

The Employability of the Hearing Impaired Graduates in Malaysia Hospitality Industry

*Mohd Salehuddin Mohd Zahari, Norhayati Mat Yusoff, Mohd Raziff Jamaluddin
Salleh Mohd Radzi and Zulhan Othman*

Faculty of Hotel and Tourism Management MARA University of Technology, Malaysia

Abstracts: There is an increasing awakening concern by the Malaysian government on the importance of giving career guidance and trainings for the young of disabled groups. The Ministry of Higher Education has introduced continuing skill-based programs for the young hearing impaired students with the intention to equip them for industry career including hospitality industry. This study empirically investigates the level of employability among the hearing impaired graduates in Malaysia hospitality industry. Using a self reported questionnaire among the hearing impaired graduates from the Polytechnic Johor Bahru, Malaysia and result revealed that the specialized hospitality programs attended explicitly developed graduates skill, confidence, interest and commitment with some at present directly working in the industry. Despite that, substantial numbers of graduates also claimed that they are rejected and excluded by the industry practitioners owing to their communication disability and physical condition. This situation has given several consequences, significant impact and implications not only to the disable students, graduates, hospitality institutions, industry and as well as the government.

Key words: Employability • Hearing Impaired and Hospitality Industry

INTRODUCTION

Advancements in technology of the world has changed the economy that shifted employers' attention from conventional style workers to those who are highly focused, technically-trained, transitory, adaptable, posses interpersonal and critical thinking skills workers [1]. The change in employers' expectations means that workers of today must be more educated than the workers of yesterday. They must also be focused on work as a career path or process, which demands constant attention to the development of new skills, adaptability to new roles and the pursuit of life-long learning [1-4]. To cope with the increasing demand of employment in every sector of diverse industries, many countries are strongly focusing on acquiring people skills especially among the youth through educational training [5]. This can clearly be seen with the increasing rates of students' participation in higher career educations including disabled youth through special education.

In relation to special education, students with disability have been identified as a key equity group for

several years on the basis of their overall participating level, progression rates and the employments outcomes they achieves after completion of their study [6]. Although, disabilities covering a broad characteristics such as physical disability, medical disability, vision disability, learning disability, hearing disability and intellectual disability some of them are suit for employment. As reported, there are thousands of disabled graduates with hearing impairment of doing the wide ranges of work including high-pressure jobs requiring high skill level in

The USA and these groups of people are equally productive, remain with the employer for longer period and tend to have better that average safety record [7]. Similarly, countries within the European Nations (Denmark, Germany, Spain, France and United Kingdom) are showing rising in the employment of graduates with minimal hearing and deaf impaired [8]. In fact, the introduction of Disability Act in many countries, for instance American Disability Act, 1990 (ADA), Disability Discrimination Act, 1996 (DDA) in the UK and many others are the mechanism used to protect the

discrimination against these groups in the employment. However, despite the growing number of disabilities acts enacted, many researches reported that there are still a large number of graduates with disabilities are excluded from employment [9, 2-4].

In the hospitality area, as reported [10] most of the restaurant and hotel operators were reluctant of hiring handicapped or disable due to the increase of invisible cost such as time and monetary in training and incentives. Operators need to consider their financial well being in hiring instructors to train these special employees. In contrast, researcher [11] noted that as the shrinkage in the traditional pool of cheap and flexible labor that previously ignored or underutilized groups such as individuals with a physical disability are regarded as more likely to be deemed suitable for employment. Such groups should be afforded a number of basic right such as provision of clear and public criteria of a motion and access to career development which in no way discriminate on the basis or factors such as physical disability. Some argued that the provision of such right as falling within sustainable perspective of industry employment and any hospitality organization that does not contain the ability to recognize the potential for growth in every individual included disability will not function effectively and therefore not be sustainable within the industry. [11, 10]

In line with the above notion, there is an increasing awakening concern by the Malaysia government on the importance of giving career guidance and training for the young disable groups. The Ministry of Higher Education has introduced continuing skill-based programs for the young hearing impaired students with the intention to equip them for industry career including hospitality industry. The Polytechnic of Johor Bahru has been given mandate to run this pilot program in the year 2001 [12]. From the applications and enrollments, students have shown high degree of interest in the program as none of them quit the course. Up to now, this institution has produced approximately 240 graduates and the number of students' intake has increased in the recent year [13]. However, despite the increased in students enrollment only small number of graduates are found to be working directly in the hospitality industry [13]. This has potentially created serious economic consequences. This situation has raised a question as to whether the graduates are not interested of taking employment in the hospitality industry or the industry practitioners are not interested of employing them or are there any other underlying reasons of this causation.

