1970

Bowe, Frank - Articles on Black Deaf

Gallaudet University Archives

s performed by the qualified craftsman or technician. Traditionally, deaf workers have not been employed as qualified craftsmen or technicians in equal proportion to the hearing working orce. A major reason for this inequitable position has been the nability of the deaf worker to competently perform Part 1, or the "make ready." This condition accounts for the "instant job plateau" as described by Boyce Williams, and the truncation or ompression of the deaf workers' earning power.

To transpose this concept into an actual job, analyze a simple eg board task. The peg board task is to determine the most efficient manner for inserting 30 pegs, squared on one end, and ounded on the opposite end, into a board. One surface of the board s flat, while the other side has indented holes. The holes are laid out n rows of five vertically and rows of six horizontally. This particular job is a repetitive job that requires efficiency and speed to btain a profit.

Simple? Yes, if the worker is properly trained in job analysis. ot quite so simple if the job is approached in a haphazard manner. here are five steps to be performed in job analysis, or "make eady." They are:

1. Place the board on a table with the indented side facing up.
2. Place the board so the rows of six holes face the worker.
3. Divide the pegs into two groups of fifteen.
4. Place the pegs in rows of 15 with the rounded edges facing the board.
5. Be sure the work is laid out on a high friction table to eliminate sliding or rolling of the pegs.

The job is now ready. Part 2, of "do the task" consists of:

1. Using both hands simultaneously, pick up two pegs, place in top center holes.
2. Working downward and outward, repeat until task is completed.

The critical input into the peg board task is in the job analysis, Part 1, "make ready." Part 2, "do the job," requires proper struction together with physical attributes to perform the job.

On another level of employment the Sperry Rand Corporation is nploying a concept of Big-think, Middle-think and Little-think. g-think illustrates researchers probing or "blue-skying" for the

(DEAF)
Education
Nonwhite

EDUCATIONAL, PSYCHOLOGICAL, AND OCCUPATIONAL ASPECTS OF THE NONWHITE DEAF POPULATION

By FRANK G. BOWE, M.A.

My topic concerns a minority within a minority, perhaps the most misunderstood segment of the national deaf population. Whether Black, Puerto Rican, Indian, Oriental or of some other group, nonwhite deaf persons face a number of problems not commonly shared by their white deaf counterparts. We wish to consider some of these problems here. Remarks will be focused primarily on the Black deaf group, insofar as most of our data concerns this segment.

Nonwhite deaf persons are likely to be grossly under-educated, severely under-employed, and largely isolated from the larger deaf community as well as from the dominant hearing society (Bowe, 1971a). They number approximately 22,000, about one-tenth of the total deaf population (Bowe, 1971b).

Educational Preparation

The history of education for nonwhite deaf persons is in many respects a bleak and discouraging story. For most of the century and a half that deaf children have been educated in special schools in America, nonwhite deaf children have often been relegated to manifestly inferior schools for the deaf, especially in the South. Even in those institutions which were desegregated, few provisions were made for the disadvantaged backgrounds and special needs of children from inner cities and from reservations.

Adapted from a paper presented to the American Psychological Association's seventy-ninth convention in Washington, D.C., September 5, 1971.

Mr. Bowe is employed by the Central Susquehanna Intermediate Unit as teacher of a class of deaf children located in Bloomsburg State College, Bloomsburg, Pa. Reprint requests to 156 Brown St., Lewisburg, Pa. 17837.

As recently as 1949, thirteen states maintained separate residential schools for white and Negro deaf children. By 1963, the total was eight (Babbidge, 1964). Only very recently have these remaining eight states desegregated their schools for the deaf.

The results of this neglect have now been documented (Bowe, 1971a,b). One study discovered that nonwhite deaf persons were twice as likely as the white deaf to have eight or fewer years of school attendance (Furfey and Harte, 1968). Another study found that twice as high a proportion of white deaf as nonwhite deaf graduated from a school for the deaf (Lunde and Bigman, 1959). A third study found that five times as many white deaf as nonwhite deaf in Washington, D.C., receive any college education (Schein, 1968). None of these studies was specifically designed to investigate problems of nonwhite deaf persons. To date in fact, few studies on this population have been attempted.

Psychological Aspects

What effect does the dual minority status have upon the psychological development of nonwhite deaf persons? Do these persons generally relate more closely with persons of their own races or with other deaf persons? To the best of our limited knowledge, these questions have seldom been raised, let alone answered, by investigators in deafness.

In fact, the entire area of psychological aspects and problems of nonwhite deaf persons has been largely ignored. The data we are reporting may be suggestive, but because replicative studies are so conspicuously absent, they cannot be interpreted as conclusive.

Two important studies in the Los Angeles area provide much of our information. The first, a 1967 effort by Ernest Hairston and John Bachman, examined the lifestyle of Negro deaf persons in Los Angeles. The second, by Linwood Smith, investigated the small "hardcore Negro deaf adult" population in Watts.

Both found that the greatest problem of the subjects was communication. The Black deaf persons studied were largely isolated. Smith found that none of his subjects knew any of the others in the study, despite the fact that all lived within a few blocks of each other. They appear to live practically invisible lives. As Smith observes, this social isolation and invisibility constitute an intellectual deprivation far in excess of that one might attribute to deafness alone. They are neglected and desperately in need of help,

yet incapable of making their needs known and of seeking assistance.

Smith and Hairston and Bachman agree that Black deaf adults customarily regard deafness as more handicapping than blackness. The hardcore deaf Negroes—those with especially meager communication skills, minimal education, and large unemployment—are often not accepted by the more fortunate Black deaf. Additionally, these persons appear to be untouched by the social movement taking place among Blacks throughout the country today. The Black community has yet to take an interest in deafness. Smith observes that lack of communication may be the major cause of these problems.

A study by Furfey and Harte (1968) of interaction between deaf and hearing persons in Baltimore, Maryland, confirms this data on communication. They found that half the nonwhite deaf persons surveyed rated below average in communication with deaf persons, and half below average in communication with hearing persons, *as compared with other deaf persons* in the study. By contrast, only 15 and 17 percent of the white deaf studied were so rated.

That other deaf persons often do not accept nonwhite deaf persons is also confirmed by several studies (see Bowe, 1971b). Clubs for the deaf in several cities exclude nonwhite deaf persons from membership explicity or implicity. Repeatedly, in city after city, we observe several circles of social life among deaf persons. The highly eduated white deaf adults move in one circle, the less highly educated white deaf in another. This pattern appears to hold for the nonwhite deaf groups as well. Rarely do the groups mix racially.

A kind of "indirect discrimination" results from this arrangement, in that nonwhite deaf persons often do not learn of educational, vocational and social opportunities available for deaf persons in their areas. Their low representation in clubs for the deaf, coupled with their lack of visibility, means that studies often miss them, as do rehabilitation case-finders. Inferior service results.

Very little is known about the intelligence of nonwhite deaf persons. The few studies we have seen indicate, depressed scores as compared to other deaf persons and to hearing persons. The validity of this gap is questionable, its reasons unknown.

The picture emerging from the data on psychological aspects of nonwhite deaf persons is one of people cut off from the hearing

community by deafness, from the deaf community by race, and from help they urgently need from service agencies by indirect discrimination. Exactly what effects this isolation has upon these persons is not known, but some effect is certain.

Occupational Status

Severe under-education appears to be a major factor in the gross under-employment and high unemployment found among many nonwhite deaf persons. According to Schein's figures (Schein, 1968) on the noninstitutionalized deaf adults of Washington, D.C., who were in the labor force, we can make these observations: 1 in 5 white deaf persons occupies a professional-technical position; by contrast, fewer than 1 in 50 nonwhite deaf persons does. Half the white deaf women are found in clerical-sales positions; only 1 in 25 nonwhite deaf women holds such a post.

Schein also found that the unemployment rate for nonwhite deaf men in Washington, D.C., was almost four times the rate for white deaf men. Regarding women, 10 percent of the white deaf women in the study were unemployed, but almost half the nonwhite deaf women were.

Lunde and Bigman (1959) report similar results for their national survey. Crammatte (1968) uncovered "no Negro deaf professionals other than teachers . despite diligent efforts." Since his study in the late fifties, however, at least four Black deaf professionals have entered the field of deafness. These individuals are currently making important progress in bringing services to increased numbers of nonwhite deaf persons.

As for earnings among nonwhite deaf persons, Schein (1968) found that the median income of white deaf men in Washington, D.C., was $6,473 which contrasts with $2,611 for the nonwhite deaf men. The white deaf women in the survey reported a median income of $3,542 while the nonwhite deaf females had a median of 90. Comparable figures were obtained by nonwhite deaf respondents in the Lunde and Bigman study (1959).

Smith (1971) observed that the hardcore Negro deaf adults he studied were generally afraid of agencies and refused to approach the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation even when informed of services available. He summarizes his observations in this message:

When the hardcore adult's deafness, racial background, lack of verbal expression, meager education, poor job attitude, poor self-concept, and unrealistic goals are brought into the rehabilitation picture it generates a mass of confusion and the client finds it difficult to get retraining services and eventually is marked off as non-feasible.

Conclusions

This paper has considered some information currently available on the nonwhite deaf population. It has hopefully spotlighted the fact that crucial data on this group are entirely too meager. Some aspects requiring further investigation include the prevalence of racial discrimination within the deaf community and means for increasing integration; how to enrich education for inner city and ghetto deaf persons, particularly in the realm of preschool education; improving case-finding techniques for use in the inner city; detailing some of the salient characteristics of nonwhite deaf persons demographically; increasing Black involvement in affairs of the deaf; studying the psychological effects of deafness and race together on nonwhite deaf persons; describing the special problems of nonwhite groups such as Indians and Orientals, with proposed solutions to these problems; exploring the effects upon Puerto Rican deaf children who have Spanish-speaking parents of the school requirements upon oral education in English only; and increasing the numbers of nonwhite deaf and hearing professionals serving in the field of deafness.

Several of these efforts will of necessity be focused exclusively upon certain nonwhite deaf groups, while others involve integrated services. In the area of intelligence, for example, IQ in deaf persons has been studied extensively with more than fifty investigations reported in the literature over an equal number of years (Vernon, 1968). However, researchers controlled for the variable of race in almost every case. In effect this means that our data on intelligence in deaf children and youth is for the most part confined to white deaf persons. Many comparative studies on the mental abilities of white and nonwhite deaf persons are needed before we can make any definitive statements about their mean IQ's.

Coming to the fore for the first time are highly qualified Black deaf professionals such as Ernest Hairston of Washington, D.C., Glenn Anderson of Detroit,, Katie Brown of Chicago and Linwood Smith of North Carolina. These individuals have the potential to provide inspired leadership in this area for decades to come.

It is a cause for grave concern that so little has been done for this group, that vast cobwebs of indifference and apathy continue to

exist among professionals and laymen alike with respect to the gross under-education, mass under-employment, and severe social isolation of nonwhite deaf persons. Hopefully, this decade will see improvements in the delivery of services to this population. As James F. Garrett said in his keynote address to the 1970 PRWAD convention in Rochester:

> The deaf who have been served thus far, whether we like to accept it or not, are not the deaf who are in most need. Our problem and our challenge in the next ten years is to do a job and to do as good a job on those deaf who are most in need as we have been doing with the others that we have been serving. The deaf who are poor, who are hidden away in our inner cities and in our ghettos, and particularly the black deaf, are individuals who need service and who *must* be given equal opportunities to enjoy the fruits of everything we have learned. (pp. 28-29)

REFERENCES

Babbidge, H. D. Education of the Deaf: a report to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare by his Advisory Committee on the Education of the Deaf. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare publication, 1964.

