



Barriers and Facilitators of Health Literacy among D/deaf Individuals: A Review Article

*Tahereh NASERIBOORIABADI¹, *Farahnaz SADOUGHI², Abbas SHEIKHTAHERI¹*

1. *Dept. of Health Information Management, School of Health Management and Information Sciences, Iran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran*
2. *Health Management and Economics Research Center, School of Health Management and Information Sciences, Iran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran*

***Corresponding Author:** Email: sadoughi.f@iums.ac.ir

(Received 22 Oct 2016; accepted 11 Feb 2017)

Abstract

Background: The implication of health literacy is the ability of individuals to find, understand, and use their required health information from reliable sources. It is an indicator of the individuals' participation in their own medical decision-making. Deaf individuals have limited health literacy and poor health status due to low literacy. Hence, this review was conducted to understand barriers and facilitators influencing health literacy among deaf community.

Methods: We searched the ISI Web of Sciences, Scopus, and Medline from 1987 to 2016. Seventy-three papers were analyzed thematically.

Results: We found three primary themes, including inadequate health literacy, barriers, and facilitators to accessing health information and health care services among deaf individuals. Facilitators were composed of four sub-theme including legal activities protecting the right of deaf patients to accessing health services, training health professionals about effective communication with deaf patients, providing sign language interpreter services, and developing deaf-tailored educational health programs and materials.

Conclusion: Closing the deaf cultural gap and their limited access to health information are achievable through the removal of the communication barriers, allowing deaf individuals with more access to health learning opportunities, and informing the hearing community about the communicative skills of deaf individuals.

Keywords: Deafness, Health literacy, Barrier, Facilitator

Introduction

Health literacy (HL) is defined as 'the knowledge, motivation, and a set of abilities required to access, understand, process, evaluate, and use health information to make judgments regarded to three-fold health domains as health care, disease prevention, and health promotion' (1).

In fact, HL is the same general literacy affected by particular and general health-related factors (2). For example, the verbal and audio information exchanged through health care episodes is an active factor in patient-provider communica-

tion related to patient health outcomes. Therefore, healthcare providers (HCPs) have to use plain language and teaching back method in patient-HCPs communication (3).

Many HCPs are not often aware of inadequate literacy among patients causing them to overestimate the patients' knowledge of medical conditions, disease prevention, and existing therapeutic options. Therefore, they may not make appropriate health educational advice during medical encounters (4, 5).

Little HL results in low participation in screening programs (6) and deprivation of receiving care efficiently among patients (7). Moreover, individuals with inadequate HL use preventive health services lower than health intelligent individuals (8). In addition, people with inadequate HL are unable to participate in self-care activities and comply with medical advice (9). Deafness, a prevalent problem around the world, remarkably influences the quality of life in hearing impaired individuals (10). Either many preventable diseases or conditions due to their limited HL threaten the health of the deaf community. The ignorance

of HCPs on their health needs and lack of communication skills worsen their poor health status (11).

The aim of this narrative review was to consider both barriers and facilitators to HL for the deaf.

Methods

Search strategies

We used the following search strategies in topic, title/abstract and keywords fields in the electronic databases of the ISI Web of Sciences, Scopus, and Medline (Fig. 1).

("health literacy" AND "deaf") OR ("health" AND "education" AND "deaf") OR ("health" AND "learning" AND "deaf") OR ("health" AND "teaching" AND "deaf") OR ("health" AND "training" AND "deaf") OR ("health" AND "deaf" AND "barrier") OR ("Act" AND "health" AND "deaf") OR ("sign language interpreter" AND "health" AND "deaf").

Fig. 1: Keywords used for this study

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Both English and non-English papers after translation into English were addressed in the review. Besides, that subject area was limited to articles or reviews. Therefore, short survey, brief research report, letter, book, book review, conference paper, and conference review were excluded.

Analysis

Collectively, we retrieved 1173 papers from the ISI web of sciences (n=262), Scopus (n=677), and Medline (n=234). Screening the titles 1015 papers were eliminated due to duplication (n=402) and irrelevancy (n=613). Scanning the titles and abstracts additional papers were omitted due to the lack of accessibility to abstract (n=22), and full texts (n=63).

Included papers were reviewed by two researchers of this study individually and initial themes lists were created. Comparing these two themes lists similarities and differences were identified. In addition, to reduce disagreements, three researchers reviewed and revised the initial themes together. Creation of final themes and subthemes were the

consensus-based process. Therefore, considering the aim of this study, we categorized papers into three primary themes and four sub-themes.

