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(ABSTRACT)

There is a need to identify a specific test to assess one's
Simultaneous Communication skills (a combination of Sign Language with
the use of spoken English). The Simultaneous Communication Evaluation
and the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview were examined to com-
pare and to determine the reliability and validity for the latter.
The Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire was used as an indepen-
dent variable.

Multitrait-multimethod methodology (Campbell and Fiske, 1959) was
used to examine construct validity of the two methods of assessing the
twenty-eight subjects' communication skills, as well as to show their
reliability. The Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire was used as
an observation tool to obtain dichotomized scores used to measure sub-
jects' performance in the classroom as compared with the two methods
of assessing the subjects' signing skills.
Based on the findings of this research, the following conclusions seem justified.

A. The Receptive portion of the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation generally showed a weak relationship to the other tests with the exception of the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview's retest, with which it showed only a moderate relationship. This indicates that the Receptive portion may not be a valid way of assessing Sign Language competency.

B. Since the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview's test-retest and the inter-rater reliability indicators are moderately high, with their levels of significance being lower than .05, this method of testing may be regarded as an at least moderately reliable means of assessing the faculty members' skills in the use of Simultaneous Communication.

C. The correlations for the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation and the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview's test and retest are .8058 and .5477 respectively. The Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire, in general, showed negative correlations with the first two tests with the probability of error being higher than the acceptable .05. One may conclude from this that there is no relationship between the ability to teach and the ability to use Simultaneous Communication.
It is anticipated that the outcome of this study will have an impact on various programs and agencies that provide educational and/or social services to the hearing impaired in the United States. At present there is no established, standardized method of evaluating professionals Sign Language skills and this study may well set a precedent in this area.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It would require many pages to pay tribute to those who made this dissertation possible. For their encouragement and support, the following individuals are especially acknowledged for helping this dissertation reach a successful conclusion:

Dr. Ron McKeen, chair of the dissertation committee, who provided much time and good counsel, and who was an understanding and helpful advisor;

Dr. Jimmy Fortune, research professor, who encouraged me to change my attitude towards statistics;

Drs. Barbara Hutson and Ken Underwood, the other members of the committee, who were helpful with both suggestions and criticism that have made this dissertation more meaningful;

Mr. Will Madsen, my mentor, who served on the dissertation committee as the Sign Communication expert and also assisted in conducting the Sign Communication Proficiency Interviews;

Ms. Catherine Moses, social work professor at Gallaudet College, who also assisted in conducting the Sign Communication Proficiency Interviews;
The members of the Simultaneous Communication Panel, who gave valuable time to rate the twenty-eight subjects for this study;

Mr. John Kubis, Ms. E. Lynn Jacobowitz, and Ms. Rae Johnson, who helped in the ratings for the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire;

Dr. Michael Karchmer, Associate Dean of Research at Gallaudet College, who supported the study by granting financial assistance from Gallaudet College's Small Grant Fund;

Drs. Carol Bloomquist and Ron Sutcliffe, who served as technical advisors. Without them, the dissertation may have been completed at a much later date;

Ms. Dorothy Smith, who typed the final manuscript of the dissertation;

Gallaudet College, and especially the twenty-eight faculty members, who gave support and encouragement by participating in this study.

Special appreciation is extended to Vicki Kemp and my son Billy (who told me that he would still rather call his father "Daddy" than "Dr. Kemp"), for their confidence and encouragement. Appreciation and gratitude is also extended to my parents, William Miller Kemp, Jr., and the late Marie Elizabeth Braungard Kemp, whose confidence nurtured my educational endeavors. It is very appropriate to mention my uncle,
Robert M. Kemp, M.D., for he was the person who inspired me to pursue my doctoral studies. He was graduated from college when I was seven years old, and this is when I first heard the word "college." It was at this point in my life that I decided to follow in his footsteps toward getting a doctorate degree. It is to my family that the study is dedicated.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</td>
<td>ix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF TABLES</td>
<td>vi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIST OF FIGURES</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td>iv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAPTER I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs for the Deaf and/or Hearing Impaired</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement of the Problem</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Setting at Gallaudet College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of the Study</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Significance of the Study</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definition of Terms</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitations to the Study</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization of the Research Report</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER II

Review of Related Literature................................. 11
Communication with Deaf People.............................. 11
Oralism versus the Combined Method.......................... 11
The Natural Language of the Deaf.............................. 12
American Sign Language as a Visual-Gestural Language..... 14
Milan Congress of 1880........................................ 14
Emergence of Total Communication............................ 15
Perpetuation of the Combined Method......................... 16
Manual Communication Continuum and the Simultaneous Method..................................................... 17
The Simultaneous Communication Evaluation................. 21
Implementation of the Evaluation Panel....................... 21
Sign Communication Proficiency Interview.................... 22
Development of the Language Proficiency Interview.......... 23
Conclusion from the Review of Literature.................... 24

CHAPTER III

Methodology.......................................................... 26
Hypothesis............................................................ 26
Subjects.............................................................. 26
Instrumentation...................................................... 28
Simultaneous Communication Evaluation System..................... 28
Sign Communication Proficiency Interview.................... 30
Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire...................... 30
Procedures.............................................................. 31
Analysis................................................................. 32
Reliability............................................................... 32
Validity................................................................. 33

CHAPTER IV
Results of the Findings.................................................. 42
Subjects........................................................................ 42
Administration of the Three Tests.......................................... 43
The Simultaneous Communication Evaluation............................. 46
Sign Communication Proficiency Interview................................. 51
Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire.................................... 55
Matrix Study.............................................................. 58

CHAPTER V
Summary......................................................................... 67
Objectives........................................................................ 67
Review of the Literature......................................................... 68
Method of the Study.............................................................. 68
  Summary of the Results........................................................ 69
    Demographic Data........................................................... 69
    Simultaneous Communication Evaluation.............................. 69
    Sign Communication Proficiency Interview............................ 69
    Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire............................... 70
Conclusions...................................................................... 73
Recommendations.......................................................... 74
**LIST OF TABLES**

| Table 3.1 | Multitrait-Multimethod matrix for subtests | 37 |
| Table 3.2 | Multitrait-Multimethod matrix showing decision consistency of three methods | 40 |
| Table 3.3 | Decision consistency for three methods | 41 |
| Table 4.1 | Demographic information | 44 |
| Table 4.2 | Preference of method of assessing skills | 45 |
| Table 4.3 | Summary of Simultaneous Communication raw scores | 47 |
| Table 4.4.1 | Test/Retest reliability scores | 52 |
| Table 4.4.2 | Inter-rater reliability scores | 54 |
| Table 4.5 | Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire raw scores | 56 |
| Table 4.6 | Dichotomous scores for three tests | 57 |
| Table 4.7 | Multitrait-Multimethod matrix for subtests | 59 |
| Table 4.8 | Multitrait-Multimethod matrix showing decision consistency of three methods | 61 |
| Table 4.9 | Decision consistency for three methods | 63 |
| Table 4.10 | Decision consistency for three methods | 64 |
| Table 4.11 | Decision consistency for Sign Communication Proficiency Interview test/retest and Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire 1/2 | 65 |
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1  Manual Communication Continuum................................. 18
Figure 3.1  Multitrait-Multimethod Matrix................................. 34
Figure 4.1  Score frequency distribution for the Simultaneous Communication Evaluations first thirteen ratings..... 48
Figure 4.2  Score frequency distribution for the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation's sentences in the Receptive portion................................. 49
Figure 4.3  Score frequency distribution for the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation's paragraph/dialogue in the Receptive portion................................. 50
Figure 4.4  Score frequency distribution for the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview test/retest..... 53
APPENDICES

A  A Summary of the Francis Report.............................. 76
B  Letters of Endorsement........................................... 95
C  The Simultaneous Communication Evaluation Documents.....100
D  Language Proficiency Interview's Definitions of Absolute Proficiency Ratings..................................103
E  Sign Communication Proficiency Interview Rating Scale.....107
F  Sign Communication Proficiency Interview's Definition of Performance Factor Scores..............................111
G  Rating Sheets for Sign Communication Proficiency Interviews.........................................................114
H  Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire......................118
I  Documents Sent to and Received from the Subjects..........120

BIBLIOGRAPHY..................................................................128

VITA..................................................................................132
CHAPTER I

Introduction

Programs for the Deaf and/or Hearing Impaired

More than 74,000 hearing impaired children and youth between the ages of 3 and 21 are being served in educational settings in the United States (U.S. Department of Education, 1985, p. 199). These settings include over 623 schools and classes for deaf children ranging from parent-infant programs, preschools, high schools, continuing education programs, and multi-handicapped programs. A great majority of these programs utilize some form of manual communication as the primary means of communicating with their charges (American Annals of the Deaf, 1984, p. 188). Most of the teachers of the deaf and/or hearing impaired in schools and programs that use sign language have normal hearing, and only some of these professionals possess even minimal skills in the use of sign language upon their initial employment. Because of this lack of sign language proficiency at the onset of employment, teachers' sign language skills need to be monitored and evaluated periodically (e.g., by the program administrator or some selected evaluation committee) in order to ensure quality education for deaf children.
In addition to the many educational programs serving hearing impaired children, there are numerous programs administered by agencies such as state vocational rehabilitation, mental health, and social services, that provide services to deaf adults. Frequently, deaf clients face problems in communicating with these counselors, psychologists, audiologists, and social workers whose signing skills are not adequate for the jobs which they perform. Again, sign communication skills need to be monitored periodically to ensure quality service provision to deaf clients. All too often, however, these agencies do not have the expertise or tools to evaluate the sign communication skills of their personnel.

Although some individual agencies or programs may conduct formal evaluations of the communication skills of their personnel, there is no standardized form for such evaluation among the programs that serve and educate deaf people in the United States. Indeed, there is not even conformity in terms of policies on communication and assessment of communication skills among those programs. This does not necessarily mean that there exists no way of assessing a person's communication skills. It does mean, however, that there are various ways of accomplishing this important task, a task that is critical in assuring quality service to and education of deaf persons.

Statement of the Problem

There is a need to identify procedures that can be used to assess competence in sign communication. Such an evaluation can guide
the establishment of a set of policies on assessment of communication skills that in turn can help to standardize sign language assessment procedures nationwide. The current situation at Gallaudet College involving the evaluation of faculty member's sign language skills provides an opportunity to gather data which will be useful in this first step in an attempt to standardize sign communication assessment procedures.

The Setting at Gallaudet College

Gallaudet College, the world's only liberal arts college for the deaf, is an appropriate site at which to conduct this study. Since 1971 the Collegiate Faculty has been using their own system of evaluating faculty members' sign language skills, a system known as the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation. This evaluation consists of two parts, one to measure expressive sign skills, the other to measure receptive sign skills. The faculty are required to take this evaluation at least once every three years.

Despite the use of an evaluation tool to monitor faculty members' sign communication competency, a recent study was commissioned by the College in response to a petition by students in which they expressed their difficulties in communicating with faculty. (See Appendix A for a summary of the report as compared with the Collegiate Faculty's guidelines). The study, known as the Francis Report, contained several recommendations directly related to sign language evaluation. The belief that the current evaluation does not accurately reflect the
skills that are observable in the classroom led to the recommendation in the Francis Report that an alternate method of evaluation be considered. The suggested alternate method utilized the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview, an adapted form of the Language Proficiency Interview widely used by the State Department as a way of assessing State Department personnel's proficiency in second languages. (Francis, 1980).

Purpose of the Study

This study constitutes an attempt to compare and evaluate the two sign communication assessment procedures, the current Simultaneous Communication Evaluation and the proposed Sign Communication Proficiency Interview. It is anticipated that this study will enable professionals in the field of Sign Communication to identify a specific, accurate method of evaluating sign language skills which can then be standardized and used on a national scale in professional and educational settings.

Hypothesis

It is hypothesized that there is no difference in the relationships between the observers' data obtained in classroom performance observations and the scores obtained from the current Simultaneous Communication Evaluation and the scores obtained from the proposed Sign Communication Proficiency Interview. In other words, both the present method of evaluating Gallaudet College faculty members'
Simultaneous Communication skills and the alternative method as recommended by Francis will have similar relationships with the data as collected from the observers, who will be using the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire as an observing tool.

Significance of the Study

One purpose of this study is to determine if there is a reliable alternative method of measuring a person's skill in Simultaneous Communication other than the one currently in use at Gallaudet College. It is hoped that the findings of this study will help professionals in the area of Sign Communication to meet the need for valid procedures for assessing skills in the use of the language being taught or used.

Similarly, sign language training programs throughout the United States could benefit from this research by adapting their own tests and evaluation systems to better evaluate their sign language students.

Further, schools and programs for the deaf and/or hearing impaired throughout the nation can benefit from this research. The results from this project would enable those programs to set up a standardized form of assessing their teachers' signing skills.

