

Author: Holliday, Mitchel, K.

Title: *Midwestern Restaurant Association Member Attitudes about Hiring Individuals with a Criminal Background and a Food Handler Certificate or Food Protection Manager Certification*

The accompanying research report is submitted to the **University of Wisconsin-Stout, Graduate School** in partial completion of the requirements for the

Graduate Degree/ Major: Edd in Career and Technical Education

Research Advisor: Dr. Debbie Stanislawski, Professor

Submission Term/Year: Spring 2018

Number of Pages: 146

Style Manual Used: American Psychological Association, 6th edition

- I have adhered to the Graduate School Research Guide and have proofread my work.
- I understand that this research report must be officially approved by the Graduate School. **Additionally, by signing and submitting this form, I (the author(s) or copyright owner) grant the University of Wisconsin-Stout the non-exclusive right to reproduce, translate, and/or distribute this submission (including abstract) worldwide in print and electronic format and in any medium, including but not limited to audio or video. If my research includes proprietary information, an agreement has been made between myself, the company, and the University to submit a thesis that meets course-specific learning outcomes and CAN be published.**
- I attest that the research report is my original work (that any copyrightable materials have been used with the permission of the original authors), and as such, it is automatically protected by the laws, rules, and regulations of the U.S. Copyright Office.
- My research advisor has approved the content and quality of this paper.

STUDENT:

NAME: Mitchel K. Holliday

DATE: 5/3/2018

ADVISOR:

NAME: Debbie Stanislawski

DATE: 5/3/2018

Committee members (other than your advisor who is listed in the section above)

1. **CMTE MEMBER'S NAME:** Brian Bergquist

DATE: 5/3/2018

2. **CMTE MEMBER'S NAME:** Kathleen Brock

DATE: 5/3/2018

3. **CMTE MEMBER'S NAME:**

DATE:

This section to be completed by the Graduate School

This final research report has been approved by the Graduate School.

Director, Office of Graduate Studies:

DATE:

Holliday, Mitchel K. *Midwestern Restaurant Association Member Attitudes about Hiring Individuals with a Criminal Background and a Food Handler Certificate or Food Protection Manager Certification*

Abstract

Correctional food service training programs have attempted to utilize certificates and certifications to impact recidivism; however, no literature was found on if individuals responsible for hiring employees would be more likely to hire individuals with a criminal background who have obtained these certificates or certifications. The purpose of this study was to identify if a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification would increase the likelihood individuals with criminal backgrounds would be hired into different types of jobs in the food service sector. A total of 1798 Minnesota and Wisconsin Restaurant Association Members were invited to participate via their respective listservs. Sixty-nine members responded. The results of the study indicated desired training for individuals with criminal backgrounds varied across positions with a preference for correctional training, with and without the offering of a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification, to be offered in coordination with a college/university culinary arts program. Individuals with a criminal background and a food handler certificate and food protection certification manager certification had a higher mean likelihood of being employed than those without across all positions. Work experience was the most desired type of training for individuals with a criminal background. Lastly, work experience and offense history were identified as the main reasons reported for hiring individuals with a criminal background.

Acknowledgments

First, I would like to thank Stephanie, Ian, and Payton. Sacrificing my time as a husband and father away from you while you were at the lake and out enjoying the other blessings of our life together has always been a struggle. I am grateful for your understanding and look forward to all of the times we have together moving forward.

Next, I would like to thank my Research Committee. To my Chair, Dr. Debbie Stanislawski, thank you for the frequent engagement and encouragement as well as the professional timeliness in your reviews and responses. To my Committee Member, Dr. Brian Bergquist, thank you for your willingness to support me with your subject matter expertise, assistance with identification of a suitable population, and timely responses. To my Committee Member, Dr. Kathleen Brock, thank you for your assistance with my survey development and thorough review and feedback on my paper.

I would also like to thank Tracy Kosbau, the Wisconsin Restaurant Association, and its members as well as Trish Stevens, the Minnesota Restaurant Association, and its members. Thank you for your willingness to support this research, providing input and assistance with the survey design and pilot testing, as well as your participation in the survey itself.

In addition, I would like to thank Dr. Amy Gillet and Becky Graham for their editorial support. Lastly, I would like to thank the members of both Cohorts I have had the privilege learning alongside, your support and motivation was appreciated.

Table of Contents

Abstract	2
List of Tables	8
Chapter I: Introduction.....	10
Statement of the Problem.....	12
Purpose of the Study	12
Research Questions/Objectives.....	12
Significance of the Study	13
Assumptions of the Study	14
Limitations of the Study.....	14
Definition of Terms.....	14
Chapter II: Literature Review	17
U.S. Crime and Incarceration Rates.....	18
Recidivism	20
Correctional Education and Vocational Education Impact on Recidivism, Cost, and Employment.....	22
Criminal History and Hiring Practices.....	26
Food Service Sector Employment	28
Food Service Sector Positions	29
Chefs and Head Cooks.....	30
Cooks	30
Food Preparation Workers	30
Waiters and Waitresses.....	31

Food Service Sector Certificates and Certifications	31
Food Handler Certificate.....	32
Food Protection Manager Certification	32
Correctional Food Service Training.....	33
Signaling Theory.....	38
Criminology Signaling.....	40
Certification Signaling.....	41
Summary.....	42
Chapter III: Method and Procedures.....	44
Research Methodology	44
Subject Selection and Description	45
Instrumentation	46
Survey Mode.....	46
Survey Ordering.....	47
Survey Length.....	47
Closed-ended Questioning	48
Open-ended Questioning	49
Question Accuracy.....	50
Cognitive Interviews.....	51
Survey Pilot Testing.....	52
Data Collection Procedures.....	52
Data Analysis	53
Closed-ended Questioning.....	53

Open-ended Questioning	54
Limitations	54
Summary.....	55
Chapter IV: Presentation of the Findings.....	56
Participants and Context	57
Research Questions	63
Question One: What is the Attitude of Restaurant Association Members Towards Hiring Individuals who have a Criminal Background to Work in their Food Service Operation?.....	63
Question Two: Does Having a Food Protection Manager Certification, Food Handler Certificate, or Other Professional Training Impact how Likely Restaurant Association Members are to Hire Individuals with Criminal Backgrounds?.....	76
Question Three: Is there a Difference in the Types of Food Service Sector Positions Restaurant Association Members would Hire Individuals with a Criminal Background for?	86
Summary.....	95
Chapter V: Summary, Conclusion and Recommendation	98
Summary/Discussion	98
Conclusion	103
Question One	103
Question Two.....	105
Question Three.....	107

Recommendations.....	108
Recommendations for Correctional Administrators for Development or Expansion of Food Service Training Programs	109
Recommendations for Individuals with Criminal Backgrounds.....	109
Recommendations for Future Research	110
References.....	111
Appendix A: Cognitive Interview Responses.....	123
Appendix B: Pilot Test Interviews.....	125
Appendix C: Initial Survey Request Email.....	127
Appendix D: Survey Instrument	128
Appendix E: Follow-Up Survey Request Email.....	144
Appendix F: Desired Training Idea Response: Sample Breakdown	145
Appendix G: Considerations Impacting Hiring Decisions Response: Sample Breakdown	146

List of Tables

Table 1: Survey Response Rate of Wisconsin and Minnesota Restaurant Association Members	58
Table 2: Respondents' Demographics.....	59
Table 3: Respondents' Experience	61
Table 4: Restaurant Demographics.....	63
Table 5: Comfort Level with Staff Working with an Individual with a Criminal Background... 64	
Table 6: Staff Comfort Level Working with an Individual with a Criminal Background.....	65
Table 7: Desired Training for Chef/Head Cook if Applicant Had a Criminal Background	66
Table 8: Desired Training for Cook if Applicant Had a Criminal Background	68
Table 9: Desired Training for Food Preparation Worker if Applicant Had a Criminal Background.....	70
Table 10: Desired Training for Waiter/Waitress if Applicant had a Criminal Background.....	72
Table 11: Additional Desired Certificates, Certifications, or Training for Individuals with a Criminal Background and Why	75
Table 12: Importance of Employees Having Certificate and Certification	77
Table 13: Likelihood of Hiring an Employee without Food Handler Certificate or Food Protection Manager Certification.....	79
Table 14: Likelihood of Hiring an Employee with Food Handler Certificate or Food Protection Manager Certification	80
Table 15: Likelihood of Hiring Someone with a Criminal Background Who Has Not Obtained a Food Handler Certificate or Food Protection Manager Certification	82

Table 16: Likelihood of Hiring Someone with a Criminal Background Who Has Obtained a Food Handler Certificate or Food Protection Manager Certification	84
Table 17: Likelihood of Hiring Someone with a Criminal Background Who Has a Food Handler Certificate or Food Protection Manager Certification	86
Table 18: Likelihood of Hiring Someone with and without a Criminal Background Who Has Not and Who Has Obtained a Food Handler Certificate or Food Protection Manager Certification	89
Table 19: Have You Previously Hired Someone with a Known Criminal Background into the Following Positions?.....	90
Table 20: Considerations that Impacted Hiring of Individuals with a Criminal Background	94

Chapter I: Introduction

The United States has the highest incarceration rate of any nation in the world (Department of Justice [DOJ], 2015). According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics (2016), there were 1,526,800 prisoners under the jurisdiction of state and federal correctional authorities at year end in 2015. In 2010 alone, incarceration of prisoners cost state and federal budgets \$80 billion dollars (DOJ, 2015).

Upon release from incarceration, 36.8% of released prisoners were rearrested for a new crime within six months and 56.7% were arrested by the end of the first year (Durose, Cooper, & Snyder, 2014). The percent of individuals who recidivate continues to increase as time goes on with 67.8% of released prisoners being rearrested within three years and 76.6% rearrested within five years (Durose et al., 2014). In 2013, a comprehensive review of the criminal justice system resulted in identification of bolstering efforts to deter and reduce recidivism as one of the five identified goals (DOJ, 2015). In attempts to meet this goal, evidence-based strategies must be used to reduce the rate of recidivism (DOJ, 2015).

Quality academic and vocationally focused programs are a key service prisons can provide and a major component of the correctional system helping to increase employment and reduce recidivism rates (Aos, Miller, & Drake, 2006; Davis, Bozick, Steele, Saunders & Miles, 2013; Wilson, Gallagher, & MacKenzie, 2000). Reasons why programs improve employment outcomes include an increase in human capital and “signaling” to an employer a seriousness partially compensating for criminal stigma (Dick, Rich, & Waters, 2016). Certificates and certifications are often provided as part of correctional vocational education and are important as they aid hiring decisions and mitigate the stigma of criminal records (Dick et al., 2016).

A continued primary concern of the restaurant industry is finding enough qualified staff (Black Box Intelligence, 2017). Population and income growth will continue to increase demand for food, and individuals will continue to consume away from home resulting in an expected growth of 1.6 million new jobs over the next decade. (Bureau of Labor Statistics [BLS], 2017d; National Restaurant Association [NRA], 2017b). Research indicates restaurants are receptive to hiring released inmates, especially for kitchen positions; however, some organizations have imposed broad background check requirements potentially decreasing the likelihood of employment and negatively impacting recidivism (Collins, 2011; Decker, Spohn, Ortiz, & Hedberg, 2014; Rodriguez, 2011).

Despite numerous correctional food service training programs existing, very few programs appear to have information on the actual effectiveness or reduction on recidivism rates. Peer-reviewed studies that isolate the effectiveness of culinary programming for inmate populations are limited (Werblow & Dischino, 2015). Certificates and certifications are often provided as part of correctional vocational education and are important as they provide a way to communicate professional training to assist employers in hiring decisions and mitigate the stigma of criminal records (Dick, Rich & Waters, 2016). However, no literature was found assessing if food service certificates or certifications might increase the likelihood someone responsible for hiring employees might actually hire someone with a criminal background into any common food service sector position. In light of this, as numerous correctional food service training programs offering certificates and certifications exist without evidence to support if certificates or certifications might actually increase employment of individuals with a criminal background in the food service sector, it needs be determined if food service

certificates and certifications increase the likelihood of employment to provide an evidence base for developing correctional food service training programs.

