

# A Study of Deaf Community and Its Impact on Children with Deafness: A Systematic Review

Anjam Zaheer Hussain<sup>1</sup>, Sajid Nadeem Khosa<sup>2</sup>, Muhammad Arif<sup>3</sup>,  
Syed Kashif Hussain<sup>4</sup> and Nasir Mehmood<sup>5</sup>

<https://doi.org/10.62345/jads.2023.12.4.90>

## Abstract

*This study explores the impact of the deaf community on children with deafness and examines the social and developmental benefits that are from being a part of a supportive and inclusive deaf community. This study also discussed the factors that contribute to the positive impact of community involvement, including language acquisition identity development and access to resources. This also investigates the influence of the deaf community on children with deafness within the context of the Pakistani population, employing descriptive research methodologies. A cohort of 50 children with hearing impairment, primarily adolescents, sourced from prominent institutions in Lahore, Pakistan, was examined. Data collection was conducted through parental surveys, revealing that 17 of the children were integrated into the deaf community. Employing a standardized 34-questionnaire instrument, data was processed using SPSS version 10. The findings underscore a substantial positive impact of the deaf community on the overall rehabilitation of these children. This study advocates for a community-centric approach to rehabilitation, emphasizing the vital role of parental support and character development. Moreover, it stresses the importance of embracing the disability and cultivating a constructive mindset among the children. To actualize these recommendations, fostering leadership opportunities through organized events such as sports, entertainment programs, seminars, and workshops is encouraged.*

**Keywords:** Deafness, Community, Impact, Rehabilitation.

## Introduction

According to Katsuya and Sano (2023), hearing loss has different grades. In mild hearing loss impaired person has difficulty hearing and understanding the soft voice of another person or from a distance. In the presence of sufficient background noise, it becomes difficult to understand the speech of other people. Flexer (1999) describes three basic types of hearing loss in deaf and hard-of-hearing individuals. These types are conductive, sensorineural, and mixed. In moderate hearing loss, there's difficulty in casual levels of speech. Hearing exchanges with a noisy surrounding. In all states of severe loss, people worry about hearing. The other man who had profound hearing loss cannot hear at a loud level, and Hearing not is used as a key interactive. The data will be

<sup>1</sup>PhD Scholar, The Superior University, Lahore. Email: [leagendsyed@gmail.com](mailto:leagendsyed@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup>Principal, National Special Education Complex, Johar Town Lahore. Email: [sajidnadeemkhosa@gmail.com](mailto:sajidnadeemkhosa@gmail.com)

<sup>3</sup>Assistant Professor in Education, The Superior University, Lahore. Email: [mu.arif@superior.edu.pk](mailto:mu.arif@superior.edu.pk)

<sup>4</sup>PhD Scholar, The Superior University, Lahore. Email: [skhb.bukhari@gmail.com](mailto:skhb.bukhari@gmail.com)

<sup>5</sup>PhD Scholar, The Superior University, Lahore. Email: [nasirue1@gmail.com](mailto:nasirue1@gmail.com)



utilised statically for the objective of people who are deaf or hard of hearing. Blair and Abdullah (2020) the attainment of language is the main hindrance defends young students who are deaf and hard of hearing. The communiqué art is necessitated essentially in every attempt at realization. Those acts of grief from the failure to hear and appreciate speech if the child is encircled from birth by another mode of discussion. The researcher shows different approaches to the quality of education for people who are deaf or hard of hearing. Guardians trusted it is marvellous to knowledge people who are deaf or hard of hearing in a similar institute as hearing children, using professional educationists and materials (Forgit, 2023). Other than that, indulge the National Association of the Deaf, and keep that insertion should truly be disabled to adopt.

