Journal of Communication Disorders, Deaf Studies and Hearing Aids

OPEN ACCESS Freely available online

Opinion Article

# Accessibility Technologies for Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Individuals

**John Smith***

*Department of Speech-Language Pathology, Oxford Health University, Oxford, England, UK.*

## ABOVE THE STUDY

Accessibility technologies for deaf and hard-of-hearing individuals have expanded rapidly, but the real question is not how many tools exist it's whether they meaningfully improve everyday communication, autonomy, and inclusion. In my view, the field has made impressive technical strides, yet still falls short when solutions are designed around convenience rather than lived experience.

One of the most visible advances is in real-time captioning and speech-to-text systems. Tools embedded in smartphones, video platforms, and public services can convert spoken language into text almost instantly. This has transformed access in classrooms, workplaces, and virtual meetings. However, accuracy remains uneven, especially with technical vocabulary, regional accents, or noisy environments. When errors occur, the burden of interpretation shifts back onto the deaf user, undermining the promise of seamless communication. These tools are helpful, but they are not a substitute for clear speech, structured communication, or professional support where needed.

Hearing devices such as hearing aids and cochlear implants are often positioned as primary solutions, but that framing is too narrow. While they can significantly enhance auditory perception for some individuals, outcomes vary widely depending on factors like age of implantation, auditory training, and personal preference. More importantly, treating these devices as a "fix" risks reinforcing a medicalized view of deafness. Technology should expand options, not define what "normal" communication must look like. A balanced perspective recognizes both the benefits and the limits of auditory technologies.

Visual and tactile alert systems are among the most practical yet underappreciated innovations. Doorbells that flash lights, vibrating alarm clocks, and visual emergency alerts directly address safety and independence in daily life. These technologies succeed because they align with how deaf individuals naturally access information through sight and touch rather than trying to replicate sound. Their effectiveness highlights a broader principle: the best accessibility solutions are those that adapt environments, not just individuals.

Video communication platforms have also played a transformative role. The ability to use sign language over video calls has strengthened social connections and expanded access to services through remote interpreting. Video Remote Interpreting (VRI) can be particularly valuable in healthcare or customer service settings where in-person interpreters are unavailable. Yet, reliability issues poor internet connections, small screens, or untrained staff can quickly erode its usefulness. Technology here is only as good as the infrastructure and policies that support it.

Emerging technologies, including sign language recognition systems and AI-driven translation tools, are often presented as the future of accessibility. While promising, they raise important concerns. Sign languages are complex, context-rich, and culturally embedded; reducing them to machine-readable gestures risks oversimplification. Moreover, many systems are trained on limited datasets, which can lead to bias and poor performance across different signing styles. There is also a subtle but important question of direction: are these tools designed to help deaf individuals communicate, or to make it easier for hearing people to avoid learning sign language? True inclusion should encourage shared responsibility for communication, not shift it entirely onto technology.

Affordability and access remain persistent challenges. Many advanced devices are expensive and not covered by insurance or public programs, particularly in low-resource settings. This creates a digital divide where only some individuals benefit from innovation. Accessibility technologies should not be luxury items; they should be treated as essential tools for participation in society.

In my opinion, the future of accessibility technology lies in integration rather than invention alone. Systems should work together captioning integrated into public infrastructure, alerts connected across devices, and communication tools embedded seamlessly into everyday environments. Equally important is involving deaf and hard-of-hearing individuals in the design

**Correspondence to**: John Smith. Department of Speech-Language Pathology, Oxford Health University, Oxford, England, UK. E-mail: john.smith@ohu.ac.uk

**Received:** 20-May-2025, Manuscript No. JCDSHA-25-41694; **Editor assigned:** 22-May-2025, PreQC No. JCDSHA-25-41694 (PQ); **Reviewed:** 05-Jun-2025, QC No. JCDSHA-25-41694; **Revised:** 12-Jun-2025, Manuscript No. JCDSHA-25-41694 (R); **Published:** 19-Jun-2025. DOI: 10.35248/2375-4427.25.13.327.

**Citation:** Smith J (2025). Accessibility Technologies for Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Individuals. J Commun Disord. 13:327.

process. Too often, technologies are built for users rather than with them, leading to solutions that miss practical needs.

Ultimately, technology can reduce barriers, but it cannot replace inclusive attitudes or policies. Accessibility is most effective when it combines well-designed tools with education, awareness, and a willingness from society to adapt. The goal should not be to "normalize" deaf individuals through technology, but to create a world where different ways of communicating are equally supported and valued.