To date, there are a growing numbers of studies addressing general aspect of employment opportunity and discrimination among the disabled people [10; 14-17]. However, there still lack of studies focusing on the recruitment of a young disables with special training or graduates from specialized education particularly in the hospitality industry. In fact, no published or unpublished research related to Malaysia hospitality has been identified. This study is therefore empirically investigates the level of employability among the disabled hospitality graduates with hearing impaired in Malaysia hospitality industry. Specifically, the impact of specialized vocational education, level of interest and factors that might restrict the hearing impaired graduates of taking employment in hospitality industry is examined.

Literature Review: There are two areas of concern among the researchers related to employment of disabled adults. The first is related to the barriers and constraints to the employment [2, 18, 3, 4, 19, 20]. Researcher [18] for instance, reported that a thousand disabled students completed their secondary schools in the United States in year 1992, however only few hundreds were directly employed while a large number worked as part-timer with low wages as the employers still underestimated and did not fully recognize their abilities. On the same note, the disabled people in the UK are 3 times more likely to be out of work than non-disabled people [21]. At every age, disabled workers are unemployed for considerably longer than non-disabled workers. Unemployment is especially high among the disabled school leavers and disabled workers over 50 years old. In fact, the UK Office of Population through National Census and Survey of 2000 found that 85 percent of disabled men and 65 per cent of the disabled who described themselves as "unable to work" had tried to find a job but had given up as they were described as discouraged workers [22].

One of the top reasons disabled people were described as discouraged workers was when employer underestimated their abilities [23, 24]. It has been recognized that disabled employees can be the recipients of discrimination in workplaces, influenced by many factors including physical appearance, particularly in service industries such as hospitality in the areas of dealing with the public directly [25]. Although, people with disabilities bring unique benefits to workplaces and those benefits outweigh the simple requirement that they have received, equal opportunity to join and advance in it, some organizations were still slightly hesitate of hiring them in the industry. Up to now, only 5.24% of people

with disabilities were employed in various industries in Malaysia. This rate of employment is significantly lower than their non-disabled counterparts [26]. The current trend in the job market toward mobile, high-tech, adaptable jobs and careers may be further exacerbating obstacles to employment for the disabled [27]. In order to pursue career in challenging industries, employers acquired workers with adequate training in the specialized area.

With sufficient trainings, employees are able to grow into good workers [28]. This is evident when employers in both private and public sectors listed lack of related experience and lack of required skills and training as the biggest barriers to employment for disabled people [29; 26; 30; 31]. Youth unemployment can be due to a number of factors but it is often associated with lack of relevant skills, qualifications and experience. In today's society, not just technical and on the job skills are important, but also social and personal development that assist an individual in getting a job [30]. Individuals with disabilities may have lower expectancies of making a successful school-to-work transition and facing challenges of adapting in the workplace [27; 32]

The second area of concern is associated with discrimination. There are substantial quantitative evidences showing that employers both in the public and private sectors discriminated openly against disabled peoples looking for work [5]. For example, a survey of employment policies of 26 UK health authorities found that one third of employers had discriminated against disabled job seekers [33]. Employers claimed disabled people could not meet the criteria necessary for working in the health service. These criteria included lifting of patients and general heavy work, the need for a professional qualification or a range of physical and intellectual skills. Such claims ignore the fact that many disabled people are generally capable of lifting and doing heavy work, in fact, some of them have qualification in nursing, accounting and general administration and others are in full possession of all faculties [34].

Similar situation also exists in the private sector. Using scientifically approved techniques similar to those used [35] in measuring racial discrimination, researchers [36] conclusively revealed that employers had discriminated against disabled people at the initial point of applying for a job. The level of discrimination of disabled people in fact remains virtually unchanged; almost identical results were achieved. They argued that non-disabled applicants were round 1.5 times more likely to receive positive responses to an application

than applicants with impairment or disabled candidates who are 6 times more likely to receive negative responses [37].

The issues of discrimination on disabled people were also popular among the researchers in the tourism and hospitality areas. Many posited that the discrimination often faced by people with disabilities and their career development could often be restricted or blocked altogether by the employers [38-40]. Nevertheless, one argued that such group of people is not small in number and they should be given chances to work as normal people especially among the minor disabilities [41]. In examining attitudes of management undergraduates towards people with disability researcher [41] made the point that such population will likely be the next generation of professionals and managers who would hire and work with employees with disabilities. Study found that whilst respondents did generally express a complex array of attitudes toward the disabled, a number of attitudes were found to be negative and potentially discriminatory and it was concluded that a need clearly exists to sensitize many management students to issues regarding the abilities and employment potential of people with disabilities.

