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Abstract

This quantitative, comparable study examined student achievement in online and traditional on-campus college level courses in SPAN 1001- Elementary Spanish I and SPAN 1002- Elementary Spanish II through an ex-post facto model of study. There were two types of final exams that were examined. Those were the final oral exam and the final written exam for each course. The study took place at a two-year college in middle Georgia. The student population included college level students that enrolled in the courses over a six-semester period. The students varied in age, previous foreign language background, sex, race, and responsibilities outside of college. The exams were the same for both the online and on-campus courses and covered materials taught in the course. In addition, the exams were tied to level and instruction of each course. Once the data were collected, two independent samples t-tests were performed. The study found that students in SPAN 1001 did have comparable scores on the final oral exam and on the written exam. However, students in SPAN 1002 did not have comparable scores on the oral final exam but scores were comparable on the final written exam. The implications of the study included offering more courses online settings.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

As the United States becomes a more diverse nation, there has been a greater demand for citizens to become bilingual. This demand began with World War II and has continued through today (Jackson & Malone, 2009). The Department of Defense has made the case that Americans need to be able to communicate in both professional and national security concerns. In addition to communication, cultural awareness of other cultures and countries is also considered necessary (Jackson & Malone, 2009). With a higher demand placed on language skills, many post secondary degrees are now requiring foreign language courses as part of the major areas of concentration in order to graduate with the preferred degree. According to the Modern Language Association (2011), schools that offer undergraduate level degrees have been encouraged to offer more degrees requiring foreign language courses as a result of the September 11, 2001, attacks on the United States of America. There has been a push to incorporate the training at the university level, to include more training in the K-12 levels, more certification in foreign language, and to make foreign language courses part of the core curriculum. Due to this push, several Public Laws, Senate Bills, and House Resolutions have been put in place to aid with the increase of language and culture instruction. These include Public Laws 110-315, 110-84, and 110-69, Senate Bill 1294, and House Resolutions 5179, 2111, 747, 1469. All of these laws and bills deal with foreign language education and components necessary for course creation or students’ abilities to take and pay for the courses (Jackson & Malone, 2009).

One way schools have addressed this need and offer flexibility is through the offering of online degrees and courses. According to www.gerogiaonmyline.org, a website dedicated to the online programs and courses in the University System of Georgia, 31 of the university system’s
institutions offer some form of online courses and a total of 251 degrees that can be fully achieved through online courses. The University System of Georgia offers 4,585 courses in online settings, which can be fully online or partially online. Of these courses, 150 are listed as foreign language, literature, or linguistics courses, and 110 of those are specifically Spanish courses ranging from 1001 to 4000 level courses at eleven different institutions (University System of Georgia, 2013). World Wide Learn (2013) sponsors a search engine style webpage for online courses as well. According to this website, there are a total of 21 languages taught in online formats for college or university credit. These languages range from Basque to ESL. In addition, the website shows a total of 33 universities throughout the United States of America and Canada that offer the courses (World Wide Learn, 2013). These numbers show the movement of colleges and universities into utilizing online systems and courses to deliver the language courses and information.

**Purpose of the Study and Research Questions**

Due to the increasing amount of language learning occurring online, an issue was raised about whether students were able to achieve similarly on exams with the same accuracy as traditional on-campus courses. Foreign language courses taught in a fully online setting are relatively new areas of implementation. In addition, most research studies found were limited to one set of skills that were taught within the course. Most studies focused on reading comprehension, culture, oral proficiency, or grammar. In addition, the majority of the studies examined the usage of online sources to aid in the teaching and learning of the above-mentioned skills with on-campus courses or hybrid style courses. Some examples of these studies included research by Tanyeli (2008) in the usage of CALL with reading comprehension, research by Celentin (2007) in the usage of CALL with grammar instruction, research by O’Dowd (2009) in
the usage of CALL and cultural instruction, and research by Warner (2004) in the usage of CALL and oral proficiency. It is important to note that none of the research found addressed student achievement neither in fully online courses nor in multiple skill sets. Therefore, the purpose of this research was to determine whether students in fully online courses reached similar achievement levels on two types of final exams.

There was one study that provided background for the formation of the research questions. The study was on equivalency theory (Lapsley, Knlik, Moody, & Argaugh, 2008). Given results from research in equivalency theory, students in both traditional and online courses were expected to perform similarly on both types of final exams given in each course (Lapsley, et al., 2008).

Based on this theory, it was hypothesized that on-campus and online students would have similar success in each course. To test this hypothesis, data were collected to address the following questions.

A) Is there a difference between traditional and online course scores on the final oral exam?

B) Is there a difference between traditional and online course scores on the written final exam?

See appendices A-E for copies of the final exams

**Brief Overview of the Research Design**

This quantitative, ex-post facto research project was designed around student scores on both types of final exams given in each course. Two independent t-tests were performed using the scores to compare achievement between the online courses and the on-campus courses. The alignment of the research questions and analysis procedures is detailed in Table 1.
Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question Skill Component</th>
<th>Assessment used to obtain data</th>
<th>Analysis Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Written Exam</strong></td>
<td>1001- SPAN 1001 Final Exam</td>
<td>Two independent samples t-tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1002- SPAN 1002 Final Exam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Final Oral Exam</strong></td>
<td>1001- SPAN 1001 Questions for Final Oral Exam and SPAN 1001 and 1002 Oral Exam Rubric</td>
<td>Two independent samples t-tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1002- SPAN 1002 Questions for Final Oral Exam and SPAN 1001 and 1002 Oral Exam Rubric</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significance of the Study**

This study carried significance because it addressed an area where there appeared to be a gap in the literature. While most literature available on the topics of learning a foreign language online addressed one component of language learning, this research project addressed student achievement based on the final exams for the courses. Both types of exams were comprehensive and covered all topics and skills taught in the course. The outcomes may be able to make foreign language instructors aware of the fact that online language education, i.e. both the teaching and learning of the language, can be achieved at the college level with student final exam scores compatible to the traditional on-campus style courses. By helping other instructors see that online foreign language can achieve equal or similar scores to the traditional on-campus courses, new courses and areas of study could be added to the ever-growing list of courses taught in a total online classroom.

In addition, this study carried significance for the school of study. The administration of the school encouraged online education, but at the same time, the courses had to be quality
courses that would meet similar student achievement. In order for the Department of Distance Learning to show this, several courses were chosen for examination to show the administration this was occurring in the courses. SPAN 1001 and SPAN 1002 were two of the courses that were chosen for this examination. The main reason these courses were chosen was they were the most technologically advanced courses the school was offering. The second reason was that the director of the division was using the courses as models on how to create and write quality courses that have a sound curriculum basis and were designed to help students succeed at levels similar to the on-campus students. It was the intention that this research project would show that students in total online courses could earn comparative scores to those in traditional classrooms.

Definitions of Terminology

Definitions of Courses used in the project:

SPAN 1001: This set of call letters and numbers refers to the course Spanish 1001: Elementary Spanish I. This college level course is designed for students that have never had Spanish, did not take Spanish in high school, or need a refresher course in the language.

SPAN 1002: This set of call letters and numbers refers to the course Spanish 1002: Elementary Spanish II. This college level course is designed as a continuation course to follow SPAN 1001. However, it can serve as the first college level course taken by students that have completed the mandatory two-years of high school Spanish.

Comprehensive- encompassing all topics and skills taught in the course

Definitions of Exam Types:

Final Oral Exam: This is a spoken exam administered at the end of the semester where students must answer questions. For on-campus students, the exam is done in a face-to-face setting with
the instructor. The online students record their answers in a recorder and submit an audio file. The exam must be completed in the target language. The questions are randomized.

**Final Written Exam:** This is a traditional style exam that is administered at the end of the semester that covers all topics and skills taught in a course. For on-campus, this is a pencil and paper style exam. For online students, this is a computerized exam where answers are typed into a computer program. This exam includes both multiple-choice and short answer questions. The test bank was created 3:1 so all questions are randomized.

**Target Language:** The language of study.

**Definitions of Acronyms used in this project:**

**CALL:** Computerized Assisted Language Learning. This is the usage of computer programs, research, and the Internet to aid in the teaching and learning of a foreign language. It may vary by the type of skill that is being taught or researched as to how it is applied within the classroom.

