Module Six Assignment

Testing

SEMAC and Exact Scoring Correlations in Cloze Tests

TS-05-03

Design and carry out a replication experiment with a 25-gap cloze test to confirm (or otherwise) the truth of the claim that SEMAC scoring and exact word scoring correlate very highly. Write up your experiment.

Michael H. Flynn

January 2006

Number of words excluding long quotes, tables, references, and appendices: 4,355

Contents

1.0 Introduction

This paper describes an experiment that explores the correlations found between exact and SEMAC scoring on cloze tests by utilizing variant Mini-cloze test forms of approximately 25 items with rational deletion. The results both replicate high correlation coefficients found on most ordinary *n* th item deletion Cloze tests and demonstrate the circumstances under which particular types of cloze items will or will not contribute to high exact/SEMAC score correlations.

2.0 Literature

Taylor(1953) in Oller and Conrad is identified as inventing the word “cloze” for “ a type of test originally designed to measure the readability of passages of prose” (1971: 183). Lado reports that , “Carroll, et al. (1959) investigated cloze items as a measure of achievement in foreign languages” and concluded that cloze items were inadequate for use in placement and diagnostic tests (1986: 130). However, on the basis of research in the intervening years, Oller and Conrad (1971: 184) concluded that “ written cloze tests correlate well with knowledge of vocabulary, reading comprehension, ability to read aloud, and intelligence quotient…and are useful measures of listening comprehension.” To conduct cloze tests Oller and Conrad recommended, deleting every *n* th word in a passage and scoring tests based on the number of exact words that a testee restores to the text and noted that “Other scoring methods, which allow acceptable substitutes for the original words are roughly equivalent and do not yield superior discrimination (ibid) . In a study which established high correlation coefficients between various methods of Cloze scoring and with the UCLA ESL Placement Exam, Oller uses the term “contextually acceptable responses” (1972: 151). The criteria for a *contextually acceptable response* is defined in Stubbs and Tucker as, “any non-grammatical form…would be automatically excluded even though the meaning happened to be exact (1974: 240). Alderson uses the term SEMAC for any SEMantically ACceptable word allowed in a given gap (1980:63). Owen et al. state that exact and SEMAC scoring on Cloze tests, “almost always correlate above .90 and usually above .97” (1997: 42). Using Pearson Product-Moment correlations (PPM), Stubbs and Tucker (1974: 240) found, “positive correlations ($r = .97$, $p < .01$) between scoring for exact versus contextually-appropriate responses” while Irvine et al., found an exact/SEMAC correlation of .94 (1974:245).

3.0 Experimental Design

This study hypothesizes that one factor affecting the degree of correlation between exact and SEMAC scores on cloze tests is the type of language item sampled. The language items considered here will be designated as Closed Class Items (CCI) or as Open Class Items (OCI). A CCI is defined as a cloze item that has a relatively small number of potential correct answers that are semantically acceptable and in many cases only one possible correct answer; the word supplied in the original text. A CCI results from either a syntagmatic (McCarthy , 1990: 16) aspect of language such as would be found in an idiom or language chunk, or is the result of context generated by the text that restricts the possible word choices. In contrast, an OCI has a larger number of semantically acceptable answers and is paradigmatic (ibid) in that many potential items can fill the slot.

To understand how OCI and CCI affect exact and SEMAC scoring correlations, it's possible to conduct a thought experiment imagining two opposite types of cloze tests. In one case, if a cloze test were constructed that contained only perfect CCI in which each blank had only one possible correct answer, the correlation coefficient would always be equal to one, or perfectly correlated, because the exact scores and the SEMAC scores would be exactly the same. In the opposite case of a test containing only OCI, each with a very large number of semantically acceptable answers that were equally probable insertions, the likelihood of a testee hitting the exact word that was deleted would be very low. In the most extreme case, the sum of the exact scores on such a test would equal zero while the SEMAC scores would represent some value consistent with the ability of the testees and the difficulty of the test. Using Person Product Moment (r), which is "equivalent to the mean cross-product of z-scores" (Owen et al., 1997: 97) to correlate exact and SEMAC scores where all the testees receive exact scores of zero yields an exact score standard deviation of zero which generates an infinite number when plugged into PPM. Since correlation coefficients cannot exceed one, the number must be infinitely small or approaching zero in which case there is no correlation. Using the same data with Spearman's ρ /rho, which unlike PPM uses testee ranks instead of z-scores (ibid: 98), returns ρ =.5, which merely reflects the assignment of the same mean rank to all testees and is arbitrary since there is no actual rank. On a mixed test with both OCI and CCI, an increase or decrease in the number of

CCI should result in a corresponding increase or decrease in the correlation coefficients of the exact and SEMAC scores. In the same way that CCI should increase exact/SEMAC correlations, OCI should lower coefficients because of random effects from multiple possible answers.

In keeping with the above reasoning, a real experiment with actual close tests was conducted wherein a single text was used to generate two different cloze tests using rational deletion (Alderson, 1980: 60) (Bachman, 1985: 535) (Chapelle and Abraham, 1990: 124) (Storey, 1997: 217) of items to create one form with a strong OCI tendency and another form with a strong CCI tendency. For the CCI forms, it is predicted that there will be a narrow score difference between the exact and SEMAC scores and that correlation coefficients will replicate the high correlations related by Owen et al. (1997:42). The OCI form is predicted to have a wider score difference between the exact and SEMAC scores and lower correlation coefficients.

Because cloze tests utilizing multiple deletions from a single block of text may result in answers which are dependent on other answers (Bachman, 1990: 181) and overestimates of internal test reliability when using the Spearman-Brown, Guttman, and Kuder-Richardson formulas (ibid:177-8), each cloze item was based on a short independent block of text to create what Hughes refers to as “Mini-cloze items”,

> The one possible disadvantage by the comparison with the more normal cloze is that the context that must be taken into account in order to fill a gap correctly is very restricted, but for such purposes as placement testing, this would not seem a serious defect.
>
> (Hughes, 2003:194)

Unlike the typical close test with a substantial context setting introduction without any gaps, the Mini-cloze items in this study often have considerably less context setting and there is no connection or continuity from one item to the next. One implication of restricted context is that for some items it generates a greater variety of possible correct SEMAC answers than a cloze test with greater context. For instance, in the sentence, “*She gave him the* _____.”, the limited context means that many answers are semantically correct. Increasing the context by adding text before or after the example provides additional clues about what the item might be and restricts the answers that would be considered semantically correct. In a Mini-cloze test format, OCI may

have a wider range of semantically correct answers than would be found in OCI on a standard cloze test. However, in spite of the restricted context of the Mini-cloze items in the present study, fluent English speakers correctly answered nearly all of the items on the CCI test form when using exact scoring and on the OCI test form when using SEMAC scoring. It may however have made the test more difficult for students.

