THE ENGLISH EXAM IN THE UNIVERSITY ENTRANCE EXAMINATION: AN OVERVIEW OF STUDIES

María Belén Díez Bedmar
Universidad de Jaén

ABSTRACT

The importance of the University Entrance Examination in the students' academic future has fostered research on the characteristics of the exams which compose it. Among them, the English exam has been analysed concerning crucial issues such as its validity and reliability, the students' written production in the foreign language, and the type of improvements which may be implemented in the exam. The results obtained in the studies conducted so far on the English exam are overviewed in this paper, so that they may be considered in forthcoming studies or when implementing changes to the exam.

KEY WORDS: University Entrance Examination, English exam, studies, revision.

RESUMEN

La importancia de la Prueba de Acceso a la Universidad en el futuro académico del alumnado ha propiciado la investigación de las características de los exámenes de los que se compone. Entre ellos, el examen de inglés se ha analizado respecto a cuestiones como su validez y fiabilidad, la producción escrita del alumnado en la lengua extranjera, y las posibles mejoras que se pueden incluir en el examen. Los resultados obtenidos en los estudios que se han realizado hasta el momento se presentan en este artículo, para que se puedan considerar en estudios futuros o cuando se implementen cambios en el examen.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Pruebas de Acceso a la Universidad, examen de inglés, estudios, revisión.

1. INTRODUCTION

The University Entrance Examination in Spain, together with the student's score from secondary education, is the key to access the European Higher Education Area (EHEA). Therefore, it is crucial that this high-stakes examination meets the six characteristics that Bachman and Palmer require for a test to be useful, namely "reliability, construct validity, authenticity, interactiveness, impact and practicability" (29-31). Only by revisiting these characteristics and implementing any necessary changes will students be offered a University Entrance Examination which

may give them equal opportunities to access a degree. In the case of the English exam, it is also important to study the students' (written) command in the foreign language (FL), as reflected in their (written) production. The results obtained in this respect will help teachers, researchers and testers to know the students' level before entering the EHEA, and see if they are ready to face the use of the FL in their degrees (i.e. to exchange ideas in the FL, to enjoy mobility programmes, etc.).

The studies which have analysed any aspect regarding the English exam in the Spanish University Entrance Examination so far have been divided into three categories (García Laborda, "Analizando" 10). However, this classification did not consider the studies that have described the students' command in the FL either by using a Computer-aided Error Analysis (CEA), or an Interlanguage (IL) analysis, methodologies developed by Dagneaux, Denness and Granger, and Selinker, respectively. Thus, this article will review the studies done on the English exam in the Spanish University Entrance Examination by dividing them into the following three sections. In the first one, the studies related to the issues of reliability and validity will be described. Then, the (C)EAs and IAs conducted with the students' written production will be reviewed. Finally, the third section will be devoted to those publications which have advocated for an improvement of the exam and suggested future lines of research.

2. RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY IN THE ENGLISH EXAM IN THE UNIVERSITY ENTRANCE EXAMINATION

In this section, the analysis of two "measurement qualities" (Bachman and Palmer 19) will be explored. The first one is the reliability of the test, that is, the extent to which test scores result from a test which is free from measurement errors. The second quality is the validity of the exam, which is determined by its reflection of the working definition of language ability being evaluated.

2.1. RELIABILITY

To analyse intra- and inter-rater agreement, in a pre- post- design experiment, Amengual Pizarro (*Discrepancy*) asked thirty-two raters to rate ten compositions in the established order and provide a holistic mark from zero to ten to each of the compositions. Three months later, the same raters were again required to mark the same compositions holistically, but in a different established order. Among the results of the study, various aspects are worth noting. First, the pre- stage was characterized by more variability among the raters' holistic scores (pre-stage: $M= 4.85$, $SD= 1.08$; post-stage: $M= 4.55$; $SD= .67$) as well as a wider range of scores (pre-stage: 2.90-7.00; post-stage: 2.80-5.60), and the raters' holistic agreement was low ($k= .66$). There were no statistically significant differences in the average composition in the pre- and post-stages, although the standard deviation ($SD= 9.1$) showed that scores were widespread around the mean, a result in line with two previous

publications which had showed poor inter-raters' agreement (Amengual Pizarro, "Study"; Amengual Pizarro and Herrera Soler). Finally, the level of intra-rater agreement proved to be quite high, although some raters showed important differences in the pre- and post- stages.