**Definitions of types of courses:**

**On-Campus Courses:** These are traditional face-to-face courses that are taught only on campus. Some on-campus courses are traditional lecture style courses that involve only the instructor and the students. Others may be web-enhanced and utilize technology into the course along with lectures.

**Web-enhanced Courses:** These are on-campus courses that utilize technology in, within, or in addition to the face-to-face component of the course. This may be through websites, electronic books, or electronic web-based learning systems.

**Hybrid Courses:** These courses are made up of face-to-face interaction and online components. Traditionally, hybrid courses meet in the classroom for a face-to-face session one day a week.
The second meeting day of the course is done in an online setting or through web-based learning systems. The instructor is traditionally not present during the online component of the course.

**Online Courses**: These courses are completed in an online setting. There are no face-to-face meetings that are held unless students make appointments to visit the instructor. All work is done through websites, electronic books, and web-based learning systems. All communication between instructor and student is completed electronically including comments given on assessments and assignments.

**Definitions of study types:**

**Quantitative**: A study that uses and analyzes data in numerical form

**Ex-post facto**: A study that compares two or more groups. It is usually done as an “after the fact” assessment for comparison of those two groups for some set assessment, project, or score (Michael, n.d.).
Chapter 2

Literature Review

This literature review deals with previous studies and articles that address the usage of Computer Assisted Language Learning (CALL) within the classroom. It addresses some generalizations and uses of CALL as well as specific usages of skills taught in the foreign language classroom. Each section of the review is grouped by topic and specific skill on which the research focused. Since the proposed research project dealt with student success on final exams that encompassed these skills, it was best to organize the literature as it pertained to that specific skill. Because CALL is still fairly new in its usage, especially the movement to total online instruction in foreign language classrooms, the need to find pertinent literature arose to see if CALL is or can be effective with second language acquisition or learning a foreign language in an online setting.

The literature was collected from a five-year period, 2009 to 2013. Multiple searches were done in databases and online to locate previous studies. The databases used included Galileo and ERIC. Internet searches were also conducted. These were done by using key phrases such as foreign language and online instruction, online courses, second language acquisition online, reading comprehension and online instruction, and many more combinations of key words and skills combined with online instruction. These multiple searches elicited a variety of studies in some areas and very few in others. The research was then compiled into categories based on the topics covered. The research included the year 1996 and multiple years between 2002 and 2013. The research studies came from a variety of sources including doctoral dissertations, conference presentations and papers, and journal articles from publications that focused on second language acquisition and/or online education. Some of the studies gave
quantitative data while others were qualitative. Some studies analyzed student test scores, some used surveys, some used student assignments for class, some used in-class assignments, and others looked at revisions based on instructor feedback. Needless to say, there were a large variety of methods used within the studies. The interesting thing that appeared from the compilation of research was the lack of studies that focused on overall performance or even student achievement in a foreign language classroom that used only CALL as a main source of instruction. This lack of research studies supplied the gap that fueled the creation of this research project.

Equivalency Theory and the Effectiveness of Online Instruction

As the number of students taking online courses and the number of courses in online formats continues to grow, it is important to address student achievement in these courses. More specifically, it is important to make sure that students in online versions of the course can meet the same outcomes required by the students in traditional on-campus courses. This is what is referred to as equivalency theory. Equivalency theory basically states that there is no difference between online and on-campus courses, and students have equal experiences and outcomes in each type of course (Lapsley, Knlik, Moody, & Arbaugh, 2008). According to the study performed by Lapsley, et al. (2008), where students in a selected junior level Human Resource course were examined, the online students outperformed traditional students in the areas of digital based tests and discussions. However, the authors’ results did not show that the traditional and on-campus courses had equivalent outcomes (Lapsley, et al., 2008).

Other studies elicited different results within the concentration of business with courses taught in online and on-campus settings. A study by Weber and Lennon (2007) examined student satisfaction and student achievement. They reviewed student satisfaction scores for four sections
of a junior level course that dealt with principles of marketing. The study was over a two-year period. They found that there was slightly lower student satisfaction in online courses, but it was at a comparable level to that of traditional courses, and that there was no difference in student results in learning outcomes which were the final exam, semester project, and final grade in the course (Weber & Lennon, 2007). A study by Wagner, Garippo, and Lovaas (2011) was performed over several years and examined a total of 606 students who took an introduction to business applications course. The course was the same, was taught by the same instructor, and contained the same materials as a traditional course. The authors found that online students did as well as traditional students when proper materials, quality texts, quality materials, notes, presentations through multimedia, clear instructions, reasonable assignments, and access to the instructor are included in the online course. The authors also stated that academic integrity was a concern for the online courses (Wagner, et al., 2011). Both of these studies showed that students can achieve similar results to those of traditional courses.

**CALL and Foreign Language Instruction**

Foreign language tends to be a relatively new subject to enter the online classroom format, and research studies have primarily been done in hybrid or web enhanced classroom settings where Computerized Assisted Language Learning (CALL) was used to support the teacher’s classroom based instruction. CALL is the usage of computers, computer software, and/or the Internet in language classrooms and subjects to help students improve and build multiple skills in the language they are studying. The usage of CALL began in the 1950s with computers being used for drill type activities where students are practicing the same concept over and over. Today, CALL has expanded to include programs on the Internet, multimedia, and hypermedia that not only aid in the learning of a language but also provide students with access
to explanations for multiple language components (Warschauer, 1996). Due to this fact, it became important to look at how each language component was affected by CALL. These components included reading comprehension, oral skills, grammatical skills, and cultural knowledge.

**CALL and Reading Comprehension Instruction**

In the area of reading comprehension, there were two studies that showed CALL can be beneficial in the teaching of reading comprehension. The first was a quantitative study conducted by Murphy (2007). In this study, Murphy found that feedback from the instructor played an important part of students acquiring reading comprehension skills online. There were three basic types of feedback that were mentioned as effective based on the type of mistakes made by students. The types of feedback were explanatory, directive, and monitoring. Murphy further found that the more elaborate feedback the students received the better equipped they were to correct mistakes. The second study, conducted by Tanyeli (2008), contained both qualitative and quantitative results. Tanyeli focused on English as a Second Language (ESOL) students. Tanyeli found that students who used CALL to aid with reading skills increased their achievement along with higher levels of learning compared to those students who only received traditional instruction.

**CALL and Grammar Instruction**

In the area of grammar instruction, there were two studies that addressed the usage of CALL. In a quantitative study by Sagarra and Zapata (2008), 245 Spanish students using electronic workbook activities in the area of grammar were examined. They found that the electronic workbook activities aided students in improving their grammatical skills. However, they also found that that the activities were time consuming, and without some traditional
instruction in the classroom, the activities would be difficult to complete. A second study, conducted by Celentin (2007), included students of Italian and online tutors. Celentin was interested in seeing how the online tutors could aid in student responses and performance of written discussion posts. The students’ posts were used to determine the language phase the students used for response, and the posts were targeted for one of four areas. Those were triggering events, exploration, integration, and resolution. Celentin found that the input given by tutors and instructors guided the responses of students to the posts. In addition, Celentin found that even with input, few students reached higher phases of integration and resolution in the posts.