Statement of the Problem

Evidence-based strategies must be used to reduce the rate of recidivism thus impacting this societal problem. Despite utilization of food service certificate and certification programs within prisons, no research literature was found on if someone potentially responsible for hiring employees would be more likely to hire individuals with criminal backgrounds who have obtained these certificates and certifications into the different types of jobs available in the food service sector.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to identify if a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification would increase the likelihood of individuals with criminal backgrounds being hired into different types of jobs in the food service sector and provide an evidence-base for correctional food service programs to base their training programs on to help reduce recidivism rates.

Research Questions/Objectives

Based on the background of the problem and purpose of the study, the study examined three important research questions:

Question One: What is the attitude of restaurant association members towards hiring individuals who have a criminal background to work in their food service operation?

Question Two: Does having a food protection manager certification, food handler certificate, or other professional training impact how likely restaurant association members are to hire individuals with criminal backgrounds?

Question Three: Is there a difference in the types of food service sector positions restaurant association members would hire individuals with a criminal background for?

Significance of the Study

In 2010 alone, incarceration of prisoners cost state and federal budgets \$80 billion dollars (DOJ, 2015). The average annual cost to confine a federal inmate in fiscal year 2015 was \$31,977.65 or \$87.61 per day (Federal Register, 2016). There are other societal costs as well. These include the cost of the suffering of victims, their families, and the effect on lives of inmates' children who are more than five times more likely to become incarcerated themselves compared to children who do not have incarcerated parents (Dick et al., 2016). In addition, upon release from incarceration, 67.8% of released prisoners were arrested for a new crime within three years, and 76.6% were arrested within 5 years (Durose et al., 2014).

Participation in vocational education during incarceration reduces recidivism rates (Aos, et al., 2006). Correctional facilities are increasing utilization of food service certificate and certification programs as a form of vocational education to attempt to reduce recidivism (Guercio, 2014). This is in-line with industry demand as several years of work experience in food service is a standard qualification; however, more formal education or certifications are being preferred (BLS, 2017d).

The proposed study will establish a body of knowledge on the attitudes of restaurant association members towards hiring individuals who have a criminal background. This knowledge will potentially assist correctional administration in development or expansion of food service related work and training programs in hopes of increasing inmate employability in the food service sector and reducing recidivism rates. This in turn could help to save on the

financial and social impacts of incarceration while at the same time supporting the employment demand needs of the growing food service sector.

Assumptions of the Study

The following assumptions inherent to this study include:

1. Restaurant association members responding to the survey understood the instrument and answered questions honestly, without bias, and to the best of their abilities.
2. The interpretation of the data collected appropriately reflected the intended responses of restaurant association member respondents.

Limitations of the Study

Design considerations and delimitations contributed to the limitations of this study. First, in the area of design considerations, the study was limited by the nature of the distribution of the survey to only Minnesota Restaurant Association (MRA) and Wisconsin Restaurant Association (WRA) members and, of those members, is only representative of the sample of members who responded. Another limitation is the sampling procedure used, in this case nonprobability self-selection design. Delimitations of the study included only generalizing criminal background.

Definition of Terms

The following terms are defined to aid in understanding of this study:

Chef/head cook. Chefs and head cooks oversee food preparation, and duties may include: supervision and coordination of activities of cooks, development of recipes, menu planning, supply and equipment inspection, ordering and maintaining of inventory, and monitoring of sanitation practices and kitchen safety standards (BLS, 2017a; Recruiter, 2017b).

Cook. Cooks prepare and cook a wide-range of foods, and duties may include: weighing, measuring and mixing of ingredients, baking, grilling, boiling, and steaming foods, garnishing foods, cleaning work areas and equipment, and handling and sorting of food and ingredients (BLS, 2017b; Recruiter, 2017c).

Criminal background. Criminal background encompasses criminal history, including pending arrests or convictions by a criminal justice agency (USLegal, 2018).

Food handler certificate. A food handler certificate verifies basic food safety knowledge for food handlers in employee-level positions (NRA, 2017c). A food handler certificate provides knowledge on food safety, personal hygiene, cross-contamination, allergens, regulations and techniques to maintain a food-safe environment, allowing for reduction in risk, improvement in safety and reduced costs (Learn2Serve, 2017a; NRA, 2017a).

Food preparation workers. Food preparation workers perform routine tasks under the supervision of cooks or food service managers, and duties may include: cleaning and sanitizing work areas and equipment, weighing and measuring of ingredients, preparing of foods for cooking, mixing of salads, storage of foods to prevent spoilage, and taking and recording of food temperatures and storage areas (BLS, 2017c; Recruiter, 2017a).

Food protection manager certification. Food protection manager certification is similar in content to a food handler certificate; however, it provides more comprehensive education. Food service manager certification verifies a person in charge has sufficient food safety knowledge to protect the public from foodborne illness (NRA, 2017c).

Incarceration. Incarceration is defined as confined in a prison or jail and may also include halfway-houses, boot camps, weekend programs, and overnight lock-up facilities (BLS, 2018)

Recidivism. Recidivism is a person's relapse into criminal behavior after punishment or intervention from a previous crime (National Institute of Justice, 2017).

Signaling. Signaling is defined as one party communicating information about themselves to another party (Dictionary.com, 2018).

Vocational education. Vocational or career technical education training is designed to teach employment skills or specific skills needed for specific jobs and industries (National Institute of Justice, 2018).

Waiters/waitresses. Waiters and waitresses take orders and serve food and beverages to customers, and duties may include: greeting customers, presenting menus, answering questions related to menus, taking and relating orders, preparing drinks, carrying and removing food and drinks, cleaning tables, preparing checks and taking payments, and setting up dining and stock service areas (BLS, 2017e, Recruiter, 2017d).

Chapter II: Literature Review

With the United States having the highest incarceration rate of any nation in the world and approximately 77% of inmates being rearrested within five years of being released, evidence-based strategies to reduce recidivism rates must be implemented (Department of Justice [DOJ], 2015; Durose et al., 2014). Quality academic and vocationally focused programs are a key service correctional programs can provide and a major component of the correctional system helping to reduce recidivism rates (Aos et al., 2006; Davis et al., 2013; Wilson et al., 2000). Despite numerous existing correctional food service training programs offering professional certificates and certifications, no current literature was found assessing if food service certificates or certifications commonly offered as part of these programs might increase the likelihood someone with these certificates or certifications and a criminal background would be hired into any of the various food service sector positions.

This literature review begins by outlining crime and incarceration rates within the United States. It then highlights the issue of recidivism and the impact of correctional education and vocational education on recidivism, cost, and employment. The literature review then focuses on the impact of having a criminal history and employers' practices towards those with criminal backgrounds. The review of literature additionally focuses on food service sector employment demands, positions, and common sector certificates and certifications. The literature review then highlights how correctional food service training programs have attempted to train individuals in hopes of influencing recidivism by increasing their employability within the food service sector. Lastly, the literature review outlines signaling theory as a conceptual basis for the study.

This literature review focused on historical and current governmental and scholarly publications pertaining to incarceration and crime, correctional educational programming, and the food service sector. Government organization databases utilized included U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Washington State Institute of Public Policy, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Bureau of Labor Statistics, National Institute of Justice, and Department of Justice. Professional associations including the National Restaurant Association and American National Standards Institute were also utilized. In addition, scholarly books, journals, and research articles through the University of Wisconsin-Stout library were also utilized. Databases searched included WorldCat and EBSCOhost and online database of Google Scholar.

U.S. Crime and Incarceration Rates

Crime rates began to increase sharply in the 1970s, peaking in 1980 and 1991, and have remained high over the past three decades (DOJ, 2000; Friedman, 2015). The cumulative prevalence of arrests for American youth has increased substantially and, by age 23, may be between 30.2% and 40.4% (Brame, Turner, Paternoster, & Bushway, 2012). In 2012, this resulted in the 50 states, American Samoa, Guam, and Puerto Rico having an estimated 100,596,300 individuals with reported criminal backgrounds (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2014). This is equal to nearly one-third of the adult working age population, approximately the same number of people who have graduated from four-year colleges or the entire U.S. population in 1900 (Friedman, 2015).

After a 50-year period of incarceration rate stability, corresponding with the increase in crime rates, the U.S. prison boom began in 1973 increasing annually by 6%-8% through the early 2000s (National Research Council, 2014). During this time, jail, state, and federal prison populations all grew, with the federal prison population growing the fastest. By 2012,

population totals grew to 2.23 million people (National Research Council, 2014). According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics (2016), though this trend shifted and there was a 2% reduction in state and federal prison populations from year-end 2014 to year end 2015, excluding jails, there were still 1,526,000 prisoners under the jurisdiction of state and federal correctional authorities at year end in 2015.

The United States has the highest incarceration rate of any nation in the world (DOJ, 2015), accounting for about 23% of the world's incarcerated individuals with rates highest among prime-age, minority men, with very low levels of education (National Research Council, 2014). This disproportionate incarceration rate is largely attributed to increases in prison admission and time served. These rates are unprecedented by both historical and comparative standards (National Research Council, 2014), and in 2010 alone, incarceration of prisoners cost state and federal budgets \$80 billion dollars (DOJ, 2015). If rates do not change, the current projection is 6.6% of individuals born in the U.S. in 2001 will become incarcerated in a state or federal prison in their lifetime (Bonczar, 2003), which could lead to a number of individual and societal burdens.

Though similar, state and federal prison populations vary. In state prisons more than half (52.9%) of inmates are serving time related to a violent offense (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2016). Property offenses account for 19%, drug related offenses account for 15.7%, public order account for 11.6%, and other/unspecified account for less than 1% (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2016). State prison inmates are 93% male with a race make up of 34% White, 35% Black, and 20% Hispanic (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2016). In federal prisons approximately half (49.5%) of inmates are serving time for drug related offenses (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2016). Violent offenses only account for 7.4% while property accounts for

6.0%, public order accounts for 36.3% and other/unspecified account for 0.8% (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2016). Federal prison inmates are 94% male with a race make up of 27% White, 37% Black, and 33% Hispanic (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2016).

Educational disparities also exist within incarcerated populations. Though there has been a large incarceration population growth for several decades, the number of incarcerated individuals who have attended college barely increased (Travis, Wester, & Redburn, 2012). Nearly all the growth in incarceration is among those with no college, and prison has turned into a place for men with little schooling. These disparities highlight the high incarceration rates among Blacks and Hispanics who tend to have very low levels of education (Travis et al., 2014).

In summary, the United States has seen an increase in crime and an unprecedented increase in incarceration rates over the past fifty years. State and federal populations vary based on offense history, however, the majority of those being incarcerated in both types of systems are predominately undereducated Black and Hispanic males.

Recidivism

Recidivism is a critical issue related to crime and incarceration rates in the United States and brings many social and economic problems (Mears & Mestre, 2012). In an assessment of over 400,000 inmates released from state prisons in 2005, Durose et al. (2014) found 36.8% were rearrested within six months, and 56.7% were arrested by the end of the first year. In addition, 67.8% of prisoners were arrested for a new crime within three years, 76.6% were arrested within five years and 16% of released prisoners were responsible for nearly half of the 1.2 million arrests that occurred within five years post release.

Durose et al. (2014) also found recidivism rates vary across age, sex, and race. During the five-year post release window, 84.1% of inmates aged 24 or younger at release were rearrested compared to 78.6% of those 25 to 39 and 69.2% aged 40 or older. Males recidivate at 72.5% compared to females who recidivate at 62.9%. Blacks have a recidivism rate at 74%, followed by persons of other races at 72.6%, Hispanics at 70.7% and Whites at 68.8%.

