

## THE CURRENT SITUATION AND INFLUENCING FACTORS OF SOCIAL ADAPTATION OF HEARING-IMPAIRED MIDDLE SCHOOL STUDENTS

**Deepika Dwivedi**

**Research Scholar**

**Dr Satyanarain Nai**

**Research Supervisor**

**Department of Special Education, Shri Khushal Das University, Hanumangarh**

### **ABSTRACT**

Hearing-impaired middle school students face unique challenges in social adaptation due to communication barriers, peer dynamics, and limited inclusive support, particularly in mainstream educational settings. This conceptual paper synthesizes global and Indian research to examine the current state of their social adaptation and the key influencing factors. Drawing on Bronfenbrenner's bio-ecological model, it explores adaptation across peer relationships, emotional well-being, and school participation. Findings from existing studies indicate that these students experience higher rates of social isolation, lower friendship quality, and reduced group engagement compared to hearing peers, despite academic progress with proper support. Influencing factors operate at multiple levels: individual (degree of hearing loss, communication mode, self-esteem), familial (parental involvement, socioeconomic status), school (teacher training, peer attitudes, educational placement), and societal (policy implementation, cultural stigma). Interactions among these factors either reinforce challenges or promote resilience. The paper identifies research gaps, including limited focus on middle school transitions and contextual variations in developing nations like India. It proposes practical recommendations for educators, parents, and policymakers to enhance inclusive practices, communication access, and social skills training. Ultimately, strengthening social adaptation is essential for the holistic development, mental health, and long-term inclusion of hearing-impaired adolescents.

**Keywords:** hearing impairment, social adaptation, middle school students, influencing factors, inclusive education, special education, bio-ecological model

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

In an era where inclusive education is both a global mandate and a moral imperative, the social adaptation of hearing-impaired middle school students remains a critical yet underexplored frontier. These adolescents, navigating the turbulent waters of puberty and

peer dynamics, face amplified challenges due to communication barriers and societal misconceptions. In India, where over 1.4 million children live with hearing impairment and most attend mainstream schools with limited support, the stakes are particularly high. This study delves into their current realities, not merely as a clinical or educational concern, but as a fundamental issue of equity, dignity, and human potential. By illuminating the interplay of personal resilience, familial support, and institutional practices, the study aims to pave the way for transformative interventions.

### **1.1 Background and Context**

Hearing impairment is one of the most common sensory disabilities among school children, with serious effects on their learning and social growth (World Health Organization, 2021). The WHO (2021) reports that about 34 million children worldwide experience disabling hearing loss, with a significant portion of these students undergoing middle school education, where they face not only academic challenges but also difficulties in social interaction and communication. In simple terms, hearing impairment means a loss severe enough to make it hard for the affected individual to understand spoken language, affecting his/her educational performance and social connections (Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 2004).

The prevalence of hearing-impaired students in middle schools has increased substantially over the past two decades, driven by improved early identification programs, advances in medical intervention, and expanded inclusive education policies (Gallaudet Research Institute, 2023). Current estimates suggest that about two to three in every 1,000 school-aged children have educationally significant hearing loss, with roughly 15% of these students enrolled in middle school programs (Mitchell & Karchmer, 2004). This demographic shift has created unprecedented opportunities and challenges for educational systems seeking to provide comprehensive support for these students' academic, social and emotional development (Antia et al., 2011).

Social adaptation is an essential component of the developmental process for all children. The ability to communicate, form peer relationships, and participate in group learning directly affects not only academic performance but also self-esteem and psychosocial health. The significance of social adaptation during adolescence cannot be overstated, particularly for hearing-impaired students who face unique communication challenges (Steinberg, 2020). Middle school years, typically spanning ages 11-14, represent a critical developmental period characterized by rapid physical, cognitive, emotional, and social changes (Eccles & Roeser, 2011). During this period, peer relationships and group learning become increasingly

important, social hierarchies take shape, and students begin forming their identity and sense of belonging within their school community (Brown & Larson, 2009). For hearing-impaired students, these typical challenges are compounded by communication barriers, potential social isolation, and the need to navigate between hearing and deaf cultural identities (Leigh, 2009). Though inclusion is growing in Indian schools, but students still face barriers under laws like the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, and National Education Policy, 2020 (Sharma & Deppler, 2018).

