

Employment of the workforce with disabilities in the hospitality industry

Murat Bengisu^{a*} and Sabah Balta^b

^a*Department of Industrial Design, Izmir University of Economics, Izmir, Turkey;* ^b*Department of Tourism and Hotel Management, Yasar University, Izmir, Turkey*

(Received 8 August 2009; final version received 25 May 2010)

A three-stage Delphi study was conducted with experts and professionals working in the fields of disability and hospitality in order to identify some basic principles with respect to employment of people with disabilities (PWD). The potential effects of employing PWD on safety, cost, efficiency, service quality and management were investigated. Potentials and limitations of people with different types and degrees of disabilities with regard to jobs in the hospitality industry were also questioned. A notable guiding principle emanating from this study is that hiring of employees should be based on merit, suitability and capability of the candidate, regardless of the presence or degree of disability. Another important outcome is that the job or task appointed to PWD should not deteriorate the disability. A common guideline expressed by the participants was that jobs which critically require a certain sense or ability are not suitable for PWD who do not possess this sense or ability even with the aid of technology or by other means. However, apart from such extreme and obvious cases, experts mostly agree that PWD can fulfill any task in the hospitality industry as long as their professional knowledge and skills fit those tasks.

Keywords: diversification; policymaking; corporate social responsibility; disability; employment; Delphi

Introduction

A global challenge faced by people with disabilities (PWD) is to find and maintain satisfactory jobs. PWD are largely excluded from the labor market, which also leads to exclusion from social life (Barnes & Mercer, 2008). Job prospects of PWD are reduced when compared with people with no disabilities who have similar professional qualifications (Berthoud, 2008). PWD are commonly faced with discrimination and prejudice during employment and promotion. Not only is this unacceptable from an ethical point of view, but it is also economically illogical, since potentially valuable human resources (HR) are wasted (Ross, 2004). From a broader viewpoint, diversity in HR is becoming an increasingly appreciated way for the sustainability and competitiveness of organizations. Diversity management has been offered as an emerging tool to gain many organizational benefits, such as lower turnover and absenteeism leading to reduced cost, increased productivity, increased sales, new markets, increased creativity, innovation, problem-solving ability and system flexibility. Diversity management has been defined as “a complete organizational cultural change designed to foster appreciation of demographic, ethnic, and individual differences” (Gilbert, Stead, & Ivancevich, 1999). Diversity of the workforce involves

*Corresponding author. Email: murat.bengisu@gmail.com

acknowledgement of differences in terms of culture, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, ability, disability, age, appearance and other individual qualities (Baum, 2007). Effective diversity management involves the consideration of all such dimensions. Disability, as one of these dimensions, merits detailed investigation for better recognition and efficient human resource management.

Turkey has a significant population with disabilities. In 2002, the total number of PWD was 8,769,963, or approximately 13% of the whole population (Turkish Statistical Institute, 2004). People with chronic illnesses comprised a large portion of the population with disabilities (Table 1). About 22% of the working-age population with orthopedic, visual, hearing, speaking and mental disabilities was employed, and about 15% was unemployed. Similarly, about 23% of people with chronic disabilities were employed, and about 11% were unemployed. However, these statistics can be quite misleading because only 21.7% of the population with orthopedic, visual, hearing, speaking and mental disabilities was in the labor force, while a much bigger percentage (78.3%) was not. Similarly, 77.1% of the population with chronic illnesses was not in the labor force. PWD who are not in the labor force include students, seasonal workers, those who are not able to work, those who are not looking for a job, those who are retired and those who are involved in domestic work. In summary, only one out of five PWD was employed. Among employed PWD, the percentage of employed women (12%) was disproportionately lower than that of employed men (88%) (Burcu, 2007).

Although the special needs of tourists with disabilities and their potential benefits to the tourism industry have been studied relatively well (see, for example, Darcy & Daruwalla, 1999; McIntosh & Goeldner, 1990, pp. 186–188; Ozturk, Yayli, & Yesiltas, 2008; Shaw & Coles, 2004), the place of employees with disabilities (EWD) in the tourism industry has been largely ignored, except for a few studies. Ross (2004) studied the reactions of potential employees to discrimination of PWD within the context of the tourism/hospitality industry from an ethical viewpoint. Gröschl (2007) interviewed HR directors of Canadian hotels and senior managers of employment agencies in order to explore the effect of HR policies and practices on the attraction and integration of PWD in hotels across Canada. The findings of those studies will be utilized in the discussion of the present paper.

Various aspects of the employment and working life of PWD have been studied so far. Lee's (1996) study with 500 New Jersey employers demonstrated that accommodating EWD is relatively inexpensive, in many cases costing nothing, while additional training, supervision and flexible work schedules were required. According to the same study, paralysis of arms and legs was perceived to be the most difficult disability to accommodate, followed by blindness and head injuries. Meager, Bates, Dench, Honey and Williams (1998) carried out a survey in the UK with 2000 PWD of working age. According to this study, adaptations have an important role in keeping PWD in work; PWD are more likely to end up in lower-skilled occupations, and PWD from ethnic minorities are more likely to be unemployed. Schur, Kruse and Blanck (2005) studied the role of corporate culture in the employment of PWD. An important conclusion of their study was that corporate culture plays a significant role in the creation of attitudinal, behavioral and physical barriers for employees or job seekers with disabilities. A recent survey with visually impaired people in Turkey indicated that they can perform many challenging jobs as long as they are provided with the adequate education, devices and equipment (Bengisu, Izbirak, & Mackieh, 2008).

Whiteneck, Harrison-Felix, Mellick, Charlifue and Gerhart (2004) pointed out that any discussion about disability should also consider environmental factors, since the aforementioned barriers have a great impact in determining a person's activity limitations.

Table 1. Disability and employment statistics of Turkey.

Type of disability	Population with disabilities	Population with disabilities (% of total population)	Population with disabilities in the workforce	Population with disabilities in the workforce (% of total population with disabilities)	Employed (number of people)	Employed (% of workforce with disabilities in each category)
Total population with orthopedic, visual, hearing, speaking and mental disabilities	2,113,575	3.08	458,645	21.7	387,555	84.5
Orthopedic	857,630	1.25	186,105 ^a	N.A.	157,258 ^a	N.A.
Visual	412,313	0.60	89,472 ^a	N.A.	75,603 ^a	N.A.
Hearing	252,807	0.37	54,859 ^a	N.A.	46,356 ^a	N.A.
Speaking	263,008	0.38	57,072 ^a	N.A.	48,225 ^a	N.A.
Mental	331,243	0.48	71,879 ^a	N.A.	60,737 ^a	N.A.
Total population with chronic illnesses	6,656,388	9.70	1,524,313	22.9	1,359,687	89.2
Total	8,769,963	72.78	1,982,958	44.6	1,747,242	88.1

Note: N.A. = not applicable.

^aEstimated from the average employment ratio.

Source: Turkey's Disability Survey 2002.

Conceptual models of disability were reviewed by Masala and Petretto (2008). According to this review, currently the most developed model of disablement is the social model, which sees disablement as a dynamic process, considering the interaction of personal characteristics with the physical, social and psychological environment. The so-called ecological perspective explains disability from the same perspective (Gröschl, 2007). The earlier model, which to a large extent still prevails in many societies and in the labor market, has been the individual or medical model of disability. This model uses medical criteria to define disability and views disability as a cause of disease, impairment, incapacity or pathology (Barnes & Mercer, 2008; Darcy, 2002; Masala & Petretto, 2008). The social model does not deny a person's impairment but places disability in a social, economic and political context and emphasizes the role of the barriers faced in daily life (Barnes & Mercer, 2008). The present authors favor the social model, although medical criteria are still necessary for classification of disabilities, since there are no other useful and scientific alternatives.

