# Employment Barriers for Persons with Hearing Impairment in the Job Market: Employers' Perspectives

**Faiza Abbas**   Phd Scholar, Department of Education, University of Management and Technology, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.

**Faisal Anis**   Assistant Professor, Institute of Islamic Banking, University of Management and Technology, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.

**Mohammad Ayaz**   Associate Professor, Department of Banking and Finance, University of Management and Technology, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan.
Email: mohammad.ayaz@umt.edu.pk

**Abstract**   This study investigated the employers' perspectives on the decent employment barriers faced by persons with hearing impairment in the job market. A survey questionnaire was developed based on literature review and the ILO model, which was validated by experts of the field and then pilot tested to determine its reliability. Data were collected from 81 employers using the snowball sampling technique. Average mean values of data related to employment barriers were calculated to rank order these to prioritize the barriers that need to be addressed most urgently. Ranking revealed that education and training, unavailability of technical support, financial support, poor implementation of quota system represent the sequence of the urgency of the barriers. Further, a one-sample t-test was used to compare the mean of employment barriers with a 75% preset criterion value. The findings of the t-test showed that the mean value of all the barriers was significantly less than 75%. The study recommended that there is a great need to propose a policy that clearly focuses on decent employment for the PWHI.

**Key Words:**
Employees with Hearing Impairment, Decent Employment, Employers, Policy Implications.

## Introduction

Work has a twin purpose of producing earnings and being a way of learning who we are and how and where we belong (Gini, Carli, & Pozzoli, 2009). Therefore, the lack of involvement in work may have a wide impact on individuals. Despite numerous attempts to raise their participation rate, PWDs appear to have sub-level job participation than the population at large (WHO, 2011). Approximately 1 billion, or 15% of the world's population, consisted of PWDs. Approximately 80% are working-age citizens. However, the right of disabled people to a fair job is often denied. In the world of work, PWDs face immense attitudinal, physical and knowledge obstacles to equal opportunities (ILO, 2017).

Generally, PWDs are prone to discrimination and are treated as outcasts. Similarly, several environmental obstacles (access to schooling, transportation),  job obstacles and recruitment process (like lack of qualification, disability stigma, housing costs), and employer attitudes in hiring PWDs have led to PWDs employment challenges  (Khoo et al., 2013a; Marrone & Golowka, 1999; Seyoum, 2017). Most employers have the assumption that PWDs are not productive and that their businesses can lose money if they employ them (Svinndal, Jensen, & Rise, 2020). However, a study states that the PWDs are less productive is not because they are disabled; rather, it's because of their working environment which makes them disable (Bredgaard & Salado-Rasmussen, 2020).

The International Labour Union (ILO) has raised awareness globally to boost social justice to help PWDs in getting a job and contributing to society. Global GDP can be boosted if all the skilled PWDs are provided with opportunities in the working world. On the other hand, unemployed PWDs can influence a nations' GDP (Buckup, 2009).

The prime objective of ILO is to provide decent work opportunities to everyone, including PWDs. It works to meet the proposed goals for decent work for all by strengthening labour standards, legislating, creating awareness, knowledge building and technical assistance. According to ILO, decent work for the PWDs is defined as "Productive work in which rights are protected, which generates an adequate income, with adequate social protection"(ILO, 2007).  Practising decent work means stimulating markets and create opportunities for employment for PWDs and focus on the principles of equal treatment, equal opportunity, equal rights and community involvement.

ILO model for decent employment is based on two main components internal and external factors. External factors were employment services; education and training; consultation mechanism and

Legislation; financial support; technical support; personal support and disability management; persuasion measures; quota system. The internal factors were awareness, fear, and trust (ILO, 2015). ILO has also identified common challenges facing PWDs related to employment. These include environmental access, poor education and training, lack of public transportation, the risk of losing employment benefits and the discriminatory behaviour of many employers, colleagues and the community (Joshi & Thomas, 2019).

In Pakistan, up to 70 percent of PWDs are dependent on their family for survival. For PWDs, the literacy rate is about 28 percent, and only 14 percent are working in Pakistan's private and public sectors (Abidi & Sharma, 2014). The Disabled Persons (Employment and Rehabilitation) Ordinance, 1981, which set aside a 1% job quota for disabled persons in public and private sectors, was the first such initiative (DSW, 1981). The government of the province of Punjab has further raised the reserved jobs quota for PWDs by up to 3 percent (SED, 2019). In addition, the first national disability policy, introduced in 2002, set aside a 2% job quota for PWDs. It also advocated the provision of self-employment, sheltered work and benefits to enable employers to accommodate PWDs (MSWSE, 2002).

Hearing impairment is an inadequate ability or failure to hear and listen (encyclopedia Britannica). The hearing impaired child lags far behind his/their peers to communicate his feelings freely (Giddens, 2009).

It is the common assumption that among all PWDs, persons with hearing impairment (PWHIs) are less productive as compared to their normal peers, mainly due to their lesser communication ability. They are not being accommodated at the job place according to their requirements; it is commonly assumed that PWHIs are poorly productive although they are not facilitated by providing basic rights, e.g. strong legislative support, quality education, skilled training, appropriate adaptations according to the individual needs in job market etc. The prejudice instinct of society and depending on the individuals with the impairment condition itself, the communication barrier might occur. In the job market, employers are the most afraid of the communication barrier since communication is a must in achieving organizational objectives. Employers have a perception that PWHI is disappointing and problematic(Noor, Manaf, & Isa, 2018).