**CALL and Cultural Knowledge Instruction**

There was little research that addressed CALL and cultural knowledge. In a study by O’Dowd (2009), intercultural exchange was examined. In this particular exchange, students in two different countries would exchange e-mails about different cultural topics in the language of study. Each student would write the e-mail in the language he/she was studying. An example of this would be an exchange between students of Spanish in the United States of America and students of English in Spain. The students of Spanish would write e-mails to the students in Spain in Spanish, and the students in Spain who were studying English would write the American students in English. O’Dowd found that there were multiple problems with the exchange. These included lack of teacher support, technology issues, lack of technology, and reliability of the exchange partners. This type of exchange is looked at as a solution to teach culture in foreign language classrooms; however, this study showed that the problems outweighed the cultural knowledge gained by the students.
CALL and Instruction Towards Oral Proficiency

With regards to CALL research, the area of foreign language that yielded the most studies was that of oral skills. Four studies showed how CALL could be used to build oral skills in a foreign language. The first study, conducted by Kung (2002), involved English as a Foreign Language (EFL) students and a group of native speakers. The students were involved in multiple types of digital exchanges. Kung found that these exchanges provided an anonymous outsource for practicing oral skills, which can lower the nervousness of speaking. A second study, performed by Warner (2004), showed that language play could improve oral skills amongst students in German. Warner found that when beginning level and conversational level students were allowed to communicate in the target language, they would involve various levels of language play including parody, sarcasm, sparring, etc. This type of play helped to build context in words and move past primary language meaning. Blake, Wilson, Cetto, and Pardo-Ballester (2008) examined oral proficiency in online, hybrid, and traditional classrooms. There were a variety of exercises that students were scored on based on a program called Versant (Pearson, 2012). Versant is an automated program that is produced by Pearson Higher Education. The program allows students to complete spoken exams in Spanish, French, or Arabic and have their oral proficiency measured (Pearson, 2012). The scores showed that all three types of classes performed at comparable levels (Blake, et al., 2008). The fourth study by Volle (2005) examined oral skills in online courses. This study examined voice e-mails and audio files. The files were of varying types of exercises and were examined for different types of skills. Volle found some differences in several of the exercises but improvement in others.

There was a variety of research that showed CALL could be used and successful in improving a variety of skills. However, the majority of the studies examined focused on specific
skills that often were used in addition to traditional on-campus courses. There was little research that utilized fully online courses and no research found that examined the overall usage of skills in online courses.
Chapter 3

Methods

The methodology for this project was designed because of an interest in the area of distance learning and creating online Spanish courses that were comparable to traditional on-campus courses in regards to student achievement. In addition, the lack of literature that addressed comparable student success in foreign language education in an online setting fueled the conception of this project. This section on methods further explains how the project was created as well as the rationale behind it; the study setting; a description of the participants for the project; the exams and materials used; the sources of data; the collection procedures of data; and the analysis of data. Each section was designed to further explain the different components of the project in ample detail as well as the procedures that were followed to collect the data.

Research Design

This project was set up as a quantitative, ex-post facto research project that involved statistical analysis of student scores associated with final exams for SPAN 1001 and SPAN 1002. The data collected included individual student scores for each final exam administered in the course over six different semesters. During these six semesters, both an on-campus and online version of SPAN 1001 and 1002 were taught concurrently. The assessments that were used included a comprehensive written final exam and comprehensive final oral exam. In addition, scores for each type of exam were stored in electronic grade-book files and were easily accessed.

Ex-post facto research was appropriate for this study because it was comparing the scores of students after the final exams were completed. Ex-post facto research by definition involves the comparison of two or more groups “after the fact” (Michael, n.d.). Therefore, using the
design of analysis of final exam scores over a six-semester period, where students had previously completed the exams, followed the standard of ex-post facto research models.

**Study Setting**

This research project took place at a two-year associate degree offering college that is part of the University System of Georgia. The college is located in a rural section of middle Georgia and contains four distinct campuses. The campuses are broken down into main campus, the aviation campus, the online campus, and the commuter campus. In January 2013, the school became a consolidated college with another local college creating six distinct campuses that will offer both associate and bachelor degrees. The school now has one main campus, three commuter campuses, the aviation campus, and the online campus.

The courses, SPAN 1001 and SPAN 1002, for this study came from the commuter campus of the two-year institution before the consolidation and from the online campus, which consists of students that take only online courses. After the consolidation, the courses for these campuses remained the same. The only difference is the campus is no longer considered the only commuter campus within the school. The traditional courses are generally capped at 25 students and few overrides into the course are granted. The online courses are capped at 24 and are many times taught as double sections or overridden to place more students in the courses. The online courses were developed from the on-campus materials to maintain continuity, and they were written and taught by the same instructor.

In addition, students enrolled themselves into the course or courses they chose to take during a set registration period, and each student had the ability to choose the on-campus or online course without regards to the campus the student normally attended. The administration attempted to limit online courses to fully online students, but this did not prove to be successful.
It was not uncommon to have students enrolled in online courses that also attended one or more on-campus courses.

**Participants**

There were a total of 375 students in the study. The participants of this study were the students enrolled in the SPAN 1001 and SPAN 1002 courses from Spring 2010 until Spring 2013. There were 141 students included in the SPAN 1001 on-campus course, 127 students in the online SPAN 1001, 44 students in the on-campus SPAN 1002, and 63 students in the online SPAN 1002 course during the six semesters included in the study. The course make up included both males and females; traditional, non-traditional, and dual enrolled high school students; some students worked part-time, others worked full-time, and some did not work at all; some were parents to children of all ages; and all came with a varied educational background and foreign language background. The traditional campus students came from a four county-area whereas online students came from all over Georgia and several other states. There was no way to show variation between the courses with specific statistical number in regards to age, sex, and race as instructors were not supplied with those data for online courses, and a lack of face to face instruction did not allow for those data to be collected. In addition, all students who withdrew from the course or were withdrawn for lack of attendance were not factored into the final student totals nor were they factored into the final course totals.

See Appendix F for student enrollment numbers per semester and per course type and number

**SPAN 1001 and SPAN 1002 Course Layout**

Prior to classes beginning each semester, students registered for the courses they needed to take. Students had the choice to register for online and on-campus courses as needed based on their location and schedule. Each course taught during the full term session lasted sixteen weeks.
The SPAN 1001 and 1002 covered four chapters worth of material from the *Intercambios* textbook. SPAN 1001 covered the preliminary chapter through chapter four. The materials in these chapters included the alphabet and pronunciation of sounds and letters; vocabulary lessons included classroom objects, geography, nationalities, time, days of the week, dates, months of the year, academic courses, majors, housing, and family; cultural information based on the differences in education, family, social interactions, greetings, presentations, goodbyes, time, and scheduling; and grammatical information included parts of speech, articles, number and gender, adjectives, verb conjugation, subject and verb agreement, regular and irregular verbs, present tense, and verb categories. SPAN 1002 covered chapters five through eight. The information in these chapter included pronunciation of words; vocabulary lessons including weather, seasons, places to work, occupations, sports, pastimes, foods, and restaurant terminology; cultural information on foods, restaurants, sports, pastimes, Hispanic athletes, bullfighting, Costa Rica, Panama, higher education differences, and Chile; grammatical information on irregular present tense stem changes, reflexive verbs, present progressive, regular and irregular preterite tense, imperfect tense, por and para, tener, tener idiomatic expressions, gustar, verbs similar to gustar, and object pronouns (Guiomar Borrás & Hendrickson, 2006).

Each course was aligned to move through the curriculum of the course based on the location of the course. The on-campus courses met twice a week for 75 minutes each time and moved in succession as each topic was covered, using lecture and practice activities, and completed. Once the unit was finished, the students tested on the unit and moved into the next unit’s material. The online courses had two weeks to finish each section of the four units assigned for the course. Each unit was divided into two sections, which gave students a total of four units divided into eight parts. During the semester, students in each course received lessons
on pronunciation, culture, vocabulary, and grammar. At the end of the semester, each student was tested on set questions that reflected what was covered throughout the course.

Both the on-campus and online courses covered the same materials in similar formats. The online courses were developed from the on-campus teaching format and materials. Students began with vocabulary lessons and practiced repeating the words. The online students were provided the pronunciation by clicking on the words. Both classes did multiple practices with vocabulary recognition including but not limited to PowerPoint. Students were also introduced to communicative questions related to the vocabulary words. The on-campus students answered the questions out loud for the teacher or in groups. The online students submitted recordings of their practices to the instructor. In the area of cultural instruction, the students in both types of courses read the cultural material in the textbook and related it in an online discussion post on a specific topic covered in the readings. In addition, each lesson that was covered in the courses had assigned homework and practice activities in the electronic workbook and online course manager.

Under the grammar sections, students received in class and online lectures as well as detailed notes containing examples, rules, and explanations. The online lectures were pre-recorded and embedded into the course. After covering the rules, looking at the examples, and having lectures, students completed multiple and varied practice exercises on those topics. On-campus students had practices both online and in the classroom. Online students completed practices only online. At the end of the exercises, students took short ten to twenty question comprehension quizzes on each topic. There were also homework and practice exercises from the workbook attached to these lessons.
The last component of each unit was a comprehensive unit exam. Once all of the lessons were covered, students had a brief review to prepare them for the exam. When the exam was completed, students moved into the next unit and accompanying lessons. Each unit was set up in a similar manner as the previous one(s) completed by the students. Once all of the units had been covered, students completed a comprehensive oral and comprehensive written final exam.