The various programs that serve the deaf or hearing impaired, such as state Vocational Rehabilitation agencies, mental health programs, and social agencies that provide services to these people would also benefit from this study. To be able to accurately assess their
personnel's sign communication skills and provide training for those whose skills are deficient would improve the communication climate in these agencies that serve a deaf population. This in turn would reduce the frustrations that deaf people experience whenever they encounter a person with minimal sign language skills. A reliable, standardized method of communication skill assessment would enable agencies to provide the best possible communication by retaining those individuals whose sign skills are superior and assisting those whose skills are deficient in upgrading their communication competency to an acceptable level.

Finally, it is also anticipated that the results of this study will assist Gallaudet College's Collegiate Faculty, the College's governing body consisting of professors from both the Undergraduate and Graduate Programs, in answering the question of whether the current system of evaluating Simultaneous Communication skills should be retained or whether the college should adopt the proposed Sign Communication Proficiency Interview considered by many to represent the state of the art in second language testing.

Definition of Terms

The following terms will be used frequently in this study and are defined for clarification:

- **deaf**: A clinical/pathological term describing a person or persons with hearing impairment (Baker and Cokely, 1980).
Deaf: A sociological term describing a group of people who gather for social purposes (Baker and Cokely, 1980).

deaf student: A student at Gallaudet College with a hearing loss which hinders communication via the use of the auditory channel with or without the use of a hearing aid. While there are various degrees of hearing loss, the generic term "deaf" will be used throughout this study to indicate a hearing impairment of any degree. (Sutcliffe, 1980).

Expressive Portion: A part of the current Simultaneous Communication Evaluation that tests the Collegiate faculty member's ability to express him or herself using Simultaneous Communication.

Receptive Portion: A part of the current Simultaneous Communication Evaluation that tests the Collegiate faculty member's ability to understand Sign Language.

Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire: A questionnaire developed by Aleomoni for students to evaluate their college professors' teaching ability. It will be used as an observation tool in this study. (Aleomoni, 1972).

Sign Communication Proficiency Interview: An alternate method of assessing signing skills. Adapted from the Language Proficiency Interview.

Sign Language: A visual-gestural language commonly used by Deaf persons to communicate with each other and with hearing people.
Simultaneous Communication: The synchronization of signs with spoken or mouthed words.

Simultaneous Communication Evaluation: The current system of assessing the Collegiate faculty members' signing skills.

Limitations to the Study

There are certain limitations to this study that need to be discussed:

1. The definition of Simultaneous Communication as used in this study refers to the use of sign language in conjunction with either spoken or mouthed English, as specified in the Collegiate Faculty Guidelines. This means that each person may sign either with spoken English or mouthed English. The use of the voice while signing, however, may affect the way in which the signs are produced. Baker (1980) asserted that when voice is utilized, the signs are either abolished completely or produced so inadequately as to make it difficult for a deaf person to understand. If the signer chooses to sign and mouth the English words without the use of voice, sign production is not as adversely affected. This limitation must be kept in mind in light of the fact that the subjects in this study either used or did not use voice while signing throughout the Expressive Portion of the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation, the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview, and/or when being videotaped while teaching in the classroom.
2. There were two interviewers, one deaf and one hearing, for the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview. Neither interviewer used voice while interviewing the subjects. A few subjects experienced some awkwardness during the interview signing to a hearing person, a problem the hearing interviewer had to take into consideration when rating each subject.

3. Videotaping of the subjects in the classroom for the rating with the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire had an affect on their teaching styles. Some professors even told their students to "behave" themselves while being videotaped. The two raters, however, were not told of this prior to viewing the videotapes for the purpose of rating the teaching skills using the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire.

4. The videotaping of the professors in action was done for only ten minutes, a period of time which does not actually reflect their routine classroom performance. The semester lasted fifteen weeks and it is very difficult to determine the subjects' overall teaching skills through a one-time, ten minute observation.

Organization of the Research Report

An introduction to the problem is presented in Chapter I. The problem statement and the significance of the study are also covered in this chapter.

Chapter II covers a review of the literature related to the issue of sign communication, the current situation at Gallaudet College, and
the current system of assessing the Collegiate faculty members' signing competence. In addition, the proposed Sign Communication Proficiency Interview is discussed. The final section of Chapter II explains the rationale as to why the proposed method of assessing one's Simultaneous Communication skills should be considered for study.

Chapter III describes the subjects, instrumentation, procedures and methods of analysis used in this study.

Chapter IV reports the results of the analysis of the data.

Chapter V summarizes the findings and discusses the outcomes of this study. Recommendations for future research follow.
CHAPTER II

Review of Related Literature

This chapter addresses three areas related to the conceptual framework for this research: Communication with Deaf people, the current Simultaneous Communication Evaluation used at Gallaudet College, and the proposed Sign Language Proficiency Interview as an alternative means of evaluating the faculty members' signing skills.

Communication with Deaf People

Oralism versus the Combined Method

For over two hundred years, the issue of whether or not Sign Language should be used in the classroom has been debated by professionals in Deaf Education. There are two distinct methods of educating deaf children: The Oral Method and the "Combined Method." The former advocates the use of speech regardless of the deaf child's ability to hear or the child's intellectual level (Lane, 1976). The "Combined Method" supports the concept of using Sign Language with spoken word (Lane, 1976).
The Natural Language of the Deaf

One of the earliest advocates of Sign Language as a legitimate method of communication for Deaf people was Jean-Marc Itard, a physician who worked at the National Institute for the Deaf and Dumb in Paris for forty years (Lane, 1976). Itard founded oral education for the deaf and trained six pupils in hearing and speech from 1805 to 1808 without using Sign Language. Even though Itard never used Sign Language himself, in his "Treatise on Diseases of the Ear and Hearing" in 1821, he came to a belief that Sign Language was "the natural language of the deaf." (Lane, 1976). He expressed his views by raising a question: "Can gestural language serve as a medium of communication, and therefore as a vehicle for the intellectual development of the deaf child?" and implied positive response to the question by saying:

If, instead of using the covert movements of his larynx and tongue to express his ideas and emotions, man had expressed them by overt movements of his limbs and physiognomy, then vision would have been the most informative sense and the vehicle for intellectual development. It is a mistake to think that the deaf-mute [in our speaking society] gives an accurate picture of what men would be like were mankind created without the sense of hearing. With the aid of the language of signs, this gestural
society would not have advanced less rapidly toward civilization. Written language, which has so greatly aided this progress, would in all likelihood have been invented sooner: for it takes less effort to imagine representing signs than drawing sounds. With this accomplishment, man could have embarked just as rapidly on the vast career that this discovery opened to his intelligence; and, apart from lacking a few ideas concerning sounds, he would have become all that the twofold gift of hearing and speech has made possible. Thus he can do without this gift; far from owing his perfectibility to the perfection of his organs, he can, with sense that function only weakly or incompletely establish relations with his peers, create signs expressing his thoughts, and convert these fleeting signs into permanent ones. Rising above the limitations of his organs, to realize his full poten-

...tialities by dint of his genius alone, man can prove, in accomplishing much with few resources, that he has issued from the intelligence that created everything from nothing. (Itard, as quoted in Lane, 1976, p. 208).
American Sign Language as a Visual-Gestural Language

Baker and Cokely (1980), linguists from the Linguistic Research Lab at Gallaudet College, assert that American Sign Language, along with other signed languages throughout the world, is a visual-gestural language used by Deaf people. This supports Itard's statement about the natural language of the deaf. Why do Deaf people use this visual-gestural language? Baker and Cokely state that,

The units of American Sign Language are composed of specific movements and shapes of the hands and arms, eyes, face, and body posture. These movements and shapes serve as the 'words' and 'intonation' of the language. (Baker and Cokely, 1980, p. 48).

One will note that there is no mention of sound or hearing in the above explanation of American Sign Language. There is no stimulus entering the deaf person's brain via the auditory channel; therefore, the eyes serve as a substitute channel for communication.

Milan Congress of 1880

In 1880, a conference for educators of the deaf was held in Milan, Italy, resulting in the climax of the controversy over whether Sign Language should be used in the classrooms. The participants at the conference overwhelmingly passed a resolution stating that "the congress supports the conclusions of the Congress of Milan, considering speech incontestably superior to signs." (Lane, 1976, p. 254). Needless to say, the "natural language of the deaf" was almost
annihilated in the classrooms through the good intentions of the participants of the Milan Congress, who felt that deaf people would be able to communicate just like normal people without sign language. This resolution, however, failed to extinguish the use of sign language in general. The controversy in the classrooms continues to this day.

Emergence of Total Communication

In the 1960's and 1970's, the question of promoting oral education for the deaf as opposed to the use of "the natural language" was challenged when research findings supported the use of the latter method (Meadow, 1968; Vernon and Koh, 1970; Stuckless and Birch, 1966; Stevenson, 1964; Quigley and Frisina, 1961; Hester, 1963; Quigley, 1969). Researchers indicated that the use of manual communication helps deaf children to perform better in the areas of reading, mathematics, vocabulary, written language, overall educational achievement, and social adjustment as compared to oral education. The aforementioned studies found no difference in both groups (those using Manual Communication and those following the Oral Method) in their performances in the use of speech and speechreading (Vernon, 1971; Moores, 1970). The philosophy of Total Communication emerged in the late 1960's and early 1970's as a result of the new discoveries (Flint, 1979).

The Total Communication concept allows the deaf child to select whichever modes of communication are best suited for him or her. The
Conference of the Executives of American School for the Deaf adopted this definition of Total Communication:

Total Communication is a philosophy incorporating appropriate aural, manual, and oral modes of communication in order to ensure effective communication with and among hearing impaired persons (Garretson, 1976, p. 88).

There are two views on the term "Total Communication." Some see it as an "extension of the simultaneous method" while others view it "as a system based on children's individual rights" (Moores, 1982, p. 9).

Perpetuation of the Combined Method

The research findings which supported Total Communication confirmed the philosophy of Edward Miner Gallaudet, the first President of Gallaudet College and son of the founder of America's first school for the deaf in Hartford, Connecticut, during the early 19th century (Thomas Hopkins Gallaudet). Despite the Milan Congress' resolution regarding the superiority of the oral method over the use of Sign Language, Edward Miner Gallaudet advocated the use in the classroom of the combined method, the synchronization of speech and signs simultaneously. It was through his efforts that Gallaudet College established its current policy of the use of Simultaneous Communication in the classroom.
Manual Communication Continuum and the Simultaneous Method

To understand what is involved in the use of the Simultaneous Method, let us take a look at the Manual Communication Continuum. As previously stated, American Sign Language (ASL) is a visual-gestural language which does not require the use of English grammatical patterns and voice. American Sign Language is an autonomous language independent from spoken English (Klima and Bellugi, 1979). This language is depicted on one end of the Manual Communication Continuum shown in Figure 2.1.

On the opposite end of the continuum is spoken English, which is independent from American Sign Language. In the middle area of the continuum is a mixture of both languages which is generally known as Pidgin Sign English. It should be clearly understood that Pidgin Sign English is not another distinctive language that can stand by itself (Woodward, 1980). Rather, Pidgin Sign English is a mixture of both languages, a mixture in which American Sign Language vocabulary is put in English word order. This is a mode of communication that both deaf and hearing people use to communicate with each other (Woodward, 1980), and it is this Pidgin Sign English area on the continuum where Simultaneous Communication can be utilized.

As the languages advance towards the English end of the continuum, there are four modes of communication known as (1) Seeing Essential English (SEE₁), (2) Signing Exact English (SEE₂), (3) Linguistics of Visual English (L.O.V.E.), and (4) Signed English. These modes are
Figure 2.1

Manual Communication Continuum

(Source: Baker and Cokely, 1980, p. 77)
categorized as Manually Coded English (MCE); their purpose is to make English visible to deaf children so they can master the language at a more rapid pace (Anthony, 1974; Gustason, 1972; Bornstein, 1975). In these systems, all English words are signed to make the language visible to deaf children who do not hear the spoken words. The developers of these systems believed that deaf children would acquire a strong command of the English language if they used Manually Coded English systems (Anthony, 1974; Gustason, 1974). The methods of communication on the continuum starting from Pidgin Sign English and continuing to the Manually Coded English end make it possible for almost anyone who knows English to use the Simultaneous Method, since it consists of coordinating signs with spoken or mouthed English words.

There are a number of disadvantages to the simultaneous method, however (Lane, 1976; Baker, 1978), the main argument being that signers tend to allow spoken English to dominate over Sign Language. Thus, not all the words which are spoken are actually being signed.

This English-like signing, which is also known as Simultaneous Communication, is required to be used in the classroom at Gallaudet College by the Guidelines of the Collegiate Faculty:

The 'simultaneous method' is a blending of speech and/or lip movements and English. The term Sign English is used to describe the type of signing used by most hearing and deaf persons when communicating with each other using signs and the
English language. Some characteristics of the "simultaneous method" are:

(1) English is used (spoken or mouthed).

(2) Most of the spoken words are signed or fingerspelled. The production of the spoken word and the production of the signs and/or fingerspelling are synchronized as much as possible.