The effect of the different types of evaluation on the reliability of the exam has also been analysed. Amengual Pizarro ("Posibles") focused on the intra-rater agreement of thirty-two raters in ten compositions when using holistic and analytic evaluations. The results revealed that the use of a holistic evaluation resulted in a low total raters' agreement (k= .64), although it was slightly higher than that found in the use of analytic rating (k= .60). Nevertheless, the degree of consistency in analytic scoring was higher than that in holistic scoring (k= .69; k= .66; respectively). In fact, data show that raters' analytic scoring was more arbitrary and heterogeneous than that in holistic scoring, although both types of evaluation showed significant correlations.

Similarly, Watts and García Carbonell compared the results obtained when using holistic and focused holistic evaluation. The latter was conducted by including six degrees of correctness and a descriptor per degree. To check the inter-rater agreement, two groups of four inexperienced raters evaluated the same one hundred exam papers, each group using a type of evaluation. The findings obtained indicate that focused holistic criteria showed significantly greater reliability in the total scores, a greater score variance, but a lower judge variance. Finally, there was a high consistency in the ratings in the pre- and post-stages in all questions.

The possible causes for the poor results of holistic evaluation have also been considered. Gila González used a questionnaire to ask eight raters about the English exam. Regarding its evaluation, the lack of vocabulary, grammatical errors and lack of coherence, in decreasing order of importance, were claimed to be the causes of errors, although the aspects which influenced the raters' score were the lack of coherence in the presentation of ideas, grammatical mistakes and the erroneous use of vocabulary, and connectors. Similarly, Amengual Pizarro ("Study"), and Amengual Pizarro and Herrera Soler asked raters to highlight the best and the worst aspects of thirty-two compositions (which had been previously classified) and to relate them to seven different aspects. The results show that the attention paid to various aspects of the students' compositions differed depending on their proficiency level. Another crucial result was that there was not a direct relationship between the raters' judgments and their scores. Two further analyses were conducted to investigate whether raters would give the same importance to errors in discourse or in isolated sentences (Amengual Pizarro, "Study"; Amengual Pizarro, Herrera Soler and Alonso Vázquez).

Other variables have proved to affect the scoring process. First, Herrera Soler ("Effect") compared the ratings by ten female (five of them working at secondary education and the other five at university) and ten male raters (same distribution in secondary education and university). Regarding gender, men were found to be more lenient than women in objective and subjective questions of the exam, and the raters' working place also proved an important variable, since secondary school teachers focused more on accuracy. The type of question rated also biased

the raters' scoring, as can be seen in the fact that university teachers agreed on the scoring of the composition, but there were significant differences when they scored open questions. Finally, the proficiency level shown in the exam also determined the raters' scoring. The data in this publication reveal that secondary school teachers were stricter when the composition was poor, but university teachers became stricter as the level of the exam was better. Amengual Pizarro ("Posibles") also studied the raters' gender and working place. Her results point out that women working in high schools were more lenient than men working in the same institution, although differences were found as far as the type of evaluation done. When using holistic evaluation, women granted higher scores than men in the same institutions, whereas the opposite trend was found when using analytical evaluation. When women worked at university, their scoring was stricter than that of men at the same higher institution, a finding in line with Herrera Soler ("Effect" 176), but contradicting his claim that the group of women working in high schools is the stricter scoring group in all the cases.

2.2. Validity

Various types of validity have been defined in the literature (Bachman; Shaw and Weir). Among them, the construct, content and predictive validity of the English exam have been the focus of research.

The construct validity of the English exam has been analysed by considering the tasks that students need to perform, and by studying the way how the evaluation of those tasks affects the score obtained. Thus, Herrera Soler ("Is") asked eight raters to evaluate four hundred and fifty exams. The results revealed that the objective items in the exam presented non-normal data distribution, lacked calibration and they did not discriminate students. The subjective items of the exam (the open-answer and non-directed composition) were the ones which did so. In another study, Herrera Soler, Esteban García and Amengual Pizarro studied the relationship between the true/false question and the composition. As a general conclusion, scorings tended to be homogenous when the true/false question and the open-answer questions were studied, while the consideration of the open-answer question alone implied a negative bias in the scoring.