## **1.2 Problem Statement**

Even with hearing aids, assistive technologies, special classroom help, communication support, and inclusive rules, hearing-impaired middle school students continue to struggle with substantial challenges in social fitting-in (Theunissen et al., 2014). Studies show they face more loneliness, social isolation, peer rejection, bullying, and emotional distress than their hearing classmates (Fellinger et al., 2012; Punch & Hyde, 2011). Limited communication opportunities create complex dynamics that affect not only their academic participation but also informal social interactions, friendships, fun interactions, and overall school engagement (Antia et al., 2009).

A concerning issue is the gap between academic achievement and social integration among hearing-impaired students. Many of these students do well in studies with support, but fall behind in social skills (Luckner & Muir, 2001; Marschark et al., 2015). This disparity highlights that current educational approaches inadequately address the vital aspect of social development for this population (Knoors & Marschark, 2012).

Research in developmental psychology indicates that middle school social experiences have lasting impacts on self-concept, interpersonal skills, and mental health outcomes (Steinberg, 2020). Poor experiences raise risks of depression, anxiety, academic disengagement, and dropping out (Qualter et al., 2010). For hearing-impaired students, who may already encounter elevated risks for these outcomes, the challenges of successful social adaptation during middle school are magnified because of communication barriers and limited inclusion opportunities (Theunissen et al., 2014).

Furthermore, the heterogeneous nature of the hearing-impaired student population adds complexity to understanding and addressing social adaptation challenges (Marschark & Spencer, 2016). Students vary widely in degree of hearing loss, age of onset, communication preferences, family background, and educational placement, all of which influence their social experiences and adaptation processes (Calderon & Greenberg, 2003; Yoshinaga-Itano,

2003). This diversity necessitates nuanced approaches to conceptualizing and supporting social adaptation rather than a ‘one-size-fits-all’ model (Antia et al., 2011).

In India, where inclusion of children with disabilities is steadily increasing, hearing-impaired students continue to face multifaceted barriers that hinder their full social integration (Sharma & Deppeler, 2018). Hearing impairment affects a learner’s ability to perceive verbal communication, which can lead to feelings of isolation, misunderstanding, and reduced participation in social activities (Marschark & Hauser, 2012). Despite the implementation of policies such as the *Rights of Persons with Disabilities (RPwD) Act, 2016* and the *National Education Policy (NEP, 2020)*, students with hearing impairment often remain at the periphery of mainstream school interactions. This conceptual study examines the current status of their social adaptation and main influencing factors.

### **1.3 Research Objectives and Questions**

This paper builds a clear theory framework for the current social adaptation situation and its factors, drawing from special education, psychology, communication, and sociology (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2007). It covers students with different hearing loss levels in any middle school setup (mainstream or special), focusing on social—not just academic—growth, though links are noted (Luckner & Muir, 2001; Antia et al., 2011; Marschark & Spencer, 2016). Three questions guide it:

- What is the current state of social adaptation among hearing-impaired middle school students?**

This question explores how hearing-impaired students are currently functioning in social contexts within middle school settings, by examining their peer relationship patterns, social participation levels, communication effectiveness in social situations, and overall social well-being indicators (Stinson & Antia, 1999; Antia et al., 2009).

- What are the main factors influencing social adaptation?**

This question focuses on identifying and analyzing the key variables that contribute to successful or unsuccessful social adaptation outcomes (Calderon & Greenberg, 2003). It encompasses factors at multiple ecological levels, including individual characteristics (degree of hearing loss, communication skills, personality traits), family influences (communication patterns, support systems, cultural background), school-related factors (educational placement, teacher attitudes, peer acceptance), and broader contextual variables (community resources, cultural attitudes toward disability, policy frameworks) (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2007; Yoshinaga-Itano, 2003).

- **How do these factors interact to affect social adaptation?**

This question examines the complex, dynamic relationships among the various factors that influence social adaptation (Sameroff, 2010). It seeks to understand their reinforcing or compensating effects (Masten & Motti-Stefanidi, 2020), acknowledging that social adaptation emerges from complex interactions among multiple influences operating across different contexts and time periods (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2007).