In addition, Durose et al. (2014) also found recidivism rates vary across criminal history. One year after release, 26.4% of prisoners with four or fewer prior arrests were rearrested compared to 56.1% of prisoners with ten or more prior arrests. Within five years of release, 82.1% of property offenders, 76.9% of drug offenders, 73.6% of public order offenders and 71.3% of violent offenders were rearrested.

In 2013, a comprehensive review of the criminal justice system resulted in identification of bolstering reentry efforts to deter and reduce recidivism as one of the five identified goals (DOJ, 2015). In attempts to meet this goal, evidence-based strategies must be used to reduce the rate of recidivism (DOJ, 2015).

According to the National Reentry Resource Center (2014), practices and policies must include establishing programs that have been shown to reduce recidivism, and implementation of them must be with fidelity. A program must have three key elements to make it effective, including targeting people who are most likely to reoffend, use of research based practices, and regular review of program quality (Justice Center, 2015).

Post-release employment and education levels are the two most influential predictors of recidivism among prisoners, regardless of ethnicity (Lockwood, Nally, Ho, & Knutson, 2015). If properly implemented, participation in education and vocational education programs during incarceration reduces recidivism rates (Aos et al., 2006). Certifications are often provided as

part of correctional vocational education. These certifications are important as they provide aid in hiring decisions and mitigate the stigma of criminal records (Dick et al., 2016).

Correctional Education and Vocational Education Impact on Recidivism, Cost, and Employment

Each year, thousands of inmates leave prison and return to their family and communities. Many successfully reintegrate and many others commit new crimes and return (Davis et al., 2014). In 2003, approximately 75% of federal inmates and 59% of state inmates had not completed high school (Harlow, 2003). Inmates also often lack vocational skills and a history of employment (Davis et al., 2013). A lack of education and vocational skills are key reasons some ex-prisoners recidivate and others do not; however, it is a challenge to prepare inmates with the needed vocational skills and education to be successful. Therefore, quality academic and vocationally focused programs are a key service prisons can provide and a major component of the correctional system (Davis et al., 2013; Wilson et al., 2000).

There has historically been dispute about the effectiveness of correctional education, and literature provided limited constructive information on the efficacy of prison-based programs (Piotrowski & Lathrop, 2012). The limitations are due to several methodological problems that made it difficult to conduct research to allow for the identification of specific programs. Examples of the problems included: prison-based programs suffering from selection-bias, prisoner motivation, identification of specific program aspects directly linked to success, lack of differentiating among program types, and few studies targeting employment outcomes (Lawrence, Mears, Dubin, & Travis, 2000).

In 1975, the first major review in the U.S on the impact of correctional education was conducted. This review focused on the years 1945-1967 and evaluated 231 programs. The

review identified no conclusive evidence that correctional programs were of benefit. It also identified that, in some instances, correctional programs might even have done more damage than good (Lipton, Martinson, & Wilks, 1975). This study is notable as it set the tone for future research and policy disclosure as it raised concerns regarding the efficacy and effectiveness of correctional education programs. Some researchers and policy makers did not feel it warranted a final determination of the overall effect of interventions (Davis et al., 2013).

The Lipton et al. (1975) study improved development of methods for existing academic and vocational training programs; however, it was not until 2000 the efficacy of correctional education was comprehensively reviewed again (Davis et al., 2013). At that time Wilson et al. (2000) meta-analyzed recidivism outcomes of 33 independent studies beginning the year after the Lipton et al. (1975) study. Though weak methodological characteristics of the studies reviewed were noted, numerous findings were identified. These findings indicated that inmates who participated in educational programming recidivate at lower rates than nonparticipants, and inmates who participated in vocational training programs were significantly less likely to recidivate compared to those who had not at an odds ratio of 1.55 and had a twofold increase in the odds they would become employed compared to nonparticipants (Wilson et al., 2000). In 2006, a co-author of the Wilson et al. study updated their original research with additional studies by limiting publications to those after 1980 and eliminating studies with the weakest designs. In this study, the findings identified a 16% higher rate of not recidivating among academic program participants, and vocational program participation was associated with 24% lower recidivism rate compared to nonparticipants (as cited in Davis et al., 2013).

Research has also focused on the impact of educational programming on specific program type and sectors of the inmate population. Case and Fasnacht (2004) found that Black

males report more value in vocational training. A review of government documents from 1980 to 2008 on the topic of educational rehabilitation programs in federal and state facilities found more focused results (Piotrowski & Lathrop, 2012). The findings indicated program success was largely a function of program type, size, and length as well as other factors such as inmate age, criminal history, and maturational level. Vocational educational programs were also found to be moderately effective, particularly when inmates' needs and skills were matched with program type (Piotrowski & Lathrop, 2012).

Additional large-scale studies on the overall effectiveness of correctional education programs have also been conducted. In research conducted as part of the evaluation of the Washington's Offenders Act, a separate review of comprehensive evidence-based correctional programs was conducted in attempt to answer a simple question: Are there any adult corrections programs that work (Aos et al., 2006). In a review of programs conducted over the previous 40 years in the U.S. and other English-speaking countries, 291 evaluations of correctional programs were evaluated. The results were mixed as a number of correctional programs demonstrated the ability to reduce recidivism rates and others did not. On average, programs were found to reduce recidivism rates by 8.2%. Specific to vocational educational programs, only three studies qualified; however, on average programs produced a statistically significant 12.6% reduction in recidivism rates (Aos et al., 2006).

In 2013, a study conducted produced more encouraging results. As part of a systematic review of 1,112 identified documents, 267 were identified as primary empirical studies and utilized for review with 58 meeting eligibility criteria established for intervention, outcome measures, and research design (Davis et al., 2013). The results of this study indicated that inmates who participated in educational programs had 43% lower odds of recidivating; even

when lower quality studies were included, a reduction in the risk of recidivating was reduced by 13%. Davis et al. (2013) also found that, across 18 studies reviewed that used employment as an outcome, the odds of obtaining employment post release among participants was 13% higher for those who participated than those who did not. Specific to vocational educational programs, defined as training in employment skills and in skills for specific jobs and industries, findings indicated vocational educational programs reduced the odds of recidivism by 36%. Davis et al. (2013) also identified the direct cost of reincarceration to be far greater than the direct costs of providing correctional education, and programs appear to far exceed the break-even point in reducing the risk of recidivism.

A follow-up to the Davis et al. (2013) study used studies that were more recent and more rigorous in their approach to selecting and evaluating. Results indicated correctional education reduces the risk of post release incarceration by 13%. It does so cost-effectively, saving five dollars for each dollar spent. Additionally, it and may increase employment (Davis et al., 2014). The results of this study prompted the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance to state, “This study showed the debate should no longer be about whether correctional education is effective or cost-effective, but rather on where the gaps in our knowledge are and opportunities to move the field forward” (Davis et al., 2014, p. iv).

Despite the more rigorous research and evidence in the area of correctional education and correctional vocational education benefit, participation in prison-based programming has declined (Lawrence et al., 2002). This is partly because of the rapid growth of the prison system, frequent transferring of inmates between systems, decreased federal funding, and more emphasis on short-term substance abuse treatment (Lawrence et al., 2002).

Going forward, correctional vocational education research and programming needs to continue to improve. Better identification of characteristics of effective programs and related variables must be identified (Davis et al., 2013; Davis et al., 2014; Wilson et al., 2000). Training and education programs should be closely aligned with job market needs and employability (Case & Fasenfest, 2004; Patiotrowski & Lathrop, 2012). Private sector businesses should also be engaged in the development of strategic partnerships with the goal of linking inmates to employment after release (Lawrence et al., 2002).

Criminal History and Hiring Practices

Employing a released prisoner potentially creates a dilemma for businesses; however, without providing individuals with job opportunities, commitment of new crimes and return to prison can be an expected outcome (Martinez, 2011). Federal law does not prohibit employers from asking about criminal history; however, federal Equal Employment Opportunity law does prohibit discrimination when criminal history information is used violating Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (EEOC, 2017a). These violations include treating people with similar criminal records differently due to race, national origin, color, sex, or religion. These violations may also include using policies or practices to screen individuals based on criminal information if they are significantly disadvantaged individuals such as Blacks or Hispanics, and they do not help the employer accurately identify if the person will be a responsible, reliable, or safe employee (EEOC, 2017a). If criminal records exclusions disproportionately exclude classes of individuals, the employer must show the exclusions are job related and consistent with business necessity to avoid liability. Employers can demonstrate this by showing (1) their screening of applicants considers the nature of the crime, the time since the conduct occurred, and nature of the job in question, and (2) giving the excluded applicant time to show why they should not be

excluded (EEOC, 2017b). In addition to federal laws, several states' laws limit use of arrest and conviction records to make employment decisions, limiting the ability to inquire about records until late in the hiring process (EEOC, 2017a).

Technology has increased the accessibility of criminal background information available to employers since the 1990s, and ease and affordability encourage prescreening of every applicant (EEOC, 2017b; Graham, 2015). Criminal background information can now be obtained through many sources, including but not limited to: court records, law enforcement and corrections agency records, registries or watch lists, state criminal record repositories, the Interstate Identification Index, and Federal Bureau of Investigation (EEOC, 2012).

A survey conducted by the Society of Human Resource Management (2012) found 92% of respondents subject all or some of their job candidates to criminal background checks. The survey also reported finding the following to be somewhat to very influential in not offering a job to an applicant:

- 100% of respondents indicated a convicted violent felony history
- 98% of respondents indicated a convicted non-violent felony history
- 93% of respondents indicated a convicted violent misdemeanor history
- 73% of respondents indicated a convicted non-violent misdemeanor history
- 31% of respondents indicated an arrest record that did not result in a conviction

Despite the use and potential impact of background checks on employer perceptions, research indicates that they do not consistently yield complete and accurate criminal history information and facilitating risk assessments have not been found to convey useful data showing an increased likelihood a particular applicant will engage in repeat offending (Harris & Keller, 2005). Disadvantages to the use of criminal record checking include obstructing the

reintegration of ex-offenders, encouraging recidivism, limiting the labor pool, and exposing organizations to discrimination claims and overuse of risk assessment (Heydon, 2012).

Regardless of the law and limited data, most employers would “probably” or “definitely” not hire an applicant with a criminal record and many major corporations use no-hire policies (Holzer, Raphael, & Stoll, 2006; Rodriguez, 2011). According to Senator Rand Paul, “The biggest impediment to civil rights and employment in our country is a criminal record. Our current system is broken and has trapped tens of thousands of young men and women in a cycle of poverty and incarceration” (Graham, 2015).

Food Service Sector Employment

Job opportunities within the restaurant industry have historically provided individuals an important entry-point into the workforce regardless of race or gender. Nearly half of adults have worked in the industry at some point, one in three Americans’ first job was an entry-level position in the industry, eight in 10 current restaurant owners’ first jobs were in entry-level positions in the industry, and nine in 10 restaurant managers starting in the industry in an entry-level position (NRA, 2017b). In addition, the number of restaurants owned by women increased 40% between 2007 and 2012 while at the same time Hispanic owned restaurants grew 40% and African-American owned restaurants increased 49% (NRA, 2017b).

A continued primary concern of restaurants is finding enough qualified staff. Nearly 80% of companies have offered higher pay incentives to attract candidates in recent years (Black Box Intelligence, 2017). Population and income growth will continue to increase demand for food, and individuals will continue to consume away from home (BLS, 2017d). Restaurant industry sales are expected to total nearly \$8 billion dollars in 2017 while employing

about one in 10 Americans. This growth is expected to add 1.6 million new jobs over the next decade to total 16.3 million in 2027 (NRA, 2017b).

Not only is the food service industry a major area of employment in the U.S., but it is also the second most common area for employment after incarceration. In 2008, Visher, Debus, and Yaher noted 12% of inmates gained employment in the food service sector after release. In 1999, a survey of the Arizona hospitality and tourism industry revealed restaurants were most receptive to hiring released inmates, especially for kitchen positions (Collins, 2011).