Sanz Sainz also claimed that the exam lacked construct and content validity. A crucial example of the lack of construct validity was seen in the little attention paid to communicative aspects in the exam. An example of the problems with content validity is the insufficient number of tasks required in the exam, which did not allow the students to produce language which is representative of their command of the FL, and it did not let them show their competences or aptitudes.

The scores obtained by eighty-one students of English Philology at the Universidad de Granada, with their scores in the Quick Placement Test and their marks during their first university year were compared by Sanz Sainz and Fernández Álvarez ("Validez"). The results revealed that the English exam in the University Entrance Examination had low predictive validity. In fact, it was the Quick Place-

ment Test score that was found to keep a direct relation with the students' mean score at the end of the first year, and with the number of credits passed in September of that academic year, thus showing a significant predictive value. In the light of these results, the authors agreed with Herrera Soler's previous claim ("Is") that the validity of the exam was not that good and it was unable to discriminate students regarding their competence level.

3. (C)EAS AND IL ANALYSES CONDUCTED WITH THE DATA IN THE ENGLISH EXAM IN THE UNIVERSITY ENTRANCE EXAMINATION

Eight studies have dealt with the language produced by Spanish students when taking their English exam. The edited book by Iglesias Rábade (*Análisis*) includes the chapters by Crespo García, Doval Suárez, González Álvarez, Iglesias Rábade ("Análisis"), and Woodward Smith, who used the English exam in the University Entrance Examination in June 1995 in Galicia. The other three studies are PhD dissertations. The first one by Wood Wood used the exams in June 1999 in the Canary Islands, whereas Rodríguez Aguado analysed the exams in June 1996 in Valladolid, and Díez Bedmar ("Analysis"; "Spanish") the ones taken in June 2008 in Jaén.

As seen in the brief descriptions below, the research interests which triggered each of these studies determined the focus of research and the methodology of each chapter or PhD dissertation. Thus, the analysis may consider either a specific linguistic aspect of the students' written command in the FL, as shown in the chapter by Doval Suárez, one error category, in the case of the chapter by Crespo García, or various error categories, as used by Rodríguez Aguado. The studies also differ in the (computer) learner corpus used (i.e. type of writing task, number of words, year and place of compilation, etc.), in the use of a (C)EA or an IL analysis for the data analysis and the error taxonomies used (Dulay, Burt and Krashen).

Morpho-syntactic errors were highlighted by Crespo García in 500 exams by means of a (C)EA which considered a linguistic category classification and a surface structure taxonomy. The data in the publication reveals that out of the 2,117 errors found, most of them are morphological (80%), then followed by morpho-syntactic (17%) and syntactic ones (3%). If the word class which triggered those errors is borne in mind, the three word classes which posed more problems were verbs (58%), adjectives (11%) and nouns (7%), in descending frequency order.

Doval Suárez scrutinized spelling errors in 322 exams (78,507 words) by means of a descriptive taxonomy considering the surface structure and the linguistic category classification. All in all, 1.27 spelling errors were found per 100 words, or a mean of 3.11 errors per exam (*SD*= 3.11). Most of these spelling errors were found in the open word classes (89.1%), and the errors triggered by phonetics were the most common ones (62.7%), specially those related to double consonants (60.2% of the errors).

The learner corpus analysed by González Álvarez was composed of 1,000 lexical errors in 304 exams (*M*= 3.29, *SD*= 2.8). The error taxonomy employed in this case focused on the open word class where the error was located, as well as the cause or process of the error. The word class where more lexical errors were found was the open word class verbs (45%), and the most frequent cause of lexical error was semantic approximation (34%), followed by hybrids and semantic extension.

