

LISTS OF SPANISH SENTENCES WITH EQUIVALENT  
PREDICTABILITY, PHONETIC CONTENT, LENGTH,  
AND FREQUENCY OF THE LAST WORD<sup>1</sup>

TERESA CERVERA

*University of Valencia*

JULIO GONZÁLEZ-ALVAREZ

*University Jaume I*

*Summary.*—This paper presents a pool of Spanish sentences designed for use in cognitive research and speech processing in circumstances in which the effects of context are relevant. These lists of sentences are divided into six lists of 25 equivalent high-predictability sentences and six lists of 25 low-predictability sentences according to the extent to which the last word can be predicted by the preceding context. These lists were also equivalent in phonetic content, length and frequency of the last word. These lists are intended for use in psycholinguistic research with Spanish-speaking listeners.

The assessment of the effects of context on recognition of spoken words has been the subject of extensive research in cognitive science and language processing. It has been firmly established that a preceding context favors the recognition of a word compared to words in isolation (Miller, Heise, & Lichten, 1951; Duffi & Giolas, 1974). The context imposes syntactic and semantic constraints which increase the predictability of the last word in the sentence.

The evaluation of speech intelligibility is a specific area of research in which this question is especially relevant. If the intention of the researcher is to approach everyday communicative situations as much as possible, then sentences are the most appropriate speech stimuli. However, in the recognition of sentences, sensory or bottom-up information interacts with top-down or linguistic information provided by the sentence's context. The most frequent way to assess the relative contribution of bottom-up and top-down information has been to present to listeners short sentences containing a contextual part and a final word. The listeners must respond by providing the final word. The contribution of the context to the recognition of the final word can be assessed by comparing the proportion of correct responses in high-predictability sentences with the responses in low-predictability sentences, on the assumption that increased contextual information contributes to a better understanding of the final word (Kallikow, Stevens, & Elliot, 1977).

The evaluation of speech intelligibility is especially important in certain situations such as background noise or with certain types of lis-

<sup>1</sup>Address correspondence to Teresa Cervera, Ph.D., Departamento de Psicología Básica, Universitat de Valencia, Blasco Ibanez 21, 46010 Valencia, Spain or email (Teresa.Cervera@uv.es).

teners such as elderly persons (Perry & Wingfield, 1994; Pichora-Fuller, Schneider, & Daneman, 1995; Gordon-Salant & Fitzgibbons, 1997; Sommers & Danielson, 1999; Dubno, Ahlstrom, & Horwitz, 2000; Wingfield, Tun, & McCoy, 2005; Pichora-Fuller, 2008). In such listeners, decreases in sensory information due to loss of auditory acuity, especially under adverse listening conditions involving background noise or voices, can be compensated by top-down information provided by the context. With the aim of equating perceptual properties of the sentences, speech materials are constructed to be equivalent in certain relevant characteristics such as length and phonetic content. In addition, the properties of the final word or target word must be controlled. Thus, these words must also be equivalent in their main characteristics such as length, syntactic category (nouns are usually used), stress, and, principally, frequency of the word. The influence of word frequency on spoken-word recognition is well-known since the studies of Samuel (1981) and Marslen-Wilson (1987), and plays a fundamental role in speech perception theories (Forster, 1981; McClelland & Elman, 1986; Marslen-Wilson, 1987).

In the English language, the speech materials which satisfy all of these requisites are the SPIN (Speech Perception in Noise) sentences (Kalikow, *et al.*, 1977). In these materials, two types of sentences are used: high-predictability sentences whose final word can be somewhat predicted by the preceding context, and low-predictability sentences whose final word cannot be predicted by the context. The same final words appear in the high- and low-predictability sentences. By comparing the recognition performance of individuals on these two types of sentences, separate effects of auditory acuity and cognitive processing, expressed as capability of using the context to recognize the final word, can be assessed. This type of testing is especially important for elderly listeners because they frequently present with age-related decreased auditory acuity (presbycusis) and, in some cases, age-related cognitive decline (Committee for Hearing, Bioacoustics, and Biomechanics, 1988). Better performance on high- than on low-predictability sentences is expected to be independent of the hearing status of the listeners. Thus, if no such differences are found, some deficiencies in cognitive processing might be suspected.