The oral exam was scored with a rubric that was designed by the senior foreign language faculty. The oral exam rubric was divided into areas of pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, proficiency, and cultural knowledge. There were specific criteria for each of theses areas and were scored on a scale of zero to four. Each student answered twelve questions, three from each of the four units, for the exam. The questions were specific to the content covered in the course. The on-campus students were provided with questions at least one week before the exam and made an appointment with the instructor on a set date and time to do the exam. They came to the instructor’s office at that set time. The instructor randomly asked three questions from each unit that the student answered. The instructor then scored them in each area of the oral exam rubric based on their responses to the twelve questions they answered.

The online students received the oral exams questions during the time that the final exam folders were open which is usually a week to two-week period. Due to issues with randomization with the online recorder, the online course was unable to have randomized questions asked by the instructor. The online students chose three questions from each unit to answer in the form of recordings based on a built-in recorder for the course. The recorder was built into a server and serviced by the school’s distance learning technicians. The instructor listened to each recording and scored it on the rubric based upon each student’s performance. Each SPAN 1001 course involved in the study used the same questions, and each SPAN 1002 course involved in the study
used the same questions. The questions varied from recall to application of the given material in the courses. See Appendices A-C

The final written exam was a traditional style exam. Students received a brief review before the exam. The on-campus students attended a set time and date to complete the exam in a proctored classroom setting. The date and time were determined by the final exam schedule provided by the school. The online students completed the exam on the computer by typing in the answers for the exam. All exams contained a 3:1 ratio of questions to allow for randomization to aid in testing security. All students received the same types of questions, but it was unlikely every student would have the exact same questions. Both the online and the on-campus students received randomized exams. The exams covered all topics covered from the course and ranged from multiple-choice questions to short answers. A scantron machine or computer scored the multiple-choice questions. A scantron machine is one that scores multiple choice style tests. Students complete answers on a special type of paper that is used with the machine. Instructors also complete a key on this paper. The instructor sends the key through the machine and then sends each students answer sheet through the machine. The machine scores each answer sheet based on the key provided by the instructor. The short answer questions were hand scored. The points earned for the multiple-choice sections and the short answer sections were added together to calculate the final grade on the written final exam. This was the case for both the SPAN 1001 and SPAN 1002 courses. See Appendices D and E

The same process as described above was utilized for each course. The main difference in set up was the online courses had more embedded audio files for listening, a recorder to submit oral recordings, and a few tweaks to programming in order to allow the lessons to function smoothly in the online setting. The largest instructional difference was whether or not the
instructor was physically present in the course. The biggest difference in set up for the oral exam and final exam was that the online courses had a longer time frame to complete the exams where the on-campus courses had specific days and times they were required to complete the oral and written final exams.

**Final Exams and Measures**

There were two types of final exams included in the study to assess student achievement in each course. This occurred in both SPAN 1001 and SPAN 1002. The final oral exam included questions students must be able to answer correctly and in complete sentences based on topics covered in class. The written exam included questions students must answer based on topics covered in the course. See Appendices A-E Due to the comprehensive nature of the exams, students had to utilize knowledge of the materials and skills taught in the courses. These skills included oral proficiency, usage of vocabulary, usage of grammar rules and writing skills, usage of cultural knowledge of Spanish speaking countries, and reading comprehension skills. Each of the exams was adapted to the materials covered in each course. All SPAN 1001 and SPAN 1002 courses were measured in the same manner without regard to campus or type of course. All tested content was aligned with set chapters of the *Intercambios* text and accompanying electronic workbook (Guiomar Borrás & Hendrickson, 2006).

Each exam was designed with testing security in mind. Therefore, multiple question banks were designed for each exam, which allowed for question randomization. Both of these exams had been administered over multiple semesters. With this consistency of use and ability to provide randomization, both the final exam and final written exam contained reliability. In addition, validity was achieved through the usage of course related content style questions.
Sources of Data

The data collected were used to analyze and compare student achievement in online and on-campus SPAN 1001 and SPAN 1002 courses. Each semester, students completed a final oral exam and a final written exam for the course that was scored and assigned a grade. The oral exam grade was calculated out of 20 points, and the final exam grade was calculated out of 100 points. These grades were placed into an electronic grade-book and calculated into the student’s final average. Both final exam scores for SPAN 1001 and SPAN 1002 counted as 25% of the overall final average for each student. The electronic grade-book files were stored each semester to create an archive for each course. The final exam scores for both the oral and written components were then pulled from the archives for each student completing the course. This was the same for both SPAN 1001 and SPAN 1002.

Data Collection Procedures

There were multiple steps taken to collect the actual student scores for each of the final exams that were used during this study. First was obtaining IRB exemption. Both the school of study and the school of graduate study required an IRB submission. Upon receiving IRB exempt status from both schools, the instructor accessed the archived electronic grade-book files. Then, individual students scores for both the online and the on-campus students were pulled for both the final oral and the final written exams. This was done for each type of class and for each semester included in the study. After the scores were pulled from the grade-book files, each score was placed into SPSS and coded by type of course and type of exam. In addition, all scores of zero for final oral and written exams that were not completed and submitted were eliminated from the data. This was the same process to collect the data for the final oral exams and the final written exams in both the SPAN 1001 and SPAN 1002 courses.
Data Analysis

After the removal of the student scores for each exam from the grade-book files for SPAN 1001, the data were organized into two groups: those from online courses and those from on-campus courses. In addition, scores were organized as to whether they were for the final oral exam or the final written exam. After the data were organized, all data were coded, labeled, and placed into SPSS for statistical analysis. SPSS is a statistical analysis program produced by IBM. This particular program was chosen because it is a reliable program and the program that was used for the required statistical course for this Educational Specialist program. The types of courses were coded as 1 for on-campus courses and 2 for online courses. Each variable column was added, labeled according to the type of exam, and the scores for each student for each of the six semesters were added to the appropriate column. Once all data was entered into SPSS, two independent samples t-tests were run. This particular test was chosen because the independent variable, the type of class instruction, was qualitative with two nominal values. Those values were on-campus and online instruction. The dependent variable, the student scores on each final exam, was quantitative. The hypothesis was formatted that the on-campus courses and online courses would have equal results, and the null hypothesis was formatted that the on-campus and the online courses would not have equal results. After the formation of the hypotheses, two independent samples t-tests were run using SPSS on student scores for the final oral exam and final written exam. This analysis process was repeated for the SPAN 1002 course data.
Chapter 4

Results

This section of results is designed to describe the statistical data and analysis for each of the research questions presented in the study. The data used student scores on the final oral exams and the final written exams that were analyzed through two-independent samples t-test through SPSS. The results of each test will be explained and charted for each type of exam included in research questions A and B.

Research Question A

The first research question examined was: Is there a difference between traditional and online course scores on the final oral exam? This question was assessed through a final oral exam and standard rubric used to grade the exam. Student scores for the final oral exam for each of the six semesters included in the study were placed into SPSS and analyzed. The following tables show the results of the two-independent samples t-tests that were run for the final oral exam score for online and on-campus courses.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>On-Campus</th>
<th>Online</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Score</td>
<td>17.29</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>16.94</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05.

There was not a statistically significant mean difference between scores on the final oral exam between online and on-campus courses at the 0.05 level. The results showed that scores for
students in the on-campus and the online courses were comparable on the final oral exam for SPAN 1001. The maximum score for the exam was 20, and the scores ranged from 8 to 20.

Table 3

Results of T-tests for the Final Oral Exam for SPAN 1002 Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>On-Campus</th>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>Online</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>17.82</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16.84</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.91*</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.

There was a statistically significant mean difference between scores on the final oral exam between online and on-campus courses and the 0.05 level. The results showed that students in the on-campus courses scored higher on the final oral exam for SPAN 1002 than the online students. The maximum score for the exam was 20, and the scores ranged from 8 to 20.