Iglesias Rábade ("Análisis") focused on the students' use of discourse markers in a learner corpus composed of 2,000 exams. To do so, he followed the classification of cohesive devices into referential, substitutive, elliptical and conjunctive. Within referential devises, the incorrect uses of "his" and "hers" as possessive pronouns, "its" as a neutral possessive pronoun and "theirs" as a possessive pronoun were highlighted. Then, the percentage of error of the plural demonstrative determiner, "these," and the adverb "near" were high when studying demonstrative reference, while comparative reference showed few errors. The problems found in the use of verbal substitutors were mainly due to the substitution of the lexical verb in the second conjoin, and the main problem with ellipsis was related to the cases in which only the operator (99.55% of errors when using it) and the auxiliary verbs (99.48% of error when using this type of ellipsis) were ellipted. Finally, clausal ellipsis always presented errors when a "wh-element" was used. The analysis of the conjunctive markers used revealed that the adversative conjunctive "actually" showed the highest percentage of error (43.14%), and the erroneous use of "after all," instead of "above all" (18.75%), was the highest one in the use of causal and sequential conjunctive markers. Finally, the temporal conjunctive most frequently mistaken was represented by "*the next time" (41.18% of errors in its use).

In Woodward Smith's chapter, the students' use of prepositions was classified by means of the surface structure taxonomy. The most frequent error was that of misuse, whereas wrong word order did not present any occurrence. The results show that the three prepositions with a higher percentage of errors are "to" (22.5%), "in" (13.2%) and "of" (13.1%). Especially important were the prepositions which may express the nuances of place, time and circumstance, because these polysemic prepositions triggered 74.1% of the errors in the prepositions in the learner corpus.

The students' use of the definite, indefinite and zero articles was the main objective of Wood Wood's PhD dissertation. To do so, the 4,976 uses of articles in 332 compositions were analysed by means of an IA. The 1,160 erroneous uses found (23.3% of the uses) were closely related to the type of reference which they express. In fact, students did not show many problems with definite reference (11.1% of erroneous uses), or the indefinite one (27.3% of errors), but struggled with the expression of generic reference (52.7% of errors). The use of the zero article in generic reference with uncountable nouns showed the highest percentage (65.9%). As far as the type of errors which students made when using each article, the most frequent one out of the three types considered (omission, agreement and misuse) was their omission in the cases of definite (75.1%) and indefinite articles (44.7%), and the addition of the article "the" in the contexts where the zero article would have been preferred (75.5%).

The learner corpus used by Rodríguez Aguado consists of 12,204 words in 123 compositions which were analysed by means of a (C)EA in which vocabulary,

morpho-syntax, spelling and discourse were considered. Thus, the 1,325 errors found in the corpus were classified into the error categories of, morpho-syntax (47%), vocabulary (27.8%), spelling (12.7%) and discourse (12.5%). Within morphosyntactic errors, the highest percentage of errors was found in verbs (38%). As highlighted by Crespo García (1999), this word class proved important as well because the study of lexical errors also showed that this word class was the most problematic one for the students when selecting vocabulary (39.12% of errors). Regarding the third error category, spelling, the most frequent spelling errors were found in double consonants (29%), problems with "y" and "I" (29%), a finding in line with González Álvarez (1999).

Finally, the learner corpus compiled by Díez Bedmar ("Analysis"; "Spanish") consists of 302 compositions (34,403 words), error-tagged with the error taxonomy developed at the Centre for English Corpus Linguistics by Dagneaux, et al. The results offered reveal that students show more problems when dealing with the selection of vocabulary (*M*= 3.23; *SD*= 2.75), then followed by spelling problems (*M*= 3.13; *SD*= 2.53), errors in the use of pronouns (*M*= 1.62; *SD*= 1.70), and articles (*M*= 1.45; *SD*= 1.56).