Results

In total, 72 full texts published from 1987 to 2016 were included (12-73, 75-76, 78-81, 84, 86, 89, 90) and analyzed thematically and classified into following six tables.

Table 1 devotes to a summary of studies on inadequate HL among the deaf community. The findings focused on deaf people's inadequate health knowledge. Table 2 relates to a summary of studies on difficulties in access to health information. Communication barrier is a primary challenge restricted deaf persons to access the health information and healthcare services (HCSs).

Facilitators in access to health information and HCSs for the deaf composed of four individual tables. For instance, some laws and regulations protected deaf individual's right to have equal access to health information and services identified (Table 3).

Table 1: A summary of studies on inadequate HL among the deaf community

<i>First Author; Reference Number</i>	<i>Methods</i>	<i>Findings</i>
Mallinson (12)	Pilot Study	Deaf more suffer from physical and mental consequences owing to the lack of deaf-friendly health services.
Oredugba (13)	Quantitative	Deaf children had poor knowledge and practice of oral dental health
Bat-Chava (14)	Qualitative	Deaf community has limited access to health information.
Orsi (15)	Quantitative	Low awareness of screening tests has been reported indicating uninformed decision-making in the deaf.
Goldstein (16)	Quantitative	American deaf high school students had limited awareness of HIV/AIDS.
Maddalena (17)	Qualitative	The deaf community had inadequate access to end-of-life care.
Wei (18)	Quantitative	Deaf students had poor knowledge and practice of oral health.
Berman (19)	Quantitative	Poor awareness and practice of breast cancer have been reported among deaf women due to unmet health information needs and communication barriers.
Napier (20)	Qualitative	The deaf community had limited access to preventive and ongoing health information due to limited English literacy.
McKee (21)	Quantitative	Low attainment of education increases the possibility of catching cardiovascular diseases among Deaf people (OR = 55.76). The lower the education level, the higher the likelihood of cardiovascular disease.
Sheppard (22)	Qualitative	Deaf community has unequal access to HCSs.
McKee (23)	Mixed Method	Researchers reported the high prevalence of low HL among the deaf is 6.9 times more than in hearing people. In addition, they stated that deaf individuals do not have access to mass media, health-care messages, and health-care communication among the deaf community due to communication and language barriers.
McKee (24)	Quantitative	Deaf use emergency services were more than in hearing persons (OR = 1.97), but the reasons are remained unknown.
Smith (25)	Qualitative	There is a high rate of catching cardiovascular disease among the deaf due to poor health knowledge.
Kushalnagar (26)	Quantitative	Low HL leads to difficulty in finding information in ASL accessible health website.
Kuenberg (27)	Review	There is a gap in health knowledge among deaf in the world.
Terry (28)	Mixed-method	Deaf individuals have limited access to sufficient and appropriate health care. They also have poor knowledge regarding health-related issues.

Table 2: A summary of studies on difficulties in access to health information

<i>Barrier</i>	<i>First Author; Reference Number</i>	<i>Methods</i>	<i>Findings</i>
Legal	Chilton (29)	Review	Deaf face difficulties in medical facilities due to either no adequate policies of providing SLISs or their reluctance to direct pay for this service.
	Steinberg (30)	Qualitative	Mistrust of HCPs and communication problems are the biggest challenges deaf patients face in mental health care.
Interpersonal	Kritzinger (31)	Qualitative	Deaf community has inadequate access to health information and services due to interpersonal factors, including independent thoughts, protectedness, and non-questioning attitudes.
	Witte (32)	Qualitative	Having difficulty in scheduling appointments and communication barriers have been identified as significant challenges.
	Chaveiro (33)	Qualitative	The communication barrier has led to social exclusion in the healthcare environment.
	Bat-Chava (14)	Qualitative	Deaf individuals are unable to communicate with health providers.
Communication	Folkins (34)	Quantitative	Deaf community has limited access to health information due to communication barriers.
	Groce (35)	Quantitative	The lack of effective communication with HCPs and access to health care facilities were reported.
	Scheier (36)	Review	Many HCPs do not understand how to improve communication with deaf patients.
	Mallinson (12)	Pilot Study	Deaf youth is at a higher risk of catching HIV due to the language barrier, stigma, and disparities faced in the health setting.
Language	Jones (37)	Mixed Method	Deaf individuals face oral and printed language barriers.
	Kritzinger (31)	Qualitative	Deaf individuals have limited access to health-care services due to communication barriers and interpersonal factors.