Bowe, F. G. "Some Observations on the Education and Rehabilitation of Black Deaf Persons." Paper delivered to the 45th Meeting, Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf, Little Rock, Arkansas, June 28, 1971. (To be printed in the *Proceedings*.)

Bowe, F. G. Nonwhite deaf persons: educational, psychological and occupational considerations. *American Annals of the Deaf*, Vol. 188, June 1971, pp. 357-361.

Crammatte, A. B. *Deaf Persons in Professional Employment*. Springfield, Ill.: Charles Thomas, 1968.

Furfey, P. H. and Harte, T. J. *Interaction of Deaf and Hearing in Baltimore City, Maryland*. Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America, 1968.

Garrett, J. F. Keynote Address to the Conference of Professional Rehabilitation Workers with the Adult Deaf, Rochester, N. Y., October 12, 1970. Printed in the *Proceedings, Journal of Rehabilitation of the Deaf*, Vol. 4, January 1971, 23-29.

Hairston, E. and Bachman, J. "A Study of a Segment of the Negro Deaf Population in the Los Angeles Area." Leadership Training Program in the Area of the Deaf, 1967.

Lunde, A. S. and Bigman, S. K. *Occupational Conditions Among the Deaf*. Washington, D. C.: Gallaudet College, 1959.

Schein, J. D. *The Deaf Community*. Washington, D. C.: Gallaudet College, 1968.

Smith, J. D. "The Hardcore Deaf Negro Adult in the Watts Area of Los Angeles, California." Leadership Training Program in the Area of the Deaf, 1971.

C.A.I.D. 45th Meeting, Proceedings of

found that the students enjoy the material in these texts and that they have responded in the way we had anticipated. We have found that this program has definitely established a wider range of reading interest in the students and that their reading abilities and word comprehension have improved. We have also been rewarded by the improvement in the sentence structure of these students when they write, and equally important, we find they are communicating with the instructor and themselves by imitating sentence patterns similar to those which they find in their texts. Possibly the most tangible improvement we see is the effort these students make at composing a poem or essay or short story even when they are not assigned one to write. When a student comes to a teacher and asks to borrow a volume of poetry or short stories for pleasure reading, that is a result. When a student comments in class about the theme of a movie he saw during the previous weekend, that is a result. When some quirk of fate occurs in the classroom and a student spontaneously remarks that the incident was "ironical," that is a result.

At the North Carolina School, we have found our program of creative writing and literature stimulating, rewarding, backbreaking, and fun. Creative writing is a well-planned, organized program. One does not walk into a classroom and decide to do some creative writing that day because "we haven't done that sort of thing lately."

Extensive planning is necessary to insure sequential experiences rather than piecemeal assignments. Initially, there will be resistance based primarily on departure from the conventional. Such opposition will disappear when the results of such a totally integrated program of learning and creativity begin to manifest themselves in all areas of the students' work. Given the tools with which to work, which is a requirement also of the hearing child, the deaf student will demonstrate that creativity does not hinge exclusively upon the sense of hearing.

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE EDUCATION AND REHABILITATION OF BLACK DEAF PERSONS

Frank G. Bowe, M.A., New York University

A black deaf man or woman in today's society is likely to be grossly under-educated, severely under employed and largely isolated from the world around him.

That is the picture that emerges from an intensive survey of the literature I conducted last summer. Actually, I stumbled upon this disheartening story quite by accident. As a newly-employed Research Assistant to the Social and Rehabilitation Service of HEW, I was required to familiarize myself with all SRS-supported research into deafness over the past few decades.

Somewhere along the line, I noticed how striking a contrast appeared between the mass of publicity and research devoted to the problems of black hearing persons and the miniscule amount of data on blacks who were deaf. This impression was subsequently reinforced in conversations with leaders in the field of deafness: almost to a man, they knew little about the black deaf population and little about potential sources of such information.

At this point, I decided to undertake an exhaustive survey of the literature in an attempt to document exactly what was known about this population segment. My findings will be reported here today, although time restrictions will require some abbreviation in the presentation. I will begin with a brief description of the limitations of the data, proceed to a discussion of educational and rehabilitation indices of this group, and finally raise some questions for further research.

At times throughout the paper, the term "nonwhite" will be used instead of "black" to indicate that other minority groups than Negroes may be included in the data.

The figures reported here emanate largely but not exclusively from three SRS-funded projects. Schein's 1963 Metropolitan Washington, D.C., study (*1*) contains information on 187 nonwhite deaf persons, representing 14 percent of the total sample. Lunde and Bigman, in their 1959 National Survey, (*2*) found 344 nonwhite deaf persons, of whom 310 were black. The 1967 Baltimore study of Furfey and Harte (*3*) reports on 35 Negroes and 2 American Indians. These samples are somewhat small and in some cases may not be representative of the national black deaf population.

Prevalence

How many persons in the United States today are both black and deaf? The question of prevalence of deafness among the Negro population has a 140-year history. The U.S. Bureau of the Census attempted to enumerate deaf persons for 100 years (1830–1930). They consistently reported that the prevalence rate of deafness among blacks was lower than that among whites. Other studies: Beasley, (*4*) *Georgia's Deaf*, (*5*) Lunde and Bigman, (*2*) Post, (*6*) Schein. (*1*) Tenney and Edwards (*7*) have supported this contention, although for different reasons.

Schein and Ries (*8*) have summarized three possible explanations: constitutional, socio-economic and methodologic. The constitutional explanation centers around hypothesized differences in genetic make-up between blacks and whites. (*6, 7, 9*) The socio-economic explanation suggests that inferior medical care presumed given to the black population might result in black persons dying of diseases which "merely" deafen white persons. The final explanation, which is methodologic in nature, assumes that the black deaf population has been consistently undernumerated by census takers. A statistical estimation of the total prevalence, based on a ratio of approximately one profoundly deaf-born person per 1,000 in the general population, would be that there are slightly less than 22,000 black deaf persons in the country today. The current National Census of the Deaf should provide further information on this question.

Education

Black deaf children are often severely under-educated, markedly in excess of the under-education of white deaf children. Lunde and Bigman, (*2*) for example, discovered that the nonwhite deaf persons in their sample were twice as likely as the white deaf to have eight

or fewer years of school attendance. Furfey and Harte (*3*) found that twice as high a proportion of white deaf persons as black deaf had been graduated from a school for the deaf or one for the hearing. Schein (*1*) suggests that approximately five times as many white deaf, proportionally, as nonwhite deaf in Washington, D.C., receive any college education. Data on college attendance from Schein (*1*) and from Lunde and Bigman (*2*) appear in Table 1.

Under-education, of course, is a function of more than the number of years of school attendance. Another factor we must consider, especially with respect to blacks no longer in school, is that of segregation in inferior schools for the Negro deaf. The Babbidge Report (*10*) has this to say on the question of separate residential institutions for deaf children (p. 28):

> In 1949, according to the *American Annals of the Deaf*, separate residential schools were maintained for white and Negro deaf children in 13 states; in 1963, this total had dropped to 8. In 6 of these 8 states, the combined total of deaf children enrolled in less than most educators consider necessary to sustain a school program of 12 grades. It is thus reasonable to conclude that the continued violation of a generally accepted principle and established public policy results not only in an injustice to the Negro deaf, but also in residential school programs for both white and Negro deaf children that are unnecessarily inferior. It was noted that the physical plants of the schools for the Negro deaf visited were markedly inferior to those of the schools for white deaf children.

TABLE 1.—PERCENTAGES OF DEAF RESPONDENTS REPORTING ANY COLLEGE, BY SURVEY, RACE AND SEX: SCHEIN (1) AND LUNDE AND BIGMAN (2)

Race and sex	Survey	
	Schein	Lunde and Bigman
Whites	37.5	9.8
Male	41.0	9.5
Female	34.0	10.1
Nonwhites	7.0	1.2
Male	9.0	2.4
Female	5.0	0.0

Fortunately, according to the 1971 *Directory of Services for the Deaf in the United States*, all of the states which previously featured separate schools for white and Negro deaf children have now desegregated their schools at least nominally.

Rehabilitation

With respect to rehabilitation, I wish to consider four general areas of discussion: employment, standard of living, case-finding and communication skills.

Severe under-education appears to be a major factor in the gross under-employment and high unemployment found among many black deaf persons. Racial discrimination may also be involved. According to Schein's figures (*1*) on the deaf adults of Washington, D.C., who were in the labor force, we can make these observations: 1 in 5 white deaf persons occupies a professional-technical position; by contrast, fewer than 1 in 50 nonwhite deaf persons do.

Half the white deaf women are found in clerical-sales positions; only 1 in 25 nonwhite deaf women holds such a position.

Schein (*1*) also found that the unemployment rate for nonwhite deaf men in Washington, D.C., was almost four times the rate for white deaf men. Regarding women, only ten per cent of the white deaf women were unemployed, but almost half the nonwhite deaf women were. (see Table 2, taken from Schein's (*1*) Table VI:1).

We might expect that the combination of under education and under-employment would result in a lower standard of living among the black deaf than is the case among the white deaf, and such appears to be the case.

Furfey and Harte (*3*) noted that "poverty was the rule" among the nonwhite deaf persons in their Baltimore study. Of these persons, 41 percent were classified as being below average in economic status, as opposed to 14 percent of the white deaf in the study. Three times as many nonwhite deaf as white deaf lived in substandard housing. Three times as high a percentage of Schein's (*1*) nonwhite deaf respondents as white deaf were lodgers, rather than homeowners, and more than twice as high a proportion lived with parents or family.

TABLE 2.—PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF DEAF PERSONS IN THE LABOR FORCE BY PRINCIPAL OCCUPATION, SEX AND COLOR: METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON, D.C. (SCHEIN (1) TABLE VI:1)

Occupational category	White		Nonwhite	
	Male (N=418)	Female (N=242)	Male (N=33)	Female (N=51)
Professional and technical	21.5	19.4	1.2	2.0
Managers, officials, owner	3.4	(1)	2.4	(1)
Clerical and sales	11.0	48.3	4.8	3.9
Craftsmen, repairmen, and foremen	48.8	14.0	15.7	2.0
Operatives, apprentices and related workers	5.3	5.8	18.1	31.4
Service workers	1.9	2.5	19.3	11.8
Laborers	3.8	(1)	21.7	7.8
Domestics	(1)	(1)	(1)	9.8
Unemployed	4.3	7.4	16.9	41.2

[1] Less than 1 percent.
[2] None appeared in sample.

The median income of the white deaf men in Schein's study (Table 3) was $6,473, which contrasts with $2,611 for the nonwhite deaf men. The white deaf women in this survey reported a median income of $3,542, while the nonwhite deaf females had a median of $990.

Case-finding is an extremely difficult problem not only for rehabilitation but also for education. Furfey and Harte (*3*) have suggested that nonwhite deaf persons are generally outside the mainstream of deaf life, as well as cut off from the hearing community. In many cases, clubs for the deaf either explicitly exclude blacks from membership or the members act in such a manner as to make a potential black deaf member feel unwanted and uncomfortable. Although my evidence is admittedly subjective, based as it is on conversations with leaders in various deaf communities, discrimination within the deaf subculture seems to be a fact of life.