4. THE NEED FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE EXAM AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The University Entrance Examination and the English exam have undergone some improvements along the history of the exam (as seen in Royal Decrees 1640/1999, 990/2000, 1025/2002, 1318/2004, 1892/2008), some of them motivated by the many voices which have claimed that the exam needed a change (e.g., Martín Úriz, et al.; Santana Lario; García Laborda, "Análisis"; Sanz Sainz and Fernández Álvarez, "University"). For instance, Sanz Sainz and Fernández Álvarez ("University") and García Laborda ("Análisis") reflected on the fact that few changes had been made in the exam, and Sanz Sainz and Fernández Álvarez ("University") highlighted the need to redesign the exam, to establish contents and objectives clearly, as well as to design a new construction protocol which ensured the quality of the exam. García Laborda ("Análisis" 29) highlighted that the English exam was still based on the Unitary factory hypothesis by Oller ("Evidence"; *Language*), who claimed that the students show a homogenous command of English in the written and oral mode. Apart from that, the criteria used to establish the students' proficiency at each level are not clear, since guidelines, such as the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), or the ones in European Association for Language Testing and Assessemnt (EALTA) or the Association of Language Testers in Europe (ALTE), have not been used so far to establish levels which are necessary for European Convergence (Sanz Sainz and Fernández Álvarez, "University"). Rating criteria or punctuation scales could also be developed by the CEFR and applied to the English exam, so that the process of rating is standardized and rater training made easier (Herrera Soler, "Vigencia" 12), which would improve the inter- and intra-rater agreement and provide more reliable results.

The need to include more skills in the English exam has also been made explicit in various publications (Fernández Álvarez; Martín Úriz, et al.; Sanz Sainz and Fernández Álvarez, "University"). Thus, various pilot exams have been designed and implemented considering listening, writing and reading (Martín Úriz, et al.), and also including the oral component, as seen in the studies by Romero García, Fernández Álvarez, and García Laborda and Gimeno Sanz ("Aproximación").

According to García Laborda ("Análisis" 29), the future of the exam for FLs revolves around three main aspects: the exam construct, its interrelation with information technology and the application of current test theory to the exam. Regarding the second aspect, the use of evaluation platforms is fostered. In the case of Spain, the multilingual platform for exams *PREVALEX* is described as a useful tool to adapt the exam to an electronic format (García Laborda, "Aportar"; "Net"; "Plataforma"; García Laborda and Gimeno Sanz, "Adaptación"; García Laborda and Magal Royo). This platform is divided into three modules, which tackle grammatical issues, writing and a blended oral module. Only the first module is automatically checked, so 30% of the tasks in the platform need human correction (García Laborda, "Plataforma").

Based on this multilingual platform for exams, the project *PAULEX* has emerged and has developed the platform *PAUER*, where (productive and receptive) oral and written tasks can be developed. As described by García Laborda, Magal Royo and Martínez Sáez, this platform makes use of an appropriate number of visual and oral aids. Pilot studies have already been conducted considering the four skills, and the major difficulties found when doing the oral and listening components have been reported (García Laborda and Gimeno Sanz, "Aproximación"). A preliminary study on the students' errors when writing on the computer for the pilot exam has also been conducted by García Laborda and Bakieva.

5. CONCLUSIONS

This paper has offered an overview of the studies which have been done so far on the English exam in the University Entrance Examination. With the results obtained so far, informed decisions can be made when considering the changes that are still necessary to improve the current English exam at any Spanish university and adapt it to the requirements of the EHEA.

To begin with the two measurement qualities analysed, both reliability and validity may be improved. The reliability of the exam has proved to be poor, and affected by variables such as the type of evaluation conducted, the number of raters, their gender, working place, type of writing task evaluated, etc. Similarly, the validity of the exam still falls short of expectations, although some important changes such as the future inclusion of the oral skill have been done (Royal Decree 1892/2008). The tension between the practicalities of the exam and its reliability and validity still needs to be considered, so further research and the application of the results to the exam are still needed.

Secondly, the students' main errors at this stage of their acquisition process have also been outlined. Despite methodological limitations, some tendencies in the students' problems when writing in the FL have been outlined by Díez Bedmar ("Spanish"). Therefore, scoring rubrics may be fine-tuned so that raters may be trained to react to these frequent errors and cope with them in the rating process, thus avoiding biased scores. The students' level at this stage should also be contrasted against a standardized scale, such as the CEFR, to see if they meet the requirements that the EHEA establishes in their degrees regarding the use of the FL.

Finally, the possibility of administering the English exam by means of a platform is being explored at the moment. Although still in a pilot stage, this promising innovation in the English exam may prove a step forward in the improvement of the exam so that it may be administered and evaluated more easily.