Throughout the world, people with disabilities are among the least privileged and most vulnerable. Their right to training, employment and job development is often overlooked. One of the main problems faced by the higher learning institutions is the choice of degree courses offers and its relevance to the employment market [32]. The institutions may produce a great number of students, but if the industries are reluctant to employ these disable graduates, the issue of poor transfers of graduates, shortage of manpower and job attrition may not be solved. Hence, it is important to assign the disabled graduates with the right job for the right person so that they would not feel incompatible and give up easily. With disabled worker's statistical likelihood for high productivity and low absenteeism, in addition to longevity and loyalty, employers might reduce the total costs in employing the disabled people in labor force [42]. In addition, many people with disabilities will work harder just to prove to themselves, to others and to employers that they can carry out their responsibilities effectively.

The Concept of Employability: Although the term employability has been the subject of various investigations, there is still little consensus among the researchers on its meaning [43]. A widely used definition of employability is “the capability to gain first

employment, maintain employment and ability to stay in employment [44]. Employability also has been interpreted differently by different groups of people. From the occupational psychology, employability is continual “up skilling” and lifelong learning [50]. It is the security of the future and the certainty that current job functions would increase the opportunities for work in the future.

Within the graduate labour market, employability is viewed as work preparation, job readiness and work know how [43, 45]. In the area of skills and competences, employability includes transferable skills [46, 47], basic skills, personal skills, social skills, creative skills and life skills [43, 48]. From the education and training perspective, employability is visualised in terms of a learning partnership, which includes vocational skills, generic skills and job specific skills [49, 50, 43].

Researcher [48] Summarise That Employability Is Not Only about Employment Preparation but Includes:

- The transfer into employment from education and training
- The progression in employment
- The transfer of skills from one setting to another
- Development of skills at work and
- Transition from periods of unemployment to employment.

Employability is also ascribed to higher education institutions on the basis of the employment rates of their graduates [51, 5, 52]. Researcher [5] for instance, discusses the attempts made to measure graduate employment rates in assessing institutional employability effectiveness through a ‘magic bullet’ model of the impact of higher education on the employment. The model implicitly assumed that the higher education institutions provide employability and development opportunities that enable the graduates to develop employability and get employed.

Methodology

Sampling and Instrument: As this study is looking at the hearing impaired graduates toward hospitality employment, a quantitative approach through self-reported questionnaires is found to be the most appropriate method. This decision is primarily based on the characteristics of the targeted groups. Graduates from Polytechnic Johor Bahru, Malaysia were selected as the targeted population for the fact that it is the only higher

institution in Malaysia that offers specialized hospitality program for the disables with hearing impairment. The survey questionnaires were divided into five main sections. Section A dealt with the respondents’ demographic profiles like age, gender, occupation as well as sectors of working industry while fifteen questions in Section B was developed and adopted to assess the impact of specialized vocational education on the hearing impaired graduates toward hospitality employment opportunities. Section C was created (nine items) to measure level of interest among the hearing impaired graduates towards employment in hospitality industry. In investigating factors that might restrict graduates’ employment opportunities, 12 items were asked in section D. For section B,C and D, respondents are required to express their level of agreement on 7-type Likert scale ranging from 1 being ‘totally disagree’ to 7 being ‘totally agree’. Pre-test survey was initially undertaken with 30 final year disable students (hearing impaired) of Polytechnic Johor Bahru to check the clarity, proper terms usage, meaning and relevancy of each statement in the instrument.

Data Collection Process: Before the actual survey, researchers paid a visit to the Polytechnic, meeting with head of department and the officer in charge of keeping the graduates information. With full cooperation, names, addresses and cellular phone numbers of the graduates were obtained. Questionnaires were then mailed to the respective graduates with cover letter which stipulated the details about the researchers, the aim, purpose of the study, confidentiality and anonymity. After two weeks, follow up letters were sent to the respondents as a reminder. Within 4 to 5 weeks, out of 240 questionnaires mailed, 123 were returned. Subsequently, the reliability test (Cronbach’s alpha) was undertaken on Section B, C and D separately and result showed that the instrument and items used was reliable with coefficient alpha value at 0.90 for section B, 0.83 for section C and 0.83 for section D.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Using frequency test, the overall dimensions of the respondents’ profiles were analyzed. Results are reported in Table 1.0.