(a) Signs are chosen from American Sign Language, from signs particular to a certain discipline, and/or from signs particular to the local conversants (especially at Gallaudet College). These signs are chosen by their meaning and not on the basis of English homonyms.

(b) English tense markers and word endings are optional and are used or deleted according to the needs of the communication situation.

(c) English function words and words with no sign are spelled or dropped, depending on the needs of the communication situation

(Guidelines of the Collegiate Faculty, 1980, p. 3)
The Simultaneous Communication Evaluation

Implementation of the Evaluation Panel

In the 1960's, Gallaudet College students began to formally express their frustrations about communication problems they were experiencing with their professors. In 1970, Dr. Edward C. Merrill, upon his appointment as the fourth president of Gallaudet College, set up the Council for the Improvement of Teaching and Learning (CITAL) to address this communication problem being experienced by students and faculty. After consulting with the Dean of the College and the President of the Student Body Government, Dr. Merrill appointed four (4) undergraduate faculty members and four (4) undergraduate students to serve on the task force. After a series of meetings, the council recommended additional conditions for granting tenure to faculty members. It was recommended that:

(1) The Gallaudet faculty, in view of the special function of Gallaudet College in educating hearing impaired students, add 'proficiency in the use of the simultaneous (total) method' as a condition to the usual academic requirements for obtaining tenure.

(2) [The Gallaudet faculty] adopt a policy of annual evaluation by a faculty-student committee which will (a) make a faculty member aware of the progress he had made in the use of the simultaneous
method and (b) inform the person or department who hired the faculty member of his progress.

(CITAL recommendations)

The CITAL members gave as a rationale for the recommendations:

...with few exceptions, faculty responses to the CITAL's January request on 'Classroom Communication' problems pointed to poor use of the language of signs as a serious problem in the classroom situation. It is only reasonable to expect that professionals in the field of higher education of the deaf be able to communicate well with the students in order to give their best. (Madsen, 1978).

The recommendations of CITAL led to the establishment of the Simultaneous Communication Panel in the Fall of 1971, the panel still responsible for the evaluation of Gallaudet faculty members' sign language competency. For a number of years, tenure at Gallaudet College was determined on the basis of the faculty member's performance in the Simultaneous Communication evaluation administered by the Simultaneous Communication Panel.

Sign Communication Proficiency Interview

The Sign Communication Proficiency Interview (SCPI) was adapted from the Language Proficiency Interview (Newell et al., 1983). To fully understand the SCPI, it is necessary to briefly address the
origin of this proposed method of assessing one's sign communication competency.

**Development of the Language Proficiency Interview**

During the pre-World War II era, American students of foreign languages were tested for their knowledge about the language in areas such as grammar, rules, culture, and appreciation of the literature rather than in their linguistic competency in the language. Participation in the war in the European and Pacific theatres, however, led Americans to recognize the need for foreign service employees to develop foreign language skills for the purpose of communication (Sollenberger, 1978; Newell et al., 1983). The usual method of testing people's language skills was through their listening to audio tapes, answering written questions about what they heard, and translating written passages. It was generally agreed that these methods of assessing language ability did not address their actual communication ability using that language. This led the Language School of the United States Foreign Service Institute to develop the Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI), later renamed the Language Proficiency Interview (LPI) by the Educational Testing Service. The purpose of the LPI was to determine how well a candidate/interviewee could use a spoken second language for communication on a variety of social and professional topics with skilled users of that language. The Sign Communication Proficiency Interview is a version of the LPI adapted for use with a signed rather than spoken language.
Conclusion from the Review of Literature

One can see from this review that the literature is fairly limited in the area of communication with deaf people. In addition, literature regarding the areas of the current Simultaneous Communication Evaluation at Gallaudet College and the proposed Sign Communication Proficiency Interview is very limited.

This review of the literature suggests that the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview merits consideration for use at Gallaudet College. Sign Communication Proficiency Interview was adapted from the Language Proficiency Interview, a type of evaluation tool which has been used by various organizations, especially the United States State Department. In light of the above discussion, it may be worthwhile to take a look into the possibilities of utilizing this method of assessing one's Simultaneous Communication skills. The basic difference between the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation and the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview is that the former is a type of diagnostic test while the latter is more of a proficiency test. In the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview, the subjects are tested on what they can actually do. This does not necessarily mean that the current method, the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation, is ineffective. In this study, the proposed Sign Communication Proficiency Interview method was compared with the current method to determine which of the two has higher reliability and validity when compared with the data obtained by using the Illinois Course Evaluation
Questionnaire as an observing tool. Data was collected from three sources, the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation, the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview, and two evaluators who viewed videotapes of the faculty members in action in the classrooms. The results were then compared to determine which of the two methods, the current Simultaneous Communication Evaluation or the proposed Sign Communication Proficiency Interview, had higher relationship.
CHAPTER III

Methodology

There is a need to identify procedures that can be utilized to measure competence in sign communication in educational and professional settings. Such an evaluation can lead to the establishment of a set of policies on assessment of sign communication skills that in turn can help to standardize sign language assessment procedures.

Hypothesis

It was hypothesized that there is no difference in the relationships between the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire's observers' data and the scores from the current Simultaneous Communication Evaluation and the scores from the Sign Communication Proficiency Interviews.

Subjects

Twenty-eight faculty members from the Academic Division at Gallaudet College were selected as subjects for this study. The criteria for selection were:

1. Must have had no prior experience in the use of Sign Language upon initial appointment to the faculty,
2. Must have no deaf relatives,
3. Must possess normal hearing status,
4. Must have been in the Academic Division at Gallaudet College for no less than two years,
5. Must teach on the undergraduate level only.

The selections of these twenty-eight persons were based in part on their willingness and availability to take the tests during the Fall Semester of 1985. They were informed that they would have to take the tests at appointed times. Originally, thirty-two people were asked to participate. Of these, one declined to participate for personal reasons; one misunderstood the procedures and upon learning that the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation was required, withdrew from the study; one agreed to participate and after taking the first Sign Communication Proficiency Interview had an accident, breaking his arm, which prevented him from continuing in the study; one subject, after taking the first Sign Communication Proficiency Interview, was subsequently selected to serve on the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation panel. To avoid bias, this subject agreed not to continue in the study.

In Chapter IV, Table 4.1 shows the demographic data on the twenty-eight persons who ultimately participated in this study, with the exception of one who did not take the first Sign Communication Proficiency Interview due to a conflict in scheduling. The participants' number of years at Gallaudet College as well as their
number of years of signing range from two (2) to twenty-five (25). Their ages range from thirty-four (34) to sixty-two (62) years.

Instrumentation

Several instruments were used to assess the relative quality of the two methods of evaluating sign communication competency. Each instrument was designed specifically to measure sign competence.

Simultaneous Communication Evaluation System: This system is the method currently used at Gallaudet College to determine faculty members' skills in the use of Simultaneous Communication.

The faculty members in this study were asked to take the Expressive portion of the current Simultaneous Communication Evaluation as prescribed in the Guidelines for the Collegiate Faculty. The subjects were given a list of topics and asked to select one to talk about briefly (for no more than two minutes) using the simultaneous method. They were then asked to read and sign verbatim a paragraph which was projected onto a screen from a transparency. Both of these activities were videotaped.

As prescribed in the Guidelines, at least six members from the Simultaneous Communication Panel evaluated the videotaped signing. Sign skills were assessed based on thirteen (13) specific criteria, using ratings from 1 to 5, and on one general criterion, using a dichotomous indicator (see Appendix C). Each Panel member's scores on the thirteen items were averaged and the score sheets with the highest and lowest averages were omitted. The remaining score sheets from
five or more Panel members were then averaged, resulting in a total score for each faculty member on a scale from 1 to 5. According to the Guidelines for the Collegiate Faculty, a rating of "competent" was awarded if (a) the faculty member got a score of 2.95 or higher on the specific criteria and/or (b) if at least seventy percent (70%) of the Panel members indicated that the faculty member "is competent."

The faculty members were then given the Receptive portion of the present Simultaneous Communication Evaluation through the use of a videotape showing three deaf undergraduate students who had been selected by the members of the Panel as "talent models." The videotape was of a script developed by the Panel members; sentences, a paragraph, and a dialogue were contained in the script. In the receptive evaluation, the subjects were asked to give an English translation of the sentences, which consisted of at least two hundred words signed on videotape, and to answer ten questions pertaining to the paragraph and dialogues.

A person selected by the entire Panel graded the answer sheets and determined the scores for sentence translation and answers to the questions. According to the Guidelines for the Collegiate Faculty, in order to be considered "competent" in the use of the Simultaneous Method, a person had to obtain a score of (a) 80% of the words correct in the sentence section, and (b) at least seven out of ten correct answers related to the paragraph and dialogue section, with at least three right responses for each paragraph/dialogue.
A faculty member was required to pass both parts to be considered competent in both the Expressive and Receptive portions of the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation.

**Sign Communication Proficiency Interview:** This method was examined as an alternative to the system currently used at Gallaudet College to assess faculty members' communication skills.

The Sign Communication Proficiency Interviews (SCPI), adapted from the Language Proficiency Interview (LPI), were conducted by two trained interviewers. Each interview lasted no longer than twenty minutes. The topics of conversation were determined at the time of the interview as is usual for any Language Proficiency Interview situation. At the end of the session, the interviewers rated the subject on a scale of 1 to 5 (See Appendix E).

For this study, a rating with a plus (+) resulted in the addition of .5 to the score. Thus, if a subject received a rating of 3+, a score of 3.5 was assigned.

**Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire:** This questionnaire was used as an observation tool for use in classroom situations (see Appendix H). Two trained observers independently viewed a ten-minute videotape of each subject's performance in the classroom and evaluated these videotapes using the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire as a guide. The subjects were videotaped during the final two weeks of the semester. If the subject's performance was judged to be inferior with respect to the criteria outlined in the questionnaire, then a
score of 0 was assigned. If, however, the performance was judged to be superior, a score of 2 was given.

**Procedures**

The current Simultaneous Communication Evaluation and the proposed Sign Communication Proficiency Interviews were administered to all subjects. To minimize order effects, the subjects were divided into two groups: the first group took the current Simultaneous Communication Evaluation followed by the two Sign Communication Proficiency Interviews, while the second group took the tests in reverse order. The classroom videotapes of each subject were viewed and evaluated using the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire. Scores obtained using the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation method were manipulated so that their reliability and validity could be assessed in terms of both raw scores and decision consistency. The scores attained from all parts of the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation were dichotomized, using "1" for not meeting the minimum scores and "2" for meeting or surpassing the minimum scores. These dichotomized scores were examined along with the raw scores on each part of the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation. The scores from the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview, in a range from 1 to 5, remained intact and were examined in light of scores obtained on the Simultaneous Communication Evaluations and the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire. The raw scores from the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire were dichotomized.
Analysis

Reliability: The internal consistency reliability of the Simultaneous Communication Evaluations are reported for raw scores for the first thirteen ratings, the panel members' decision, and the entire instrument. Decision consistency for the two sections are also reported, where the two scores are dichotomized at the College's normal cutoff for the Expressive and Receptive sections. In other words, scores on the 5-point Expressive scale were dichotomized at 2.95. The judgment scores were dichotomized in such a way that if 70% of the Panel members judged the person to be "competent" in the use of the Simultaneous Communication method, the subject's score was 2. Otherwise the score was 1. The Receptive scores were dichotomized such that scores lower than 80%, seven correct answers for paragraph/dialogue, and three correct answers each for paragraph and dialogue were assigned 1. Scores at the minimum level of passing or higher were assigned 2.

The consistency (test-retest) reliability of the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview was estimated. Pearson product-moment correlations were computed from scores from two separate administrations of the interview. In addition, the inter-rater reliability for the same test was reported. The inter-rater reliability of the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire was shown in terms of decision consistency over the two raters (trained observers).
Validity: Multitrait-multimethod methodology (Campbell and Fiske, 1959) was used to examine construct validity of the two methods of assessing the subjects' communication skills—the current Simultaneous Communication Evaluation and the proposed Sign Communication Proficiency Interview—as well as to show their reliabilities. Multitrait-multimethod matrices were formed following the guidelines given by Campbell and Fiske. With this procedure, correlations of scores measuring same or different traits using different methods of measurement were organized into a matrix. Patterns of correlations were then examined and interpreted with regard to both reliability and validity.

Figure 3.1 shows a theoretical multitrait-multimethod matrix. The diagonal values on the matrix ($r_{11}$, $r_{22}$, $r_{33}$) contain the reliability scores from each of the measurements. Without regard to the method used in obtaining the scores, the scores for each of the variables are correlated with the scores for each of the other variables. After the scores with the same method for the same variable are calculated, correlational scores are obtained. The coefficients ($r_{12}$, $r_{13}$, $r_{23}$) inside the solid triangles determine the relationship between measurements of different variables with the same method.

