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This paper is basically a review of personality studies done in the past on deaf persons. If the Rorschach Psychodiagnostic has been unnecessarily stressed here, this is due to the fact it has been the most popular instrument employed in this area. Current opinion among professionals in the behavioral sciences is admittedly divided regarding the efficiency of projective tests in general. The arguments employed to substantiate the pros and cons of this controversy are familiar to those who work in the area of psychology and need not be restated. What is important for our purposes here is to determine the effects of such research on the deaf, examine the validity of conclusions drawn, expose possible areas of error, and finally, to offer constructive suggestions aimed at improving such research. This is patently the moral obligation of every professional who takes a serious sense of pride in his work. It is applicable to an even greater degree to those who specialize in working with population minorities.

The study of deaf personality dynamics is not new. Research has been carried on since the turn of the century. Yet, because relatively few workers have occupied themselves in this area, the field is largely, to this day, undeveloped. In a way, this is true of psychology in general where the deaf are concerned. The deaf present certain problems not usually met when dealing with the normally hearing. Thus, the tests used in measuring or assessing the latter are not ordinarily suitable for use on the deaf. Examiners, hence, find it needful to be extra cautious in interpreting the results gained. This is nowhere more true than in the area of personality assessment.

That there is a very vital need for expanded research and improvement in professional tools and techniques is self evident. The requirements of modern industrial processes on
one hand, and the increasingly “tight” labor market in skilled categories have combined to place the current social position of the deaf in jeopardy. It has been reported by Garrett, for example, that in the coming decade almost a third of the nation’s work force will be employed in activities which have not existed prior to the present time (1963). To meet the needs of this massive industrial upheaval, it is clear that if the deaf are to partake in the benefits of the future, new techniques will necessarily have to be developed in such fields as education, social orientation, industrial testing, counseling, and placement. Further, it will also be necessary to program these efforts in such a way as to anticipate the needs of employing firms as well as recognize those of auditorily disabled clients.

The current efforts of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to stimulate such research reminds us the government is fully aware of the problem. Paralleling this activity, today one sees leaders of the deaf emerging who, until recently, were content to toil in the slack waters of their somewhat insulated society, never attempting to develop and utilize their native potential and acquired abilities for purposes other than social activities of miniscule importance. Concurrent with this renaissance, the vast masses of “average” deaf have also begun to stir. No longer content with their lot, having been exposed to the light of hope being offered by various agencies serving them today, they have begun to demand more and more from their representatives. Manual labor, once practically their only hope of subsistence, is now treated as passe; a state the sooner erased, the better. For some of these people the future now holds a bright promise: work in the cybernetic fields, new positions in a greatly expanded and sophisticated graphic arts industry, increased opportunity to qualify, through adequate training, for skilled jobs in industries where their former roles were limited to the lowest employment levels.

This seemingly tangential introduction is a necessary prelude to the article’s main thesis. It is the author’s opinion that a problem cannot be seen in its proper perspective without first contemplating its specific role against the surrounding background. Unless deaf persons are perceived as individuals and thereby given the chance to be accepted as social equals, they will never achieve the full fruits of their labor. No amount of technical proficiency and financial remuneration will remedy the gnawing frustration and sense of deprivation, the feelings of inadequacy and the thought and fear of living in isolation that lurk beneath the facade of “the deaf personality”. If the deaf are to be fully habilitated and provided the chance to assume their rightful position in
society, this factor becomes of paramount importance. It is depressing at times to reflect that in this supposedly enlightened age it is still almost the universal opinion of rank-and-file citizens that a deaf person, by definition, is not precisely identical to those who retain normal hearing and therefore, logically, he must be different. When such a concept penetrates and dominates the thinking of even the so-called upper intellectual strata, it reaches the proportions of a national tragedy from the viewpoint of the deaf themselves, as with other minorities afflicted with the same problem of negative identification.

It is irrelevant to mull over how this situation came about. The prime questions which should engage those in the area of deafness is the problem of correcting the misconceptions fostered by irreversible auditory impairment. Ideally, regenerative techniques or surgical replacement of physical attributes would solve most of our problems. Since it is highly impractical to speculate when this happy day will arrive, it is far more realistic if we turn to the behavioral sciences for an interim solution. The task then is a double one: psychological research and data collection initially, and then through the dissemination of relevant information, the reformation of the general public's attitudes. Assuredly this will be a difficult task, as all unlearning is, and time consuming as well, but the rewards are well worth the effort expended.