Nearly two-thirds of PWHIs and communication incapability indicates that they faced career restrictions, most frequently in terms of the job type they could do and job-changing difficulties. Many HI persons who work in a hearing group may face regular problems. The most commonly found problems were related to communication and lack of employers' knowledge of deafness; other barriers include sexism, the level of education necessary for specific jobs, and unjustified employer expectations (Perkins-Dock Ph D, Battle MS, Edgerton MS, & McNeill MS, 2015).

Employers express concerns about the amount and quality of work undertaken by PWHIs and worry that there is low flexibility and high levels of absenteeism (Link & Phelan, 2001). Similarly, in the case of HI individuals, employers also worried that PWHIs are insufficiently motivated to function or unable to tolerate frustration and obey and understand the instructions (Gergen, McNamee, & Barrett, 2001). Employers often attach importance to disability awareness and facts and good and stable communication with disability employment services or an expert to be consulted in the event of workplace problems(Kaye, Jans, & Jones, 2011). The hypothesis that employers' attitude towards hiring PWDs or hearing impairment depends on the size of their organization. Particularly, employers of smaller businesses viewed workers with HI in a study conducted by Fraser et al. (2011) as less skilled and less able in performing tasks efficiently relative to employers of larger businesses, where employees with HI were more welcomed (Fraser et al., 2011). These findings were confirmed in a study conducted by Jasper and Waldhart (2012), where it also seemed that a general trend of openness to hiring persons with HI increased with the size of the company, employers' awareness of impairment and all its consequences, such as the worker productivity (Jasper & Waldhart, 2012).

Employers are responsible for maintaining a trustworthy working atmosphere that encourages the participation of the deaf. The attitude and openness of the employer, their prior interaction and experiences in hiring PWHIs, are the key factors determining whether the effect of inclusion in the workplace is positive or negative. However, in the realistic process of bringing prospective workers with HI into work, even when employers are able to recruit and accept people with HI, other difficulties and obstacles can also occur. Employers may not have support for helping persons with HI in work because of their being concerned with benefits and efficiency (Shankar et al., 2014).

Owners, as well as HR staff assigned with hiring new workers, naturally want to find the most qualified applicant for each role. One way to deal with this is to recruit widely, identifying possible candidates in labour pools that rivals have missed or ignored. Employees with HI make up one of the most underutilized labour pools. Managers regularly complain that attracting eligible candidates with HI is difficult. The recruiting process does not remove barriers to ascertain that eligible people with HI are included in the candidate group. (Kulkarni, Atkins, & Baldridge, 2020; L. A. Schur, Ameri, & Kruse, 2020). In fact, the application process often discourages participation

inadvertently. Many digital resources and business webpages, for example, have weak accessibility characteristics and are not seen as especially friendly (Domzal et al., 2008).

To make sure that eligible candidates with HI are present among applicants, the selection process itself should not generate hindrances (Kulkarni & Kote, 2014). However, Bruyère, Van Looy, & Peterson (2005) found that many electronic job boards and company websites have poor accessibility features.

Another issue raised is that some administrators personally believe that applicants with hearing impairment hinder the hiring procedure because they are unable to inquire about a job applicant's condition, making it difficult to determine if the individual is qualified for the position (Kaye et al., 2011). Many employees admit that they lack the requisite training to deal with potential employees with disabilities at all levels of the employee-employer bond (Kaye et al., 2011; Wilson-Kovacs, Ryan, Haslam, & Rabinovich, 2008). Employers may be concerned about ascertaining that applicants with HI have a good interview exposure because interviews are the most popular form of selection instrument (Jans, Kaye, & Jones, 2012). There's also evidence that interviewers who have a facial or contact stigma remember less detail about them and spend more time looking at them (Madera & Hebl, 2012).

Many laws around the world (for example, the ADA in the United States) state that failing to provide fair accommodations is illegal, particularly if candidates or workers reveal a disability while applying for accommodations. Administrators, on the other hand, frequently have concerns about the perceived importance of accommodating disabled workers (Domzal et al., 2008; Lengnick-Hall, Gaunt, & Kulkarni, 2008). In short, the problem (and core of dissatisfaction) is that productivity as organizational gains may not be sufficient to justify business costs (Hernandez et al., 2008).

Some managers express uncertainty about how to manage the social inclusion of workers with disabilities within the working environment and the wider company (Jans et al., 2012). This is a crucial factor to remember. Organizational culture and the degree to which variety and inclusive working activities are respected and endorsed by both leaders and workmates play a role in the effective adjustment of employees with hearing impairment (L. Schur et al., 2005; L. Schur, Kruse, Blasi, & Blanck, 2009; Vornholt, Uitdewilligen, & Nijhuis, 2013). As opposed to workers without disabilities, employees with HI report more instances of overt prejudice, such as being barred from casual activities or being overlooked in meetings (Naraine & Lindsay, 2011; Snyder, Carmichael, Blackwell, Cleveland, & Thornton, 2010). Many employers report being unsure of how to discipline or let off disabled employees who fail to fulfil performance prospects, and they may be concerned about legal ramifications if the process is handled incorrectly (Kaye et al., 2011; Lengnick-Hall et al., 2008).

When we discuss specifically hearing impaired or deaf, it's crucial to figure out why workers with hearing impairment do worse than those who don't. Sufficient accommodation has not been provided or adopted, which may be one explanation for lower relative efficiency (Gignac et al., 2018).  Manager's main issues have been identified as absenteeism and tardiness (Hernandez et al., 2008; Kaye et al., 2011). In the same way, as there is proof that staff with HI do not practice higher levels of unpunctuality or absence than employees with normal hearing (Fredeen et al., 2013; Roberts, 2010) At the last study found that employees with deafness had considerably lower turnover rates than their colleagues who didn't have any disability (Roberts, 2010).