There were no distinguishable differences between male and female of hearing impaired graduates with the ratio of 51:49 percent. The majority of age ranges were between 21-25 years old as opposed to 26 -30 years old.

Table 1.0: The Respondent

VARIABLES	N	%
Gender		
Male	62	50.4
Female	61	49.6
Marital Status		
Single	103	83.7
Married	20	16.3
Age		
21 - 25 years	86	69.9
26 - 30 years	37	30.1
Educational Background		
Certificate	106	86.2
Diploma	17	13.8
Employable Status		
Yes	87	70.7
No	36	29.3
Working Sector		
Hospitality	44	35.8
Non Hospitality	43	35.0
Non Employed	36	29.2
Working Place		
Hotel	26	21.1
Restaurant	18	14.6
Non Hospitality (Petrol Pump, Hair Salon, Boutique, Hypermarket, Flower Shop, Tolls and Factory)	43	35.0
Not Working	36	29.3
Working Experience		
Below 1 year	44	50.6
2 - 3 years	40	46.0
4 - 5 years	3	3.4
Job Title		
Cooks	19	15.4
Kitchen Helper	17	13.8
Butcher	3	2.4
Chambermaid	2	1.6
Steward	2	1.6
Front Office	1	0.8
Others (Pump Attendant, Hair Washer, Florist, Storekeeper, Factory Worker and Toll Operator)	43	35.0
Unemployed	36	29.3

86.2 percent (n=106) of the graduates were certificate holders compared to 13.8 percent (n=17) who had diplomas from the same institution. It interesting to note that only small proportion of disable graduates were working directly in the hospitality industry (35.8 percent, n = 44) especially in the hotel and restaurant sectors than those who worked in other sectors (35.0 percent, n=43 and unemployed (29.3 percent, n = 36). Those who worked in hospitality industry were attached at the back of the house as cooks, kitchen helpers, butchers, chambermaids

and stewards while those who worked in other industries had taken jobs as gas station attendants, hair washers in saloons, storekeepers, florists and toll-booth operators and others. Considering the fact that the first batch of graduates produced in 2003 it is therefore not surprising that 96.6 percent (n = 84) of them having work experience less than five years. This indicated that those graduates were unemployed or struggling to get job in the industry.

Educational Impact on the Employment: The descriptive statistic looking at the mean score was used to examine the impact of specialized vocational education on hearing impaired graduates toward hospitality employment. Results are presented in Table 2.0.

The majority of the respondents agreed that knowledge gained from the program is beneficial to their career ($M= 5.50$, item 1) and having adequate education is essential for their future employment opportunities in hospitality industry ($M= 5.50$, item 2). They also believed that they were able to get jobs based the on education from the program ($M= 4.50$, item 3). Similar views were given to the program's aspect. Disable graduates perceived that the special program is useful for their future career ($M= 5.40$, item 4), adequately prepared them for industry work ($M = 5.15$, item 7), worth taking the program ($M=5.24$, item 6) and satisfied with the program ($M=5.60$, item 5). In addition, they also agreed that the program offers them better career opportunities ($M = 5.35$, item 8).

Another interesting result is related to the skills obtained from the program. The magnitude of the mean score above five (5.00) points indicates that they agreed with all the statements. Such items are:

- Skills obtained from this program enable me to work in the industry ($M = 5.28$, item 9).
- Skills and abilities possessed through the program meet the industry's needs ($M = 5.20$, item 10).
- The program developed skills and abilities to work in the industry ($M = 5.22$, item 11).
- They could easily get jobs in the hospitality through vocational skills and trainings ($M = 5.82$, item 12).

In an effort to identify the disable graduates' perceptions of the trainings provided in the program, 3 items were probed in the instrument. Again, positive views were given by respondents. They believed that industrial attachment is beneficial for their professions ($M = 5.60$, item 13), developed more realistic expectations on the potential jobs in hospitality industry

Table 2.0: Showing the mean of the educational impact for hearing impaired graduates on employment.

