

1 Factors Related to the Quality of Life in the Context of Deaf 2 Sign Language users in Brazil

3 Israel Bispo dos Santos¹, ,Ana Paula Berberian², Giselle Massi³, Rita Tonocchi⁴, Jair
4 Mendes Marques⁵ and Everton Moraes⁶

5 ¹ Universidade Tuiuti do Paraná

6 *Received: 9 December 2019 Accepted: 31 December 2019 Published: 15 January 2020*

7

8 **Abstract**

9 Introduction: Deaf sign language users population often has been facing linguistic difficulties
10 regarding to interacting with people who are not aware, who have not learnt about using sign
11 language, such difficulties may have been revealing serious consequences to their social,
12 emotional and also cognitive development.Objective: This study has aimed to analyze the
13 factors which may be associated with the best scoring of Quality of Life (QOL) in a group of
14 deaf Brazilian sign language (Libras) users.Methods: It is a quantitative study, whose data
15 collection has been assessing using the WHOQOL-BREF scale and a sample profile
16 questionnaire as well. Sixty (60) deaf Libras users, who has been living in Southern region of
17 Brazil have participated. Statistical analysis was used by means of descriptive statistical
18 methods and inference methods, considering the significance level of 0.05 (5

19

20 **Index terms**— deafness. quality of life. sign language. health promotion.

21 **1 I.**

22 Background ne of the societal challenges in the 21st century is interacting with the diversity and assuring the
23 right to equality to all shares of the population. It certainly must include the interaction with disabled people,
24 including deaf people which are sign language users (Ayantoye & Luckner, 2016).

25 Brazilian researchers, Chaveiro et al. (2014), state that this population often has been facing linguistic
26 difficulties to interact with people who do not use sign language and those difficulties may have revealed serious
27 consequences to their social, emotional and also cognitive development.

28 In Brazil, the Brazilian Sign Language (Libras) was recognized by Federal Law number 10.436 in 2002 as a
29 legal mean of communication and expression, it has also been considered a visual-motor linguistic system with
30 its own grammatical structure ??Brasil, 2002). That legislation also sets institutionalized ways to support and
31 disseminate Libras in public health service concessionaires and institutions, which must reassure proper care
32 and treatment to deaf individuals, according to current legal regulations. Chaveiro et al (2013) has explained
33 the nonrecognition of deaf individuals' linguistic diversities hinders the access of that share of the population to
34 primary health care services offered by the Unified Health System (SUS). That system was set up in 1988 under
35 the Brazilian Constitution, and states that "Health is a right for all and duty of the State". Although this system
36 has been in effect since late 1980s, Brazilian studies, such as Chaveiro (2011Chaveiro (, 2014)) and Garcia
37 (2016), has showed that there are very few sign language interpreters in public institutions over the country, in
38 addition, there is no qualification for public servants, as a whole, to render service to deaf sign language users,
39 which weakens their interactions in these settings (Quadros, 1997;Chaveiro et al, 2014).

40 The National Health Policy for impaired people, which came to effect in Brazil in 2002 ??Brasil, 2008), states
41 that quality of life and its promotion are shared social responsibilities and the improvement of information
42 mechanisms to drive health and impairment research must be accessible in Braille and Libras. In this light, our

4 A) PARTICIPANTS

43 greatest interests are studies that assume that the promotion of the quality of life to this share of the population
44 is essential ??Brasil, 2008).

45 Quality of life should be understood as a multidimensional concept in this context, which reflects people's
46 perception regarding to their social, cultural position, their conditions of education, labor, health, housing,
47 security and personal relations. According to the World Health Organization (WHO), quality of life 1 (QOL)
48 is defined as "an individual's perception of their position in life in the context of the culture and value systems
49 where they live and in relation to their goals, expectations, standards and concerns" (The Who QOL Group,
50 1995, p. 03). The assessment of health-related quality of life has been increasingly used to analyze outcomes of
51 clinical studies and broaden understanding about the impact of certain diseases on an individual's life.

52 By reviewing literature which relates quality of life (QOL) and deafness, it was possible to verify that studies
53 by Almeida et al (2015), Angelo et al (2016), and Himi & Takano (2016) on this subject, are usually carried out
54 with hard of hearing people users of hearing aids and cochlear implants. On the other hand, studies, such as
55 Chaveiro et al (2014), Fellinger et al (2012), and Garcia (2016) have addressed to the QOL of deaf sign language
56 users are in lower number and have evidenced the difficulties that this share of the population has been facing
57 to access health care services, in addition to a reduced knowledge on their own life and QOL.

58 International studies show that deaf people who have higher scores in quality of life (QOL) social relations
59 and emotional domains are the ones who participate in deaf communities and use sign language (Fellinger et al,
60 2005; Fellinger et al, 2007). According to Jaiyeola & Adeyemo (2018), unlike in Europe and North America, the
61 experiences of deaf people and the effects of deafness on their QOL have not been fully studied in developing
62 countries yet. Their study was held in Nigeria, but we can also infer that in Brazil, like many developing countries
63 have had sparse data relating QOL and deaf people sign language users. Such data is required for population
64 who needs assessment, intervention programs design, evaluation and educational placement.

65 A study by Kushalnagar et al. (2010), from the Department of Health Services at the University of Washington
66 in Seattle, USA ha showed important implications in the quality of life of deaf young individuals. Its data shows
67 that several deaf individuals evidence depressive symptoms, which are related by the authors to either their
68 difficult or almost non-existent communication to their parents. The convenience sample in this study comprised
69 230 young deaf teenagers (mean age =14.1, 24% users of the Sign Language, 40% used speech, and 36% used
70 both, Sign Language and speech). The authors have researched QoL and communication related issues and have
71 noticed that the deaf people who have had good communication with their parentes have featured lower scores
72 of depressive symptoms.