Table 1: Summary of Predictions for Different Test Forms

Closed Class Item Form	Open Class Item Form
Narrow gap between exact/SEMAC scores	Wide gap between exact/SEMAC scores
High exact/SEMAC score correlations	Low exact/SEMAC score correlations

4.0 Subjects

The subjects consist of one hundred second year Japanese university EFL students in five of my English Communication classes and twelve fluent English speaker colleagues teaching English at Japanese universities. Two of the teacher subjects have trace accents. One is from Denmark and learned English as a second language. The other is from Hawaii and the accent may be the result of a dialectal form of English. Both were included in the fluent English speaker group in the belief that there were no significant differences in their linguistic competencies when compared with the other ten subjects.

The students are grouped into classes based on scores from TOEFL tests administered on December 18, 2004. The Cloze tests for this study were administered almost exactly one year latter. Out of 18 ranks of classes, the highest rank of 1 scored from 600-520. The classes in this study were one class from rank 16-- TOEFL 443-437, one from rank 17—TOEFL 437-427, three from rank 18—TOEFL 427-367. These groups are hereafter referred to by the rank numbers 16, 17, 18A, 18B, and 18C. Since students had received nine months of instruction and in some cases had spent the summer studying abroad, some of the students if tested on the date of the Cloze test would have probably received different TOEFL scores than the ones used for the initial placement.

5.0 Materials

Hughes (2003:193) suggests, “ we should base cloze tests on passages that reflect the kind of language that is relevant for the overall ability that we are

interested in ” and provides a cloze test utilizing a tape-recorded conversation transcript. While not directly related to the goal of comparing Exact and SEMAC scores, a conversational Cloze seemed particularly appropriate for use in a Communicative English class where the main goal is teaching conversation.

Transcripts of native speaker conversations were examined but as Hughes noted, “…false starts and hesitations, the almost complete unpredictability of some items” made it difficult to determine acceptable answers (Hughes 1981: 164). This was acceptable for OCI but in most cases the amount of the conversation that would have to be included to generate a CCI was too long and would have created a very lengthy test. A procedure whereby sections of transcripts were simplified was attempted but proved very difficult and resulted in text of dubious authenticity.

As an alternative that follows Farhady and Keramati’s use of student textbooks to construct cloze tests (1996: 193-4), dialogs from New Interchange 3, which none of the students had studied, were chosen. Although the dialogs have denser more organized language than authentic conversation, the language has much in common with ordinary conversation. Within each text segment, an intuitive attempt was made to identify at least one CCI and one OCI from a mixture of interesting words, grammatical categories and items typical of conversations. After exhausting the dialogs, six additional text sections from the textbook’s reading passages were also included. Of these, item 26 is the least conversational. The other five passages from reading sections all seem to have the possibility of occurring as spoken language. 26 items were selected instead of 25 to give even splits in the event that a split half analysis for internal test reliability was deemed necessary at some latter point.

6.0 Test Administration

Testees were instructed to fill each blank on a separate answer sheet with one word to complete each passage and given as much time as they needed. Students finished the test within 30 minutes while native speakers took about 10 to 15 minutes. Group 18 C, which has approximately the same number of students enrolled as the other classes was smaller than expected because of an unusually large number of absences. The fluent native speakers who took the test were clearly aware that the test was not part of an actual evaluation and

usually attempted to finish the test as quickly as possible which may have resulted in some errors that would have been caught if the test takers had slowed down or rechecked their work. The students on the other hand were not told until after everyone had completed the test that the scores would not be used as part of their grades.

During the first administration, the test forms and answer sheets were collected and the instructor's intention was to initiate a new unrelated class activity. However, when finishing the test, many students commented that the test was very difficult. Even after being informed that the scores were not part of their grades, the students still seemed to remain discouraged by their performance. Instead of beginning a new unrelated class activity, students were put into groups, given a copy of the test form, told they could speak Japanese and use dictionaries, and instructed to complete the test again with each group preparing a single answer sheet which upon completion was given to the instructor for correction. Each group's answer sheet was quickly corrected and returned. Groups continued working on items that were still incorrect. After the groups were able to supply most of the correct answers, the instructor provided the correct answers and briefly explained any problematic items. The activity was well received and adopted on subsequent administrations. Finally, while not integral to the experiment, incorporating the test as part of a teaching procedure transformed what might otherwise have simply been an experimental procedure conducted at the expense of the students' lesson time with possible negative effects on the subjects' self-esteem into a useful learning experience.

With the Fluent English Speaker group, the original plan was to divide the group into two. However, after administering four CCI forms, it was noted that the scores were very close to perfect and that there was a very small gap between the exact and SEMAC scores. In the belief that additional administrations would result in the same pattern, two of the original CCI group members were given the OCI form instead to gain a better impression of the potential range between exact and SEMAC scores and to get a larger sample of fluent English speaker SEMAC answer types.

7.0 Scoring

Tests were scored using both exact and SEMAC scoring. While designing the

test, a list of words considered correct for SEMAC scoring was recorded. Additional words were added to the list based on replies not anticipated by the test designer. Students supplied some answers that the test designer was uncertain about how to score. Each questionable item was discussed with an experienced instructor colleague to determine whether to include the answer as a correct SEMAC response. It is however recognized that different individuals may reach different conclusions about what constitutes an acceptable SEMAC answer (Klein-Braley and Raatz, 1984: 135) (Oller, 1972:151).

8.0 Results

Table 2 provides an overview of the results of the tests. Tables 5 and 7 are excerpts of Table 2 and are provided for ease of reference. All calculations were performed and double-checked with a non-statistical calculator. The individual data sheets with student scores are included in the appendix.

Table 2: Summary of Results

	CCI Form	CCI Form	CCI Form	OCI Form	OCI Form	CCI Form	OCI Form
	17	18A	18C	16	18B	Fluent A	Fluent B
T Rank	1	2	5	3.5	3.5	NA	NA
n	21	22	13	20	24	4	8
Range x	8	13	6	3	4	3	7
Mean x	10.29	9.68	9.85	1.1	1.125	24	7.125
SD x	1.98	2.73	1.82	.91	.95	1.41	2.75
Range y	6	9	5	9	13	1	2
Mean y	12.09	11.59	11.31	11.2	11.125	25.5	25.25
SD y	2.0	2.79	1.55	2.84	3.35	.71	.70
r	.84	.93	.85	.46	.77	-0.33	.42
ρ	.87	.88	.875	.43	.73	-0.05	.48

T Rank = teacher's subjective ranking of class before test, n = number of testees, Range x = Highest score on exact score minus the lowest score, Mean x = Exact score mean, SD x = Exact score standard deviation, Range y = Highest score on SEMAC minus the lowest score, Mean y = SEMAC score mean, SD y = SEMAC score standard deviation, r = PPM correlation coefficient between Exact and SEMAC scores, ρ = rho correlation coefficient between Exact and SEMAC scores.