Research Question B

The second research question examined was: Is there a difference between traditional and online course scores on the final written exam? This question was assessed through a final written exam. Student scores for the final written exam for each of the six semesters included in the study were placed into SPSS and analyzed. The following tables show the results of the two-independent samples t-tests that were run for the final written exam score for online and on-campus courses.
Table 4

Results of T-tests for the Final Written Exam for SPAN 1001 Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>On-Campus</th>
<th>Online</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written Exam</td>
<td></td>
<td>84.78</td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>86.67</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05.

There was not a statistically significant mean difference between scores on the final written exam between online and on-campus courses at the 0.05 level. The results showed that students in both the on-campus and online courses’ scores were comparable on the final written exam for SPAN 1001. It is interesting to note that the t-score was negative because the online course had a slightly higher mean score than the on-campus courses. However, the difference was not enough to create statistically significant results. The maximum score was 100 for this exam, and scores ranged from 2 to 100.

Table 5

Results of T-tests for the Final Written Exam for SPAN 1002 Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Course Type</th>
<th>On-Campus</th>
<th>Online</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written Exam</td>
<td></td>
<td>81.17</td>
<td>9.99</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>83.37</td>
<td>14.01</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

There was not a statistically significant mean difference between scores on the final written exam between online and on-campus courses at the 0.05 level. The results showed that students in both the on-campus and online courses scored comparatively equal on the final written exam for SPAN 1002. It is interesting to note that the t-score was negative because the
online course had a slightly higher mean score than the on-campus courses. However, the difference was not enough to create statistically significant results. The maximum score for the exam was 100, and the scores ranged from 10-100.
Chapter 5

Discussions and Conclusions

This section is designed to further address the statistical findings of the study. It will include a summary of the statistical findings as well as a discussion of those findings. In addition, limitations, implications, and recommendations for the study will be addressed.

Summary of Findings

The results of the two-independent t-tests showed that students in SPAN 1001 courses had comparable scores on both final exams. The on-campus students scored slightly higher on the oral exam than the online students, but the online students scored slightly higher on the final written exam. However, the results from the t-test for SPAN 1002 showed mixed results. The t-tests showed a statistically significant mean difference in scores on the oral exam, but the scores on the final written exam were comparable. The on-campus students scored higher on the oral exam, and the online students scored slightly higher on the final written exam. Therefore, the students in the SPAN 1002 online and on-campus courses yielded comparable scores on the final written exam but not on the final oral exam.

Discussions of Research Findings

Results of this study indicated that it is possible for students to achieve similar scores on final oral and written exams at the SPAN 1001 course level and on written exams at the SPAN 1002 level. However, it did not indicate that the SPAN 1002 course level could achieve this similarity on the final oral exam. In addition, multiple potential variable and demographics could create differing results for this study.

The findings of this study were unique in the fact that it addressed a gap in the literature. No studies were found that observed overall success in second language acquisition though the
usage of final exams. This included the inability to locate studies that focused neither on final oral exams nor final written exams. The literature and studies found discussed achievement in multiple skills areas. However, there was no way to tie achievement into specific skill areas from the final exams as multiple skills were utilized within each exam creating an overlapping usage of skills necessary to complete the exam.

There was one study that became relevant to the results of this study. That was the research on equivalency theory by Lapsley, Knlik, and Arbaugh (2008). The results of this study both support and do not support the concept of equivalency theory. While equivalency theory stated that there should be no difference between the achievements of on-line and on-campus students, the results of this study showed that this was the case for only the final written exam in SPAN 1002. The results for both the final written and final oral exams for the SPAN 1001 courses also supported this theory. However, the results of the t-tests on the final oral exam in SPAN 1002 did not support this theory. Therefore, the results appeared to support equivalency theory only on certain exams and only in certain courses.

**Limitations of the Study**

As with any research, there were multiple threats that could cause the results of the study to be considered invalid. One such threat was the way the students are tested. In on-campus classes, the professor was present for the exam and can monitor each and every student as he/she tests. However, in online courses, this was not feasible. This opened up issues with cheating or academic dishonesty. The instructor, even if they require honor code statements and enforce the academic dishonesty policies of the school, could not control cheating in online courses. It was possible that online students could use the textbook, online translators, have someone else complete their assignments, or have written answers in front of them when they complete the
tests. There were ways to help limit the amount of cheating in the course, but flexibility had to be allowed.

A second threat was the fact that there was no way to ensure that both the on-campus and online courses were consistent and comparable for the following: student background in the language, sex, age, class size, and registration into the course. This was all based on who registered for the courses and when he/she registered for the courses. This allowed for a lot of diversity that could have possibly allowed the results to skew towards one particular group.

A third possible threat was the lack of true randomization for oral exam questions in the online courses. In order for an oral exam to fully test a students’ ability to answer the questions, they needed to be randomized. Randomization allowed for the instructor to see how much the student has learned throughout the course. The student had a combination of easy and harder questions to answer, which allowed for language progression and not just memorized answers. Face-to-face exams, such as those for the on-campus courses, allowed for this as the instructor chose the questions the student answered. However, due to programming issues with the embedded recorder and the testing options in the online courses, true randomization was not available. This was discussed at length with the technical programmers in the Department of Distance Learning for the school. However, there was not a solution developed to address this. Since this is the case, online students chose the questions they answered which could allow for them to focus on developing better crafted responses then would exist for a truly randomized test.

A fourth possible threat was the length of time each course had to review the materials before the exams. Due to the fact that the school created a final exam-testing schedule, it was possible that some classes had a longer period to prepare for the exam. Additional study time
could have increased the scores of those students that had longer amounts of time to prepare for
the exams, and those with less time could have had their scores negatively impacted by the
reduction of study time.

A fifth possible threat was the fact that each course contained students who were re-
taking the course and students in Learning Support courses. This was especially true for the
SPAN 1001 course. If students did not earn a letter grade of C or higher in the course, they
would have to re-take the course in order to increase their grade to earn college level credit. By
having repeating students factored into the study, the scores could have been skewed, as they
would have made higher grades during the second attempt in the course due to the repetition of
the course’s curriculum and topics. In addition, SPAN 1001 often had a large number of students
enrolled that are taking Learning Support, or remedial courses, in Reading or English. These
students did not possess the reading and grammatical skills to place into college level courses
and had to have remediation in these skills. These students can take SPAN 1001, as there were
no pre-requisites that stated students must be out of remedial reading and grammar courses.
Since, the language skills between English and Spanish most often times overlapped, these
students would also be lacking basic understanding of transferrable skills into Spanish. This fact
alone could have caused these students to score lower on the exams then the ones that did not
require remediation.

**Implications for Practice**

There were many implications that could be drawn from this study. The first and most
important was the fact that students could and did achieve similar or even near similar results on
both the final oral exams and the final written exams in SPAN 1001 and on the written exam for
SPAN 1002. Secondly, it means that the higher-level course, SPAN 1002, was unable achieve
similar scores on the oral exams. With this being said, one could imply that the online oral exam may have become more difficult for students at the 1002 level. It also implied that online courses should be able to achieve similar scores. The third implication was that by better addressing some of the limitations in the study, students might be able to show better similarity in achievement on both oral and written final exams in each level of the course. Teachers, course designers, subject advisors, administrators, and students could benefit from this study because it would help all of them to know what success level students had with the online courses. In addition, teachers and course designers would be aware of the limitations for the courses that needed to be addressed to aid in students’ success as well as need for more courses to be designed for the students in online settings.

Recommendations for Practice and Future Research

There are multiple recommendations that can be made based on the findings of this study. Those recommendations are as follows:

1. Develop and launch more language courses in an online setting. The results of the study showed that the courses were able to show similar results on the written exams, thus indicating that language courses function well in online settings in the area of written student achievement. This would also allow students more flexibility to take language courses, as many of these courses are often limited to only on-campus instruction.

2. Create more opportunities within the 1002 course for online students to practice communicative questions and oral skills throughout the semester. The results showed that SPAN 1002 courses did not have similar scores on the oral exam, but the SPAN 1001 courses did. Due to the nature of material in the course, SPAN 1001 focused more on pronunciation of letter sounds than SPAN 1002. SPAN 1001 also provided more oral
practice throughout the semester than 1002. Therefore, the additional practice may have helped the students have more comparable scores in the 1001 course.