The triangles with broken lines contain the coefficients of correlation ($r_{ab}$, $r_{ac}$, $r_{bc}$) between measurements of different variables obtained by different methods. The coefficients of correlation between measurements ($r_{AB}$, $r_{AC}$, $r_{BC}$) are found in the diagonals between these dashed triangles. They are the validity coefficients.
Figure 3.1

Multitrait-Multimethod Matrix
Below is a list of requirements as determined by Campbell and Fiske for an acceptable validation process:

1. The coefficients of correlation between measurements of the same variable with different methods, $r_{AB}$, $r_{AC}$, $r_{BC}$, must be significantly greater than zero. This is the criterion which is normally considered sufficient.

2. The measurements of a variable must correlate more closely with measurements of the same type which are carried out with another method than with measurements of another type which are carried out with the same method. The validity coefficients, $r_{AB}$, $r_{AC}$, $r_{BC}$, for a certain variable should thus be greater than the coefficients for the same variable in the triangles enclosed by solid lines, $r_{12}$, $r_{13}$, $r_{23}$.

3. A validity coefficient for a given variable must be greater than the correlation between the measurements of this variable and the measurements of all other variables with any other method. A validity coefficient should thus be greater than the corresponding coefficients, $r_{ab}$, $r_{ac}$, $r_{bc}$, in the same row and column within the triangle enclosed by dashed lines.

4. Whether the same or different methods are used, the magnitude of the coefficients for the correlation between different variables should have the same pattern (Magnusson, 1966, p. 136-137.)
Magnusson (1966) asserted that if the coefficients of correlation between measurement of the same variable with different methods (requirement 1) is significant, then the methods are considered to have convergent validity. If requirements 2 and 3 are met, then the measurements have discriminant validity. Magnusson pointed out that "Campbell and Fiske's requirements can not be considered without taking into account the methods' reliability" (p. 136). If unreliability affects the results, then the unfulfillment of the discriminant validity requirements must be tolerated. According to Magnusson, the fourth requirement makes discriminant validity difficult to attain. He feels that "this requirement is unrealistic and impossible to maintain rigorously" (p. 136).

In the current study, several matrices were examined. The matrices differed in terms of the degree of manipulation of the scores.

Table 3.1 shows a multitrait-multimethod matrix for subtests. Some of the scores for the Expressive and the Receptive portions of the current Simultaneous Communication Evaluation were dichotomized as described above. The Sign Communication Proficient Interview and the dichotomous scores from the observers’ data remained intact for this analysis. The reliability coefficients shown for the sections containing more than one item are alpha.

The matrix in Table 3.1 enabled the researcher to determine which of the methods of assessing the subjects' communication skills had higher relationship with the observers' judgments.
Table 3.1

Multitrait-Multimethod Matrix for Subtests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHOD</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>Rec.</td>
<td>SCPI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>I Expressive</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>SCPI</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>ICEQ</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Legend for Table 3.1:

Method I - Simultaneous Communication Evaluation

Expressive
- A - The first thirteen ratings from the current Simultaneous Communication Evaluation
- B - Dichotomous score from Panel members' judgement on competency
- C - Pass/Fail score on Expressive portion

Receptive
- A - Pass/Fail scores on Receptive portion

Method II - Sign Communication Proficiency Interview

SCPI*
- A - Test scores
- B - Retest scores

Method III - Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire

ICEQ**
- A - First observer's dichotomous score
- B - Second observer's dichotomous score

* Sign Communication Proficiency Interview
** Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire
Tables 3.2 and 3.3 show the decision consistency of three methods of assessing sign competence. The scores were either dichotomous or dichotomized. To pass the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation, one had to pass both the Expressive and Reception portions. The scores attained from the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview were dichotomized in such a way that if a subject received a score of 3 or better, the score of 2 (pass) was assigned. Otherwise, the score of 1 was assigned.

The construct validity coefficients for the current Simultaneous Communication Evaluation and the proposed Sign Communication Proficiency Interview were also examined and interpreted. The two methods' decision consistency with the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire as determined by two observers were then focused.
Table 3.2
Multitrait-Multimethod Matrix Showing Decision Consistency of Three Methods of Assessing Subjects' Sign Competence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simultaneous Communication Evaluation</th>
<th>SCPI</th>
<th>ICEQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>Retest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simultaneous Communication Evaluation</td>
<td>alpha</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCPI Test</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retest</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICEQ I</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICEQ II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.3
Decision Consistency for Three Methods of Assessing Sign Competence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illinois Course</th>
<th>Simultaneous Evaluation</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Questionnaire Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simultaneous Communication Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sign Communication Proficiency Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL = XX

Note: The values shown are the numbers of subjects judged to be in each category.
CHAPTER IV

Results of the Findings

This chapter presents the statistical analysis of the findings from the research comparing the two assessment methods used at Gallaudet College for determining Simultaneous Communication competence of faculty members. This chapter discusses the subjects' demographic data and the three tests that were used for this research: (1) the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation, (2) the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview, and (3) the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire. The third test was used as an independent variable to determine which of the two dependent variables' scores actually reflect what is observable in the classroom. To test the hypothesis, Campbell-Fiske matrices were used.

Subjects

A total of twenty-eight subjects participated in this study. Table 4.1 shows the demographic data of the twenty-eight persons who fully participated in this study (with the exception of one who did not take the first Sign Communication Proficiency Interview). The participants' number of years at Gallaudet College as well as their
number of years of signing range from two (2) to twenty-five (25). They range in age from thirty-four (34) to sixty-two (62) years.

In the demographic questionnaire (shown in Appendix F), the participants were asked to check which of the methods for assessing Simultaneous Communication skills they preferred for the College to use. Table 4.2 gives the number of responses for each of the two methods. No one chose the current method of assessing signing skills presently in use at Gallaudet College.

Administration of the Three Tests

The tests were administered to the subjects during the Fall Semester 1985 at Gallaudet College. The subjects were divided into two groups, the first containing thirteen subjects, the other fifteen subjects. Group A (the first thirteen subjects) first took the test of the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview, then one week later, the retest, with two different interviewers. Two weeks after taking the retest, these thirteen subjects then took the Expressive and Receptive portions of the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation, together with the other fifteen subjects (Group B). Two weeks after taking both portions of the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation, members of Group B were given the test and retest of the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview by the same two interviewers who tested Group A. During the last two weeks of the semester, all subjects were videotaped in their classrooms and the tapes were then rated by two
Table 4.1  
Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years at Gallaudet College</td>
<td>9.107</td>
<td>5.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of signing</td>
<td>9.107</td>
<td>5.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>43.107</td>
<td>7.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of subjects: 28 (20 males, 8 females)
Table 4.2
Preferred Method of Assessing Simultaneous Communication Skills for Gallaudet College to Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simultaneous Communication Evaluation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Communication Proficiency Interview</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 28
observers using the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire as an observation tool.

**The Simultaneous Communication Evaluation**

For purposes of this study, to be considered competent in the use of Simultaneous Communication, one had to obtain a score of 3.0 or greater in the Expressive Portion of the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation; eighty percent (80%) or greater in the Receptive portion under the sentences category; give at least seven correct answers related to the paragraph and dialogue sections, broken down into at least three right responses for each paragraph/dialogue. The scores for the paragraph/dialogues were converted to percentages for statistical purposes. Table 4.3 summarizes the subjects' scores for the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation. (The score distributions are shown in Figure 4.1). The Expressive portion scores ranged from 2.30 to 4.30, as shown in Figure 4.1. The Receptive portion's sentence scores ranged from fifty-seven percent (57%) to one hundred percent (100%) (Fig. 4.2). Three people received the maximum score. The paragraph/dialogue scores ranged from forty-five percent (45%) to one hundred percent (100%) as shown in Figure 4.3. Ten participants attained the highest score for the paragraph/dialogue.
Table 4.3
Summary of Simultaneous Communication Evaluation Raw Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expressive (first 13 ratings)</td>
<td>3.164</td>
<td>0.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptive Sentences</td>
<td>94.321</td>
<td>8.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptive Paragraph/Dialogue</td>
<td>86.964</td>
<td>15.113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of subjects: 28
Score frequency distribution for the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation's first 13 ratings in the Expressive Portion

N = 28
Mean = 3.164
S.D. = .478
Skewness = .856
Figure 4.2

Score frequency distribution for the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation's sentences in the Receptive Portion
Figure 4.3

Score frequency distribution for the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation's paragraph and dialogue
Sign Communication Proficiency Interview

The Sign Communication Proficiency Interviews were conducted by two interviewers specially trained to conduct such a test. After conducting the interviews, the raters used a raw data sheet to determine the rating for each subject (shown in Appendix G).

There are two ways to analyze the results from the Sign Communication Proficiency Interviews: The test/retest reliability and the inter-rater reliability. Table 4.4.1 explains the reliability score for test/retest's raw and dichotomized scores. The raw score range is from 2.0 to 4.5 with a -0.167 skewness as shown in Figure 4.4. The dichotomized scores' skewness is -1.718. The test/retest reliability score is .7402 with the significance level of $P = .00$. The phi correlation for the dichotomized score is .4382 with the significance level being $P = .011$.

The Collegiate Faculty Guidelines state that to be considered competent in the use of Simultaneous Communication, a person must attain a pre-determined minimum score. There are no compensations or a citation of any kind for attaining other than the minimum score. For this reason, dichotomized scores were used in this study.

Table 4.2.2 shows the inter-rater reliability scores. The reliability score for the inter-rater reliability is .7929 with a significance level of $P = .000$, the phi correlation for dichotomized inter-rater reliability is at .5311 with $P = .002$. 
Table 4.4.1
Test-Retest reliability scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th># of Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCP! Test</td>
<td>3.241</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCP! Retest</td>
<td>3.286</td>
<td>.775</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson r = .7402 (Raw Scores)

P = .000

Phi correlation = .4382

P = .011
Figure 4.4

Score frequency distribution for the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview test/retest
Table 4.4.2
Inter-rater reliability scores for
Sign Communication Proficiency Interview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th># of Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCPI Rater #1 (Raw Scores)</td>
<td>3.093</td>
<td>.734</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCPI Rater #2 (Raw Scores)</td>
<td>3.339</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson r = .7929 (Raw Scores)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P = .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCPI Rater #1 (Dichotomized)</td>
<td>1.786</td>
<td>.418</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCPI Rater #2 (Dichotomized)</td>
<td>1.929</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi correlation = .5311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P = .002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire

At the end of the Fall Semester, the subjects were videotaped in their classrooms for the purpose of rating by the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaires. Two raters, who are experienced supervising teachers in the field of Deaf Education, were trained to view a ten-minute segment for each videotaped subject and to then answer a fifty-item questionnaire form (shown in Appendix H). Each of the fifty questions gave the raters the opportunity to respond with either "strongly agree," "agree," "disagree," or "strongly disagree." There were some items on the questionnaire that were not applicable to this study, and the raters were instructed not to answer these. The missing responses did not affect the overall raw scores for the subjects. Table 4.5 shows the results of the two raters' observations as recorded through the use of the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire forms.

To test the hypothesis which states that there is no difference in the relationship between the observers' data and the scores obtained from the current Simultaneous Communication Evaluation and the scores obtained from the proposed Sign Communication Proficiency Interviews, Campbell and Fiske's multitrait-multimethod matrices were used. To carry out this study, the scores of all three tests were dichotomized with the exception of the Panel Decision under the Expressive portion of the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation since the Panel Decision scores are already dichotomous. Table 4.6 illustrates the mean scores
Table 4.5
Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire
Raw Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICEQ 1</td>
<td>2.6914</td>
<td>0.3376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICEQ 2</td>
<td>2.7759</td>
<td>0.2981</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Subjects: 28
Pearson r = -0.0302
P = .439
Table 4.6
Dichotomous Scores for three tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simultaneous Communication Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel Decision</td>
<td>1.750</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive (First 13 ratings)</td>
<td>1.643</td>
<td>.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptive (Paragraph and Dialogue)</td>
<td>1.929</td>
<td>.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both Expressive and Receptive</td>
<td>1.714</td>
<td>.460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Communication Proficiency Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test *</td>
<td>1.815</td>
<td>.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retest</td>
<td>1.893</td>
<td>.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater #1</td>
<td>1.857</td>
<td>.356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rater #2</td>
<td>1.983</td>
<td>.315</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One person failed to show up for the interview

Number of subjects: 28
and their standard deviations for all three tests. The scores for the first thirteen ratings in the Expressive portion were dichotomized at 3.0, the cut-off for passing the test. In the Receptive portion, a subject's score was dichotomized to that of passing if the raw score for sentences was eighty percent (80%) or better and if seven out of the possible ten questions related to the paragraph and dialogue were correctly answered, with at least three correct answers given for each paragraph/dialogue. The SCPI scores were dichotomized at 2.5. The scores for the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire were dichotomized at 2.25 or greater. If a subject received a raw score of lower than 2.25, a failing rating was assigned.