The literature on the attitudes of individuals, employers, disability employment advisers (DEAs) and the society to disability provide important clues about some of the challenges that PWD face in daily life and in the job market. Employers commonly have a prejudiced image of PWD. Negative perceptions regarding productivity, mobility, performance, absenteeism and appearance have been determined by various researchers (Burcu, 2007; Daruwalla & Darcy, 2005; Gonzales, 2009). Barriers and negative attitudes have been shown to grow further if the PWD is also a woman (Gonzales, 2009) or from an ethnic minority (Meager et al., 1998). Some of the common deficiencies that contribute to negative attitudes are lack of information and fear in the society. It was shown that it is possible to change the personal attitudes of nondisabled persons toward PWD through disability awareness training programs (Daruwalla & Darcy, 2005). A large-scale survey in Turkey, conducted with 1321 PWD, indicated that the attitudes which disturb PWD most are being constantly pitied by other people, being treated with contempt and being rejected from the society (Burcu, 2007). In terms of their self-evaluation, about one third of the participants "made peace with their disabilities", and another third did not consider themselves different from the rest of the society. The most important target for the participants of this survey was to find a job or to be promoted in their job.

A Delphi study was conducted with 100 employers and 100 DEAs in the UK to determine their attitudes toward EWD (Schneider & Dutton, 2002). While 90% of the participants believed that "in the right job, a disabled person is as productive as any other worker", 78% believed that "employing disabled people is good for a business's image", and 70% thought that "disabled people are more loyal employees". Overall, a small portion of respondents thought that "people with mental health problems are unreliable" (10%), that "customers find it hard to accept disabled people in the workplace" (21%) or that "workforces find it hard to accept disabled people as colleagues" (24%). Three statements which resulted in major differences in opinion between employees and DEAs were the following: "disabled people are more motivated to work than nondisabled people" (39% of employers and 76% of DEAs agreed, respectively); "people with epilepsy pose extra risks in the workplace" (50% of employers and 9% of DEAs agreed); and "people with progressive conditions are more difficult to retain in their jobs" (79% of employers and 51% of DEAs agreed).

An exemplary effort by the Marriott Foundation for People with Disabilities was the Bridges . . . from School to Work program. The program's aim was to break the "fear" barrier faced by young people with disabilities, to foster their employment and to develop guidelines for working with PWD (Bardi, 2007, pp. 355–357). The program, which was

still active as of early 2010, addresses common fears about employing PWD, such as the following:

- PWD need expensive accommodation;
- PWD may not be able to do the job; and
- PWD need preferential treatment.

Such fears are progressively replaced with realistic views on the issue through the efforts of the program. The program “has facilitated the placement of more than 8,900 youth with disabilities, most of them members of racial or ethnic minorities, in competitive placements with over 1,500 different employers” (Marriott Foundation for People with Disabilities, 2010). Such initiatives demonstrate the importance and potential benefits of disability awareness programs both for the industry and for PWD.

The tourism industry is one of Turkey’s important industries with a great potential for growth. During the period 2000–2008, the national income from the tourism industry rose from \$10.4 billion to \$21.9 billion (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2006, 2009). However, this growth must be a planned and sustainable one, with appropriate consideration of its HR. The hospitality industry is a significant employer, and lodging is the largest sector, assuming a critical role in the hospitality industry with about 500,000 employees (Ministry of Culture and Tourism, 2006). The major focus of the present study is the hospitality industry because it is the major employer in the tourism sector.

This study employed the Delphi technique in order to develop a collective expert view on key issues regarding employment of the workforce with disabilities in the hospitality industry. Basic principles in the employment of PWD, possible risks for the employee as well as the firm, possible effects on service quality and customer satisfaction and potential limitations in the employment of people with different types and degrees of disability were addressed. The Delphi technique has traditionally been used as a forecasting (Rowe & Wright, 1999) and foresight tool (Saritas, Taymaz, & Tumer, 2007) regarding issues that require expertise. The same technique has also been adapted to generate opinion or to form policies about complex or controversial issues (Miller, 2001; Schneider & Dutton, 2002).

Methodology

A Delphi study with three rounds was designed according to the guidelines given in the literature (Costa, 2005; Dalkey, Brown, & Cochran, 1970; Garrod & Fyall, 2005; Landeta, 2006; Miller, 2001; Osborne, Collins, Ratcliffe, Millar, & Duschl, 2003). Initial analysis for the selection of panel members indicated the need to include three expert groups in the study, namely professionals active in the hospitality industry, professionals dealing with the needs and/or employment of PWD and academics active in disability or tourism research. Potential participants were searched through various institutions, such as public organizations, universities and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) dealing with different groups of PWD and hospitality. Invitations to participate in the study were made by direct phone calls, through their respective organizations’ administration or by email. All of these candidates were considered to be experts, according to guidelines in the literature. Additionally, as a form of self-assessment, respondents were allowed to skip the questions in areas where they did not consider themselves experts or where they felt that they lacked the necessary background.

Out of 45 candidates who were invited to join the survey, 18 accepted to participate. Questionnaires were sent to these experts as email attachments. A cover letter explained the

Table 2. Number of participants according to affiliated organization.

Type of organization	Number of participants		
	Round 1	Round 2	Round 3
Academia	8	6	5
Hospitality industry	2	0	2
NGO	4	3	3
Public organization	4	3	2
School for disabled children	0	0	1
Total	18	12	13

purpose and the method of the survey in detail. The purpose of the survey was “to evaluate expert views on the possibilities of work in the tourism sector for PWD”. More specifically, “this study targets especially the hospitality industry within the tourism sector”. The basic principles of Delphi surveys were explained in a paragraph. The types of experts who were invited to the survey were listed in seven groups:

- (1) researchers/academics with published research on disability or tourism,
- (2) experts who work at foundations/associations related to PWD,
- (3) experts who work at organizations for vocational training/rehabilitation of PWD,
- (4) experts who work at public organizations related to PWD and the Turkish Employment Organization (Iskur),
- (5) career experts,
- (6) managers working in the tourism sector and
- (7) other experts related with the subject.

Table 2 lists the number of participants at each round and the type of organizations they worked for during the study.

In order to view different expert viewpoints on the subject and crystallize potentially vague arguments, the participants were asked to write their opinion on various key issues which could be typically of concern for any firm active in hospitality. Questions in the first round were general, open-ended ones with the aim of collecting different and detailed views on the subject. At this stage, basic principles regarding the following were questioned: the employment of PWD in the hospitality sector; potential impact on safety, customer satisfaction, efficiency, cost and management; the need for preventive measures; and possible limitations in the employment of different groups of PWD in different jobs. Customer satisfaction, cost and efficiency were selected because they are some of the common measures of organizational performance used in the hospitality industry (Cho, Woods, Jang, & Erdem, 2006; Olsen, 2004). Groups of disability were the same six as those used for Turkey’s 2002 Disability Survey (Çalık, 2005; Turkish Statistical Institute, 2004), as listed below:

- (1) orthopedic disabilities,
- (2) visual disabilities,
- (3) hearing disabilities,
- (4) speech and language disabilities,
- (5) mental disabilities and
- (6) chronic illnesses.

These groups were clearly defined and described to the participants in the questionnaires.

The first round of answers were studied carefully, grouped and transformed into 69 statements to be scored in the second and third rounds. An 11-point Likert scale, where 0 stands for complete disagreement, 5 for neutral and 10 for complete agreement, was used to determine the level of agreement with each statement. The mean, mode and standard deviation for each statement were calculated after the second round, and these were provided to the participants as an anonymous table in the third round. The same procedure was repeated in the third round, and these results were sent to the participants as a final feedback.