No.	Items	N	M	S.D
1.	The knowledge gained from the program is beneficial to my career	123	5.50	1.176
2.	A good educational background is important for employment.	123	5.50	1.197
3.	I can get a job based on education from the program.	123	5.50	1.162
4.	Whatever I learnt is useful in my career.	123	5.40	1.291
5.	I am satisfied with hospitality program that I have taken	123	5.60	1.107
6.	Taking the hospitality program is worth it for me.	123	5.24	1.183
7.	Hospitality program adequately prepared me for industry work	123	5.15	1.194
8.	The program offers me better career opportunities in hospitality industry.	123	5.35	1.221
9.	The skills obtained from the program enable me to work in hospitality industry.	123	5.28	1.417
10.	The skill and abilities possessed through the program meet the hospitality industry needs.	123	5.20	1.136
11.	The program has developed my skills and abilities to work in hospitality industry.	123	5.52	1.027
12.	I could easily get job in the hospitality through vocational skills and training.	123	5.8	2.915
13.	Industrial attachments as part of program are beneficial in hospitality industry career.	123	5.60	1.014
14.	Theoretical and practical aspects learnt in the program help me to get job in the hospitality industry easily.	123	5.08	1.367
15.	Industrial attachment helps me to develop more realistic expectations on potential jobs in hospitality industry.	123	5.61	1.150

Note : 1= Totally disagree, 2= Disagree , 3= Slightly disagree, 4= Neither 5= Slightly agree, 6= Agree, 7 = Totally agree

Table 3.0: Showing the mean on hearing impaired graduates' level of interest of being employed in hospitality industries

No.	Items	N	M	S.D
1.	Hospitality job suits my career interest.	123	4.54	1.386
2.	I am happy to take any job in the hospitality	123	5.36	1.380
3.	I am confident on my ability to work in hospitality industry.	123	5.13	1.079
4.	I believed hospitality program qualifies me to do a specialized job	123	5.09	1.261
5.	I am satisfied with my choice of career in hospitality	123	5.00	1.625
6.	I would remain working in this industry.	123	5.15	1.252
7.	I am willing to work longer in this hospitality industry.	123	4.78	1.512
8.	I will definitely leave the job if been given heavy workload	123	3.89	1.624
9.	I will definitely leave the job with better offer from other industry.	123	5.01	1.501

Note : 1= Totally disagree, 2= Disagree , 3= Slightly disagree, 4= Neither 5= Slightly agree, 6= Agree, 7 = Totally agree

($M = 5.61$, item 15) and assisted them to get jobs in hospitality industry ($M = 5.08$, item 14). What could be said from this analysis is that special education even not hundred percent has given significant impact on the employment of hearing impaired graduates. Not only that this special education has equipped them with knowledge and skills of survival.

Level of Interest and Commitment: Table 3 reports the mean rating given by the hearing impaired graduates on their level interest and commitment toward hospitality employment.

Again, slight positive views were given by the respondents in almost all items. Respondents somewhat believed that the hospitality job suits their career interests ($M = 5.61$, item 1) and happy to take job in hospitality ($M = 5.36$, item 2). On the job attainment, they somewhat confident on their abilities to work in hospitality ($M = 5.13$, item 3) and as

hospitality program qualify them to do specialized jobs in the industry ($M = 5.09$, item 4) and therefore satisfied with their career choices (5.00, items 5). This positive feeling was further carried on the commitment items. Barring the unforeseen circumstances, respondents slightly agreed that they would remain working ($M = 5.15$, item 9) and willing to work longer in the hospitality industry ($M = 4.78$, item 12). Nevertheless, will quit their jobs if too heavy workload are still being given to them ($M = 3.89$, item 10) or receive better offers from other industries ($M = 5.01$, item 11).

Together, this point indicates that the some of the hearing impaired graduates explicitly having interests and enchanting towards employment in the hospitality industry. In fact, they have shown good commitments toward the jobs. This is inline with the statement that that these groups of people are equally productive, remain with the employer for longer period of time and tend to have better life [53].

Table 4.0: Showing the mean of factors that restrict employment opportunities of the hearing impaired in hospitality industries.

No.	Items	N	M	S.D
1.	I have interest to work in hospitality industry but due to my disabilities I have not been employed.	123	5.47	1.106
2.	My physical disabilities restrict me from getting job opportunity in the hospitality	123	5.16	1.387
3.	My physical disallowed me to get any job in the industry.	123	5.10	1.308
4.	My physical made me feel unconfident to work in hospitality industry.	123	5.14	1.282
5.	Communication factor is a barrier for me to get any job in the industry.	123	5.03	1.552
6.	Most job opportunities in hospitality industries require me to have good communication skills.	123	5.56	1.041
7.	I feel unsecured working in hospitality due to my communication disability.	123	4.79	1.451
8.	I feel isolated if I working in hospitality industry due to my disabilities.	123	4.87	1.270
9.	I have is a barrier for me to excel in the career that I have chosen.	123	4.82	1.355
10.	I am given the same treatment as other workers.	123	5.20	1.030
11.	I have never felt discriminated by my colleagues.	123	4.82	1.584
12.	This hospitality industry makes me feel special.	123	4.59	1.405