#### **1.4 Significance of the Study**

This conceptual study carries both theoretical and practical significance.

From a theoretical perspective, the paper aims to contribute to the understanding of how multiple ecological factors, ranging from familial and school support to societal attitudes, affect the social development of hearing-impaired adolescents (Marschark & Spencer, 2016; Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2007). The paper expands the conceptual framework of social adaptation by integrating developmental, communicative, and educational dimensions. From a practical perspective, the insights of the study can guide educators, school administrators, counsellors and therapists in designing more inclusive social environments with effective interventions such as peer sensitivity programs, structured social-skills training, and counselling support (Antia et al., 2011; Luckner & Muir, 2001). For policymakers, the study aims to provide an evidence-informed foundation for enhancing special education policy by improving laws and services for hearing-impaired students (Knoors & Marschark, 2012).

For parents, the study highlights the importance of communication-rich home environments and emotional support in fostering social resilience in such children (Calderon & Greenberg, 2003). Ultimately, this paper emphasizes that social adaptation is as crucial as academic success in the holistic development of hearing-impaired students. Strengthening their social participation not only improves their school experience but also lays the foundation for lifelong confidence, emotional well-being, and social inclusion (Theunissen et al., 2014; Marschark et al., 2015).

## **2. LITERATURE REVIEW**

A strong understanding of social adaptation in hearing-impaired middle school students requires reviewing existing research and theories. This section defines key concepts, summarizes what we know about their current social situation, and explores the main factors that help or hinder adaptation. It draws from global studies while highlighting issues specific to India. The review identifies gaps that this paper aims to address.

## 2.1 Conceptual Framework of Social Adaptation

Social adaptation refers to how well a person adjusts to social settings by building relationships, managing emotions, and joining group activities (Ladd & Proflet, 1996). For hearing-impaired students, it includes communication skills, peer acceptance, and feeling part of the school community (Antia et al., 2009).

This study uses Bronfenbrenner's Bioecological Model (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2007). It views development as shaped by following layers:

- **Microsystem:** Close settings like family, peers, and classroom.
- **Mesosystem:** Links between settings, such as home-school communication.
- **Exosystem:** External factors like teacher training or community services.
- **Macrosystem:** Bigger cultural values, laws, and attitudes toward disability.
- **Chronosystem:** Changes over time, like moving to middle school.

This framework helps explain how different factors interact to affect social adaptation.

## 2.2 Current Situation of Social Adaptation of Hearing-impaired Middle School Students

Hearing-impaired middle school students often face more social challenges than hearing peers. A review of 20 studies found they score lower on friendship quality and higher on loneliness (Pinquart & Pfeiffer, 2020). In mainstream schools, only 40–50% report close friends, compared to 80% of hearing students (Antia et al., 2011).

Students with cochlear implants or good sign language support show better peer interaction (Punch & Hyde, 2011). In inclusive settings with trained teachers, social participation improves by 25–30% (Xie et al., 2014). However, in India, most schools lack sign language interpreters or peer awareness programs, leading to isolation (Sharma & Depeler, 2018).

Middle school is tougher because group work and casual talks increase. Hearing-impaired students miss jokes, gossip, or quick instructions, reducing belonging (Bat-Chava & Deignan, 2001). Girls often adapt better through one-on-one talks, while boys struggle more in team activities (Theunissen et al., 2014).

## 2.3 Influencing Factors

### (i) Individual Factors:

- Degree of Hearing Loss: Mild loss allows better speech reading; profound loss needs visual cues (Marschark and Spencer, 2016).
- Communication Mode: Students fluent in sign language or using implants interact more (Yoshinaga-Itano, 2003).

- Self-Esteem and Resilience: High self-confidence predicts better adaptation (Fellinger et al., 2012).

**(ii) Family Factors:**

- Parental Involvement: Homes using sign language or encouraging social activities help children (Calderon & Greenberg, 2003).
- Socioeconomic Status: Better resources mean access to therapy or devices (NSSO, 2018).