Psychological Research on Emotional Aspects of the Deaf

What can be said about the current climate among professionals in the behavioral sciences with respect to the staff? More precisely, how do such people usually tend to evaluate the deaf mentality in terms of adjustment to an environment which was neither created by these persons nor for them? Can the loss of a vital organ necessary for proper sequential development (at least in some directions) operate to influence the professional toward the idea that such loss invariably produces patterns of emotional nuances which are radically different from those of the hearing? Or is the deaf person accepted in the same light as, say, a paraplegic, a diabetic, or some other disabled individual, deprived of the use of one or more internal or external functions, but in no way hampered in the use of his native intelligence, and thus, for all practical purposes, a functioning, living, breathing human being . . . capable of the same emotions as others . . . and capable of reacting to these emotions, within the limits of his individual ability, with equal facility?

Psychological research indicates, as is so often the case in our discipline, that over the years professional opinions concerning the effects of auditory failure on the adjustment pattern of the deaf have polarized to some extent. In one divi-
sion of this dichotomy of opinion there are those who maintain the loss of hearing, whether fully or partially, leads to an increasing number of atypical behavioral symptoms which suggest at least a graduated degree of emotional maladjustment probably is present. At some variance with this form of ontological metaphysics, there are those who maintain that the functional loss of any part of the physique, be it motor, sensori-neural, or some other variety, need not necessarily be pinpointed as a probable etiological source of observed abnormalities.

Supporting the first viewpoint, a study in English (1924) reported in its sample a small, but statistically significant, correlation between the onset of deafness and the incidence of paranoid responses. Myklebust (1960), in commenting on his research entailing the use of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, has observed that responses of the deaf suggest involvement among the deaf may imply psychotic reactions. Springer (1938), and also Springer and Roslow (1938), in comparing the deaf and hearing, felt abnormally neurotic tendencies occurred more frequently among the deaf, and that these people were prone, as a rule, to a deeper degree of repressive and regressive behavior. Altshuler (1962) has reported, on the basis of his psychiatric studies, that the deaf exhibit symptoms of arrested or regressed developmental maturity, typified by a lack of social affectivity, egocentric behavior, a paucity of rational introspection, and often accompanied by excessive feelings of dependency. Solomon (1943) agrees with Altshuler on at least two points: he found that the deaf characteristically were somewhat delayed in developmental maturity and that they were inclined to be submissive and dependent. In addition, insecurity, apathy, and anxiety, were also observed in his sample, as well as a heightened attitude of suspicion. Pinter, Fusfeld, and Brunswig (1937) agree in essence with these investigations in stating that the deaf are slightly more neurotic, more given to introversive patterns of behavior and somewhat less dominant than the hearing. Knapp, studying the emotional aspects of auditory loss where war-deafened service men were concerned, has also observed the presence of withdrawal and isolating tendencies. (1968)

In contrast to these opinions, Best (1943) has described the deaf as an exceptionally optimistic and cheerful group. Practically all the material acquisitions of our society are in their possession, and they do not, according to him, lack for normal cultural interests. The suspicion reported in other studies is refuted by Knapp (1968) and Zeckel, (1953) who differentiate carefully between psychopathological and healthy reactive state. These authorities feel the label of abnormal
distrust is not justified in the case of the deaf, as they frequently have good reason to be aware of derogatory behavior on the part of others. Zeckel further observes that the neuroses seen in the deaf have their identical counterparts in the hearing. Preferring to hold to developmental psychological theory, he insisted the onset of auditory failure, similar to other traumatic events, serves only to precipitate the employment of whatever behavioral defenses exist.

Myklebust, in further evaluating his Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory studies of the deaf, has commented on the fact, that while some resultant scores were markedly deviant from hearing norms, the deaf as a group also were characterized by extroverted social feelings, i.e. they tended to be gregarious in their behavior. Such activity, as a rule, does not mark the psychotic personality. Myklebust therefore concluded the effects of deafness on the individual’s emotional state is not comparable to the usual psychopathological categories and that the deaf differ from the hearing in defining what is normal.

