sociedad? ¿Piensas que vivimos en una sociedad consumista? ¿Cuáles son los aspectos positivos/negativos en la sociedad de adquirir objetos materiales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las tradiciones culturales.</td>
<td>¿Qué tradiciones existen en tu cultura? ¿Piensas que es importante mantener las tradiciones? ¿Juegan un papel importante las tradiciones en la sociedad?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las profesiones.</td>
<td>¿Qué profesiones han proliferado en el último siglo? ¿En qué se diferencian las profesiones modernas de profesiones tradicionales? ¿Qué profesión te gustaría tener?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La ecología.</td>
<td>¿Qué piensas del movimiento ecologista? ¿Qué efectos tiene la vida moderna en el medio ambiente? ¿Qué pasos se podrían tomar para conservar el medio ambiente?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX 3

### Entry Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>GV</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GV</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30/50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10/15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>70/100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*GV = Grammar & Vocabulary (Satisfactory score = 30/50); L = Listening (Satisfactory score = 10/15); R = Reading (Satisfactory score = 10/15); W = Writing (Satisfactory score = 70/100); S = Speaking (Satisfactory score = 70/100)*

**Dear X:**

Your test results indicate that you ___ meet the level of language ability required by the Spanish program at the beginning of the sequence of courses for the Spanish Major. You show good ___ abilities while ___ are areas that you should strive to improve. Overall, you ___ seem to be well prepared linguistically to succeed in advanced content courses in Spanish.

Please keep in mind that, by the end of the Capstone experience, Spanish Majors will be expected to demonstrate advanced Spanish language competency so that they will be capable to use their Spanish language skills in a professional setting. Please see language level specifications and samples in our web page. To discuss your test results or to be retested, please contact ____________________________

Following the results of your test, the Spanish faculty has the following recommendations:

- Attendance to weekly conversation hours. Please date sessions attended.
- Attendance to weekly tutoring sessions. Please date sessions attended.
- Participation in Study Abroad Program.
- Taking a conversation class (S317 or equivalent).
- Participating in extracurricular activities that require use of the Spanish language (immersion days, talks, community work, reading newspapers and books, watching movies or TV programs, etc.) Please date and describe activity.
- Meeting with your advisor every semester to assess progress.