TABLE 3.—MEDIAN EARNINGS REPORTED BY DEAF RESPONDENTS, BY SURVEY, RACE AND SEX: SCHEIN (1) AND LUNDE AND BIGMAN (2)

Race and sex	Survey	
	Schein	Lunde and Bigman
Whites	$5,075	$2,500–3,500
Male	6,473	3,000–3,999
Female	3,542	2,000–2,999
Nonwhites	1,801	1,500–2,500
Male	2,611	2,000–2,999
Female	990	1,000–1,999

Because of such low representation in clubs for the deaf and low rates of participation in activities organized by deaf leaders, names of deaf persons who are black often cannot be found through such sources. Furthermore, a kind of indirect discrimination results because black deaf persons frequently do not learn of services available to deaf persons in their areas.

Another factor influencing both case-finding and integration with white deaf people is the apparently low level of communication ability possessed by many black deaf persons. In this connection, certain findings of Furfey and Harte (*3*) may be of interest. They attempted to rate their respondents' communication abilities on a scale ranging from "excellent" to "below average." These comparisons are with other deaf persons so, as the authors point out, a rating of "excellent" in speech and speechreading does not imply good communication with hearing persons because the average deaf person is not very successful in such communication.

They rated 46 percent of the nonwhites, as opposed to 15 percent of the whites, as below average in communication by speech and speechreading with hearing persons. Likewise, 49 percent of the nonwhites, but only 17 percent of the whites, were rated as below average in communication by signs and fingerspelling with other deaf people.

Insofar as these figures may be said to represent deaf persons nationwide, they indicate that black deaf persons may have difficulty integrating with other deaf persons. They also suggest one reason for the apparent isolation of many black deaf persons from the larger hearing community. Again, they implicate a kind of indirect discrimination against black deaf persons insofar as people with minimal communication skills are unlikely to be informed of services for which they are eligible. Finally, the figures reflect negatively upon the schools these black deaf persons attended.

Conclusions

The picture emerging from these data is one of extreme isolation. Cut off from the hearing community by deafness, from the deaf community by race, and from help from service agencies by indirect discrimination, black deaf persons often appear to live quite lonely lives. They often meet with frustration in attempting to find and keep good jobs, in attempting to live normal social lives and in at-

tempting to find the assistance they need to overcome the effects of their lack of adequate education.

What is being done now for this population? Regrettably little. The New York University Deafness Research and Training Center is planning to develop new approaches to the Harlem deaf population, especially those who are multiply handicapped. Kendall School for the Deaf in Washington, D.C., was recently awarded a grant for among other things, expansion of educational services including preschool activities, for the city's deaf children. Also in Washington, the District of Columbia Division of Vocational Rehabilitation is experimenting with a number of innovative programs. Other activities in St. Louis, Kansas City and Chicago deserve mention.

Mr. Glenn Anderson, Coordinator for the Deaf in the Michigan Division of Vocational Rehabilitation is currently preparing a paper on discrimination against black deaf persons. At San Fernando Valley State College, Mr. Linwood Smith is developing a project with this population, following guidelines set down by Ernest Hairston and John Bachman in their 1967 project at the Leadership Training Program. Other projects, unknown to the author, undoubtedly are in progress in various parts of the country.

This paper has considered some of the important information currently available on the black deaf population. It has hopefully spotlighted the fact that critical data on this group are entirely too meager. Some aspects upon which future research might concentrate include:

(1) How prevalent is racial discrimination in the deaf subculture? What forms does this discrimination take? In what ways might this be modified?

(2) Why do so many black deaf youth leave school without graduating? What ways might be found to enrich education, especially in the direction of preschool education, for inner city and ghetto deaf persons? One especially important question in this connection concerns whether we would provide a better education for all deaf children in those states which have recently desegregated their schools for the deaf if these states consolidated their efforts into one school for white and black deaf children together.

(3) What case-finding techniques would be most effective with inner city deaf populations, which are often predominantly black? Is it true that rehabilitation is generally failing to reach and serve this population?

(4) What are some of the salient demographic characteristics of this segment of the deaf population? How do these persons compare to white deaf persons and to hearing persons in such areas as education, employment, social life. communication abilities, marriage and fertility rates, standard of living, prevalence of deafness and of multiple handicaps?

(5) What effect, if any, does the additional minority group status of deaf persons who are also black have upon their psychosocial development? Do some black deaf persons have special ego and self-identity problems? Does deafness effectively preclude identification with the larger "Black America," especially with the struggle of blacks for equality?

I would like to close with the suggestion that this Convention convene a committee to study various aspects of some of the questions just raised. Additionally, I would recommend the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on the Education and Rehabilitation of Black Deaf Persons by the following bodies: the Social and Rehabilitation Service, the Bureau of Education of the Handicapped of the Office of Education, the Professional Rehabilitation Workers with the Adult Deaf, and the Conference of Executives of American Schools for the Deaf. This Committee, under which each participating organization would have a subcommittee studying those problems it is most qualified to handle, would establish basic priorities and procedures for improving educational and rehabilitation services for black deaf persons.

LIST OF REFERENCES

(1) Schein, J. D. *The Deaf Community.* Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet College, 1968.

(2) Lunde, A. S., and Bigman, S. K. *Occupational Conditions Among the Deaf.* Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet College. 1959.

(3) Furfey, P. H., and Harte, T. J. *Interaction of Deaf and Hearing in Baltimore City, Maryland.* Washington, D.C.: Catholic University, 1967.

(4) Beasley, W. C. Characteristics and distribution of impaired hearing in the population of the United States. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America,* 12, 1940, 114–121.

(5) *Georgia's Deaf.* Atlanta, Georgia: Works Project Administration of Georgia (Official Project Number 665-34-3-90), 1942, 19.

(6) Post, R. H. Hearing acuity variation among Negroes and whites. *Eugenics Quarterly,* 11, 1964, 65–81.

(7) Tenney, H. K., and Edwards, C. Race as a variable in hearing screening. *American Journal of Disorders in Children,* Vol. 120, December 1970, 547–550.

(8) Schein, J. D., and Ries, P. W. Proceedings of the Special Meeting on the Identification of Black Deaf Persons, unpublished summation, September 16, 1970.

(9) Rosen, S., Plester, D., El-Mofty, A., and Rosen, H. V. Relation of hearing loss to cardiovascular disease. *Transactions of the American Academy of Opthamology and Otolaryngology,* 68, 1964, 433–444.

(10) Babbidge, H. D. *Education of the Deaf:* a report to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare by his Advisory Committee on the Education of the Deaf. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare publication, 1964.

CAREER DEVELOPMENT OF DEAF YOUNG PEOPLE

David W. Lacey, Ph. D., National Technical Institute for the Deaf

What questions are most pressing in the career development of deaf young people? Some of these are:

1. What career development concerns do deaf students have at various grade levels that are most relevant?
2. How do deaf students reach out beyond the boundaries of the "deaf job"?
3. How can deaf students be introduced to a diverse range of educational and occupational goals, as well as to educational and occupational strategies for reaching these goals?

These and similar questions are the substance of vocational decision-making. The purpose of this presentation is to describe a process defined as career development, and to present its unique way

Non-White Deaf Persons: Educational, Psychological, and Occupational Considerations

A Review of the Literature

Frank G. Bowe, Jr., Washington, D. C.

Widely scattered information on non-white deaf persons has been collected and analyzed. Perhaps the most significant finding concerns the paucity of research data available. Large gaps in our knowledge are apparent in every aspect of the problem. Analysis of what data is presented reveals lower educational and occupational attainments for the non-white segment of the deaf population than for the white segment. Although the limited data on the psychological characteristics of this group are suggestive, they are not conclusive. The need for extensive further research on the non-white deaf is as crucial as it is evident.

They are deaf in a 'hearing world,' black-, red- or yellow-skinned in a color-conscious country. Many of them live in the inner city. Their mother tongue might be some variety of Black English, an Indian dialect, or it may be Spanish. It is suspected that a somewhat higher proportion of their number is multiply handicapped. They are the non-white deaf.

In view of the often-staggering problems faced by this group, it is somewhat surprising to discover that no major research study focusing primarily upon this segment of the deaf population has been published. Basic questions remain unanswered. For example, "How many nonwhite deaf are there in the country today? What are their achievement levels? Communication scores? Intellectual levels? Social functioning abilities? Occupations? Earnings? Psychological adjustment? Secondary handicaps? Generally, what is the effect, if any, of the additional minority group status upon these deaf persons?"

Although little national data is available, it would be a mistake to conclude that nothing is known about this segment of the deaf population. Some general patterns can be drawn from information collected by recent research studies. This paper presents these emerging patterns.

The data presented must be interpreted with considerable care insofar as they are based upon very small populations. Assuming one profoundly deaf person per 1,000[1] in the Negro population, we arrive at an estimate of 22,000 Negro deaf persons in the United States today. A relatively small number of other non-whites would be added to this total. Vague as the resulting figure is, it provides some frame of reference against which to evaluate the non-white deaf samples from various research studies.

Lunde and Bigman's 1959 national survey[2] turned up a non-white deaf sample of 344. This figure represents 3% of their total deaf sample of 10,101. Unfortunately, the non-white deaf sample, like the total sample. is at best a 'chunk' of the population, not a representative sample. Furfey and Harte found only four non-white deaf in Frederick County during their 1964 project.[3] Their Baltimore study[4]

Mr. Bowe is a graduate student at Gallaudet College, Washington, D.C. This review was prepared as part of a special project while emplo/ed as Research Assistant to L. Deno Reed, Sc. D., Executive Secretary, Sensory Study Section, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

exist among professionals and laymen alike with respect to the gross under-education, mass under-employment, and severe social isolation of nonwhite deaf persons. Hopefully, this decade will see improvements in the delivery of services to this population. As James F. Garrett said in his keynote address to the 1970 PRWAD convention in Rochester:

> The deaf who have been served thus far, whether we like to accept it or not, are not the deaf who are in most need. Our problem and our challenge in the next ten years is to do a job and to do as good a job on those deaf who are most in need as we have been doing with the others that we have been serving. The deaf who are poor, who are hidden away in our inner cities and in our ghettos, and particularly the black deaf, are individuals who need service and who *must* be given equal opportunities to enjoy the fruits of everything we have learned. (pp. 28-29)

REFERENCES

Babbidge, H. D. Education of the Deaf: a report to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare by his Advisory Committee on the Education of the Deaf. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare publication, 1964.

Bowe, F. G. "Some Observations on the Education and Rehabilitation of Black Deaf Persons." Paper delivered to the 45th Meeting. Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf, Little Rock, Arkansas, June 28, 1971. (To be printed in the *Proceedings*.)

Bowe, F. G. Nonwhite deaf persons: educational, psychological and occupational considerations. *American Annals of the Deaf*, Vol. 188, June 1971, pp. 357-361.

Crammatte, A. B. *Deaf Persons in Professional Employment*. Springfield, Ill.: Charles Thomas, 1968.

Furfey, P. H. and Harte, T. J. *Interaction of Deaf and Hearing in Baltimore City, Maryland*. Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America, 1968.

Garrett, J. F. Keynote Address to the Conference of Professional Rehabilitation Workers with the Adult Deaf, Rochester, N. Y., October 12, 1970. Printed in the *Proceedings, Journal of Rehabilitation of the Deaf*, Vol. 4, January 1971, 23-29.

Hairston, E. and Bachman, J. "A Study of a Segment of the Negro Deaf Population in the Los Angeles Area." Leadership Training Program in the Area of the Deaf, 1967.

Lunde, A. S. and Bigman, S. K. *Occupational Conditions Among the Deaf*. Washington, D. C.: Gallaudet College, 1959.

Schein, J. D. *The Deaf Community*. Washington, D. C.: Gallaudet College, 1968.

Smith, J. D. "The Hardcore Deaf Negro Adult in the Watts Area of Los Angeles, California." Leadership Training Program in the Area of the Deaf, 1971.