8.1 Significance of Data

Owen (1997: 94) states, “samples of 30 are big enough to draw fairly reliable conclusions.” Since the largest sample is 24, conclusions drawn from this data are very tentative. However, there are still strong tendencies in the results. One possibility for increasing the significance of the results would be to combine all students taking the CCI form into one group, and all students taking the OCI form into another group. However, performing the necessary calculations requires computer software that was not available for this study.

8.2 Comparison with other Cloze tests

Brown(1993) in an experiment involving 2,298 Japanese EFL students from 18 Japanese universities used 50 cloze tests with 30 items constructed from a random sampling of books from a public library in the United States to determine the natural characteristics of a cloze test. In spite of considerable variation in results of individual tests, some of Brown’s findings (ibid: 102) for typical cloze tests based on exact scoring are summarized in Table3:

Table 3: Brown(1993) Characteristics of Natural Cloze Tests

Mean	Standard Deviation	Range
4.11	2.61	11.16

In Table 4, the 26 item Mini-Cloze test results are converted to a 30 item scale for comparison with Brown’s results in Table 3. Unadjusted figures are bracketed.

Table 4: Characteristics of Mini-Cloze in Present Study

	Mean x	Standard Deviation x	Range x
17 CCI Form	[10.29] 11.87	[1.98] 2.28	[8] 9
18A CCI Form	[9.68] 11.17	[2.73] 3.15	[13] 15
18C CCI Form	[9.85] 11.37	[1.82] 2.1	[6] 7
16 OCI Form	[1.1] 1.27	[.91] 1.05	[3] 3.5
18B OCI Form	[1.125] 1.30	[.95] 1.10	[4] 5

The means for the CCI form are higher than Brown’s but this can probably be accounted for by language in an intermediate EFL textbook being easier than the language in a typical public library book. Also, the lower means on the OCI forms reflect the difficulty of hitting the exact word deleted on the OCI questions.

In both cases however, the Mini-Cloze test format generated results consistent with the range of results found in Brown's study. The small differences in the standard deviations are probably the result of tests being administered to relatively homogeneous classroom groups.

8.3 Experimental Gap Predictions and Discussion

In 3.0 Experimental Design, it was predicted that there would be a narrow gap between exact/SEMAC scores on the CCI form and a wider gap on the OCI form. In the table below, the gap is determined by subtracting a group's exact mean score from its SEMAC mean score.

Table 5: Mean's and Gaps on Mini-Cloze in Present Study

	CCI Form	CCI Form	CCI Form	OCI Form	OCI Form	CCI Form	OCI Form
	17	18A	18C	16	18B	Fluent A	Fluent B
Mean x	10.29	9.68	9.85	1.1	1.125	24	7.125
Mean y	12.09	11.59	11.31	11.2	11.125	25.5	25.25
Gap	1.8	1.91	1.46	10.1	10	1.5	18.125

The prediction held true for all test groups. As expected CCI generate a limited range of SEMAC answers which are reflected in the small gap on the CCI forms. OCI offer more semantically correct possibilities and consequently produce a wider gap. There were however a number of items that did not perform as expected as CCI or OCI which are indicated in bold on in Table 6 on the following page which shows the % of correct exact answers followed by the % of correct SEMAC answers for combined groups.

Table 6: Discrimination Index

Item #	CCI Form n=56			OCI Form n=44			CCI Form n=4				OCI Form n=8			
	17,18A,18C			16, 18B			Fluent A				Fluent B			
	E	S	E/S	E	S	E/S	E	S	E/S		E	S	E/S	
1	.27	.27	1.0	0	.93	0	1.0	1.0	1.0	=	1.0	1.0	1.0	>
2	.035	.035	1.0	0	.09	0	1.0	1.0	1.0	=	.125	1.0	.125	>
3	.86	.86	1.0	0	.23	0	1.0	1.0	1.0	=	.125	1.0	.125	>
4	.285	.285	1.0	0	.70	0	.75	1.0	.75	<	.375	1.0	.375	>
5	.82	.82	1.0	.02	.59	.03	1.0	1.0	1.0	=	**.625**	**1.0**	.625	>
6	.285	.285	1.0	.09	.59	.15	1.0	1.0	1.0	=	**.75**	**1.0**	.75	>
7	.98	.98	1.0	0	.39	0	1.0	1.0	1.0	=	.125	1.0	.125	>
8	.32	.32	1.0	.02	.20	.10	1.0	1.0	1.0	=	.50	1.0	.50	>
9	.34	.70	.49	**.43**	**.795**	.54	.5	1.0	.50	>	**.75**	**1.0**	.75	>
10	**.14**	**.57**	.25	0	.18	0	1.0	1.0	1.0	>	.375	1.0	.375	>
11	.70	.70	1.0	.045	.57	.79	1.0	1.0	1.0	=	.25	1.0	.25	<
12	.035	.035	1.0	0	.57	0	1.0	1.0	1.0	=	.25	1.0	.25	>
13	.41	.66	.62	0	.07	0	1.0	1.0	1.0	>	0	.875	0	=
14	.05	.05	1.0	0	.43	0	.75	.75	1.0	=	.125	1.0	.125	>
15	.98	.98	1.0	.02	.84	.02	1.0	1.0	1.0	=	.375	1.0	.375	>
16	.73	.82	.89	.02	.14	.14	1.0	1.0	1.0	>	.25	1.0	.25	>
17	0	0	0	0	0	0	1.0	1.0	1.0	>	**.875**	**.875**	1.0	>
18	**.05**	**.52**	.10	.14	.34	.41	1.0	1.0	1.0	>	.125	1.0	.125	<
19	.625	.625	1.0	.07	.61	.11	1.0	1.0	1.0	=	.125	1.0	.125	>
20	.59	.64	.92	0	.86	0	.75	1.0	.75	<	0	1.0	0	=
21	.21	.21	1.0	0	.52	0	1.0	1.0	1.0	=	.125	1.0	.125	>
22	.02	.02	1.0	0	.20	0	1.0	1.0	1.0	=	0	.875	0	=
23	.39	.39	1.0	.27	.545	.50	.75	1.0	.75	<	.375	1.0	.375	<
24	.535	.535	1.0	0	.07	0	1.0	1.0	1.0	=	.125	1.0	.125	>
25	.11	.11	1.0	0	.07	0	.50	.75	.66	<	.375	1.0	.375	>
26	.21	.285	.74	0	.52	0	1.0	1.0	1.0	>	0	.875	0	=

E= percentage of group members with correct exact answers

S= percentage of group members with correct SEMAC answers

E/S = E divided by S gives proportion of exact answers to SEMAC answers.