The effect of context on recognition of the subsequent word for other types of listeners also is a relevant issue. One example would be nonnative listeners having differences in second language proficiency. Nonnative speech communication is known to be less effective than native communication (Flege, 1995). Nonnative listeners take less advantage of the context than native listeners do. Differences in the recognition of high- and low-predictability sentences would presumably indicate the extent to which the nonnative listeners are fluent enough to profit from the se-

semantic and syntactic information provided by context (Mayo, Florentine, & Buus, 1997). Thus, the use of high- and low-predictability sentences is appropriate for assessing the type of sensory or cognitive processes involved in sentence processing by bilingual listeners. In addition, the use of high- and low-predictability sentences by audiologists has demonstrated their efficacy in the evaluation of hearing-impaired listeners (Hutcherson, Dirks, & Morgan, 1979).

Several listening conditions have been used in examining high- and low-predictability sentences, including background noise at different signal-to-noise levels (Kalikow, *et al.*, 1977; Gordon-Salant & Fitzgibbons, 1999, 2001, 2004; Dubno, *et al.*, 2000; Gordon-Salant, Fitzgibbons, & Friedman, 2007; Humes, Burk, Coughlin, Busey, & Strauser, 2007), fast speech (Gordon-Salant & Fitzgibbons, 1999, 2001, 2004; Humes, *et al.*, 2007; Gordon-Salant, *et al.*, 2007), same versus different speakers' voices (Goy, Pichora-Fuller, van Lieshout, Singh, & Schneider, 2007), or some speech distortions such as jitter (Pichora-Fuller, Schneider, MacDonald, Pass, & Brown, 2007) or noise-vocoded speech (Sheldon, Pichora-Fuller, & Schneider, 2008).

The high- and low-predictability sentences have also been used to evaluate the extent to which elderly listeners may benefit from context, both in perception and recall. Working memory capacity (Baddeley & Hitch, 1974) was assessed by Pichora-Fuller, *et al.* (1995) using an auditory version of the Daneman and Carpenter task for reading materials (Daneman & Carpenter, 1983). In the study by Pichora-Fuller, *et al.* (1995), participants were asked to report the final word of the sentence immediately after hearing the sentence and to successively maintain a number of these final words in memory until they were asked to recall them at the end of a set of sentences. Finally, the availability of several equivalent lists of high- and low-predictability sentences is useful when it is necessary to test the same individuals on several occasions over a period of time.

Although these questions are interesting regardless of the native language of the individuals, most studies have been conducted with English-speaking participants and English-language materials. To date, there are no sets of high- and low-predictability sentences in the Spanish language similar to those for the English language (SPIN sentences) for use by researchers and clinicians. The Hearing in Noise Test (HINT), originally developed by Nilsson, Soli, and Sullivan (1994) and adapted to the Castilian Spanish language by Huarte (2008), uses sentences as speech material but the distinction between high and low predictability is not contemplated in these lists. In the present study, equivalent sets of high- and low-predictability sentences were generated. The final pool consisted of six high-predictability lists of sentences, and six low-predictability lists, each list com-

prising 25 sentences. These lists were equivalent on predictability, but also on other characteristics such as length, phonetic content (both the whole sentence and the last word), syllabic structure, word stress, and frequency of the final word. The length of the sentence is an important characteristic because processing the sentence cannot take so long that it requires extensive memory. It is also important because there is a positive relation between sentence length and effects of the context on the recognition of the last word (van Petten & Kutas, 1990). On the other hand, as the sentences are constructed for use in differentially assessing sensory and cognitive processing of the sentence, an important property of the sentence (including the last word) which must be balanced is the phonetic content.

At the same time, controlling the characteristics of the last word is also important, as this word (rather than the whole sentence) is normally required as a response because it simplifies the listener's task, and it is faster and easier for the researcher or clinician to evaluate. The last words used in the present study were also equivalent in frequency of occurrence. All the words are bisyllabic and accented on the first syllable (instead of the monosyllabic words used in the English language) because this structure is the most frequent one in the Spanish language. These lists of sentences, which are equivalent in predictability, length, and final word frequency, are suitable for use in psycholinguistic research with Spanish-speaking participants in those circumstances in which sensory reception and cognitive processing (context effects) are important factors to be considered.