Matrix Study

To determine which of the two methods of assessing one's Simultaneous Communication skills had higher relationship, Campbell and Fiske's multitrait-multimethod matrices were used. Table 4.7 suggests that only the Receptive portion of the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation has moderately low relationship with the other portion of the same test, as well as with the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview. The Receptive portion has either very low relationship or negative relationship with both Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire raters. The Expressive portion of the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation and the Sign Communication Proficiency Interviews have high relationship ranging from .5419 with a significance level of .001 to .8043 with a significance level of .000.
Table 4.7

Multitrait-Multimethod Matrix for subtests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>METHOD</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>Expressive A</th>
<th>Rec.</th>
<th>SCPI</th>
<th>ICEQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>Retest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Expressive A</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.5972</td>
<td>.6830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*****</td>
<td>P=.00</td>
<td>P=.00</td>
<td>P=.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.7746</td>
<td>.1601</td>
<td>.7755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*****</td>
<td>P=.00</td>
<td>P=.21</td>
<td>P=.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.3721</td>
<td>.8043</td>
<td>.6227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*****</td>
<td>P=.03</td>
<td>P=.00</td>
<td>P=.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Receptive D</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.3512</td>
<td>.4686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*****</td>
<td>P=.04</td>
<td>P=.006</td>
<td>P=.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>SCPI</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.7402</td>
<td>-.0410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*****</td>
<td>P=.00</td>
<td>P=.42</td>
<td>P=.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.1533</td>
<td>-.0975</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*****</td>
<td>P=.29</td>
<td>P=.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>ICEQ</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.1886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*****</td>
<td>P=.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*****</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expressive A - First 13 ratings (raw data)
B - Panel Decision (dichotomous)
C - Pass/Fail Scores for Expressive (dichotomized at 2.95)

Receptive D - Receptive portion containing sentences and paragraph/dialogue (dichotomous)

SCPI E - Test (raw data)
F - Retest (raw data)

ICEQ G - First observer (dichotomized at 2.25)
H - Second observer (dichotomized at 2.25)

Number of subjects: Simultaneous Communication 28
SCPI Test 27
Retest 28
ICEQ 1 and 2 28
The correlation between the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview's test and retest is .7402 with significance level being .000. The Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire's relationship between the other tests ranged from -.2000 to .1646 with the significance levels being .15 and .20 respectively.

Table 4.8 shows similar information to that in Table 4.7 for the dichotomized scores. There are negative relationships between the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire and the two tests used to assess a person's signing skills. The correlations between the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation and the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview (test/retest) are .8058 and .5477, with the significance levels being .00 and .001 respectively. The correlation between dichotomized test and retest for the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview is .4382 with $P = .011$.

The matter of correction for attenuation should be addressed here. A decision was made not to correct for attenuation in reporting validated coefficient. This refers to estimating a larger value for a correlation coefficient that corresponds to validity. The larger value is thought to be the correlation obtained if both tests, the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation and the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview, were perfectly reliable. Cronbach asserted that "this measure of relevance is more pertinent in construct validity than the observed correlation" (Cronbach, 1970). However, he also stated that "in examining convergence, the relation between the
### Table 4.8
Multitrait-Multimethod matrix showing decision consistency of three methods of assessing subjects' sign competence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sign Communication</th>
<th>Illinois Course</th>
<th>Sign Test</th>
<th>Illinois Course</th>
<th>Sign Test</th>
<th>Illinois Course</th>
<th>Sign Test</th>
<th>Illinois Course</th>
<th>Sign Test</th>
<th>Illinois Course</th>
<th>Sign Test</th>
<th>Illinois Course</th>
<th>Sign Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simultaneous</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.8058</td>
<td>.5477</td>
<td>-.0323</td>
<td>.2191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*****</td>
<td>P=.00</td>
<td>P=.001</td>
<td>P=.44</td>
<td>P=.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simultaneous</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.4382</td>
<td>-.1685</td>
<td>-.1685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.1414</td>
<td>-.1200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*****</td>
<td>P=.24</td>
<td>P=.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois 1</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.1886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questionnaire 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The scores are dichotomized

Number of subjects:  
- Simultaneous Communication: 28
- SCPI Test: 27
- Retest: 28
- ICEQ 1 and 2: 28
universe scores for the two procedures should be considered, not the relation between the observed scores; the latter may be much weaker."
Cronbach feels that it is usually acceptable to take unreliability into account informally (1970). Magnusson indicated that "if low reliability scores are used for correction, they will already contain a considerable error which will affect the correction. In the case of low reliability coefficients, correction can have a considerable effect which will arise partly from the errors to be found in the reliability scores. Corrected validity coefficients must under such conditions make the usual equation for testing the significance of correlation coefficients unsuitable for testing corrected correlation coefficients" (Magnusson, 1966).

The decision was made to use uncorrected correlations, because the reliability coefficients obtained were of the magnitude warned about in Magnusson's article. With such low reliability coefficients, it was decided that validity might easily be overestimated; therefore, Cronbach's recommendation to take unreliability into account informally was accepted.

The decision consistency for the three methods of assessing sign competence are shown in Tables 4.9, 4.10, and 4.11. These tables indicate that a vast majority of the twenty-eight subjects passed each pair of tests. The percent passing ranges from 60.7% on Table 4.9 to 89% on Table 4.11.
Table 4.9
Decision consistency for three methods of assessing sign competence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Illinois Course Evaluation</th>
<th>Simultaneous Communication Evaluation Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fail 3.6% 25.0% 28.6% 71.4%</td>
<td>Pass 10.7% 60.7% 71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simultaneous Communication Evaluation</td>
<td>Fail 3.6% 25.0% 28.6% 71.4%</td>
<td>Pass 10.7% 60.7% 71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Communication Proficiency Interviews</td>
<td>Fail 0.0% 18.5% 18.5% 74.1%</td>
<td>Pass 11.1% 70.4% 0.0% 74.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of subjects: Simultaneous Communication 28
SCPI Test 27
Retest 28
ICEQ 1 and 2 28
Table 4.10
Decision consistency for three methods of assessing sign competence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illinois Course Evaluation</th>
<th>Simultaneous Communication Questionnaire Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Simultaneous Communication Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fail</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Fail</th>
<th>Pass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sign Communication Proficiency Interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Fail</th>
<th>Fail</th>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Fail</th>
<th>Pass</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of subjects: Simultaneous Communication 28
SCPI Test 27
Retest 28
ICEQ 1 and 2 28
Table 4.11

Decision consistency for SCPI test/retest and ICEQ 1/2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sign Communication Proficiency Interview</th>
<th>Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Test</td>
<td>Retest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Pass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                      | 1                                         | 2                                        |
|                      | Fail                                      | Pass                                    |
|                      | Pass                                      | Pass                                    |
|                      | Fail                                      | Pass                                    |
|                      | Pass                                      | Pass                                    |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of subjects:</th>
<th>SCPI Test</th>
<th>27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retest</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICEQ 1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To summarize the hypothesis and findings, there are relationships among the four parts of the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation: the Expressive portion's first thirteen ratings, the Panel's decisions, the dichotomous scores for the Expressive portion, and the Receptive portion. The Receptive portion of the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation has the lowest relationship with the other three parts. In general, the current Simultaneous Communication Evaluation (including the Expressive and Receptive portions) and the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview's test and retest show a moderate correlation. There are negative correlations between the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire and the two tests, the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation and the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview. Pearson Product Moment and Phi correlations were used to compute the findings.

From the results of the analysis, it is concluded that the null hypothesis is not rejected. There is no difference between the scores attained through the current Simultaneous Communication Evaluation and the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview when compared with the scores from the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire. Chapter Five will discuss ramifications regarding this finding.
CHAPTER V
Summary, Conclusion, Recommendations

This chapter presents a summary of the study, including the problem statement, review of the literature, methods of study, and the results. Conclusions based on the results of the study and the review of the literature are discussed. The final section presents the implications of the study and suggestions for future research.

Summary
Objectives

The purpose of this study was to determine which of the ratings from the two methods of assessing a person's Simultaneous Communications skills--the current Simultaneous Communication Evaluation used at Gallaudet College or the proposed Sign Communication Proficiency Interview--reflect what is observable in the classroom. In other words, reliability and validity studies were attempted. In addition, an attempt was made to determine the test/retest and inter-rater reliability scores from the proposed Sign Communication Proficiency Interview.
Review of the Literature

The literature review focused mainly on the problems with the current method of evaluating one's sign language skills, the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation. John Francis, in his report to Gallaudet College, asserted that the current method is an unreliable test. He went on to propose as an alternative method of assessing sign skills the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview as adapted from the widely-used Language Proficiency Interview.

The Quality Academic Committee's report stated that the majority of the faculty members at Gallaudet College do not believe that the ratings obtained from the current Simultaneous Communication Evaluation actually reflect their own performances in the classroom. The report, however, did not discuss what type of evaluation should be used as an alternative.

It must be noted that the literature in the area of assessing one's signing ability is very limited.

Method of the Study

There were three phases in this study: the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation, the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview, and the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire ratings based on videotaped classroom performance. The subjects in the study took the first two tests prior to being videotaped at the end of the semester. Two observers were asked to view the tapes and rate the
subjects' teaching abilities through the use of the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire.

Campbell-Fiske matrices were used to examine the reliability and validity for each of the three tests that were used for this study. Decision-consistency was used to compare the number of subjects who passed with those who failed all three tests.

**Summary of the Results**

**Demographic Data:** The demographic data on the subjects indicate that the average number of years of signing and employment at Gallaudet College is slightly over nine years. The average age for the subjects was a little over forty-three years. As for subjects' preference for method of assessing their Simultaneous Communication skills, the proposed Sign Communication Proficiency Interview prevailed. This agrees with the Quality Academic Committee report's assertion that the majority of the collegiate faculty felt that the current system does not reflect their actual sign skills, as well as with the Frances Report proposals.

**Simultaneous Communication Evaluation:** The majority of the subjects passed both the Expressive and the Receptive portions. No one who passed the Receptive portion failed the Expressive portion.

**Sign Communication Proficiency Interview:** There are three parts to this discussion: the subjects' results, the test-retest reliability, and the inter-rater reliability.
The majority of the subjects passed both the test and the retest. More subjects passed the retest than the test. The phi correlation between the test and the retest is .4382, with .011 for probability of error. This indicates that there is moderate stability (test-retest) reliability for the Sign Communication Proficiency Interviews. The proposed method of measuring Simultaneous Communication skill can be expected to be moderately reliable over time.

As for the inter-rater reliability, the results indicate a positive relationship. The phi correlation for the inter-rater reliability is .5311 with the level of significance at .002. This reinforces the previous statement that the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview is a reliable test; it shows consistency over raters as well as over occasions.

Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire: Despite the fact that two raters were trained to use the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaires to rate the subjects' teaching ability after viewing the videotapes, the results were mixed. For example, the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire received a very low phi correlation score of .1886 with .17 for probability of error, which indicates that there was some disagreement between the raters regarding the subjects' teaching abilities.

Surprisingly, the correlations among the three segments in the Expressive portion of the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation and the Receptive portion of the same test existed, even though they were
relatively low. This was not expected because of the high negative skewness in the scores obtained from the Receptive portion of this test, leading one to expect either a negative relationship or none.

The relationship between the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview's test and retest was moderately high with the probability of error being at .00 for the raw scores and at .011 for the dichotomized scores. This indicates that this method of assessing a person's sign communication skills is reliable after only the first testing of its kind, an unexpected finding.

There was a mixture of surprise and disappointment with the correlations between the two raters for the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire. Despite having trained the raters prior to the actual evaluation of the subjects, the relationship came out to be very low. The Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire underwent reliability and validity testing and was found to be high (Aleomoni, 1972). This was more of a disappointment because it was hoped that through this questionnaire, the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview would be validated. However, at this point we cannot say that this new method of evaluating signing skills is validated, because of the low correlation in the construct validity test.

In addition, the consistent negative correlations between the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire and the two tests, the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation and the Sign Communication
Proficiency Interview, came out to be low negative. These low negative correlations deserve discussion. It was believed that the ability to teach deaf students had something to do with the ability to use sign language. The findings of this research, however, indicate otherwise.

The Sign Communication Proficiency Interviews prevailed, with most of the subjects indicating that they preferred this method of assessing their sign language skills. This supports to some extent the Quality Assessment Committee's report that the scores from the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation do not reflect what is actually observable in the classroom. Dr. Catherine Ingold, Provost of Gallaudet College, indicated in her letter (see Appendix B) that as "a foreign language teacher who has participated in other types of language proficiency assessment," the proficiency interview method is "inherently more accurate than the videotaped exam now in use." This would seem to indicate that some administrators at Gallaudet also support the idea that the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview is a reliable test for use at Gallaudet College.

Despite the fact that both the Expressive portion of the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation and the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview are different in the manner in which one's sign communication skills are evaluated, the correlations between the two were high. In reference to the Receptive portion of the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation, the correlations were very low, due to the difficulty in
assessing one's receptive skills through the use of television. Both the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation and the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview have negative correlations with the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire. One reason for this finding is the fact that the raters were rating the subjects' teaching skills and not their signing skills. This negative correlation indicates that teaching and signing are not necessarily related.