The hearing impaired persons' employment remains chronic and challenging in Pakistan. Most of the hearing impaired persons are underemployed and unemployed. One of the primary reasons behind the low participation of PWHI in the work market is the employers' negative perceptions of the PWHI. The current research tried to find out the employers' reservations regarding hiring decent employment of PWHI. In the light of the above discussion, it seems necessary to focus on the employers' reservations while hiring the PWHI by considering different barriers. Current research is bridging the literature gap in Pakistan regarding barriers faced by the employers in hiring the HI persons as an employee. The main purposive of this study was to determine the employers' perspectives regarding the barriers in employment for persons with hearing impairment

## Methodology

A quantitative research approach was used for the data collection and analysis to find out the answer to the research question. The type of research was descriptively conducted through the survey method. All employers from the public and private sectors having employees with hearing impairment in Punjab province comprised the population of the study. Eighty-one employers from different private and public sectors were selected through the snowball sampling technique.

Based on extensive literature review and the adapted ILO model for decent employment for PWDs provide the guideline for developing survey questionnaires for the employers from the different private and public organizations.  The questionnaire was mainly divided into two parts. Part one consisted of the demographic information, which included location, business sector, age, qualification etc., of the employers. The second part consisted of the items related to employment barriers which include environmental barriers, physical barriers and

internal factors that relate to personal attributes. Items related to each sub-components of employment barriers were developed, which include employment services, education and training, consultation mechanism and legislation, financial support, technical support, personal support and disability management, persuasion measures and quota system and personal attributes (awareness, fear and trust). A five-point (never, seldom, sometimes, often and always) rating scale was used to rate the responses.

The instrument was presented to a panel of five experts in the relevant field to determine their content validity. According to the expert's view, the instrument had good content validity, and all items were directly related to the topic. Statements of instruments were clear in meaning, simple and mutually exclusive. According to the opinion of the experts, the instrument was refined in the light of suggestions given by experts. A pilot study was conducted to determine the reliability of the instrument. Twenty employers were selected as samples for a pilot study. Cronbach's Alphas analysis was used to estimate the reliability of the instrument. The reliability of the instrument was 0.95.

## Procedure for Data Collection

The researcher collected the data from the employers by herself. First, some of the employers were identified as having employees with hearing impairment. They were contacted, and consent was asked to collect the data. The researcher personally visited most of the employers on the given schedule to collect data through semi-structured interviews from the stakeholders. For this purpose, the researcher has identified the institutions where PWHI were employed in private and public organizations through telephonic and by visiting chambers of commerce and Directorate Offices of selected divisions, then was contacted the heads on the telephone and was informed them about her purpose of research then the information was collected from the relevant population through survey method. The researcher was given the survey questionnaires to the required employers in the quantitative phase of the study.

## Data Analysis and Results

### Employers Perception

**Table 1.** Distribution of respondents by age

| Variable | Values | *f* | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 22-33 | 24 | 29.6 |
| Age | 34-44 | 33 | 40.7 |
| | 45-55 | 24 | 29.6 |
| | Matric | 19 | 23.5 |
| | FA | 17 | 21.0 |
| Qualification | BA | 17 | 21.0 |
| | Master & Above | 28 | 34.6 |
| | Government | 16 | 19.8 |
| Governing Body | Management Body | 13 | 16.0 |
| | Individual | 52 | 64.2 |
| | Government | 17 | 21.0 |
| | Food & Hospitality | 13 | 16.0 |
| | Garments | 12 | 14.8 |
| | Fashion & Beauty | 7 | 8.6 |
| | Metal Industry | 5 | 6.2 |
| Sector | Textile | 3 | 3.7 |
| | Leather Industry | 3 | 3.7 |
| | Grocery Store | 3 | 3.7 |
| | Electrical | 3 | 3.7 |
| | Construction | 3 | 3.7 |
| | Miscellaneous | 12 | 14.8 |
| | Bahawalpur | 7 | 8.6 |
| | Faisalabad | 4 | 4.9 |
| Division | Gujranwala | 44 | 54.3 |
| | Lahore | 15 | 18.5 |
| | Multan | 3 | 3.7 |
| | Rawalpindi | 8 | 9.9 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 1-10 | 62 | 76.5 |
| No. of Employees | 11-20 | 13 | 16 |
| | 21-Above | 6 | 7.4 |

As shown in Table 1, the age range of the respondent employers was from 22to 65 years. All the respondents were literate with Minimum qualifications, and the maximum was master or above. The majority of the employers (64%) were managing their individual business setup. More than 60% of the respondents were from four sectors, namely government service (21%), Food and Hospitality (16%), Garments (15%) and Fashion and Beauty (8.6%).

Data regarding the perceptions of employers were analyzed using descriptive analysis conducted using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS V21). Mean analysis was conducted to determine the extent of the employment barriers perceived by employers. The mean score was divided into three levels which are low (0-1.33), intermediate (1.64-2.66), and high (2.67-4.00)