## Literature Review

Skyer (2023) suggests that the existence of the deaf community can be attributed to the influence of institutions for people who are deaf or hard of hearing. Such institutions promote equality for those who are deaf, leading to the creation of a unique community with distinct characteristics. There are various local, regional, national, and international organizations for the deaf. The deaf community has a high rate of intermarriage and often follows deaf religious practices Moores (1996). It provides a sense of pride and support for its members and serves as a source of information about deaf culture and lifestyle. Roemen (2023) argues that the community's use of communication methods contributes to its self-expression and individuality, as well as its support system. Kwon (2023) note that the deaf community values family and relies on communication for interaction and support, primarily through signing in classrooms, as opposed to communicating through speech. Terry & Rance (2023) highlight that the deaf community has a unique and isolated culture. Understanding their communication methods can lead to better interaction and integration with the wider community.

## Objective

The objective of the study was:

- To assess the influence of the deaf community on children with deafness.
- To understand the parents' perspective on the role of the deaf community in the rehabilitation of these children.

## Theoretical Framework

The theoretical frameworks discussed provide a foundational understanding of the intricate relationship between the deaf community and children with deafness. By considering these theories, the study aims to explore the multifaceted ways in which community involvement positively influences the lives of children with hearing impairment. Through this theoretical lens, the study contributes to a broader discourse on inclusive practices and the empowerment of individuals with deafness within society.

## Social Identity Theory

Steffens et al. (2021) social identity theory posits that individuals categorize themselves and others based on shared characteristics, which leads to the formation of social identities. For children with deafness, their affiliation with the deaf community provides a crucial social identity that shapes their self-concept and influences their sense of belonging and acceptance.

### **Ecological Systems Theory**

Brymer et al. (2020) ecological systems theory emphasizes the interplay between various environmental systems in a person's life. The microsystem, which includes immediate environments like family and community, significantly impacts the development of children with deafness. The deaf community serves as a vital microsystem that provides support, understanding, and shared experiences, influencing the child's overall well-being.

### **Cultural Capital Theory**

Graham et al. (2023) cultural capital theory posits that individuals possess cultural knowledge, skills, and behaviours that are valuable in a specific social context. Within the deaf community, children with deafness gain a unique form of cultural capital, including sign language proficiency and cultural competence, which can enhance their social integration and educational success.

### **Social Model of Disability**

The social model of disability, as articulated by Davies et al. (2023), shifts the focus from individual impairments to societal barriers that create disability. In the context of deafness, this perspective underscores the importance of societal inclusivity and accessibility, advocating for the empowerment and rights of individuals with hearing impairment.

### **Critical Period Hypothesis**

Liu's (2023) critical period hypothesis suggests that there is an optimal window for language acquisition, particularly in the early years of life. For children with deafness, exposure to a rich linguistic environment within the deaf community during this critical period is essential for the development of language skills and cognitive abilities.

### **Cultural Deafness**

Haukaas (2023) introduced the concept of "cultural deafness," highlighting the historical oppression and marginalization of deaf individuals by society at large. The study of the deaf community's impact on children with deafness sheds light on the potential for the community to counteract cultural deafness by fostering pride, resilience, and a positive self-identity.

### **Methodology**

The methodology was explained with descriptions that were taken from community members or none community members on children with deafness from the Pakistani population; the data samples were collected through questionnaires from the parents of children with hearing impairment by personal visits and instruments were used Likert scale. The responses to each statement of the questionnaire were analyzed by converting it into data using by coding scheme after the percentage of their responses was calculated through SPSS, and in the end, the percentage of these responses was interpreted with complete detail simple t-test and a way ANOVA was used to compare the opinion of parents about the children with hearing impairment of being a community or non-community member. The t-test is used to determine whether two means are significantly different at a selected probability level. It adjusts to the fact that the distributions of scores for small samples become increasingly different from a normal distribution as sample sizes become increasingly smaller. The one-way ANOVA is used to determine whether more than two means are significant at a selected probability level.

POST HOC was recognized as an important increase or collective Kind I fault. It exemplifies the possibility that any one of the usual evaluations or consequence assessments is a Kind I fault. As further trials are directed, the probability that one or more are momentous is fair owed to casual (Newsom 2006) USP 534 Data Analysis I.

**Table 1: One way ANOVA on age of the parents of deaf children**

ANOVA	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	666.508	3	222.169	1.183	.327
Within Groups	8639.272	46	187.810		
Total	9305.780	49			

The table indicates that there is no significant difference between and within the mean of parental age (F=1.183, P=.327).