Results and discussion

Key statements formulated from the first round of the Delphi study, which also served to determine the level of agreement of the participants in the second and final rounds, are discussed below. These statements are grouped under basic principles, potential effect of employment of PWD on management and organizational performance (safety and risk, service quality and efficiency, customer satisfaction, operational cost, management, preventive measures and additional activities) and limitations caused by specific disabilities. Statistical results indicating the level of agreement with each statement are provided under each heading, the details of which are given in Appendix 1. A discussion of these results is provided, on the basis of relevant literature and the present authors' viewpoints.

Basic principles

Some of the outstanding basic principles regarding the employment of PWD in the hospitality industry remarked on by the participants are listed below:

- (1) The employer should provide equal opportunities for people with and without disabilities and act in an equal, nondiscriminating manner.
- (2) The employer should have no prejudice against candidates and EWD.
- (3) Hiring should be based on merit, suitability of the person for the job and capability of the person.
- (4) As a complement to the third principle, job analysis should be applied to determine the physical, cognitive and other requirements of the position.
- (5) If necessary, positive discrimination should be used in favor of the workforce with disabilities, with regard to issues such as working hours and workload distribution.

Among the above statements, the first four were highly agreed upon ($\mu \geq 9$; Appendix 1). The only statement which did not receive strong agreement was the fifth one, which is related to affirmative action ($\mu = 7.6$, $\sigma = 3.0$). Positive discrimination or affirmative action for PWD is a thorny issue which may be rejected in principle by the community with disabilities. As stated by one of the leading journals in human health, "Disabled people do not want or need privileges denied to others; they want opportunities to live and work within the boundaries of their abilities" (Groce, 1999). On the other hand, from the viewpoint of a legal scholar, legal requirements that obligate the employer to make reasonable accommodations for EWD provide an important piece of positive discrimination (Sargeant, 2005). Certain accommodations have been requested by Turkey's Regulation on the Employment of the Impaired of 1987 (Republic of Turkey, 1987), the USA's Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (Lee, 1996), and the UK's Disability Discrimination Act of 1995 (Sargeant, 2005). The literature on affirmative action for African Americans or

women suggests that individuals who benefit from such programs are perceived by others as less competent and more negatively than individuals selected on the basis of merit for qualifications, although the type of reaction from coworkers would depend on how strong the preferential treatment will be. Accommodation requests may evoke similar reactions as those evoked by affirmative action (Cleveland, Barnes-Farrel, & Ratz, 1997). In fact, affirmative action programs may be eliminated in the near future and replaced by voluntary programs involving diversity management. Substantial benefits have been gained in organizations implementing diversity management effectively (Gilbert et al., 1999).

Safety and risk

Several remarks under this title were linked by the participants to the relationship between the employee and the working environment. Some participants stated that some firms have prerequisites to ensure that the employment of PWD does not create hazards or risks for the firm, staff and themselves. These prerequisites might include the following:

- (1) employment of PWD in jobs which are suitable to their knowledge, skills and experience;
- (2) adaptation of the working environment to them;
- (3) providing them with the necessary orientation and training; and
- (4) informing all staff about disabilities and assuring a positive attitude toward PWD.

It was remarked that if there is a critical need for a certain skill beyond the capability of a person with disabilities, then there would be a high probability that it would give rise to a hazard or a risk to the firm, staff and customers. To make this statement clear, an example was given: if at a certain step of the task, there is a need for full vision, the employment of a person with visual disabilities for such a task will most probably cause a hazard or a risk. There was strong agreement with this statement ($\mu = 8.8, \sigma = 1.5$).

Another remark was about potential employees with mental retardation and psychological disabilities. It was claimed that aggressive behavior found in people with such disabilities is a factor which could put the customers at risk. Only 2 out of 13 respondents disagreed with this claim, although the level of agreement was not too high ($\mu = 7.1, \sigma = 3.2$).

Some participants noted that job safety and risks are not directly related to an employee's disability. However, there was no clear agreement or disagreement with this statement ($\mu = 5.2, \sigma = 3.8$).

Service quality, customer satisfaction and efficiency

In the first round it was stated that typically the employment of PWD would impact the service quality and efficiency negatively in the short run (until the orientation or adaptation phase is completed). This statement did not find much support in the following rounds (final round $\mu = 4.4, \sigma = 2.4$). On the other hand, it was stated that typically the employment of PWD would impact the service quality and efficiency positively in the long run because of factors such as their determination, patience, care for low absenteeism and eagerness to push themselves forward, which was supported by most of the participants ($\mu = 7.9, \sigma = 2.0$). There is significant evidence in the literature supporting this point of view. Increased workplace productivity as a positive example for coworkers, providing reliable, cooperative, loyal and highly effective employees, adding greater creative thinking and decreasing

absenteeism are just some of the many benefits listed by Gröschl (2007) regarding the employment of PWD. Employees with developmental disabilities such as autism were also reported to be effective, dependable and reliable individuals (Kregel, 1999). In a study with 124 employers who had previous experience with workers with disabilities (WWD), 97 were satisfied with their performance (Kregel & Tomiyasu, 1994, cited in Kochel, 2002).

Most participants agreed with the claim that if the staff member with disabilities has been placed according to their background, with necessary accommodations being made and necessary training being provided, then improved quality, customer satisfaction and efficiency will be obtained ($\mu = 8.9$, $\sigma = 1.6$). Some participants stated that there is no direct relationship between quality and whether or not the employee has a disability. Similar views were expressed in the case of efficiency, cost, management and effective work. All of these statements were supported with a mean ranging from 7 to 8, depending on the specific subject (Appendix 1). Another view expressed was that customers with a social conscience may appreciate and prefer firms which employ PWD. This statement received strong support ($\mu = 8.8$, $\sigma = 1.6$). A similar view was expressed by Gröschl (2007): "Travelers with disabilities represent a large spending power and might be more attracted by hotels that value employee diversity and individuality as opposed to an employee or organizational image based on looks and physical attractiveness".

Operational cost

Some participants predicted that certain accommodations made for EWD would increase the cost to the firm initially, but they would also benefit customers with disabilities or senior or pregnant customers, and therefore the cost would be balanced in the long run. This claim received moderate agreement ($\mu = 7.3$, $\sigma = 3.6$). The perceived cost of accommodations is one of the greatest concerns of employers who consider the employment of WWD (Lee, 1996; Unger, 1999). However, research in the USA (usually in relation to the Americans with Disabilities Act) has shown that more than half of the accommodations cost nothing, and most accommodations cost somewhere between \$100 and \$500 (Lee, 1996; Unger, 1999). Even in the case of workers with significant disabilities, employers are capable of providing workplace accommodations by using existing resources of the firm (Unger, 1999).

Similar to quality and efficiency, it was expressed that the employment of PWD would increase the cost of services in the short run, for the reasons expressed above. There was no clear support or disapproval regarding this claim ($\mu = 5.1$, $\sigma = 2.4$). The participants supported the view that the cost of services would decrease in the long run because of certain qualities of PWD mentioned before ($\mu = 8.0$, $\sigma = 1.9$). It was also pointed out that certain financial benefits provided by the law would decrease the cost of labor. This statement was mostly supported by the participants ($\mu = 8.8$, $\sigma = 1.3$). Many of the benefits of employing PWD, such as loyalty, low absenteeism and creative thinking, could reduce operational costs and increase the financial gains of firms (Gröschl, 2007). Governmental financial incentives are also important to consider. For example, according to current Turkish laws, at least 3% of the staff in private firms with 50 or more employees has to be PWD (Republic of Turkey, 2006). If this quota is exceeded voluntarily, certain tax incentives become available for the firm (Republic of Turkey, 2008). Such financial incentives are also available in many other countries (see, for example, Government of Canada, 2002; US Office of the Attorney General, 1998).

