

\*

(125) (90) 215  
 ( )  
 $(0.05 \geq \alpha)$   
 54-35  $(0.05 \geq \alpha)$   
 54-35 90  
 $(0.05 \geq \alpha)$

.2008; Martin and Clark, 2009; Smith, 2007)

Hard Deaf .of hearing  
 (English,  
 15 .2007; Kirk, Gallagher, and Anastasiow, 2003)  
 69  
 70 .(2010 )  
 (Northern (Bess and Humes, 2008; DeBonis and Donohue,  
 .and Downs, 2002)

\* كلية العلوم التربوية، الجامعة الأردنية، عمان، الأردن. تاريخ  
 استلام البحث 2010/9/29، وتاريخ قبوله 2011/8/23.

(Northern and Downs, 2002)

(Moore, 2001)

(Hallahan, Kuffman, and Pullen, 2009; Heward, 2006; Moore, 2001)

Postlingually

Prelingually deafness  
deafness

(Stach, 2009)

(Smith, 2007)

(Andrews, Leigh and Weiner, 2004; Reya, Knoblauch, Jouventa, Colletc and Dubal, 2009; Scheetz, 2004)

18

54

35

Hearing Aid

(Northern and Downs, 2002)

55

(Moore, 2001)  
69

(Northern and Downs, 2002)

Hearing Aid

(Moore, 2001)

89

70

(Northern and Downs, 2002)

(Moore, 2001)

90

.(Smith, 2007; Hallahan, Kuuffman, and Pullen, 2009)

.(McLoughlin and Lewis, 2008; Moores, 2001)

(Heward, 2006; Kirk, Gallagher,  
and Anastasiow, 2003; Northern and Downs, 2002  
).(2009

(McDermott, Williams,  
Kuo, Reid, and Proops, 2009; Gordon- Salant and  
.Proops, Reid, and Callahan, 2009; Ho, Monksfield,  
Egan, 2009)

(Schrimmer, 2001; Vernon and Andrews, 1990)

- .1
- .2

.3

.4

.(Paul, 2007)

.5

- ( ) 54- 35 -1
- ( ) 69 - 55 -2
- ( ) 89 - 70 -3
- ( ) 90 -4

.(2004

/ /  
/

(Smith,

/ 90

.2007)

/ /

(Hallahan, Kauffman, and

/

.Pullen, 2009)

/

/

89-35

.(Heward, 2006)

/

.(Heward, 2006)

/

- 
- 
-

(McDermott, Kuo, Reid, and Proops, 2009)

Williams,

182

15.1-2

(McDermott, Williams, Kuo, Reid, and Proops,

2009)

(Knoblauch, Jouvent, Collet, and Dubal, 2009

84

Reya)

32

13

25

19

6

7

7

(Reid, and Ho, Monksfield, Egan, Proops, 2009)

(Monksfield, Ho, Reid, and Proops, 2009)

50

111

(Ahlstrom,

Horwitz and Dubno, 2009)

(de Worlf, Leijendeckers, Mylanus, Hol,

Snik, and Cremers, 2009)

21

211

(Gordon- Salant and

-  
Callahan, 2009)

43	51	15	82-59
:	:		
	.1		
	.2		
	.3	(Proops, 2009 Reid, and Egan, Ho, Monksfield)	
	.4		
	.5	Benefit Glasgow Inventory	
	.6		93
	.7		
	:		
	.8		
	.9		
	.10		
	.11		215
	.12	8	(125) (90)
	.13		18
	:		
	.14		
	.15		
	.16	(Gordon- Salant and Callahan, 2009)	-
	.17	(Proops, Ahlstrom, Horwitz and Dubno, 2009)	
	.18	(Proops, Ho, Monksfield, Egan, Reid, and 2009)	