73 Similarly, Zöller & Archer (2015) carried out a study at the University of Gothenburg, Sweden, addressing
74 the QOL of deaf sign language users. Results from this research have evidenced that, deaf individuals, who
75 communicate better with their families, have had a better quality of life. Likewise, studies by Vaccari & Marschark
76 (1997), Steinberg et al (1999), Meadow et al. (??004), Marschark (2007), and Kushalnagar et al. (2010) have
77 showed that the access to interactions at home, at school and with their peers is highly important for the
78 development of sign language, and that it is reflected on their QOL.

79 Analyzing and measuring the QOL among the population of deaf sign language users worldwide has shown to
80 be a challenge. Chaveiro et al (2014), carrying out an integrative review of the scientific production on health-
81 related quality of life of deaf sign language users, published between 2000 and 2012, has found only 14 articles
82 using that criterion. Three of them have investigated the quality of life with instruments translated to sign
83 language, six used instruments without translation or with simultaneous translation into the sign language, and
84 five of them described the translation methodology of the instruments into the sign language.

85 Considering the discussion above, this paper has aimed to answer the following research question: which factors
86 have influenced the quality of life among the deaf sign language population? Thus, this study aims to analyse
87 some of the factors associated with better QOL scores among a group of deaf users of the Brazilian sign language
88 by means of the proposed domains in the WHOQOL-BREF and in a sample profiling questionnaire.

89 2 II.

90 3 Methods

91 This is a quantitative study using two instruments: the WHOQOL-BREF (The Who QOL Group, 1995), and
92 a sample profiling questionnaire. This research was carried out in a city located in Southern Brazil, Curitiba,
93 capital city of Paraná State, and in smaller towns around this capital city (Metropolitan Area) -São José dos
94 Pinhais, Campo Largo, Pinhais and Colombo. Those towns were selected due to their proximity to the center
95 where the research was performed and due to the presence of many deaf people, users of the sign language. It is
96 worth elucidating that, according to data by the Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística/2015 1 (Brazilian
97 Institute of Geography and Statistics), there are over 2000 deaf-impaired individuals in the studied region.

98 This study was approved by the Ethics Research Board under number 50438915.5.0000.5529.

99 4 a) Participants

100 Sixty (60) deaf individuals participated in the research and the inclusion criteria were deaf participants, users of
101 Libras, over 18 years old, residents in a city in the Southern Brazil and in towns around it, called Metropolitan
102 Area.

103 Initially, for the participants' selection, institutions that have been attending deaf individuals, such as schools,
104 universities, associations and religious institutions located in the above-mentioned cities were contacted. Such
105 institutions provided deaf individuals' names and contacts from those ones who matched the research inclusion
106 criteria. Then, a researcher e-mailed the participants and explained the study goals and instruments, thus, those
107 deaf individuals, who have already matched the research inclusion criteria, were invited to participate.
108

The study sample consisted of 60 participants, Libras signers, between the ages of 18 and 58 years.

109 **5 b) Instruments used**

110 It should be elucidated that the WHOQOL-Bref questionnaire was selected for being an instrument objectifying
111 the assessment of the quality of life, translated into several languages, and that presents satisfactory levels of
112 equivalence, so that results reliably reflect the actual quality of life of a given community in its transcultural use.
113 In addition, this instrument was selected for being the only Brazilian instrument with a validated version in the
114 Brazilian sign language (WHOQOL-Bref, Libras 2016).

115 That instrument comprises 26 questions about the respondents Qol, health, other segments of their lives and
116 their experiences in the four weeks prior to the study, which entail the original instrument. All the items in
117 WHOQOL-Bref have five options each ranging from the highest to the lowest score . The questions of the
118 instrument entail diverse aspects of the daily life and approach four domains of the QOL: physical, psychological,
119 environmental and social relationships. Domain scores feature values between zero and one hundred, where the
120 ones closest to zero stand for the worst, and the best ones are the closest to one hundred. The answers follow
121 Likert scale (from 01 to 05), in which the higher the scoring, the better the quality of life. (The WHOQOL
122 Group, 1995).

123 Using the WHOQOL-Bref Libras, one of the researchers e-mailed Chaveiro initially, who was responsible for
124 the Brazilian validation of this instrument, requesting a "key" of the WHOQOL-Bref Libras software with its
125 videos to use it. Chaveiro et al. (2014) developed a proper instrument to assess the QOL of deaf in their own
126 language, justifying that it is easier for the deaf to answer these instruments in Libras.

127 It's important to notice that the WHOQOL-Bref Libras is a video instrument, so the questionnaire questions,
128 instead of use the written language as in the original test, are made through Libras. As it was explained in the
129 introduction, this instrument was validated in Brazil in 2011.

130 This questionnaire was applied to obtain information about each participant and allows crossing and comparing
131 the answers provided at the application of the QOL questionnaire, making the necessary complementations to
132 measure the QOL of Libras, adding other factors that could influence it.

133 The suitability of these tools to the study population was pretested in a previous study with a similar population
134 in another Brazilian city.

135 **6 c) Data collection**

136 Data collection was held between July 2015 and February 2016, with 60 deaf individuals, in previously scheduled
137 places by the researcher, via e-mail or phone contact. The participants, who have accepted to participate in the
138 research, they have met individually with the researcher. Before answering the instruments, each participant has
139 signed the Free Informed Consent Form.

140 Carrying out the data collection, the responsible researcher, proficient in Brazilian sign language 1 , has
141 explained to the participants, through Libras, that they have had the option to either answer the Written
142 Portuguese Language version or to watch the video of the Sign Language version of the WHOQOL-Bref
143 instrument.

144 Libras version was presented on a video and answers were provided in a printed sheet. Each participant could
145 either choose to watch the videos and answer or only answer the printed version of the questionnaire. After
146 elucidation, each participant has answered the questionnaires individually, with no researchers interference.

147 In addition to the WHOQOL-Bref instrument, each participant has answered the sample profiling question-
148 naire. It has contemplated questions on participants' sociocultural aspects, such as: gender, age, type of deafness,
149 salary, current employment or unemployment status, use of Libras at work, occupation, schooling, view of each
150 participant about him/herself regarding to the use of Libras and the Portuguese language and use of Libras by
151 his/her family members.