**(iii) School and Peer Factors:**

- Inclusive Practices: Teacher training in deaf education boosts acceptance (Antia et al., 2011).
- Peer Attitudes: Awareness programs reduce bullying and increase friendships (Knoors & Marschark, 2012).
- Educational Placement: Mainstream with support works well; full isolation limits exposure (Luckner & Muir, 2001).

**(iv) Societal Factors:**

- Policies: India's RPwD Act, 2016, and NEP, 2020, push inclusion but lack full implementation in rural and underdeveloped areas (Sharma & Deppeler, 2018).
- Cultural Views: Stigma in some communities sees disability as a burden, affecting confidence (Marschark & Hauser, 2012).

## **2.4 Research Gaps**

Most studies are from Western countries; few focus on India or middle school specifically. Furthermore, quantitative data dominates, but qualitative views from students are rare. Also, interactions between factors (e.g., family and school support) are underexplored. This paper addresses these gaps using an ecological lens.

## **3. DISCUSSION**

Building upon the literature review, this section synthesizes the global and Indian research through the lens of Bronfenbrenner's bio-ecological model (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2007). It analyzes the current state of social adaptation among hearing-impaired middle school students, elucidates the key influencing factors at multiple ecological levels, and examines their dynamic interactions. This conceptual integration highlights how adaptation is not a static outcome but a process shaped by ongoing person-environment transactions (Sameroff, 2010). Recent studies, including those from 2020-2025, underscore persistent challenges

amid emerging opportunities, such as advancements in assistive technologies and inclusive policies, while revealing contextual nuances in developing nations like India.

### **3.1 Current State of Social Adaptation: Global and Indian Perspectives**

Globally, hearing-impaired middle school students continue to exhibit lower levels of social integration compared to their hearing peers; recent meta-analyses confirm elevated rates of loneliness, reduced peer interactions, and limited participation in group activities (Pinquart & Pfeiffer, 2020). Studies on the social adaptation of hearing-impaired middle school students report that while academic progress is achievable with support, social isolation persists due to communication barriers, with students often describing feelings of exclusion during informal peer exchanges (Eichengreen et al, 2025; Aggarwal, 2023). Positive developments include improved outcomes for students using cochlear implants or AI-driven assistive tools, which enhance communication and boost social participation by 20-30% in supportive environments (Every Learner Everywhere, 2025; Alkahtani, 2024; Levesque et al, 2023). However, in mainstream settings, only about 40-50% of these students report having close friendships, a stark contrast to 80% among hearing peers (Antia et al., 2011).

In India, the situation is compounded by resource disparities and cultural factors (Ansari, 2021). Comparative studies indicate that hearing-impaired upper primary and middle school students score significantly lower on social adjustment measures (mean = 6.92) compared to normal hearing students (mean = 12.22), leading to higher emotional instability and reduced group engagement (Hong and Lv, 2025). Indian research highlights that adolescents with hearing impairment demonstrate poorer adaptive emotional abilities, which directly impair social adaptation through difficulties in recognizing and managing emotions in interactions (Bhuvaneswari & Selvaraj, 2013). Limited access to early intervention and speech services in rural areas exacerbates these issues, resulting in lower happiness and interpersonal relationship scores, particularly among creatively inclined students who may prioritize individual expression over social conformity. Despite policies like the RPwD Act (2016) and NEP (2020), implementation gaps in schools lead to persistent stigma and bullying, with only marginal improvements in urban inclusive programs (Sharma & Deppler, 2018). Overall, while some Indian students show resilience through family-supported sign language use, the majority face amplified isolation during middle school transitions, where peer dynamics intensify (Theunissen et al., 2014).

### **3.2 Influencing Factors through the Bio-ecological Lens**

Bronfenbrenner's model provides a structured framework for categorizing influencing factors, revealing how they operate across nested systems to shape social adaptation.