Organizations including Applebees, Baskin-Robbins, Buffalo Wild Wings, Chili's, Chipotle, Dairy Queen, Denny's, Dunkin Donuts, Golden Corral, IHOP, Jack in the Box, Long Horn Steakhouse, McDonalds, Ocean Properties, Ltd & Affiliates, Olive Garden, Red Lobster, Red Robbin, Subway, and Wendy's have all been identified as "friendly" to individuals with criminal backgrounds (Guercio, 2014).

Employment in the food service industry does appear to have employment challenges for those with criminal backgrounds. A three-year study on the impact of gaining employment after release found having a criminal record decreases job prospects for ex-inmates, particularly in the low-skill food service sector where ex-offenders are likely to seek employment during reentry (Decker et al., 2014). In addition, some of the nation's largest companies, including Domino's Pizza, which employees 170,000 worldwide, have imposed overbroad background check requirements (Rodriguez, 2011).

Food Service Sector Positions

The food service sector provides customers with prepared meals, snacks, and beverages for immediate on-site or off-site consumption through a wide range of establishments, including full-service restaurants (BLS, 2017d). According to the BLS (2017d), employment occupations

within full-service restaurants include: chefs and head cooks, cooks, food preparation workers, and waiters and waitresses. Duties, education and experience, work schedules, salary and employment outlooks vary across these occupations.

Chefs and head cooks. Chefs and head cooks oversee food preparation, and duties include: supervision and coordination of activities of cooks, development of recipes, menu planning, supply and equipment inspection, ordering and maintaining of inventory, and monitoring of sanitation practices and kitchen safety standards (BLS, 2017a, Recruiter, 2017b). Most chefs and head cooks work full-time and learn skills through work experience while others receive more formal academic training or learn through apprenticeship programs (BLS, 2017a). The salary range is between \$32,000 and \$48,000 annually with median annual pay of \$43,180, and outlook for projected employment is expected to grow 9% between 2014 and 2024 (BLS, 2017a, Recruiter, 2017b).

Cooks. Cooks prepare and cook a wide-range of foods, and duties include: weighing, measuring and mixing of ingredients, baking, grilling, boiling, and steaming foods, garnishing foods, cleaning work areas and equipment, and handling and sorting of food and ingredients (BLS, 2017b, Recruiter, 2017c). Most cooks work full-time and learn skills through on-the-job training and related work experience although some attend culinary school (BLS, 2017b). The salary range is between \$16,000 and \$24,000 annually with median annual pay of \$22,850, and outlook for projected employment is expected to grow 4% from 2014-2024 (BLS, 2017b, Recruiter, 2017c).

Food preparation workers. Food preparation workers perform routine tasks under the supervision of cooks or food service managers, and duties include: cleaning and sanitizing work areas and equipment, weighing and measuring of ingredients, preparing of foods for cooking,

mixing of salads, storage of foods to prevent spoilage, and taking and recording of food temperatures and storage areas (BLS, 2017c, Recruiter, 2017a). About half of food preparation workers are employed part-time and learn skills through short-time on-the-job training with no formal education or experience required (BSL, 2017c). The salary range is between \$16,000 and \$24,000 with median annual pay of \$21,440; outlook for projected employment is expected to grow at 6% from 2014-2024 (BLS, 2017c, Recruiter, 2017a).

Waiters and waitresses. Waiters and waitresses take orders and serve food and beverages to customers, and duties include: greeting customers, presenting menus, answering questions related to menus, taking and relating orders, preparing drinks, carrying and removal of food and drinks, cleaning tables, preparing checks and taking payments, and setting up dining and stock service areas (BLS, 2017e, Recruiter, 2017d). About half of waiters and waitresses are employed part-time and learn skills through on-the-job training with no formal education or experience required (BLS, 2017e). The salary range is between \$16,000 and \$24,000 annually with median annual pay of \$19,990 and outlook for projected employment is expected to grow at 3% from 2014-2024 (BLS, 2017e, Recruiter, 2017d).

Food Service Sector Certificates and Certifications

The demand for employee certificates and certifications has increased within the food service sector (American National Standards Institute [ANSI], 2017a). To meet this increased demand, ANSI has developed a food service sector Certificate Program. The ANSI Certificate Program ensures American National Standard, Standard Practice for Certificate Programs, and offers accreditation for food safety (ANSI, 2017c). ANSI itself follows the International Standard defined by quality third-party accreditation practices (ANSI, 2017a). To become an

accredited program through ANSI, a program must meet predefined industry standards for content, processes, and feedback for quality improvement (ANSI, 2017a).

ANSI offers food service sector accreditation to programs on food safety allowing them to issue food handler certificates and food protection manager certifications. Several industries and government agencies require ANSI accredited certificates (ANSI, 2017a). State and local governments rely on to these certificates and certifications to determine qualifications and meet established standards (ANSI, 2017c). Currently some local jurisdictions, six states including California, Illinois, Arizona, West Virginia, Texas, and New Mexico, require food handler certificates for various positions. While 26 states, including Minnesota and Wisconsin, require food protection manager certification for the person-in-charge (ANSI, 2017c; NRA 2016). ANSI has accredited 17 organizations as Food Handler Training Certificate Programs and five organizations as accredited Food Protection Manager Certification Programs (ANSI, 2017b; ANSI, 2017d).

Food handler certificate. A food handler certificate verifies basic food safety knowledge for food handlers in employee-level positions (NRA, 2017c). A food handler certificate provides knowledge on food safety, personal hygiene, cross-contamination, allergens, regulations and techniques to maintain a food-safe environment allowing for reduction in risk, improvement in safety and reduced costs (Learn2Serve, 2017a; NRA, 2017a). After completion of the course, individuals will have skills and ability to identify biohazards, foodborne illnesses, signs of spoilage, safe storage, effectively store and handle food and properly clean and sanitize (Learn2Serve, 2017a).

Food protection manager certification. The Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has written requirements within the Food Code specifying the person in charge of food

establishments must either have a certification or show demonstrated proficiency in food safety knowledge (FDA, 2013). Food protection manager certification is similar in content to a food handler certificate; however, it provides more comprehensive education. Food service manager certification verifies a person in charge has sufficient food safety knowledge to protect the public from foodborne illness (NRA, 2017c). Food protection manager certification provides a better knowledge and understanding of food safety, types of foodborne illness and causes, biological, physical and chemical contamination, temperature control, importance of personal hygiene, and identification of cleaning, sanitation, and facility design (Learn2Serve, 2017b).

Correctional Food Service Training

Food service training programs in corrections are not new and may offer development of skillsets allowing inmates the opportunity to become viable citizens after release (Camplin, 2017). Limited peer-reviewed studies identifying the effectiveness of food service programming for inmate populations exist (Werblow & Dischino, 2015). As a result, consistency of program offerings appears to vary across correctional systems. Programming ranges from basic kitchen education, to internally developed culinary programs, to the use of ANSI certificates and certifications programs, to collaborations with technical colleges and universities.

Many state food service training programs date back several decades. The Culinary Arts Program at Eastern Correctional Facility in New York began in the 1960s (Mitchell, 2014). At the Northeastern Correctional Center in Massachusetts, inmates have been running a full-service kitchen since 1979 in attempts to develop culinary skills (Camplin, 2017). The Wisconsin Department of Corrections began using food service training programs, including sanitation,

safe food handling, hygiene, baking, recipe conversion, and kitchen basics education in three prisons since 1995 (Matsumoto, 2000).

Michigan implemented a Food Technology Program in 1998 at the G. Robert Cotton Correctional Facility. The program follows a one-year curriculum teaching the following: cooking principles, industry history, sanitation, tools and equipment, nutrition considerations, menu function, gourmet recipes, and five-star presentation. The program also employs inmate tutors who have completed the program. The program requires a high school diploma or GED to participate and all tests must be passed with an 80% or better (Michigan Department of Corrections, 2017).

In Cook County, Illinois, a program entitled Recipe for Change has been implemented through the introduction of healthy food, good nutrition and the art of quality cooking. As part of the program students are challenged to meet similar expectations of the best and most rigorous culinary arts school (Recipe for Change, 2017).

The Virginia Department of Corrections (VDOC) has implemented an ANSI Food Handler Certificate program with over 5,000 inmates receiving certificates; in 2013, the VDOC added an ANSI Food Protection Manager program with 117 graduates in the first year (Guercio, 2014). Delaware recently began renovations of an empty cafeteria at its largest men's prison into a commercial-style restaurant kitchen with an attached classroom in efforts to expand current programming (Walter, 2016).

More formal programs have also been developed in collaboration with technical colleges and universities. At the Timpanogos Women's Correctional Facility in Utah, the Culinary Arts Program is one of six vocational programs Davis Applied Technology College provides to inmates sentenced to the Utah State Prison (Stephenson, 2014). The program requires the same

number of hours and skills to pass as students taking on campus programming and includes two weeks of bookwork and passing examinations in areas such as equipment and sanitation.

Students are required to be in the kitchen as part of programming Monday through Friday for six hours each day (Stephenson, 2014).

Organizations that contract to provide correctional food service have also begun to implement programming. The Trinity Services Group provides a program called Work Feed Succeed that includes six sections: sanitation, safety, food safety, hazard analysis critical control point, cooking skills, and ANSI Food Handler Certificate. The program is growing and running in many different forms around the country with programs customized to reflect the facility where the training program occurs (Guercio, 2014).

Despite numerous correctional food service training programs existing, very few programs appear to have information on actual effectiveness in increasing employability or reduction on recidivism rates. In attempts to determine if its culinary programming was beneficial, the State of Connecticut Department of Correction (CTDOC) conducted an evaluability study to determine if a subsequent impact analysis was feasible. The purpose of the study was to provide a baseline of the quality of the culinary arts programming and provide recommendations to increase program consistency and adequacy for an impact analysis to result in meaningful interpretation (Werblow & Dischino, 2015). The finding determined, due to programming inconsistencies, an impact analysis could not even be conducted. As a result, some of their recommendations to the CTDOC included: make a commitment to programming vision by providing adequate culinary arts resources, create a plan to support all culinary arts programs by providing internships experiences, improve program schedules, partner with the State Department of Labor to coordinate services to track employment rates of ex-offenders,

and collaborate with local civic agencies to develop local volunteers to assist program completers with finding and maintaining employment (Werblow & Dischino, 2015).

One program has appeared to demonstrate its effectiveness on reducing recidivism. Aramark Correctional Services partnered with the Indiana Department of Corrections (IDOC) implementing Aramark's In2Work vocational program. The program consists of three phases of vocational training including: hands-on kitchen experience, classroom instruction, and an ANSI Certification. Graduates of the program were found to recidivate at a 7.7% lower rate compared to IDOC system rates. The program was found to save the IDOC more than \$85 million dollars in the first seven years of operation and was awarded the National Governors Association's Public-Private Partnership Award in 2013 (Guercio, 2014). The In2Work program is offered in more than 75 correctional facilities across 19 states that are served by Aramark (Guercio, 2014).

Very few correctional programs appear to have actual relationships developed with the restaurant industry. An exception appears to be Sussex Community Corrections in Delaware and SoDel Concepts. SoDel Concepts has earned a reputation of encouraging redemption (Carroll, 2016). SoDel Concepts, in collaborations with the Food Bank of Delaware and the Sussex Community Corrections, began offering a 14-week program, including hands-on training in basic and high-end cooking techniques, safe food handling, and life skills. In addition, the last two weeks of the program include placement in a paid internship at a local restaurant, food service, or catering company, resulting in nearly all students securing employment by graduation (Carroll, 2016).