C.A.I.D. 45th Meeting, Proceedings of

found that the students enjoy the material in these texts and that they have responded in the way we had anticipated. We have found that this program has definitely established a wider range of reading interest in the students and that their reading abilities and word comprehension have improved. We have also been rewarded by the improvement in the sentence structure of these students when they write, and equally important, we find they are communicating with the instructor and themselves by imitating sentence patterns similar to those which they find in their texts. Possibly the most tangible improvement we see is the effort these students make at composing a poem or essay or short story even when they are not assigned one to write. When a student comes to a teacher and asks to borrow a volume of poetry or short stories for pleasure reading, that is a result. When a student comments in class about the theme of a movie he saw during the previous weekend, that is a result. When some quirk of fate occurs in the classroom and a student spontaneously remarks that the incident was "ironical," that is a result.

At the North Carolina School, we have found our program of creative writing and literature stimulating, rewarding, backbreaking, and fun. Creative writing is a well-planned, organized program. One does not walk into a classroom and decide to do some creative writing that day because "we haven't done that sort of thing lately."

Extensive planning is necessary to insure sequential experiences rather than piecemeal assignments. Initially, there will be resistance based primarily on departure from the conventional. Such opposition will disappear when the results of such a totally integrated program of learning and creativity begin to manifest themselves in all areas of the students' work. Given the tools with which to work, which is a requirement also of the hearing child, the deaf student will demonstrate that creativity does not hinge exclusively upon the sense of hearing.

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE EDUCATION AND REHABILITATION OF BLACK DEAF PERSONS

Frank G. Bowe, M.A., New York University

A black deaf man or woman in today's society is likely to be grossly under-educated, severely under employed and largely isolated from the world around him.

That is the picture that emerges from an intensive survey of the literature I conducted last summer. Actually, I stumbled upon this disheartening story quite by accident. As a newly-employed Research Assistant to the Social and Rehabilitation Service of HEW, I was required to familiarize myself with all SRS-supported research into deafness over the past few decades.

Somewhere along the line, I noticed how striking a contrast appeared between the mass of publicity and research devoted to the problems of black hearing persons and the miniscule amount of data on blacks who were deaf. This impression was subsequently reinforced in conversations with leaders in the field of deafness: almost to a man, they knew little about the black deaf population and little about potential sources of such information.

At this point, I decided to undertake an exhaustive survey of the literature in an attempt to document exactly what was known about this population segment. My findings will be reported here today, although time restrictions will require some abbreviation in the presentation. I will begin with a brief description of the limitations of the data, proceed to a discussion of educational and rehabilitation indices of this group, and finally raise some questions for further research.

At times throughout the paper, the term "nonwhite" will be used instead of "black" to indicate that other minority groups than Negroes may be included in the data.

The figures reported here emanate largely but not exclusively from three SRS-funded projects. Schein's 1963 Metropolitan Washington, D.C., study (*1*) contains information on 187 nonwhite deaf persons, representing 14 percent of the total sample. Lunde and Bigman, in their 1959 National Survey, (*2*) found 344 nonwhite deaf persons, of whom 310 were black. The 1967 Baltimore study of Furfey and Harte (*3*) reports on 35 Negroes and 2 American Indians. These samples are somewhat small and in some cases may not be representative of the national black deaf population.

Prevalence

How many persons in the United States today are both black and deaf? The question of prevalence of deafness among the Negro population has a 140-year history. The U.S. Bureau of the Census attempted to enumerate deaf persons for 100 years (1830–1930). They consistently reported that the prevalence rate of deafness among blacks was lower than that among whites. Other studies: Beasley, (*4*) *Georgia's Deaf*, (*5*) Lunde and Bigman, (*2*) Post, (*6*) Schein, (*1*) Tenney and Edwards (*7*) have supported this contention, although for different reasons.

Schein and Ries (*8*) have summarized three possible explanations: constitutional, socio-economic and methodologic. The constitutional explanation centers around hypothesized differences in genetic make-up between blacks and whites. (*6*, *7*, *9*) The socio-economic explanation suggests that inferior medical care presumed given to the black population might result in black persons dying of diseases which "merely" deafen white persons. The final explanation, which is methodologic in nature, assumes that the black deaf population has been consistently undernumerated by census takers. A statistical estimation of the total prevalence, based on a ratio of approximately one profoundly deaf-born person per 1,000 in the general population, would be that there are slightly less than 22,000 black deaf persons in the country today. The current National Census of the Deaf should provide further information on this question.

Education

Black deaf children are often severely under-educated, markedly in excess of the under-education of white deaf children. Lunde and Bigman, (*2*) for example, discovered that the nonwhite deaf persons in their sample were twice as likely as the white deaf to have eight

or fewer years of school attendance. Furfey and Harte (*3*) found that twice as high a proportion of white deaf persons as black deaf had been graduated from a school for the deaf or one for the hearing. Schein (*1*) suggests that approximately five times as many white deaf, proportionally, as nonwhite deaf in Washington, D.C., receive any college education. Data on college attendance from Schein (*1*) and from Lunde and Bigman (*2*) appear in Table 1.

Under-education, of course, is a function of more than the number of years of school attendance. Another factor we must consider, especially with respect to blacks no longer in school, is that of segregation in inferior schools for the Negro deaf. The Babbidge Report (*10*) has this to say on the question of separate residential institutions for deaf children (p. 28):

> In 1949, according to the *American Annals of the Deaf*, separate residential schools were maintained for white and Negro deaf children in 13 states; in 1963, this total had dropped to 8. In 6 of these 8 states, the combined total of deaf children enrolled in less than most educators consider necessary to sustain a school program of 12 grades. It is thus reasonable to conclude that the continued violation of a generally accepted principle and established public policy results not only in an injustice to the Negro deaf, but also in residential school programs for both white and Negro deaf children that are unnecessarily inferior. It was noted that the physical plants of the schools for the Negro deaf visited were markedly inferior to those of the schools for white deaf children.

TABLE 1.—PERCENTAGES OF DEAF RESPONDENTS REPORTING ANY COLLEGE, BY SURVEY, RACE AND SEX: SCHEIN (1) AND LUNDE AND BIGMAN (2)

Race and sex	Survey	
	Schein	Lunde and Bigman
Whites	37.5	9.8
Male	41.0	9.5
Female	34.0	10.1
Nonwhites	7.0	1.2
Male	9.0	2.4
Female	5.0	0.0

Fortunately, according to the 1971 *Directory of Services for the Deaf in the United States*, all of the states which previously featured separate schools for white and Negro deaf children have now desegregated their schools at least nominally.

Rehabilitation

With respect to rehabilitation, I wish to consider four general areas of discussion: employment, standard of living, case-finding and communication skills.

Severe under-education appears to be a major factor in the gross under-employment and high unemployment found among many black deaf persons. Racial discrimination may also be involved. According to Schein's figures (*1*) on the deaf adults of Washington, D.C., who were in the labor force, we can make these observations: 1 in 5 white deaf persons occupies a professional-technical position; by contrast, fewer than 1 in 50 nonwhite deaf persons do.

Half the white deaf women are found in clerical-sales positions; only 1 in 25 nonwhite deaf women holds such a position.

Schein (*1*) also found that the unemployment rate for nonwhite deaf men in Washington, D.C., was almost four times the rate for white deaf men. Regarding women, only ten per cent of the white deaf women were unemployed, but almost half the nonwhite deaf women were (see Table 2, taken from Schein's (*1*) Table VI:1).

We might expect that the combination of under education and under-employment would result in a lower standard of living among the black deaf than is the case among the white deaf, and such appears to be the case.

Furfey and Harte (*3*) noted that "poverty was the rule" among the nonwhite deaf persons in their Baltimore study. Of these persons, 41 percent were classified as being below average in economic status, as opposed to 14 percent of the white deaf in the study. Three times as many nonwhite deaf as white deaf lived in substandard housing. Three times as high a percentage of Schein's (*1*) nonwhite deaf respondents as white deaf were lodgers, rather than homeowners, and more than twice as high a proportion lived with parents or family.

TABLE 2.—PERCENT DISTRIBUTION OF DEAF PERSONS IN THE LABOR FORCE BY PRINCIPAL OCCUPATION, SEX AND COLOR: METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON, D.C. (SCHEIN (1) TABLE VI:1)

Occupational category	White		Nonwhite	
	Male (N=418)	Female (N=242)	Male (N=83)	Female (N=51)
Professional and technical	21.5	19.4	1.2	2.0
Managers, officials, owner	3.4	(1)	2.4	(2)
Clerical and sales	11.0	48.3	4.8	3.9
Craftsmen, repairmen, and foremen	48.8	14.0	15.7	2.0
Operatives, apprentices and related workers	5.3	5.8	18.1	31.4
Service workers	1.9	2.5	19.3	11.8
Laborers	3.8	(1)	21.7	7.8
Domestics	(1)	(1)	(1)	9.8
Unemployed	4.3	7.4	16.9	41.2

[1] Less than 1 percent.
[2] None appeared in sample.

The median income of the white deaf men in Schein's study (Table 3) was $6,473, which contrasts with $2,611 for the nonwhite deaf men. The white deaf women in this survey reported a median income of $3,542, while the nonwhite deaf females had a median of $990.

Case-finding is an extremely difficult problem not only for rehabilitation but also for education. Furfey and Harte (*3*) have suggested that nonwhite deaf persons are generally outside the mainstream of deaf life, as well as cut off from the hearing community. In many cases, clubs for the deaf either explicitly exclude blacks from membership or the members act in such a manner as to make a potential black deaf member feel unwanted and uncomfortable. Although my evidence is admittedly subjective, based as it is on conversations with leaders in various deaf communities, discrimination within the deaf subculture seems to be a fact of life.

TABLE 3.—MEDIAN EARNINGS REPORTED BY DEAF RESPONDENTS, BY SURVEY, RACE AND SEX: SCHEIN (1) AND LUNDE AND BIGMAN (2)

Race and sex	Survey	
	Schein	Lunde and Bigman
Whites	$5,075	$2,500–3,500
Male	6,473	3,000–3,999
Female	3,542	2,000–2,999
Nonwhites	1,801	1,500–2,500
Male	2,611	2,000–2,999
Female	990	1,000–1,999

Because of such low representation in clubs for the deaf and low rates of participation in activities organized by deaf leaders, names of deaf persons who are black often cannot be found through such sources. Furthermore, a kind of indirect discrimination results because black deaf persons frequently do not learn of services available to deaf persons in their areas.

Another factor influencing both case-finding and integration with white deaf people is the apparently low level of communication ability possessed by many black deaf persons. In this connection, certain findings of Furfey and Harte (*3*) may be of interest. They attempted to rate their respondents' communication abilities on a scale ranging from "excellent" to "below average." These comparisons are with other deaf persons so, as the authors point out, a rating of "excellent" in speech and speechreading does not imply good communication with hearing persons because the average deaf person is not very successful in such communication.

They rated 46 percent of the nonwhites, as opposed to 15 percent of the whites, as below average in communication by speech and speechreading with hearing persons. Likewise, 49 percent of the nonwhites, but only 17 percent of the whites, were rated as below average in communication by signs and fingerspelling with other deaf people.

Insofar as these figures may be said to represent deaf persons nationwide, they indicate that black deaf persons may have difficulty integrating with other deaf persons. They also suggest one reason for the apparent isolation of many black deaf persons from the larger hearing community. Again, they implicate a kind of indirect discrimination against black deaf persons insofar as people with minimal communication skills are unlikely to be informed of services for which they are eligible. Finally, the figures reflect negatively upon the schools these black deaf persons attended.