Table 3: A summary of studies on legal activities to improve HL among deaf community

<i>First Author; Reference Number</i>	<i>Methods</i>	<i>Findings</i>
Chacko (38)	Review	Under the Section 504 of the U.S. Rehabilitation Act, effective deaf patient-HCPs communication is mandatory during emergency health service delivery.
Chilton (29)	Review	The Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act (Public Law 93-112) and Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) are facilitators in this field.
Ubido (39)	Quantitative	HCPs' ignorance of the Disability Discrimination Act leads to legal action against them.
Chaveiro (40)	Review	The importance of using sign language in a health setting to overcome the communication barrier and improve health outcomes for the deaf community has been recognized under Federal Law 10.436/02.
Pereira (41)	Qualitative	Under the decree, 5626/05 under Federal Law 16.436/02, HCPs have to be familiar with sign language or hiring sign language interpreters.
Chan (42)	Review	Providing SLISs is mandated under the ADA.
Haricharan (43)	Quantitative	Under the Convention on Rights of Persons with Disabilities, providing qualified sign interpreter services is mandatory, as a constitutional right of access to health care is a pre-requisite of information accessibility in South Africa.
Brown (44)	Review	Health care entities have to be obliged to facilitate deaf patients' accessibility to health services under the ADA through hiring a qualified interpreter and through needed communication technologies.

Table 4 summarizes studies on sign language interpreting services (SLISs) in health care. It shows that qualified SLIs mediated deaf patient-HCPs communication. Table 5 relates to studies on training HCPs about deaf culture and devel-

oping communication proficiency. Additionally, health professionals would provide deaf-tailored health services if they have attended in training courses on developing and improving communication skills.

Table 4: A summary of studies on sign language interpreting services in health care

<i>First Author; Reference Number</i>	<i>Methods</i>	<i>Findings</i>
MacKinney (45)	Quantitative	The presence of full-time interpreters in medical encounters leads to a higher level of satisfaction with physician communication and better preventive health outcomes.
Chilton (29)	Review	The effective way of communication in response to the deaf patient is using a SLI rather than paper and pen, or lip-reading.
Cardoso (46)	Qualitative	The presence of qualified SLI is necessary for having effective patient-HCPs communication.
McKee (47)	Quantitative	SLIs may reduce potential risks of miscommunication between deaf patients and HCPs.
Major (48)	Qualitative	The health lexicon of Auslan is underdeveloped; therefore, professional interpreters have to play a mediating role in health terms and communication to improve health terminology comprehension among deaf patients.

Table 5: A summary of studies on training HCPs about deaf culture and developing communication proficiency

<i>First Author; Reference Number</i>	<i>Methods</i>	<i>Findings</i>
Margellos-Anast (49)	Quantitative	Training HCPs about deaf culture and communication is a need.
Mathews (50)	Quantitative	First-year pharmacy students confirmed the effectiveness of role-playing exercises on patient-HCPs communication.
Hoang (51)	Quantitative	Training medical students in deaf cultural competency may lead to improving health outcomes for the deaf community.
Thew (52)	Quantitative	Medical students in the clinical-oriented stage confirmed the long impact of the "Deaf Strong Hospital Program a year after launching the program.
Nagakura (53)	Quantitative	Students are not familiar with deaf culture due to the limited related academic training.
Adib-Hajbagheri (54)	Quantitative	Nursing students had poor knowledge and practice of interaction with deaf patients.
Lapinski (55)	Quantitative	Confidence and knowledge of the way of communication with the deaf have been increased over the course of "deaf culture and primary medical ASL".
Velonaki (56)	Quantitative	Educating nurses for developing their proficiency in communication with the deaf was welcomed.
Ferguson (57)	Quantitative	Pharmacists have to educate about deaf culture to improve their communication skills.
Yuksel (58)	Qualitative	Simulated patient method improved the communication skills of nursing students in caring for deaf patients.

Table 6 shows a summary of studies on developing deaf-tailored materials and programs. Nota-

bly, it focused on the effectiveness of holding deaf-tailored educational health programs.