LEGAL DOCUMENTS CITED

– Real Decreto 1640/1999, de 22 de octubre, por el que se regula la prueba de acceso a estudios universitarios.
– Real Decreto 990/2000, de 2 de junio, por el que se modifica y completa el Real Decreto 1640/1999, de 22 de octubre, por el que se regula la prueba de acceso a estudios universitarios.
– Real Decreto 1025/2002, de 4 de octubre, por el que se modifica el Real Decreto 1640/1999, de 22 de octubre, modificado y completado por el Real Decreto 990/2000, de 2 de junio, por el que se regula la prueba de acceso a estudios universitarios.
– Real Decreto 1318/2004, de 28 de mayo, por el que se modifica el Real Decreto 827/2003, de 27 de junio, por el que se establece el calendario de aplicación de la nueva ordenación del sistema educativo, establecida por la Ley Orgánica 10/2002, de 23 de diciembre, de Calidad de la Educación.
– Real Decreto 1892/2008, de 14 de noviembre, por el que se regulan las condiciones para el acceso a las enseñanzas universitarias oficiales de grado y los procedimientos de admisión a las universidades públicas españolas.

WORKS CITED

AMENGUAL PIZARRO, Marian. "Posibles sesgos en los resultados del examen de selectividad." *Estudios y criterios para una selectividad de calidad en el examen de inglés*. Ed. Honesto Herrero Soler, and Jesús García Laborda. Valencia: Editorial de la Universidad Politécnica de Valencia, 2005. 121-148.

—— "A Study of Different Composition Elements That Raters Respond to." *Estudios Ingleses de la Universidad Complutense* 11 (2003): 53-72.

—— "Rater Discrepancy in the Spanish University Entrance Examination." *Journal of English Studies* 4 (2003-2004): 23-36.

AMENGUAL PIZARRO, Marian, and Honesto HERRERA SOLER. "What Is That Raters Are Judging?" *Las lenguas en un mundo global*. Ed. Gloria Luque Agulló, Antonio Bueno González, and Gabriel Tejada Molina. Jaén: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Jaén, 2003. 11-18.

AMENGUAL PIZARRO, Marian, Honesto HERRERA SOLER, and Cristina ALONSO VÁZQUEZ. "How Do Teachers React to ESL Writing Errors?" *La enseñanza de las lenguas en una Europa multicultural*. Actas del XXI Congreso Internacional de la Asociación Española de Lingüística Aplicada (AESLA). Ed. José Manuel Oro Cabanas, JoDee Anderson, and Jesús Varela Zapata. Lugo: Universidad de Lugo, 2005. 994-1004.

BACHMAN, Lyle. *Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1990.

BACHMAN, Lyle, and Adrian PALMER. *Language Testing in Practice*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996.

CRESPO GARCÍA, Begoña. "Errores morfosintácticos." *Análisis de los errores del examen de inglés en las pruebas de acceso a la universidad en el distrito universitario de Galicia*. Ed. Luis Iglesias Rábade. Santiago de Compostela: Servicio de Publicacións e Intercambio Científico Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, 1999. 167-206.

DAGNEAUX ESTELLE, Sharon Denness, and Sylviane GRANGER. "Computer-Aided Error Analysis." *System 26* (1998): 163-174.

DAGNEAUX, Estelle, et al. *Error Tagging Manual Version 1.1*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Université Catholique de Louvain, 1996.

DÍEZ BEDMAR, María Belén. "Analysis of the Written Expression in English in the University Entrance Examination at the University of Jaén." Diss. Universidad de Jaén, 2010.

—— "Spanish Pre-university Students' Use of English: CEA Results from the University Entrance Examination." Corpus Linguistics International Conference. Universtitat Politécnica de Valencia, Valencia. 8 April 2011.

DOVAL SUÁREZ, Susana. "Análisis de los errores ortográficos." *Análisis de los errores del examen de inglés en las pruebas de acceso a la universidad en el distrito universitario de Galicia*. Ed. Luis Iglesias Rábade. Santiago de Compostela: Servicio de Publicacións e Intercambio Científico Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, 1999. 115-165.

