EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

In the United States, deaf people attained lower levels of education than their hearing peers in 2015, according to national educational attainment data (Garberoglio et al., 2017). Educational attainment also varied across gender, race, and ethnicity.

In New Hampshire, 2.3% of 25–64 year olds are deaf.

In this report, we use the term deaf in an all-encompassing manner to include individuals who identify as Deaf, hard of hearing, hearing impaired, late deafened, and deafdisabled.
Figure 2
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT IN NEW HAMPSHIRE BY GENDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIGH SCHOOL</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME COLLEGE</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BACHELOR’S</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; BACHELOR’S</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A large percentage of deaf individuals have additional disabilities, and each combination of which results in unique strengths and challenges. Educational attainment rates vary by type of disability. Across the nation, deaf individuals with any type of additional disability reported lower educational attainment levels.
EMPLOYMENT RATES

National employment statistics show lower employment rates among deaf individuals. Almost half of deaf people are not in the labor force (Garberoglio, Cawthon, & Bond, 2016). Employment rates also vary by gender, race, and ethnicity.

Figure 5
EMPLOYMENT RATES IN NEW HAMPSHIRE

NATIONAL

- Deaf Individuals
  - Not in labor force: 45%
  - Employed: 49%
  - Unemployed: 6%

- Hearing Individuals
  - Not in labor force: 22%
  - Employed: 73%
  - Unemployed: 5%

NEW HAMPSHIRE

- Deaf Individuals
  - Not in labor force: 39%
  - Employed: 57%
  - Unemployed: 4%

- Hearing Individuals
  - Not in labor force: 17%
  - Employed: 79%
  - Unemployed: 4%
Figure 6
EMPLOYMENT RATES IN NEW HAMPSHIRE BY GENDER

**MEN**
- Deaf Individuals: 59% Employed
- Hearing Individuals: 84% Employed

**WOMEN**
- Deaf Individuals: 52% Employed
- Hearing Individuals: 75% Employed

Figure 7
EMPLOYMENT RATES IN NEW HAMPSHIRE BY RACE AND ETHNICITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Deaf Individuals</th>
<th>Hearing Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EARNINGS

National data show lower median earnings among deaf individuals who were employed full time. Earnings also vary across gender, race, ethnicity, and disability status.

Figure 9

MEDIAN EARNINGS FOR FULL-TIME EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NATIONAL</th>
<th>NEW HAMPSHIRE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEAF INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>43,800</td>
<td>46,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEARING INDIVIDUALS</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME

Deaf individuals receive supplemental security income (SSI) benefits at different rates across the nation. 11.9% of deaf people ages 25–64 in the U.S. receive SSI benefits. In New Hampshire, 9.6% of deaf people receive SSI benefits.

Figure 8

EMPLOYMENT RATES IN NEW HAMPSHIRE BY DISABILITY

72% DEAF + NO ADDITIONAL DISABILITY
36% DEAF + ANY ADDITIONAL DISABILITY
38% DEAFBLIND
Figure 10
MEDIAN EARNINGS FOR FULL-TIME EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS IN NEW HAMPSHIRE BY GENDER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Deaf</th>
<th>Hearing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>57,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>39,538</td>
<td>42,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11
MEDIAN EARNINGS FOR FULL-TIME EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS IN NEW HAMPSHIRE BY RACE AND ETHNICITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Deaf Individuals</th>
<th>Hearing Individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>46,000</td>
<td>46,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>45,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12
MEDIAN EARNINGS FOR FULL-TIME EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS IN NEW HAMPSHIRE BY DISABILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disability</th>
<th>Median Earnings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deaf + No Additional Disability</td>
<td>47,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deaf + Any Additional Disability</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deafblind</td>
<td>38,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
METHODS

The data for this project come from the Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) of 5-year estimates (2011–2015) from the American Community Survey (ACS), conducted by the U.S. Census. The PUMS provides a confidential subset of the ACS for the public to analyze. The ACS is a legally mandated questionnaire that is typically used to determine how federal funds may be allocated from region to region. As such, addresses of homes and group quarters, rather than individuals, are sampled, meaning that these data are meant to generalize to housing units, not individuals. Although the PUMS provides data on both individuals and housing units, only individual-level data were used for this project. More information on the ACS may be found at http://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/about.html.

The sample in these analyses was people ages 25–64. Recall that the U.S. Census collects data on functional limitations and not disability or identity labels, so we used the variable “hearing difficulties” to track deaf individuals. The survey respondents who stated that they had “hearing difficulties” were used to represent the deaf population in these analyses. More than 38,000 deaf individuals were in the full 5-year sample. The comparison group, what we label as hearing individuals, were those who did not report having any “hearing difficulties.” For the most part, the data for the group of hearing individuals are largely comparable to data for the general population. But for comparison purposes, we focused on individuals in the general population who did not report any type of “hearing difficulties,” which allows for an understanding of what educational experiences may be unique to the deaf population.

The descriptive statistics in this report are all corrected by the person-level survey weights provided by the U.S. Census. These survey weights are intended to account for the intricacies involved in getting a sample that is representative of the United States population. When numbers are compared to each other in this report, we used a survey-corrected t-test to determine if difference in the numbers were due to statistical noise. These statistical tests are purely descriptive in nature, and we do not intend to suggest that any of the associations described are causal in nature. As such, we did not correct for any other variables in providing these descriptive statistics.
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