Table 6: A summary of studies on developing deaf-tailored materials and programs

<i>First Author; Reference Number</i>	<i>Methods</i>	<i>Findings</i>
Gregg (59)	Qualitative	Developing a health educational program requires addressing little proficiency in spoken and written languages, need for the presence of SLI, and limited readability skills among deaf.
Bat-Chava (14)	Qualitative	Developing and disseminating deaf-tailored educational materials and providing further deaf medical services were recommended.
Margellos-Anast (49)	Quantitative	Deaf tailored medical education materials have to be developed because of a lower level of cardiovascular knowledge for deaf people comparing with hearing people.
Kaskowitz (60)	Quantitative	The deaf community health knowledge was increased after viewing a cancer educational video in ASL.
Jones (61)	Quantitative	The self-efficacy of deaf adults for health behaviors was increased after the completion of heart health intervention.
Choe (62)	Quantitative	Deaf women's knowledge of cervical cancer was increased after one viewing of a related graphically enriched educational video in ASL.
Wilson (63)	Quantitative	The efficiency and cost-effectiveness of telehealth services to the deaf community, and their satisfaction with these services was demonstrated.
Jones (64)	Quantitative	Deaf community appreciated an interactive web-based education.
Berman (65)	Quantitative	Tobacco-related knowledge, attitude and practice were affected by the deaf-tailored tobacco-use prevention curriculum so that tobacco exposure was decreased and an anti-tobacco attitude increased.
Sadler (66)	Quantitative	Knowledge of cancer was increased after viewing the deaf-tailored videos among the deaf.
Hickey (67)	Quantitative	The knowledge of breast cancer in deaf women was increased after viewing the educational video.
Chiriac (68)	Quantitative	Translation of medical knowledge and concepts into the sign language through the avatar interface is necessary in developing e-health systems for deaf users.
Ahmadi (69)	Mixed Method	The health education software facilitates efficient learning of child health topics for teachers and parents of deaf students.

Discussion

(a) Inadequate HL for the deaf

Deaf individuals are unaware of the health-disease process and ignorant of health knowledge due to poor access to deaf-tailored health information sources, and limited access to mass media and healthcare messages owing to communication and language barriers (20,26,59,60). Hence, they have limited knowledge of medical conditions and symptoms of diseases (32,52,61,62), inadequate awareness of disease prevention (71, 72) medical screening tests (15), and preventive health services (47). Hence, it is necessary to identify the barriers to accessing health information for the deaf.

(b) Barriers to access health information and HCSs among the deaf

According to Helen Killer's comment about hearing loss, communication is vital for deaf individuals (74). Nevertheless, communication and language barriers have been recognized as the indubitable underlying causes of the gap in health knowledge among the deaf community (27,75). Communication barriers, lack of education, and limited access to deaf-tailored health information are significant contributors to poor health among the deaf (76). The lack of HCPs in understanding the deaf culture and required communication skills to interact better with deaf individuals is the leading cause of communication problem deaf individual face in health settings (77). Moreover, the lack of knowing how to communicate with

hearing HCPs is more bothersome than hearing loss, particularly when the preferred communication method is ASL (78). Communication and language barriers may lead to negative consequences for deaf individuals, including isolation, low self-esteem, abuse, and inadequate health care (79). In addition, deaf person's interpersonal factors (31), and the ignorance of HCPs on the rights of deaf individual's access to HCSs make the accessibility of HCSs for deaf individuals, a serious issue (29).

(c) Facilitators in access to health information and HCSs for the deaf

To remove the obstacles to improving HL "facilitators" composed to the following four sub-themes including protecting deaf people right to access to health services, providing sign language interpreter, training health providers about deaf culture, and developing deaf-tailored programs in health education.

(c₁) Legal activities protecting deaf individual's right to access HCSs

Deaf individuals caught in a dangerous situation regarding the source of HL process. As for enhancing HL, deaf persons have the right to have equal access to HCSs under different regulations in which having effective communication with deaf individuals and providing SLISs are recognized in particular in providing emergency health care (38,81). Health care entities obligated to provide communication technologies and SLISs for deaf individuals (76), and disobedience of health care entities to provide a sign language interpreter can incur heavy penalties and litigation (39).

(c₂) Providing sign language interpreting services

Given the possibility of failed lip reading attempts in health-related situations and the patients' concerns about their confidentiality violations during medical encounters and procedures in the presence of family members, sign language interpreter service is compulsory (76). However, the ignorance of physicians to their liabilities to provide interpreters for their deaf patients has

been demonstrated in other previous studies (82,83).

In addition, the association between the presence of a full-time interpreter in medical encounters and more satisfaction with physician communication, and improved preventive health outcomes have been confirmed in another study (45).

Developing proficiency in mutual apprehension, communication, and negotiation about common professional tasks among HCPs and interpreters to provide a flourishing bilingual medical encounter is a requirement (84).

(c₃) Training HCPs about deaf culture

Holding academic training courses on effective communication skills are required for closing the miscommunication between deaf individuals and HCPs (54). These educational interventions have influenced on gaining practical experience regarding deaf culture and required communication skills in communication with deaf individuals. Since the possibility of interacting with deaf individuals may occur, HCPs have to develop proficiency in managing HCSs to deaf individuals (85, 86).