Summarizing here, of the previous studies cited, which utilized widely divergent samples of the deaf population, three found the deaf to be reality oriented, four termed them passive in attitude, and two found them to possess hostile feelings. Rigidity of thought patterns was observed in seven studies, impulsiveness in three; egocentric behavior was cited as typical of the deaf in five, as was a related concept, insensitivity. At least one study suggested the deaf neurotic symptoms, another reversed this, maintaining abnormalities tended toward psychotic indices. Three found the deaf to be confused or unorganized and several termed the deaf as restricted in concept formation ability. In view of the heterogeneity of the samples which were under construction and the potpourri of research methodology which was employed in evaluation, little can be realistically inferred here, beyond the fact that the majority of these studies concluded that the deaf, as a group, exhibit excessive rigidity.

Few of the investigators cited have cared to make statements implying unqualified acceptance and endorsement of the results gained in their studies. Perhaps, one suspects, their confidence has been shaken somewhat by these findings. But how does one account for such divergent phenomenon which on the one hand indicate emotional adjustment seriously deviates from accepted norms, while on the other hand social adjustment, when measured in material and cultural acquisitions, appears to be normal? The evidence would seem to indicate that the problem of psychodiagnostic evaluation has not been approached properly and the resulting conclusions
are, at best, mere speculations arrived at through the questionable use of subjective reasoning based on a reference matrix which is obviously inadequate for such purposes.

Man is said to be a creature of habit. As behavior is formed through the interaction of the organism with its environment, altering the environment consequently should lead us to expect the occurrence of different behavioral indices. Should such behavior, being the product of the given environment, be adjudged abnormal? Such reasoning would brand its exponents with the very iron which is sometimes used to describe the deaf, namely, the unflattering subriquet of constricted personality. Gestalt psychology as expounded by Werthheimer (1912), Koffka (1935), Kohler (1929), and Lewin (1935), among others, has constantly stressed the importance of the perceptual field's influence in assessing the behavior of the individual. It is saddening to see these lessons, basic to psychology, all but ignored by many who seek to evaluate the deaf personality.

Rorschach Studies

Personality assessors may be of the structured or unstructured type. The primary difference between these tests lies in the nature of their construction. Unstructured tests employ stimuli which hopefully will reflect facets of the personality which are ordinarily concealed in the unconscious. Interpretation of such tests is largely subjective; the experience and skill of the clinician plays a large part in the assessment of personality dynamics here. Structured tests represent an attempt to replace this reasoning and analytic procedure through the use of empirically determined probabilities. Statistical procedures similar to those employed in the construction of achievement and aptitude tests, using factorial analysis techniques constitute the usual approach.

While otherwise well planned and executed, these tests have several drawbacks which are inherent in all statistical studies. Poor correlation with predictive validity indices presents one problem. Reliability, insofar as item response is concerned, is another. With respect to the deaf as a subculture (and this applies to other minorities as well) no satisfactory solution has yet come to light, and so, structured tests, as in the case of projectives (but for different reasons), are probably not too reliable as tools in understanding the dynamics of the thought processes of the deaf. Essentially, these statements are made with one overriding consideration in mind: the low level of language achievement which continues to stultify the communicational ability of this group.

The chief value of unstructured personality tests in gene-
ral, and of the Rorschach in particular, lies in the flexibility with which they can be employed. Language is not an insurmountable barrier to a test such as the Rorschach; it can be given in English, German, Urdu, or the language of signs used by deaf persons. The only really important criterion, aside from the examiner's professional proficiency, is the determination of whether the language employed is the one the client and examiner can adequately use in discussing the complete percept seen. This is a most important consideration where the deaf are concerned. Vernon (1967), commenting on a number of educational level studies concerned with English language proficiency, reported that average language achievement in young American deaf adults was at about the mid-elementary school level. He further suggested that, because of outmoded educational methods, language development does not parallel that of the identically aged hearing, although intelligence is distributed similarly in both groups. These observations were substantiated, at least in part, by a broad survey conducted by Wrightstone, et al (1963), which reported that after the age of 10 years, reading level among deaf students rose in the ensuing six years by less than a single grade level.