The fourth column for each group the fluent speakers shows whether fluent speakers were more (>), less (<) or equally likely (=) to select the exact answers than students and is derived by comparing the E/S values for the students and fluent speakers using the same test forms

For the students taking the CCI form, in items 10 and 18 only a small number hit on the exact word but a much higher percentage hit on a SEMAC word. This had the effect of moving these items away from being CCI towards the OCI side of the cline. The fluent speakers taking the same form all answered item 10 with the exact word, different" suggesting that the most frequent SEMAC response by students, "far", to item 10 is perhaps only marginally correct. Item 18 on the

CCI was answered with the exact word “can” by all fluent speakers to indicate that the speaker was referring to their own experience. Students tended to answer with “will, might, or should” which can be considered correct if the testee interprets the speaker as referring to a prediction about the other person. This was a problematic item because it not only created unanticipated responses but questioning individual students would probably reveal that many did not understand the shift in meaning caused by using a modal other than can and that modals other than “can” perhaps should have been marked incorrect.

A number of anomalous items also occurred on the OCI form, a relatively large percentage of students 43% and fluent speakers 75% hit on the exact answer for item 9. This may be partially due to the fact that only three SEMAC answers were identified for this item. Even so, the hit rates for the exact item are still higher than what would be expected if each item had an equal probability of being hit. With four targets and enough random shots, each item should receive about 25% of the hits. Items 5,6,9, 17 on the fluent speaker OCI test also show high hit rates on the exact answer exceeding 50%. These items are in effect behaving like CCI even though each question had a variety of possible SEMAC answers. Item 6 on the fluent speaker OCI form is particularly interesting since the word nice could have been replaced by quite a number of other adjectives and yet 75% of the responses were the exact word “nice”. This indicates that even when a variety of SEMAC answers are available that the colocational tendency of a particular word may be so strong that an OCI may actually behave like a CCI. Additionally, as shown in table 7 which tallies the results in the fourth column within the fluent speaker groups in Table 6, fluent speakers are more likely to select exact answers than students.

Table 7: Number of items where fluent speakers were more, less or equally likely to choose exact items.

	CCI Form	OCI Form
More likely	7	20
Less likely	4	3
Equally likely	15	3

The tendency of the fluent speakers to select exact answers suggests that fluent speakers are more familiar with particular collocational tendencies than students. Interestingly, there may have also been differences in the collocational

knowledge of fluent speakers taking the OCI form. Even though all SEMAC scores were uniformly high, the two lowest exact scores were the fluent speakers with mild accents suggesting that they might not be as familiar with collocational patterns as the other test takers. It is also worth noting that in some cases it is difficult to hit an exact answer when the SEMAC options represent more common alternatives. For instance, in item 22 the fluent speakers preferred the SEMAC alternative “say” to the exact word “insist”.

8.4 Experimental Correlation Predictions and Discussion

Table 8: Summary of Exact/SEMAC Correlations

	CCI Form	CCI Form	CCI Form	OCI Form	OCI Form	CCI Form	OCI Form
	17	18A	18C	16	18B	Fluent A	Fluent B
n	21	22	13	20	24	4	8
r	.84	.93	.85	.46	.77	-0.33	.42
ρ	.87	.88	.875	.43	.73	-0.05	.48

In the experimental design section, it was predicted that the CCI form would yield high exact/SEMAC correlations and that correlation coefficients would be lower on the OCI form. For the student groups, the predictions that the CCI Form would generate higher correlations than the OCI form generally held true. However, the CCI form coefficients are slightly lower than the .90-.97 correlations reported by Owen et al. (1997: 42). Both the small sample size and the inclusion of items 10 and 18 that behaved like OCI on the CCI form may have contributed to the slightly lower correlations.

The correlation coefficients for the OCI form student group were lower than those for the CCI form student group but in the case of the 18B group, the correlation coefficients (r = .77, $\rho = .73$) come close to the low end of correlation coefficients for the CCI form in Table 8. Three factors probably contributed to the unexpectedly high correlation numbers for 18B. First, even though 18B is the largest group, there are still less than 30 results. Second, item 9 behaved like a CCI with the exact answer being hit by 43% of the students. Third, exact scores on the OCI form are skewed or compressed towards a very narrow range of four. In fact, in 18 B only one student had a score of four while the other 23 students ranged from zero to three points. The

mean for exact student scores on the OCI was about one. Since item 9 behaved like a CCI on the OCI form, and contributed one point to the exact scores of 43% of the students, it probably played a disproportionate role in increasing the correlation coefficients of both group 16 and 18B.

The results for fluent speakers on the CCI form are completely opposite to the prediction of a high correlation coefficient. With only four testees and a narrow range for both the exact and SEMAC scores, one testee achieving both the lowest exact score (22) and the highest SEMAC score (26) was enough to make the correlation coefficient negative.

On the OCI Form, the correlation coefficients for the fluent speakers group are low as predicted and might have been lower if items 5,6,9, and 17 hadn't acted as CCI with the fluent speakers hitting the exact answer more than 50% of the time. These items are interesting because they demonstrate that even though an item may have multiple possible SEMAC answers, that some answers may have a higher collocational probability or simply seem more natural to a fluent speaker.

9.0 Implications for Other Cloze Tests and Scoring Methods

Cloze tests utilizing written prose will probably tend to yield high exact/SEMAC correlations because of a high proportion of CCI generated when long texts create an extensive context that limits potential answers. For instance, Lado (1986) using the 50 item prose cloze test from Oller (1971) with native speakers revealed that 41 of the items received only Exact answers and no SEMAC answers while 6 of the items had one word as a SEMAC answer and one word as an exact answer. In other words, 94% of the test items behaved as CCI. However even though *n* th word deletion in cloze tests such as Lado's will probably on average result in a relatively high proportion of CCI, it is still possible that *n* th item deletion may by chance result in some tests containing a high proportion of OCI which as shown in this paper will probably result in low exact/SEMAC score correlations.