In this line, the practical courses are more efficient than traditional teaching methods (52). The effectiveness of the interventions has been confirmed through a training workshop with osteopathic students (55). Educating nurses for developing their proficiency in communication with the deaf was welcomed (56).

(c₄) Developing deaf-tailored programs in health education

In fact, deaf individuals have inconsistent health information about conditions such as cardiovascular risk factors (87), and medical screening tests (15). Therefore, to decrease the health inequalities to access preventive health services, educating deaf community is of particular significant (88). Many health education interventions have conducted through different platforms ranged from booklets, slides, videos to interactive websites over the last few years. These interventions may result in better comprehension of health-related issues using native sign language, open captioning, and images and videos (89, 90).

Implication for promotion of HL among deaf community

The deaf community might have better access to reliable health information sources through educating sign language-fluent HCPs and training sign language interpreters proficient in basic medical concepts.

Conclusion

To date, many barriers have been identified by which deaf individuals have no equal access to health information and healthcare services. These barriers are classified into five groups, including interpersonal factors, cultural, language, and communication barriers.

Deaf community has common characteristics like inadequate HL, poor health, and social exclusion in health settings. In fact, deaf individuals are passive in their personal health decision-making due to their particular conditions they experience. As a result, they cannot overcome these barriers by themselves.

Meeting deaf individuals health needs, and promoting their health status involve increasing incidental health learning situations, providing sign language interpreter services, developing deaf-tailored educational programs, and training HCPs about deaf individuals' health needs.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical issues (Including plagiarism, informed consent, misconduct, data fabrication and/or falsification, double publication and/or submission, redundancy, etc.) have been completely observed by the authors.

Acknowledgements

This article is a part of a dissertation granted by Iran University of Medical Sciences.

Conflict of Interests

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

References

1. Sørensen K, Pelikan JM, Röthlin F et al (2015). Health literacy in Europe: comparative results of the European health literacy survey (HLS-EU). *Eur J Public Health*, 25:1053-8.
2. Kindig DA, Panzer AM, Nielsen-Bohlman L (2004). *Health Literacy: A Prescription to End Confusion*. National Academies Press.
3. Nouri SS, Rudd RE (2015). Health literacy in the "oral exchange": An important element of patient-provider communication. *Patient Educ Couns*, 98:565-71.
4. Evangelista LS, Rasmusson KD, Laramée AS et al (2010). Health literacy and the patient with heart failure—implications for patient care and research: a consensus statement of the Heart Failure Society of America. *J Card Fail*, 16:9-16.
5. Shaw SJ, Huebner C, Armin J et al (2009). The role of culture in health literacy and chronic disease screening and management. *J Immigr Minor Health*, 11:460-7.
6. Davis TC, Dolan NC, Ferreira MR et al (2001). The role of inadequate health literacy skills in colorectal cancer screening. *Cancer Invest*, 19:193-200.
7. Williams MV, Parker RM, Baker DW et al (1995). Inadequate functional health literacy among patients at two public hospitals. *JAMA*, 274:1677-82.
8. Scott TL, Gazmararian JA, Williams MV, Baker DW (2002). Health literacy and preventive health care use among Medicare enrollees in a managed care organization. *Med Care*, 40:395-404.
9. Reisi M, Mostafavi F, Hasanzadeh A, Sharifirad G (2011). The Relationship between Health Literacy and General Health Status and Health Behaviors of Elderly People. *J Health Syst Res*, 7:469-80.(In Persian)
10. Korth S (2004). Using a root cause analysis process to analyze issues of safety. In Youngberg, B.J. & Hatile, M.J. *The patient safety handbook* (p. 257). London, UK: Jones & Bartlett Publishers.
11. Morgan L (2013). *Best Practice Patient Teaching Strategies to Promote Health Literacy When Working with Individuals with Deafness*. https://research.libraries.wsu.edu/xmlui/bitstream/handle/2376/4376/L_Morgan_10716550.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y; Accessed 25.02.16