**Microsystem:** Immediate environments like family, peers, and classrooms exert the most direct influence. Communication competency remains a core individual factor, with students proficient in sign language or oral methods showing better peer interactions (Yoshinaga-Itano, 2003). Degree of hearing loss and self-esteem also play roles; mild losses facilitate lip-reading and higher resilience, while profound losses increase reliance on visual aids (Marschark & Spencer, 2016). In Indian contexts, family involvement, such as using preferred languages at home, significantly predicts adaptive emotional abilities, explaining up to 28% of variability in social skills (Sud and Panda, 2023; van Driessche et al., 2014). Peer attitude, which is often negative due to lack of awareness, contributes to bullying and rejection (Knoors & Marschark, 2012).

**Mesosystem:** Interconnections between microsystems, such as home-school collaboration, are crucial. Parental awareness and teacher training enhance adjustment, but in India, stigmas and limited resources weaken these links, leading to poorer social outcomes (Rout and Khanna, 2012; Calderon & Greenberg, 2003). Recent applications of the model emphasize that effective mesosystem interactions, like joint parent-teacher programs, can mitigate isolation by fostering consistent communication support.

**Exosystem:** Indirect influences include community services and teacher preparation. Access to assistive technologies, like AI-driven tools or tele-health, positively impacts adaptation by improving academic and social participation (Antia et al., 2011). In India, socioeconomic status determines therapy availability, with lower SES correlating to delayed interventions and heightened emotional challenges (National Sample Survey Organization, 2018).

**Macrosystem:** Broader cultural and policy contexts shape attitudes. In Western settings, inclusive policies promote better integration, but in India, cultural stigma views disability as a burden, reinforcing isolation (Marschark & Hauser, 2012). Global shifts toward equity, as per WHO guidelines, contrast with uneven implementation in developing nations.

**Chronosystem:** Time-related transitions, like entering middle school, amplify challenges. Age of onset and early intervention timing form the key; earlier support leads to stronger social foundations (Yoshinaga-Itano, 2003).

### 3.3 Interactions among Factors

Factors do not operate in isolation; their interactions create reinforcing or compensatory effects (Masten & Motti-Stefanidi, 2020), eg strong microsystem support (e.g., resilient self-

esteem) can buffer exosystem deficits (e.g., poor school resources), as seen in students who thrive despite limited services through family encouragement. In India, negative macrosystem attitudes (stigma) interact with mesosystem weaknesses (poor home-school links) to exacerbate social withdrawal, but positive chronosystem factors like timely cochlear implantation can compensate, improving peer relationships by enhancing communication (Punch & Hyde, 2011). Creativity, an individual factor, may interact ambiguously with social domains, potentially fostering independence but hindering interpersonal bonds if not supported by inclusive peers. Overall, resilient adaptation emerges when positive factors across levels align, such as policy-driven teacher training (macrosystem) enhancing classroom interactions (microsystem).

#### **4. RECOMMENDATIONS**

To enhance social adaptation, multifaceted interventions are proposed:

**For Educators:** Implement peer awareness programs and social skills training, and integrating assistive technologies like AI captioning to bridge communication gaps (Luckner & Muir, 2001; Levesque et al, 2023; Alkahtani, 2024). Teacher training in deaf education should emphasize ecological interconnections, such as collaborating with families for consistent support.

**For Parents:** Foster communication-rich homes through sign language or oral methods, and advocate for early interventions to build emotional resilience (Calderon & Greenberg, 2003).

**For Policymakers:** Strengthen RPwD Act and NEP implementation with rural-focused resources, including mandatory inclusive curricula and anti-stigma campaigns (Sharma & Deppeler, 2018). Promote research on middle school transitions in India to address gaps.

These recommendations aim to create synergistic effects across Bronfenbrenner's systems, promoting holistic development.

#### **5. CONCLUSION**

Hearing-impaired middle school students' social adaptation remains challenged by communication barriers and ecological imbalances, yet opportunities for resilience exist through targeted support. By applying Bronfenbrenner's model, this paper synthesizes evidence showing that integrated factors at individual, familial, school, and societal levels drive outcomes. Addressing Indian-specific gaps via inclusive practices is vital for equity.

Future empirical studies should validate these conceptual insights, ultimately fostering environments where these students thrive socially and emotionally.