Management

Some participants stated that in order to prevent problems during the employment of PWD, all staff need to be trained about relevant problems and solutions. Similarly, it was stated that managerial problems could be prevented by bringing together the available staff and the new staff members with disabilities for mutual acquaintance (or by training the staff about disability), by the preparation and implementation of job plans for the staff with disabilities, by customized occupational safety activities, by the implementation of legal requirements regarding EWD, by applying special conditions for candidates and EWD (for example customizing entry-level examinations, providing assistive products and furniture for work, making adjustments in performance criteria) and by taking precautions against negative attitudes of customers toward staff with disabilities (for example informing the customers by appropriate communication techniques). All of these claims were strongly supported (Appendix 1).

HR policies recommended in the employment of WWD, for example changes in communication and developing special programs such as vocational training (Gröschl, 2007), are in line with the present recommendations.

Preventive measures and additional activities

It was suggested that physical conditions (such as staircases, restrooms, entrances and exits of buildings and work environments) must be rearranged to assure that an EWD works effectively. Another claim was that PWD should be equipped with the necessary assistive devices to assure effective work. Furthermore, it was claimed that training programs are necessary to accustom PWD to the working environment and their colleagues in order to ensure effective work. These three statements were strongly supported by the participants (Appendix 1). One of the participants suggested that to ensure the effective work of an EWD, any possibility of negative attitudes of customers toward EWD should be prevented. This claim received moderate support ($\mu = 7.7, \sigma = 2.2$).

Limitations caused by specific disabilities

In the first round of the study, the participants were asked what types of tasks could be performed in the hospitality industry by employees with a certain kind of disability. However, many answers indicated that a great variety of tasks could be accomplished by PWD or that anything can be done by them as long as they have the suitable professional qualifications and are provided with the correct tools and environment. These are obviously very generic statements which could be interpreted in many different ways. Since there were too many tasks claimed possible, we took the other extreme and tried to understand what type of tasks are not possible or feasible or what type of tasks are hazardous for the EWD or for customers. On the other hand, a few positive statements were also tested which, according to the authors, were critical in the hospitality industry. Statements regarding jobs which necessitate direct contact with the customer (such as receptionist, bell captain, front cash register or public relations) are among those critical ones. For some type of disabilities, these jobs were found to be suitable, and for some they were thought to be unsuitable, as discussed below.

A guideline which was accepted by most participants was that jobs or tasks which critically require a certain sense or ability are not suitable for a person with disabilities who does not possess this sense or ability even with the aid of technology or by other means.

A generic expression (hereafter “expression 1”) tested for all six types of disabilities was as follows: “People with this type of disability can perform any job which fits their knowledge, expectations and experience”. Although this claim has been supported by most of the participants as will be discussed, it is important to refer to the literature at this point. Feldman (2004) describes two groups of constraints regarding hurdles faced by people with physical disabilities. Constraints in the first group are called “objective constraints”, which are concrete, verifiable obstacles created by the physical disability. For example, blindness is considered to be an objective constraint in a situation where a blind person needs or wants to drive a vehicle. Individuals with chronic fatigue syndrome or other chronic illnesses may not have the stamina for working long days or long weeks. Hypertension may result in an inability to work under great time pressure and stress. Similarly, some major orthopedic disabilities may make extensive travel and relocation for work very difficult. Constraints in the second group are called “subjective constraints”. These are social, perceptual or attitudinal barriers. The level of discomfort a disability creates for others is a subjective constraint. So are presumed intolerance of customers for physical problems and concerns about negative reactions from clients. So it can be safely argued that expression 1 overly favors EWD, since actually there may be objective constraints which could prevent the assignment of a particular job to an EWD even if her knowledge, expectations and experience are suitable. On the other hand, some statements in this Delphi study actually address some kinds of objective constraints without using that particular terminology. The participants stated on several occasions that to prevent any harm to the person with disabilities or a deterioration of the disability, the supervisor who deals with job descriptions, safety or activity planning should consider the potential harm a task may inflict upon a person with disabilities. A simple example may be useful here. In order to calculate maximum load in unfavorable lifting conditions, the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health guidelines are typically used (Dul & Weerdmeester, 2001). However, the typical guidelines do not contain any information about special procedures to follow because of a specific disability. Nevertheless, the supervisor should not use the standard guidelines which have been developed for persons with no disabilities. Either additional precautions should be used, or the task, which poses risk according to experts, should not be assigned to the EWD.

Employees with orthopedic disabilities

Some participants stated in the first round that it is not suitable for employees with orthopedic disabilities to lift and carry heavy loads or to perform tasks requiring heavy physical effort. Tasks which require dynamism or moving very fast were also expressed to be unsuitable. Such tasks can be considered objective constraints, discussed at the beginning of this section. All of these three statements were supported by the participants, on average (Appendix 1). It is important to note that expression 1 received the highest agreement among all six categories of disability ($\mu = 9.1$, $\sigma = 1.1$), reflecting a relatively lower level of impediment due to orthopedic disabilities compared with other types, according to experts who participated in the study. Tasks which require direct contact with the customer were deemed to be suitable by the participants ($\mu = 8.5$, $\sigma = 2.2$).

Several studies identified that dress sense, voice, accent and physical appearance are seen by many employers as crucial elements in the selection of employees in the hospitality industry (Gröschl, 2007; Ross, 2004; Warhurst & Nickson, 2007). The requirements of emotional and aesthetic labor in tourism have been discussed by Baum (2007). The operational definition of emotional labor is given as “the degree of manipulation of one’s inner

feelings or outward behavior to display the appropriate emotion in response to display rules or occupational norms” (Chu & Murrmann, 2006). Aesthetic labor, on the other hand, is the employer’s expectation that employees demonstrate the ability to “look good” or “sound right” (Nickson, Warhurst & Dutton, 2005). Gröschl (2007) pointed out that physical attractiveness is seen by many employment agencies as a key selection tool of hotel recruiters in Canada, and they discussed the implications. It was argued that the emphasis on aesthetics and physical attractiveness, in other words aesthetic labor, may prevent job applicants with the right skills from applying to a job because of their tangible disabilities and their self-perceived lack of emotional or aesthetic attributes. It was further argued that this emphasis on aesthetics might hinder the recruitment of PWD. The possible implications of emotional labor should also be included in this discussion. It might be argued that certain expressions which may be required from a frontline worker in the hospitality sector, such as smiling, may not be possible because of certain disabilities. For example, facial paralysis is such a disability, which involves the inability to move some or all of the facial nerve branches and related regions of the face, such as the eyelids or mouth (Stricker, Simon, Coffinet, Sellal, & Duroure, 2004). Facial paralysis cases are part of orthopedic disabilities according to the classification given under the methodology section. The emphasis on the abilities of emotional display, aesthetics and physical appearance could in practice cause employers in hospitality to prevent workers with orthopedic and other tangible disabilities to assume frontline jobs. Such concrete possibilities necessitate special programs to be initiated by NGOs, universities and local and national government.

Employees with visual disabilities

Tasks which critically require vision, such as those requiring hygiene, visual control, exchange of money or the ability to read the body language of the customer, were perceived to be unsuitable for employees with significantly low vision in both eyes ($\mu = 8.7$, $\sigma = 2.1$). Although such a precaution may seem obvious to some, it is important to discuss the logic behind it. For example, it is not recommended to appoint a blind employee to a task which requires the visual inspection of the cleanliness and tidiness of a hotel room. There is a high probability that a blind person will not be able to fulfill the necessities of the task, which is visual inspection and which cannot be replaced by other senses or feasible means.

Employees with partial vision were believed to be suitable for tasks which require direct contact with the customer, while those with significantly low vision were not (see Appendix 1, claims 9.5 and 9.2, respectively). Expression 1 was approved by most of the participants ($\mu = 7.8$, $\sigma = 3.5$). Tasks which require frequent reading of documents (in cases where such documents are not available in a digital/computerized or other easily accessible format) or dynamism were considered to be unsuitable for employees with significantly low vision ($\mu = 9.6$, $\sigma = 1.2$).