12. Mallinson RK (2004). Perceptions of HIV/AIDS by deaf gay men. *J Assoc Nurses AIDS Care*, 15:27-36.
13. Oredugba FA (2004). Oral health care knowledge and practices of a group of deaf adolescents in Lagos, Nigeria. *J Public Health Dent*, 64:118-20.
14. Bat-Chava Y, Martin D, Kosciw JG (2005). Barriers to HIV/AIDS knowledge and prevention among deaf and hard of hearing people. *AIDS Care*, 17:623-634.
15. Orsi JM, Margellos-Anast H, Perlman TS et al (2007). Cancer screening knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors among culturally Deaf adults: Implications for informed decision making. *Cancer Detect Prev*, 31:474-9.
16. Goldstein MF, Eckhardt EA, Joyner-Creamer P et al (2010). What do deaf high school students know about HIV? *AIDS Educ Prev*, 22:523-537.
17. Maddalena V, O'Shea F, Murphy M (2012). Palliative and end-of-life care in Newfoundland's deaf community. *J Palliat Care*, 28:105-112.
18. Wei H, Wang YL, Cong XN et al (2012). Survey and analysis of dental caries in students at a deaf-mute high school. *Res Dev Disabil*, 33:1279-86.
19. Berman BA, Jo A, Cumberland WG et al (2013). Breast cancer knowledge and practices among D/deaf women. *Disabil Health J*, 6:303-316.
20. Napier J, Kidd MR (2013). English literacy as a barrier to health care information for deaf people who use auslan. *Aust Fam Physician*, 42:896-9.
21. McKee MM, McKee K, Winters P et al (2014). Higher educational attainment but not higher income is protective for cardiovascular risk in Deaf American Sign Language (ASL) users. *Disabil Health J*, 7:49-55.
22. Sheppard K (2014). Deaf adults and health care: Giving voice to their stories. *J Am Assoc Nurse Pract*, 26:504-510.
23. McKee MM, Paasche-Orlow MK, Winters PC et al (2015). Assessing Health Literacy in Deaf American Sign Language Users. *J Health Commun*, 20 Suppl 2:92-100.
24. McKee MM, Winters PC, Sen A et al (2015). Emergency department utilization among Deaf American Sign Language users. *Disabil Health J*, 8:573-8.
25. Smith SR, Kushalnagar P, Hauser PC (2015). Deaf adolescents' learning of cardiovascular health information: Sources and access challenges. *J Deaf Stud Deaf Educ*, 20: 408-418.
26. Kushalnagar P, Naturale J, Paludneviene R et al (2015). Health Websites: Accessibility and usability for american sign language users. *Health Commun*, 30:830-7.
27. Kuenburg A, Fellingner P, Fellingner J (2016). Health Care Access Among Deaf People. *J Deaf Stud Deaf Educ*, 21:1-10.
28. Terry DR, Lê Q, Nguyen HB (2016). Moving forward with dignity: Exploring health awareness in an isolated Deaf community of Australia. *Disabil Health J*, 9:281-8.
29. Chilton EE (1996). Ensuring effective communication: The duty of health care providers to supply sign language interpreters for deaf patients. *Hastings Law J*, 47:871-911.
30. Steinberg AG, Sullivan VJ, Loew RC (1998). Cultural and linguistic barriers to mental health service access: The deaf consumer's perspective. *Am J Psychiatry*, 155:982-4.
31. Kritzingner J, Schneider M, Swartz L, Braathen SH (2014). "I just answer,'yes' to everything they say": Access to health care for deaf people in Worcester, South Africa and the politics of exclusion. *Patient Educ Couns*, 94:379-83.
32. Witte TN, Kuzel AJ (2000). Elderly deaf patients' health care experiences. *J Am Board Fam Pract*, 13:17-22.
33. Chaveiro N, Barbosa MA (2005). Assistance to the deaf in the health area as a factor of social inclusion. *Rev Esc Enferm USP*, 39:417-22.
34. Folkins A, Sadler GR, Ko C et al (2005). Improving the Deaf community's access to prostate and testicular cancer information: a survey study. *BMC Public Health*, 5:63.
35. Groce N, Yousafzai A, Dlamini P et al (2006). HIV/AIDS and disability: A pilot survey of HIV/AIDS knowledge among a deaf population in Swaziland. *Int J Rehabil Res*, 29:319-24.
36. Scheier DB (2009). Barriers to health care for people with hearing loss: a review of the literature. *JNY State Nurses Assoc*, 40:4-10.
37. Jones EG, Renger R, Firestone R (2005). Deaf community analysis for health education priorities. *Public Health Nurs*, 22:27-35.
38. Chacko MR, Buttler JT, Kirkland RT (1987). Communication and special health care needs of a profoundly hearing impaired adolescent. *Clin Pediatr (Phila)*, 26:395-397.
39. Ubido J, Huntington J, Warburton D (2002). Inequalities in access to healthcare faced by