Conclusions

Based on the findings in this research, the following conclusions seem justified:

A. The Receptive portion of the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation generally showed a weak relationship to the other tests with the exception of the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview's retest, with which it showed only a moderate relationship. This indicates that the Receptive portion may not be a valid way of assessing signing ability.

B. Since the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview's test-retest and the inter-rater reliability indicators are moderately high, with their levels of significance being lower than .05, this method of testing may be regarded as at least a moderately reliable means of assessing the faculty members' skills in the use of Simultaneous Communication.

C. The correlations for the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation and the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview's test and retest are
.8058 and .5477 respectively. The Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire, in general, showed negative correlations with the first two tests with the probability of error being higher than the acceptable .05. One may conclude that there is no relationship between the ability to teach and the ability to use Simultaneous Communication.

Recommendations

The following recommendations follow from the results of this research:

1. There is a need to conduct a predictive validity study for the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview. An attempt should be made to determine the relationship of scores from the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview with successful teaching and, finally, the attainment of tenure. The validity of the proposed Sign Communication Proficiency Interview as a predictor of a professor's potential for obtaining tenure must be examined.

2. There is a need to repeat this study with the students rating their professors' teaching ability using the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire. The students' ratings should then be compared with those of two trained observers. Interferring variables are involved in this recommendation, but when the students' ratings are compared with the trained observers', we may be able to see if the scores obtained from the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation and the Sign Communication Proficiency Interviews are correlated.
3. This study should be repeated in such a fashion that the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire raters visit the professors' classes periodically throughout the semester prior to filling out the questionnaire forms. This would give the raters a better sample (and better insight) into what is really going on in the classroom. The idea of using a "one-shot" videotape to rate a professor's teaching ability is similar to the idea of trying to see what a room looks like by looking through a keyhole.

4. The inter-rater reliability test of the current Simultaneous Communication Evaluation should be examined. The panel members' ratings should be compared with those of professionals who are experienced in the area of evaluating Sign Language. This will determine whether the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation panel members are as qualified as the professionals to make such evaluations.

5. There should be an item by item inter-rater reliability examination of the Sign Communication Proficiency Interview. This in-depth analysis of the test itself can point out the weaknesses in the test which can then be ameliorated.
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A Summary of the Francis Report

The Commission of the Francis Report

In 1977, a group of deaf students submitted a petition to the College's administration, indicating that they continued to have problems in communicating with their professors. This prompted the administration to commission an outside consultant, John Francis, to study the situation and to come up with recommendations regarding the current system of evaluating the faculty members' Simultaneous Communication skills. Francis submitted his report, known as the Francis Report, to the administration and the Collegiate Faculty in 1980. The report discussed the problems that the faculty had with the current Simultaneous Communication Evaluation Panel and proposed recommendations for the adoption of an alternative method of assessment, the Language Proficiency Interview.

The Francis Report

The Francis Report suggested that there are six problems with the current method of evaluating faculty members' Simultaneous Communication skills. These problems affect the validity of the current evaluation system. Francis discussed each problem in light of directives
set forth in the Guidelines for the Collegiate Faculty which were revised in 1982. Francis' analysis of the problems continues to be valid despite the revisions made to the Guidelines.

Francis identified six problem areas:

Problem 1:

Francis Report:

The evaluation panels have been composed of individual faculty members who have no expertise in test design in general or with the evaluation of language proficiency in particular. (Francis, 1980, p. vii).

The Collegiate Faculty agreed that its members would be selected by the Vice President/Provost to serve on the Simultaneous Communication Panel. The Guidelines of the Collegiate Faculty has a provision on selection to this panel:

6.3.2 Composition of the Panel

From a list of nominees submitted by the Collegiate Faculty and the Student Body Government, or its duly elected representatives, respectively, the Vice President for Academic Affairs shall appoint seven (7) Faculty members - four (4) who teach primarily
undergraduates and three (3) who teach primarily graduate students, and four (4) students - two (2) undergraduate juniors or seniors and two (2) graduate students. Faculty members shall be appointed for a term of three (3) years, beginning on 1 May. The terms will be staggered to provide continuity. Student members shall be appointed for a term of one academic year. Vacancies shall be filled in the manner of choosing the Panel. In order to be eligible for membership on the Panel, a Faculty member must have been a member of the Collegiate Faculty for at least seven (7) semesters and must have been judged competent in the simultaneous method by a panel within the previous three (3) years. In making selections for the faculty membership on the Panel, the Vice-President for Academic Affairs must assure that there is a balance of deaf and hearing faculty members. Faculty members serving on the Panel shall be considered competent during the term of their service and, thereafter, for one academic year (Guidelines, 1982, p. 9).

The guideline mentioned above states that faculty members, regardless of what their expertise may be in evaluating language proficiency, can evaluate their peers' Simultaneous Communication skills if
they themselves are rated as competent by the Panel. Students, too, are selected for the Panel without regard for their experience and skill in language proficiency evaluation. In addition, the students who are recommended by the Student Body Government for appointment on the Panel, may lack the ability to evaluate their professors' Simultaneous Communication skills objectively. These student members may have the skill to use Sign Language but they do not necessarily have knowledge in the area of testing and measurement. This situation raises the question of validity for this current system of evaluation faculty members' Simultaneous Communication skills.

**Problem 2:**

**Francis Report:**

The test lacks objectivity. On the expressive portion of the test, scores are assigned on the basis of subjective impressions rather than on the basis of hard-edged criteria. The panel raters receive meager training for their role—possibly a few trial runs designed more with a view to securing agreement among raters than an understanding of the meaning of the ratings themselves. Scores are therefore unreliable. (Francis, 1980, p. vii).

The Guidelines mandate that the members of the Panel receive some kind of training before they perform the actual evaluation, but,
according to Francis' observations, the training of panel members is inadequate.

6.3.3 Training

Members of the Panel, both student and faculty, shall participate in a training program designed to familiarize them with the general standards of competence accepted by the Faculty and with the testing instruments to be used, and to provide them with information concerning the evaluation of simultaneous communication method skills. This training program will take place early in the fall semester of each year, and review sessions will be held as needed during the year. (Guidelines, 1982, p. 9).

However, personal interviews conducted by this researcher with some Panel members (1985) revealed that the length of time of training for the members of the panel can be from one hour to no more than a few hours.

Problem 3:

Francis Report:

The expressive portion of the test, which records on videotape the examinee's performance without a conversational partner, bears little resemblance to the requirements of communicating about shared topics with the well-defined and known audience that
teachers address in their classrooms. This criticism challenges the validity of the test. (Francis, 1980, p. vii.)

The administration of the Expressive portion of the evaluation is explained in the Guidelines:

6.3.4.1 Expressive Portion

The Panel will use a format similar to that which has been traditional in this portion of the evaluation; i.e., while using the simultaneous method, the faculty member will be video-taped, giving her/his name and the department, a short monologue (perhaps two minutes) on a topic of interest to the member, and a paragraph provided by the Panel. The member shall be given the topic for the monologue, or asked to pick such a topic, a few minutes before the video-taping begins. so that he/she will have an opportunity to think about it before speaking. The Panel shall use the same paragraph for each individual being given the expressive portion of the evaluation. This paragraph should be written so that many words with commonly used signs appear and some amount of fingerspelling is necessary. Faculty members should be informed that they are to express the paragraph as written using the simultaneous method.
The Panel shall attempt to make the physical surroundings comfortable and relaxed. Arrangements shall be made with the T.V. studio so that the effects of being "on stage" and "in the spotlight" are minimized. Finally, the Panel will use the "Expressive Evaluation Form" to evaluate the expressive competence of the faculty member (See Appendix A). While viewing the expressive videotape of a faculty member, each Panel member shall mark the appropriate blanks. After completing the rating process, the Panel member shall circle the appropriate word or words in the final sentence on the form, i.e., "in my judgment, as a member of the Collegiate Faculty Simultaneous Method Evaluation Panel, this individual is/is not competent in the expressive use of the simultaneous method." A faculty member shall be declared "competent on the expressive portion of the evaluation" is either of the following is satisfied (with a minimum of six (6) Panel members evaluating):

(a) at least seventy (70) percent of the panel members scoring the individual indicate that he/she "is competent."
(b) the average score is 3.0 (i.e., that is 2.95 rounded) or above. This average score will be calculated as follows: each individual score will be averaged, the score sheets with the highest and the lowest averages will be removed, and the remaining score sheet averages will be averaged. If neither (a) nor (b) is satisfied, the faculty member shall be declared "to have failed the expressive portion of the evaluation." (Guidelines, 1982, pp. 10-11).

Problem 4:

Francis Report:
The validity of the receptive portion of the test is further challenged on the ground that the student models who record the test sentences and paragraphs are signing in ways uncharacteristic of their usual mode of communication. (Francis, 1980, p. vii).

The Guidelines explain the procedures for the receptive portion of the test:

6.3.4.2 Receptive Portion
The Panel shall use a format similar to that which has been traditional in this portion of the evaluation, i.e., the faculty member shall view a video-tape that includes three student models giving
sentences, and a paragraph and/or dialogue, and shall be asked to give a verbatim transcript of the sentences and answer several questions related to the paragraph and/or dialogue. The Panel shall be aware of the following in relation to this videotape:

(a) the student models used on the tape should be given adequate training and time for preparation to insure that the simultaneous method used is as natural as possible, and at the same time is clear, accurate and of a nature which would be called expressively good or excellent. At least two of the three models should use voice, and their voices shall be of quality 4 or 5 as rated by the Department of Audiology (Communication Arts). There need not be sound provided for one of the models, provided that this model is lipreadable. If there is a dialogue involved, then both models should use voice and sound should be provided.

(b) the sentences used in the sentence portion of the receptive evaluation should not be so lengthy that memory becomes a dominant factor.

(c) care should be taken that not too many fingerspelled words appear in succession.
(d) commonly signed words should be signed, not fingerspelled. The sign vocabulary used should be checked to assure that it does not include too many specialized signs, that the signs are commonly used on the Gallaudet campus.

(e) care should be taken that the technical quality of the video-tape is excellent and that variables such as background, viewing angle, viewing environment, the dress of the models, etc., are controlled.

(f) the answer papers provided should have an adequate amount of space for giving answers.

(g) care should be taken that instructions are clearly understood before the evaluation proceeds.

The sentence portion of the video-tape shall include at least two hundred words. The paragraph portion shall include at least five questions related to each part. Care should be exercised in the construction of these questions so that not more than three of them have answers that are fingerspelled (not more than two in any one paragraph/dialogue). Also, not more than two numbers (one per paragraph) should be included as answers.
A faculty member shall be declared "competent on the receptive portion of the evaluation" if both of the following are satisfied:

(a) he/she gets at least eighty (80) percent of the words correct in the sentence part.

(b) he/she gets at least seven (7) answers correct related to the paragraph/dialogue, with at least three (3) answers correct for each.

If one or both of (a) or (b) above is not satisfied, the faculty member shall be declared "to have failed the receptive portion of the evaluation." (Guidelines, 1982, p. 11-12).

There are several points to consider regarding Francis' observation that the student model's signing style differs from that used under normal conditions. These students are not trained to perform before a TV camera and this affects their process of communication. When the student model's process of communication is affected, it often becomes difficult to understand what is being signed on the TV screen.

Furthermore, the student models, under normal conditions, do not use voice while signing with other Deaf persons. Since American Sign Language is a visual-gestural language (Baker and Cokely, 1980), which means that voice is not required for communication, one would find it rather artificial and unnatural to see two or more Deaf persons, who
do not hear each other, use their voices along with Sign Language when conversing among themselves. It is impossible for one to sign American Sign Language syntax and speak in English at the same time, since the two languages have different grammatical structures. It would be similar to the idea of simultaneously speaking in English while writing in French. If these student models are required to use voice while signing before a TV camera, their communication style naturally differs significantly from that used in daily life. There has been no formal research that supports this statement; however, this phenomenon is observable even through untrained eyes.

When two Deaf persons communicate with each other, they use a language that is different from English. However, as soon as a hearing person comes into the picture, these two Deaf persons would automatically switch over to English-like signing (Woodward, 1980). If it is accepted that Deaf persons generally do not use their voice while signing with each other, and if there is no hearing person on the TV screen conversing with the Deaf student models, then one can argue that the communication process between these two Deaf models is unnatural. This artificial environment could affect the faculty members' receptive skills, since the student models' signing style would differ from that normally seen in the classroom, adversely affecting the faculty members' ability to comprehend a monologue or a conversation on the TV screen.
The points discussed above lead to another point which Francis raised concerning the current system's validity:

Problem 5:

Francis Report:

More generally, the simultaneous method of communication so strongly diverges from the language used with faculty by a large fraction of the students that even proven facility is a pale indication of a faculty member's actual ability to communicate with them. (Francis, 1980, p. vii).