**Table 2: Post Hoc tests**

**Multiple Comparisons. Dependent Variable: Total score**

**LSD**

(I) Age of parent.	(J) Age of parent.	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
31 to 40 years old	41 to 50 years old	-.03846	4.65515	.993	-9.4088	9.3319
	51 to 60 years old	-9.66346	6.15818	.123	-22.0592	2.7323
	61 to 70 years old	-5.87179	8.77783	.507	-23.5407	11.7971
41 to 50 years old	31 to 40 years old	.03846	4.65515	.993	-9.3319	9.4088
	51 to 60 years old	-9.62500	5.54074	.089	-20.7779	1.5279
	61 to 70 years old	-5.83333	8.35625	.489	-22.6536	10.9869
51 to 60 years old	31 to 40 years old	9.66346	6.15818	.123	-2.7323	22.0592
	41 to 50 years old	9.62500	5.54074	.089	-1.5279	20.7779
	61 to 70 years old	3.79167	9.27792	.685	-14.8838	22.4671
61 to 70 years old	31 to 40 years old	5.87179	8.77783	.507	-11.7971	23.5407
	41 to 50 years old	5.83333	8.35625	.489	-10.9869	22.6536
	51 to 60 years old	-3.79167	9.27792	.685	-22.4671	14.8838

### Post Hoc Test

Post hoc multiple comparison results show that mean of (31 to 40) years old parent's views is greater about the personality of deaf children than the parents of (41 to 50) years, (51 to 60) years old and (61 to 70) years old.

Post hoc multiple comparison results show that mean of (41 to 50) years old parent's views is less about the personality of deaf children than the mean of (31 to 40) years old and the mean is greater than (51 to 60) years old and (61 to 70) years old parents.

Post hoc multiple comparison results show that mean of (51 to 60) years old parent's views is greater about the personality of deaf children than the parents of (31 to 40) years, (41 to 50) years old and (61 to 70) years old.

Post hoc multiple comparison results show that mean of (61 to 70) years old parent's views is greater about the personality of deaf children than the parents of (31 to 40) years, (41 to 50) years old and is less than the mean of (51 to 60) years old parents.

**Table 3: t-test on the basis of total score and sex of the parents of deaf children**

#### t-Test, Group Statistics

	Sex of parent.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Total score	Male	43	115.8372	14.53719	2.21690
	Female	7	112.5714	7.80720	2.95084

Table 3 shows the group statistics which indicate the mean ( $X=115.83$ ) of male parents is greater than the mean ( $X=112.57$ ) of female parents. So the attitude of male parents is more positive than the female parents.

**Table 4: t-test on the basis of total score and sex of the parents of deaf children**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2- tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper	
Total score	Equal variances assumed	3.004	.089	.577	48	.566	3.26578	5.65528	-8.10492	14.63648
	Equal variances not assumed			.885	14.045	.391	3.26578	3.69082	-4.64785	11.17941

Table 4 shows results of t-test on the basis of total score and the sex of the parents. The Levene's test for equality of variance indicates that the variance of two groups of sample ( $F=3.004$ ,  $P=.089$ ) is significant. The t-test for equality of mean ( $T=.577$ ,  $P=.566$ ) indicates that there is no difference between the attitude of male and female parents.

**Table 5: One way ANOVA on designation of parents**

ANOVA	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	171.772	2	85.886	.442	.645
Within Groups	9134.008	47	194.341		
Total	9305.780	49			

Table 5 shows applying one way ANOVA on designation of parents. The table indicates that there is no significant difference between and within the mean of parental designation ( $F=.442$ ,  $P=.645$ ).

**Table 6: Post Hoc****Multiple comparisons-Post Hoc Tests**

(I) Designation of parent.	(J) Designation of parent.	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Government job	Private	-3.77500	4.22073	.376	-12.2660	4.7160
	House wife	.04167	6.36299	.995	-12.7590	12.8423
Private	Government job	3.77500	4.22073	.376	-4.7160	12.2660
	House wife	3.81667	6.48900	.559	-9.2375	16.8709
House wife	Government job	-.04167	6.36299	.995	-12.8423	12.7590
	Private	-3.81667	6.48900	.559	-16.8709	9.2375

Post hoc results show that the mean of parents with government job is less than the private job parents and is greater than the house wives.