Other types of cloze tests based on authentic conversations, mini-cloze, or rational deletion need to be examined carefully to determine whether different text types or procedures for making cloze tests generate a higher proportion of

OCI that would tend to lower exact/SEMAC correlations. Additionally, scoring procedures other than SEMAC that permit an even greater number of non-exact answer types will likely result in even lower correlations than exact/SEMAC scoring. For instance, Alderson used three scoring methods that are all more lenient than SEMAC scoring: grammatically correct procedure (GRCO), identical form class procedure (IFDC), and acceptable form class procedure (ACFC) that all allowed for a greater number of acceptable answers than SEMAC scoring (1980: 63). With both native speakers and nonnative speakers being tested with easy, medium and difficult texts, these alternative scoring methods resulted in lower correlations with exact scoring than exact/SEMAC scoring (ibid: 69).

10.0 Classroom Use

While the purpose of this experiment was not to develop a proficiency or placement test, the test scores generally fit well with my subjective pre-assessments for both groups and individuals. Even in the case of 18C which performed better than my expectations for the group (See teacher rank in table 2), the relatively high means for 18C can be explained by the absence of the weakest students. With some modifications, the Mini-cloze tests may be useful as a rough measure to match students of similar abilities for pair and group work. The discrimination index showed that some items were correctly answered by almost all of the students or none at all. Since these items are not helpful in distinguishing between the ability of different students, such items should be replaced on subsequent tests. This would also improve the tests as experimental devices by alleviating the tendency toward narrow skewed ranges.

11.0 Conclusion

This experiment using rationally deleted Mini-cloze tests approximately replicated the high exact/SEMAC score correlation coefficients found in prose cloze tests produced by *n* th word deletion in a block of text. In spite of small sample sizes and some test items that performed unexpectedly, as predicted, Mini-cloze tests consisting of Closed Class Items generated high coefficients while tests consisting of Open Class Items generated lower coefficients. This study also suggests that even items that appear to be OCI may actually function as CCI when some SEMAC answers have a stronger collocational tendency than others. When fluent speakers take the same cloze test as learners it is also

probable that the fluent speakers with greater collocational knowledge are more likely to select exact answers than SEMAC answers. Cloze tests that produce high exact/SEMAC correlations will probably contain a high proportion of CCI and perhaps some OCI that behave like CCI because of collocation or contextual information. Conversely, cloze tests with low exact/SEMAC correlations would probably contain a high proportion of OCI. The tendency of prose cloze tests to generate high exact/SEMAC correlations probably reflects the tendency of language to operate on a syntagmatic level and the effects of blocks of text creating context limiting the likely answers in deletions.

12.0 References

Alderson, J.C. (1980) ‘Native And Nonnative Speaker Performance On Cloze Tests’. *Language Learning* 30,1:59-76.

Bachman, L. F. (1985) ‘Performance on Cloze Tests with Fixed-Ratio and Rational Deletions’. *TESOL Quarterly* 19,3: 535-556.

Bachman, L. F. (1990) *Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brown, J. D. (1993) ‘What are the characteristics of natural cloze tests*?*’ *Language Testing* 10: 93-116.

Chapelle, C.A. and Abraham, R.G. (1990) ‘Cloze method: what difference does it make?’. *Language Testing* 7,2: 121-146.

Farhady, H. and Keramati, M.N. (1996) ‘A text-driven method for the deletion procedure in cloze passages’. *Language Testing* 13: 191-207.

Hughes, A. (1981) ‘Conversational Cloze as a Measure of Oral Abilty’. *English Language Teaching Journal* 35, 2: 161-8.

Hughes, A. (2003) *Testing for Language Teachers* (2nd edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Irvine, P., Atai, P. and Oller, J.W., Jr. (1974) ‘Cloze, Dictation, And The Test Of English as a Foreign Language’. *Language Learning* 24,2: 245-252.

Klein-Braley, C. and Raatz, U. (1984) ‘A survey of research on the C-Test’. *Language Testing* 1,2: 134-146.

Lado, R. (1986) ‘Analysis of native speaker performance on a cloze test’. *Language Testing* 3:130-146.

McCarthy, M. (1990) *Vocabulary.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Oller, J.W., Jr. and Conrad, C.A. (1971) ‘The Coze Technique And ESL Proficiency’. *Language Learning* 21,1: 183-195.

Oller, J.W. (1972) ‘Scoring Methods and Difficulty Levels for Cloze Tests of Proficiency in English as a Second Language’. *Modern Language Journal* LVI, 1: 151-8.

Owen, C., Rees, J., Wisener, S. and Crompton, P. (1997) *Testing.* Birmingham: Centre for English Language Studies.

Storey, P. (1997) ‘Examining the test-taking process: a cognitive perspective on the discourse cloze test’. *Language Testing* 8: 214-231.

Stubbs, J. A. and Tucker, G.R. (1974) ‘The Cloze Test as a Measure of English Proficiency’. *Modern Language Journal* LVIII: 239-241.

Appendices: Group Data Sheets

Students Rank 17: Closed Form n=21

ID	Exact	x-x	SEM	y-y	(x-x)(y-y)	Rk E	Rk S	E-S	$(E-S)^2$
1	14	3.71	15	2.91	10.80	1	2.5	-1.5	2.25
2	13	2.71	15	2.91	7.89	2	2.5	-.5	.25
3	12	1.71	15	2.91	4.98	5	2.5	2.5	6.25
4	12	1.71	15	2.91	4.98	5	2.5	2.5	6.25
5	12	1.71	13	.91	1.56	5	7	-2	4
6	12	1.71	13	.91	1.56	5	7	-2	4
7	12	1.71	13	.91	1.56	5	7	-2	4
8	11	.71	13	.91	.65	9	7	2	4
9	11	.71	12	-.09	-.06	9	12	-3	9
10	11	.71	12	-.09	-.06	9	12	-3	9
11	10	-.29	13	.91	-.26	12	7	5	25
12	10	-.29	12	-.09	.03	12	12	0	0
13	10	-.29	11	-1.09	.32	12	16	-4	16
14	9	-1.29-	12	-.09	.12	15.5	12	3.5	12.25
15	9	-1.29	11	-1.09	1.41	15.5	16	-.5	.25
16	9	-1.29	9	-3.09	3.99	15.5	19.5	-4	16
17	9	-1.29	9	-3.09	3.99	15.5	19.5	-4	16
18	8	-2.29	12	-.09	.21	19	12	7	49
19	8	-2.29	11	-1.09	2.50	19	16	3	9
20	8	-2.29	9	-3.09	7.08	19	19.5	-.5	.25
21	6	-4.29	9	-3.09	13.26	21	19.5	1.5	2.25
	Mean 10.29		Mean 12.09		$\Sigma = 66.51$				$\Sigma = 195$