152 This questionnaire was applied to obtain information about each participant and has allowed crossing
153 and comparisons of answers provided at the application of the QOL questionnaire, making the necessary
154 complementations to measure the QOL of Libras and also adding other factors that could influence it.

155 **7 d) Analysis**

156 The collected data were submitted to statistical analysis by means of descriptive statistical methods (tables
157 of frequency, mean, standard deviation, minimum value, maximum value), and inference methods (Friedman's
158 ANOVA and Statistical Tests -Chi-square Test and Fisher's Test), considering significance level of 0.05 (5%).

159 The sample profiling questionnaire collected data were analyzed in this research by crossing of the WHOQOL
160 Bref results. In the discussion below, it was chosen to cross only some data from the WHOQOL -Bref

10 DISCUSSION

161 questionnaire, especially in the domains of Social Relationships (best scoring), and Environment (worst scoring)
162 with data from the sample profiling Volume XX Issue I Version I3 (G)
163 questionnaire to meet this study aims and the research question.
164 III.

165 8 Results

166 Table 1shows the distribution of some variables: gender, age, hearing loss, degree of hearing loss, salary and
167 schooling by absolute and relative frequencies. The mean age of the 60 participants in the study was 28 years,
168 standard deviation of 9.97 years (minimum age of 18 years and maximum age of 58). Regarding to the type of
169 deafness, 91.67% (n=55) of the participants answered that they had congenital deafness, and only 8.33% (n=05)
170 had acquired deafness. All of them had a severe to profound hearing loss. 10.00% of the participants (n=6)
171 concluded Middle School, 30.00% (n=18) answered that they concluded High School, 31.67% (n=19) graduated
172 from Higher Education, 21.67% (n=13) had post-graduation, and 6.67% (n=4) of the sample concluded a master's
173 degree.

174 Thus 33.33% of the sample (n=20) work as a production assistant in automotive factories and earn 1 or 2
175 Brazilian minimum salaries 2 , 25,00% (n=15) earn 3 or 4 salaries, work as sign language teachers, only 12
176 participants (20,00%) earn more than 4 salaries and they work as teachers at the university and 13 of them
177 (21,67%) are unemployed.

178 Regarding general issues, in the application of the WHOQOL-Bref, it was perceived that more than half of the
179 sample (51.7%) assesses their quality of life as good or very good, and 55% report satisfaction with their health.

180 Mean scoring obtained in each domain (physical, psychological, social relationships and environment) of the
181 quality of life is shown in Table 2. Friedman's ANOVA test was applied to organize that table, significance level
182 of 0.05 (5%), it is being possible to verify the existence of outstanding differences ($p=0.0355$) between the results
183 of the domains. Identification of the differences evidences significant results between Environment and Physical
184 domains ($p=0.0085$), Environment and Psychological domains ($p=0.0032$), Environment and Social Relationships
185 domains ($p=0.0069$). Friedman's ANOVA was used because it requires the following assumptions: independence,
186 homoscedasticity and normal distribution, not all of which were satisfied. Friedman's ANOVA is then adequate
187 because the data are related and the scale is at least ordinal (not requiring normal distribution) since the method
188 is non-parametric. The internal reliability of the WHOQOL-Bref questionnaire scale was 0.85. Likewise, for each
189 of its four dimensions, Cronbach's scores were: 0.50 for the Physical domain, 0.51 for the Psychological domain,
190 0.76 for the Social Relations domain and 0.70 for the the Environment domain. By means of these results, it
191 is possible to affirm that the items are homogeneous and that the scale consistently has measured what was
192 proposed, for the Physical and Psychological domains the values were moderate.

193 It could be observed in the table above that the Environment domain, related to safety in daily life, leisure
194 activities, housing conditions, means of transport and health care service has showed a significantly lower result
195 than other domains. The physical environment, (THE WHOQOL GROUP, 1998).

196 In table 3, the scores for all the questions of the WHOQOL-Bref questionnaire are shown. Additional variances
197 were analysed from the socio demographic variables collected by the sample profiling questionnaire. The results
198 from this instrument, regarding the view about themselves on the use of the Portuguese Language have showed
199 that almost 50% (n=29) of the participants reported that they currently have a good or very good use of the oral
200 language. Also, for written language proficiency, 80% (n=49) of the participants reported to have a reasonable
201 or good writing. When asked if they use Libras to interact with their family, only 25% (n=15) of the sample
202 reported to interact by means of this language. Among those, most of them (n=14) have said that they have been
203 using Libras with their mothers. By correlating data between salary and the use of oral and written language,
204 it was observed by means of the Fisher's Test, significance level of 0.05, significant correlation between salary
205 rate and orality ($p=0.0481$) and written language ($p=0.0329$), with frequencies showing that the best results for
206 orality and writing occur among higher salary rates. According to the table 6 below, through the chisquare test,
207 at the significance level of 0.05, it is verified that there is a significant correlation between schooling and orality
208 ($p = 0.0001$), written language ($p = 0, 0005$) and reading ($p = 0.0005$), evidencing that the best QOL results
209 occur through the improvement of schooling. IV.

210 9 Volume XX Issue I Version I

211 10 Discussion

212 The current study is one of the few Brazilian studies which assess the QOL of Brazilian deaf sign language users.
213 In this section only some of the research results, especially the ones related to the Social Relationship (best
214 scores) and Environment (worst scores) domains of the WHOQOL-Bref will be discussed and compared with the
215 variables found in the sample profiling questionnaire.

216 The collected data reveal that most individuals of this sample were female, mean age of 28 years, congenital
217 deafness, working and among the working participants, most of them earn between one and two minimum salaries,
218 the percentage of deaf individuals earning more than two minimum salaries gradually decreases.

219 Crossing those data with question 18 from the physical domain of the WHOQOL-Bref, How satisfied are
220 you with your job performance? it is perceived that the participants, in general, are satisfied with their job
221 environment.