Note : 1= Totally disagree, 2= Disagree , 3= Slightly disagree, 4= Neither 5= Slightly agree, 6= Agree, 7 = Totally agree

Barriers and Constraints: Table 4.0 reports the mean scores given by the respondents on items related to constraints and barrier that might restrict the hearing impaired graduates towards employment opportunities in hospitality industries.

Respondents somewhat agreed that despite having interest to work in the hospitality industry, some were not employed due to their disabilities ($M = 5.47$, item 1). They felt unconfident or self-doubting to work in hospitality industry ($M = 5.14$, item 4), disabilities disallowed them to get any job ($M = 5.10$, item 3) and restricted them from any employment opportunity in the industry ($M = 5.16$, item 2). Similar feelings were given on the communication barrier towards employment. This can clearly be seen with the high level of agreement ($M = 5.03$, item 5) given to this item. This was supported with their belief that most job opportunities in hospitality industry require them to have good communication skills ($M = 5.56$, item 6).

The most remarkable findings obtained in this subsection analysis are related to inferiority complex. Disable graduates slightly felt insecure in hospitality due to communication disability ($M = 4.79$, item 7) which restricted them to excel in their chosen careers ($M = 4.82$, item 9), hence felt isolated if they work in the hospitality industry ($M = 4.87$, item 8). These results may come from those who were not working in hospitality industry. Despite these some reported that hospitality industry has made them feel somewhat special ($M = 4.59$, item 12), felt that they were treated the same as other workers ($M = 5.20$, item 10), therefore never felt discriminated by their colleagues ($M = 4.82$, item 11). This on the other could represent those respondents who were attached or currently working in the hospitality industry.

All in all, analysis clearly indicates that although having interest there are still barriers and constraints of employability on hearing impaired graduates in the hospitality industry when only small proportion of them working directly in this industry as revealed in the respondent profiles. This is not surprising as restaurants and hotel operators were slightly reluctant of hiring handicapped and hearing impaired people due to the increase of invisible costs such as time and monetary in trainings and incentives [54].

DISCUSSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

From the findings, it is evident that majority of the hearing impaired graduates were satisfied with special education program as it provides skills and trainings to them. Not only the program they also have higher level of interest and commitment towards hospitality employment. This is evident when some of the hearing impaired graduates presently working directly in hospitality industry or sub-sectors of it. It is good indications that some of the disable graduates are really taking advantage of the opportunities given to them. However, despites this, substantial numbers of graduates are found to be struggling of getting job in the industry owing to their physical condition. Not to exaggerate and probably with their own reasons, this study revealed that many hospitality organizations are still reluctant to take the hearing impaired graduates working with them. This situation has caused several consequences and implications for the disabled students, graduates, hospitality institutions, industry and the government.

Graduates perhaps feel that the program fails to meet their expectations and disappointed with their career choices. The graduates may also feel that their efforts and time spent together with their parents' investments for education and career skill development during the 2 years of study have not been worthwhile. The institution may produce a great number of graduates, but if the industries hesitate to hire them, government's funding through taxpayers' ringgit on higher hospitality education towards the specialized education for the development of young disabled people may have been used inefficiently. With the issues highlighted, some proactive actions should be taken.

It was appearing in this study that vast majority of graduates were enchanting with the hospitality industry jobs. That is the reason for them of taking hospitality program. Hospitality institution has provided, not to say solid but an acceptable skills and knowledge for the graduates to further enhance them in the hospitality working world. Therefore, the introduction of this specialized educational program is beneficial to this special interest group. This is evident as some are successfully entering the industry. However, despite that, there are still some constraints faced by these disabled graduates while pursuing their career interests in the hospitality industry. Industry practitioners as the end users thus should support the institutions of higher learning by giving more opportunities to these special people in the industry. By employing this group some long issues related to Malaysian hospitality industry, such as shortage of manpower, attrition, job hopping and poor transfer of graduates into the industry can slightly be reduced as disabled groups were found to be more loyal than the normal ones. For the government, particularly the Ministry Human Resource, they should improve what they have done now by imposing more strict monitoring processes against the industry practitioners in ensuring the industry will not violate the Malaysian Disability Act 1996. On top of that the collaboration efforts between hospitality institutions, industry practitioners and the Ministry of Human Resource should continuously be held. This effort, in the long run, will ensure the government's allocation and intention of giving equal opportunity of education and employment to disabled peoples could be achieved.