Students Rank 18A Closed Form n=22

ID	Exact	x-x	SEM	y-y	(x-x)(y-y)	Rk E	Rk S	E-S	$(E-S)^2$
22	16	6.32	17	5.41	34.19	1	1	0	0
23	13	3.32	14	2.41	8	2	4	-2	4
24	12	2.32	14	2.41	5.59	3	4	-1	1
25	11	1.32	14	2.41	3.18	5.5	4	1.5	2.25
26	11	1.32	13	1.41	1.86	5.5	8.5	-3	9
27	11	1.32	13	1.41	1.86	5.5	8.5	-3	9
28	11	1.32	12	.41	.54	5.5	11	-5.5	30.25
29	10	.32	14	2.41	.77	11	4	7	49
30	10	.32	14	2.41	.77	11	4	7	49
31	10	.32	13	1.41	.45	11	8.5	2.5	6.25
32	10	.32	13	1.41	.45	11	8.5	2.5	6.25
33	10	.32	11	-.59	-.19	11	14	-3	9
34	10	.32	11	-.59	-.19	11	14	-3	9
35	10	.32	11	-.59	-.19	11	14	-3	9
36	9	-.68	11	-.59	.40	17	14	3	9
37	9	-.68	11	-.59	.40	17	14	3	9
38	9	-.68	10	-1.59	1.08	17	18	-1	1
39	9	-.68	10	-1.59	1.08	17	18	-1	1
40	9	-.68	10	-1.59	1.08	17	18	-1	1
41	6	-3.68	8	-3.59	13.21	20	20	0	0
42	4	-5.68	5	-6.59	37.43	21	21	0	0
43	3	-6.68	6	-5.59	37.34	22	22	0	0
	Mean 9.68		Mean 11.59		Σ =149. 11				Σ=214

Students Rank 18C Closed Form n=13

ID	Exact	x-x	SEM	y-y	(x-x)(y-y)	Rk E	Rk S	E-S	$(E-S)^2$
44	12	2.15	13	1.69	3.63	1.5	2.5	-1	1
45	12	2.15	13	1.69	3.63	1.5	2.5	-1	1
46	11	1.15	13	1.69	1.94	5	2.5	2.5	6.25
47	11	1.15	13	1.69	1.94	5	2.5	2.5	6.25
48	11	1.15	12	.69	.79	5	5.5	-.5	.25
49	11	1.15	12	.69	.79	5	5.5	-.5	.25
50	11	1.15	11	-.31	-.36	5	8	-3	9
51	9	-.85	11	-.31	.26	9	8	1	1
52	9	-.85	10	-1.31	1.11	9	11	-2	4
53	9	-.85	10	-1.31	1.11	9	11	-2	4
54	8	-1.85	11	-.31	.57	11.5	8	3.5	12.25
55	8	-1.85	10	-1.31	.57	11.5	11	.5	.25
56	6	-3.85	8	-3.31	12.74	13	13	0	0
	Mean 9.85		Mean 11.31		Σ=28. 72				Σ=45. 5

Students Rank 16 Open Form n=20

ID	Exact	x-x	SEM	y-y	(x-x)(y-y)	Rk E	Rk S	E-S	$(E-S)^2$
81	3	1.9	12	.8	1.52	1	10	-9	81
82	2	.9	15	3.8	3.42	4.5	1	3.5	12.25
83	2	.9	14	2.8	2.52	4.5	2.5	2.0	4
84	2	.9	13	1.8	1.62	4.5	5.5	-1.0	1
85	2	.9	12	.8	.72	4.5	10	-5.5	30.25
86	2	.9	12	.8	.72	4.5	10	-5.5	30.25
87	2	.9	12	.8	.72	4.5	10	-5.5	30.25
88	1	-.1	13	1.8	-.18	11	5.5	-5.5	30.25
89	1	-.1	13	1.8	-.18	11	5.5	-5.5	30.25
90	1	-.1	12	.8	-.08	11	10	1	1
91	1	-.1	11	-.2	.02	11	13.5	-2.5	6.25
92	1	-.1	10	-1.2	.12	11	15.5	-4.5	20.25
93	1	-.1	9	-2.2	.22	11	17.5	-6.5	42.25
94	1	-.1	9	-2.2	.22	11	17.5	-6.5	42.25
95	0	-1.1	14	2.8	-3.08	17.5	2.5	15	225
96	0	-1.1	13	1.8	-1.98	17.5	5.5	12	144
97	0	-1.1	11	-.2	.22	17.5	13.5	4	16
98	0	-1.1	10	-1.2	1.32	17.5	15.5	2	4
99	0	-1.1	6	-5.2	5.72	17.5	19	-1.5	2.25
100	0	-1.1	3	-8.2	9.02	17.5	20	-2.5	6.25
	Mean 1.1		Mean 11.2		Σ=22. 6				Σ=759

Students Rank 18B Open Form n=24

ID	Ex	x-x	SEM	y-y	(x-x)(y-y)	Rk E	Rk S	E-S	$(E-S)^2$
57	4	2.875	19	7.875	22.64	1	1	0	0
58	2	.875	17	5.875	5.14	4.5	2	2.5	6.25
59	2	.875	15	3.875	3.39	4.5	4	.5	.25
60	2	.875	15	3.875	3.39	4.5	4	.5	.25
61	2	.875	13	1.875	1.64	4.5	6.5	-2.0	4
62	2	.875	13	1.875	1.64	4.5	6.5	-2.0	4
63	2	.875	11	-.125	-.11	4.5	12	-7.5	56.25
64	1	-.125	15	3.875	-.48	13	4	9	81
65	1	-.125	11	-.125	.02	13	12	1	1
66	1	-.125	11	-.125	.02	13	12	1	1
67	1	-.125	12	.875	-.11	13	8.5	4.5	20.25
68	1	-.125	11	-.125	.02	13	12	1	1
69	1	-.125	10	-1.125	.14	13	15.5	-2.5	6.25
70	1	-.125	10	-1.125	.14	13	15.5	-2.5	6.25
71	1	-.125	9	-2.125	.27	13	17.5	-4.5	20.25
72	1	-.125	9	-2.125	.27	13	17.5	-4.5	20.25
73	1	-.125	8	-3.125	.39	13	19.5	-6.5	42.25
74	1	-.125	7	-4.125	.52	13	22	-9	81
75	0	-1.125	12	.875	-.98	21.5	8.5	13	169
76	0	-1.125	11	-.125	.14	21.5	12	9.5	90.25
77	0	-1.125	8	-3.125	3.52	21.5	19.5	2	4
78	0	-1.125	7	-4.125	4.64	21.5	22	-.5	.25
79	0	-1.125	7	-4.125	4.64	21.5	22	-.5	.25
80	0	-1.125	6	-5.125	5.77	21.5	24	-2.5	6.25
	Mean 1.125		Mean 11.125		Σ=56.66				Σ=621.5