Employees with hearing disabilities

Experts agreed in general that tasks which critically require hearing, such as communication on the phone or face-to-face conversation with the customer, were not suitable for employees with hearing disabilities (employees who cannot hear sufficiently even with hearing aids) ($\mu = 9.6$, $\sigma = 1.0$). There was a low level of agreement on the statement claiming that it is suitable for employees with hearing disabilities who can hear sufficiently (with or without a hearing aid) to work in positions which require direct contact with the customer ($\mu = 6.3$,

$\sigma = 4.1$). Moderate agreement was received for expression 1 in this category ($\mu = 7.5$, $\sigma = 3.3$).

Employees with speech and language disabilities

On average, experts agreed that tasks where speech is critical, such as phone or face-to-face conversations with the customer, are not suitable for people with speech and language disabilities ($\mu = 9.7$, $\sigma = 0.9$). A similar but opposite statement claimed that if a person has sufficient capability of communication with the aid of a device or who has stuttering problems could be given tasks requiring direct contact with customers. There was no strong indication of agreement or disagreement regarding this statement ($\mu = 5.4$, $\sigma = 3.9$), but when analyzed in more detail, it was seen that managers in the hospitality sector were fully against this statement ($\mu = 0.0$, $\sigma = 0.0$), while experts from NGOs and academia slightly supported it ($\mu = 6.3$, $\sigma = 1.2$ and $\mu = 6.6$, $\sigma = 4.2$, respectively). Opposing views of experts from the sector and NGOs could be explained by the different perspectives of the professions. While managers in the hospitality industry normally tend to protect the company image and the business from any potential harm inflicted by an unsuitable employee (Ross, 2004), the mission of NGOs is to aid the empowerment of their members and fulfill their potential at the highest possible level. There was moderate agreement on expression 1 in this case ($\mu = 7.3$, $\sigma = 3.3$).

Employees with mental disabilities

The participants mostly agreed that tasks requiring direct contact with the customer are not suitable for employees with mental disabilities ($\mu = 9.0$, $\sigma = 2.1$). According to some participants, one staff member should be responsible of employees with mental disabilities, and he/she should guide them and keep them under control ($\mu = 7.5$, $\sigma = 3.1$). The view that it is not suitable for people with mental disabilities to work in any position in the hospitality industry was rejected by the majority of the participants ($\mu = 3.0$, $\sigma = 3.5$). There was agreement on the view that people with mental disabilities can perform tasks which are routine, which have a given order and sequence and which can be learned as a stereotype (such as kitchen tasks, photocopying, laundry, gardening) ($\mu = 7.9$, $\sigma = 2.5$). Expression 1 received the lowest level of agreement among all six categories of disability ($\mu = 6.3$, $\sigma = 3.2$). A parallelism can be found with this result and an earlier study which showed that “employers are more likely to hire or retain workers with physical disabilities than those with other types of disabling conditions, such as psychiatric disorders” (Combs & Omvig, 1986, as cited in Lee, 1996).

Employees with chronic illnesses

People with chronic illnesses form the biggest portion of PWD in Turkey (Table 1), and most of those in the labor force have been employed in 2002. The high number of people with chronic illnesses participating in the labor force (about 1.5 million) represents a high probability of employment in the hospitality industry.

Two related statements in this category were related to tasks which could harm an employee with a chronic illness. The first one claimed that heavy physical tasks or tasks which require lifting and carrying heavy weights are not suitable for employees with chronic illnesses. This claim was mostly accepted by the participants ($\mu = 7.6$, $\sigma = 1.6$). The second one claimed that tasks which have the potential to deteriorate the illness are not suitable for

employees with chronic illnesses. This claim was almost unanimously agreed upon ($\mu = 9.5, \sigma = 1.6$). Expression 1 also received a positive response from most participants ($\mu = 7.6, \sigma = 3.1$).

Summary and conclusions

This study attempted to identify certain principles for the employment of PWD in the hospitality industry with the aid of experts from the hospitality industry, academia, NGOs and public organizations. The potential effects of employing PWD on certain important indicators of an organization, such as service quality, cost and efficiency, were investigated. Furthermore, the possible limits of employability of candidates were questioned according to the specific type of disability, taking into consideration the available technologies and working environments in Turkish facilities serving the hospitality industry. Therefore, these results reflect a local and subjective reality at a given time. However, considering the global nature of most of Turkey's touristic facilities because of many reasons, such as customers coming from all parts of the world, international investments, multinational management and the impetus to accept international standards, these findings are also meaningful for other parts of the world.

Among the basic principles that were discussed, the one highlighted most was the principle of hiring on the basis of merit, suitability and capability. Experts in the field pointed out that when employing a person for the hospitality industry, having a disability or not or (if having a disability) the type and degree of disability should not be of any concern for the employer; rather the criteria for selection should be the professional knowledge, abilities, experience and capabilities of a candidate.

The present study indicates that a firm needs to fulfill several requirements before and during the employment of PWD in order to assure safety, customer satisfaction, efficiency and effective work. These requirements can be summarized as training and orientation programs for newly hired EWD, training all employees about disabilities and generating a positive attitude toward PWD, adapting the working environment according to the specific disability and placing the right person in the right job. There is empirical evidence in the literature that disability awareness training for employees is a valuable method to change negative attitudes toward PWD (Daruwalla & Darcy, 2005).

Most participants supported the view that employing PWD would improve service quality and efficiency and reduce service cost. The reason behind this prediction was the conviction that EWD are more determined, patient and eager to push themselves forward compared with an average employee. The participants also supported the view that socially aware customers would prefer facilities which employ PWD. Such predictions need to be verified by additional research.

The Delphi study indicated that while EWD should not be discriminated against in terms of the type of jobs and tasks, their disability cannot be ignored either, because that would put the person with disabilities, the firm, the staff and the customers under certain risks. The most frequently mentioned precautions pointed out by the participants were the following:

- lifting and carrying heavy loads or tasks requiring heavy physical effort should not be performed by employees with orthopedic disabilities and chronic illnesses;
- tasks which require dynamism or moving very fast should not be performed by employees with orthopedic or visual disabilities;

- tasks which critically require vision and frequent reading of documents not available in another accessible format are not suitable for employees with visual disabilities;
- tasks which critically require hearing are not suitable for employees with hearing disabilities;
- tasks which critically require speech are not suitable for employees with speech and language disabilities;
- tasks which require direct contact with the customer are not suitable for employees with mental disabilities;
- tasks which may potentially deteriorate a chronic illness should not be performed by employees with chronic illnesses.

The principles and guidelines derived from this study are obviously open for debate and refinement. We believe, however, that such guiding principles are necessary as a starting point in the employment of PWD, while detailed work needs to be performed by related organizations for standard HR approaches and work practices.

Notes on contributors

Dr Murat Bengisu is Professor at the Department of Industrial Design at Izmir University of Economics. He has been conducting research in blindness, disability, assistive technologies and employment of disabled people in addition to other fields, especially materials science. He teaches courses on human factors, materials and manufacturing processes.

Dr Sabah Balta is Assistant Professor at the Department of Tourism and Hotel Management and Director of the Continuing Education Center at Yasar University. Her research publications have focused on tourism, hotel management and education technology. Sabah teaches in the areas of tourism and hotel management, travel agency and tour operations, legal aspect of tourism and computerized reservations systems in the hospitality industry.