3. Repeat the study in multiple ways. By doing so, one would be able to see whether or not similar results to this study could be achieved. It would be beneficial to do more studies with the following changes:

   a. Add more semesters and course sections. This will allow for a higher number of students to be examined.

   b. Conduct similar studies using different textbooks and curriculum. This will allow one to see if the text and course lay out or curriculum has an effect on student achievement and could be causing the differences in scores.

   d. Analyze higher-level courses such as SPAN 2001 and 2002. This would allow one to see if equivalency theory does indeed exist in these courses as the study results suggest equivalency exists in higher-level courses.

   e. Identify and eliminate student scores of those enrolled in Learning Support Courses and those re-taking the course for a second or third time. By eliminating these two groups, one would have a clearer understanding of the student achievement of first time class takers in a college level course.

4. Address as many of the limitations as possible to better streamline the two types of courses. Due to the set up of the academic calendar and the registration process, it may be impossible to have equal number of students by race, sex, and age or even equal number of students in the course, as well as have equal amounts of time to prepare for the exam. However, several limitations need to be addressed to ensure better similarity between the two types of courses. Have all students take truly randomized oral and written final
exams and require all written finals to be proctored would be a beginning. This will take a lot of effort on the technological end in order to develop ways to better test online students during the final oral exam, but in the end, it should allow for more closely structured courses. Also, addressing the issues of every student taking a proctored final written exam will be challenging for the online students, but it may very well be the best format to ensure testing security and the ability to see true student achievement on a written final exam.

5. Present the study’s findings at a state conference such as the Foreign Language Association of Georgia, Georgia Educational Research Association, or some other conference dedicated to language learning and/or distance learning. This will help other instructors understand how students achieve on final exams in online language courses when compared to on-campus courses.

6. Publish this study or publish journal articles based off of the study’s findings to reach learners in a larger learning community that share an interest in distance learning and/or language learning. This will help reach larger audiences and instructors that do similar research or instruction with languages in online settings.
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Appendix A
SPAN 1001 and 1002 SACS Oral Exam Rubric

ORAL EXAM RUBRIC FOR SACS LEARNING OUTCOMES

STUDENT: __________________________________________

**Pronunciation:**
4 points: Articulates and enunciates perfectly. A proficient speaker in the
target language would have absolutely no problem comprehending.
3 points: Pronounces well and articulates adequately.
2 points: Pronounces barely well enough to be understood by proficient speaker. Still has issues
of articulation but communicate rudimentarily.
1 point: Very difficult for a proficient speaker to understand. Can make out words but hasn’t
adequately addressed the proper pronunciation of the target language’s vowels or
consonants.
0 points: Student did not submit/complete assignment.

**Vocabulary:**
4 points: Has great command of vocabulary learned.
3 points: Knows vocabulary fairly well. Will use the English equivalent occasionally.
2 points: Is barely adequate. Tends to use English equivalents more.
1 points: Completely struggles. No mastery of Vocabulary learned.
0 points: Student did not submit/complete assignment

**Grammar:**
4 points: Knows the correct syntax and organizes the sentences structures according to the
proper rules.
3 points: Adequately knows the proper rules of grammar.
2 points: Is barely adequate. Tends to structure the sentences with and English style syntax.
1 point: Does not know how to properly structure the sentence in the target language
0 points: Student did not submit/complete assignment

**Proficiency:**
4 points: Highly proficient
3 points: Fairly proficient
2 points: Student constantly has to stop and think about what needs to be said.
1 point: Must constantly start over, stop and look quickly at his/her notes. Fluency is highly
disrupted.
0 points: Student did not submit/complete assignment
Appendix A continued
SPAN 1001 and 1002 Oral Exam Rubric

Cultural Knowledge
4 points: Superior knowledge and expression of cultural norms taught in class.
3 points: Adequate knowledge and expression of cultural norms taught in class.
2 points: Barely adequate knowledge and expression of cultural norms taught in class.
1 point: No incorporation of knowledge and expression of cultural norms taught in class.
0 points: Student did not submit/complete assignment

TOTAL SCORE OUT OF TWENTY:
Appendix B
SPAN 1001 Questions for Final Oral Exam

Unit 1
1. ¿Cómo te llamas?
2. ¿Cuál es su nacionalidad?
3. ¿Cuántos estudiantes hay en la clase? (t=46)
4. ¿Cómo es usted?
5. ¿De dónde es usted?
6. ¿Cómo está?
7. ¿Eres tú alto?
8. ¿Eres tú simpático?

Unit 2
1. ¿De qué colores es la bandera de los Estados Unidos?
2. ¿Te gustan los perros?
3. ¿Qué clases tomas este semestre?
4. ¿Para qué carrera estudias?
5. ¿Hablas español siempre?
6. ¿Con qué frecuencia hablas español?

Unit 3
1. ¿Cuál es la fecha de hoy?
2. ¿Qué hora es?
3. ¿Cuándo es tu cumpleaños?
4. ¿Dónde vives?
5. ¿Qué te gusta hacer?
6. ¿Adónde vas a ir el viernes por la noche?
7. ¿Estás contento/a hoy?
8. ¿Cómo están las cosas?
9. ¿Qué día es hoy?
10. ¿Cuántos años tienes?
11. ¿Quieres ir al parque tú?

Unit 4
1. ¿Cómo se llama tu mamá o papá?
2. ¿Dónde vive tu abuelo o abuela?
3. ¿Cuántos años tiene su hermano o hermana?
4. ¿Qué cosas tienes en tu dormitorio?
5. ¿Cuántos abuelos tienes?
6. ¿Cuántos hermanos tienes?
Appendix C
SPAN 1002 Questions for Oral Exam

Unit 5
1. ¿Dónde trabaja el doctor?
2. ¿Cuál es su profesión?
3. ¿Dónde trabajan los bomberos?
4. ¿A qué se dedica usted?
5. ¿Quién trabaja en el hospital?
6. ¿Quién trabaja en la estación de bomberos?
7. ¿Cuál es la capital de Costa Rica?
8. ¿Quién sirve en un restaurante?

Unit 6
1. ¿Qué tiempo hace hoy?
2. ¿En qué estación estamos?
3. ¿A qué hora te dormiste anoche?
4. ¿Quieres ducharte o bañarte?
5. ¿Cómo es el clima en el verano?
6. ¿Cuál es tu estación favorita?
7. ¿Qué estación tiene nieve?
8. ¿Durante qué meses es la estación seca en Panamá?
9. ¿En qué año dio los Estados Unidos a Panamá?
10. ¿Qué parte del cuerpo tiene que lavarse antes de comer?

Unit 7
1. ¿Cuáles son sus pasatiempos favoritos?
2. ¿Qué deporte te gusta mirar en la televisión?
3. ¿A qué deporte juega Oscar de la Hoya?
4. ¿Qué hizo usted el verano pasado?
5. ¿Cuáles son los deportes más populares en el mundo hispano?
6. ¿En qué regiones juegan al béisbol?
7. ¿Qué significa <<ir a la playa>>?
8. ¿Qué significa <<montar a caballo>>?
9. ¿Son los pasatiempos más populares en el mundo hispano sociales o individuales?
10. ¿Qué significa por ejemplo?
Appendix C continued
SPAN 1002 Questions for Oral Exam

Unit 8
1. ¿A qué hora comes la cena?
2. ¿Cuáles son sus verduras favoritas?
3. Cuando vas a un restaurante, ¿qué usas para pagar la cuenta?
4. Cuando eras niño/a, ¿qué comiste para el desayuno?
5. ¿A qué hora se desayuna el mundo hispano en general?
6. ¿Cómo se llama la comida principal del día?
7. ¿Qué significa <<Buen provecho>>?
8. ¿En un restaurante, puede encontrar secciones de fumar, no fumar, o ambos?
9. ¿Cuánto por ciento de una cuenta es lo común de dejar para una propina?
10. ¿Qué tipo de actividades hacen los españoles en un bar de tapas?
Appendix D
SPAN 1001 Final Written Exam