Fluent Speakers: Closed Form n=4

ID	Exact	x-x	SEM	y-y	(x-x)(y-y)	Rk E	Rk S	E-S	$(E-S)^2$
A	25	1	26	.5	.5	1.5	1.5	0	0
B	25	1	25	-.5	-.5	1.5	3.5	-2	4
C	24	0	25	-.5	0	3	3.5	-.5	.25
D	22	-2	26	.5	-1	4	1.5	2.5	6.25
	Mean 24		Mean 25.5		$\Sigma = -1$				Σ=10.5

Fluent Speakers: Open Form n=8

ID	Exact	x-x	SEM	y-y	(x-x)(y-y)	Rk E	Rk S	E-S	$(E-S)^2$
E	11	3.875	25	-.25	-.97	1	5.5	-4.5	20.25
F	10	2.875	26	.75	2.16	2	2	0	0
G	9	1.875	25	-.25	-.47	3	5.5	-2.5	6.25
H	8	.875	26	.75	.66	4	2	2	4
I	6	-1.125	26	.75	-.84	5	2	3	9
J	5	-2.125	25	-.25	.53	6	5.5	.5	.25
K	4	-3.125	25	-.25	.78	7.5	5.5	2	4
L	4	-3.125	24	-1.25	3.91	7.5	8	-.5	.25
	Mean 7.125		Mean 25.25		$\Sigma = 5.76$				$\Sigma =$ 44

OCI Form

1. Chris: Do you have a date for the party yet?
   Kim: _____, I don't…Do you think you could help me find one?

2. Jim: Hi. My name's Jim Hunt. I'm calling about the ad for a _____.
   Dave: Oh, right.
   Jim: Are you still looking for one?

3. Rod: Oh, hi, Jack. What's up?
   Jack: I'm going to my friend's wedding this weekend. I'd love to _____it. Would you mind if I borrowed your video camera?

4. Jeff: Hello, would you mind if I speak to Sophia, please?
   Amy: I'm sorry she's not _____ right now. Would you like to leave a message?

5. Fred: I hear Maggie is going to work in India.
   Pam: India! Wow! I hear it's a beautiful place, but I don't think I could ever _____there.

6. Marta: Guess what! I just got invited to my teacher's house for dinner!
   Karen: Oh, how _____.
   Marta: Yes, but what do you do when you are invited to someone's house here?

7. Clerk: Can I help you?
   Helen: Yes, I'd like to return this _____.
   Clerk: Is there something the matter with it?
   Helen: Yes, I didn't notice when I bought it, but it's torn in several places.

8. Andy: You know, there's a factory outside town that's pumping _____ into the river.
   Carla: How can they do that? Isn't that against the law?

9. Paula: Um, actually, I think I'd rather take an art class. They have one on landscape photography and another one on making videos.

Jason: That _____OK. But I think I'd prefer studying video.

10. Mike: What about looking through the personal ads in the newspaper? That's how I met Stephanie.
    James: Actually, I've _____ that. But the people you meet are always so different from what you expect.

11. Tracy: Being an intern sounds more interesting than being a landscaper. And it's probably not as hard.
    Mark: _____, but a landscaper earns more money than an intern. And you get a great tan!

12. John: Yeah, and soon everyone will be using computers that fit into the palm of your hand.
    Kathy: Within 20 years, I _____ *all* our news and information will be coming through computers.

13. Kelly: So what do you have to do in order to succeed in this town? I mean, don't you need some sort of gimmick?
    Joe: Well, I've come up with a _____ that I think will work very well.

14. Alice: Well, it just opened a couple of months ago, everything is brand new and modern, and there are lots of _____ people who go there. It's called the Casablanca.
    Eric: Oh, right. It's the newest "in" place. I hear the reason people go there is just to be seen.

15. Jackie: You asked Beth to _____ here around seven o'clock, didn't you?
    Bill: Yes, What time is it now?
    Jackie: It's nearly a quarter to eight. I wonder what happened?

16. Brent: How was your dinner party?
    Adam: I think it went _____ well. People really seemed to enjoy themselves.

17. Sarah: Health Insurance bills, child-care bills, rent! Now that I'm going to school and only working part time, I have a _____ time making ends meet.
    Todd: Health Insurance is so expensive, isn't it.

18. Kurt: What's the most challenging thing about being in the Peace Corps?
    Brenda: For me, it's finding a way to fit into a community that's _____ different from my own. It can be frustrating!

19. Won Gyu: So how's your French class going?
    Jan: Not bad, but I'm finding the pronunciation difficult.
    Won Gyu: _____, it takes a while to get it right. You could improve your accent by listening to tapes.

20. Peter: I should have listened to my mother. She wanted me to major in business.
    Kay: _____? What does she do?
    Peter: Mom? She's a literature professor.

Reading Passage Fragments

21. One day I was reading the newspaper when I _____ a photo of a young woman who looked a lot like Mary and whose last name was Wagman—Mary's married name.

22. My new car has a problem: Every few hundred miles, more oil needs to be added. Each time I take the car into the dealer though, the service people _____ that nothing needs fixing. What can I do?

23. If the trend continues, scientists say, many_____ will suffer. Bangladesh, for example, might lose one-fifth of its land.

24. Mark began to introduce the guest speaker to the audience, but then he_____ in horror. He had forgotten her name.

25. A smiling, round-cheeked baby has helped sell countless jars of Gerber baby food. So when Gerber marketed its products in Africa, it kept the picture of the baby on the jar. What Gerber didn't _____was that in many African countries, the picture on the jar shows what the jar has in it.

26. First, relax. If you're _____ about something, you'll forget it. And avoid being negative. If you keep telling yourself that your memory is bad, your mind will come to believe it and you won't remember things.