References

- Bardi, A.J. (2007). *Hotel front office management*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.
- Barnes, C., & Mercer, G. (2008). Disability, work, and welfare: Challenging the social exclusion of disabled people. *Work, Employment and Society*, 19(3), 527–545.
- Baum, T. (2007). Human resources in tourism: Still waiting for change. *Tourism Management*, 28(6), 1383–1399.
- Bengisu, M., Izbirak, G., & Mackieh, A. (2008). Work related challenges for visually impaired individuals in Turkey. *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness*, 102(5), 284–294.
- Berthoud, R. (2008). Disability employment penalties in Britain. *Work, Employment and Society*, 22(1), 129–148.
- Burcu, E. (2007). *Being an individual with disabilities in Turkey: A study on principal sociological characteristics and problems* [in Turkish]. Ankara, Turkey: Hacettepe University Publications.
- Çalık, S. (2005). Methodological approaches for the measurement of disability and Turkey's 2002 Disability Survey [in Turkish]. *Öz-Veri Dergisi*, 1(2), 153–375.
- Cho, S., Woods, R.H., Jang, S., & Erdem, M. (2006). Measuring the impact of human resource management practices on hospitality firms' performances. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 25(2), 262–277.
- Chu, K.H.L., & Murrmann, S.K. (2006). Development and validation of the hospitality emotional labor scale. *Tourism Management*, 27(6), 1181–1191.
- Cleveland, J.N., Barnes-Farrell, J.L., & Ratz, J.M. (1997). Accommodation in the workplace. *Human Resource Management Review*, 7(1), 77–107.
- Combs, I.H., & Omvig, C.P. (1986). Accommodation of disabled people into employment: Perceptions of employers. *Journal of Rehabilitation*, 52(2), 42–45.

- Costa, A.C. (2005). The status and future of sport management: A Delphi study. *Journal of Sport Management*, 19(2), 117–142.
- Dalkey, N., Brown, B., & Cochran, S. (1970). Use of self-ratings to improve group estimates: Experimental evaluation of Delphi procedures. *Technological Forecasting*, 1(3), 283–291.
- Darcy, S. (2002). Marginalised participation: Physical disability, high support needs and tourism. *Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management*, 9(1), 1–12.
- Darcy, S., & Daruwalla, P.S. (1999). The trouble with travel: People with disabilities and tourism. *Social Alternatives*, 18(1), 41–46.
- Daruwalla, P., & Darcy, S. (2005). Personal and societal attitudes to disability. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(3), 549–570.
- Dul, J., & Weerdmeester, B. (2001). *Ergonomics for beginners*. New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- 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 Review*, 14(3), 247–274.
- Garrod, B., & Fyall, A. (2005). Revisiting Delphi: The Delphi technique in tourism research. In B.W. Ritchie (Ed.), *Tourism research methods: Integrating theory with practice* (pp. 85–98). Cambridge, MA: CABI Publishing.
- Gilbert, J.A., Stead, B.A., & Ivancevich, J.M. (1999). Diversity management: A new organizational paradigm. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 21(1), 61–76.
- Gonzales, M.L. (2009). Getting to know reality and breaking stereotypes: The experience of two generations of working disabled women. *Disability & Society*, 24(4), 447–459.
- Government of Canada. (2002). *Advancing the inclusion of persons with disabilities* (Cat. No. RH37-4/1-2002-1). Retrieved from <http://dsp-psd.pwgsc.gc.ca/Collection/RH37-4-1-2002-1E.pdf>
- Groce, N. (1999). The spectrum of disability. *The Lancet*, 354(9180), 693.
- Gröschl, 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.
- Kochel, A.L. (2002). *Small business needs for information regarding the employment of people with disabilities* (MS thesis, research paper, University of Wisconsin, USA). Retrieved from <http://www.uwstout.edu/lib/thesis/2002/2002kochell.pdf>
- Kregel, J. (1999). Why it pays to hire workers with developmental disabilities. *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities*, 14(3), 130–132.
- Kregel, J., & Tomiyasu, Y. (1994). Employers' attitudes toward workers with disabilities: The effect of the Americans with Disabilities Act. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation*, 4(3), 165–173.
- Landeta, J. (2006). Current validity of the Delphi method in social sciences. *Technological Forecasting & Social Change*, 73(5), 467–482.
- Lee, B. (1996). Legal requirements and employer responses to accommodating employees with disabilities. *Human Resource Management Review*, 6(4), 231–251.
- Marriott Foundation for People with Disabilities. (2010). *Link to a record of success landing page*. Retrieved from <http://www.marriottfoundationbridges.org/bridges>
- Masala, C., & Petretto, D.R. (2008). From disablement to enablement: Conceptual models of disability in the 20th century. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 30(17), 1233–1244.
- McIntosh, R., & Goeldner, C.R. (1990). *Tourism: principles, practices, philosophies*. New York, NY: John Wiley.
- Meager, N., Bates P., Dench S., Honey S., & Williams M. (1998). *Employment of disabled people: Assessing the extent of participation* (Department for Education and Employment Research Report RR69). Nottingham, UK: Department for Education and Skills Publications.
- Miller, G. (2001). The development of indicators for sustainable tourism: Results of a Delphi survey of tourism researchers. *Tourism Management*, 22(4), 351–362.
- Ministry of Culture and Tourism. (2006). *Turkey's tourism strategy* [in Turkish]. Ankara, Turkey: Author, pp. 20–21.
- Ministry of Culture and Tourism. (2009). *Tourism income* [in Turkish]. Retrieved from <http://www.kulturturizm.gov.tr/TR>
- Nickson, D.P., Warhurst, C., & Dutton, E. (2005). The importance of attitude and appearance in the service encounter in retail and hospitality. *Managing Service Quality*, 15(2), 195–208.
- Olsen, M.D. (2004). Literature in strategic management in the hospitality industry. *Hospitality Management*, 23(5), 411–424.

- Osborne, J., Collins, S., Ratcliffe, M., Millar, R., & Duschl, R. (2003). What "ideas about science" should be taught in school science? A Delphi study of the expert community. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 40(7), 692–720.
- Ozturk, Y., Yayli, A., & Yesiltas, M. (2008). Is the Turkish tourism industry ready for a disabled customer's market? The views of hotel and travel agency managers. *Tourism Management*, 29(2), 382–389.
- Republic of Turkey. (1987, February 26). *Regulation No. 19402*. Ankara, Turkey: Author.
- Republic of Turkey. (2006, January 1). *Law No. 4857, Item 30*. Ankara, Turkey: Author.
- Republic of Turkey. (2008, May 15). *Law No. 5763, Item 2*. Ankara, Turkey: Author.
- Ross, G.F. (2004). Ethics, trust and expectations regarding the treatment of disabled staff within a tourism/hospitality industry context. *Hospitality Management*, 23(5), 523–544.
- Rowe, G., & Wright, G. (1999). The Delphi technique as a forecasting tool: Issues and analysis. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 15(4), 353–375.
- Sargeant, M. (2005). Disability and age-multiple potential for discrimination. *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*, 33(1), 17–33.
- Saritas, O., Taymaz, E., Tumer, T. (2007). Vision 2023: Turkey's national technology foresight program: A contextualist analysis and discussion. *Technological Forecasting & Social Change*, 74(8), 1374–1393.
- Schneider, J., & Dutton, J. (2002). Attitudes towards disabled staff and the effect of the national minimum wage: A Delphi survey of employers and disability employment advisors. *Disability & Society*, 17(3), 283–306.
- Schur, L., Kruse, D., & Blanck, P. (2005). Corporate culture and the employment of persons with disabilities. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 23(1), 3–20.
- Shaw, G., & Coles, T. (2004). Disability, holiday making and the tourism industry in the UK: A preliminary survey. *Tourism Management*, 25(3), 397–403.
- Stricker, M., Simon, E., Coffinet, L., Sellal, S., & Duroure, F. (2004). Paralytic faciale [Facial paralysis; in French]. *EMC Dentisterie*, 1(4), 382–416.
- Turkish Statistical Institute. (2004). *Turkey's Disability Survey 2002*. Ankara: Turkish Statistical Institute Publications.
- Unger, D.D. (1999). Workplace supports: A view from employers who have hired supported employees. *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities*, 14(3), 167–179.
- US Office of the Attorney General. (1998). *Tax incentives packet on the Americans with Disabilities Act*. Retrieved from <http://www.ada.gov/taxpack.htm>
- Warhurst, C., & Nickson, D. (2007). Employee experience of aesthetic labour in retail and hospitality. *Work, Employment and Society*, 21(1), 103–120.
- Whiteneck, G.G., Harrison-Felix, L.C., Mellick, D.C., Charlifue, S.B., & Gerhart, K.A. (2004). Quantifying environmental factors: A measure of physical, attitudinal, service, productivity, and policy barriers. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*, 85(8), 1324–1335.