222 However, they have reported dissatisfaction, even graduated and post-graduated deaf individuals, with their
223 low salaries.

224 According to some participants, as they answered in the sample profiling questionnaire, deaf individuals earn
225 less than people with normal levels of hearing. Regarding that comment, it is worth elucidating that, in the
226 literature, it was not found national studies which point out salary discrepancies between people with normal
227 levels of hearing and the deaf population. The fact that many deaf subjects earn between one and two minimum
228 salaries meets national salary average. According to IBGE Census, 2015, over half of Brazilians earn less than a
229 minimum salary per capita (IBGE, 2015). Brazilian minimum salary in 2019 is R\$ 998.00, that is \$ 260.

230 In this regard, a research which was held in Australia by Willoughby (2011) has elucidated that some deaf
231 individuals in that study revealed that they have had the same position in their job and earned unequal salaries
232 because they do not have the same level of access to information and communication as people with normal levels
233 of hearing. The study by Perkins-Dock et al. ??2015) with 224 deaf participants from a Southern city located in
234 the United States, also has showed that communication disabilities and lack of assistive technologies at workplace
235 preclude the deaf from getting higher job positions and salaries.

236 It seems that most deaf participants in our study despite their lower salaries are satisfied with their jobs. Most
237 of the employed ones do not have access to information and communication by sign language. Sample participants
238 were asked how they interact with people with normal levels of hearing at workplace. Six, or 10%, answered
239 that they interact orally, as their co-workers did not know sign language. Eight participants, 13.33%, explained
240 that they use writing Portuguese language at their workplace. It should be clarified that those participants
241 who use Portuguese language inside their jobs earned over four salaries, work at universities and had at least
242 Higher Education. That fact seems to show that the use of written Portuguese language may be a differential
243 for better job positions and salaries, thus facilitating accessibility at workplace. It's important to notice that 39
244 participants that earn between one and four minimum salaries do not use Portuguese language inside their jobs,
245 they probably must have less access to communication and information in this environment.

246 This data matches with another Brazilian study from Guarinello et al. (2017), which shows that many Brazilian
247 deaf have difficulties in the use of the written language. The authors also reveal that the use of the Portuguese
248 language by means of more effective social practices may improve deaf individuals' quality of life. Furthermore,
249 Lustosa et al. (2016) point out that the use of reading and writing is essential not only in daily life, but also
250 for the appropriation of not-daily productions in human existence. The authors still observe that, in a literate
251 society, the achievement of full citizenship demands the mastery of reading and writing, once it is the way that
252 individuals may privilegedly get appropriated from the information and knowledge produced by mankind.

253 Even though 29 participants have reported that they have had good or very good oral language skills and 49
254 have affirmed that they have a reasonable or good writing skills, most of them do not use this language at work,
255 perhaps because they have low levels of literacy. Willoughby (2011) also points out, in his study, that many
256 Australian deaf individuals have low levels of literacy, which harms them at workplace, especially regarding the
257 use of electronic communication based on written texts. The author explains that the researched deaf suffered
258 from prejudice at their workplace. It appears that, countries, like Brazil, should invest more heavily on support
259 services to the deaf, by means of specialized teachers, who mediated reading and writing learning, so that deaf
260 people could get better jobs and salaries.

261 Significant results were found when oral and written language questions where crossed with salaries, so best
262 results for orality and writing skills occur among higher salaries.

263 Regarding occupation and schooling, it was perceived by participants' answers that most of them were
264 graduated or post-graduated. Among the graduated deaf participants, one attended Computer Science; one,
265 Mathematics; two, Physical Education; one, Psychology; two are graduated from Business; five from Education;
266 and seven from Language-Libras 3 . As for post-graduation, only four deaf participants had suchVolume XX
267 Issue I Version I 8 (G)

268 an educational level; all the others had specialization in special education. The participants, who told that
269 they had a master degree, took this degree in Education.

270 It should be clarified that during their education, most participants relied on the presence of an interpreter of
271 sign language. Such participants also answered how they interacted with their teachers at school; 43.33% (n=26)
272 reported the use of writing to interact with their teacher, and 36.67% (n=22) used speech. It should also be
273 observed that 28.33% (n=17) of the deaf were mediated by one sign language interpreter.

274 Many participants pointed out that they did not have sign language interpreters during elementary and middle
275 school, that probably occurred because, at the time they attended school, the presence of such a professional
276 in the classroom was not mandatory in Brazil. It became mandatory in the country in 2002, due to the Libras
277 Law, which assured the action scope of those professionals in all educational levels. It is agreed that the legal
278 obligation of the presence of that professional enables deaf individuals to interact with the greatest possible
279 number of people in the institutions that they attend (Silva, 2016).

280 Also, in that regard, studies show that the mediation with the interpreter can improved deaf individuals' QOL,
281 (Schubert, 2012; Silva, 2016), during their educational process.

10 DISCUSSION

282 Apart from the fact that many participants in this study had the help of an interpreter during their school years,
283 it should also be pointed out that over half of this sample has Higher Education, which is a restricted condition
284 to a small share of the Brazilian population. According to data from the National Research of Residences by
285 IBGE (2015), only 16% of Brazilian professionals have Higher Education. Moreover, three out of 10 people from
286 Brazilian labour force do not even conclude middle school (IBGE, 2015).

287 Probably the lack of interpreters during their school's years justifies the fact that many participants have
288 answered that they use either written or oral language with their teachers of schools. Despite that, it is necessary
289 to point out that most Brazilian population features limited levels of literacy, even those who attend Higher
290 Education. Research by Lustosa et al. (2016), in which the authors analyzed the practices of literacy from
291 beginners and graduated at a Higher Education institution, elucidates that many hearing students had difficulties
292 in the use of reading and writing in daily practices, regarding the primary genres. Such genres, according to the
293 research, should be acquired until the 9th grade of Middle School. This study also shows that the entrance in
294 Higher Education of Brazilians from different social classes unveils that the greatest part of this population has
295 literacy difficulties (Lustosa et al., 2016).