## METHOD

### *Procedure*

*Selecting the last word of sentences.*—The first step in generating the sentences was to select the words which would be the last words in the sentences. After that, the sentences were generated. Following the procedure by Kalikow, *et al.* (1977), the last word in the sentence must be a noun, but it has to be bisyllabic and have the stress on the first syllable as this is the most representative syllabic structure in Spanish, rather than the monosyllabic words preferably used in the English language. Another requirement was that all the words have a similar frequency index. The words could not be little used or very frequently used. The measure of frequency of occurrence used was one word per million in the Spanish written language from the Alameda and Cuetos' corpus (1995). The words selected had a frequency of between 16 and 41 per million, and they were nouns, bisyllabic, and stressed on the first syllable. The initial pool consisted of 240 words.

*Generation of sentences.*—The next step was to generate a high-predictability sentence and a low-predictability sentence for each of the 240

words. The low-predictability sentences were formed with the target word preceded by a neutral context such as "No temas hablar de . . ." ("Don't be afraid to talk about . . .") or "Carlos habló sobre . . ." ("Carlos talked about . . ."). The high-predictability sentences were generated by using the last word preceded by a context semantically connected with that word, such as "Llegó una hora tarde a su cita" (He/she arrived an hour later to his/her appointment") or "Tengo el dinero en el banco" ("I have the money in the bank"), but without the key word being the only possible word. Proverbs, sayings, maxims, adages, etc., were avoided. All sentences with both high and low predictability had a similar length of seven to 10 syllables, and they had a variety of syntactic structures.

*Predictability of the sentences and initial selection.* — The 240 high-predictability sentences were judged on their predictability by a group of 150 participants, students at the University of Valencia from 21 to 26 years of age who participated voluntarily and gave their informed consent. All the sentences were presented as a paper-and-pencil test without the last word in the sentence (e.g., "Tengo el dinero en el . . .," "I have the money in the . . ."). The listeners were instructed to fill in the last word of the sentence according to what they thought was the most likely word to occur. They were told that the last word was a bisyllabic noun stressed on the first syllable. The task was performed in different sessions over a period of several weeks.

For each sentence, the number of responses which coincided with the last word, transformed into percentages (of the total number of participants' answers), was taken as the measure of sentence predictability. From the initial pool of 240 sentences, those sentences whose predictability was between 10% and 90% were selected. This way, the sentences of very high or very low predictability were excluded. The total number of selected sentences was 168. Of these 168 sentences, 150 were randomly selected and randomly assigned to the six lists of 25 high-predictability sentences. The 18 remaining sentences were not used.

The means and the standard deviations for the values of predictability for each of the six lists of sentences were calculated (Table 1). As the intention was to have lists homogeneous in predictability values, the present objective was to obtain similar mean values for all the lists. To confirm that the six lists did not differ statistically on their predictability values, a one-way ANOVA was conducted with the predictability scores for each sentence (expressed in percent) as a dependent variable and the list to which the sentences belonged (list) as an independent variable with six levels. Analysis showed no significant effects of list ( $F=0.59$ ,  $p>.05$ ;  $\eta^2=0.02$ ), therefore, the six lists did not differ with respect to the predictability of the last word.

TABLE 1  
 MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE MEASURES OF PREDICTABILITY (%) AND FREQUENCY  
 OF THE LAST WORD IN THE SENTENCE IN THE LIST OF HIGH-PREDICTABILITY SENTENCES

	Predictability		Frequency	
	M	SD	M	SD
List 1	0.40	0.23	26.50	12.48
List 2	0.39	0.24	26.72	7.34
List 3	0.38	0.26	28.50	8.33
List 4	0.36	0.23	31.36	15.01
List 5	0.38	0.22	28.90	14.38
List 6	0.40	0.28	25.86	14.38

*Frequency of the last word.*—From the initial pool of 240 words selected from Alameda and Cuetos' corpus (1995), only 150 (six lists of 25 sentences, Table 1) were finally used in a preceding high- or low-predictability sentence, as explained above. Because it was necessary to test whether the frequency values of the last word were similar for the six lists, a one-way ANOVA was conducted on values of frequency of the last word, obtained from Alameda and Cuetos' corpus (1995) as the dependent variable, and list as the independent variable with six levels. There were no significant effects of list ( $F=0.11$ ,  $p>.05$ ;  $\eta^2=0.05$ ), indicating that the six lists did not differ with respect to the frequency of the last word.