**Table 2.** Descriptive statistics

| S. No | Statement | Max | Min | M | S.D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | Employment Services | | | | |
| 1. | Is there any provision of special recruitment facilities for hearing impaired persons in your organizations? | 0.00 | 4.00 | 1.20 | 1.70 |
| 2. | Does your organization provide placement according to the requirement for hearing impaired persons? | 0.00 | 4.00 | 1.28 | 1.27 |
| 3. | Does your organization provide special adaptations and reasonable accommodations at the workplace to hearing-impaired persons? | 0.00 | 4.00 | 1.19 | 0.89 |
| | Average Mean | | 1.22 | | |
| b. | Education and Training | | | | |
| 4. | Do you think that the educational qualification of hearing-impaired persons is appropriate for the job? | 0.00 | 4.00 | 0.68 | 0.96 |
| 5. | Do you think that the quality of education of hearing-impaired persons is appropriate for the job? | 0.00 | 4.00 | 0.43 | 0.89 |
| 6. | Do you think that hearing-impaired persons are equipped with the necessary jobs acquisition skills (interview, job application) for jobs? | 0.00 | 4.00 | 0.27 | 0.76 |
| 7. | Do you think that hearing-impaired persons are fully equipped with appropriate vocational guidance according to the job requirement? | 0.00 | 4.00 | 0.29 | 0.79 |
| 8. | Do you think that hearing-impaired persons are fully equipped with appropriate vocational training according to the job requirement? | 0.00 | 4.00 | 0.71 | 0.99 |
| | Average Mean | | 0.48 | | |
| c. | Consultation Mechanism and Legislation: | | | | |
| 9. | Are you aware of any anti-discrimination legislation? | 0.00 | 4.00 | 0.68 | 1.15 |
| 10. | Does your organization provide equal opportunities for the job to hearing-impaired persons? | 0.00 | 4.00 | 1.25 | 1.20 |
| 11. | Does your organization provide equal remunerations to all employees with the same designation, including hearing impaired persons? | 0.00 | 4.00 | 1.83 | 1.33 |
| 12. | Does your organization provide a socially protected environment to hearing-impaired persons? | 0.00 | 4.00 | 2.54 | 1.22 |
| 13. | Does your organization allow membership of labour and trade unions to your hearing-impaired employees? | 0.00 | 4.00 | 1.51 | 1.67 |
| | Average Mean | | 1.56 | | |
| d. | Financial Support | | | | |
| 14. | Does your organization provide the grant for in-service training /refresher courses to hearing-impaired persons? | 0.00 | 4.00 | 0.96 | 1.44 |
| 15. | Does your organization bear extra workplace adjustment cost in regard to hearing-impaired persons? | 0.00 | 4.00 | 0.85 | 1.38 |
| 16. | Does your organization offer medical insurance facilities to hearing-impaired persons? | 0.00 | 4.00 | 1.17 | 1.63 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 17. | Do you have awareness about financial support provided by the government to the hearing impaired person? | 0.00 | 4.00 | 0.49 | 1.21 |
| | Average Mean | | 0.87 | | |
| e. | Technical Support | | | | |
| 18. | Does your organization provide assistive technology to hearing-impaired persons in order to accomplish their targets in assigned time? | 0.0 | 4.00 | 0.79 | 1.09 |
| | Average Mean | | 0.79 | | |
| f. | Personal Support and Disability Management | | | | |
| 19. | Does your organization provide an appropriate work environment for hearing impaired persons? | 0.00 | 4.00 | 1.82 | 1.29 |
| 20. | Does your organization plan a specific work schedule and sequence for hearing impaired persons? | 0.00 | 4.00 | 1.05 | 1.22 |
| 21. | Does your organization provide adaptive working tools and equipment to hearing-impaired persons in order to facilitate them while performing the assigned task? | 0.00 | 4.00 | 1.99 | 1.09 |
| | Average Mean | | 1.92 | | |
| g. | Persuasion Measures | | | | |
| 22. | Does your organization provide advocacy services to other organizations to promote employment culture for hearing impaired persons? | 0.00 | 4.00 | 1.64 | 1.04 |
| 23. | Does your organization participate or arrange any awareness-raising campaign regarding the rights of employment of hearing-impaired persons? | 0.00 | 4.00 | 1.90 | 1.02 |
| 24. | Does your organization receive any incentives from the government for the hiring of persons with hearing impairment? | 0.00 | 4.00 | 1.83 | 1.01 |
| | Average Mean | | 1.79 | | |
| h. | Quota System: | | | | |
| 25. | Does your organization provide employment to hearing-impaired persons according to the government-approved quota? | 0.00 | 4.00 | 0.91 | 1.28 |
| | Average Mean | | 0.91 | | |
| | Internal Factors: | | | | |
| 26. | Do you have awareness regarding hearing impaired person characteristics for job placement in your organization? | 0.00 | 4.00 | 1.44 | 0.99 |
| 27. | Do you feel fear about the productivity of your organization as a result of the the hiring a person with hearing impairment? | 0.00 | 4.010 | 2.03 | 1.16 |
| 28. | Do you have trust in your selection of employees with hearing impairment? | 0.00 | 4.00 | 2.00 | 1.07 |
| | Average Mean | | 1.82 | | |

Average mean values of the perception of the respondents were conducted to rank order the extent of different employment barriers. As shown in Table 2, five out of nine aspects of employment barriers have a very low value of the average mean, i.e. education and training (0.48), technical support (0.79), financial support (0.87), quota system (0.91), and employment services (1.22). This indicates that these are the most alarming barriers as the average mean value falls in the low level of satisfaction.

The situation is slightly improved in the case of the remaining four aspects of employment barriers, i.e. consultation mechanism and legislation (1.56), persuasion measures (Mean=1.79), internal factors (Mean=1.82), and disability management (Mean=1.92). The average mean values of all these barriers fall in a moderate level of satisfaction.

One sample t-test was used to compare the mean values of perception about the employment against barriers against a predefined criterion value, i.e. 75%.

