From: "D. Landrum" < DRLoffice@AUSTIN.RR.COM>
To: < RORSCHACH@MAELSTROM.STJOHNS.EDU>

Subject: Fw: Testing deaf persons

Date: 27 February, 2004 06:29

Jan -

I do a lot of assessments with deaf people (outpatient now, used to do inpatient). I sign, so I don't use an interpreter and have a more direct experience with the misinterpretations that can occur. The biggest problem I have had is, like with any language-based assessment measure, ASL is not English. How many times have you been sure the person responding was looking at the color or shading, but since they don't articulate either that, or some sort of signal for you to query, you can't score it? **We score based on what a person articulates, not what they mean.** ASL is so conceptual, that our reliance on a certain type of wording really limits what we can get out of it for a deaf person.

I have found that when testing deaf individuals (especially those from deaf families) I feel like I am saying (signing) all the types of leading kinds of questions that I never would for hearing individuals. For example (and this has been confirmed by an interpreter I used to work with who worked in an inpatient deaf unit for many years), the initial query, "What might this be"? When signed, is really a whole lot more like, "What does this look like," or "Imagine what this is." This isn't supposed to be a test of imagination. When you ask, "What makes it look like that?" it ends up being more of "Why does it look like that," which could lead to different responses.

I have not done a study, but informally I think we are more likely to see FDs in deaf people, whose language involves a tremendous amount of describing objects in reference to their placement relative to others, and more PER (as well as DRs), since telling personal stories to respond to information is culturally expected.

In general, I think it depends on the cultural identification with the deaf community, the degree to which the person knows English, and the skill of the examiner or interpreter greatly affects how much the results would be valid. I tend not to use the Rorschach on deaf people anymore.

I haven't found any really useful literature; although a few years ago someone sent me some references (I think it was Tony Sciara). You might write him to check it out.

Take Care, Doreen

Doreen R. Landrum, Ph.D. Director, APC 1500 W. 38th Street, Suite 53

```
Austin, TX 78731
  (512) 377-2500
  (512) 377-2501 - fax
  ---- Original Message -----
  From: "Richard Sethre, Psy. D., L.P." <drsethre@sihope.com>
  To: <RORSCHACH@MAELSTROM.STJOHNS.EDU>
  Sent: Thursday, February 26, 2004 10:15 AM
  Subject: Re: Testing deaf persons
  > Hi.
  > I used to do psychological testing on a specialized hospital unit that
  > provided chemical dependency treatment for hard of hearing patients. I
  > used the Rorschach, with sign language interpreters, about 20 times, and
  > the consensus was that it was better than nothing, but there were problems
  > with the translators. Most of them tended to overempathize with the
  > patient, and to "help" them with their responses.
  > On the other hand, if there is no other objective data available, it seemed
  > like the resulting Rorschach protocols provided helpful info, as long as
  > they were interpreted cautiously.
    Dick Sethre
  > Minneapolis
---- Original Message -----
  > From: "Barry Ritzler" < Barry.Ritzler@LIU.EDU>
  > To: <RORSCHACH@MAELSTROM.STJOHNS.EDU>
  > Sent: Thursday, February 26, 2004 10:05 AM
  > Subject: Re: Testing deaf persons
  >
  >
  > Jan,
  >
       We used sign language interpreters when I was at the University of
  > Rochester and we had some concerns about the accuracy of the translations
  > from the interpreter. Also, sign language tends to abbreviate information
  > that might convey more subtle implications in original form.
  >
  > Barry
  > ----Original Message-----
  > From: Jan Ivanouw [mailto:ivanouw@POST8.TELE.DK]
  > Sent: Wed 2/25/2004 1:49 PM
         RORSCHACH@MAELSTROM.STJOHNS.EDU
  > To:
```

- > Cc:
- > Subject: Testing deaf persons
- > I am supervising a group of psychologists which are doing assessments of
- > deaf people and I wanted to give them some useful literature reference about a administration problems. It seems that there are not that many. The one that keeps coming up is a study by Schwarz et al.

>

- > I also know that this topic has been up in the list some time ago.
- > My question is: do any one on the list have new information about
- > administration problems using the Rorschach with deaf people?

>

> Jan Ivanouw PhD