Another exception was past inmate food service programming in Arizona. In 2002, Northern Arizona University (NAU) implemented a pilot program for female inmates at the

Arizona State Prison Complex in Perryville. The program combined transition skill training with hands-on training in the kitchen to include an ANSI Food Handler Certificate. Other programming components included transitional and employability skills training and follow-up services for released inmates (Collins, 2011). Curriculum and instruction were adapted to the learning styles of the inmate population and to entry-level restaurant skills. Inmates who completed the program received a Certificate in Basic Culinary from NAU School of Hotel & Restaurant Management, a Certificate in Customer Service from the NAU School of Hotel and Restaurant Management, and an ANSI Food Protection Manager Certification.

Three staff were hired to develop and implement the program, including a culinary instructor, a life skills coach, and an aftercare coordinator. Thirty inmates completed the program and an advisory committee was formed to help place participants into jobs with over 100 employers from the Phoenix area agreeing to hire program graduates. Assessment of the program determined participants could be responsible citizens and dependable employees, no special risk posed to employers by hiring inmates, and cost-effectiveness. However, the program was discontinued in 2005 due to budget problems and increasing prison populations (Collins, 2011).

Food service training programs in corrections are not new and may offer development of skillsets allowing inmates the opportunity to become viable citizens after release through a variety of programs (Camplin, 2017); however, limited peer-reviewed studies that isolate the effectiveness of food service programming for inmate populations exist (Werblow & Dischino, 2015). As a result, consistency of program offering appears to vary across correctional systems ranging from basic kitchen education, to internally developed culinary programs, to the use of

ANSI certificates and certifications programs, to collaborations with technical colleges and universities.

Signaling Theory

Individuals are continually conveying and signaling information to each other. These signals can potentially be positive or negative as employees attempt to market themselves and provide valuable information to employers. These signals could potentially include a criminal background, type of crime committed, level of education, or professional certificates or certifications obtained.

Signaling theory is based on these assumptions: (1) individuals have different levels of productivity not affected by education, (2) additional education incurs cost, which differs for high and low productivity workers, (3) workers know their skill level and employers do not, and (4) schooling levels can be observed by using educational qualifications to predict productivity, hiring decisions, and setting wages on the assumption more educated applicants are more productive (Bushway & Apel, 2010; Page, 2010). Though signaling theory has been around for decades, much is still unknown about its importance; however, economists believe signaling theory to be a dominant explanation of labor market returns on education due to a large number of employees' abilities not being observable to the employer that must be signaled (Frazis, 2002; Page, 2010).

Page (2010) noted education is a signaling device used early in an employee's career chosen to produce the highest benefit between the cost of education and earnings. Employees' abilities and productivity levels are identified by their education rather than enhanced by it, implying more-educated employees receive higher pay because education provides a credential,

rather than because of acquired skill (Page, 2010). Education only reflects human capital and this inherent human capital, not education, increases productivity and wages (Kjelland, 2008).

According to Spence (1973), typically employers are not aware of the level of productivity of an applicant when they hire them or shortly after they are hired. The time it takes to learn this means hiring is an uncertain investment decision (Spence, 1973). What employers do see is personal data in the form of observable characteristics, some of which are fixed and others that are alterable, and these attributes must be utilized for assessment (Spence, 1973). Fixed signals are observable characteristics referred to as indices, reserving the term signals for alterable characteristics subject to change that reveal information previously unobservable about a person (Bushway & Apel, 2012; Spence, 1973). Applicants have limited ability to change indices; however, they can alter signals which are subject to manipulation (Spence, 1973). Certain signals are more important with some types of jobs than others and individuals are assumed to select signals to allow for maximizing the difference between offered wages and signaling cost (Spence, 1973). Equilibrium is reached when applicant signals are received by an employer through their beliefs and assessment of wages, applicant signaling, hiring and market data over time consistent with initial beliefs (Spence, 1973).

On the basis of experience, an employer will have assessment capabilities over productivity capacities given combinations of indices and signals (Spence, 1973). Indices and signals are parameters for shifting conditional probability distributions that define an employer's beliefs (Spence, 1973). Signals can both be positive and negative (Ramekers, van Wilsem, & Apel, 2012). When an employer is confronted with an applicant, this capability allows the employer to determine probability distributions over productivity based on the data given (Spence, 1973). For each set of indices and signals an employer faces, they will have an

expected marginal product for the applicant who has these observable characteristics (Spence, 1973). As a result, employers have an incentive to utilize signals to screen and hire productive employees (Bushway & Apel, 2010; Kjelland, 2008).

Criminology signaling. The labor market in the United States can be difficult and an inequitable environment for individuals from a variety of demographics including those with criminal backgrounds who have well documented employment problems (Bushway & Apel, 2012; Doleac, 2016; Fahey, Roberts, & Engel, 2006). Employers look for signals like education levels, criminal backgrounds and drug tests to provide information about an applicant's productivity potential (Doleac, 2016; Fahey et al., 2006). The literature suggests individuals with criminal backgrounds may differ from those who do not have criminal backgrounds with the same level of education due to a variety of negative signals that reduce an individual's perceived work readiness (Doleac, 2016). In addition, even if positive signals exist, they may be too weak to make a large difference in employer's decisions (Bloom, 2012).

Individuals with criminal backgrounds may be negatively impacted due to the potential negative signal sent caused by the belief of a likelihood of recidivism, higher rates of social or mental issues, potentially being less honest or trustworthy, having violent tendencies, or lower work competencies (Bushway & Apel, 2012; Doleac, 2016; Raemakers et al., 2012). These negative signals may motivate the use of a criminal background as a substitute for knowledge of work qualities (Doleac, 2016; Fahey et al., 2006). Pager (2003) supported the impacts of negative signaling and employment challenges finding employers were less than half as likely to call back applicants with reported criminal backgrounds. Ramakers et al. (2012), have also shown when employers are not aware of a criminal background this history is not likely to influence applicant chances of obtaining employment.

In contrast, individuals with criminal backgrounds who have completed job-specific work programs might send a positive signal that could be exploited during on a job application or during an interview process (Bushway & Apel, 2012; Fahey et al., 2006; Ramekers et al., 2012). Increasing information available to employers helps them look beyond a criminal background to the potential inherent in the job applicant (Dolaec, 2016). Job training, apprenticeships, and other programs resulting in certifications tailored specifically to the type of employment play an important role in communicating positive signals between applicants and employers and have been shown to decrease recidivism (Bushway & Apel, 2012; Dolaec, 2016). As a result, literature shows successful completion of prison-based employment programs, to include the offering of certificates and certifications, are excellent candidates for desistance signaling; however, no systematic evidence is available to show that programs are being used in this manner (Bushway & Apel, 2012; Ramakers et al, 2012).

In a time of increased employer use of criminal background checking of job applicants and the potential negative signal associated with a criminal background, without positive signaling employers may be unable to accurately identify if individuals with criminal backgrounds will desist from crime and be productive employees (Bloom, 2012). Job specific training programs may provide this positive signal needed to increase employment potential (Bushway & Apel; 2012; Fahey et al., 2006; Ramekers et al., 2012).

Certification signaling. When limiting focus to hiring and wages, signaling theory is one of the most commonly applied theoretical views allied to the economic aspects of education (Bartlett, 2012). A common form of job specific training signaling is certifications. Certifications serve to signal a level of competence the certification holder possesses, providing value to both the employer and applicant (Bartlett, 2012; Carter, 2005). Throughout the 1900s

and early 2000s, there was an increase in the number and types of professional certifications awarded as part of education programs (Carter, 2005). Industry-based skills standards are a way to empower individuals, and employer acceptance has mirrored the rate of increased employer demand for skilled employees (Aragon, Woo & Marvel, 2005; Carter, 2005). These certifications make it possible for individuals to obtain and document advanced training as a means of entry into careers and could help increase diversity in the workforce (Carter, 2005).

If a certification is not legally required for entry into a field, the certification improves the likelihood of employment as these forms of credentials are considered a signal for meeting certain levels of proficiency and widely accepted as a trend in education (Bartlett, 2012; Carter: 2005). Certifications are a valuable investment if the applicant knows the employer will have information asymmetries in relation to their knowledge, skills and abilities and an asset to eliminate information gaps (Bartlett, 2012). In addition, certifications have economic returns independent of years of education, potentially signaling to an employer a higher level of ability, leading to higher earnings and supporting signaling theory (Carter, 2005; Kjelland, 2008).

Summary

Crime and incarceration rates within the United States are historically high. Incarceration rates are impacted by high rates of recidivism that disproportionately affect Blacks and Hispanics, males and those who are uneducated. Correctional training programs have been shown to reduce recidivism. Correctional food service training programs have attempted to train individuals in hopes of reducing recidivism by increasing their employability in the high demand food service sector. One of the ways they have done this is through the issuance of food service certificates and certifications.

Based on the concepts of Signaling Theory, certificates and certifications would likely be positive signals to employers partially compensating for or mitigating the negative signal of a criminal background. Despite utilization of food handler certificates and food protection manager certification programs within corrections to help increase employability and reduce recidivism rates, no research has been found identifying whether restaurant association members responsible for hiring would be more likely to hire individuals with criminal backgrounds who have obtained these certificates and certifications into the different types of jobs available in the food service industry. Thus, the primary purpose of this nonexperimental quantitative research study is to identify if a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification would cause individuals with criminal backgrounds to be hired into different types of jobs in the food service sector and provide an evidence-base for correctional food service programs to base their training programs off to help reduce recidivism rates.

Chapter III: Method and Procedures

Despite numerous correctional food service training programs offering professional certificates and certifications, no literature was found assessing if food service certificates or certifications commonly offered as part of these programs might increase the likelihood someone with these certificates/certifications and a criminal background might be hired into any of the various positions within the food service sector. The primary purpose of this study was to identify if a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification would increase the likelihood individuals with criminal backgrounds to be hired into different types of jobs in the food service sector. Thus, providing evidence correctional food service programs can base their training programs off. As a result, the study sought to answer the following questions shaped by literature pertaining to individuals with criminal backgrounds and if restaurant association members would be more likely to employ them into different types of jobs in the food service industry.

Questions 1: What is the attitude of restaurant association members towards hiring individuals who have a criminal background to work in their food service operation?

Question 2: Does having a food protection manager certification, food handler certificate, or other professional training impact how likely restaurant association members are to hire individuals with criminal backgrounds?

Question 3: Is there a difference in the types of food service sector positions restaurant association members would hire individuals with a criminal background for?

Research Methodology

To examine attitudes and opinions, nonexperimental quantitative research methods were utilized. Nonexperimental research may be the most widely used research types in education

(Weirisma & Jurs, 2009). Nonexperimental quantitative research is a form of quantitative research with the incidence, relationship, and distribution of variables generally studied in a natural setting where numerous variables are operating simultaneously (Wiersma & Jurs, 2009). Quantitative research allows for gathering of data to quantify and statistically analyze and generalize results to one or more populations when potential participants are not available for extensive interaction (Patten, 2009). In addition, when funds are limited and audiences require hard numbers, quantitative research should be favored (Patten, 2009). As this study examined numerous variables at one time, extensive interaction with the population was not likely, and as the results are intended to influence policy makers, a quantitative design was utilized.

One of the most common ways to conduct a nonexperimental study is through surveys (Patten, 2009). A survey design utilizing closed-ended and open-ended questions was utilized for this study. This study design selection was appropriate as surveys are used to measure attitudes and opinions and allow for a plan of operations for data collection, data set development, statistical analysis, and reporting (Monsen & Van Horn, 2008; Wiersma & Jurs, 2009). In addition, a survey helps describe the attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors of the sample and make inferences about the population while at the same time allowing for ease in question administration to a large sample of a population in a short period of time (Patten, 2009).

Subject Selection and Description

The target population for this study consisted of 377 Minnesota Restaurant Association (MRA) and 1421 Wisconsin Restaurant Association (WRA) members. MRA and WRA members hold positions as food service managers, restaurant owners, and restaurant franchisees/licensees within the state of Minnesota and Wisconsin. A nonprobability self-selection sampling of MRA and WRA members was utilized. A nonprobability sampling is a

viable alternative when conducting quantitative research and useful in exploratory research when self-selection will allow individuals to take part in research on their own accord with advantages of time reduction and potential for participant-increased commitment in completing the survey (Lund Research, 2017a; Lund Research, 2017b). The MRA and WRA email listservs were used to send a questionnaire (See Appendix A) to MRA and WRA members with the sample based on those who submitted their response to the survey.