DULAY, Heidi, Marina BURT, and Stephen KRASHEN. *Language Two*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1982.

FERNÁNDEZ ÁLVAREZ, Miguel. "Propuesta metodológica para la creación de un nuevo examen de inglés en las pruebas de acceso a la universidad." Diss. Universidad de Granada, 2007.

GARCÍA LABORDA, Jesús. "Un análisis cualitativo de la selectividad de inglés abierto a la esperanza." *Estudios y criterios para una selectividad de calidad en el examen de inglés*. Ed. Honesto Herrera Soler, and Jesús García Laborda. Valencia: Editorial de la Universidad Politécnica de Valencia, 2005. 27-40.

—— "Analizando críticamente la selectividad de inglés ¿Todos los estudiantes españoles tienen las mismas posibilidades?" *Tesol Spain* 30 (2006): 9-12.

—— "On the Net: Introducing Standardized ESL/EFL Exams." *Language Learning & Technology* 11 (2007): 3-9.

—— "La plataforma de exámenes plurilingüe PREVALEX: resultados del diseño y perspectivas de investigación futura de la Plataforma de Exámenes Valenciana de Lenguas Extranjeras." *Didáctica (Lengua y Literaturas)* 18 (2006): 135-145.

—— "¿Qué pueden aportar las nuevas tecnologías al examen de selectividad de inglés? Un análisis de fortalezas y oportunidades." *Revista de Ciencias de la Educación* 206 (2006): 151-166.

García Laborda, Jesús, and Margarita Bakieva. "Análisis primario de la expresión escrita de estudiantes de 2º de bachillerato en una prueba de acceso a la universidad informatizada." *2010: analizar datos > describir variación/ Analysing Data > Describing Variation*. Ed. Jorge L. Bueno Alonso, et al. CD-ROM. Vigo: Servizo de Publicacións Universidade de Vigo, 2010. 756-764.

García Laborda, Jesús, and Ana Gimeno Sanz. "Adaptación del examen de inglés de las pruebas de acceso a la universidad a un entorno informático: estudio sobre las tipologías de pregunta." *25 años de lingüística aplicada en España: hitos y retos*. Ed. Rafael Monroy and Aquilino Sánchez. Murcia: EDINUM, 2007. 723-730.

—— "Aproximación cualitativa observacional a los problemas de la sección de inglés de la P.A.U. asistida por ordenador." *2010: analizar datos > describir variación/ Analysing Data > Describing Variation*. Ed. Jorge L. Bueno Alonso, et al. CD-ROM. Vigo: Servizo de Publicacións Universidade de Vigo, 2010. 746-755.

García Laborda, Jesús, and Teresa Magal Royo. "Diseño y validación de la plataforma PLEVALEX como respuesta a los retos de diseño de exámenes de lenguas para fines específicos." *Ibérica* 14 (2007): 79-98.

García Laborda, Jesús, Teresa Magal Royo, and Antonio Martínez Sáez. "Visual Aids and Iconicity in Computer Based Foreign Language Testing." *La lingüística aplicada actual: comprendiendo el lenguaje y la mente*. Ed. Carmen María Bretones Callejas, et al. Almería: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Almería., 2009. 1391-1398.

Gila González, Blanca. "Encuesta sobre la selectividad." *GRETA* 4.2 (1996): 90-92.

González Álvarez, Elsa. "Errores léxicos." *Análisis de los errores del examen de inglés en las pruebas de acceso a la universidad en el distrito universitario de Galicia*. Ed. Luis Iglesias Rábade. Santiago de Compostela: Servicio de Publicacións e Intercambio Científico Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, 1999. 207-270.

Herrera Soler, Honesto. "The Effect of Gender and Working Place of Raters on University Entrance Examination Scores." *Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada* 14 (2000-2001): 161-180.

—— "Is the English Test in the Spanish University Entrance Examination as Discriminating as It Should Be?" *Estudios Ingleses de la Universidad Complutense* 7 (1999): 89-107.