REFERENCES

1. Grzeda, M.M., 1999. Re-conceptualizing career change: A career development perspective. *Career Development International*, 4(6): 305-311.
2. Orpen, C., 1994. The effects of organizational and individual career management on career success. *International J. Manpower*, 15(1): 27-37.
3. Romaniuk, K. and F. Snart, 2000. Enhancing employability: the role of prior learning assessment and portfolios. *Career Development International*, 5(6): 318-322.
4. Zheng, A.Y. and B.H. Kleiner, 2001. Developments concerning career development and transition. *Management Research News*, 24(3): 33-39.
5. Harvey, M., 2001. The efficacy of vocational education for student with disabilities concerning post school employment outcomes: a review of literature. *J. Industrial Teacher Education*, 38(3): 25-44.
6. Phelps, L.A. and C. Hanley-Maxwell, 1997. School-to-work transitions for youth with disabilities: A review of outcomes and practices. *Review of Educational Res.*, 67(2): 197-226.
7. Campbell, I., 1996. Cases in disability. *Management Development Rev.*, 9(5): 22-24.
8. Riley, M., 1996. *Human resource management in the hospitality & tourism industry* (rev. 2nd ed.). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
9. Thompson, A.R., 1994. *Career development project: Postsecondary education programs for individuals with disabilities final report*. Mississippi: Mississippi State University.
10. Kreismann, R. and R. Palmer, 1994. Reasonable accommodation under the ADA: What's an employer to do? *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 42: 24-33.
11. Baum, T., 1995. *Managing human resources in the European tourism and hospitality industry-A strategic approach*. London: Chapman & Hall,
12. Airil, H.D. and A.H. Intan, 2001. A disabling education: The case of disabled learners in Malaysia. *Disabilities and Society*, 16(5): 665-669.
13. Johor Bahru Polytechnic. 2008. *Annual Report*. Department of Hospitality Johor Bahru Polytechnic.
14. Lee, B.A., 1996. Legal requirements and employer responses to accommodating employees with disabilities. *Human Resource Management Rev.*, 6: 231-251.
15. Jen-Gwo C.J. and H. Zesheng, 1997. Using analytic hierarchy process and fuzzy set theory to rate and rank the disability. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 88: 1-22.
16. Uijl, D.S. and T. Bahlmann, 2000. A complex societal problem: Reintegration of partially disabled people in the workforce in the Netherlands. *European J Operational Res.*, 140: 413-426.