Conclusions

The picture emerging from these data is one of extreme isolation. Cut off from the hearing community by deafness, from the deaf community by race, and from help from service agencies by indirect discrimination, black deaf persons often appear to live quite lonely lives. They often meet with frustration in attempting to find and keep good jobs, in attempting to live normal social lives and in at-

tempting to find the assistance they need to overcome the effects of their lack of adequate education.

What is being done now for this population? Regrettably little. The New York University Deafness Research and Training Center is planning to develop new approaches to the Harlem deaf population, especially those who are multiply handicapped. Kendall School for the Deaf in Washington, D.C., was recently awarded a grant for among other things, expansion of educational services including preschool activities, for the city's deaf children. Also in Washington, the District of Columbia Division of Vocational Rehabilitation is experimenting with a number of innovative programs. Other activities in St. Louis, Kansas City and Chicago deserve mention.

Mr. Glenn Anderson, Coordinator for the Deaf in the Michigan Division of Vocational Rehabilitation is currently preparing a paper on discrimination against black deaf persons. At San Fernando Valley State College, Mr. Linwood Smith is developing a project with this population, following guidelines set down by Ernest Hairston and John Bachman in their 1967 project at the Leadership Training Program. Other projects, unknown to the author, undoubtedly are in progress in various parts of the country.

This paper has considered some of the important information currently available on the black deaf population. It has hopefully spotlighted the fact that critical data on this group are entirely too meager. Some aspects upon which future research might concentrate include:

(1) How prevalent is racial discrimination in the deaf subculture? What forms does this discrimination take? In what ways might this be modified?

(2) Why do so many black deaf youth leave school without graduating? What ways might be found to enrich education, especially in the direction of preschool education, for inner city and ghetto deaf persons? One especially important question in this connection concerns whether we would provide a better education for all deaf children in those states which have recently desegregated their schools for the deaf if these states consolidated their efforts into one school for white and black deaf children together.

(3) What case-finding techniques would be most effective with inner city deaf populations, which are often predominantly black? Is it true that rehabilitation is generally failing to reach and serve this population?

(4) What are some of the salient demographic characteristics of this segment of the deaf population? How do these persons compare to white deaf persons and to hearing persons in such areas as education, employment, social life, communication abilities, marriage and fertility rates, standard of living, prevalence of deafness and of multiple handicaps?

(5) What effect, if any, does the additional minority group status of deaf persons who are also black have upon their psychosocial development? Do some black deaf persons have special ego and self-identity problems? Does deafness effectively preclude identification with the larger "Black America," especially with the struggle of blacks for equality?

Ed. file G-'55

Deafness and Minority Group Dynamics

By McCAY VERNON, Ph.D.
Psychologist, Psychosomatic and Psychiatric Institute, Michael Reese Hospital

and

BERNARD MAKAWSKY, MSW
Associate Director, Psychiatric Social Service and Adjunctive Therapy
Psychosomatic and Psychiatric Institute, Michael Reese Hospital

Deaf people in the United States have achieved a superior status to those in other Western civilizations, yet in many ways they are still relegated to second class citizenship. Insight into reasons underlying this inequity can be gained by a careful examination of the psychological and sociological relationships of other minority groups to the majority culture. Or prime importance in this endeavor is an understanding of the factors present that permit minorities such as Jews, Mormons and Orientals to attain prominence and success in American society whereas other groups such as Puerto Ricans, Negroes and American Indians do not.

By setting aside history and analyzing the contemporary picture it is found that the one overriding factor characterizing progress of a minority is the degree of its participation and influence in major social institutions. A vivid illustration of this comes from a detailed look at the American Indian. He is virtually controlled by a non-Indian bureaucracy which determines his education, political representation and total life circumstances.

By contrast Jews, Mormons and Orientals have either developed their own educational institutions, influenced public ones or combined these programs. In addition these minority groups are appropriately represented by their own in the overall political system assuring them of reasonable power and control over their basic socio-economic circumstance. It is not by chance that one group lives in mud hovels in the Everglades while another achieves world recognition in science and business. Intelligent, informed and concerned deaf citizens in moments of reflection must look at many aspects of their own sometimes limited life situation and that of fellow deaf people and ponder the question—Why? What follows are some efforts to examine some of the issues.

Education

Minorities in American society have widely differing experiences with the educational system. Persons of Chinese and Japanese descent and Jews have higher median levels of educational achievement and percentages of their populations with college degrees than does the Caucasian majority (Yinger, 1968). By contrast, Indians, deaf people, Puerto Ricans, Mexicans and Negroes as a group are seriously academically disadvantaged. In assessing the reasons for this, one of the most notable appears to be influence or control over schools. Many historical, sociological and psychological factors contribute to these differences in minority influence on education.

In the case of Orientals, Catholics, Mormons or Jews two key dynamics or reasons are apparent. As noted earlier, these minorities either participate directly in the majority group school system, have their own self-controlled school or have a combination. These provide opportunities to learn necessary aspects of both the minority and majority values. On the other hand Puerto Ricans, Indians, Negroes and deaf people tend to be forced into segregated schools over which they have little control. Indian schools are dominated by white bureaucrats secure in well-paying civil service positions (Leon, 1968). Negroes and Puerto Ricans in "segregated" ghetto schools may have a few classroom teachers and administrators of their ethnic group, but essential control is not indigenous but "downtown" in the hands of the dominant group power structure. In schools for the deaf or in "integrated" public school programs there are no deaf persons in top administrative positions. As with the Indians this must result in a feeling of helplessness among these minorities that stems from the fact that there is no control of their own destiny (Leon, 1968).

The consequence of the almost exclusive use of "outside" educators has often been teachers and administrators who cannot fathom the life circumstances of their pupils. The Indian in a segregated reservation school taught by a white middle class American who does not understand nor accept Indian language or culture finds his education has little meaning. The Negro of the large inner city schools often has teachers who cannot fathom his idiom or comprehend his life circumstance. Frequently there are low expectations or else a "Lady Bountiful" milieu which is depreciating to minority group children and attacks their self worth. The imposition of a value system in the best may be undemocratic and in the final analysis is a reinforcement of an already poor self image. The black

the agencies can be found operating. The Rehabilitation Services Administration has a deaf person in a key position of influence. The Office of Education (O.E.) does not have deaf persons at top policy making levels although there are some employed by the agency. In O.E. deafness is being handled like another "Bureau of Indian Affairs" instead of an area needing the involvement of those it purports to serve. By analogy what has happened quite often is that majority group misconceptions and values, for example the limiting of teaching to just "oral" methods alone are being imposed on a minority. This ignoring of minority group sensitivitiy to minority group needs has inherent in it damaging, sociological and psychological effects on deaf students.

It is improbable that the educational establishment and its governmental bureaucrats will yield of their own accord to needed changes. Education is enormously clever at avoiding self examination and it is full of an impenetrable web of vested interest. If progress is to come about, it will probably result from aggressive deaf leadership, new knowledge gained from psychology and sociology and from new professionals entering the field of deafness. Until this occurs there will continue to be an inappropriate and insensitive imposition of majority group values on a minority, a process which is undemocratic, which fails to respect the rights of others and which has a damaging effect upon the individual.

Self Concept and Minority Status

The Jew, the Mormon and the American Oriental are proud of their ethnic and religious identification. In fact, when they are not, it is often viewed as a problem. Rarely do they feel a need or desire psychologically to deny their heritage. By contract, Indians and Negroes in the past commonly tried to conceal or bleach out their skin color or in the case of the latter straighten their hair. Painful, expensive and time consuming routines art followed which, in essence, communicate to others "I am ashamed of what I am," or "Only in this way am I acceptable." These behaviors represent an internalization of the values of the majority, not a wholesome recognition and pride in real and essentially irreversable differences. Insightful Negroes now realize that the solution to the so-called problem of blackness does not come from an inevitably futile effort to "be white," but from an acceptance and pride in being what one is and a full realization of the potentialities this offers.

In deafness there is much evidence of unhealthy denial of self (Stewart, 1969). We see many hearing professionals working with deaf children who subtly and unconsciously instill in them and their families that they should not be deaf but be "hearing." As Dr. Arnold Gessell, the famed pediatrician, wrote in the **Volta Review** 15 years ago (Gessell. 1956).

> "Our aim should not be to convert the deaf child into a somewhat fictitious version of a normal hearing child, but into a well adjusted non-hearing child who is completely managing the limitations of his sensory defect."

Instead one sees professionals in the education of the deaf castigating that which is natural and normal in deaf children. A system which impedes educational achievement, as research indicates a limitation to "oralism" alone does, actually takes from the deaf person the tools that would make possible his integration as an equal (Meadows, 1967; Montgomery, 1966; Quigley, 1968; Quigley and Frisina, 1961; Stuckless and Birch, 1966; and Vernon, 1969).

There is a relationship between this effort to remake the deaf child into a fictitious version of a hearing child and the prohibition of fingerspelling and the language of signs. The irony of the prohibition is that while its purpose is ostensibly to promote integration into the majority society, its proponents rarely care to interact socially with deaf people. The parallel can be drawn with the ghetto teacher who lives in the suburbs and wants his pupils to identify with his values before he has established with his students an open communication and a firm relationship of trust. In fact professionals in deafness who ardently advocate "oralism" for its integrative value often studiously avoid deaf people except during the hours they are paid "to help" them.

Relevant to the concept of deaf people "integrating" with the nondeaf several other points need to be made. For one, jt is often observed that those who publicly advocate integration most vehemently are the same ones who in the teachers workroom and at professional meetings shun deaf colleagues.

By contrast Jews, Greeks and Orientals find relative acceptance and, if not acceptance, respect from professionals serving them. Nor are their desires to interact socially with their own subgroups depreciated as are those of the deaf. For example, some teachers react to the use of gestures, fingerspelling and the language of signs by putting bags over deaf children's heads or their hands or with other forms of punishment. This is not done to the Jewish youth who speaks Hebrew. Yet research evidence shows manual communication aids not only education but psychological adjustment as well (Meadow, 1967; Montgomery, 1966; Quigley, 1968; Guigley and Frisina, 1961; Stevenson, 1964; Stuckless and Birch, 1966; Vernon, 1969). Much that would be transmitted to the child simply through fingerspelling or the language of signs is denied. The opportunity to identify with a deaf teacher, which can be so crucial, is denied deaf children because many schools will not hire them. This prohibition is analogous to forbidding Negro professors to teach at Howard University or qualified Jews to teach in Hebrew schools.

Furthermore, preschool programs for deaf children exist which refuse to accept deaf children of deaf parents in part because they prefer that hearing parents of deaf children not interact with deaf adults. The fear professionals infer in these cases is that the hearing parent will see signs or be exposed to their role in the life of deaf adults. Should this occur the parents might then reject the "oral" alone philosophy the preschool is trying to impose.

In day schools and some residential schools for the deaf across

(Pleas turn to page 14.)

will give them to mother.

—Jimmie Cash.

I brought a deck of cards to school for math.

—Marcia Overfelt.

Mrs. Pemberton's Class

Our class decorated the showcase for March.

Cheryl Gahimer helped with the shamrocks.

Pam Crosby helped with the cards.

Jeff Anderson put on the yellow paper.

Anna Marie Sparks put on the pink paper.

Doug Rowe helped with the rabbits.

David DeVries helped with the pictures.

Dave Jon Choate put on the green paper.

Diana Robertson climed the ladder.

Miss Kathleen Brown's Class

I put some red nail polish on my fingernails.

I have on a red sweater. I have six buttons on my sweater. My mother and father went to a store. They bought me some slacks.

My father drove a truck Sunday. My grandma gave me a new white and black hat.—Debbie Owen.