*Phonetic content.*—Another aim of the present study was for the six lists of 25 high-predictability sentences to have similar phonetic content in case these lists were to be used in intelligibility experiments. For this purpose, the phonetic balance of the speech materials should be controlled. For the low-predictability sentences this question was not as relevant because the same 25 preceding contexts were used in each of the six lists. The phonetic counts were performed separately for the last words of the 150 high-predictability sentences and for the whole high-predictability sentence (the preceding context plus the last word). In these counts, only content words (verbs, nouns, and adjectives) were taken into account, and articles, prepositions, and adverbs were not considered. The phonetic count was calculated by counting the number of occurrences of segments in each phoneme class (occlusives, fricatives, nasals, liquids, and vowels). Phonetic content calculations were performed by the authors. No special training in phonetics is needed for this task because the correspondence between phoneme and letter is almost biunivocal in the Spanish language.

A distribution of frequencies for each phoneme class was obtained for each of the 150 sentences (the whole sentence). The total distribution made it possible to specify whether any of the sentences deviated in the number of occurrences in any of the phoneme classes. For instance, the table of frequencies for the occlusives showed that most of their values ranged from

1 to 4, and only one sentence had 5 occlusives. Thus, this sentence was replaced by one of the remaining 18 sentences from the initial distribution of sentences to the six lists. The new sentence had to have approximately the same predictability as the one which was replaced. Only one sentence had to be replaced by another. Table 2 shows the number of occurrences of each phoneme class for the six lists of high- and low-predictability sentences.

TABLE 2  
PHONETIC COUNTS BY NUMBER OF OCCURRENCES IN EACH PHONEME  
CLASS FOR LAST WORD AND WHOLE SENTENCE, FOR BOTH HIGH-  
PREDICTABILITY (HP) AND LOW-PREDICTABILITY (LP) SENTENCES

List	Count Type	Phoneme Class				
		Occlusive	Fricatives	Nasals	Liquids	Vowels
List 1	Last word	24	14	3	15	48
	HP whole sentence	80	38	23	52	171
	LP whole sentence	93	49	39	59	213
List 2	Last word	21	10	7	15	48
	HP whole sentence	75	35	41	37	172
	LP whole sentence	90	45	43	59	210
List 3	Last word	18	16	11	11	50
	HP whole sentence	81	37	39	44	176
	LP whole sentence	87	52	47	55	214
List 4	Last word	26	19	7	13	56
	HP whole sentence	71	49	25	48	184
	LP whole sentence	95	54	43	57	222
List 5	Last word	24	15	10	14	55
	HP whole sentence	81	37	35	46	179
	LP whole sentence	93	50	46	58	220
List 6	Last word	26	15	10	15	50
	HP whole sentence	83	39	37	52	172
	LP whole sentence	95	50	46	59	219

To test whether all the sentences of each type (high and low predictability) had equivalent phonetic content, a  $\chi^2$  analysis was performed with the counts obtained from the phonetic content analysis for each sentence type. Phoneme class (occlusives, fricatives, nasals, liquids, and vowels) and list (six levels) were included as factors. The  $\chi^2$  values were not significant for the high- or low-predictability sentences ( $\chi^2 = 19.30$ ,  $df = 20$ ,  $p > .05$ , and  $\chi^2 = 2.80$ ,  $df = 20$ ,  $p > .05$ , respectively). Thus, the six lists of high- and low-predictability sentences did not differ in their phonetic content. The final lists of high- and low-predictability sentences are presented in the Appendix (pp. 527-529).

#### DISCUSSION

The objective was to generate equivalent lists of high- and low-predictability Spanish sentences, as none existed for use in the Spanish lan-

guage. Such sentences have many applications in the psycholinguistics, especially in those circumstances in which one would be interested in assessing the sensory or bottom-up processing and the cognitive (effective use of context) or top-down processing skills of the listeners during language processing. The six lists of 25 high-predictability sentences and the equivalent six lists of 25 low-predictability sentences were generated. All sentences were equivalent on characteristics of predictability, length, and phonetic content. As the last or key word is normally used in testing effective processing of a sentence by the listener, it was also necessary to control the properties of these words: frequency of occurrence, length, stress, and phonetic content. The data showed that all the lists of high- and low-predictability sentences were equivalent in these characteristics. These lists are intended for use in psycholinguistic research and they would be suitable for an intelligibility assessment in future studies.