This observed underachievement in language skills among the deaf may well influence the results of personality tests in two ways, assuming there are no other complicating factors present. A limited vocabulary may contribute to the excessive use of simple, concrete percepts, such as one often sees in the protocols of children. And again, since a certain amount of linguistic skills are necessary for educational achievement in this age of the printed book, it can safely be assumed that an otherwise intelligent person will simply lack the educational background to adequately express his full intellectual potential. From this, one may conclude with some reason that while personality cannot be judged strictly in terms of language facility, most certainly some linguistic ability (which reflects the intellect) is necessary before either subjective or objective evaluation of personality can be realistically attempted.

It is the author's firm conviction that in the absence of suitable communicational modalities, personality tests such as the Rorschach are largely wasted, their value dissipated, their results invalid and unreliable. The following Rorschach studies on the deaf may lend some credence to this view. In the main, the data compiled here was collected through a variety of methods which were based on linguistic skills typical of those of the hearing. The use of speechreading constituted one such method; written exchanges comprised another. Some use was made of fingerspelling. All three systems are adap-
tations of the English language. Another method, that of the language of signs, which is the major mode of conceptual expression used by the deaf today, was rarely used, and then only through the medium of a third person, who served as an interpreter. An interpreter was necessary because the majority of the examiners, while skilled in projective techniques, were functionally illiterate in the use of sign language.

Baroff (1955), then, in comparing three different samples of deaf (normal, neurotics, and schizophrenics) came to the interesting conclusion that the deaf, as a group, deviate from the hearing, insofar as cognitive patterns are considered. According to him, cognitive functions in the deaf tend toward weakness in the area of abstract ideation. Emotionally, the deaf display personality nuances which are on reflection, strikingly similar to those found in children: lack of anxiety, lack of introspection, lack of impulse control, and little emotional responsiveness.

McAndrew (1948), in studying rigidity and isolation patterns among deaf and hearing children, reported findings which are essentially similar to those of Baroff. Levine (1948) also reported some deviant findings, but tempered her conclusions somewhat by suggesting they reflected normal adjustment procedures. Further, she was of the opinion that signs typical of neurotics and psychotics, such as excessive anxiety, depressive behavior, tension, etc., were not present, thus taking issue with reports of other workers.

Altable (1947), employed an interpreter in his projective study of a group of Mexican deaf children. Judging on the basis of a high percentage of rejections in his protocols, poor perception of form, an abnormally high percentage of anatomical and sexual responses, he concluded neurotic symptoms were present and suggested there was an apparent correlation between these symptoms and aural dysfunction. Zucker (1947) attempted to hold to the original Rorschach methodology, altering it only in the form of presenting printed instruction instead of using oral directives. She also found stereotyped thought processes, lack of organization, and such emotional factors as passivity, hostility, anxiety, and depression. It should be noted, however, that Zucker's sample was drawn from a clinical population, and as such, is of doubtful value in assessing the personality indices of the general community of the deaf.

The most ambitious study in recent years, using the Rorschach, was conducted by Neyhus (1962). Employing a sample of 80 deaf, of varying ages and occupations, this examiner attempted to minimize the effects of poor intercommunication by employing a multi-model communicative approach. He used, consequently, a flexible system which entailed...
speechreading, fingerspelling, and manual signs, together with written exchanges. No interpreter was employed. His findings suggested the personality of the deaf is identical to that of the hearing, although experience is restricted, some confusion in thought processes exists, rigidity is somewhat marked, and the deaf appear to be incapable of successfully integrating environmental experiences realistically. He tempered these observations also by stating that language facility appeared to be at least one determining factor in certain areas related to personality function.

Goetzinger and his associates (1966), concerned with the effects of language retardation in the presence of normal intelligence, attempted to employ the Structural Objective Rorschach Test (SORT) in assessing the personality dynamics of some school age deaf youth. The SORT contains the standard set of Rorschach plates. It differs from the Psychodiagnostic in that the subject is expected to select a response from three alternative choices. Ten such trial items are furnished with each Rorschach plate, assuring at least 100 responses under optimal conditions. Using this test on a group of deaf students attending a mid-western residential school, and comparing them with a chronologically and ostensibly educationally similar group of hearing, it was found that more aggressivity and consistency in behavior characterized the deaf. On the other hand, the hearing were more anxious, more inclined to conform, and more cooperative.