296 Difficulties in reading and writing are not only deaf people's, it extended to the whole Brazilian population.
297 Moreover, it should be clarified that despite the considerable increase in the number of enrolments in Higher
298 Education in the past years, data from the Indicator of Functional Literacy (INAF, 2016) evidence that the
299 population schooling level does not match the gains in the skill domains of reading and writing (Instituto
300 Abramundo, 2014).

301 Significant results were found in our study when crossing data between orality, writing and schooling, best
302 results in orality and writing occur by enhancing schooling.

303 The participants were also questioned on their views about themselves regarding the use of Libras and
304 Portuguese language, and the use of Libras by their family members. In this aspect, the results point out
305 that most participants refer to make a reasonable or good use of the Portuguese language, in the oral and writing
306 modes.

307 The answers in this study have shown that the deaf individuals that self-reported to have good skills in orality
308 and writing were exactly those who had better schooling and better answers in the QOL scoring. Participants
309 answers also indicate that despite these deaf individuals being users of Libras, most of their family members do
310 not use that language. Some of them point out that their parents have a tendency to use only the oral language
311 to communicate, even banning sign language.

312 About that, Witkoski (2009) has revealed that it is still common in families with normal hearing levels, the
313 obstination on spoken language and reading training as a normalization measure, disregarding identity formation,
314 cognitive and psychic development of the deaf subject.

315 Concerning the use of the Sign Language by hearing family of deaf subjects, Guarinello et al. (2013), in their
316 study, has clarified that many parents feel not able of taking care of their deaf children, and they often search for
317 help, but do not get appropriate information. Their study reveals that many parents had a lack of explanation
318 on what deafness is and its consequences; in general, they do not use sign language and opt for orality, often
319 guided by professionals who points out only the importance of the oral language to the deaf children (Guarinello
320 et al., 2013).

321 It is essential to highlight the family on language appropriation process and quality of life of their children.
322 Some studies show that if families had early access to sign language, their linguistic interactions with their deaf
323 children would be more effective (Hyde & Punch, 2011; Chaveiro, 2011; Novogrodsky et al., 2014; Garcia, 2016;
324 ??rastinski & Wilbur, 2016). Despite of that, the current research reveals that most parents do not use sign
325 language, so most deaf people only learn this language at school. Thinking about changing this hard situation,
326 it is understood that Brazilian public policies should prioritize family empowerment in the linguistic development
327 of their children, therefore, Brazilian states should assure families the access to Libras by means of actions
328 prioritizing the use of this language, and its importance as the second official language in the country. It is
329 perceived that despite the recognition of the sign language in the Brazilian education policies, there is still the
330 prevalence of monolingual practices in the country, which only prioritize the use of the Portuguese language
331 (Guarinello et al., 2009).

332 In relation to the Environment domain, the worst scored evaluated by participants in this research, questions
333 Q8 and Q9 How safe are you in your daily life? How healthy is your physical environment? (Climate, noise,
334 pollution, attractions), were the ones in which most participants had lower scores.

335 In questions (Q13) How available is for you the information you need in your daily life? And (Q24) How
336 satisfied are you with your access to health care services? data shows that the deaf participants are not satisfied
337 with their access to information, safety and healthcare services. It can be inferred that this occurs because
338 that share of population, in general, has been facing difficulties to perform daily activities due to the lack of
339 interpreters and, mainly, access to the healthcare area, similar data was reported by other studies (Black &
340 Glickman, 2006; Zöller & Archer, 2015; Gerich & Fellinger, 2012; Garcia, 2016).

341 Moreover, it is worth pointing out that Brazilian legislation, Law 13.146/15 determined that public services
342 concessionaires should assure institutional ways to support the use and dissemination of Libras as the means of
343 an objective communication ??Brasil, 2015). Despite the legislation, there is still a lot to be done regarding deaf

344 accessibility to society, once most of institutions do not provide information to the deaf, either by means of the
345 written language (legends) or Libras ??Brasil, 2015).

346 The lowest scoring evidenced in the questions on the Environment was also found in other studies (Garcia,
347 2016;Chaveiro, 2011; ??intermair, 2011;Gerich & Fellinger, 2012;Marinho & Vieira, 2015), which show that some
348 factors related to the environment affect deaf individuals QOL, such as the lack of sewage system and healthcare
349 services, lack of accessibility to leisure, money and means of transport, among others.

350 It can also be inferred that the negative answers to the question related to leisure activities may have relation
351 to money shortage and low salaries from part of this sample.

352 Similar results regarding the environment domain were also perceived in other Brazilian studies with other
353 samples, such as, teachers. Penteado & Pereira (2007) have explained that, in this domain, teachers' devaluating
354 job is evidenced, as in Brazil, they generally have scarce salary to their needs, which makes their possibilities of
355 personal, social and professional investment decrease. Like this study, several participants' job in our sample are
356 in the educational field, which has been suffering salary downsizing, professional scarcity and disqualification in
357 Brazil.

358 In our study, it is perceived that a considerable part of the sample evidences satisfactory levels of literacy and
359 education. Thus, many participants refer to themselves as bilingual, as they consider that they have proficiency
360 in the use of Portuguese language, in the oral and writing modes, and in Libras for their social interaction. That
361 seems to show that the use of the Portuguese language, in addition to the sign language, is one of the factors
362 that may improve the quality of life for this share of the population.

363 Similar findings were evidenced in a research by Hrastinski & Wilbur (2016), whose results unveil that deaf
364 students, proficient in the sign language and in English, presented better answers than their less fluent colleagues
365 in tests of reading comprehension in English, as well as evaluations on the use of the English language. Those
366 authors have observed that a bilingual environment is essential for the deaf to have a more favorable academic
367 development.

368 Based on the presented findings, it is possible to consider that higher educational level, best salaries associated
369 with better use of Portuguese language could be considered as factors that can influence a higher QOL.