Appendix 1
 Statements regarding employment of PWD in hospitality and corresponding statistics regarding scores given by the participants.

	Mean	Mode	Standard deviation	Score, 0–4 Somewhat disagree/ disagree (%)	Score, 5 Neutral (%)	Score, 6–10 Somewhat agree/ agree (%)
1 Basic principles						
1.1 The employer should provide equal opportunities for PWD and act in an equal, non-discriminating manner.	9.5	10	0.7	100.0	0.0	0.0
1.2 The employer should have no prejudice against candidates and EWD.	9.6	10	1.1	100.0	0.0	0.0
1.3 Hiring should be based on merit, suitability and capability.	9.8	10	0.6	100.0	0.0	0.0
1.4 As a complementary to the third principle, job analysis should be applied to determine physical, cognitive and other requirements of the position.	9.0	10	2.8	92.3	0	7.7
1.5 If necessary, positive discrimination should be used in favor of the workforce with disabilities with regard to issues such as working hours and workload.	7.6	10	3.0	76.9	15.4	7.7
2 Safety and risk						
2.1 If a firm wants to ensure that employment of PWD does not create safety problems and risks for the firm, staff and themselves, PWD should be employed in jobs which are suitable to their knowledge, skills and experience.	9.5	10	0.8	100.0	0.0	0.0
2.2 If a firm wants to ensure that employment of PWD does not create safety problems and risks for the firm, staff and themselves, the working environment should be adapted to them.	8.5	10	2.8	92.3	0	7.7
2.3 If a firm wants to ensure that employment of PWD does not create safety problems and risks for the firm, staff and themselves, EWD should be provided with the necessary orientation and training.	9.4	10	0.9	100.0	0.0	0.0
2.4 If a firm wants to ensure that employment of PWD does not create safety problems and risks for the firm, staff and themselves, an important prerequisite is to inform all staff regarding disabilities and assure a positive attitude.	9.6	10	0.7	100.0	0.0	0.0
2.5 If there is a critical need for a certain skill beyond the capability of PWD, there is a high probability that it would raise a safety problem or a risk to the firm, staff and customers. For example if at a certain step of the task, there will be a need for full vision, the employment of a person with visual disabilities for such a task will most probably cause a safety problem or a risk.	8.8	10	1.5	92.3	7.7	0.0
2.6 Aggressive behavior found in people with mental retardation and psychological disabilities is a factor which could put the customers under risk.	7.1	10	3.2	75.0	8.3	16.7
2.7 Job security and risks are not directly related to an employee's disability.	5.2	0	3.8	38.5	23.0	38.5

Statements regarding employment of PWD in hospitality and corresponding statistics regarding scores given by the participants. (Continued)

	Mean	Mode	Standard deviation	Score, 0–4 Somewhat disagree/ disagree (%)	Score, 5 Neutral (%)	Score, 6–10 Somewhat agree/ agree (%)
3						
3.1	4.4	5	2.4	15.4	61.5	23.1
	Service quality and customer satisfaction					
	Typically the employment of PWD would impact the service quality and customer satisfaction negatively in the short run (until the orientation or adaptation phase is completed).					
3.2	7.9	10	2.0	84.6	15.4	0.0
	long run because of factors such as their determination, patience, care for low absenteeism and eagerness to push themselves forward.					
3.3	7.9	10	2.9	91.7	0.0	8.3
	Typically the employment of PWD would impact the service quality and customer satisfaction positively because of factors such as their determination, patience, care for low absenteeism and eagerness to push themselves forward.					
3.4	7.7	10	2.9	91.7	8.3	0.0
	Typically the employment of PWD may impact the service quality and customer satisfaction positively thanks to skills they have developed because of being disabled or because of some skills which compensate for those which are lost.					
3.5	8.9	10	1.6	92.3	7.7	0.0
	As long as the staff with disabilities have been placed according to their background, with necessary accommodations being made and necessary training being provided, improved quality and customer satisfaction will be obtained.					
3.6	8.8	10	1.6	92.3	7.7	0.0
	Customers with a social conscience may appreciate and prefer firms which employ PWD.					
3.7	8.3	10	2.6	92.3	0.0	7.7
	Service quality and customer satisfaction are not directly related to an employee's disability.					
4						
4.1	4.3	5	2.5	16.7	50.0	33.3
	Efficiency					
	Typically the employment of PWD would impact efficiency negatively in the short run (until the orientation or adaptation phase is completed).					
4.2	8.1	10	1.9	83.3	16.7	0.0
	Typically the employment of PWD would impact efficiency positively in the long run.					
4.3	7.6	10	3.1	75.0	16.7	8.3
	Typically the employment of PWD would impact efficiency positively because of factors such as their determination, patience, care for low absenteeism and eagerness to push themselves forward.					
4.4	7.1	10	3.0	75.0	16.7	8.3
	Typically the employment of PWD may impact efficiency positively thanks to skills they have developed because of having a disability or because of some skills which compensate for those which are lost.					

(Continued on next page)

Statements regarding employment of PWD in hospitality and corresponding statistics given by the participants. (Continued)

		Mean	Mode	Standard deviation	Score, 0-4 Somewhat disagree/ disagree (%)	Score, 5 Neutral (%)	Score, 6-10 Somewhat agree/ agree (%)
4.5	As long as the staff with disabilities have been placed according to their background, with necessary accommodations being made and necessary training being provided, improved efficiency will be obtained.	8.3	10	2.0	77.0	23.0	0.0
4.6	Efficiency is not directly related to an employee's disability.	7.4	10	2.8	69.3	23.0	7.7
5	Cost	5.1	5	2.4	33.3	41.7	25.0
5.1	The employment of PWD would increase the cost of services in the short run because of measures such as physical and ergonomical adaptations, additional health- and safety-related activities and training programs.	8.0	10	1.9	81.8	18.2	0.0
5.2	The relative high cost of services would be decreased and balanced in the long run because of certain qualities of PWD such as their determination, patience, care for low absenteeism and eagerness to push themselves forward.	8.8	10	1.3	100.0	0.0	0.0
5.3	Certain financial benefits provided by the law would decrease the cost of labor if PWD are employed in the hospitality sector.	7.3	10	3.6	83.3	0.0	16.7
5.4	Certain adaptations made for EWD would increase the cost to the firm initially, but such adaptations would also benefit customers with disabilities or senior or pregnant customers, and therefore the cost would be balanced in the long run by an increased number of customers who have the need for accessible accommodation.	6.6	10	3.3	66.6	16.7	16.7
5.5	Cost is not directly related to an employee's disability.	8.9	10	1.5	92.3	7.7	0.0
6	Management						
6.1	One of the important prerequisites for prevention of managerial problems is to train managers and staff about problems which may occur when working together with PWD, and their solutions.	8.6	10	1.9	84.6	15.4	0.0
6.2	One of the important prerequisites for prevention of managerial problems is to acquaint the staff with disabilities with the working place in detail.	8.3	9	1.8	84.6	15.4	0.0
6.3	One of the important prerequisites for prevention of managerial problems is to bring together the available staff and the (new) staff members with disabilities for mutual acquaintance.	9.5	10	0.7	100	0.0	0.0
6.4	One of the important prerequisites for prevention of managerial problems is to prepare and implement job plans customized for the staff members with disabilities.	8.8	10	1.5	92.3	7.7	0.0
6.5	One of the important prerequisites for prevention of managerial problems is to apply additional occupational safety and health measures related to PWD.						