	.40	.19
	.41	.20
		.21
	.42	
	.43	:
وقد اتبع في تصحيح المقياس التدرج الرباعي (جيد جداً،		.22
جيد، ضعيف، ضعيف جداً). وتمّ الاعتماد على المعيار		
الإحصائي ذي التدرج المطلق، حيث قُسم فيه الفارق على عدد		.23
فئات التصنيف (4 / 3)، وبذلك أصبح الفارق 0.75 ويمثل		
الانتظام في الانتقال من فئة إلى أخرى، وذلك على النحو الآتي:		.24
(4 - 3.27) جيد جداً، (3.26 - 2.51) جيد، (2.50 - 1.76)		
ضعيف، (1.75-1) ضعيف جداً.		.25
		.26
12		.27
		.28
10		.29
:	%83	
	"	.30
	"	
	"	.31
	"	
	"	.32
	"	( )
	"	.33
	"	
	"	:
		.34
	:	.35
		.36
		.37
		.38
		.39

: (1) 20  
(1)

0.86	
0.88	
0.84	
0.90	
0.81	
0.86	

( )

:

0.90 0.81

:

:1

(x)

(2)

(2)

0.83	3.02	
0.79	2.98	
0.82	3.06	
0.76	2.95	
0.78	2.90	
0.75	2.97	

(

):

10 10 ) : •  
 54-35) : •  
 90 89-70 69-55 : •  
 ) : •  
 ) : •

(2)

.(



( ) :  
 .(3) (3) :2

---



---

0.643	213	0.464	0.78	2.99	0.90	3.05
0.278	210	1.087	0.75	2.93	0.84	3.05
0.043	207	2.039	0.78	2.96	0.86	3.20
0.311	210	1.016	0.70	2.91	0.84	3.01
0.980	210	0.01	0.72	2.90	0.86	2.90
0.318	213	1.001	0.69	2.92	0.82	3.03

: (3)  
 :3

(4) α) 2.039 ( )  
 .(0.05 ≥  
 .296 3.20  
 (5)  
 (4)

	15	14 - 10	10		
	0.72	3.07	0.84	3.05	0.79 3.19
	0.55	3.22	0.73	2.98	0.75 3.19
	0.64	3.22	0.83	3.04	0.66 3.36
	0.55	3.08	0.71	2.97	0.69 3.12
	0.71	3.05	0.72	2.82	0.72 3.01
	0.54	3.12	0.73	2.94	0.63 3.18

(4)  
 )

(

.(5)

(5)

0.635	0.46	0.29	2	0.58
		0.64	130	83.26
			132	83.84
0.197	1.65	0.81	2	1.62
		0.49	128	63.02
			130	64.64
0.085	2.52	1.37	2	2.75
		0.55	128	69.84
			130	72.59
0.517	0.66	0.30	2	0.60
		0.46	128	58.32
			130	58.92
0.250	1.40	0.72	2	1.43
		0.51	128	65.47
			130	66.90
0.151	1.92	0.83	2	1.67
		0.43	130	56.38
			132	58.05

( ) (5)  
 .(0.05 ≥ α)

(6)

:

:4

(7)

(6)

	90	89-70	69-55	54-35
0.92	2.87	0.68	3.25	0.68
0.81	3.03	0.68	3.16	0.69
0.90	3.06	0.56	3.34	0.80
0.80	2.85	0.52	3.21	0.63
				3.23
				3.09
				3.16
				3.17
				0.34
				0.50
				0.33
				0.61
				3.59
				3.37
				3.52
				3.37

90		89-70		69-55		54-35	
0.80	2.80	0.63	3.12	0.77	3.06	0.68	3.10
0.81	2.88	0.51	3.23	0.64	3.14	0.42	3.38

( (6)

(7) )  
(7)

0.007	4.22	2.47	3	7.40
		0.58	130	75.94
			133	83.35
0.454	0.88	0.46	3	1.38
		0.52	128	66.82
			131	68.20
0.143	1.84	1.05	3	3.16
		0.57	128	73.13
			131	76.28
0.019	3.45	1.59	3	4.78
		0.46	128	59.12
			131	63.90
0.167	1.71	0.94	3	2.82
		0.55	128	70.18
			131	73.00
0.023	3.27	1.46	3	4.37
		0.45	130	57.96
			133	62.33