In the early part of 1985, the Quality Assessment Committee, established by Dr. Jerry Lee, the College's newly appointed president, distributed questionnaires to the Collegiate Faculty. One of the questions was: "Do you feel that your scores on the Sign Communication (sic) Evaluation accurately reflect your sign communication skills in an instructional situation?" Personal conversation with Dr. Catherine Ingold, Chair of the Committee, reveals that responses were received from approximately 50% of the Collegiate Faculty. The overall results showed that 56.3% of the respondents feel that the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation scores do not reflect their signing skills. A further analysis (see Table 1) found that 59.9% of the hearing faculty members do not feel that their
Table 1

Responses to the question regarding the scores reflecting faculty members' own signing skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Deaf</th>
<th>Hearing</th>
<th>Hard of Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Ingold, 1985)
scores represent their actual signing competence. Another question from the same questionnaire shed a different light on the communication situation. (See Table 2). This second question asked the Collegiate Faculty members if most "hearing faculty at Gallaudet have adequate sign skills for teaching effectively." Almost 61% of the deaf members and 62.5% of hard of hearing members responded that the hearing members lack communication skills while 64.9% of the hearing members believed that their hearing peers do have the skills. Dr. Ingold stated that she feels that the deaf faculty members were looking at their hearing peers instead of at themselves when they responded to the question regarding the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation scores reflecting their own signing skills. She conceded that there is no evidence that supports this assumption; however, the results from the second question in reference to hearing faculty members' adequate signing skills seem to confirm her suspicions (Source: Personal conversation with Dr. Ingold on May 21, 1985, in her office).

Problem 6:

Francis Report:

Faculty criticize the evaluation system for lack of clarity in the definition of the criteria they must satisfy in order to be judged competent in the Simultaneous Method. Although the cut-off scores are firmly fixed (they have varied from one test to the next), there is no substantive characterization
Table 2

Responses to question whether hearing faculty members have adequate signing skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Deaf</th>
<th>Hearing</th>
<th>Hard of Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Ingold, 1985)
of what the cut-off scores mean in terms of mastery or accomplishment. This arbitrariness together with the uncertainty it generates lend a punitive tone to the test in the eyes of those for whom the cost of failure may be severe. (Francis, 1980, p. vii).

All college faculty members are evaluated to become eligible for reappointments, merit increases, promotions, and tenure. The Guidelines of the Collegiate Faculty require three areas for evaluation: (a) Academic Competence, (b) Service, Professional/Scholarly Competence, and (c) Competency in the Simultaneous Method (Guidelines, 1982, p. 7-8). Francis, after interviewing a number of faculty members, concluded that there is an opinion among faculty members that the College Administration has a "sink or swim" attitude towards those who lack the ability to use the simultaneous method (Francis, 1980, p. vii).

To conclude this discussion on the current Simultaneous Communication Evaluation used at Gallaudet College, Francis comments on the method of assessing the faculty members' sign competency:

...The SCM (Simultaneous Communication) evaluation must be considered an inadequate test of language proficiency. It clearly does not directly probe those abilities which count. As an indirect measure its emphasis on mechanization of administration and on routinized scoring procedures have resulted in a
test format which samples behaviors too remote from those of genuine interest. The receptive portion of the test fails to disclose significant differences in performance. The validity of the test is further weakened by the almost exclusive focus in the expressive test on 'manual pronunciation' and by the failure to test deep features of language structure which alone enable the user to express meaning.

(Francis, 1980, p. 16).

A total of fourteen recommendations were outlined in the Francis report, dealing mostly with the concept of the Language Proficiency Interview being conducted at Gallaudet College in lieu of the current Simultaneous Communication Evaluation.
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Letters of Endorsement
Mike Kemp
Gallaudet College

Dear Mike:

Let me express my heartfelt support for your research in comparing methods of assessing simultaneous method proficiency. For many years, the procedure for evaluating proficiency of our faculty in simultaneous communication has been a source of controversy and low faculty morale. The survey of faculty opinion last year by the Quality Assessment Committee bears out faculty dissatisfaction with the accuracy and relevance of the current evaluation method. At the same time, it is clear to everyone that SimCom proficiency is crucial to successful teaching at Gallaudet, and this vital skill cannot be fostered without adequate means of assessing skill level.

As a foreign language teacher who has participated in other types of language proficiency assessments, I have a strong belief that the interview method you are trying is inherently more accurate than the videotaped exam now in use. My observation is that the current exam tests a number of irrelevant skills, such as the ability to recall information received in sign, the ability to write while looking at a speaker, and the ability to remain calm in a highly uncomfortable and threatening situation, i.e. staring into a videocamera. I am also concerned by the use of a single level of exam to evaluate first-year faculty and those being evaluated for tenure. No foreign language teacher would use the same exam for a first-year student and a graduate student!

The proficiency interview has a long and successful track record in other contexts; I cannot believe that it can't be made to work here. Your research will, I hope, give us the impetus needed to implement it, and the information needed to make it accurate.

I am happy to serve as one of the "guinea pigs" in your research; if there are other ways in which I can be helpful, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Catherine W. Ingold, Dean
October 3, 1985

Mr. Mike Kemp
Department of Sign Communication
Gallaudet College
Kendall Hall
CAMPUS MAIL

Dear Mr. Kemp:

It is my pleasure to inform you of my support for your dissertation proposal entitled "The Comparison of Simultaneous Communication Evaluation with Sign Communication Proficiency Interview". Your research into alternative methods of simultaneous communication evaluation will certainly assist us in providing the all important and much needed research into our evaluation process.

Best wishes to you and I look forward to seeing the conclusion reached on this very important topic.

Very truly yours,

David Tweedie, Ed.D.
Dean, School of Communication

DT/kf

cc: Dr. Riekehof
MEMORANDUM

TO:     Mike Kemp,  
         Assistant Professor of Sign Communication

FROM:   Michael A. Karchmer, MAK  
         Associate Dean for Research

RE:     Your grant request

I am pleased to inform you that your request for a grant of $700 to help support your dissertation research has been approved. A faculty-staff review committee read your proposal and thought that the work was well-conceived. Dean Trybus and I agree; we think that this work on comparisons of methods of sign language evaluation is a timely topic for our institution.

Your budget is approved as requested. The funds will be transferred to department's account for administration. Also, please note that these funds are meant to be used during the current fiscal year.

We would appreciate a copy of your dissertation when it is completed. Also, if publications result from your work, please cite this grant as a source of support.

cc:     Trybus      
         Tweedie      
         Riekehof    
         Provost's office
Mr. William M. Kemp  
Assistant Professor  
Gallaudet College  
Washington, D. C. 20002

Dear Mike:

Enclosed are my ratings for individuals participating in the Sign Communication Proficiency Interviews which we agreed to do for your Ph.D. dissertation study. Also enclosed for your information is a copy of the "performance factors" used in computing these ratings which also includes a "rating table." The latter was from John Francis' work and was used in training Cathy Moses and myself in conducting interviews and determining ratings. I thought it might be helpful to you, but if you should have any questions or need further information, I will be happy to share it with you for purposes of your study.

The task was quite overwhelming in the midst of an otherwise very hectic fall semester, but I would like to say I enjoyed doing the interviews immensely. I thought all were quite productive and I learned much about myself in reviewing the tapes and determining the ratings. I feel this experience has helped me grow in this type of evaluation and that I now have confidence in my ability to do interviews and ratings more rapidly and in much less time than I spent on these interviews, the average of which was approximately 45 minutes in length. I think now I could do the same thing in 30 minutes or less, so it has been a positive experience for me.

I wish you every success in completing your study and will look forward to positive results coming from it for the best interests of all of us at Gallaudet.

Sincerely,

Willard J. Madsen  
Associate Professor

Encls. (2)
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The Simultaneous Communication Evaluation Documents
GALLAUDET COLLEGE UNDERGRADUATE FACULTY SIM COM EVALUATION

I. Simultaneity of Signs, Fingerspelling and Voice and/or Lip Movement
   A. Fluency and rate ......................................... 0 0 0 0 0
   b. Signs/fingerspelling in time with lip movement .......... 0 0 0 0 0

II. Use of Signs
    A. Sign formation. .................................. 0 0 0 0 0
    B. Sign concepts used. .................................. 0 0 0 0 0
    C. Fluency and rate. .................................. 0 0 0 0 0
    D. Hand position and movement. .......................... 0 0 0 0 0
    E. Facial expression and gestures. ...................... 0 0 0 0 0

III. Use of Fingerspelling
    A. Clarity of formation of letters ....................... 0 0 0 0 0
    B. Inclusion of all letters in a word .................. 0 0 0 0 0
    C. Fluency and rate. .................................. 0 0 0 0 0
    D. Hand movement and position. .......................... 0 0 0 0 0
    E. Separation of words fingerspelled in sequence ....... 0 0 0 0 0

IV. Use of Voice/Lip Movement ................................ 0 0 0 0 0

V. In my judgment this individual is competent in the expressive use of the simultaneous method.
   A = YES
   B = NO

   NOTE: For the purpose of scoring, A=1, B=2, C=3, D=4, E=5.
GALLAUDET COLLEGE
Washington, D.C. 20002

Evaluation of Expressive and Receptive Proficiency for Use of the Simultaneous Method of Communication

Name: ___________________________________ Ratings: Expressive: ___
Dept: _________________________________ Receptive: ___
Date: _________________________________

On the EXPRESSIVE portion of the evaluation, a score of 3.0 and higher is considered satisfactory.

Expressive skills which averaged below your total expressive average rating:
   1. Fluency/rate in simultaneity of signs, fingerspelling, voice and/or lip movement.
   2. Signs/fingerspelling in time with lip movement.
   3. Sign formation.
   4. Sign concepts used.
   5. Fluency and rate of signs.
   6. Hand position and movement of signs.
   7. Facial expression and gestures used with signs.
   8. Clarity of formation of fingerspelled letters.
   9. Inclusion of all fingerspelled letters.
  10. Fluency and rate of fingerspelling.
  11. Hand movement and position of fingerspelling.
  12. Separation of words fingerspelled in sequence.

On the RECEPTIVE portion of your evaluation, a minimum score of 70% out of ___ is required for sentences. A minimum score of 70% on the paragraph and dialogue is required for passing with a minimum of 3 answers correct from the paragraph and 3 correct answers from the dialogue.

Your score is: Sentences ________
             Paragraph _________
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Definitions of Absolute Proficiency Ratings
Definitions of Absolute Proficiency Ratings

Elementary Proficiency (S-1):

Able to satisfy routine needs and minimum courtesy requirements. Can ask and answer questions on topics very familiar to him; within the scope of his very limited language experience can understand simple questions and statements, allowing for slowed expression, repetition or paraphrase; vocabulary inadequate to express anything but the most elementary needs; errors in pronunciation and grammar are frequent, but can be understood by a "native" or exemplary speaker used to dealing with "non-natives" attempting to use his language. While topics which are "very familiar" and elementary needs vary considerably from individual to individual, any person at the S-1 level should be able to order a simple meal, ask for help in finding campus resources, ask and give simple directions, make purchases, and tell time.

Limited Working Proficiency (S-2):

Able to satisfy routine social demands and limited work requirements. Can handle with confidence but not with facility most social situations including introductions and casual conversations about
current events, as well as work, family, and autobiographical information; can handle limited work requirements, needing help in handling any complications or difficulties; can get the gist of most conversations on non-technical subjects (i.e., topics [sic] which require no specialized knowledge) and has a vocabulary sufficient to express himself simply with some circumlocutions; accent, though often quite faulty, is intelligible; can usually handle elementary constructions quite accurately but does not have thorough or confident control of the grammar.

Minimum Professional Proficiency (S-3):

Able to use the language with sufficient structural accuracy and vocabulary to participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social, and professional topics. Can discuss particular interests and special fields of competence with reasonable ease; comprehension is quite complete for normal rate of production; vocabulary is broad enough that he rarely has to grope for a word; accent may be obviously non-native; control of grammar good; errors never interfere with understanding and rarely disturb the native user.

Full Professional Proficiency (S-4):

Able to use the language fluently and accurately on all levels normally pertinent to professional needs. Can understand and participate in any conversation within the range of his experience with a high degree of fluency and precision of vocabulary; would rarely be
taken for a native user but can respond appropriately even in unfamiliar situations; errors of pronunciation and grammar quite rare; can handle informal interpreting from and into the language.

Native Bilingual Proficiency (S-5):

Proficiency equivalent to that of an educated native user. Has complete fluency in the language such that his use on all levels of formality is fully accepted by educated native users in all of its features, including breadth of vocabulary and idiom, colloquialisms, information, and pertinent cultural references.