A. Mark A if the statement is True and B if the statement is False.

1. La unidad social más importante para los hispanos es la familia.

2. Normalmente sólo dos generaciones viven en la misma casa.

3. Los abuelos contribuyen a la educación de los niños y ayudan a los padres.

4. En el mundo hispánico hay muchas casas de ancianos.

5. En las familias hispanas, los primos casi no se conocen.

6. Las familias hispanas son muy unidas.

7. En la tradición hispana los niños reciben sólo un nombre.

8. Mirtha Guerra de Suárez es el nombre de una mujer soltera.

9. A veces los niños reciben el nombre del santo del día en que nacen.

10. Casi siempre, el primer hijo varón lleva el nombre del padre.

11. Los sobrenombres no son comunes en los países hispanos.

12. En el nombre Olga Álvarez G., la “G” es la primera letra del apellido del esposo.

13. Los niños hispanos llevan el apellido del padre y de la madre.

14. María del Carmen no es un nombre compuesto.

15. Isabelita y Guillermito son sobrenombres.
Appendix D Continued
SPAN 1001 Final Written Exam

B. Mark A if it is a greeting, B if it is a leave taking and C if it is a courtesy phrase.

16. Hola
17. Hasta luego
18. permiso
20. de nada

16. Chau
17. Hasta la vista
18. perdón
19. Buenas noches
20. con mucho gusto

16. Hasta luego
17. más o menos
18. adiós
19. Buenas tardes
20. por nada

B. Match the family relationship to the right person.

21. El padre de mi mamá es mi...  a. tíos
22. La hija de mi hermana es mi...  b. cuñada
23. Los hijos de mis tíos son mis...  c. hermanastro
24. El hijo de mi padre es mi...  d. hermano
25. Las hermanas de mi padre son mis...  e. abuelo
26. La esposa de mi hermano es mi...  ab. sobrina
27. El hijo de mi madrastra es mi...  cd. primos

21. El madre de mi mamá es mi...  a. tíos
22. El sobrino de mi hermana es mi...  b. nuera
23. Los hijos de mis hermanos son mis...  c. hermanastro
24. El hijo de mi padre pero no de mi madre es mi...  d. hermano
25. Los hermanos de mi madre son mis...  e. abuela
26. La esposa de mi hijo es mi...  ab. hijo
27. El hijo de mi madre es mi...  cd. sobrinos

21. La hija de mi hermano es mi...  a. prima
22. El padre de mi papá es mi...  b. nietos
23. El hijo de mi madre y mi padrastro es mi...  c. sobrina
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24. La madre de mi esposo es mi…
    d. medio hermano
25. La hija de mi tía es mi…
    e. abuelo
26. La esposa de mi padre no es mi madre; es mi…
    f. suegra
27. Los hijos de mi hija son mis…
    b. g. madrastra

   C. Mark A if the object is located in el dormitorio, B if it is la cocina, C if it is la sala, D if it is el baño, and E if it is el comedor.

28. el refrigerador
29. la silla
30. el inodoro
31. la cama
32. el sofá
33. la ducha
34. el armario
35. la mesa

28. el horno
29. la bañera
30. la mesa de café
31. el cómodo
32. el sillón
33. el inodoro
34. la mesa
35. la estufa

28. la ducha
29. el fregadero
30. la cama
31. el microondas
32. la mesa de noche
33. el lavamanos
34. el lavaplatos
35. la cómoda

   D. Mark A if the article el goes with the noun, B for la, C for los, and D for las.

36. borrador
37. pizarra
38. bicicletas
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39. nieto  
40. lápiz  
41. tarea  
42. libros  
43. sillones  
44. camas  
45. guatemaltecas  
46. doctora  
47. carros  
48. inglés  
49. historias  
50. negocios  

36. borradores  
37. pizarras  
38. bicicleta  
39. nietos  
40. lápices  
41. tareas  
42. sillón  
43. silla  
44. cama  
45. guatemalteca  
46. doctoras  
47. carro  
48. ingleses  
49. historia  
50. negocio  

36. luz  
37. reloj  
38. gatos  
39. ventanas  
40. cine  
41. española  
42. casas  
43. arte  
44. mapas  
45. geografía  
46. domínico  
47. playas  
48. pupitres  
49. estación
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50. africanas

    E. Mark A if you would use tú or B if you would use usted

51. your Spanish instructor
52. one of your classmates
53. Teresa González, whom you just met
54. Blanca González, Teresa’s grandmother
55. Alicia, your niece
56. Sr. Morales
57. El Presidente de los Estados Unidos
58. your new business client
59. a new student in your class
60. an old friend

51. your history professor
52. one of your teammates
53. Teresa González, whom you have known your whole life
54. Blanca González, a new student
55. Alicia, your classmate
56. Sra. Morales
57. El vice-presidente de los Estados Unidos
58. your business client
59. a student in your class
60. an older classmate

51. an old friend
52. your English teacher
53. the cashier at the grocery store
54. your sibling
55. your doctor
56. the President of Middle Georgia College
57. your best friend
58. your business partner
59. your younger cousin
60. a person you just met

    F. Mark A if the verb is conjugated in the yo form; B if it is tú; C if it is él, ella, or usted; D if it is nosotros; E if it is vosotros; and AB if it is ellos, ellas, or ustedes.

61. hablo
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62. asisten
63. comemos
64. escribís
65. miran
66. tomas
67. bebe
68. visita
69. leen
70. creo
71. bailáis
72. tengo
73. pone

61. habla
62. asistes
63. como
64. escribimos
65. miráis
66. tomo
67. beben
68. visitamos
69. lee
70. creemos
71. bailan
72. pongo
73. tiene

61. bebemos
62. pago
63. escribe
64. visitáis
65. conocen
66. cantas
67. hablo
68. quiere
69. vamos
70. tienen
71. abríis
72. estudia
73. tomas
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G. Mark A if it is an –ar verb, B if it is an –er verb, and C if it is an –ir verb

74. hablo
75. asisten
76. comemos
77. escribís
78. tengo
79. tomas
80. bebe
81. visita
82. leen
83. creo
84. salgo

74. hablas
75. asiste
76. comen
77. escriben
78. tienen
79. tomo
80. bebo
81. visitan
82. leo
83. creen
84. pongo

74. cantamos
75. vendo
76. abres
77. aprendéis
78. caminas
79. queremos
80. reciben
81. tomas
82. tengo
83. compra
84. decidís
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H. Mark A if it is a rule for the usage of ser, B for estar, C for saber, and D for conocer.

85. location  
86. familiar with places  
87. time  
88. Facts  
89. emotions  
90. days of the week  
91. people  
92. current month of the year  
93. physical characteristics

Reading Comprehension: Complete each question with a complete sentence.


94. ¿De dónde es Rafaela Lugones?  
95. ¿Por qué estudia geología y biología?  
96. ¿Qué hace el gobierno costarricense para preservar la naturaleza?  
97. ¿Qué quiere ser?  
98. ¿Tiene problemas con sus estudios?  
99. ¿Habla inglés Rafaela?  
100. ¿De dónde es la mamá de Rafaela?
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A. Marca A la frase es cierta (C) o B si es falsa (F).

1. En Chile la merienda se llama la once.
2. En España se cena entre las nueve y las once de la noche.
3. La comida a precio fijo también se llama el plato del día.
4. Cuando una persona entra en un restaurante en Latinoamérica se sienta donde quiere.
5. Casi todos los restaurantes ya tienen una sección de no fumar.
6. Al terminar la comida el camarero le ofrece café y postre a su cliente.
7. Inmediatamente después de traer el café y el postre les trae la cuenta.
8. Muchas veces la cuenta ya incluye la propina.
9. El desayuno en el Latinoamérica se toma mucho más tarde que aquí.
10. En general el desayuno consiste en café con leche, pan con mantequilla y mermelada y a veces fruta.
11. El almuerzo, que se sirve entre la una y las tres de la tarde, es la comida principal del día.
12. La sobremesa es la costumbre de hablar por media hora o más después de comer.
13. La cena, que se sirve después de las ocho de la noche, es la comida más fuerte del día.
14. Las tapas son aperitivos como, por ejemplo, la tortilla mexicana, el curanto o el róbif.
15. Se hace la tortilla española de patatas, huevos y cebolla frita en aceite de oliva.