17. Konur, O., 2002. Access to nursing education by disabled students: rights and duties of nursing programs. *Nurse Education Today*, 22: 364-374.
18. Thompson, A.R., 1994. Career Development Project: Postsecondary Education Programs for Individuals with Disabilities Final Report. Mississippi: Mississippi State University.
19. Wehman, P., W.G. Revell and V. Brooke, 2002. Competitive Employment: Has it Become the "First Choice" Yet? Retrieved January 9, 2009, from the Website: <http://www.worksupport.com/Main/downloads/dean/competitivesechap2.pdf>
20. Kiernan, W., 2002. Service integration trends, practices and challenges from a systemic perspective. Paper presented at the National Capacity Building Institute: Coordination and Managements of Supports and Services Conference, Boston. Retrieved January 16, 2009, from Website: <http://www.ncset.hawaii.edu/institutes/de c2002/papers/pdf/>
21. Prescott-Clarke, P., 1990. Employment and handicap. Social and Community Planning Research. London.
22. Martin, A.J., J. Milne-Home, J. Barret, E. Spalding and G. Jones, 2000. Graduate Satisfaction with University and Perceived Employment Preparation. *J. Education and Work*, 13(2): 199-213.
23. Jayasooria, D., B. Krishnan and G. Ooi, 1997. Disable people in a newly industrializing economy: Opportunities and challenges in Malaysia. *Disability and Society*, 12(3): 445- 463.
24. Newton, R., M. Ormerod and P. Thomas, 2007. Disabled people's experiences in the workplace environment in England. *Equal Opportunities International*, 26(6): 610-623.
25. Ross, G.F., 2004. Ethics trust and expectations regarding the treatment of disabled staff within a tourism/hospitality industry context. *Hospitality Management*, 23: 523-544.
26. Faridah, S.H., 2003. Career and employment opportunities for women with disabilities in Malaysia. *Asia Pacific Disability Rehabilitation J.*, 14(1): 71-78.
27. Feldman, D.C., 2004. The role of physical disabilities in early career: Vocational choice, the school-to-work transition and becoming established. *Human Resource Management Rev.*, 14: 247-274.
28. Verhaar, C.H.A. and H.R.M. Smulders, 1999. Employability in practice. *J. European Industrial Training*, 23(6): 268-274.
29. Noraini, M.S., A. Khalid and B. Nor Aishah, 2001. Job opportunities for special needs population in Malaysia. *Jurnal Pendidikan*, 27: 77-85.
30. Clarke, M. and M. Patrickson, 2008. The new covenant of employability. *Employee Relations*, 30(2): 121-141.
31. Lemaire, G.S. and K. Mallik, 2008. Barriers to supported employment for persons with developmental disabilities. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing*, 22(3): 147-155.
32. Rae, D., 2007. Connecting enterprise and graduate employability: Challenges to the higher education culture and curriculum? *Education and Training*, 49(8): 605-619.
33. Rothwell, A., I. Herbert and F. Rothwell, 2008. Self-perceived employability: Construction and initial validation of a scale for university students. *J. Vocational Behavior*, 73: 1-3.
34. Dyer, L., 1995. *The right to work*. London: MIND.
35. Fry, E., 1986. *An equal chance for disabled people: A study of discrimination in employment*. London: The Spastics Society.
36. Graham, P., D. Jordan and B. Lamb, 1990. *An equal chance or no chance?* London: The Spastics Society.
37. Lucas, R.E., 1993. Ageism and the UK hospitality industry. *International J. Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 15: 14-23.
38. Argyle, M., P. Collet and A. Furham, 1995. *Social psychology and work*. London: Routledge.
39. Peterson, N. and R. Gonzalez, 2000. *The role of work in people's lives: Applied career counseling and vocational psychology*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth / Brooks Cole.
40. Springer, S. 2001. Why should the hotel industry be concerned about accessibility? *Industry News from Cornell University School of Hotel Administration*. Retrieved April 2, 2009, from Hospitality Net Web site: www.hospitalitynet.org/news/All_Latest_News/4010284
41. Loo, R., 2001. Attitudes of management undergraduates toward persons with disabilities: A need for change. *Rehabilitation Psychol.*, 46: 288-295.
42. Groschl, S., 2007. An exploration of HR policies and practices affecting the integration of persons with disabilities in the hotel industry in major Canadian tourism destinations. *Hospitality Management*, 26: 666-686.
43. Hughes, C., 2000. FE's role in developing employability. Paper presented at the Conference in Learning for Employability: Skills for Life, Barbican Centre, London.

44. Hillage, J. and E. Pollard, 1999. Employability: Developing a framework for policy analysis. Institute of Employment Studies (IES) in Labor Market Trends. London: DfEE Publications.
45. Fenton, M., 2000. Developing graduate employability. Paper presented at Learning for Employability: Skills for Life Conference, Barbican Center, London.
46. Bailey, A., 1990. Personal transferable skills for employment: the role of higher education. In Wright, P. (Ed.) *Industry and Higher Education: Collaboration to improve students learning and training*, pp. 68-74. Buckingham: SRHE & Open University Press.
47. Hughes, M., 1999. Skill and enterprise: A challenge to further education and industry. Further Education and Development Agency (FEDA), London.
48. Hughes, M. and F. Stoner, 2000. Understanding and sustaining employability. Paper presented at the Conference in Learning and Skills Development Agency (LSDA), London.
49. Berkley, J., 1995. New school ties. *People Management*, 3(23): 24-29.
50. Clarke, A. 1997. Survey on employability. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 29(6): 177-183.
51. Taylor, J. 1986. The Employability of Graduates: Differences between universities. *Studies in Higher Education*, 11(1),: 17-27.
52. Woodley, A. and J. Brennan, 2000. Higher education and graduate employment United Kingdom. *European J. Education, Research, Development and Policies*, 35(2): 239-249.
53. Campbell, I., 1996. Cases in disability. *Management Development Rev.*, 9(5): 22-24.
54. Kreismann, R. and R. Palmer, 1994. Reasonable accommodation under the ADA: what's an employer to do? *The Cornell Hotel and Restaurant Administration Quarterly*, 42: 24-33.