I have a bird at home. The bird flew to a picture. The bird flew to the curtains. The bird flew to the cage.

I had a birthday February 25. I am 7 years old. We had a birthday party. We ate cake and sodas. Miss Brown gave us a balloon.

—Jimmy Stafford.

Kelly and Kimmy are my friends.

Ann gave Peggy a horse. I brought the horse to school.

My mother and mother went far away to Flordia. My father brought me some sea shells.

—Peggy Groningen.

I brought a toy fish to school. I brought a car and a truck to school. My grandma gave me a Charlie Brown puppet. I saw the Charlie Brown Show on TV.

I was at home Monday and Tuesday. I was sick.

I wrote a letter. I gave the letter to Miss Brown.

—Scott Vrooman.

I will play in the snow today.

I have a red headband in my hair. I have on long white stockings.

I was at home. I was sick for many days.—Laurie Miller.

My mother and father gave me a pretty dress.

I have on a red sweater.

I brought a black comb and a white string to school.

—Margie Michael.

Arlene and I have the same color dress.

I gave Miss Kathy some valentine candy.

I brought a noteboook and pocketbook to school. I brought two little balls to school.

I have on a blue sweater.

I polished my brown shoes.

A dog bit my hand.

—Bobbie Downing.

Mother gave me some money.

I brought some valentine candy to school. I have a white comb.

I was sick.—Mike Atkinson.

Mrs. Pemberton's Class

Cheryl Gahimer wore her jacket.

Anna Marie Sparks said, "I am happy it is warm."

Dave Jon Choate opened the window.

Pam Cosby found a dandelion.

David DeVries saw some birds.

Doug Rowe and Jeff Anderson flew a kite.

Diana Robertson played outside.

Mrs. Pemberton planted asaparaus and roses.

Miss Kathleen Brown's Class

I have a new red jacket. My mother bought me some brown shoes. I brought a tractor to school. I found a coloring book in my basket Easter Sunday. My tooth came out.—Scott Vrooman.

My mother gave me a pink purse. I have four bracelets and a necklace in my purse.

I went see a dentist. The dentist pulled mytooth.

My mother was asleep. I took some photography. I put the photgraphy in my coat pocket.

David, Brian and I will plant some flower seeds at home.

—Laurie Miller.

My father gave me some string. My kite broke. My mother gave me a jumprope.

We planted some flower seeds at school.—Margie Michael.

I have a flower on my orange dress. A man fixed the car.

I went to Santa Land Spring Vacation.—Bobbie Downing.

I have a ball. I found the ball in a box. I brought a pink balloon to school. Miss Brown wrote my name on the balloon.

I fell on the floor last night. I hurt my leg.—Jimmy Stafford.

My mother made me a pretty dress and a brown cape. I found a rabbit under my bed.

I saw a red bird in a tree at home.

I was at home for two weeks.

—Peggy Groninger.

My mother bought me nine sticks of candy. I brought the candy to school. I wore a red shirt to school. My grandma gave me four shirts.

My daddy gave me four cars.

—Mike Atkinson.

My daddy, mother and I went to my grandma's house Easter Sunday. My mother and father bought me a yellow vest. My grandma gave me some roller skates for Easter.

My mother and I went to the dentist.

Jan cut my hair.

—Debbie Owens.

Mrs. Holmes' Class

Once upon a time some monsters lived in a mysterious castle. The castle was not enchanted. The monster locked the door because soon the Voodoo woman would come. Then I flew to the mysterious castle on my magic carpet. I saw the Voodoo woman. I killed her. I was afraid. Then I saw a spook. I hurried and went off on my magic carpet to a cave. I saw a man with sharp teeth. I killed him. Then I flew on my magic carpet up to the clouds. I lived happily ever after.—Steven Diller.

Once upon a time I rode magic carpet I landed in front of a mysterious castle.

Bats, ghosts, magic spoon and mice lived in the castle. The mysterious castle was not enchanted.

A tarantula came to the door. The tarantula fell and three of his legs stuck in the floor. Its legs were broken. Afterawhile the bats, ghosts, magic spoons and mice be-

Black Deaf People

Non-White Deaf Persons: Educational, Psychological, and Occupational Considerations

A Review of the Literature

Frank G. Bowe, Jr., Washington, D. C.

Widely scattered information on non-white deaf persons has been collected and analyzed. Perhaps the most significant finding concerns the paucity of research data available. Large gaps in our knowledge are apparent in every aspect of the problem. Analysis of what data is presented reveals lower educational and occupational attainments for the non-white segment of the deaf population than for the white segment. Although the limited data on the psychological characteristics of this group are suggestive, they are not conclusive. The need for extensive further research on the non-white deaf is as crucial as it is evident.

They are deaf in a 'hearing world,' black-, red- or yellow-skinned in a color-conscious country. Many of them live in the inner city. Their mother tongue might be some variety of Black English, an Indian dialect, or it may be Spanish. It is suspected that a somewhat higher proportion of their number is multiply handicapped. They are the non-white deaf.

In view of the often-staggering problems faced by this group, it is somewhat surprising to discover that no major research study focusing primarily upon this segment of the deaf population has been published. Basic questions remain unanswered. For example, "How many nonwhite deaf are there in the country today? What are their achievement levels? Communication scores? Intellectual levels? Social functioning abilities? Occupations? Earnings? Psychological adjustment? Secondary handicaps? Generally, what is the effect, if any, of the additional minority group status upon these deaf persons?"

Although little national data is available, it would be a mistake to conclude that nothing is known about this segment of the deaf population. Some general patterns can be drawn from information collected by recent research studies. This paper presents these emerging patterns.

The data presented must be interpreted with considerable care insofar as they are based upon very small populations. Assuming one profoundly deaf person per 1,000[1] in the Negro population, we arrive at an estimate of 22,000 Negro deaf persons in the United States today. A relatively small number of other non-whites would be added to this total. Vague as the resulting figure is, it provides some frame of reference against which to evaluate the non-white deaf samples from various research studies.

Lunde and Bigman's 1959 national survey[2] turned up a non-white deaf sample of 344. This figure represents 3% of their total deaf sample of 10,101. Unfortunately, the non-white deaf sample, like the total sample. is at best a 'chunk' of the population, not a representative sample. Furfey and Harte found only four non-white deaf in Frederick County during their 1964 project.[3] Their Baltimore study[4]

Mr. Bowe is a graduate student at Gallaudet College, Washington, D.C. This review was prepared as part of a special project while employed as Research Assistant to L. Deno Reed, Sc. D., Executive Secretary, Sensory Study Section, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

but also in residential school programs for both white and Negro deaf children that are unnecessarily inferior. It was noted that the physical plants of the schools for the Negro deaf visited were markedly inferior to those of the schools for white children.

The eight states mentioned by the Babbidge Committee have since desegregated their schools for the deaf according to the 1970 *Directory of Services for the Deaf in the United States*. However, a number of states still maintain two residential institutions, one of which, according to knowledgeable educators, is generally much smaller, older, more meagerly equipped, and staffed with fewer, less well qualified teachers. It is often the latter school which most of the non-white deaf children of the state attend.

If we can accept the available data on educational achievement as at all representative, it would appear to indicate that many non-white deaf children have been shortchanged in their birthright to an education.

Psychological Development

What effect does the additional minority group status of the non-white deaf have upon their psychological development? Their measured mental abilities (IQ's)? Do the non-white deaf reflect the unrest and rebellion of Black America or does their communication problem diminish identification with their hearing peers? The literature presents no real answers to these engrossing questions.

Furfey and Harte[4] noted that 49% of their non-whites could not communicate with even average ability with other deaf persons, and 46% could not communicate effectively with hearing persons. This deficiency in communication skill is largely a function of under-education. Partly as a consequence, many of the Baltimore non-white deaf persons are social isolates.

Some data is available on the intelligence of Negro deaf children and youth. Testing the IQ's of Negroes is a hazardous undertaking,[8,9,10] perhaps exceeded only by the task of determining the IQ's of deaf children.[11,12,13] One of the more reliable studies on this problem is an effort[14] by the Georgia Department of Public Health on 164 children enrolled in the Georgia School for the Deaf (Negro Division) in 1964. The test employed was the Leiter International Performance Scale, with the usual five points being added to bring the scores into line with others.[15,16] The Leiter is generally regarded as one of the better scales for use with the deaf[12] and testing procedures were carefully followed.

The Georgia Negro deaf children obtained a mean IQ of 74.1, with a standard deviation of 14.59 and a range of 30 to 117. Exactly one half of the children fell within the educable mentally retarded range (51-75 IQ), another 30% were in the dull normal area (76-90), and 12% placed within the normal range (91-110).

These scores are much lower than those obtained in tests upon hearing Negroes.[17,18] Comparable data from the Florida School for the Deaf and the Blind reveals a median IQ for non-white deaf students of 83, which is closer to the national mean of 85 often reported for Negroes.[9] These findings must be judged in view of the validity of IQ tests with blacks, the relative effects of culture and heredity and a host of other confounding variables upon IQ.

Jensen[19-20] has argued against the popular assumption that IQ differences are almost entirely a result of environmental variables and the cultural bias of IQ tests. He suggests that genetic factors might be more important than environmental considerations, but this view has been vigorously attacked.[21,22]

The Bureau of Social Research at the Catholic University of America has conducted a study[23,24,25] on the intellectual stimulation of Negro ghetto infants in Washington, D.C. An experimental group of 28 infants was intensively tutored at home from the ages of 15 to 36 months. During that period their IQ's rose from a mean of 105 to a mean of 106. A control group of infants who were not exposed to the tutoring had IQ's that *fell* from a mean of 108 to 89. Given the generally low-level socio-economic status of the families of many non-white deaf children as revealed by some of the studies we have considered, could this kind of intellectual deprivation, augmented by the isolation inevitably introduced by deaf-

females of Washington, D.C. One third of the white deaf women in Lunde and Bigman's survey[2] reported earnings over $3,000 annually, but none of the non-white deaf women did. Seventy-five per cent of the white deaf men in this survey earned more than $3,000 annually, as compared to only 40% of the non-white deaf men. Only one non-white deaf person reported an income of over $6,000 in this survey.

Summary

Despite the absence of national studies on the non-white deaf, enough information is available in the literature to present a cursory overview. Such a survey reveals under-education and under-employment among the non-white deaf in excess of that found for white deaf persons. No definitive conclusions can be drawn from the data on intelligence reported.

References

1. Schein, J. D.: *The Deaf Community.* Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet College, 1968.

2. Lunde, A. S. and Bigman, S. K.: *Occupational Conditions Among the Deaf.* Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet College, 1959.

3. Furfey, P. H. and Harte, T. J.: *Interaction of Deaf and Hearing in Frederick County, Maryland.* Washington, D.C.: Catholic University, 1964.

4. Furfey, P. H. and Harte, T. J.: *Interaction of Deaf and Hearing in Baltmore City, Maryland.* Washington, D.C.: Catholic University, 1968

5. Manning, W. and Stansbury, E.: *Promoting Civil Service Employment Among the Deaf.* Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare publication, 1959.

6. Rainer, J. D. Altshuler, K. Z., Kallman, F. J., and Deming, W. E. (Eds.): *Family and Mental Health Problems in a Deaf Population.* New York; Department of Medical Genetics, New York State Psychiatric Institute, Columbia University, 1963.

7. Babbidge, H. D.: *Education of the Deaf:* a report to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare by his Advisory Committee on the Education of the Deaf. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare publication, 1964.

8. Garfunkel, F. and Blatt, B.: The standardization of intelligence tests on southern Negro school children. *Training School Bulletin,* **60**, 94-99, 1963.