## REFERENCES

- ALAMEDA, J. R., & CUETOS, F. (1995) *Diccionario de frecuencias de las unidades lingüísticas del castellano*. Oviedo, Spain: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Oviedo.
- BADDELEY, A. D., & HITCH, G. J. (1974) Working memory. In G. A. Bower (Ed.), *Recent advances in learning and motivation*. Vol. VIII. New York: Academic Press. Pp. 47-90.
- COMMITTEE FOR HEARING, BIOACOUSTICS, AND BIOMECHANICS. (1988) Speech understanding and aging. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 83, 859-895.
- DANEMAN, M., & CARPENTER, P. A. (1983) Individual differences in integrating information between and within sentences. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 25, 1-18.
- DUBNO, J. R., AHLSTROM, J. B., & HORWITZ, A. R. (2000) Use of context by young and aged adults with normal hearing. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 107, 538-546.
- DUFFI, J. R., & GIOLAS, T. G. (1974) Sentence intelligibility as a function of key word selection. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, 17, 631-637.
- FLEGE, J. (1995) Second-language speech learning: theory, findings, and problems. In W. Strange (Ed.), *Speech perception and linguistic experience: issues in cross-language research*. Timonium, MD: York Press. Pp. 229-273.
- FORSTER, K. I. (1981) Frequency blocking and lexical access: one mental lexicon or two? *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior*, 20, 190-203.
- GORDON-SALANT, S., & FITZGIBBONS, P. J. (1997) Selected cognitive factors and speech recognition performance among young and elderly listeners. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, 40, 423-431.
- GORDON-SALANT, S., & FITZGIBBONS, P. J. (1999) Profile of auditory temporal processing in older adults. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 42, 300-311.
- GORDON-SALANT, S., & FITZGIBBONS, P. J. (2001) Sources of age-related recognition difficulty for time-compressed speech. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 44, 709-719.



- GORDON-SALANT, S., & FITZGIBBONS, P. J. (2004) Effects of stimulus and noise rate variability on speech perception by younger and older adults. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 115, 1808-1817.
- GORDON-SALANT, S., FITZGIBBONS, P. J., & FRIEDMAN, S. A. (2007) Recognition of time-compressed and natural speech with selective temporal enhancements by young and elderly listeners. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research*, 50, 1181-1193.
- GOY, H., PICHORA-FULLER, M. K., VAN LIESHOUT, P., SINGH, P., & SCHNEIDER, B. A. (2007) Effect of within- and between-talker variability on word identification in noise by younger and older adults. *Canadian Acoustics*, 35, 108-109.
- HUARTE, A. (2008) The Castilian Spanish Hearing in Noise Test. *International Journal of Audiology*, 47, 369-370.
- HUMES, L. E., BURK, M. H., COUGHLIN, M. P., BUSEY, T. A., & STRAUSSER, L. E. (2007) Auditory speech recognition and visual text recognition in younger and older adults: similarities and differences between modalities and the effects of presentation rate. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 50, 283-303.
- HUTCHERSON, R. V., DIRKS, D. D., & MORGAN, D. E. (1979) Evaluation of the Speech Perception in Noise (SPIN) test. *Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery*, 87, 239-245.
- KALIKOW, D. N., STEVENS, K. N., & ELLIOT, L. L. (1977) Development of a test of speech intelligibility in noise using sentence materials with controlled word predictability. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 5, 1337-1360.
- MARSLÉN-WILSON, W. (1987) Functional parallelism in spoken word recognition. *Cognition*, 25, 71-102.
- MAYO, L. H., FLORENTINE, M., & BUUS, S. (1997) Age of second-language acquisition and perception of speech in noise. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, 40, 3, 686-693.
- MCCLELLAND, J. L., & ELLMAN, J. L. (1986) The TRACE model of speech perception. *Cognitive Psychology*, 18, 1-86.
- MILLER, G. A., HEISE, G. A., & LICHTEN, W. (1951) The intelligibility of speech as a function of the context in test materials. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 41, 329-335.
- NILSSON, M., SOLI, S. D., & SULLIVAN, J. A. (1994) Development of the Hearing in Noise Test for the measurement of speech reception thresholds in quiet and in noise. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 95, 1085-1099.
- PERRY, A. R., & WINGFIELD, A. (1994) Contextual encoding by young and elderly adults as revealed by cued and free recall. *Aging and Cognition*, 1, 120-139.
- PICHORA-FULLER, M. K. (2008) Use of supportive context by young and older adult listeners: balancing bottom-up and top-down information processing. *International Journal of Audiology*, 47(Suppl. 2), S72-S82.
- PICHORA-FULLER, M. K., SCHNEIDER, B. A., & DANEMAN, M. (1995) How young and old adults listen and remember speech in noise. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 97, 593-608.
- PICHORA-FULLER, M. K., SCHNEIDER, B. A., MACDONALD, E., PASS, H. E., & BROWN, S. (2007) Temporal jitter disrupts speech intelligibility. *Hearing Research*, 223, 114-121.
- SAMUEL, A. S. (1981) The role of bottom-up confirmation in phoneme restoration illusion. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 7, 1124-1131.