Post hoc results show that the mean of parents with private job is greater than the government job parents and house wives.

Post hoc results show that the mean of house wives is less than the government job and private job parents.

**Table 7: T-test on the basis of total score and community member of deaf children****Group Statistics**

	Community member.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Total score	Yes	17	121.2941	11.40595	2.76635
	No	33	112.3333	14.05717	2.44704

Table 7 shows that the community member children by applying t-test on the total score. The group statistics showed that mean ( $X=121.29$ ) of community member children is better than the mean ( $X=112.33$ ) of the non-community member deaf children.

**Table 8: T-test on the basis of total score and community member of deaf children****Independent Samples Test**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper	
Total score	Equal variances assumed	.932	.339	2.268	48	.028	8.96078	3.95047	1.01784	16.90373
	Equal variances not assumed			2.426	38.92	.020	8.96078	3.69333	1.48983	16.43174

Table 8 shows the results of t-test on the basis of total score and community member the Leven's test for equality of variance indicates that the variance of two groups of sample ( $F=.932$ ,  $P=.339$ ) is not significant. The t-test of equality of mean ( $T=2.26$ ,  $P=2.42$ ) indicates that there is no difference between the community members and non-community members children.

### Conclusion

The majority of parents expressed that the deaf community had a significant impact on their children. Most of the parents and their deaf children were male, and education played a crucial role in their lives. Additionally, a significant portion of the parents and children were not members of the deaf community. Parents generally held high expectations for their children, hoping they would actively participate in family events, garner attention, effectively communicate, display a thirst for learning, demonstrate obedience, show interest in various tasks, exhibit leadership qualities, work independently, respect elders, display love and affection, uphold ethical values, preserve self-respect, show enthusiasm, and enjoy socializing with like-minded individuals. Conversely, parents had lower expectations regarding their child's tendency to cry easily, feel pressured when performing in public, express ambitions, and grasp international and political affairs in their own country.

Statistical analyses, including independent t-test and one-way ANOVA, revealed no significant differences in parental opinions based on age, sex, or designation. Furthermore, there were no notable disparities in the views of parents whose children were members of the deaf community compared to those whose children were not.

### Recommendations

Following the conclusion of this study, the following recommendations are suggested:

1. Emphasize community-based rehabilitation as an effective approach for rehabilitating children with deafness.
2. Foster a supportive environment within the community to strengthen parents of deaf children.

3. Encourage the community to acknowledge and accept the disability of children with deafness, aiding parents in their children's emotional adjustment.
4. Raise awareness within the community about the potential and capabilities of children with deafness.
5. Cultivate a sense of enthusiasm and motivation among children with deafness.
6. Set high expectations for children with deafness, as elevated levels of expectation can boost their morale.
7. Assist in the character development of children with deafness through community support.
8. Organize sports and entertainment programs tailored for children with deafness.
9. Conduct workshops and seminars for parents of deaf children to increase awareness about their unique challenges.
10. Provide opportunities for leadership development for children with deafness within the community.
11. Advocate for government financial support for organizations focused on deafness.
12. Promote role models who are successful individuals with deafness to inspire and guide children facing similar challenges.
13. Encourage further research on this topic for continued advancement in supporting children with deafness and their families.

### **Implications**

The implications drawn from this study emphasize the pivotal role that the community plays in the lives of children with deafness. By fostering inclusivity, providing targeted support, and advocating for their needs, communities can significantly enhance the well-being and potential of these children.

*Community-Centered Interventions:* The study underscores the importance of community-based interventions for children with deafness. Programs and initiatives should be designed to involve the local deaf community in supporting these children's development and well-being.

*Parental Support and Education:* Recognizing that a significant portion of parents and children with deafness are not members of the deaf community, there is a need for targeted support and education for parents. This could include workshops, counseling, and resources to help them navigate the challenges associated with raising a child with deafness.