370 It is crucial to notice that the WHOQOL-Bref instrument used in this study is a general instrument for quality
371 of life used for all sorts of population, so further studies should be developed QOL instruments especially to deaf
372 sign language users, which can contemplate their culture, educational and social aspects of life.

373 Despite such limitations, the WHOQOL-Bref does not miss its value as a feasible instrument for the QOL
374 perception, especially when used with other instruments that enable to a deep discussion.

375 V.

376 11 Conclusion

377 By analyzing the key research question, which factors influence the quality of life among the deaf sign language
378 users population, it was noticed that the best scores of QoL in this group are related to the proficiency in the
379 Portuguese language, in addition to earning the best salaries and higher education. It was also observed that
380 low earnings prevail in great part of the sample, even among those with Higher Education. Moreover, it was
381 perceived that the lower the schooling, the worse is QoL perception.

382 Despite many participants are reasonably satisfied with their quality of life, it can be noticed by their answers,
383 especially in the environment domain, that aspects related to jobs, healthcare services, safety and leisure are
384 unfavorable. These factors should be considered while planning and implementing health promotion actions
385 toward the studied community.

386 It seems to elucidate that, in Brazil, despite the broad formulation of public policies to support deaf individuals
387 accessibility, such as the Libras Law ??Brasil, 2012), and the Law of Accessibility ??Brasil, 2015), there are still
388 many hurdles that this population have to overtake to access some social and cultural institutions. So, it is vital to
389 invest in public policies and affirmative actions to reduce inequality conditions and also get rid of communication
390 obstacles, which prevent their participation in society. ^{1 2}

¹Year 2020 © 2020 Global Journals Factors Related to the Quality of Life in the Context of Deaf Sign Language users in Brazil

²© 2020 Global Journals Factors Related to the Quality of Life in the Context of Deaf Sign Language users in Brazil

11 CONCLUSION

1

Variables	Frequency	%
Gender		
Male	20	33,33%
Female	40	66,67%
Age	Mean age 28 years	
Hearing Loss		
	55	91,67%
	5	8,33%
Degree of hearing loss		
Severe to profound	60	100%
Salary		
1to 2 salaries 1 20		33.33%
3to 4 salaries 15		25.00%
More than 4 salaries	12	20.00%
Occupation		
Unemployed	13	21,67%
Employed	47	78,33%
Schooling		
MiddleSchool (9 years)	06	10.00%
High School	18	30.00%
Graduated	19	31.67%
Specialization 13		21.67%
Master's degree 04		06.67%
Source: Research Data		

Figure 1: Table 1 :

2

Domains	R	N	N/R	Average	Rank	Sum	Of Ranks	Mean	Standard deviation
Physical	54	6	2,49		92,00		58.40	11.80	
Psychological	57	3	2,66		99,00		61.26	14.13	
Social Relationships	46	14	2,82		104,50		64.31	21.06	
Environment	57	3	2,01		74,50		54.77	14.49	

[Note: R = number of subjects who answered; N/R = number of subjects who did not answer.]

Figure 2: Table 2 :

3

Question	N	MED	MIN	MAX	STD
1. How you rate your quality of life?	60	3.28	1	5	1.28
2. How satisfied are you your health?	60	3.35	1	5	1.10
3. To what extend do you feel that physical pain prevents you from doing what you need to do?	59	2.71	1	5	1.20
4. How much do you need any medical treatment to function in your daily life?	60	2.58	1	5	1.05
5. How much do you enjoy life?	60	3.52	1	5	1.10
6. To what extent do you feel your life to be meaningful?	60	3.45	1	5	0.91
7. How well are you able to concentrate?	59	3.20	1	5	0.80
8. How safe do you feel in your daily life?	59	3.39	2	5	0.77
9. How healthy is your physical environment?	59	2.95	1	5	1.06
10. Do you have enough energy for everyday life?	60	3.23	1	5	0.91
11. Are you able to accept your bolidy appearance?	58	3.57	2	5	0.88
12. Have you enough money to meet your needs?	60	3.08	1	5	0.87
13. How available to you is the information that you need in your day-to-day life?					

Figure 3: Table 3 :

4

Variable	Frequency	%
Oral language proficiency		
Very good	16	26,67
Good	13	21,67
Reasonable	13	21,67
Bad	18	30,00
Written language proficiency		
Good	19	31,67
Reasonable	30	50,00
Bad	11	18,33
Family use of Libras		
Yes	15	25,00
No	45	75,00

Source: Research Data

Figure 4: Table 4 :

11 CONCLUSION

5

Salary	Orality			P
	Bad	Medium	Good	
1 to 2 salaries	9	2	2	13
3 to 4 salaries	8	7	5	20
More than 4 salaries	1	8	6	15
Unemployed	1	3	8	12
TOTAL	19	20	21	60
	WRITING			
1 to 2 salaries	5	5	3	13
3 to 4 salaries	3	15	2	20
More than 4 salaries	-	11	4	15
Unemployed	2	4	6	12
TOTAL	10	35	15	60
	READING			
1 to 2 salaries	3		1	13
3 to 4 salaries	3	14	3	20
More than 4 salaries	1	9	5	15
Unemployed	1	4	7	12
TOTAL	8	36	16	60

Source: Research Data

Figure 5: Table 5 :

6

Variable	School Training			Total	P
	Elementary School	High School	Higher Education		
Orality					
Bad	-	17	2	19	
Medium	-	11	9	20	*0,0001
Good	1	2	18	21	
Writing					
Bad	-	9	1	10	
Medium	-	20	15	35	*0,0005
Good	1	1	13	15	
Read					
Bad	-	7	1	8	
Medium	-	22	14	36	*0,0005
Good	1	1	14	16	

Source: Research Data

Figure 6: Table 6 :

391 [Deafness Education International] , *Deafness & Education International* 1 (3-4) p. .

392 [Educativa] , Ação Educativa .

393 [Black and Glickman ()] , P A Black , N S Glickman . 2006.