Conclusions

In reflecting on what has been said before on the subject of linguistic ability in relation to psychodiagnostics with deaf clients, the evidence would seem to suggest the results attained to date in research may not be presenting a valid picture of this sub-culture's personality structure. Possibly part of the onus of these findings can be laid at the door of the tests themselves. As was indicated, projective tests have never been fully validated and objectively tested for reliability. What statistical procedures have been used in an effort to provide something more solid than an examiner’s sometimes nebulous clinical judgements are still but records of subjective interpretations, and hence, only slightly more useful. Even Beck (1944), one of the foremost advocates of the Rorschach, in discussing its merits, has pointed out the chief value of this test lies in its worth as a supplement in helping the clinical worker form an overall assessment of this client. Furthermore, the experiences of Masling (1960), Sarason (1954), and Schafer (1954), suggest there is valid evidence indicating the presence of a differential effect of social in-
structions between examiner and subject. According to them, the degree of this social interaction may influence greatly the nature, quality, and quantity of the responses elicited.

Useful results with projectives probably can be obtained if the inherent limitations of these tests are fully recognized, and if they are administered by competent examiners. In terms of research on the deaf, the crucial issue is what constitutes a good tester? Some maintain only the deaf understand the deaf and therefore only deaf examiners should be used to present such tests. This "catch a thief" tenet is probably as extreme as is the conception that the deaf are too helpless to make their own way in the world with less than maximal aid. The competent tester should possess at least two attributes primarily. He should be (1) well versed in all communicational techniques utilized by the deaf persons he tests. By this, it is also implied that the limitation of each of these techniques should be recognized and accounted for. As an example, some of the research using the Rorschach which depending on speechreading ignored the fact that the best of lipreaders understand but 26% of what is said. Obviously, failing to acknowledge this belies the illusion of competent testing. (2) The tester should be able to identify closely with the testee, i.e., exhibit some degree of empathy.

The various means of expression utilized by the deaf, together with the scope of differences seen in them, due to either geographical isolation or linguistic instructional preferences, make the task of mastering them staggering. The fact that all these expressional methods are living languages, subject to constant change, further complicates the picture. The author has never seen a deaf person who possessed a complete mastery over any single facet of this communicational system, let alone a comprehensive grasp of them all. Everything considered, the picture would seem dark to the average hearing person who aspires to work among the deaf. Is this so? The answer is: probably not.

Mastery of the verbal language patterns of the deaf and the language of signs, while valuable, does not constitute the whole answer to the problem of accurate personality evaluation. A certain degree of empathy and identification with the deaf sub-culture is also a desirable and necessary skill for competence in psychodiagnostics. A recent German language text book illustrates this concept admirably. The student is cautioned that the proper method of acquiring a facile command of this language does not lie in the realm of memory; he is urged to "think German", to submerge himself completely into the Teutonic mold. This is exactly what the professional interested in working with the deaf should strive to attain.

Aside from ordinary manual, oral, and written communi-
cations, the deaf have certain mannerisms which are peculiar to them. For the most part, these mannerisms consist of facial reactions and physical movements which accompany conversations involving the language of signs. These "body language" symbols convey major components of the interactions of the deaf. They have no objectively recorded documentation, and are usually omitted or given cursory mention at best in texts devoted to the manual language because they are so little understood by the non-deaf who are generally the authors of these texts. Nonetheless, they are an important factor where ideational exchange is considered. The manual language, as practiced today, probably contains no more than 6,000 word-signs in its lexicon, many of which are not universally used. In contrast to this, the English language possesses 600,000 separate definitions. If the deaf were limited to such a paucity of vocabulary expressions, their lives might indeed be sterile and barren, lacking in creativity and eloquence. Fortunately this is not the case. The employment of these supplementary movements lends "flavor" to manual expression. Through their utilization those subtle nuances of thought that delight the heart of the aesthete are transmitted. It is disappointing therefore, to observe that although similar behavior by the Latin peoples is really perceived and accepted, where the deaf are concerned, the underlying purpose of such activity goes almost unnoticed or may be perceived as eccentric.

In sum, it would seem that a great deal of previous psychological investigation into the personality patterns of the deaf is open to question. Although ninety percent of this subculture are facile with the use of the manual language technique, while only a few are adept at other forms of communication, practically none of the investigators cited professed any degree of experience in this means of cultural interchange. This raises a serious question of how well the samples concerned were actually examined. A cardinal criterion of successful Rorschach administration insists that full communication must exist between the principals involved. A certain amount of success is admittedly feasible using methods involving alterations of test procedures; but the results cannot be accepted as bonafide indices and are, in fact, likely to yield distortions. The inability of so many researchers to agree on their findings leads to the suspicion such an acceptance would not find many sponsors.