—— "Vigencia del examen de selectividad." *Estudios y criterios para una selectividad de calidad en el examen de inglés*. Ed. Honesto Herrera Soler, and Jesús García Laborda. Valencia: Editorial de la Universidad Politécnica de Valencia, 2005. 5-15.

Herrera-Soler, Honesto, Milagros Esteban García, and Marian Amengual Pizarro. "Lectura de la prueba de inglés de la selectividad desde una perspectiva pitagórica." *La lingüística aplicada al final del siglo XX: ensayos y propuestas*. Ed. Isabel de la Cruz Cabanillas, et al. Alcalá de Henares: Universidad de Alcalá, 2001.177-183.

Iglesias Rábade, Luis, ed. *Análisis de los errores del examen de inglés en las pruebas de acceso a la universidad en el distrito universitario de Galicia*. Santiago de Compostela: Servicio de Publicacións e Intercambio Científico Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, 1999.

—— "Análisis de los errores de organización textual." *Análisis de los errores del examen de inglés en las pruebas de acceso a la universidad en el distrito universitario de Galicia*. Ed. Luis Iglesias Rábade. Santiago de Compostela: Servicio de Publicacións e Intercambio Científico Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, 1999. 357-397.

Martín Uriz, Ana, et al. "Confección de pruebas de lengua inglesa para el acceso a la universidad." *Actas del cuarto congreso nacional de lingüística aplicada (AESLA)*. Ed. Antonio León Sendra. Córdoba: Universidad de Córdoba, 1986. 693-707.

Oller, John W., Jr. "Evidence for a General Language Proficiency Factor: An Expectancy Grammar." *Die Neuren Sprachen* 2 (1976): 165-71.

—— *Language Tests at School: A Pragmatic Approach*. New York: Longman, 1979.

Rodríguez Aguado, José Ignacio. "Análisis de errores en el ejercicio de redacción en las pruebas de acceso a la universidad: asignatura, lengua extranjera, inglés." Diss. Universidad de Valladolid, 2004.

Romero García, José Alberto. "Impacto de la prueba de selectividad en el desarrollo y evaluación de las destrezas orales: estudio de un caso y pilotaje de pruebas orales." Diss. Universidad de Granada, 2003.

Santana Lario, Juan. "El nuevo bachillerato LOGSE y la selectividad de inglés." *GRETA* 7.1 (1999): 80-84.

Sanz Sainz, Inmaculada. "El examen de selectividad a examen." *GRETA* 7.1 (1999): 16-29.

Sanz Sainz, Inmaculada, and Miguel Fernández Álvarez. "The University Entrance Exam in Spain: Present Situation and Possible Solutions." Professionalism in Language Assessment, EALTA (European Association for Language Testing and Assessment) Conference. University of Gothenburg, Voss. 5 June 2005.

—— "La validez del examen de inglés en selectividad." *Estudios y criterios para una selectividad de calidad*. Ed. Honesto Herrera Soler and Jesús García Laborda. Valencia: Editorial de la Universidad Politécnica de Valencia, 2005. 149-164.

Selinker, Larry. "Interlanguage." *International Review of Applied Linguistics* 10 (1972): 209-231.

Shaw, Stuart, and Cyril Weir. *Examining Writing: Research and Practice in Assessing Second Language Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007.

Watts, Frances, and Amparo García Carbonell. "Control de calidad en la calificación de la prueba de lengua inglesa de selectividad." *Estudios y criterios para una selectividad de calidad en el examen de inglés*. Ed. Honesto Herrera Soler, and Jesús García Laborda. Valencia: Editorial de la Universidad Politécnica de Valencia, 2005. 99-115.

Woodward Smith, Elizabeth. "Análisis de los errores en las palabras funcionales (preposiciones, conjunciones y partículas)." *Análisis de los errores del examen de inglés en las pruebas de acceso a la universidad en el distrito universitario de Galicia*. Ed. Luis Iglesias Rábade. Santiago de Compostela: Servicio de Publicacións e Intercambio Científico Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, 1999. 271-356.

Wood Wood, Manuel. "La transferencia de la L1 a la L2 (español-inglés): el artículo en la lengua escrita de los alumnos en las pruebas de acceso a la universidad." Diss. Universidad de Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, 2002.