**Table 3.** One-Sample Statistics against Employment Barriesrs

| Employment Barriers | M | S.D | t | Sig. | Test-value (75%) | Test-value (50%) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Employment Services | 3.67 | 3.60 | -13.33 | .000 | 09 | 06 |
| Education and Training | 9.14 | 4.11 | -12.85 | .000 | 15 | 10 |
| Consultation Mechanism & Legislation | 7.81 | 4.88 | -13.26 | .000 | 15 | 10 |
| Financial Support | 3.48 | 4.84 | -15.86 | .000 | 12 | 08 |
| Technical Support | 0.79 | 1.09 | -18.21 | .000 | 03 | 02 |
| Personal Support & Disability Management | 3.85 | 3.05 | 15.21 | .000 | 09 | 06 |
| Persuasion Measures | 1.38 | 2.19 | -31.35 | .000 | 09 | 06 |
| Quota System | 0.91 | 1.28 | -14.71 | .000 | 03 | 02 |
| Internal Factors | 5.47 | 1.93 | -16.46 | .000 | 09 | 06 |

One sample t-test (4.26) showed that on all components of employment barriers, there was a significant statistical difference between mean values and the predefined criterion value, i.e., 75%. In each component, the mean value is significantly less than the criterion value. Even if the satisfaction level against each component is lowered to 50%, the mean value is still significantly lower than the given criterion value. Results of comparative e analysis support the findings of descriptive analysis.

**Conclusions**

The satisfaction level of employers with respect to different aspects of employment of PWHIs was not satisfactory even on a single component. It can be concluded conveniently that the employment services to the persons with hearing impairment at workplace were not adequate as well as the level of education and training of PWHIs was not sufficient. Employers usually do not provide equal participation to the HI employees in organizational consultation mechanisms, nor do they provide ample financial support to PWHIs. Technical as well as personal support and disability management service at workplace is not up to the mark to hearing-impaired persons for decent employment were not at an appropriate level. Employers were reluctant to take any persuasive measures for promoting decent employment for hearing impaired persons as well as they were not abiding by the provision of job quota to the PWHIs.

**Discussion**

The current research was based on the employers' reservations regarding the hiring persons with hearing impairment as an employee. Education and training of the PWHI is a major barrier towards decent employment of the current study. The HI persons' education and training are not appropriate according to the labour market requirements. Their vocational training is outdated, and job acquisition skills are also the most lacking area. Emmet and Francis (2015) investigated associations between hearing loss and jobs, education, and income level. It was found that hearing loss was linked to low educational attainment, low wages, and unemployment.

Hearing-impaired people have limited access to quality education and vocational training. As a result, they face unemployment or underemployment. They are forced to work in low-wage jobs such as hawking, daily wages, and selling small products (Mishra, Nagarkar, & Nagarkar, 2018). Placement issues, adaptations and reasonable accommodations, and recruitment facilities are the barriers towards decent employment at the work place of PWHI. Organizations do not have any particular policy for decent employment of PWHI (Baldridge & Swift, 2016; Haynes & Linden, 2012).

The results of the present study show that the anti-discrimination legislation specifically for the employment of PWHI is the most lacking area. They face discriminatory behavior by the employers in consultation mechanisms and legislation. Mostly they are not socially protected and not be able to get equal job opportunities and remunerations from organizations. Perceived levels of social support were stated to be lower for hearing impaired staff than for a comparison group. Social support was found to be a moderating factor between hearing capacity and perceived job performance (Danermark & Gellerstedt, 2004; Kramer, 2008; Nachtegaal et al., 2009). It implies that social support is a significant factor in mitigating the negative impact of hearing loss for hearing impaired people in the workplace. Barriers to employment and the attitude of employers against recruiting disabled people have been described as the primary cause. Employers have a negative attitude about PWDs because they are afraid that they will be unable to complete the job (Nachtegaal et al., 2009; Stokar & Orwat, 2018).

In the current study, employers admitted that organizations are not providing equal participation to the HI employees in organizational consultation mechanisms and legislation; ultimately, they are socially cornered. Situations involving group interactions, such as meetings, in-service training sessions, and work-related social functions, were found to be especially difficult for hearing impaired employees (Haynes, 2014; Haynes & Linden, 2012; Renée Punch, Hyde, & Power, 2007). This result is in line with previous findings that these types of group conditions are among the most challenging for HI personnel (Scherich & Mowry, 2019).

The finding of the present study shows that employers agreed that there is lack of support of assistive technology according to the need. Assistive technology is helpful to overcome the working obstacles and enhance the working productivity of PWHI at their official working place. Technology plays a significant role in organizational adjustments and accommodations, and it has the potential to reduce these barriers. Because of the rapid advancement of technology in recent years, a growing number of devices and systems for hearing impaired people can have the effect of increasing workplace accessibility. Many technologies specifically designed for people with hearing loss, as well as advancements in information, communication and technology such as text-based communication and automated ways of face-to-face interaction via video telephony, have been shown to assist hearing-impaired people in their work and personal lives (Garberoglio, Dickson, Cawthon, & Bond, 2015).

The present study shows that the job quota system is not implemented appropriately in govt. And private organizations, so PWHI, are continuously facing unemployment and underemployment. In countries that currently use a quota system, the job rate of disabled people is still significantly lower than that of non-disabled people (Shima, Zólyomi, & Zaidi, 2008; WHO, 2011). PWHI have poor self-confidence in their skills during their employment and at the time of entrance in the practical work field. PWHI must have the expertise, skills and courage to speak for them and receive any accommodations they need to fully participate in the workforce. Communication, assertiveness, negotiation and problem solving are essential self-determination skills that should be encouraged and fostered in young people who are deaf or hard of hearing. Additionally, vocational therapy counsellors working with hearing-impaired clients must assist in the development of self-advocacy skills and inform employees about deafness when possible (Michael & Zidan, 2018). According to a study, deaf workers' morale levels may be poor, they face numerous challenges at work, and they feel isolated from their coworkers (Fusick, 2008). In the current research, similar results were found in the interpretation of the personal characteristics of employers and workers with HI.

## Recommendations

On the basis of the findings of the study, the following recommendations may be proposed."