B. Marca A si el tiempo es parte del invierno, B si es del verano, C si es de la primavera, o D si es del otoño.

16. Hace sol
17. Hace viento
18. Hace fresco.
19. Llueve
20. Hace frío

16. nieva
17. hace calor
18. está a 105 °Fahrenheit
19. hay hielo
20. hace mucho sol

16. hace mucho frío
17. hace calor
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18. nieva
19. llueve
20. está a 5 º Fahrenheit

C. Marca A si el verbo está en el presente, B si es el pretérito, o C si es el imperfecto.
21. hablo
22. estaba
23. pude
24. tomaba
25. se llama
26. habló
27. se afeitó
28. pusimos
29. comían
30. eramos
31. supe
32. conozco
33. hizo
34. hubo
35. había
36. hay
37. tomabáis
38. comió
39. come
40. condujiste

21. Puse
22. Fui
23. vi
24. quise
25. pude
26. vino
27. hacía
28. se preocupaban
29. jugaba
30. iba
31. me ducho
32. nos vestimos
33. me lavo
34. me quito
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35. me pongo
36. Vimos
37. Tomaron
38. pedí
39. podemos
40. almuerzan

21. asistía
22. era
23. molestaba
24. estaban
25. volvían
26. permitían
27. se despiertan
28. me levanto
29. se afeita
30. se acuestan
31. me duermo

32. Pasé
33. Escribí
34. Leyó
35. dijo
36. pude
37. hice
38. invitó
39. Comimos
40. Vimos

D. Marca A si es una fruta, B si es carne, C si es verdura, D si es producto de leche, E si es merienda/postre, o AB si es una bebida.

41. el pollo
42. la manzana
43. el chocolate
44. las uvas
45. la zanahoria
46. la leche
47. el helado
48. la lechuga
49. el bistec
50. las galletas
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41. el agua
42. a leche
43. la cerveza
44. el pastel
45. la papaya
46. el pescado
47. el queso
48. la carne de res
49. el pollo
50. las fresas

41. las manzanas
42. las bananas a
los huevos
44. chocolate
45. palomitas de maíz
46. galletas e
47. vino tinto
48. la langosta
49. el flan
50. el café

E. Pon la letra correcta con el deporte o el pasatiempo

51. tocar a. ejercicio
52. montar b. el sol
53. jugar c. de compras
54. hacer d. a las cartas
55. esquiar e. en la piscina
56. nadar ab. en el invierno
57. ir ac. por la red
58. navegar ad. la guitarra
59. tomar ae. a caballo
60. visitar bc. Museos

51. el doctor a. el avión
52. la ranchera b. la escuela
53. el guía c. el restaurante
54. la científica d. el rancho
55. el bibliotecario e. la biblioteca
56. el bombero ab. el juzgado
57. el azafata ac. el laboratorio
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58. el juez  ad. el hospital
59. el maestro  ae. el museo
60. la mesera  bc. el parque de bomberos

51. el médico  a. la cafetería
52. la secretaria  b. la oficina
53. el vendedor  c. la oficina de computación
54. la científica  d. el juzgado
55. la programadora  e. la comisaría
56. el policía  ab. el laboratorio
57. el maestro  ac. la tienda
58. el abogado  ad. el hospital
59. la bibliotecaria  ae. el colegio
60. el cocinero  bc. la biblioteca

F. Marca A si es una regla del pretérito o B si es el imperfecto

61. for a past completed action
62. Describe weather in the past
63. To “set the stage” of the story
64. when the beginning AND/OR the end is stated
65. for a one time occurrence in the past
66. To express age and time in the past
67. To describe a continual action that was interrupted
68. when something interrupted something else in the past
69. for a series of actions in the past
70. To describe habitual, repeated, and continuous actions in the past

G. Marca A si es por y B si es para

71. Yo trabajó ______ Middle Georgia College.
72. Mi papá está enfermo. Yo trabajé _____ él.
73. El Señor Vargas va a España _____ tres semanas.
74. _____ un gringo, ella habla español muy bien.
75. El examen es _____ lunes.
76. Yo te doy 10 pesos ______ la pluma.
77. Nosotros vamos _____ México.
78. Llegamos _____ tren.
79. Gracias _____ todo.
80. Normalmente, yo me baño _____ la noche.
71. Yo paso ______ Jefferson City cuando conduzco a Kingdom City.
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72. Yo necesito ir al banco ______ cambiar un cheque de viajero.
73. Mis padres van a salir ______ Cancún mañana.
74. El cartero trabaja ______ la oficina de correos.
75. Uds. necesitan preparar la comida ______ mañana.
76. Voy a estudiar ______ una hora esta noche.
77. ¡Gracias ______ el regalo, Mario!
78. Normalmente yo me baño ___ ______ la mañana.
79. Vamos a México ______ seis días.
80. Voy a mandar la tarjeta ______ correo aéreo.

71. Felipe habló con su novia ______ teléfono anoche.
72. Víctor compró los sellos ____ tres euros
73. Mis amigos y yo vamos al cine _______ la noche.
74. ¡Gracias _________ todo!
75. Yo juego al tenis _________ hacer ejercicio.
76. Compré estos patines ______________ mi sobrina.
77. Fuimos a Chile _______________ dos semanas.
78. El cartero trabaja _______ la oficina de correos.
79. Uds. necesitan preparar la comida _______ mañana.
80. Voy a estudiar _________ una hora esta noche.

H. Marca A si el cambio radical es e →ie, B si el e → i, C si el o → ue, o D si el u → ue

81. jugar
82. querer
83. repetir
84. probar
85. servir
86. cerrar
87. poder
88. vestir
89. contar
90. recomendar

81. pensar
82. venir
83. devolver
84. acostarse
85. probar
86. seguir
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87. medir
88. decir
89. encontrar
90. sentir

81. tener a
82. despertarse
83. jugar
84. encontrar
85. repetir
86. costar
87. conseguir
88. almorzar
89. mentir
90. cerrar

I. Marca A si la frase es correcta y B si es incorrecta

91. El juez trabaja en la corte.
92. El científico no trabaja en el laboratorio.
93. La policía trabaja en el parque de bomberos.
94. Un vendedor trabaja en una tienda.
95. La enfermera trabaja en el centro comercial.

91. El maestro trabaja en la universidad.
92. El doctor trabaja en la corte.
93. El mesero trabaja en un restaurante.
94. El cocinero no cocina en un restaurante.
95. El agente de viajes trabaja en un agencia de viajes.

91. La profesora trabaja en el colegio.
92. El bombero trabaja en una oficina.
93. El cartero trabaja en la oficina de correos.
94. El jardinero trabaja en un rancho.
95. El periodista trabaja para un periódico.
Antes, mi familia vivía en Guatemala. Mi abuelo trabajaba en una plantación bananera. Era un trabajo duro pero ganaba lo suficiente para vivir. Mi papá decidió buscar otro trabajo. Quería trabajar menos y ganar más. Cuando cumplió veinte años, salió del pueblo para buscar trabajo en la capital. Después de dos semanas encontró empleo en la cervecería Gallo. No le gustó el trabajo pero ganaba el doble (double) de lo que ganaba en el pueblo. La vida de la capital era difícil para él. Había mucho ruido por el tráfico y necesitaba a la familia y los amigos. El gerente de la cervecería le contó (told him) de una oportunidad de trabajar en un rancho grande en Texas. Aprovechó (He took advantage) de la oportunidad y vino a los Estados Unidos en 1965. Le gustaba el trabajo aquí porque pasaba los días al aire libre (outside). Decidió quedarse aquí.

96. ¿Dónde trabajaba mi abuelo?
97. ¿Por qué no quería trabajar allí mi papá?
98. ¿Cuándo salió de su pueblo?
99. ¿Cómo era la vida en la capital?
100. ¿Por qué le gustaba el trabajo en los Estados Unidos?
### Appendix F

**Table of Number of Students Enrolled Per Semester and Course Type**

Number of Students Per Semester and Per Course Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester and year</th>
<th>Total number of students enrolled in SPAN 1001 on-campus</th>
<th>Total number of students enrolled in SPAN 1001 online</th>
<th>Total number of students enrolled in SPAN 1002 on-campus</th>
<th>Total number of students enrolled in SPAN 1002 online</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2010</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2011</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2012</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Totals</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>