394 [Chaveiro et al. ()] , N Chaveiro , S B R Duarte , A R Freitas , M A Barbosa , C C Porto , M P A Fleck . 2013.

395 [Angela et al. ()] , T C S Angela , A L M Moret , O A Costa , L T Nascimento , K F Aalvarenga . 2016.

396 [Perkins-Dock et al. ()] ‘A survey of barriers to employment for individuals who are deaf’. R E Perkins-Dock , T R Battle , J M Edgerton , J N Mcneill . [http://repository.wcsu.edu/jadara/vol49/iss2/3\(02/02/2017](http://repository.wcsu.edu/jadara/vol49/iss2/3(02/02/2017) *Jadara* 2015. 49 (2) p. .

397 [Hrastnski and Wilbur (2016)] ‘Academic achievement of deaf and hard-of-hearing students in an ASL/English bilingual program’. I Hrastnski , R B Wilbur . 10.1093/deafed/env072. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education* 2016. 2016 Feb 10. 21 (2) p. .

398 [Lustosa ()] ‘Análise das práticas de letramento de ingressantes e concluintes de uma instituição de ensino superior: estudo de caso’. S S Lustosa . 10.1590/1982-021620161843716. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1982-021620161843716> *Revista CEFAC* 2016. 18 (4) p. .

399 [Steinberg ()] *Assessment of quality of life and preferences of parents with children who are deaf. Abstract Book at Association of Health Services Research Meeting*, A Steinberg . 1999. 16 p. .

400 [Almeida et al. ()] ‘Avaliação da qualidade de vida em crianças usuárias de implante coclear’. R A Almeida , C G Matas , A I V Couto , A C M Carvalho . 10.1590/%201982-0216201618313215. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1982-0216201618313215> *Rev Cadas* 2015. 27 (1) p. .

401 [Abramundo ()] *Brasil (Org.). ILC -Indicador de Letramento Científico: Sumário executivo de resultados. São Paulo: Fundação Carlos Chagas em Parceria com Instituto Paulo Montenegro*, Instituto Abramundo . 2014.

402 [Vaccari and Marschark ()] ‘Communication between parents and deaf children: implications for social-emotional development’. C Vaccari , M Marschark . 10.1111/j.1469-7610.1997.tb01597. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 1997. 38 p. .

403 [Brasil ()] *Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil*, Brasil . 1988. Brasília: Senado Federal.

404 [_____ ()] *Constituição da República Federativa do Brasil. Lei Federal de Acessibilidade. nº 13.146 de 15 setembro de*, Lbi _____. 2015. 2015.

405 [Guarinello et al. (ed.) ()] *Deafness: Educational-Historical Aspects in the Brazilian Context*, A C Guarinello , A P Santana , A P Berberian , G A Massi . Moores, D.F., Millers M.S. (ed.) 2009. Washington, DC: Gallaudet University Press. p. . (Deaf People Around the world. Educational and social perspectives)

406 [Demographics, psychiatric diagnoses, and other characteristics of North American Deaf and hard-ofhearing inpatients] J Deaf Stud Deaf Educ 2012. 17 (1) p. .

407 [Demographics, psychiatric diagnoses, and other characteristics of North American Deaf and hard-ofhearing inpatients]. 10.1093/deafed/enj042. *J Deaf Stud Deaf Educ* 11 (3) p. .

408 [Quadros ()] *Educação de surdos*, R M Quadros . 1997. Porto Alegre: Artes Médicas.

409 [Gerich and Fellinger ()] ‘Effects of Social Networks on the Quality of Life in an Elder and Middle-Aged Deaf Community Sample’. J Gerich , J Fellinger . 10.1093/deafed/enr022. <https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enr022> *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education* 2012. 17 (1) p. .

410 [Zöller and Archer ()] ‘Emotional Disturbances Expressed by Deaf Patients: Affective Deaf Syndrome’. M E T Zöller , T Archer . 10.4172/2471-2701.100109. *Clinical Experimental Psychology* 2015. 2 p. 109.

411 [Lodi ()] ‘Ensino da Língua Portuguesa como segunda língua para surdos: impacto na educação básica’. A C B Lodi . *Tenho um aluno surdo, e agora? Introdução à Libras e educação de surdos*, C B F Lacerda, L F Santos (ed.) (São Carlos) 2013. EdUFSCar. p. .

412 [Himi and Takano ()] ‘Excellence in Otolaryngology. 70 Years of the Department of Otolaryngology of the’ T Himi , K Takano . *Sapporo Medical University. Advanced Otorhinolaryngology* 2016. 77 p. .

413 [Guarinello et al. ()] A C Guarinello , D P Claudiao , P S V Festa , R Paciornik . *Reflexões sobre as interações linguísticas entre familiares ouvintes: filhos surdos. Ciência e Cultura*, 2013. 46 p. .

414 [Hinterman ()] ‘Health-related quality of life and classroom participation of deaf and hard-ofhearing students in general schools’. M Hinterman . 10.1093/deafed/enq045. <https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enq045> *The Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education* 2011. 16 (2) p. .

415 [Instituto and Montenegro ()] *Indicador de Alfabetismo funcional: Estudo especial sobre alfabetismo e mundo do trabalho*, Paulo Instituto , Montenegro . 2016. (Brasil (Org.))

416 [Kushalnagar et al. ()] ‘Infants and children with hearing loss need early language access’. P Kushalnagar , G Mathur , C Moreland , D Napoli , W Osterling , C Padden , C Rathmann . 20866021. *Journal of Clinical Ethics* 2010. 21 (2) p. .

11 CONCLUSION

445 [Instrumentos em Língua Brasileira de Sinais para avaliação da qualidade de vida da população surda Revista Saúde Publica]
446 'Instrumentos em Língua Brasileira de Sinais para avaliação da qualidade de vida da população surda'.
447 10.1590/S0034-8910.2013047004136. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S0034-8910.2013047004136>
448 *Revista Saúde Publica* 47 (3) p. .