1. There is a great need to focus on the development of the manual of recruitment of HI employees. This manual may be helpful for employers to understand the weakness and strengths of HI individuals. It is equally helpful for PWHI as they receive recruitment services that are according to their individual needs.
2. There is a need to develop a curriculum that is focused on the skills rather than the memorization of words. The curriculum should emphasize the knowledge about the job choices that they have the ability to perform, vocational guidance regarding the information of job how and where from they obtain and then how to read job details, job application and interview skills.
3. Proper career guidance and counselling services are necessary to guide SWHI about the careers available to them and the requirements of these jobs so that they can better prepare for them.
4. There is a need to develop vocational training programs that are market-oriented. Government should launch these programs with the collaboration of the chamber of commerce. Vocational training programs are based on the latest technology that is adapted according to the specified needs of HI individuals.
5. Knowledge about workplace adjustment issues also needs to be the part of the educational curriculum so that they adjust at workplace easily.

## References

Abidi, J., & Sharma, D. (2014). Poverty, disability, and employment: global perspectives from the National Centre for Promotion of Employment for Disabled People. *Career Development and Transition for Exceptional Individuals, 37*(1), 60-68.

Agomoh, O. E., & Kanu, S. A. (2011). Introduction to psychology of special needs children: Understanding special needs education. Port Harcourt: Kanissi Books

Baldridge, D. C., & Swift, M. L. (2016). Age and assessments of disability accommodation request normative appropriateness. *Human Resource Management, 55*(3), 385-400.

Bredgaard, T., & Salado-Rasmussen, J. (2020). Attitudes and behaviour of employers to recruiting persons with disabilities. *Alter, 15*(1), 61-70.

Bruyère, S. M. (2000). Civil rights and employment issues of disability policy. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies, 11*(1), 18-28.

Bruyère, S. M., Van Looy, S. A., & Peterson, D. B. (2005). The international classification of functioning, disability and health: Contemporary literature overview. *Rehabilitation Psychology, 50*(2), 113.

Buckup, S. (2009). *The price of exclusion: the economic consequences of excluding people with disabilities from the world of work.*

Danermark, B., & Gellerstedt, L. C. (2004). Psychosocial work environment, hearing impairment and health. *International journal of audiology, 43*(7), 383-389.

Domzal, C., Houtenville, A., & Sharma, R. (2008). *Survey of employer perspectives on the employment of people with disabilities: Technical report*: Office of Disability Employment Policy, Department of Labor.

DSW. (1981). Disabled Persons' (Employment and Rehabilitation) Ordinance Pakistan. doi:https://www.ilo.org/dyn/natlex/docs/ELECTRONIC/50075/97325/F1697756412/PAK50075.pdf

Emmett, S. D., & Francis, H. W. (2015). The socioeconomic impact of hearing loss in US adults. *Otology & neurotology: official publication of the American Otological Society, American Neurotology Society [and] European Academy of Otology and Neurotology, 36*(3), 545.

Foster, S., & MacLeod, J. (2003). Deaf people at work: Assessment of communication among deaf and hearing persons in work settings. *International journal of audiology, 42*, S128-S139.

Fraser, R., Ajzen, I., Johnson, K., Hebert, J., & Chan, F. (2011). Understanding employers' hiring intention in relation to qualified workers with disabilities. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 35*(1), 1-11.

Fredeen, K. J., Martin, K., Birch, G., & Wafer, M. (2013). Rethinking disability in the private sector. *Panel on Labour Market Opportunities for Persons with Disabilities, 28*.

Fusick, L. (2008). Serving clients with hearing loss: Best practices in mental health counseling. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 86*(1), 102-110.

Garberoglio, C. L., Dickson, D., Cawthon, S., & Bond, M. (2015). Bridging the communication divide: CMC and deaf individuals' literacy skills. *Language Learning & Technology, 19*(2), 118-133.

Garberoglio, C. L., Schoffstall, S., Cawthon, S., Bond, M., & Ge, J. (2014). The role of self-beliefs in predicting postschool outcomes for deaf young adults. *Journal of Developmental and Physical Disabilities, 26*(6), 667-688.

Garske, G. G., & Stewart, J. R. (1999). Stigmatic and Mythical Thinking: Barriers to Vocational Rehabilitation Services for Persons with Severe Mental Illness. *Journal of Rehabilitation, 65*(4).

Gergen, K. J., McNamee, S., & Barrett, F. J. (2001). Toward transformative dialogue. *International journal of public administration, 24*(7-8), 679-707.

Giddens, E. (2009). Teaching written language to students who are deaf or hard of hearing. http://digitalcommons.wustl.edu/pacs_capstones/186

Gignac, M. A., Kristman, V., Smith, P. M., Beaton, D. E., Badley, E. M., Ibrahim, S., & Mustard, C. A. (2018). Are there differences in workplace accommodation needs, use and unmet needs among older workers with arthritis, diabetes and no chronic conditions? Examining the role of health and work context. *Work, aging and retirement, 4*(4), 381-398.

Gini, G., Carli, G., & Pozzoli, T. (2009). Social support, peer victimization, and somatic complaints: A mediational analysis. *Journal of paediatrics and child health, 45*(6), 358-363.

Granberg, S., Pronk, M., Swanepoel, D. W., Kramer, S. E., Hagsten, H., Hjaldahl, J., . . . Danermark, B. (2014). The ICF core sets for hearing loss project: functioning and disability from the patient perspective. *International Journal of Audiology, 53*(11), 777-786.

Hauser, P. C., Lukomski, J., & Hillman, T. (2008). Development of deaf and hard-of-hearing students' executive function. Deaf cognition: Foundations and Outcomes, 286-308. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195368673.003.0011

Haynes, S. (2014). Effectiveness of communication strategies for deaf or hard of hearing workers in group settings. *Work, 48*(2), 193-202.