- women who are deaf. *Health Soc Care Community*, 10:247-53.
40. Chaveiro N, Porto CC, Barbosa MA (2009). The relation between deaf patients and the doctor. *Braz J Otorhinolaryngol*, 75:147-150.
 41. Pereira PC, Fortes PA (2010). Communication and information barriers to health assistance for deaf patients. *Am Ann Deaf*, 155:31-7.
 42. Chan YF, Alagappan K, Rella J et al (2010). Interpreter services in emergency medicine. *J Emerg Med*, 38:133-9.
 43. Haricharan HJ, Heap M, Coomans F, London L (2013). Can we talk about the right to healthcare without language? A critique of key international human rights law, drawing on the experiences of a Deaf woman in Cape Town, South Africa. *Disabil Soc*, 28:54-66.
 44. Brown HL, Hughes-Bell A, McDuffie AW (2015). Caring for patients who are deaf or hard of hearing. *JAAPA*, 28:50-5.
 45. Mackinney TG, Walters D, Bird GL, Nattinger AB (1995). Improvements in preventive care and communication for deaf patients - results of a novel primary health-care program. *J Gen Intern Med*, 10:133-7.
 46. Cardoso AHA, Rodrigues KG, Bachion MM (2006). Perception of persons with severe or profound deafness about the communication process during health care. *Rev Lat Am Enfermagem*, 14:553-60.
 47. McKee MM, Barnett SL, Block RC, Pearson TA (2011). Impact of Communication on Preventive Services Among Deaf American Sign Language Users. *Am J Prev Med*, 41:75-9.
 48. Major G, Napier J, Ferrara L, Johnston T (2012). Exploring lexical gaps in Australian sign language for the purposes of health communication. *Commun Med*, 9:37-47.
 49. Margellos-Anast H, Estarziou M, Kaufman G (2006). Cardiovascular disease knowledge among culturally Deaf patients in Chicago. *Prev Med*, 42:235-239.
 50. Mathews JL, Parkhill AL, Schlehofer DA et al (2011). Role-Reversal Exercise with Deaf Strong Hospital to Teach Communication Competency and Cultural Awareness. *Am J Pharm Educ*, 75:53.
 51. Hoang L, LaHousse SF, Nakaji MC, Sadler GR (2011). Assessing deaf cultural competency of physicians and medical students. *J Cancer Educ*, 26:175-182.
 52. Thew D, Smith SR, Chang C, Starr M (2012). The deaf strong hospital program: A model of diversity and inclusion training for first-year medical students. *Acad Med*, 87:1496-500.
 53. Nagakura H, Schneider G, Morris J et al (2015). Assessing Deaf Awareness Training: Knowledge and Attitudes of Recent Genetic Counseling Graduates. *J Genet Couns*, 24:104-16.
 54. Adib-Hajbaghery M, Rezaei-Shahsavaroo Z (2015). Nursing students' knowledge of and performance in communicating with patients with hearing impairment. *Jpn J Nurs Sci*, 12:135-44.
 55. Lapinski J, Colonna C, Sexton P, Richard M (2015). American Sign Language and Deaf Culture Competency of Osteopathic Medical Students. *Am Ann Deaf*, 160:36-47.
 56. Velonaki V-S, Kampouroglou G, Velonaki M et al (2015). Nurses' knowledge, attitudes and behavior toward Deaf patients. *Disabil Health J*, 8:109-17.
 57. Ferguson M, Liu M (2015). Communication needs of patients with altered hearing ability: Informing pharmacists' patient care services through focus groups. *J Am Pharm Assoc (2003)*, 55:153-60.
 58. Yuksel C, Unver V (2016). Use of Simulated Patient Method to Teach Communication With Deaf Patients in the Emergency Department. *Clin Simul Nurs*, 12:281-9.
 59. Gregg AL, Wozar JA, Wessel CB, Epstein BA (2002). Designing a curriculum on Internet health resources for deaf high school students. *J Med Libr Assoc*, 90:431-6.
 60. Kaskowitz Iii SR, Nakaji MC, Clark KL et al (2006). Bringing prostate cancer education to deaf men. *Cancer Detect Prev*, 30:439-48.
 61. Jones EG, Renger R, Kang Y (2007). Self-efficacy for health-related behaviors among deaf adults. *Res Nurs Health*, 30:185-92.
 62. Choe S, Lim RS, Clark K et al (2009). The impact of cervical cancer education for deaf women using a video educational tool employing American sign language, open captioning, and graphics. *J Cancer Educ*, 24:10-5.
 63. Wilson JB, Wells MG (2009). Telehealth and the deaf: A comparison study. *J Deaf Stud Deaf Educ*, 14:386-402.
 64. Jones EG, Goldsmith M, Effken J et al (2010). Creating and testing a deaf-friendly, stop-smoking web site intervention. *Am Ann Deaf*, 155:96-102.