(0.05 ≥ α) ( ) (7)  
 54-35 (0.05 ≥ α)  
 90 ( )  
 (6) 3.27 3.45 4.22  
 54-35  
 90 3.59 .(8)  
 .2.87 (8)

$\geq \alpha$   
 54-35  
 90  
 (6)  
 54-35  
 3.38  
 .2.88  
 90  
 (8)

(0.05  $\geq \alpha$ )  
 54-35  
 90  
 (6)  
 54-35  
 3.37  
 .2.85  
 90

	90	89-70	69-55	
*0.72	0.34	0.36	54-35	
0.36	0.03-		69-55	
0.38			89-70	
*0.52	0.16	0.20	54-35	
0.32	0.04-		69-55	
0.36			89-70	
*0.50	0.14	0.23	54-35	
0.27	0.09-		69-55	
0.36			89-70	

:  
:5

( )  
.(9)  
(9)

0.081	135	1.76-	0.69	3.33	0.84	3.04
0.443	133	0.77-	0.67	3.17	0.75	3.06
0.400	133	0.84-	0.65	3.27	0.79	3.13
0.101	133	1.65-	0.62	3.23	0.72	2.99
0.050	133	1.97-	0.67	3.17	0.75	2.87
0.064	135	1.87-	0.63	3.25	0.70	2.99

(9)

1.97- ( )  
.(0.05  $\geq \alpha$ )

3.17

.2.87

:1

:3

( )  
( $0.05 \geq \alpha$ )

(Moore, 2001; Northern and Downs, 2002)

(McDermott,

:4

Williams, Kuo, Reid, and Proops, 2009)

( $0.05 \geq \alpha$ )

90

54-35

54-35

54

35

Egan, Reid, and (Ho, Monksfield, Proops, 2009)

:2

( $0.05 \geq \alpha$ )

90

(0.05 ≥ α)  
54-35  
90  
54-35

Reid, and (Ho, Monksfield, Egan, Proops, 2009) 90

(Ahlstrom, Horwitz and Dubno, 2009)

(2009)

(de Worlf, Leijendeckers, Mylanus, Hol, Snik, and Cremers, 2009)

•

•

•

•

:5

(0.05 ≥ α)