Exact answers in bold

1. **Actually**, No, Unfortunately, sorry, well, maybe
2. **Roommate**, [job titles] (i.e. Secretary) date
3. **Videotape**, film, shoot, tape, record video
4. **In**, home, free, available, around, here
5. **Live**, work, go, survive, visit, move
6. **Nice**, lovely, wonderful, great, awful, interesting, exciting, unusual, stupid
7. **Jacket**, [article of clothing], [something made of fabric or paper] thing, purchase product
8. **Chemicals**, waste, sewage, [name of some specific type of chemical or waste] poison, stuff, it
9. **Sounds**, seems, looks is('s)
10. **Tried**, done, considered, used, read, heard
11. **Yeah**, yes, true, maybe, perhaps, no, probably, ok, huh, right
12. **Bet**, think, believe, suspect, hope, hear, promise, understand, reckon, expect, guess, know
13. **Concept**, idea, plan, gimmick, angle, trick, scheme, thing
14. **Hip**, trendy, cool, fashionable, (negative evaluative adjectives also possible) hip, happy, foreign, famous, interesting, new, rich, beautiful, young
15. **Be**, come, arrive, call, get, wait, stay, meet
16. **Pretty**, really, fairly, quite, amazingly, very
17. **Hard**, difficult, tough, rough
18. **Very**, completely, entirely, quite, fairly, so, much, far, like, really,
19. **Well**, hmm, maybe, perhaps, yeah, actually, probably, yes, so, sure, yes, ok, surely
20. **Oh**, really, huh, hmm, why, business, what, really,

21. **Noticed**, saw, found, remembered, discovered

22. **Insist**, say, claim, pretend, think

23. **Countries**, people, areas, places, nations, lands, forests, more

24. **Paused**, stopped, cringed, screamed, fainted, stammered, gasped, recoiled, froze, smiled, stood

25. **Realize**, understand, know, thinking

26, **Overanxious**, nervous, anxious, upset, worried, confused, sad, bothered, worrying, talking, thinking

CCI Form

1. Chris: Do you have a date for the party yet?
   Kim: Actually, I don't…Do you think you could help _____ find one?

2. Jim: Hi. My name's Jim Hunt. I'm calling _____ the ad for a roommate.
   Dave: Oh, right.
   Jim: Are you still looking for one?

3. Rod: Oh, hi, Jack. What's up?
   Jack: I'm going to my friend's wedding this weekend. I'd love to videotape it. Would you _____if I borrowed your video camera?

4. Jeff: Hello, would you mind if I speak to Sophia, please?
   Amy: I'm sorry she's _____in right now. Would you like to leave a message?

5. Fred: I hear Maggie is going to work in India.
   Pam: India! Wow! _____ hear it's a beautiful place, but I don't think I could ever live there.

6. Marta: Guess_____! I just got invited to my teacher's house for dinner!
   Karen: Oh, how nice.
   Marta: Yes, but what do you do when you are invited to someone's house here?

7. Clerk: Can I help you?
   Helen: Yes, I'd _____to return this jacket.
   Clerk: Is there something the matter with it?
   Helen: Yes, I didn't notice when I bought it, but it's torn in several places.

8. Andy: You know, there's a factory outside town that's pumping chemicals into the river.
   Carla: How can they do that? Isn't that against the _____?

9. Paula: Um, actually, I think I'd rather take an art class. They have one on landscape photography and _____one on making videos.

Jason: That sounds OK. But I think I'd prefer studying video.

10. Mike: What about looking through the personal ads in the newspaper? That's how I met Stephanie.
    James: Actually, I've tried that. But the people you meet are always so _____from what you expect.

11. Tracy: Being an intern sounds more interesting than being a landscaper. And it's probably not as hard.
    Mark:Yeah, but a landscaper earns more money _____an intern. And you get a great tan!

12. John: Yeah, and soon everyone will be using computers that fit into the palm of your_____.
    Kathy: Within 20 years, I bet *all* our news and information will be coming through computers.

13. Kelly: So what do you have to do in order to succeed in this town? I mean, don't you need some sort of gimmick?
    Joe: Well, I've come _____with a concept that I think will work very well.

14. Alice: Well, it just opened a couple of months ago, everything is brand new and modern, and there are lots of "hip" people who go there. It's called the Casablanca.
    Eric: Oh, right. It's the newest "in" place. I hear the _____ people go there is just to be seen.

15. Jackie: You asked Beth to be here around seven o'clock, didn't you?
    Bill: Yes, What time is _____ now?
    Jackie: It's nearly a quarter to eight. I wonder what happened?

16. Brent: How was your dinner party?
    Adam: I think it went pretty well. People really seemed to _____themselves.

17. Sarah: Health Insurance bills, child-care bills, rent! Now that I'm going to school and only working part time, I have a hard time making _____ meet.
    Todd: Health Insurance is so expensive, isn't it.

18. Kurt: What's the most challenging thing about being in the Peace Corps?
    Brenda: For me, it's finding a way to fit into a community that's very different from my own. It _____be frustrating!

19. Won Gyu: So how's your French class going?
    Jan: Not bad, but I'm finding the pronunciation difficult.
    Won Gyu: Well, it takes a while to get it right. You could improve your accent by _____to tapes.

20. Peter: I should have listened to my mother. She wanted me to major in business.
    Kay: Oh? What _____ she do?
    Peter: Mom? She's a literature professor.

Reading Passage Fragments

21. One day I was reading the newspaper when I noticed a photo of a young woman who looked a lot _____ Mary and whose last name was Wagman—Mary's married name.

22. My new car has a problem: Every few hundred miles, more oil needs to be added. Each time I take the car into the dealer though, the service people insist that nothing _____fixing. What can I do?

23. If the trend continues, scientists say, many countries will suffer. Bangladesh, for_____, might lose one-fifth of its land.

24. Mark began to introduce the guest speaker to the audience, but then he paused in horror. He _____ forgotten her name.

25. A smiling, round-cheeked baby has helped sell countless jars of Gerber baby food. So _____Gerber marketed its products in Africa, it kept the picture of the baby on the jar. What Gerber didn't realize was that in many African countries, the picture on the jar shows what the jar has in it.

26. First, relax. If you're overanxious about something, you'll forget it. And avoid _____negative. If you keep telling yourself that your memory is bad, your mind will come to believe it and you won't remember things.

Exact answers in bold

1. **me**
2. **about**
3. **mind**
4. **not,** sleeping
5. **I**
6. **What**
7. **like**
8. **law**
9. **another,** that, have, also, like
10. **different** far
11. **than**
12. **hand**
13. **up** here, along, onto
14. **reason**
15. **it**
16. **enjoy** be
17. **ends**
18. **can**, may, will, might, gonna, should
19. **listening**
20. **does** did
21. **like**
22. **needs**
23. **example**, instance
24. **had**

25. when, although

26. being, feeling, becoming