Haynes, S., & Linden, M. (2012). Workplace accommodations and unmet needs specific to individuals who are deaf or hard of hearing. *Disability and Rehabilitation: Assistive Technology, 7*(5), 408-415.

Hernandez, B., Keys, C., & Balcazar, F. (2000). Employer attitudes toward workers with disabilities and their ADA employment rights: A literature review. *JOURNAL OF REHABILITATION-WASHINGTON-, 66*(4), 4-16.

Hernandez, B., McDonald, K., Divilbiss, M., Horin, E., Velcoff, J., & Donoso, O. (2008). Reflections from employers on the disabled workforce: Focus groups with healthcare, hospitality and retail administrators. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 20*(3), 157-164.

ILO. (2007). *Equality at Work: Tackling the Challenges: Global Report Under the Follow-up to the ILO Declaration on Fundamental Principles and Rights at Work* (Vol. 1). International Labour Office. Director-General: International Labour Organization.

ILO. (2015). *World employment and social outlook: trends 2015*. ILO, Geneva:

ILO. (2017). *World employment and social outlook: Trends 2017*.

Inge, K. (2008). Customized employment. *Journal of vocational rehabilitation, 28*(3), 133-134.

Jans, L. H., Kaye, H. S., & Jones, E. C. (2012). Getting hired: Successfully employed people with disabilities offer advice on disclosure, interviewing, and job search. *Journal of occupational rehabilitation, 22*(2), 155-165.

Jasper, C. R., & Waldhart, P. (2012). Retailer perceptions on hiring prospective employees with disabilities. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services, 19*(1), 116-123.

Joshi, B., & Thomas, B. (2019). Barriers Faced by Persons with Disabilities in Formal Employment in India. *Disability, CBR & Inclusive Development, 30*(3), 125-132.

Kaye, H. S., Jans, L. H., & Jones, E. C. (2011). Why don't employers hire and retain workers with disabilities? *Journal of occupational rehabilitation, 21*(4), 526-536.

Khoo, S. L., Tiun, L. T., & Lee, L. W. (2013a). Unseen challenges, unheard voices, unspoken desires: Experiences of employment by Malaysians with physical disabilities. *Kajian Malaysia: Journal of Malaysian Studies, 31*(1).

Khoo, S. L., Tiun, L. T., & Lee, L. W. (2013b). Workplace discrimination against Malaysians with disabilities: Living with it or fighting against it? *Disability Studies Quarterly, 33*(3).

Kramer, S. E. (2008). Hearing impairment, work, and vocational enablement. *International Journal of Audiology, 47*(sup2), S124-S130.

Kulkarni, M., & Kote, J. (2014). Increasing employment of people with disabilities: The role and views of disability training and placement agencies. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 26*(3), 177-193.

Kulkarni, M., & Lengnick-Hall, M. L. (2014). Obstacles to success in the workplace for people with disabilities: A review and research agenda. *Human Resource Development Review, 13*(2), 158-180.

Kulkarni, M., & Lengnick-Hall, M. L. (2011). Socialization of people with disabilities in the workplace. *Human Resource Management, 50*(4), 521-540.

Lengnick-Hall, M. L., Gaunt, P. M., & Kulkarni, M. (2008). Overlooked and underutilized: People with disabilities are an untapped human resource. *Human Resource Management: Published in Cooperation with the School of Business Administration, The University of Michigan and in alliance with the Society of Human Resources Management, 47*(2), 255-273.

Link, B. G., & Phelan, J. C. (2001). Conceptualizing stigma. *Annual review of Sociology, 27*(1), 363-385.

Luft, P. (2000). Communication barriers for deaf employees: Needs assessment and problem-solving strategies. *Work, 14*(1), 51-59.

Madera, J. M., & Hebl, M. R. (2012). Discrimination against facially stigmatized applicants in interviews: an eye-tracking and face-to-face investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 97*(2), 317.

Marschark, M., Morrison, C., Lukomski, J., Borgna, G., & Convertino, C. (2013). Are deaf students visual? Learning and Individual Differences, 25, 156-162. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2013.02.006

Marrone, J., & Golowka, E. (1999). If work makes people with mental illness sick, what do unemployment, poverty, and social isolation cause? *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal, 23*(2), 187.

Michael, R., & Zidan, H. M. (2018). Differences in self-advocacy among hard of hearing and typical hearing students. *Research in developmental disabilities, 72*, 118-127.

Mishra, A., Nagarkar, A. N., & Nagarkar, N. M. (2018). Challenges in Education and Employment for Hearing Impaired in India. *Journal of Disability Management and Special Education, 1*(1), 35.

MSWSE. (2002). National Policy for Persons with Disabilities, Pakistan. doi:http://pspmr.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/3-National-Policy-for-Persons-with-Disabilities-2002.pdf

MSWSE. (2006). National Plan of Action 2006, To implement the National Policy for Person with Disabilities. doi:https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/wp-

content/uploads/sites/15/2019/10/Pakistan_National-Plan-of-Action-to-implement-the-National-Policy-for-Persons-with-Disabilities-2006-%E2%80%93-2011.pdf

Nachtegaal, J., Kuik, D. J., Anema, J. R., Goverts, S. T., Festen, J. M., & Kramer, S. E. (2009). Hearing status, need for recovery after work, and psychosocial work characteristics: Results from an internet-based national survey on hearing. *International journal of audiology, 48*(10), 684-691.

Naraine, M. D., & Lindsay, P. H. (2011). Social inclusion of employees who are blind or low vision. *Disability & Society, 26*(4), 389-403.