Statements regarding employment of PWD in hospitality and corresponding statistics regarding scores given by the participants. (Continued)

		Mean	Mode	Standard deviation	Score, 0–4 Somewhat disagree/ disagree (%)	Score, 5 Neutral (%)	Score, 6–10 Somewhat agree/ agree (%)
6.6	One of the important prerequisites for prevention of managerial problems is to analyze relevant legal regulations and implement them.	8.5	10	1.9	84.6	15.4	0.0
6.7	One of the important prerequisites for prevention of managerial problems is to analyze job requirements and modify them considering EWD.	9.0	10	1.5	92.3	7.7	0.0
6.8	One of the important prerequisites for prevention of managerial problems is to apply special conditions for candidates and EWD (for example customizing entry-level examinations, providing assistive products and furniture for work, making adjustments in performance criteria)	8.9	10	1.7	92.3	7.7	0.0
6.9	One of the important prerequisites for prevention of managerial problems is to take precautions against negative attitudes of customers toward staff with disabilities (for example informing the customers via appropriate communication techniques). Managerial problems are not directly related to an employee's disability.	8.0	10	2.1	76.9	23.1	0.0
6.10	Preventive measures and additional activities	7.6	10	2.4	76.9	7.7	15.4
7	One of the important prerequisites to ensure that EWD work effectively is that physical conditions (such as staircases, restrooms, entrances and exits of buildings and work environments) must be rearranged.	9.1	10	1.3	100.0	0.0	0.0
7.2	One of the important prerequisites to assure that EWD work effectively is that they are provided with the necessary assistive devices (such as screen readers for the staff with visual disabilities or adaptive devices in a car for a driver with orthopedic disabilities).	9.6	10	0.7	100.0	0.0	0.0
7.3	One of the important prerequisites to assure that EWD work effectively is to implement training programs to accustom them to the working environment and the staff to the (new) EWD.	9.2	10	1.4	92.3	7.7	0.0
7.4	One of the important prerequisites to assure that EWD work effectively is to prevent any possibility of negative attitudes of customers toward them.	7.7	10	2.2	69.2	23.1	7.7
7.5	Effective work of an employee in the hospitality industry is not directly related to his/her disability.	8.2	8	1.5	92.3	7.7	0.0
8	Employees with orthopedic disabilities						
8.1	It is not suitable for employees with orthopedic disabilities to lift and carry heavy loads or to perform tasks requiring heavy physical effort.	8.1	10	3.1	81.8	9.1	9.1
8.2	It is not suitable for employees with orthopedic disabilities to perform tasks which require dynamism or moving very fast.	7.8	10	3.1	81.8	9.1	9.1

(Continued on next page)

Statements regarding employment of PWD in hospitality and corresponding statistics regarding scores given by the participants. (Continued)

		Mean	Mode	Standard deviation	Score, 0-4 Somewhat disagree/ disagree (%)	Score, 5 Neutral (%)	Score, 6-10 Somewhat agree/ agree (%)
8.3	It is suitable for employees with orthopedic disabilities to perform tasks which require direct contact with the customer (e.g. at the reception, front cash register, bell captain or public relations).	8.5	10	2.2	81.8	9.1	9.1
8.4	People with orthopedic disabilities can perform any job which fits their knowledge, expectations and experience.	9.1	10	1.1	100.0	0.0	0.0
9	Employees with visual disabilities						
9.1	Tasks which critically require vision, such as those requiring hygiene, visual control, exchange of money or the ability to read the body language of the customer are unsuitable for employees with significantly low vision in both eyes.	8.7	10	2.1	83.3	16.7	0.0
9.2	Tasks which critically require the ability to read the body language of the customer (such as receptionist, front cashier, bell captain, public relations) are unsuitable for employees with significantly low vision in both eyes.	9.0	10	1.8	91.7	8.3	0.0
9.3	Tasks which require frequent reading of documents (in cases where such documents are not available in a digital/computerized format) are unsuitable for employees with visual disabilities.	9.6	10	1.2	100.0	0.0	0.0
9.4	It is not suitable for employees with visual disabilities to perform tasks which require dynamism or moving very fast.	8.5	10	1.8	90.9	9.1	0.0
9.5	It is suitable for employees with partial vision to perform tasks which require direct contact with the customer (e.g. reception, front cash register, bell captain or public relations).	7.1	10	3.4	66.6	16.7	16.7
9.6	People with visual disabilities can perform any job which fits their knowledge, expectations and experience.	7.8	10	3.6	83.4	8.3	8.3
10	Employees with hearing disabilities						
10.1	Tasks which critically require hearing, such as communication on the phone or face-to-face conversation with the customer, are not suitable for employees who cannot sufficiently hear even with hearing aids.	9.6	10	1.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
10.2	It is suitable for employees with hearing disabilities who have sufficient hearing (with or without hearing aids) to perform tasks which require direct contact with the customer (e.g. reception, front cash register, bell captain or public relations).	6.3	10	4.1	58.3	8.3	66.6
10.3	People with hearing disabilities can perform any job which fits their knowledge, expectations and experience.	7.5	7	2.9	83.4	8.3	8.3

Statements regarding employment of PWD in hospitality and corresponding statistics regarding scores given by the participants. (Continued)

	Mean	Mode	Standard deviation	Score, 0–4 Somewhat disagree/ disagree (%)	Score, 5 Neutral (%)	Score, 6–10 Somewhat agree/ agree (%)
11						
11.1	9.7	10	0.9	100.0	0.0	0.0
	Employees with speech and language disabilities					
	Tasks where speech is critical, such as phone or face-to-face conversations with the customer, are not suitable for people with speech and language disabilities.					
11.2	5.4	10	3.9	50.0	16.7	33.3
	If a person has sufficient capability of communication with the aid of a device or has stuttering problems, they could be given tasks requiring direct contact with customers (e.g. reception, front cash register, bell captain or public relations).					
11.3	7.3	7	2.9	83.4	8.3	8.3
	People with speech and language disabilities can perform any job which fits their knowledge, expectations and experience.					
12						
	Employees with mental disabilities					
12.1	9.0	10	2.1	92.3	0.0	7.7
	Tasks requiring direct contact with the customer (e.g. reception, front cash register, bell captain or public relations) are not suitable for employees with mental disabilities.					
12.2	7.5	10	3.1	76.9	7.7	15.4
	One staff member should be responsible of employees with mental disabilities; he/she should guide them and keep them under control.					
12.3	3.0	0	3.2	15.4	23.1	61.5
	It is not suitable for people with mental disabilities to work at any position in the hospitality industry.					
12.4	7.9	10	2.5	76.9	15.4	7.7
	People with mental disabilities can perform tasks which are routine, which have a given order and sequence and which can be learned as a stereotype (such as kitchen tasks, photocopying, laundry, gardening).					
12.5	6.3	10	3.2	66.7	8.3	25.0
	People with mental disabilities can perform any job which fits their knowledge, expectations and experience.					
13						
	Employees with chronic illnesses					
13.1	7.6	10	2.5	75.0	16.7	8.3
	Heavy physical tasks or tasks which require lifting and carrying heavy weight are not suitable for employees with chronic illnesses.					
13.2	9.5	10	1.1	100.0	0.0	0.0
	Tasks which have the potential to deteriorate the illness are not suitable for employees with chronic illnesses.					
13.3	7.6	10	3.0	84.6	7.7	7.7
	People with chronic illnesses can perform any job which fits their knowledge, expectations and experience.					

Copyright of Journal of Sustainable Tourism is the property of Multilingual Matters and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.