## REFERENCES

1. Aggarwal, K. (2023). *Striving for social inclusion: Still a dream for individuals with hearing loss*. Student Academy of Audiology. Retrieved from <https://saa.audiology.org>
2. Alkahtani B. N. (2024). The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Quality of Life for Deaf and Hard of Hearing Students. *American annals of the deaf*, 169(4), 329–347. <https://doi.org/10.1353/aad.2024.a946587>
3. Ansari, M. S. (2021). Hearing screening program for school going children in India: Necessity, justification, and suggested approaches. *The Egyptian Journal of Otolaryngology*, 37(1), 118. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43163-021-00182-x>
4. Antia, S. D., Jones, P. B., Reed, S., & Kreimeyer, K. H. (2009). Academic status and progress of deaf and hard-of-hearing students in general education classrooms. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 14(3), 293-311. <https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enn025>
5. Antia, S. D., Jones, P., Luckner, J., Kreimeyer, K. H., & Reed, S. (2011). Social outcomes of students who are deaf and hard of hearing in general education classrooms. *Exceptional Children*, 77(4), 489-504. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001440291107700407>
6. Bat-Chava, Y., & Deignan, E. (2001). Peer relationships of children with cochlear implants. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 6(4), 285–298. <https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/6.4.285>
7. Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A. (2007). The Bioecological Model of Human Development. In *Handbook of Child Psychology* (Vol. 1). Wiley Online Library. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470147658.chpsy0114>
8. Brown, B. B., & Larson, J. (2009). Peer relationships in adolescence. In R. M. Lerner & L. Steinberg (Eds.), *Handbook of adolescent psychology* (3rd ed., pp. 74–103). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470479193.adlpsy002004>
9. Calderon, R., & Greenberg, M. T. (2003). Social and emotional development of deaf children: Family, school, and program effects. In M. Marschark & P. E. Spencer (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of deaf studies, language, and education* (pp. 177–189). Oxford University Press.

10. Eccles, J. S., & Roeser, R. W. (2011). Schools as developmental contexts during adolescence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 21(1), 225–241. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2010.00725.x>
11. Eichengreen, A., Spigt, A., & Zaidman-Zait, A. (2025). Social inclusion of mainstreamed deaf or hard-of-hearing preadolescents and their perspectives on coping with communication barriers. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08856257.2025.2537508>
12. Every Learner Everywhere. (2025). *How AI in assistive technology supports students and educators with disabilities*. Retrieved from <https://www.everylearnereverywhere.org/resources/where-ai-meets-accessibility-considerations-for-higher-education/>
13. Fellinger, J., Holzinger, D., & Pollard, R. (2012). Mental health of deaf people. *The Lancet*, 379(9820), 1037–1044. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(11\)61143-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(11)61143-4)
14. Gallaudet Research Institute. (2023). *Regional and national summary report of data from the 2022-23 Annual Survey of Deaf and Hard of Hearing Children and Youth*. Gallaudet University.
15. Hong, M., & Lv, S. (2025). The Current Situation and Influencing Factors of Social Adaptation of Hearing Impaired Middle School Students: A Qualitative Research. *Current Psychology*, 44, 8245–8256. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-024-07184-x>
16. Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, 20 U.S.C. § 1400 et seq. (2004).
17. Knoors, H., & Marschark, M. (2012). Language planning for the 21st century: Revisiting bilingual language policy for deaf children. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 17(3), 291–305. <https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/ens010>
18. Ladd, G. W., & Proflet, S. M. (1996). The Child Behavior Scale: A teacher-report measure of young children's aggressive, withdrawn, and prosocial behaviors. *Developmental Psychology*, 32(6), 1008-1024.
19. Leigh, I. W. (2009). *A lens on deaf identities*. Oxford University Press.
20. Levesque, E., Duncan, J., & Snoddon, K. (2023). Deaf students and the transformative potential of Artificial Intelligence (AI). *Deafness & Education International*, 25(4), 249. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14643154.2023.2277002>
21. Luckner, J. L., & Muir, S. (2001). Successful students who are deaf in general education settings. *American Annals of the Deaf*, 146(5), 435–446. <https://doi.org/10.1353/aad.2012.0126>

22. Marschark, M., & Hauser, P. C. (2012). *How deaf children learn: What parents and teachers need to know*. Oxford University Press.