Noor, A. A. M., Manaf, A., & Isa, M. F. M. (2018). Qualities of employees with disabilities in organization: Exploring evidence from Malaysian employers. *Int. J. Account, 3*, 32-43.

Perkins-Dock Ph D, R. E., Battle MS, T. R., Edgerton MS, J. M., & McNeill MS, J. N. (2015). A survey of barriers to employment for individuals who are deaf. *JADARA, 49*(2), 3.

Punch, R. (2016). Employment and adults who are deaf or hard of hearing: Current status and experiences of barriers, accommodations, and stress in the workplace. *American annals of the deaf, 161*(3), 384-397.

Punch, R., & Duncan, J. (2020). A Model of Targeted Transition Planning for Adolescents who are Deaf or Hard of Hearing. *Deafness & Education International*, 1-16.

Punch, R., Hyde, M., & Creed, P. A. (2004). Issues in the school-to-work transition of hard of hearing adolescents. *American Annals of the Deaf, 149*(1), 28-38.

Punch, R., Hyde, M., & Power, D. (2007). Career and workplace experiences of Australian university graduates who are deaf or hard of hearing. *Journal of deaf studies and deaf education, 12*(4), 504-517.

Ramiah, A. A., Schmid, K., Hewstone, M., & Floe, C. (2015). Why are all the W hite (A sian) kids sitting together in the cafeteria? Resegregation and the role of intergroup attributions and norms. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 54*(1), 100-124.

Roberts, M. V. (2010). *Dualities: A theology of difference*: Westminster John Knox Press.

Scherich, D., & Mowry, R. L. (2019). Accommodations in the Workplace for People who are Hard of Hearing: Perceptions of Employees. *JADARA, 31*(1), 6.

Schur, L., Kruse, D., & Blanck, P. (2005). Corporate culture and the employment of persons with disabilities. *Behavioral sciences & the law, 23*(1), 3-20.

Schur, L., Kruse, D., Blasi, J., & Blanck, P. (2009). Is disability disabling in all workplaces? Workplace disparities and corporate culture. *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society, 48*(3), 381-410.

Schur, L., Nishii, L., Adya, M., Kruse, D., Bruyère, S. M., & Blanck, P. (2014). Accommodating employees with and without disabilities. *Human Resource Management, 53*(4), 593-621.

Schur, L. A., Ameri, M., & Kruse, D. (2020). Telework after COVID: a "silver lining" for workers with disabilities? *Journal of occupational rehabilitation, 30*(4), 521-536.

SED. (2019). Punjab Special Education Policy, Government of the Punjab. doi:https://sed.punjab.gov.pk/system/files/Special%20Education%20Policy%20Final%20Draft.pdf

Seyoum, Z. (2017). Employment Opportunities and Challenges of People with Disabilities in Dire-Dawa, Ethiopia: Policy and Practice. *Journal of Education, Society and Behavioural Science*, 1-11.

Shankar, J., Liu, L., Nicholas, D., Warren, S., Lai, D., Tan, S., . . . Sears, A. (2014). Employers' perspectives on hiring and accommodating workers with mental illness. *Sage Open, 4*(3), 2158244014547880.

Shima, I., Zólyomi, E., & Zaidi, A. (2008). The labour market situation of people with disabilities in EU25. *Policy Brief, 1*.

Shuler, G. K., Mistler, L. A., Torrey, K., & Depukat, R. (2014). More than signing: Communicating with the deaf. *Nursing Management, 45*(3), 20-27.

Smith, J. A. (2011). Embracing the Elephant in the Room: Interviewing Ideas for Applicants who are Deaf or Hard of Hearing. *Journal of the American Deafness & Rehabilitation Association (JADARA), 44*(2).

Smith, K., Webber, L., Graffam, J., & Wilson, C. (2004b). Employer satisfaction, job-match and future hiring intentions for employees with a disability. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 21*(3), 165-173.

Snyder, L. A., Carmichael, J. S., Blackwell, L. V., Cleveland, J. N., & Thornton, G. C. (2010). Perceptions of discrimination and justice among employees with disabilities. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal, 22*(1), 5-19.

Stokar, H., & Orwat, J. (2018). Hearing Managers of Deaf Workers: A Phenomenological Investigation in the Restaurant Industry. *American annals of the deaf, 163*(1), 13-34.

Stone, D. L., & Colella, A. (1996). A model of factors affecting the treatment of disabled individuals in organizations. *Academy of management Review, 21*(2), 352-401.

Stone, D. L., & Williams, K. J. (1997). The impact of ADA on the selection process: Applicant and organizational issues. *Human Resource Management Review, 7*(2), 203-231.

Svinndal, E. V., Jensen, C., & Rise, M. B. (2020). Employees with hearing impairment. A qualitative study exploring managers' experiences. *Disability and rehabilitation, 42*(13), 1855-1862.

Vornholt, K., Uitdewilligen, S., & Nijhuis, F. J. (2013). Factors affecting the acceptance of people with disabilities at work: A literature review. *Journal of occupational rehabilitation, 23*(4), 463-475.

WHO. (2001). *The World Health Report 2001: Mental health: new understanding, new hope*.

WHO. (2011). *World report on disability 2011* (9241564180).

WHO. (2018). Deafness and Hearing Loss. doi:Available online: https://www.who.int/en/newsroom/fact-sheets/detail/deafness-and-hearing-loss

Wilson-Kovacs, D., Ryan, M. K., Haslam, S. A., & Rabinovich, A. (2008). 'Just because you can get a wheelchair in the building doesn't necessarily mean that you can still participate': barriers to the career advancement of disabled professionals. *Disability & Society, 23*(7), 705-717.