It is not the purpose of this article to dismiss previous work. A certain amount of trial and error occurs in practically every aspect of human activity, particularly when the activity entails the use of familiar tools in unfamiliar situations. In reviewing the studies done to date and searching for en-
lightment, two cardinal points of attack on existing psychological evaluation and research practices appear:

1. Sample identification

Geographically, the deaf are scattered the length and breadth of the United States. While the operation of their natural gregarious tendencies and economic needs encourages the deaf to concentrate in thickly settled urban areas, large numbers never make the move and remain for the rest of their lives in thinly populated areas. Each of these environments call for specific adjustment patterns to be developed. Nor can this dichotomy hope to end here. Urban deaf persons, as an example, vary from region to region, from city to city. This may be due to local identification; it may be due to economic and vocational factors. Educational practices may play a role. It is important to note that not only these differences exist but that they play a definite role in making valid assessment difficult, and that generalizing from samples based on a local population can be very misleading.

2. Utilization of technique

The factors governing test assignment methodology generally revolve on the capacity and ability of the testee to communicate and his general intelligence level. Thus, a projective test founded upon the principle of oral communication would be useless where speechreading was sub-marginal, and of doubtful value even in the majority of cases where some ability is present. Illustrative of this, Mindel (1968) has observed that approximately half the phonemes in daily use are perceptually similar, and therefore difficult, if not impossible, for the deaf to distinguish accurately without some accompanying degree of aural ability. Similarly, the use of written language must be carefully evaluated prior to its employment. Even at Gallaudet College, language skill deficiency among students has admittedly been a recurring problem over the years. Rosen (1967), in studying the applicability of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory to deaf students attending Gallaudet College, states that the use of this test on the deaf may give rise to misleading conclusions. He cited language retardation as a prime reason for this opinion. The MMPI, while not extremely difficult when considered from its readability index, oriented as it is to a population of fairly low linguistic attainment, is nevertheless thoroughly permeated with idiomatic expressions. According to Rosen, it is precisely here where the deaf encounter linguistic difficulties. Lacking the social interchange so necessary to become ac-
quainted with the existence of the idiom, the deaf tend to introduce an abnormal profile which is often at complete variance with their ongoing test composure and general social and emotional behavior.

Due to the large diversity seen among the deaf, whether one speaks of educational factors, levels of auditory failure, communicational preferences, etc., it is debatable therefore whether the giving of a single test by a single method to such a heterogeneous group will reflect accurate sampling. Neyhus (1962), in testing a group of 80 deaf, observed that only 55 per cent of his sample considered themselves of average or better ability in using oral speech, 56 per cent, using the same self-rating system, considered themselves proficient in speechreading, and fully 91 per cent maintained they could carry on meaningful conversations in the manual sign language. Admittedly, this is a weak method of assessment, but in the absence of suitable measurement tools, it is better than none at all. Superficially it would seem the manual sign language would enjoy the most success in terms of general application. Closer inspection of this term reveals it was not precisely defined. Manual movements may consist of either fingerspelling, the language of signs, or a combination of these. The average hearing person relies on fingerspelling, i.e., an exact translation of English. The typical deaf person prefers the language of signs, using fingerspelling for emphasis, or to express an idea or identification for which there is no corresponding gesture. Seen in this context, and considering the relative underachievement in linguistic skills among the deaf, reliance on fingerspelling in the administration and scoring of tests is of dubious value.

In conclusion then, before personality studies of the deaf can achieve any modicum of success, the examining psychologist must attempt to prepare himself thoroughly beforehand. Mere professional competency alone in any field of behavioral study will not guarantee success in applying technological precepts if there is no parallel knowledge of necessary language skills and cultural patterns of deaf persons. The thinking processes of the deaf are possibly similar to those of the hearing, but the manner in which this thinking is expressed will vary with the educational and social backgrounds of the various deaf. Future investigators therefore, when planning their research, may do well to take as many of the complexities of this subcultural minority into consideration as possible.
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