Instrumentation

The instrument was developed and based on structured closed-ended and open-ended questions that were provided to respondents. Designing a good data collection instrument involves such steps as drafting a tentative set of questions, conducting cognitive interviews, development of a survey instrument, and pretesting of collection procedures (Fowler, 2002). The following narrative outlines these steps as well as survey mode selection, survey length determination, and the manner through which questions were developed, reviewed, and tested.

Survey mode. Survey question development depends strongly on how questions are delivered to respondents with the key consideration being if the interviewer is present or not (Dillman, Smyth, & Waters, 2014). The interviewer was not present for this survey; rather, a self-administered internet survey (See Appendix D) was utilized. A self-administered internet survey allowed for numerous advantages. Some of these advantages include: ease of presenting questions, ease in asking questions with long or complex response categories, ease in asking batteries of similar questions, responses can remain anonymous, answers can be in machine-readable form, information from previous questions can be taken into account in question wording or sequencing of questions, low cost, high speed on response returns, and time for thoughtful responses by respondents (Dillman et al., 2014; Fowler, 2002).

Survey ordering. According to Dillman et al. (2014), surveys cannot be viewed as independent questions that do not influence one another and each question must be viewed both individually and within the larger context of the survey. Thus, question-ordering plays a role in this larger context as proper ordering can both motivate respondents and minimize ordering effects (Dillman et al., 2014).

Questions requiring more thought or believed to be more sensitive are frequently reserved for the middle or final sections of a survey (Dillman et al., 2014; Fowler, 2002; Isaacson & Green, 2015). According to Dillman et al. (2014), though many questions remain about ordering in self-administered survey modes, it is believed respondents can more fully process items appearing early. In order to reduce the effect of survey order due to question sensitivity or respondents' processing ability, questions believed to be more sensitive or requiring more processing ability were placed in the middle of the survey. This survey also intentionally grouped similar questions into separate topic sections. These methods are supported by Dillman et al. (2014) whose recommendations for improving ordering include clustering related questions that cover similar topics, beginning with questions important to most respondents and choosing the first question deliberately.

Survey length. According to research conducted by Rolstad, Adler, & Ryden (2011), it is recommended to base survey length on content. Fowler (2002) notes it is hard to determine an appropriate survey length. According to Dillman (2000), considerations should be given to respondents' levels of responsibility, commitment, interest and stamina (as cited in Fanning, 2005). As survey length consideration must be based on a number of variables, to ensure an appropriate length, this survey was designed to take no more than ten to fifteen minutes as recommended by Isaacson & Green (2015) of the UW-Stout Office of Planning, Assessment,

Research and Quality. To ensure this survey's length met UW-Stout recommendations, survey length was assessed as part of cognitive interviewing and pilot testing. In addition, length was estimated within Qualtrics.

Closed-ended questioning. Survey questions are generally categorized into two groups, open-ended and closed-ended questions (Dillman et al., 2014; Fowler, 1995; Fowler, 2002; Patten, 2009). There are advantages to open-ended questions; however, closed-ended questions are typically a more appropriate way to create data (Fowler, 2002). Reasons for this include: respondents can reliably answer the questions when answers are given, the researcher can better interpret the meaning of the answers when they are provided to the respondent, and when open-ended questions are asked, respondents often give answers that are not analytically useful (Fowler, 2002). As the reliability of respondent answers was a critical component to allow this research to meet its purpose, a closed-ended survey design was primarily utilized.

Closed-ended questions should include a question stem or words that form the inquiry (Dillman, et al., 2014). They should also be written based around the variables to be measured (Fowler, 2002). For this survey, question design utilized a question stem development based around variables to be measured to meet the purpose of the research.

Closed-ended question response options have a large impact on how respondents interpret the question (Dillman et al., 2014). In nominal question development, responses can be a set of categories with no natural order underlying the categories (Dillman et al., 2014). Nominal question responses can be variables subjectively ordered alphabetically or grouped by type in order to increase ease for the respondent (Dilman et al., 2014). For this survey design, natural ordering was only used for nominal questions related to years of experience in the food service sector.

In closed-ended questions utilizing ordinal measures, the research assumes a dimension that goes from the most negative feelings to the most positive feelings possible (Fowler, 2002). In order for responses to be placed into ordered categories, the researcher must develop labels on a continuum, ask respondents to consider labels and their own feelings, and place themselves in the proper categories (Fowler, 2002). These ordered categories and continuums are referred to as Likert Scales. A Likert Scale is a scale that, commonly containing five points or spaces, represents a set of related responses (Weirisma & Jurs, 2009). The respondent checks a certain point, which is given a value of 1-5 or 0-4 with the values totaled over responses (Weirisma & Jurs, 2009). To the extent respondents differ in their understanding of the criteria, there is unreliability; however, the measurement will still have meaning (Fowler, 2002). For this survey, 5-point Likert Scale responses for all questions requiring ordinal measures were utilized.

Open-ended questioning. Closed-ended questions are not appropriate for all forms of questions, especially when the scope of possible answers may be unanticipated, may be beyond what can be provided in a few words, or the researcher does not want to provide a list of alternatives (Fowler, 1995; Fowler, 2002). There are numerous research benefits to asking open-ended questions when conducting a survey. According to Dillman et al. (2014), open-ended questions allow respondents to formulate their answers using their own words without limiting their responses and are preferable when a surveyor does not want to influence responses. According to Fowler (1995), when the rationale behind a previous response is of interest, the best way to understand the reasoning is to have respondents respond in their own words in open-ended responses.

Additional advantages to open-ended questions include allowing the researcher to gather unanticipated answers; they more accurately describe the views of the respondents, and respondents like the opportunity to answer questions in their own words (Fowler, 1995; Fowler, 2002; Wiersma & Jurs, 2009). Finally, open-ended questions can be an easy way to collect systematic information about complex situations (Fowler, 1995). The rationale for the response to certain closed-ended questions was of interest in this research. In addition, it was believed that this researcher could potentially not anticipate important information that would allow for enhanced answering of the overall research questions through only closed-ended questioning; therefore, two opened-ended questions were included as part of the survey design.

Question accuracy. According to Fowler (2002), to provide a consistent data collection experience for respondents, the question-and-answer process should be scripted. Fowler (2002), also states questions should mean the same things to every respondent, and the appropriate response answers should be communicated consistently to all respondents. Questions should be easy to read using simple words that are short and understood widely, respondents should not be given any options about what questions to read or how to read them, and, when definitions are needed, precisely worded definitions should be provided (Fowler, 1995; Fowler, 2002). To give respondents the same perceptions of correct answers, a list of acceptable answers should be provided (Fowler, 2002). To ensure respondent knowledge, the selected respondents should be appropriate for the study (Fowler, 2002). In addition, to increase the respondents' willingness to respond on certain facts, minimizing respondent risks to include decreasing sense of judgement, allowing for self-administering of data collection procedures, and respondent confidentiality are desired (Fowler, 2002).

To increase the consistency of reporting, a questionnaire with concise closed-ended questions, common terminology, and definitions was utilized. Similar question format was utilized throughout the survey. Across respondents, identical questions were asked to ensure consistent responses and all answer options was provided for all closed-end questions. In addition, to ensure subject knowledge, MRA and WRA members were purposively selected to make up the study population. To increase respondent desirability, questions with sensitive content were minimized, respondents self-administered the survey, and respondents were made aware their responses are confidential.

Cognitive interviews. Once questions have been drafted and before pilot testing, determining if the questions are consistently understandable and answerable is recommended (Fowler, 2002). According to Fowler (2002), after volunteer respondents have been provided the drafted questions, it should be determined if questions are understood, respondents have the needed information to answer corresponding questions, answers describe what the respondents have to say, and answers provide valid measures for the question. Before pilot testing was conducted, to ensure content validity and face validity, draft questions were provided to the Membership Director of the Minnesota Restaurant Association and Vice President of Marketing and Public Relations of the Wisconsin Restaurant Association. Next cognitive interviews were conducted by phone with both individuals to determine question comprehension, recall, judgment, response, and the extent to which they believed the survey effectively stated its aim (See Appendix A). Responses from these cognitive interviews resulted in survey changes, including specifically defining food handler certificate and food protection manager certifications.

Survey pilot testing. According to Fowler (2002), once draft questions are nearly ready for pretesting, the questions need to be put into a form to facilitate an interview or self-administration with the purpose of finding out how the data collection protocols and survey instrument work under realistic conditions. Self-administered questionnaires require pretesting so interviewers can fix problems not identified in the design of the instrument (Fowler, 2002). Respondents should first complete the questionnaire followed by the researcher leading a discussion about the instrument to determine if the instructions and questions were clear and if there were any problems with understanding or providing answers to questions (Fowler, 2002). In addition, having respondents test instruments provides information on the ease of use (Fowler, 2002). To ensure content validity, face validity, and data collection methods, a pilot test of the survey was completed with one member of both the MRA and WRA. The pilot test of the survey was intended to address potential issues with the survey's online format, method of data collection, and identification of any inherent biases that might influence the content validity of the study. A corresponding phone interview to identify these issues was conducted by the researcher (See Appendix B). Results of pilot testing and related interviews resulted in reformatting and describing of rank order questions for better understandability and functionality. Responses from the pilot test were excluded from the main study.

Data Collection Procedures

According to Dillman et al. (2014), survey procedures need to encourage all sample members to respond and build a positive social exchange considering elements such as survey sponsorship and content of the survey. To ensure these considerations were met, on February 26, 2018, an email (See Appendix C) was sent to each email address of MRA and WRA members via the MRA member listserv by the Membership director and WRA Vice President

of Marketing and Public Relations. Within the email, background information on the purpose of the study, a request for voluntarily participation in the study, and a link to the Qualtrics survey were included. MRA and WRA members clicked a link within the email that took them to a page defining food handler certificate and food protection manager certifications as well as outlined risks, time commitment, confidentiality, right to withdraw, IRB approval. That same link initiated the survey (See Appendix D). In an attempt to increase respondent response rates and to thank previous respondents for participation, a follow-up survey email was sent. WRA members received the follow-up survey email on March 5, 2018, (Appendix E). MRA members received the follow-up survey email on March 7.

Respondent data was maintained within the Qualtrics survey program without identifiers linked to data. Data remained password protected within Qualtrics. Results were presented in a way that did not link responses to individual respondents.

Data Analysis

The following outlines closed and open-ended question analysis:

Closed-ended questioning. Descriptive statistics describe the distributions of variables and relationships between variables (Wiersma & Jurs, 2009). Descriptive statistics were utilized to assess the distribution, frequency, central tendency, and variability of response scores to summarize the likelihood of being offered identified jobs within the food service sector with and without criminal backgrounds, likelihood of being offered a job with a criminal background with and without a food handler certificate or food service manager certification. They were also utilized to determine if there is a difference in the types of food service industry jobs individuals with a criminal background can obtain with a food handler certificate or food service manager certification. Qualtrics was utilized for data analysis as statistical software

allowed for ease of use, offered a multitude of statistical procedures, provided speed, accuracy, reduced error, and was accessible (Wiersma & Jurs, 2009). The results of the analysis were used to address the original research problem.

Open-ended questioning. To analyze open-ended questions, answers must be coded and placed into meaningful numerical categories (Dillman et al. 2014; Fowler, 1995). Coding is the process in which descriptive information is organized through a data reduction process through categorizing, describing, and synthesis for interpretation of the phenomenon being studied (Wiersma & Jurs, 2009). According to Fowler (1995) coding also allows for results to be produced into reliable and valid reflections of responses.