9. Shuey, A. M.: *The Testing of Negro Intelligence.* Lynchburg, Va.: J. P. Bell, 1968.

10. Tumin, M. M.: (Ed.) *Race and Intelligence.* New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1963.

11. Furth, H. G.: Research with the deaf: implications for language and cognition. *Psychol. Bulletin,* **62**, 145-164, 1964.

12. Vernon, M. and Brown, D.: A guide to psychological tests and testing procedures in the evaluation of deaf and hard of hearing children. *Jour. Sp. Hear. Dis.,* **29**, pp. 414-423, 1964.

13. DuToit, J. M.: Measuring intelligence of deaf children. *Amer. Annals of the Deaf,* **99**, 237-251, 1954.

14. *A Health Survey of Negro Students, Georgia School for the Deaf, 1964 Part II.* Prepared by the School Health Service, Georgia Department of Public Health, May, 1967.

15. Beverly, L. and Bensberg, G.: A comparison of the Leiter, the Cornell-Coxe, and the Stanford-Binet with mental defectives. *Am. J. Mental Deficiency,* **57**, 89-91, 1952.

16. Orgel, A. R. and Dreger, R. M.: Comparative study of the Arthur-Leiter and Stanford-Binet intelligence scales. *J. Genetic Psychol.,* **86**, 359-365, 1955.

17. Kennedy, W. A., Van De Riet, V. and White, S. C., Jr.: A narrative sample of intelligence and achievement of Negro elementary school children in the S.E. United States. *Monographs of Soc. for Research in Child Devel.,* **28**, 1963.

18. Young, F. M. and Bright, H. A.: Results of testing 81 Negro rural juveniles with the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children, *J. Social Psychol.,* **39**, 219-226, 1954.

19. Jensen, A. R.: How much can we boost IQ and scholastic achievement? *Harvard Educ. Review,* **39**, 1-123 (Winter 1969).

20. Jensen, A. R. Reducing the heredity-environment uncertainty: a reply. *Harvard Educ. Review,* **39**, 449-483, (Summer 1969).

21. Anderson, E. N., Jr. The social factors have been ignored. (Correspondence: Political, Technical, and Theoretical Comments) *Harvard Educ. Review,* **39**, 581-585, (Summer 1969).

22. Light, R. L. and Smith, P. V. Social allocation models of intelligence: a methodological inquiry. *Harvard Educ. Review,* **39**, 484-510, (Summer 1969).

23. *Infant Education Research Project, Washington, D.C.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education publication No. OE-37033. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969.

24. Yahraes, H.: Reducing the effects of cultural deprivation. Mental Health Program Reports-4, National Clearinghouse for Mental Health Information publication No. 5026, January 1970.

25. Lloyd, G. (Ed.): International Research Seminar on the Vocational Rehabilitation of Deaf Persons. Report of a conference May 25-June 14, 1968. U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare publication, pp. 25-27, 1968.

26. Crammatte, A. B.: *Deaf Persons in Professional Employment.* Springfield, Ill.: Charles Thomas, 1968.

The Hoosier
"There's a language that is Mute; a silence that Speaks."
Vol. 82 MARCH, 1970 No. 7

Jean Bromberg

April 18, 1963 - February 26, 1970

OUR SCHOOL FAMILY mourns the death of Jean Bromberg, a delightful little six-year old girl, who was a pupil in the Willard Unit. Jean died February 26 as a result of complications due to measles.

She is survived by her parents, Mr. and Mrs. David J. Bromberg of Valparaiso, Indiana; one brother and one sister, both of the home; her maternal grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. Forrest Singer of Flat Rock, Ill., and her paternal grandmother, Mrs. Alma Bromberg of Valparaiso.

Jean's mother, the former Faye Singer, attended our school from September 1957 to April 1961. Her father attended the Detroit Lutheran School for the Deaf.

Our hearts go out in deepest sympathy to the Bromberg family for the loss of Jean.

community which currently is aware of the need for some control of their schools as well as for models for young people to identify with have begun a crusade for Negro teachers and administrators.

The deaf youngster faces an analagous situation in many repects (Sanderson, 1969). The National Association of the Deaf has long supported the use of the language of signs and fingerspelling. Yet the child is taught that these modalities, the only ones he can master for purposes of full communication with other deaf persons and with his family, are bad. This negative value is transmitted by its being forbidden to him and his family by the school. His teachers rarely know the language and refuse to use it if they do. Covertly and openly he and his parents are told that it is better if he chooses non-deaf friends. By By contrast the Jew, the Greek Orthodox and the American Oriental teach their ethnic languages and relate them to English, the end result being a better mastery of both and a more healthy communication between child and family (Schlesinger, 1967). In addition ethnic heritage is learned and cherished. Puerto Ricans, Negroes, Indians and deaf peoeple are told that their languages and customs and/or in the case of the Negro his idioms are undesirable and these are forbidden in schools. The children are not helped to relate these symbols to English and they are denied an opportunity to learn academic material through the help of modality they understand. The entire theory of "beginning where the child is" is ignored.

An early conclusion that may be drawn from these remarks is the necessity for the deaf community to have an influential role in the education of the young. Lacking this, one might expect to find teachers and administrators with little empathy and insight, who impose values and who fail to serve as identity models. This has been understood by perceptive deaf leaders who for years have fought for such representation, but with bitter frustration.

This discrimination against the deaf as a group may be observed on many levels. Most public school programs for deaf children, as for example in Chicago, forbid the hiring of deaf teachers. There are many teacher preparation centers which will not accept deaf candidates (Newman, 1969). National professional organizations have had movements to exclude deaf teachers. Although the Leadership Training Program of San Fernando Valley State College has accepted and prepared deserving deaf educators for administrative positions, they have not found ready acceptance for good positions despite their demonstrated competence. Gallaudet, the world's only college for the deaf, has a policy of selection and requirements for educational certification that discourages and/or eliminates many deaf young people from becoming teachers.

The essential importance and effect of the denial of representation to deaf people in the educational power structure is brought home with vivid impact by the federal government's handling of deafness. For example, the U.S. Office of Education with a gigantic budget and tremendous influence supports many teacher preparation programs which exclude deaf persons. While it spends vast sums in the field of deafness and offers many well paid positions in the area, a look at the Ph.D.'s and the leaders produced by these program reveals that they are invariably people of normal hearing. This is also true of those administering Office of Education projects. In preschool education no deaf people are represented and hearing leaders in this field such as child psychiatrists Hilde Schlesinger and Eugene Mindel, and sociologist Kay Meadows, who represent the views of the majority of deaf people, are conspicuous by their absence. It contributes to what Ullmann (1967) states is the most symptomatic characteristiic of modern bureaucracy—the growing imbalance between ability and authority.

As might have been predicted, an examination of the practices of the Office of Education reveals that in high level policy making positions in the area of deafness there are no deaf people. At lower levels there are some. In the state departments of education and in large city programs the situation is almost universally even worse, i.e., deaf persons are totally excluded. Furthermore, the efforts by organizations of the deaf to influence educators tend to be derogated as "non-professional."

The benefits that derive from having deaf persons play a prominent role in education are best demonstrated by the Rehabilitation Services Administration (RSA). The RSA with far less money and not nearly so much direct responsibility for education has supported programs which have produced a number of deaf Ph.D. candidates, a leadership program which accepts and graduates deaf leaders and deaf administrators and workshops in which deaf persons have had policy making roles. Furthermore grant funds from this agency have been awarded to organizations such as the National Association of the Deaf which are comprised of and run by and for deaf people. RSA's programs have also led to the establishment of new services such as the Council of Organizations Serving the Deaf, the Registry of Interpreters of the Deaf and the Communication Skills Program headed, not by hearing people, but by deaf administrators. It is not surprising that it is these programs that have had positive impact on the deaf community while many of those sponsored by other agencies have been characterized by "Lady Bountiful" pronouncements with little substantial benefit to deaf people.

Needless to say the "in group" educational power structure has resented the change in established procedures which has given more authority to deaf leadership. In reaction it has moved through other governmental agencies to create organizations and programs where control is not with deaf persons, but where the activities are termed "for the hearing impaired," yet where power and key positions are denied deaf persons. The lessons hopefully learned from the failure of many aspects of the poverty program and other phases of the "Great Society" have yet to be generalized to the field of deafness, i.e., the need for community involvement.

The conclusion one would have predicted from this comparison of

came frightened because they were afraid of tarantula. They yelled. They yelled, "Boo! OOO! KK! Bang! Coo Coo! ZZZ!

The ghost said. "What a mysterious castle. Boo!—Pamela Zeller.

Once upon a time a man was flying on a magic carpet. He was going to a mysterious castle. He knocked on the draw-bridge. A very wicked witch, a monster and Frankinstein came. They opened the door. The castle was not enchanted. They scared the little man and he ran away. He got on his magic carpet and flew home. He told the boss of the little men to go and help kill the wicked witch, monster and Frankenstein. The boss flew to the mysterious castle on his magic carpet and killed them. The little men lived happily ever after.

—Jodie Scharfenberger.

Once upon a time I rode on a magic carpet. I landed at a mysterious castle. A witch, giant, ghost, bat, monster, skeleton and bad killer lived in the castle. The mysterious castle was not enchanted. A mean ugly witch came to the door. I went into the castle and I was afraid. The witch had a magic wand. I looked all around. I was afraid and I ran back to my magic carpet. I flew home. No one hurt me I was not afraid anymore and I lived happily ever after.

—Kevin Reagan.

Once upon a time Snoopy, Charlie Brown, Lucy and Mighty Mouse landed at a myterious castle. They knocked on the door and a skeleton came. Snoopy ran and shot him. Then a giant named Fred asked his wife, Pam, Where is John the skeleton?" Pam said, "He is dead."

Suddenly Charlie Brown and Mighty Mouse came on their magic carpet called "The Red Baron," and went into the castle. They shot some of the monsters and shot the jolly giant. Mighty Mouse took the giant's money. The giant's wife used her magic and she disappeared. Mighty Mouse and his friends went away and lived happily ever after.—Carl Pramuk.

Mrs. Huyber's Class

My brother has a birthday April 11, 1970. He will be 10 years old.

I have new gym shoes.

I have a new green suit.

—Dean Timberlake.

I got new shoes.

Patty, Roy and I made a snowman. Patty is at school.

I will go home in the car with mother, April 17, 1970.

—Joe Koreba.

I play ball with Erin at home.

Mother will go to work.

My brother will go to school.

I will go home Friday, April 17, 1970.—Beth Kifer.

My mother has twin babies. One baby is a girl. One baby is a boy.

—Jerry Rowe.

I am a new girl in school. My name is Brenda.—Brenda Dich.

I have a picture of myself. It was made in December 18, 1969.

My sister Christy is a girl.

—Joni Kay Schultz.

The sun is bright. We will go to gym today. Brenda is a new girl in school. I have an old coat.

—Annalisa Metz.

I brought a doll to school today.

—Debbie Lott.

I have a new shirt and new socks. I have new pants yesterday. I had new shoes yesterday.

—Brent Jackson.

Mrs. Campbell's Class

My father cut my hair. My mother said, "You look like a girl." I have new shoes. My brother said, "Why do you have two new pairs of shoes?" I said, "Because my boots are worn out."—Phil.

I went to the zoo in Cincinnati, Ohio, Easter vacation. My grandmother stuck out her tongue at a balloon. The balloon screamed at my grandmother. I could hear the lions roar.—Kathy.

Last Saturday night my family went to a pancake supper at the church. I ate three pancakes and sausage. Many people were there. We went home at 8:00.