65. Berman BA, Guthmann DS, Crespi CM, Liu W (2011). Development and testing of an antitobacco school-based curriculum for deaf and hard of hearing youth. *Am Ann Deaf*, 155:592-604.
66. Sadler GR, Branz P, Fager M et al (2012). Health Promotion via Deaf-Friendly Ministries. *J Cancer Educ*, 27:606-11.
67. Hickey S, Merz EL, Malcarne VL et al (2013). Breast cancer education for the deaf community in American sign language. *Oncol Nurs Forum*, 40:E86-91.
68. Chiriac IA, Stoicu-Trivadar I, Podoleanu E (2015). Comparing video and avatar technology for a health education application for deaf people. *Stud Health Technol Inform*, 210:516-20.
69. Ahmadi M, Abbasi M, Bahaadinbeigy K (2015). Design and implementation of a software for teaching health related topics to deaf students: The first experience in Iran. *Acta Inform Med*, 23:76-80.
70. Pollard RQ, Barnett S (2009). Health-Related Vocabulary Knowledge Among Deaf Adults. *Rehabil Psychol*, 54:182-5.
71. Zazove P, Meador HE, Reed BD et al (2009). Cancer Prevention Knowledge of People with Profound Hearing Loss. *J Gen Intern Med*, 24:320-6.
72. Oliveira YCA, Celino SDM, de França ISX et al (2015). Deaf people's knowledge and information sources regarding health and disease. *Interface (Botucatu)*, 19:549-60.
73. Zazove P, Meador HE, Reed BD et al (2012). Effectiveness of videos improving cancer prevention knowledge in people with profound hearing loss. *J Cancer Educ*, 27:327-37.
74. Meador HE, Zazove P (2005). Health care interactions with deaf culture. *J Am Board Fam Pract*, 18:218-222.
75. Mprah WK (2013). Perceptions about barriers to sexual and reproductive health information and services among deaf people in Ghana. *Asia Pac Disabil Rehabil J*, 24:21-36.
76. Berry JA, Stewart AJ (2006). Communicating with the deaf during the health examination visit. *J Nurse Pract*, 2:509-515.
77. Hines J (2000). Communication problems of hearing-impaired patients. *Nurs Stand*, 14:33-37.
78. Dickson M, Magowan R (2014). Meeting Deaf patients' communication needs. *Nurs Times*, 110:12-5.
79. Shabaik S, LaHousse SF, Branz P et al (2010). Colorectal cancer video for the deaf community: a randomized control trial. *J Cancer Educ*, 25:518-523.
80. Chaveiro N, Barbosa MA, Porto CC (2008). Literature revision about the attendance of deaf patient by health professionals. *Rev Esc Enferm USP*, 42:578-83.
81. Kутten J, Reedy S (2009). Are you tuned into deaf patients? *Nurse Pract*, 34:44-9.
82. Mustafa MS, Addar MH (2000). Obstetric handling of a deaf patient. *Saudi Med J*, 21:1185-8.
83. Ali S (2012). Providing Interpreters for Patients with Hearing Disabilities: ADA Requirements. *Innov Clin Neurosci*, 9:30-33.
84. Henning MA, Krageloh CU, Sameshima S et al (2011). Access to New Zealand Sign Language interpreters and quality of life for the deaf: a pilot study. *Disabil Rehabil*, 33:2559-66.
85. Oliveira YCAD, Celino SDDM, Costa GMC (2015). Communication as an essential tool for deaf people's health care. *Physis*, 25:307-320.
86. Alsmark SS, García J, Martínez MR, López NE (2007). How to improve communication with deaf children in the dental clinic. *Med Oral Patol Oral Cir Bucal*, 12:E576-81.
87. Dean RK, Pollard RQ Jr (2001). Application of Demand-Control Theory to Sign Language Interpreting: Implications for Stress and Interpreter Training. *J Deaf Stud Deaf Educ*, 6:1-14.
88. Hsieh E (2010). Provider-interpreter collaboration in bilingual health care: competitions of control over interpreter-mediated interactions. *Patient Educ Couns*, 78:154-9.
89. Jensen LG, Nakaji M, Harry KM et al (2013). Ovarian cancer: Deaf and hearing women's knowledge before and after an educational video. *J Cancer Educ*, 28:647-55.
90. Yao CS, Merz EL, Nakaji M et al (2012). Cervical cancer control: Deaf and hearing women's response to an educational video. *J Cancer Educ*, 27:62-6.