As respondents answer in their own words in open-ended questioning, code development is required whereby the researcher develops categories that have emerged as well as developing an order of the answers that were obtained (Dillman et al., 2014; Fowler, 2002). To create these categories, each answer must be assigned and placed into meaningful categories (Fowler, 2002). Steps to construct such codes include initial identification of answer differences important to the researcher, development of non-overlapping categories based on these differences, and placement of “other” responses into separate categories. For this study, the coding of questions utilized steps developed by Haltinner (2008) to include reading of text responses, separating responses into unique statements, sorting and identifying common themes, developing major concepts from themes, clustering concepts by theme, and calculating theme frequencies (as cited in Reisinger, 2015).

Limitations

Design considerations and delimitations contributed to the limitations of this study. Design considerations limited the nature of the distribution of the survey to only MRA and

WRA members. Responses cannot be assumed to reflect all MRA and WRA members or other populations who potentially might be responsible for the hiring of employees into the food service sector. Another design limitation is the sampling procedure used, in this case nonprobability self-selection design, potentially causing a biased sample. Lastly, delimitations of the study included only generalizing criminal background. The survey questions did not specify the various types of criminal backgrounds that could have independently influenced respondent responses to questions. As a result, survey results are limited to only assessing answers to the research questions.

Summary

To answer the research questions, a nonexperimental quantitative survey was utilized to collect data. The survey design considered sensitivities to survey ordering, length, question design, and accuracy, which were assessed through cognitive interviews and survey pilot testing. This survey was distributed to the target population of MRA and WRA members through their respective association member listservs through utilization of Qualtrics for data collection and analysis. The results of the survey analysis were used to address the original research questions.

Chapter IV: Presentation of the Findings

Chapter Four presents the results and findings of the research study. The primary purpose of this nonexperimental quantitative research study was to identify if a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification would cause individuals with criminal backgrounds to be hired into different types of jobs in the food service sector; in addition, it provides an evidence-base for correctional food service programs on which to base their training programs to help reduce recidivism rates. Based on the purpose of the study, the study examined three important research questions:

Questions 1: What is the attitude of restaurant association members towards hiring individuals who have a criminal background to work in their food service operation?

Question 2: Does having a food protection manager certification, food handler certificate, or other professional training impact how likely restaurant association members are to hire individuals with criminal backgrounds?

Question 3: Is there a difference in the types of food service sector positions restaurant association members would hire individuals with a criminal background for?

A nonexperimental quantitative research design was utilized. Data was collected using a researcher designed survey including closed and open-ended questions titled *Midwestern Restaurant Association Member Attitudes about Hiring Individuals with a Criminal Background* (Appendix D). The target population consisted of Minnesota Restaurant Association (MRA) and Wisconsin Restaurant Association (WRA) members who hold positions as food service managers, restaurant owners, and restaurant franchisees/licensees within the states of Minnesota and Wisconsin. A nonprobability self-selection sampling of MRA and WRA members was utilized. The MRA and WRA email listservs were used to distribute a questionnaire (See

Appendix A). The sample was based on those who completed the survey. Data from closed-ended questions was analyzed through descriptive statistics to assess the distribution, frequency, central tendency, and variability of response scores. Data from open-ended questions was analyzed through a coding process that consisted of reading of text responses, separating responses into unique statements, sorting and identifying common themes, developing major concepts from themes, clustering concepts by theme, and calculating theme frequencies.

Participants and Context

The target population for this study consisted of 377 MRA and 1421 WRA members. MRA and WRA members responded through the initial survey request email (See Appendix C) or follow-up survey request email (See Appendix E) sent to them by their respective association member listservs. One hundred and six restaurant association members clicked the link within the emails to review additional information about the research project. A sample of 69 restaurant association members completed the survey. Of the 69 respondents, a total of 68 identified their state association. As reported in Table 1, 62% (42) of the respondents reported being members of the WRA for a response rate of 3% while 38% (26) of the respondents reported being members of the MRA for a response rate of 7%. Across both state associations, the total response rate for those who indicated a state association membership was 3%.

Table 1

Survey Response Rate of Wisconsin and Minnesota Restaurant Association Members

Ranking	<i>WRA</i>	<i>MRA</i>	<i>Total</i>
Number of WRA Members	1421	377	1798
Number of Completed	42	26	48
Response Rate	3%	7%	3%

Age, gender, and ethnicity demographic information was analyzed utilizing descriptive statistics. The first demographic question was the age of the respondent. As reported in Table 2, a majority of respondents were over 41. Fourth-eight percent (32) of respondents indicated they were between 51-60 years old and 25% (17) of respondents indicated they were between 41-50 years old. Thirteen percent (9) of respondents were over sixty years old. The range of respondents' age was between 27 and 72 years old with a mean age of respondents of 52 years ($SD = 9.36$) and mode of 53. Table 2 shows 61% of respondents indicated they were male while 38% of respondents indicated they were female. Only 2% of respondents preferred not to disclose their gender while no respondents indicated their gender was non-binary. Lastly, Table 2 reports 96% of respondents indicated they were White. One respondent reported each of the following: Black, Hispanic, and "Other" race than those listed.

Table 2

Respondents' Demographics

Total Participants	<i>N</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Age	2	3%
18-30	7	10%
31-40	17	25%
41-50	32	48%
51-64	9	13%
65+		
Gender	40	61%
Male	25	38%
Female	1	2%
Prefer not to disclose		
Ethnicity	64	96%
White	1	2%
Black	1	2%
Hispanic (any race)	1	2%
Other		

Three questions were asked related to respondents' experience in the food service sector. The majority of respondents, 67%, were restaurant owners (see Table 3). Six percent reported they were restaurant managers and only 4% indicated they were a restaurant franchisee/licensee. Twenty-three percent of respondents reported "Other" and described their current positions as educators, food and beverage directors, director of culinary operations or culinary instructor, human resources, corporate vice-president, general manager, or combination owner and manager.

Respondents' current responsibility level related to the hiring of Chef/Head Cook, Cook, Food Preparation Worker, or Waiter/Waitress positions. As reported in Table 3, 77% of

respondents indicated they were directly responsible for hiring or providing final approval of hiring, and 14% indicated they provide manager training on organizational hiring practices. Only a small percentage (3%) indicated having no responsibility related to hiring while 6% indicated “Other” responsibilities including hiring only when necessary and a combination of hiring and training of managers or training practices.

The majority of respondents (71%) have worked in the food service sector for over 20 years. As reported in Table 3, 41% of respondents indicated they have worked in the food service sector more than 30 years, while an additional 30% reported having worked in the food service sector for 21-30 years. Sixteen percent of respondents indicated they worked between 11-20 years in the food service sector while only 13% indicated they worked in the food service sector for 1-10 years.

Table 3

Respondents' Experience

Total Respondents	<i>N</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Current Position		
Restaurant Owner	46	67%
Restaurant Franchisee/Licensee	3	4%
Restaurant Manager	4	6%
Other	16	23%
Current Responsibility Level		
Directly responsible for hiring or provided final approval of hiring	53	77%
Provided manager training on organizational hiring practices	10	14%
Have no responsibility to hiring	2	3%
Other	4	6%
Years in Food Service		
0-10	9	13%
11-20	11	16%
21-30	21	30%
31+	28	41%

A third group of demographic questions was related to the restaurants respondents worked with. Most respondents represented various types of locally owned businesses. As reported in Table 4, 52% of respondents indicated they represented a locally owned, small business with only one site. In addition, 29% of respondents indicated they represented a locally owned business with multiple sites. Seven percent of respondents reported their restaurants were a regional franchise/licensed or national franchise/licensed. Only 4% of respondents indicated "Other" with one noting their restaurant was represented as not locally owned but with multiple sites and another noting they work in a correctional setting.

Another set of questions was asked related to how many total chef/head cook, cook, food preparation worker, and waiter/waitress positions does their restaurant/do your restaurants have and what type of position would most likely have an employment opening for at any given time. As reported in Table 4, 34% of respondents indicated they have over 40 positions in total. Twenty-one percent of respondents indicated they have 1-10 positions in total, 19% of respondents indicated they have 11-20 positions in total, 18% of respondents indicated they have 21-30 positions in total, and 8% of respondents indicated they have 31-40 positions in total. Seventy-one percent of respondents indicated the cook position is the position they would most likely have an opening for with only 17% indicated they would most likely have a Waiter/Waitress opening, 10% indicating they would most likely have a Food Preparation Worker opening and only 2% indicating they would have a Chef/Head Cook as their most likely employment opening.

Table 4

Restaurant Demographics

Total Respondents	<i>N</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Type of Restaurant		
Locally-owned, small business with only one site	36	52%
Locally-owned, small business with multiple sites	20	29%
Regional Franchise/ Licensed	5	7%
National Franchise/ Licensed	5	7%
Other	3	4%
Number of Employees		
1-10	14	21%
11-20	13	19%
21-30	12	18%
31-40	5	8%
40+	23	34%
Most Likely Employment Opening		
Chef/Head Cook	1	2%
Cook	49	71%
Food Preparation Worker	7	10%
Waiter/Waitress	12	17%

Research Questions

The following findings are presented and organized by research question:

Questions one: What is the attitude of restaurant association members towards hiring individuals who have a criminal background to work in their food service

operation? To answer this research question, respondents were asked six survey questions.

The questions were related to personal comfort level of their staff working with an individual

with a criminal background, staff comfort level with working with an individual with a criminal background, and questions related to their desired training an applicant with a criminal background would have received for various positions within the food service sector.

Table 5 shows the frequency of responses related to the question which asked “I would be comfortable with my staff working with an individual with a criminal background.” The data from this question was collected in Likert responses used to determine the level of agreement respondents had with each question ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. The mean response was 3.95 ($SD = 0.82$) with a total of 71% respondents indicating they either somewhat agreed (43%) or strongly agreed (28%). Only 3% of respondents indicated they somewhat disagreed while no respondents indicated they disagreed.

Table 5

Comfort Level with Staff Working with an Individual with a Criminal Background

Ranking	<i>N</i>	%
Strongly Agree	19	28%
Somewhat Agree	29	43%
Neither Agree or Disagree	18	26%
Somewhat Disagree	2	3%
Disagree	0	0%

Table 6 shows the frequency of responses related to the question which asked, “I believe employees in my organization would be comfortable working with an individual with a criminal background.” The mean response was 3.82 ($SD = 0.79$) with a total of 71% of respondents indicating they either somewhat agreed (53%) or strongly agreed (18%). Only 6% of respondents indicated they somewhat disagreed while no respondents indicated they disagreed.

Table 6

Staff Comfort Level Working with an Individual with a Criminal Background

Ranking	<i>N</i>	%
Strongly Agree	12	18%
Somewhat Agree	36	53%
Neither Agree or Disagree	16	24%
Somewhat Disagree	4	6%
Disagree	0	0%

Another set of questions asked the types of training individuals with criminal backgrounds may have received. Respondents were asked to rank the types of training they desired individuals with criminal backgrounds would have received. Table 7 shows the frequency of responses related to the question which asked, “If an applicant had a criminal background and was applying to a Chef/Head Cook position, please rank the following types of training you desire they would have received.” For this question, 61% of respondents indicated their first or second ranked desired training was either a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification received as part of a culinary training program provided by prison/jail food service staff in coordination with a college/university culinary arts program. In addition, 58% of respondents indicated their first or second ranked desired training was culinary training provided by a prison/jail food service staff in coordination with college/university culinary arts program. Only 2% of respondents indicated first ranked desired training was a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification received as part of a culinary training program provided by prison/jail food service staff. No respondents indicated their first ranked desired training was culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff.