(Source: Wilds, 1975)
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Sign Communication Proficiency Interview Rating Scale
Sign Communication Proficiency Interview

(SCPI Rating Scale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratings</th>
<th>Functional Descriptors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superior +</td>
<td>Able to use all aspects of signing fluently and accurately to discuss in depth a variety of topics, including social work, current events, religion, etc. Has complete fluency such that signing on all levels is fully accepted by highly skilled native signers, including breadth of vocabulary and idioms, grammar, colloquialisms, accent/production, and cultural references.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>Able to use sign vocabulary and grammar fluently and accurately on all levels pertinent to social and work needs. Comprehension (sign reception) is excellent and can respond appropriately even in unfamiliar situations. Able to negotiate, persuade, counsel, and tailor language to audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced +</td>
<td>Able sometimes to use grammar, vocabulary, and cultural knowledge in ways consistent with superior/superior plus signers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Able to sign with sufficient grammatical accuracy and vocabulary to participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on social and work topics. Comprehension is good, vocabulary is broad, grammar is good, and errors seldom interfere with understanding and rarely disturb native signers. Able to handle unfamiliar topics, hypothesize, and provide supported opinion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate +</td>
<td>Able to satisfy with confidence most social demands and work situations. Good control of general everyday sign vocabulary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>Able to satisfy with some confidence routine social demands and limited work requirements. Demonstrates use of some sign grammatical features in connected discourse. Able to narrate and describe topics related to background, family, interests/hobbies, work, travel, and current events, although groping for some everyday sign vocabulary still evident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival +</td>
<td>Able to satisfy most survival needs in social and work situations. Can use most question forms and shows beginning of other sign grammatical features.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival</td>
<td>Able to engage in simple conversations within a limited range of topics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Able to satisfy basic survival needs in social work or work situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can ask and answer basic questions and has some skills in creating sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>utterances based on learned sign vocabulary. Can get into, through, and out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of simple survival situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novice +</td>
<td>Able to use connected sign utterances for learned/memorized sign phrases,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with most or all utterances related to everyday social questions/topic areas,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>such as names of family members, basic objects, colors, numbers, names of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>weekdays, and time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novice</td>
<td>Basically limited to single sign utterances with vocabulary primarily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>related to everyday social, question/topic areas such as names of family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>members, basic objects, colors, numbers, names of weekdays, and time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No functional skills in signing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Newell, 1983, p. 322)
APPENDIX F

Sign Communication Proficiency Interview's

Definition of Performance Factor Scores
DEFINITION OF PERFORMANCE FACTOR SCORES

Give the examinee a score on each of the performance factors below using the definitions. Enter the score for each factor on the examinee's checklist by circling the appropriate score. Circle as well the weighted score for each factor on the computational schedule. Find the raw score by summing all five weighted scores on the performance factors. Next use the Language Proficiency Table to find the proficiency rating that corresponds to the examinee's raw score. Then enter the examinee's proficiency rating on his individual check sheet.

If you find that an examinee's performance on a factor (e.g., fluency) falls between two definitions, split the score accordingly.

CAUTION! ! ! ! The definitions given below DO NOT correspond to the proficiency levels with the same number. For example, a score of "2" on fluency does not correspond to proficiency rating requirements of level 2.

Physical production

0 Production frequently unintelligible.
1 Frequent gross errors and very heavy accent make understanding difficult, require frequent repetition.
2 "Foreign accent" requires concentrated listening and mispronunciations lead to occasional misunderstanding and apparent errors in grammar or vocabulary.
3 Marked "foreign accent" and occasional mispronunciations which do not interfere with understanding.
4 No conspicuous mispronunciations, but would not be taken for a native speaker.
5 Native pronunciation, with no trace of "foreign accent."

Grammar

0 Grammar almost entirely inadequate or absent.
1 Constant errors showing control of very few major patterns and frequently preventing communication of precise message.
2 Frequent errors showing some major patterns uncontrolled and causing occasional irritation and misunderstanding.
3 Occasional errors showing imperfect control of some patterns but no weakness that causes misunderstanding.
4 Few errors, with no patterns of failure.
5 No more than two errors during the interview.
Sign Vocabulary

0  Vocabulary inadequate for simple conversations.
1  Vocabulary limited to basic personal and survival areas 
   (schedules, food, transportation, family, location of facilities)
2  Choice of words sometimes inaccurate, limitations of vocabulary 
   prevent discussion of some common professional and social topics.
3  Professional vocabulary adequate to discuss special interests; 
   general vocabulary permits discussion of any non-technical 
   subject with some circumlocutions.
4  Professional vocabulary broad and precise; general vocabulary 
   adequate to cope with complex practical problems and varied 
   social situations.
5  Vocabulary apparently as accurate and extensive as that of an 
   educated native speaker.

Fluency

0  Language is so halting and fragmentary that conversation is 
   virtually impossible.
1  Language is very slow and uneven except for short or routine 
   sentences.
2  Language is frequently hesitant and jerky; sentences may be 
   left uncompleted.
3  Language is occasionally hesitant, with some unevenness caused 
   by rephrasing and groping for words.
4  Language is effortless and smooth, but perceptibly non-native 
   in speed and evenness.
5  Language on all professional and general topics as effortless 
   and smooth as a native speaker's.

Comprehension

0  Understands too little for simple conversations.
1  Understands only slow, very simple delivery on common social 
   and routine topics; requires constant repetition and rephrasing.
2  Understands careful, somewhat simplified language directed to 
   him, with considerable repetition and rephrasing.
3  Understands quite well normal educated language directed to 
   him, but requires occasional repetition or rephrasing.
4  Understands everything in normal educated conversation except 
   for very colloquial or low-frequency items, or exceptionally 
   rapid or slurred language.
5  Understands everything in both formal and colloquial language, 
   to be expected of an educated native.
APPENDIX G

Rating Sheets for Sign Communication Proficiency Interviews
### Checklist of Performance Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Score (see definition)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Production</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of individual letters in fingerspelling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of all letters in fingerspelled words</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency and rate of fingerspelling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand movement and position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separation of fingerspelled words</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign formation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand position in relation to body</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lip readability)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Vocabulary</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent and accuracy of sign concepts used</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall evenness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Name of judge ___________________ (Name of examinee) ___________________ (Date of test)
**SCHEDULE FOR COMPUTING PROFICIENCY RATING**

**USING PERFORMANCE FACTORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accent</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehension</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Procedure: Place in Column (A) the credits to be given for each scale on the Check List. For example, a check mark in position 3 on the "Accent" scale is given a credit of 2. Add the credits to find the total score. The final S-rating is to be equated with the total score by the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-25</td>
<td>S-0+</td>
<td>43-52</td>
<td>S-2</td>
<td>73-82</td>
<td>S-3+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-32</td>
<td>S-1</td>
<td>53-62</td>
<td>S-2+</td>
<td>83-92</td>
<td>S-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33-42</td>
<td>S-1+</td>
<td>63-72</td>
<td>S-3</td>
<td>93-99</td>
<td>S-4+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SCP I Raw Data on: ____________________________________________

(Name)

__________________________________________

(Department)

OVERALL RATING: _________

PERFORMANCE FACTOR SCORES USED IN COMPUTING OVERALL RATING:

1. Physical Production/Accent: ______
2. Grammar: ______
3. Sign Vocabulary: ______
4. Fluency: ______
5. Comprehension: ______

PROFICIENCY RATING RAW SCORE: ______

Interviewer/Rater: _______________________

January, 1986
APPENDIX H

Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire
ILLINOIS COURSE EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Name: ____________________________

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The instructor seemed to consider teaching as a chore or routine activity.

More outside reading is necessary.

Course material was poorly organized.

Course was not very helpful.

It was quite interesting.

I think that the course was taught quite well.

I would prefer a different method of instruction.

The pace of the course was too slow.

At times I was confused.

Excellent course content.

The examinations were too difficult.

Generally, the course was well organized.

Ideas and concepts were developed too rapidly.

The content of the course was too elementary.

Some days I was not very interested in this course.

It was quite boring.

The instructor exhibited professional dignity and bearing in the classroom.

Another method of instruction should have been employed.

The course was quite useful.

I would take another course that was taught this way.
APPENDIX I

Documents Sent To and Received From the Subjects
MEMORANDUM

TO:

RE: Your participation in my doctoral research dissertation

FROM: Mike Kemp, Assistant Professor - Dept. of Sign Communication

Please permit me to express my sincere thanks to you for being willing to take the time to help me with my doctoral dissertation. You can be sure that whatever the outcome of this research may be, it certainly will guide Gallaudet College in the right direction in determining what should be done about our system of assessing our faculty members' Simultaneous Communication skills.

You have agreed to take the two Sign Communication Proficiency Interviews in Room LE 33 at the Merrill Learning Center on the following dates and times:

First Interview:

Second Interview:

It is very important that these interviews be done prior to your taking the current Simultaneous Communication Evaluation which will take place during the weeks of October 14 and 21. If, for any reason, you are not able to take the interviews, please contact me at this number 5630 or 5633.

In reference to the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation, please be sure to go to the Faculty Orientation Program at the Merrill Learning Center during the week of September 30 to sign up for the Expressive and the Receptive portions of the evaluation. I will be checking on the sign-up sheet to make sure that all of my research participants are scheduled to take the two portions.

Please fill out the enclosed forms and immediately return them to me. The forms will enable me to obtain the scores from both the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation and the Sign Communication Proficiency Interviews. It is important that you check the box indicating whether your Simultaneous Evaluation scores should be put in your files. In reference to the ten minute video-taping of you in your classroom, please be sure to state when the best time is to have this done. The video-taping part will take place during the last week of November and the first week of December. All the scores will be kept confidential.
MEMORANDUM

TO: 

RE: Your participation in my doctoral research dissertation

FROM: Mike Kemp, Assistant Professor - Dept. of Sign Communication

Please permit me to express my sincere thanks to you for being willing to take the time to help me with my doctoral dissertation. You can be sure that whatever the outcome of this research may be, it certainly will guide Gallaudet College in the right direction in determining what should be done about our system of assessing our faculty members' Simultaneous Communication skills.

You have agreed to take the two Sign Communication Proficiency Interviews in Room LE 33 at the Merrill Learning Center on the following dates and times:

First Interview:

Second Interview:

It is very important that you take the Expressive and Receptive portions of the current Simultaneous Communication Evaluation during the weeks of October 14 and 21 prior to your taking the Sign Communication Proficiency Interviews. If, for any reason, you are not able to take the interviews, please contact me at this number 5630 or 5633.

In reference to the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation, please be sure to go to the Faculty Orientation Program at the Merrill Learning Center during the week of September 30 to sign up for the Expressive and the Receptive portions of the evaluation. I will be checking on the sign-up sheet to make sure that all of my research participants are scheduled to take the two portions.

Please fill out the enclosed forms and immediately return them to me. The forms will enable me to obtain the scores from both the Simultaneous Communication Evaluation and the Sign Communication Proficiency Interviews. It is important that you check the box indicating whether your Simultaneous Evaluation scores should be put in your files. In reference to the ten minute video-taping of you in your classroom, please be sure to state when the best time is to have this done. The video-taping part will take place during the last week of November and the first week of December. All the scores will be kept confidential.
This gives permission to release the scores of my Fall Semester, 1985 Simultaneous Communication Evaluation (Expressive and Receptive) and the Sign Communication Proficiency Interviews to Mike Kemp for the purpose of conducting his research. It is further understood that the scores will be kept confidential.

I [ ] do, [ ] do not wish the Simultaneous Communication scores to be placed in my personnel file.

Signed: ____________________________ Date: ____________________________
November 8, 1985

MEMORANDUM

TO:

RE: Your videotape schedule and demographic questionnaire

FROM: Mike Kemp, Assistant Professor - Sign Communication

This is to let you know that I or someone will be visiting your class to videotape you in action. The date and the time for this to occur will be on ___ at ___ in ___. If you have problems with the day and the time, please let me know immediately. In the event I do not hear from you, I will then assume that all is well.

The purpose of videotaping you in action is so that I can have two persons observe you and use the Illinois Course Evaluation Questionnaire (ICEQ). Once I get the dichotomous scores from these two persons, I will then see which of the methods of assessing the Simcom skills, the current Simultaneous Communication Evaluation system or the proposed Sign Communication Proficiency Interview, has higher relationship with what is actually observed in the classroom.

It would be greatly appreciated if you could fill out the questionnaire that is enclosed. I need to have some demographic information on my research participants. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated. You can be sure that I will let you know the results of this research project.
VIDEO-TAPING SCHEDULE

Please indicate which days and times are acceptable for someone to come to your classroom and video-tape a ten minute segment of your class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday, Nov. 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, Nov. 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, Nov. 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, Nov. 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, Nov. 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, Dec. 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, Dec. 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, Dec. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, Dec. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, Dec. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signed: __________________

You will be reminded about this when the time is appropriate.
Please fill out this questionnaire and return to Mike Kemp immediately. Information will be kept confidential. Thank you!

Name: ____________________________________________________________

Department you teach: ____________________________________________

How many years have you been working at Gallaudet College? _________

How long have you been signing? __________

Highest Degree held: __________ What field? ______________

Your age: _________ (I need to calculate the mean age of my research participants)

Which method of evaluation do you prefer? (Check one)

________ The current Simcom Evaluation.

________ The proposed Sign Communication Proficiency Interview.

________ Neither.

Thank you!
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