- SHELDON, S., PICHORA-FULLER, M. K., & SCHNEIDER, B. A. (2008) Effects of age, presentation method, and learning on identification of noise-vocoded words. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 123, 476-488.
- SOMMERS, M. S., & DANIELSON, S. M. (1999) Inhibitory processes and spoken word recognition in young and old adults: the interaction of lexical competition and semantic context. *Psychology and Aging*, 14, 458-472.
- VAN PETTEN, C., & KUTAS, M. (1990) Interactions between sentence context and word frequency in event-related brain potentials. *Memory & Cognition*, 18, 380-393.
- WINGFIELD, A., TUN, P. A., & MCCOY, S. L. (2005) Hearing loss in older adulthood: what it is and how it interacts with cognitive performance. *Current Directions in Psychological Sciences*, 14, 144-148.

*Accepted October 13, 2010.*

## APPENDIX

LISTS OF HIGH-PREDICTABILITY SENTENCES WITH THEIR  
EQUIVALENT LISTS OF LOW-PREDICTABILITY SENTENCES

High-predictability Sentences	Last Word	Low-predictability Sentences	Last Word
<b>List 1</b>		<b>List 1</b>	
En el castillo se alza la	torre	Ha estado pronunciando	torre
La explosión causó un	caos	Ellos escribieron	caos
Iba vestida con falda y	blusa	Pronuncia la palabra	blusa
Ata el regalo con una	cinta	Ahora voy a decir	cinta
Guardo el dinero en el	bolso	Ella dijo la palabra	bolso
Me tocó el primer	premio	Y a continuación dijo	premio
Es un gran salón de	baile	No temas hablar del	baile
Hay que limpiar, hay mucho	polvo	No discutieron sobre el	polvo
El río sigue por su	cauce	Tu oíste que decía	cauce
El ladrón pertenece a la	banda	Está interesado en decir	banda
Amontónalo en una	pila	Juan no discute de la	pila
Disparó con las flechas el	arco	Espero que hables de un	arco
Cruzó el charco de un	salto	La niña sabía decir	salto
Le gusta escurrir el	bulto	Laura no pudo hablar del	bulto
Lleva la compra en la	bolsa	Les oí que hablaban de una	bolsa
Me convenció con malas	artes	Carlos habló sobre las	artes
Bebe la leche de la	taza	Deberías poder decir	taza
No suelen comer carne de	cerdo	Estábamos pensando en un	cerdo
Nos recibió en pijama y	bata	Ayer Luis soñó con una	bata
De la cloaca salió una	rata	Ellos no consideraron la	rata
Se revolcó en el sucio	barro	Laura estaba pronunciando	barro
En el cielo hay bandadas de	aves	Es probable que hablen de unas	aves
Son auténticos perros de	caza	No creas que voy a decir	caza
Soplaba una suave	brisa	Lo que esta describiendo es la	brisa
Todo se repite es un	ciclo	Adivina lo qué es un	ciclo
<b>List 2</b>		<b>List 2</b>	
Voy al museo de	cera	Ha estado pronunciando	cera
Pronto alcanzarán la	cima	Ellos escribieron	cima
Iba cargado como un	burro	Pronuncia la palabra	burro
Llegó una hora tarde a su	cita	Ahora voy a decir	cita
Dicen que habrá un cambio de	clima	Ella dijo la palabra	clima
Yo estudio música y	danza	Y a continuación dijo	danza
Voy al trabajo en	metro	No temas hablar del	metro
Torció la boca en una	mueca	No discutieron sobre una	mueca
Tómate caliente la	sopa	Tu oíste que decía	sopa
Todos seguíamos al	guía	Está interesado en decir	guía
Tiene una casa junto a un	lago	Juan no discute del	lago
Tengo que podar esa	rama	Espero que hables de una	rama
Te has pasado de la	raya	La niña sabía decir	raya
Sírveme ginebra con	hielo	Laura no pudo hablar del	hielo
Tengo el dinero en el	banco	Les oí que hablaban del	banco
Se requiere vestido de	gala	Carlos habló sobre la	gala
Dormimos hasta el	alba	Deberías poder decir	alba
Se dejó la comida en el	plato	Estábamos pensando en un	plato
Se bebió el vino de un	trago	Ayer Luis soñó con un	trago
La carta lleva su	firma	Ellos no consideraron la	firma
Refresca mucho chupar un	polo	Laura estaba pronunciando	polo
Reduce la emisión de	gases	Es probable que hablen de unos	gases
Por fin han derribado el	muro	No creas que voy a decir	muro
Paramos para hacer una	pausa	Lo que esta describiendo es la	pausa
Para leer necesita	gafas	Adivina lo qué son unas	gafas