449 [Fellinger ()] 'Mental distress and quality of life in a deaf population'. J Fellinger . DOI: 10.1007/s00127-005-0936-8. *Society Psychiatry Psychiatry Epidemiology* 2005. 40 (9) p. .

450 [Fellinger ()] 'Mental distress and quality of life in the hard of hearing'. J Fellinger . 10.1111/j.1600-0447.2006.00976.x5. *Acta Psychiatr Scand* 2007. 115 (3) p. .

451 [Fellinger et al. ()] 'Mental health of deaf people'. J Fellinger , D Holzinger , R Pollard . 10.1016/S0140-6736(11)61143-4. *Lancet* 2012. 379 p. .

452 [_____ ()] *Ministério da Saúde. Manual de Estrutura Física das Unidades Básicas de Saúde. 2. ed. Brasília. 10.436, de 24 de abril de 2002. Dispõe sobre a Língua Brasileira de Sinais -Libras, _____.* 2008. Brasília, DF: CC.

453 [Silva ()] *O intérprete de libras no contexto do ensino superior. 77f. Dissertação (Mestrado)*, R Q Silva . 2016. Universidade Tuiuti do Paraná Curitiba

454 [Marques ()] *O método da análise de componentes principais na detecção e identificação de outliers múltiplos em fototriangulação*. Curitiba. Tese (Doutorado em Ciências Geodésicas da, J M Marques . 1994. Universidade Federal do Paraná

455 [Schulbert ()] *Políticas públicas e os sentidos e significados atribuídos pelos educandos surdos ao intérprete de língua de sinais brasileira*, S E M Schulbert . 2012.

456 [_____ ()] *Presidência da República*, _____. 2002.

457 [Garcia ()] *Qualidade de vida da pessoa surda no ambiente familiar. 145 f. Dissertação (Mestrado em*, R R Garcia . 2016. Goiânia. Ciências da Saúde) -Universidade Federal de Goiás

458 [Penteado and Pereira ()] *Qualidade de vida e saúde vocal de professores Revista de Saúde Pública*, R Z Penteado , I M T B Pereira . 10.1590/S0034-89102007000. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/S0034-89102007000> 2007. 200010. 41 p. .

459 [Marinho and Vieira ()] *Qualidade de vida em adolescentes com necessidades especiais em um município de Pernambuco. Revista brasileira de promoção da saúde*, C L A Marinho , S C M Vieira . 2015. 28 p. .

460 [Qualidade de vida em adultos usuários de implante coclear Rev Cadas] 'Qualidade de vida em adultos usuários de implante coclear'. 10.1590/2317-1782/20162015097. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/2317-1782/20162015097> *Rev Cadas* 28 (2) p. .

461 [Jaiyeola and Adeyemo ()] 'Quality of life of deaf and hard of hearing students in Ibadan metropolis'. A Jaiyeola , A Adeyemo . 10.1371/journal.pone.0190130. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0190130> Nigeria. *Journal Plos One* 2018. p. .

462 [Chaveiro et al. ()] 'Quality of life of deaf people who communicate in sign language: integrative review'. N Chaveiro , S B R Duarte , A R Freitas , M A Barbosa , C C Porto , M P A Fleck . 10.1590/1807-57622014.0510. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1807-57622014.0510> *Interface* 2014. 18 (48) p. .

463 [Chaveiro ()] *Quality of life of the deaf people that communicate through sign languages: construction of the LIBRAS version of the WHOQOL-BREF and WHOQOL-DIS instruments. 252 f. Tese (Doutorado em*, N Chaveiro . 2011. Goiânia. Ciencias da Saude) -Universidade Federal de Goiás

464 [Marschark ()] *Raising and educating a deaf child*, M Marschark . 2007. New York: Oxford University Press.

465 [Ibge. Censo Demográfico ()] 'Rio de Janeiro: Ministério do Planejamento'. Ibge. Censo Demográfico . *características gerais da população, religião e pessoas com deficiência*, 2015. p. 215.

466 [Willoughby ()] 'Sign Language Users' Education and Employment Levels: Keeping Pace with Changes in the General Australian population'. L Willoughby . 10.1093/deafed/enq067. <https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enq067> *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education* 2011. 16 (3) p. .

467 [Guarinello et al. ()] *Speech language group therapy in the context of written language for deaf subjects in Southern Brazil*, A C Guarinello , G Massi , A P Berberian , R Tonocchi , S M L Valentin . 2017.

468 [Ayantoye and Luckner ()] 'Successful Students Who Are Deaf or Hard of Hearing and Culturally and/or Linguistically Diverse in Inclusive Settings'. C A Ayantoye , J L Luckner . 10.1353/aad.2016.0008. *American Annals of the Deaf* 2016. 60 (5) p. .

469 [Novogrodsky et al. ()] 'The development of antonym knowledge in American Sign Language (ASL) and its relationship to reading comprehension in English'. R Novogrodsky , C Caldwell-Harris , S Fish , R J Hoffmeister . 10.1016/j.cognition.2014.03.014. *Language Learning* 2014. 64 p. .

470 [Hyde and Punch ()] 'The modes of communication used by children with cochlear implants and the role of sign in their lives'. M Hyde , R Punch . *American annals of the deaf* 2011. 155 (5) p. .

501 [The World Health Organization Quality of Life Assessment (WHOQOL): Position paper from the Health Organization Soc. Sci.
502 'The World Health Organization Quality of Life Assessment (WHOQOL): Position paper from the Health
503 Organization'. *Soc. Sci. Med* 1995. (10) p. . The Whoqol Group

504 [Meadow-Orlans et al. ()] *The world of deaf infants: a longitudinal study*, K P Meadow-Orlans , P E Spencer ,
505 L S Koester . 2004. New York: Oxford University Press.

506 [Libras ()] *Tradução do questionário WHQOL Libras Brasil*, Whoqol Libras . <https://www.medicina.ufg.br/qualidadedevida/> 2016.

508 [Volume XX Issue I Version I 11 (G)] *Volume XX Issue I Version I 11 (G),*