*Emotional Adjustment and Acceptance:* Communities should work towards creating an inclusive environment where the disability of children with deafness is acknowledged and accepted. This can significantly contribute to the emotional well-being and self-esteem of these children.

*Raising Awareness and Advocacy:* It is imperative to raise awareness within the community about the capabilities and potential of children with deafness. This can help dispel misconceptions and stereotypes, leading to more inclusive practices and opportunities.

*Empowerment and High Expectations:* Communities should play a role in empowering children with deafness by setting high expectations. Providing opportunities for them to excel in various areas can boost their confidence and self-belief.

*Character Development and Leadership Opportunities:* The community can contribute to the character development of children with deafness by offering mentorship, role models, and leadership opportunities. This can help instill important values and skills that will serve them throughout their lives.



*Inclusive Recreational Activities:* Organizing sports and entertainment programs tailored for children with deafness can foster a sense of belonging and camaraderie. It also promotes physical fitness and overall well-being.

*Advocacy for Financial Support:* The study suggests that government financial aid should be directed towards organizations focused on supporting the deaf community. This can help in sustaining and expanding programs and services for children with deafness.

## References

- Blair, J., & Abdullah, S. (2020). It Didn't Sound Good with My Cochlear Implants: Understanding the Challenges of Using Smart Assistants for Deaf and Hard of Hearing Users. *Proceedings of the ACM on Interactive, Mobile, Wearable and Ubiquitous Technologies*, 4(4), 1-27.
- Brymer, E., Araújo, D., Davids, K., & Pepping, G. J. (2020). Conceptualizing the human health outcomes of acting in natural environments: an ecological perspective. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 1362.
- Davies, A., Brass, J., Martins Mendonca, V., O'Leary, S., Bryan, M., & Neustifter, R. (2023). Enhancing Comprehensive Sexuality Education for Students with Disabilities: Insights from Ontario's Educational Framework. *Sexes*, 4(4), 522-535.
- Flexer, C. (1999). *Facilitating hearing and listening in young children*. Singular Publishing Group.
- Forgit, A. A. C. (2023). *Experiences of Parents of Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Children with Supporting the Literacy Education of Their Children* (Doctoral dissertation, Northeastern University).
- Graham, P., Kurz, C., & Batamula, C. (2023). Finding Vygotsky in early childhood deaf education: Sociocultural bodies and conversations. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 168(1), 80-101.
- Haukaas, A. (2023). Everyone's a Composite: Rethinking Three of Cyberpunk's Overlooked Women Writers as New Materialists. In *Disability Identity in Simulation Narratives* (pp. 23-52). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.
- Kwon, E. Y. (2023). *Exploring considerations for the learner, family, and school in the education of students who are deaf or hard of hearing with disabilities* (Doctoral dissertation, University of British Columbia).
- Katsuya, N., & Sano, T. (2023). How Do People Disclose Their Mild-To-Moderate Hearing Loss? 1, 2. *Japanese Psychological Research*, 65(3), 215-229.
- Liu, W. (2023). The theory of second language development for international students. *Journal for Multicultural Education*.
- Moores, D. F. (1996). *Educating the deaf: Psychology, principles and practices*. Houghton Mifflin: Boston, MA. And The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1995. Newsom (2006), USP 534 Data Analysis I.
- Roemen, B. M. (2023). *Educator-Caregiver Communication Through Technology: A Survey of Early Childhood Educators of the Deaf* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota).
- Skyer, M., Scott, J. A., & O'Brien, D. (2023). O/No Power but Deaf Power\O: Revitalizing Deaf Education Systems via Anarchism. *Social Inclusion*, 11(2).
- Steffens, N. K., Munt, K. A., van Knippenberg, D., Platow, M. J., & Haslam, S. A. (2021). Advancing the social identity theory of leadership: A meta-analytic review of leader group prototypicality. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 11(1), 35-72.
- Terry, J., & Rance, J. (2023). Systems that support hearing families with deaf children: A scoping review. *Plos one*, 18(11), e0288771.