High-predictability Sentences	Last Word	Low-predictability Sentences	Last Word
List 3		List 3	
Para entrar necesitas un	pase	Ha estado pronunciando	pase
Colecciona objetos de	lujo	Ellos escribieron	lujo
Nos guiamos siguiendo el	mapa	Pronuncia la palabra	mapa
Nos despertó el canto del	gallo	Ahora voy a decir	gallo
No quiero meter la	pata	Ella dijo la palabra	pata
Sirve a una causa muy	noble	Y a continuación dijo	noble
No lo acabes, guárdame un	trozo	No temas hablar del	trozo
No cabía en sí de	gozo	No discutieron sobre el	gozo
No arañes con esas	uñas	Tu oíste que decía	uñas
Metete la guitarra en su	funda	Está interesado en decir	funda
Me obligan a seguir esa	norma	Juan no discute de la	norma
Me gusta cantar en la	ducha	Espero que hables de una	ducha
Llevaba un pañuelo de	seda	La niña sabía decir	seda
Llego tarde, cogeré un	taxi	Laura no pudo hablar del	taxi
Los leones viven en la	selva	Les oí que hablaban de la	selva
Los católicos van a	misa	Carlos habló sobre la	misa
Lo mediré con una	regla	Deberías poder decir	regla
Le regaló un ramo de	rosas	Estábamos pensando en unas	rosas
Le gusta el fútbol y los	toros	Ayer Luis soñó con unos	toros
Le golpeó con un	palo	Ellos no consideraron el	palo
Las maletas las lleva el	mozo	Laura estaba pronunciando	mozo
La sangre corre por sus	venas	Es probable que hablen de unas	venas
La pluma mancha de	tinta	No creas que voy a decir	tinta
La modista compra una	tela	Lo que esta describiendo es la	tela
La lengua mas hablada es el	chino	Adivina lo qué es un	chino
List 4		List 4	
La escayola inmoviliza el	hueso	Ha estado pronunciando	hueso
La actriz no soportó la	fama	Ellos escribieron	fama
Juega al ajedrez y las	damas	Pronuncia la palabra	damas
Juan fue a un colegio de	curas	Ahora voy a decir	curas
Haz un hoyo con pala y	pico	Ella dijo la palabra	pico
Hay que resolver ciertas	dudas	Y a continuación dijo	dudas
Guarda bien el dinero y las	joyas	No temas hablar de unas	joyas
En el cielo no se ven	nubes	No discutieron sobre unas	nubes
Fue escrito con su propia	letra	Tu oíste que decía	letra
Este piso no está en	venta	Está interesado en decir	venta
Estás rayado como un	disco	Juan no discute de un	disco
Estaba encerrado en la	jaula	Espero que hables de una	jaula
Es un sagrado lugar de	culto	La niña sabía decir	culto
Es un consumidor de	droga	Laura no pudo hablar de la	droga
Es un bolso negro de	cuero	Les oí que hablaban del	cuero
Es letal a ciertas	dosis	Carlos habló sobre la	dosis
Es el primero de la	fila	Deberías poder decir	fila
Es el militar de más	rango	Estábamos pensando en el	rango
Es el colmo de todos los	males	Ayer Luis soñó con los	males
Firmó un cheque con muchas	cifras	Ellos no consideraron las	cifras
Era tan fiero como un	lobo	Laura estaba pronunciando	lobo
Enciende la mecha de esa	vela	Es probable que hablen de una	vela
En matemáticas es un	genio	No creas que voy a decir	genio
En la urna depositó el	voto	Lo que esta describiendo es el	voto
En la tormenta cayó un	rayo	Adivina lo qué es un	rayo
List 5		List 5	
En la cola espero mi	turno	Ha estado pronunciando	turno
En Italia comí mucha	pasta	Ellos escribieron	pasta
En el mar hay grandes	olas	Pronuncia la palabra	olas