Cathy

My mother and I went to Penney's store. Water was in a camera and I was afraid. Mother bought me a blue pant skirt, a pair of red leotites and a red sweat shirt. We ate hot dogs with lots of mustard.—Dina.

My grandpa bought three Easter baskets. On Easter morning my two sisters and I looked for Easter eggs. I found 19 and my sisters found 5.—Susan.

My sister Joani had a birthday party April 3. She is 11 years old. Five girls came. They played baseball and kickball with me. We ate cake and ice cream.—Pat.

Kris and I went to Jennifer's house to stay all night. We sneaked downstairs to the kitchen and got some Fresca. We looked at Jennifer's baby book. Her mother was asleep. Jennifer's cat jumped on my bed. Then she ran downstairs in a few minutes.

—Cheri.

Easter vacation the snow was very deep in Gary and Hobart. I shoveled the sidewalk for my father. Then I made a huge snowman with stick arms, a stick mouth and a carrot nose. I put my hat on his head, my sunglasses over his eyes, my tie around his neck, my belt around his waist and my gloves on his hands. Everyone liked my snowman. The next day the sun melted my snowman. I was sad.

—Mike.

Mother gave me some money at home last week. I went to the store and bought a pair of roller skates. They cost $1.50. Then I went roller skating with my sister Virginia and Debbie Menn.—Jimmy.

DEAFNESS AND MINORITY GROUP DYNAMICS

(Continued from page four.)

the United States one sees parent-teacher association meetings without interpreter for deaf parents of deaf children despite the fact that they represent 10 per cent of all parents of deaf children (Rainer et al, 1963). Often there is no faculty member in the school who can or will communicate with these parents about their child manually. a modality that many deaf parents require for effective communication. Nor will these schools obtain the services of interpreters.

The tragedy of this denial of deafness is that it leads the deaf child to think it is wrong to be deaf, that he is necessarily inferior. The implication is that if he does not try to deny his deafness he is failing to cope with it.

Unfortunately this misleading message usually comes to parents from professionals in the field.

found 35 Negroes and two American Indians.

Schein's data on non-white deaf persons in Washington, D.C., are based upon a sample of 187 (90 males and 97 females) from a total deaf sample of 1,132. A recent District of Columbia Department of Vocational Rehabilitation project[5] involved 44 nonwhite deaf persons from Detroit, Baltimore and Washington, D.C., as well as 112 whites.

Only Schein's sample can be considered at all representative. The problems in case-finding demonstrated to some extent by all five studies can be attributed to several factors, among others: the racial characteristics of the enumerators; the poverty of many of the subjects; social isolation; insufficient communication skills among many of the respondents; and the natural reluctance of many deaf persons to surrender personal information to strangers, a reluctance perhaps accentuated by their additional minority group status and low educational levels.

Very little information is available from research projects beyond these five. As a consequence of Title 6 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, research studies which potentially might have contributed knowledge essential for improving services to non-white deaf persons have not classified their data for race.

Educational Achievement

The non-white deaf persons in the various samples reported less educational achievement overall than did their white deaf peers (Table I). According to Lunde and Bigman,[2] twice as high a proportion of non-whites reported eight years or less of school attendance; virtually none of the non-whites in their sample had completed more than one year of college. Racial discrimination at Gallaudet prior to 1945 may be one factor contributing to the latter phenomenon.

Furfey and Harte[4] also found their non-whites to be educationally disadvantaged. While none of the whites surveyed reported less than four years in school, 11% of the non-whites did. Twice as high a proportion of the whites had received a high school education.

Table 1. — Percent White and Nonwhite Deaf Reporting Any College

	Schein[1]	Lunde and Bigman[2]
White deaf		
male	41	9 5
female	34	10.1
Nonwhite deaf		
male	9	2 4
female	5	0

Schein[1] found that 41% of his white deaf males had "some college, no BA," while the corresponding figure for the white deaf females was 34%. However, Schein counted the preparatory year at Gallaudet as "some college, no BA" which partially accounts for his high scores. Another factor inflating these figures would be the selective nature of Washington, D.C., as a deaf community. Despite these influences, only 9% of the non-white deaf females reported any education at the college level. Half of these males (4.5%) and one-fifth of these females (1%) attained a bachelor's degree.

More typical educational figures are presented by Lunde and Bigman[2] and Rainer *et al.*[6] The former reported that less than 10% of their total sample had one or more years of college; the latter put the figure at 3.7% for New York State. A very small percentage of the non-whites in these surveys reported any college.

The under-education of non-white deaf persons goes far beyond mere years in school. Their inferior preparation is often explained as a function of segregation in inferior institutions for Negro deaf children. For example, the Babbidge Report[7] states (p. 28):

> In 1949, according to the *American Annals of the Deaf*, separate residential schools were maintained for white and Negro deaf children in 13 states; in 1963, this total had dropped to eight. In six of these eight states, the combined total of deaf children enrolled is less than most educators of the deaf consider necessary to sustain a school program of 12 grades. It is thus reasonable to conclude that the continued violation of a generally accepted principle and established public policy results not only in an injustice to the Negro deaf,

ness, account in large part for the low IQ scores many non-white deaf children apparently demonstrate?

To conclude then, we know very little about the status of non-white deaf persons psychologically, probably less than we do regarding their educational and occupational levels.

Occupational Levels

The occupational levels of the adult Negro deaf reflect the built-in handicaps of deafness and color. Finding a job commensurate with his ability appears to present staggering problems for a non-white deaf person.

Schein[1] studied the occupational distribution of deaf adults of Washington, D.C., who were in the labor force. He found that one in five white deaf persons occupies a professional or technical position; by contrast, fewer than one in 50 non-white deaf persons does. Half the white deaf women can be found in clerical-sales positions; only one in 25 non-white deaf women holds such a relatively desirable job. Almost half the non-white deaf women were unemployed, as contrasted to less than one-tenth of the whites. The unemployment rate for the non-white deaf men is almost four times that for the white deaf men. Schein's exact figures are presented in Table 2, which is taken from his Table 6.1.

Lunde and Bigman[2] reported similar results for their 1959 national survey, finding 5.5% of their non-white deaf males in the upper three occupational levels — professional-technical; manager, officials, owner; and clerical-sales. Crammatte's nationwide effort[26] to find deaf professionals who had scaled "The Formidable Peak" to executive positions uncovered "no Negro deaf professionals other than teachers . . . despite diligent efforts."

The D.C. Department of Vocational Rehabilitation's 1969 project[5] attempted to instruct low-achieving deaf persons so as to enable them to pass civil service examinations. For non-white deaf persons, this effort is especially commendable, insofar as they may expect less racial discrimination in the hands of the Federal Government. However, the deleterious conditions surrounding their previous education doomed this project to what was essentially failure as far as the non-whites were concerned: 70.45% of them failed the exam despite intensive training, almost double the proportion (38.36%) of the whites who failed.

Table 2. — Percent Distribution of Deaf Persons in the Labor Force* by Principal Occupation, Sex and Color: Metropolitan Washington, D.C. (Schein[1] Table 6.1)

Occupational Category	White		Nonwhite	
	Male (N=418)	Female (N=242)	Male (N=83)	Female (N=51)
Professional and Technical	21.5	19.4	1.2	2.0
Managers, Officials and Owners	3.4	†	2.4	—
Clerical and Sales	11.0	48.3	4.8	3.9
Craftsmen, Repairmen and Foremen	48.8	14.0	15.7	2.0
Operatives, Apprentices, and Related Workers	5.3	5.8	18.1	31.4
Service Workers	1.9	2.5	19.3	11.8
Laborers	3.8	†	21.7	7.8
Domestics	—	†	—	9.8
Unemployed	4.3	7.4	16.9	41.2

* Housewives, students, retired persons, etc. are not considered to be in the labor force. Only persons working or seeking employment (if no other principal occupation is noted) are considered in this category

† Less than 1%.

Table 3. — Median Earnings: White + Nonwhite

	Schein[1]	Lunde and Bigman[2]
White deaf		
male	$6,473	$3,000-3,999
female	3,542	2,000-2,999
Nonwhite deaf		
male	2,611	2,000-2,999
female	990	1,000-1,999

The generally low-level occupations and substandard education of many non-white deaf persons result in low overall earnings figures (Table 3). Schein[1] discovered that his non-white deaf males had median earnings of $2,611 compared to $6,473 for white deaf males.

Non-white deaf females reported a median of $990, compared to $3,542 for the white deaf

Problems of Severely Handicapped Deaf

Implications for Educational Programs

Larry G. Stewart, Ed.D., Hot Springs, Ark.

A study of multiply handicapped deaf adults at the Hot Springs project revealed that communication inadequacies and behavioral problems were central obstacles to rehabilitation. Despite average intelligence and an 11 year average of prior schooling, the subjects progressed slowly at the center and experienced an extremely high attrition rate (55%). Special staff training was fundamental to success with the population, as well as relatively flexible standards for student conduct and in-depth services such as personal adjustment training, counseling, and work adjustment training. The findings suggest need for increased attempts at preschool education for young deaf children, parent education and counseling, strengthening dormitory programs in elementary and secondary schools, stronger counseling and guidance programs, and greater involvement in total education from teachers. Total communication is viewed as one possible solution to the communication problems, when initiated at an early age and used by parents and teachers. A special rehabilitation facility for severely handicapped deaf people can fill the need for appropriate training and adjustment following secondary school. Such a center, staffed by competent and dedicated personnel, should be able to make significant progress in efforts to educate and rehabilitate this population segment.

In recent years the literature dealing with the education and rehabilitation of deaf people has given increasing attention to those who are referred to as either multiply handicapped, severely handicapped, or seriously disadvantaged. Several recent publications, in fact, focused exclusively on the problems and needs of these low achieving deaf people.[1-4] Generally, this literature made a definite contribution in that it uncovered the size and magnitude of the problems involved in educating and rehabilitating severely handicapped deaf people. Yet, as one reviews the scene it becomes abundantly clear that the field has yet to mount a concerted, systematic attack on the problems that beset these people and the lack of effective teaching methodology.

There are several central obstacles that impede our work with severely handicapped deaf people. The first is that of vague nomenclature. The terms used in reference to the population with which we are concerned have been inadequate if not actually misleading. For example, under the broad rubric "Multiply Handicapped" come such multiple handicaps as deafness/blindness, deafness/cerebral palsy, deafness/minimal brain dysfunction, deafness/emotional disturbance, deafness/paraplegia, and, of course, various combinations where the individual has three or more handicaps. Thus, the term "Multiply Handicapped" tells little more than that two or more handicaps are involved. Development of a nomenclature that permits good communication among other workers is the only hope for reaching a better understanding of our work.

Second, the literature suggests we have given adequate attention to describing the physical bases of multiple handicaps[4], but comparatively little attention has been given to the socio-cultural and family interaction variables that possibly may account for the severity of impact of many disabilities. I suggest that much greater attention should be given to these variables since they are amenable to earliy therapeutic intervention.

Third, a sampling of the literature[5-8] reveals that systematic teaching methods based upon principles of behavior modification yield gratifying results with deaf children having emotional problems and learning disabilities. Yet, many schools and rehabilitation programs do not apply this knowledge with their deaf

---

Dr. Stewart was Director, Services for the Deaf, Arkansas Rehabilitation Research and Training Center, Hot Springs 71901 until June 1, 1971. He is now on the staff of New York University.

This article was made possible through a research and demonstration project jointly sponsored by the Social and Rehabilitation Service, Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Arkansas Rehabilitation Research and Training Center.

Reprint requests to 80 Washington Square, E., Room 51, New York, N.Y. 10003.