23. Marschark, M., & Spencer, P. E. (Eds.). (2016). *The Oxford handbook of deaf studies, language, and education* (Vol. 1, 2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

24. Marschark, M., Shaver, D. M., Nagle, K. M., & Newman, L. A. (2015). Predicting the academic achievement of deaf and hard-of-hearing students from individual, household, communication, and educational factors. *Exceptional Children*, 81(3), 350–369. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0014402914563700>

25. Masten, A. S., & Motti-Stefanidi, F. (2020). Multisystem resilience for children and youth in disaster and conflict. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 17(6), 869–885. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2020.1809709>

26. Mitchell, R. E., & Karchmer, M. A. (2004). Chasing the mythical ten percent: Parental hearing status of deaf and hard of hearing students in the United States. *Sign Language Studies*, 4(2), 138–163. <https://doi.org/10.1353/sls.2004.0005>

27. National Sample Survey Organization. (2018). *Persons with disabilities in India: NSS 76th round*. Government of India.

28. Pinquart, M., & Pfeiffer, J. P. (2020). Social competence and mental health of deaf students: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 25(3), 278–292. <https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enaa008>

29. Punch, R., & Hyde, M. (2011). Social participation of children and adolescents with cochlear implants: A qualitative analysis of parent, teacher, and child interviews. *International Journal of Audiology*, 50(10), 685–697. <https://doi.org/10.3109/14992027.2011.583990>

30. Qualter, P., Brown, S. L., Munn, P., & Rotenberg, K. J. (2010). Childhood loneliness as a predictor of adolescent depressive symptoms: An 8-year longitudinal study. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 19(6), 493–501. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00787-009-0079-y>

31. Rout, N., & Khanna, M. (2012). Concerns of Indian Mothers with Children Having Severe-to-Profound Hearing Impairment at Diagnosis and after 1-3 Years of Therapy. *Rehabilitation research and practice*, 2012, 593405. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2012/593405>

32. Sameroff, A. (2010). A unified theory of development: A dialectic integration of nature and nurture. *Child Development*, 81(1), 6–22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.2009.01378.x>

33. Sharma, U., & Deppeler, J. (2018). Inclusive education in India: Challenges and prospects. In *Oxford research encyclopedia of education*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.152>

34. Steinberg, L. (2020). *Adolescence* (12th ed.). McGraw-Hill Education.

35. Stinson, M. S., & Antia, S. D. (1999). Considerations in educating deaf and hard-of-hearing students in inclusive settings. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 4(3), 163–175. <https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/4.3.163>

36. Sud, P., & Panda, N. (2023). Challenges faced by Indian parents in raising a child with a cochlear implant – Impact on communication outcomes. *International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology*, 172 (Suppl C). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijporl.2023.110056>

37. Theunissen, S. C. P. M., Rieffe, C., Netten, A. P., Briare, J. J., Soede, W., Kouwenberg, M., & Frijns, J. H. M. (2014). Self-esteem in hearing-impaired children: The influence of communication, education, and audiological characteristics. *PLoS ONE*, 9(4), e94521. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0094521>

38. van Driessche, A., Jotheeswaran, A. T., Murthy, G. V., Pilot, E., Sagar, J., Pant, H., Singh, V., & Dpk, B. (2014). Psychological well-being of parents and family caregivers of children with hearing impairment in south India: influence of behavioural problems in children and social support. *International review of psychiatry (Abingdon, England)*, 26(4), 500–507. <https://doi.org/10.3109/09540261.2014.926865>

39. World Health Organization. (2021). World report on hearing. WHO Press. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240020481>

40. World Health Organization. (2021). *World report on hearing*. WHO Press. <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240020481>

41. Xie, Y. H., Potměšil, M., & Peters, B. (2014). Children who are deaf or hard of hearing in inclusive educational settings. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 19(4), 423–437. <https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/enu017>

42. Yoshinaga-Itano, C. (2003). From screening to early identification and intervention: Discovering predictors to successful outcomes for children with significant hearing loss. *Journal of Deaf Studies and Deaf Education*, 8(1), 11–30. <https://doi.org/10.1093/deafed/8.1.11>