High-predictability Sentences	Last Word	Low-predictability Sentences	Last Word
En el mapa sigue la	ruta	Ahora voy a decir	ruta
En el informe nos falta un	dato	Ella dijo la palabra	dato
Fue herido con una	lanza	Y a continuación dijo	lanza
La nota mínima es un	cero	No temas hablar del	cero
En el camino pinché una	rueda	No discutieron sobre la	rueda
El viento levantó su	falda	Tu oíste que decía	falda
Casi me muero del	susto	Está interesado en decir	susto
El tren circula por las	vías	Juan no discute de las	vías
El silencio fue en señal de	duelo	Espero que hables de un	duelo
El seguro cubrirá los	daños	La niña sabía decir	daños
Ella cargó con toda la	culpa	Laura no pudo hablar de la	culpa
El rey se sienta en su	trono	Les oí que hablaban de un	trono
El pescador recoge las	redes	Carlos habló sobre las	redes
El palacio pertenece al	duque	Deberías poder decir	duque
El detective sigue la	pista	Estábamos pensando en una	pista
El barco encalló en las	rocas	Ayer Luis soñó con unas	rocas
El anillo se lo puso el	novio	Ellos no consideraron al	novio
El abuelo cuida de su	nieto	Laura estaba pronunciando	nieto
El poeta le escribió un	verso	Es probable que hablen de un	verso
Duermo con un cojín de	plumas	No creas que voy a decir	plumas
Devuelve lo robado a su	dueña	Lo que esta describiendo es la	dueña
Es austero como un	monje	Adivina lo qué es un	monje
List 6		List 6	
Se despidió con un	beso	Ha estado pronunciando	beso
La soprano da clases de	canto	Ellos escribieron	canto
Corta el tallo y las	hojas	Pronuncia la palabra	hojas
Para abrir la puerta tengo	llave	Ahora voy a decir	llave
Cogió con sus garras la	presa	Ella dijo la palabra	presa
El tren entró en el oscuro	túnel	Y a continuación dijo	túnel
Canta de tenor en un	coro	No temas hablar del	coro
El caballo tira del	carro	No discutieron sobre el	carro
Al mar van a desembocar los	ríos	Tu oíste que decía	ríos
Al correr se me acelera el	pulso	Está interesado en decir	pulso
Al caer se dio en la	nuca	Juan no discute de la	nuca
A la miel acuden las	moscas	Espero que hables de unas	moscas
Deja el niño en la	cuna	La niña sabía decir	cuna
Brindamos alzando la	copa	Laura no pudo hablar de la	copa
El siempre gasta pesadas	bromas	Les oí que hablaban de unas	bromas
La historia tiene una buena	trama	Carlos habló sobre la	trama
Espera su turno en la	cola	Deberías poder decir	cola
Tengo asiento en primera	fila	Estábamos pensando en una	fila
El ratón cayó en la	trampa	Ayer Luis soñó con la	trampa
Acampamos con nuestras	tiendas	Ellos no consideraron la	tienda
El sabe como lanzar un	dardo	Laura estaba pronunciando	dardo
De noche hay luz de	luna	Es probable que hablen de la	luna
Corta la carne en pequeños	trozos	No creas que voy a decir	trozos
No hubo heridos en el	choque	Lo que esta describiendo es el	choque
El árbitro hizo sonar el	pito	Adivina lo qué es un	pito