2010

2009

2004

- Kirk, S., Gallagher, J. and Anastasiow, N. 2003. *Educating exceptional children*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Martin, F. and Clark, J. 2009. *Introduction to audiology*, Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- McDermott, A. Williams, J. Kuo, M. Reid, A. and Proops, D. 2009. Quality of life in children fitted with a bone-anchored hearing aid, *Otology and Neurotology*, 30, 344-349.
- McDermott, A. Williams, J. Kuo, M. Reid, A. and Proops, D. 2009. The Birmingham pediatric bone-anchored hearing aid program: A 15-year experience. *Otology and Neurotology*, 30, 178-183.
- McLoughlin, J. and Lewis, R. 2008. *Assessing students with special needs*, Upper Saddle River: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Monksfield, P. Ho, E. Reid, A. and Proops, D. 2009. Experience with the longer (8.5 mm) abutment for bone-anchored hearing aid, *Otology and Neurotology*, 30, 274-276.
- Moore, D. 2001. *Educating the deaf: Psychology, principles, and practice*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Northern, J. and Downs, M. 2002. *Hearing in children*, Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams and Wilkins.
- Paul, P. 2001. *Language and deafness*, Canada: Singular Thompson Learning.
- Reya, G. Knoblauch, K. Jouventa, R. Colletc, L. and Dubal, S. 2009. The experience of pleasure before and after hearing rehabilitation. *International Journal of Rehabilitation Research*, August.
- Scheetz, N. 2004. *Psychosocial aspects of deafness*, Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Schrimer, B. 2001. *Psychological, social, and educational dimensions of deafness*, Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Smith, D. 2007. *Introduction to special education: Teaching in an age of challenge*, Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Stach, B. 2009. *Clinical audiology*, San Diego: Singular Publishing Group, INC.
- Vernon, M. and Andrews, J. 1990. *The psychology of deafness: Understanding deaf and hard of hearing people*. New York: Longman.
- Ahlstrom, J. Horwitz, A. and Dubno, J. 2009. Spatial benefit of bilateral hearing aids. *Ear and Hearing*, 30, (2): 203-218.
- Andrews, J., Leigh, I., and Weiner, M. 2004. *Deaf people: Evolving perspectives from psychology, education, and sociology*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bess, F. and Humes, L. 2008. *Audiology: The fundamentals*. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams and Wilkins.
- de Wolf, M. Leijendeckers, J. Mylanus, M. Hol, M. Snik, A. and Cremers. C. 2009. Age-related use and benefit of the bone-anchored hearing aid compact. *Otology and Neurotology*, 30, 787-792.
- DeBonis, D. and Donohue, C. 2008. *Audiology: Fundamentals for audiologist and health professionals*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- English, K. 2007. Audiologic rehabilitation services in the school setting. In: Roland L. Schow and Mitchael A. Nerbonne (Eds.), *Introduction to Audiologic rehabilitation* (p.269-300). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Gordon-Salant, S. and Callahan, J. 2009. The benefits of hearing aids and closed captioning for television viewing by older adults with hearing loss, *Ear and Hearing*, 30(4): 458-465.
- Hallahan, D., Kauffman, J. and Pullen, C. 2009. *Exceptional learners: Introduction to special education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Heward, W. 2006. *Exceptional children: An introduction to special education*. Upper Sanddle River: Memill and Prentice Hall.
- Ho, E. Monksfield, P. Egan, E. Reid, A. and Proops, D. 2009. Bilateral bone-anchored hearing aid: Impact on quality of life measured with the Glasgow Benefit Inventory. *Otology and Neurotology*, 30, 891-896.
- Ho, E. Monksfield, P. Egan, E. Reid, A. and Proops, D. 2009. Bone-anchored hearing aid: Patient satisfaction with the cordelle device. *Otology and Neurotology*, 30, 793-799.
- Kelly, L. 1996. The interaction of syntactic competence and vocabulary during reading by deaf students. *Journal of deaf studies and deaf education*, 11(1): 76-90.

## **Assessing Perceived Benefits of Using Hearing Aids among Hearing-Impaired Students in Jordan and Its Relation to Some Variables**

*Ibrahim El-Zraigat, Farid Al-Khateeb, Randa M. Almomani, Adel Tannous, Hadhal Zureiqat  
and Warod Al-Awamleh\**

### **ABSTRACT**

The main purpose of the present study was to assess the benefits of using hearing aids among hearing impaired students. The sample of the study consisted of 215 students, enrolled at schools for deaf children in Jordan, 90 males and 125 females. The benefits of hearing aids scale were developed and used in assessing the benefits of using hearing aids of students. The reliability and validity of the scale were established. The researcher used the t-test and ANOVA to answer the research questions. The results indicated that the hearing impaired students had good benefits of using hearing aids in general. The results showed that male students had better benefits of using hearing aids than female students on the dimension of school benefits. Also, the results showed that students who had a hearing loss of 35-54 dB had better benefits of using hearing aids than students of 90 dB or above on the dimensions of family and communication benefits. Differences between mean scores of students who have parents hold general school education exam or below and who have parents hold bachelor degree or above were in favor of students have parents hold bachelor degree or above on the dimension of psychological benefits. The study recommended focusing on using hearing aids in educating these students.

**Keywords:** Hearing Impairment, Hearing Impaired, Hearing Aids, Special Education.

---

\* Faculty of Education, The University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan. Received on 29/9/2010 and Accepted for Publication on 23/8/2011.