Table 7

Desired Training for Chef/Head Cook if Applicant Had a Criminal Background

	Rankings					
	1 <i>N (%)</i>	2 <i>N (%)</i>	3 <i>N (%)</i>	4 <i>N (%)</i>	5 <i>N (%)</i>	6 <i>N (%)</i>
Food handler certificate	11 (18%)	5 (8%)	2 (3%)	9 (15%)	7 (12%)	26 (43%)
Food protection manager certification	8 (13%)	9 (15%)	8 (13%)	7 (11%)	23 (34%)	6 (10%)
Culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff	0 (0%)	13 (23%)	11 (19%)	18 (32%)	5 (9%)	10 (18%)
Culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff in coordination with a college/university culinary arts program	24 (41%)	10 (17%)	14 (24%)	10 (7%)	6 (10%)	1 (2%)
Food handler certificate or food protection manager certification received as part of a culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff	1 (2%)	15 (26%)	14 (24%)	12 (21%)	7 (12%)	9 (16%)
Food handler certificate or food protection manager certification received as part of a culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff in coordination with a college/university culinary arts program	24 (41%)	12 (20%)	11 (19%)	6 (10%)	6 (10%)	2 (3%)

Table 8 shows the frequency of responses related to the question which asked, “If an applicant had a criminal background and was applying to a Chef position, please rank the

following types of training you desire they would have received.” For this question, 58% of respondents indicated their first or second ranked desired training was culinary training provided by a prison/jail food service staff in coordination with college/university culinary arts program. In addition, 53% of respondents indicated their first or second ranked desired training was a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification received as part of a culinary training program provided by prison/jail food service staff in coordination with a college/university culinary arts program. Only 7% of respondents indicated their first ranked desired training was a food protection manger certification. In addition, only 5% of respondents indicated their first ranked desired training was a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification received as part of a culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff and only 3% of respondents indicated their first ranked desired training was culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff.

Table 8

Desired Training for Cook if Applicant Had a Criminal Background

	<i>Rankings</i>					
	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>6</i>
	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N (%)</i>
Food handler certificate	15 (24%)	5 (8%)	4 (6%)	8 (13%)	8 (13%)	22 (35%)
Food protection manager certification	4 (7%)	11 (19%)	8 (14%)	6 (10%)	23 (39%)	7 (12%)
Culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff	2 (3%)	13 (22%)	10 (17%)	21 (35%)	4 (7%)	10 (17%)
Culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff in coordination with a college/university culinary arts program	23 (38%)	12 (20%)	13 (22%)	3 (5%)	8 (13%)	1 (2%)
Food handler certificate or food protection manager certification received as part of a culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff	3 (5%)	13 (23%)	13 (23%)	15 (27%)	5 (9%)	7 (13%)
Food handler certificate or food protection manager certification received as part of a culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff in coordination with a college/university culinary arts program	17 (30%)	13 (23%)	10 (18%)	4 (7%)	6 (11%)	7 (12%)

Table 9 shows the frequency of responses related to the question which asked, “If an applicant had a criminal background and was applying to a Food Preparation Worker position, please rank the following types of training you desire they would have received.” For this

question, 47% of respondents indicated their first or second ranked desired training was food handler certificate or food protection manager certification received as part of a culinary training program provided by prison/jail food service staff in coordination with a college/university culinary arts program. In addition, 43% of respondents indicated their first or second ranked desired training was a food handler certificate as well as 43% of respondents indicated their first or second ranked desired training was culinary training provided by a prison/jail food service staff in coordination with college/university culinary arts program. Only 5% of respondents indicated their first ranked desired training was a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification received as part of a culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff and only 3% of respondents indicated their first ranked desired training was a food protection manager certification.

Table 9

Desired Training for Food Preparation Worker if Applicant Had a Criminal Background

	<i>Rankings</i>					
	<i>1</i> <i>N (%)</i>	<i>2</i> <i>N (%)</i>	<i>3</i> <i>N (%)</i>	<i>4</i> <i>N (%)</i>	<i>5</i> <i>N (%)</i>	<i>6</i> <i>N (%)</i>
Food Preparation Worker Food handler certificate	20 (33%)	6 (10%)	6 (10%)	6 (10%)	4 (7%)	19 (31%)
Food protection manager certification	2 (3%)	15 (26%)	7 (12%)	7 (12%)	20 (34%)	7 (12%)
Culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff	6 (10%)	11 (18%)	11 (18%)	16 (27%)	6 (10%)	10 (17%)
Culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff in coordination with a college/university culinary arts program	15 (26%)	10 (17%)	15 (26%)	8 (14%)	8 (14%)	2 (3%)
Food handler certificate or food protection manager certification received as part of a culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff	3 (5%)	15 (26%)	14 (25%)	11 (19%)	8 (14%)	6 (11%)
Food handler certificate or food protection manager certification received as part of a culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff in coordination with a college/university culinary arts program	17 (31%)	9 (16%)	5 (9%)	8 (14%)	7 (13%)	9 (16%)

Table 10 shows the frequency of responses related to the question which asked, “If an applicant had a criminal background and was applying to a Waiter/Waitress position, please

rank the following types of training you desire they would have received.” For this question, 44% of respondents indicated their first or second ranked desired training was food handler certificate or food protection manager certification received as part of a culinary training program provided by prison/jail food service staff in coordination with a college/university culinary arts program, while 36% of respondents indicated their first or second ranked desired training was culinary training provided by a prison/jail food service staff in coordination with college/university culinary arts program. Only 4% of respondents indicated their first ranked desired training was a food protection manager certification or culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff and only 2% of respondents indicated their first ranked desired training was a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification received as part of a culinary training received provided by prison/jail food service staff.

Table 10

Desired Training for Waiter/Waitress if Applicant had a Criminal Background

	<i>Rankings</i>					
	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>6</i>
	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N (%)</i>
Food protection manager certification	2 (4%)	15 (28%)	7 (13%)	11 (21%)	11 (21%)	7 (13%)
Culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff	2 (4%)	10 (20%)	11 (22%)	8 (16%)	6 (12%)	14 (27%)
Culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff in coordination with a college/university culinary arts program	11 (22%)	7 (14%)	7 (14%)	10 (20%)	14 (27%)	2 (4%)
Food handler certificate or food protection manager certification received as part of a culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff	1 (2%)	9 (18%)	12 (24%)	12 (24%)	11 (22%)	6 (12%)
Food handler certificate or food protection manager certification received as part of a culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff in coordination with a college/university culinary arts program	15 (29%)	8 (15%)	7 (13%)	3 (6%)	5 (10%)	14 (27%)

To enhance the understanding of additional types of certificates, certifications, or types of training respondents would like individuals with criminal backgrounds to have the question was asked, “Aside from a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification, what additional certificates, certifications, or training would you desire an individual with a criminal

background have? Why?” For this question, a total of 39 individual responses were received. Of these 39 responses, 6 individuals provided no additional suggestion for certificates, certifications, or training. To assess the remaining 33 text responses, responses were initially separated into unique statement ideas (Appendix F). These unique statements were then sorted to identify common themes, developed into major concepts of themes, clustered by themes, and calculated into theme frequencies as detailed in Table 11.

As seen in Table 11, the most frequently responded form of desired training was professional training. The most common themes of professional training included work experience, customer service training, culinary training, leadership training, and prison food service training. Related to the importance of work experience, one respondent stated, “It is not so much about the certificates for us. Experience is huge – just working in a restaurant is a plus these days. The more experience the better.” Other respondents commented, “Hands on experience is very valuable for work in the restaurant industry,” and “Previous restaurant experience/training is most important to our organization.”

Other types of training desired included interpersonal training and emotional training. For interpersonal training, the most common themes noted included communication and team skills training. Related to interpersonal training and team skill training, one respondent indicated they were important because “The person can develop positive working relationships with others.” Another respondent emphasized the “Need to be able to work closely with others in a very confident and nonthreatening atmosphere.” For emotional training, the most frequent noted themes included training in attitude, behavior, and anger management.

Aside from desired types of training, several respondents offered comments that don't fit within training themes yet do provide important perspectives on the attitude of restaurant

association's members towards hiring individuals who have a criminal background to work in their food service operation. For example, respondents also indicated a desire for attendance records and references from previous managers or parole officers. One respondent stated "Some type of letter from previous trainer/manager endorsing their skills, attitude, and behavior would be helpful." One respondent indicated desire for the applicant to have "The ability to display they could to do the job" while another respondent indicated individuals would need to be "Reliable, fast, clean, and accurate." In addition, one respondent noted a concern regarding the potential liability with hiring an individual with a criminal background and the potential for negligence, liability and punitive damages if hired.

Table 11

*Additional Desired Certificates, Certifications, or Training for Individuals with a Criminal**Background and Why*

Frequency	Identified Theme	Cluster Concept
13	Work Experience	Professional
5	Customer Service	Professional
2	Culinary	Professional
2	Leadership	Professional
2	Prison Food Service	Professional
1	Beverage Service Certificate	Professional
1	Math/Reading	Professional
1	Etiquette	Professional
1	Ethics	Professional
1	Work Ethic	Professional
1	Organizational	Professional
1	Business Management	Professional
3	Communication	Interpersonal
2	Team Skills	Interpersonal
1	Mentorship	Interpersonal
1	Trust	Interpersonal
1	Social Skills	Interpersonal
2	Attitude	Emotional
2	Behavior	Emotional
2	Anger Management	Emotional
1	Conflict Management	Emotional
1	Stress Management	Emotional

Question two: Does having a food protection manager certification, food handler certificate, or other professional training impact how likely restaurant association members are to hire individuals with criminal backgrounds? To answer this research question, respondents were asked eight survey questions. Two initial questions were asked related to how important respondents felt a food handler certificate and food protection manager certification were to various positions within the food service sector. The data from these questions was collected in Likert responses used to determine the level of importance of a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification related to various positions. Then, questions were asked related to how likely respondents would be to hire individuals into various food service positions, how likely respondents would be to hire individuals with a criminal background into these positions, as well as how likely they would be to hire these individuals into these positions with and without a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification. The data from these questions was collected in Likert responses used to determine the level of likelihood respondents would hire individuals with a criminal background into various positions. The Likert Scale used to collect the data ranged from (1) strongly disagree to (5) extremely likely.

Table 12 shows the frequency of responses related to the question which asked, “How beneficial would you rate the overall importance of having a food handler certificate for any applicant in the following positions.” For this question a total of 80% of respondents indicated a food handler certificate was either absolutely important (64%) or very important (16%) for the position of Chef/Head Cook. A total of 78% of respondents indicated a food handler certificate was absolutely important (50%) or very important (28%) for the position of Cook. A total of 66% of respondent indicated a food handler certificate was absolutely important (38%) or very

important (28%) for the position of Food Preparation Worker. In contrast, approximately one-third (34%) of respondents indicated a food handler certificate was of little importance (23%) or not important at all (11%) for the position(s) of Waiter/Waitress.

Table 12

Importance of Employees Having Certificate and Certification

	<i>Absolutely important N (%)</i>	<i>Very important N (%)</i>	<i>Of average importance N (%)</i>	<i>Of little importance N (%)</i>	<i>Not important at all N (%)</i>
Food Handler Certificate					
Chef/Head Cook	43 (64%)	11 (16%)	6 (9%)	5 (7%)	2 (3%)
Cook	34 (50%)	19 (28%)	9 (13%)	4 (6%)	2 (3%)
Food Preparation Worker	26 (38%)	19 (28%)	16 (24%)	5 (7%)	2 (3%)
Waiter/Waitress	6 (9%)	16 (25%)	21 (32%)	15 (23%)	7 (11%)
Food Protection Manager Certification					
Chef/Head Cook	44 (68%)	13 (20%)	5 (8%)	1 (2%)	2 (3%)
Cook	24 (36%)	23 (35%)	13 (20%)	4 (6%)	2 (3%)
Food Preparation Worker	13 (20%)	23 (35%)	20 (30%)	7 (11%)	3 (5%)
Waiter/Waitress	1 (2%)	8 (12%)	21 (32%)	21 (32%)	14 (22%)

Table 12 also shows the frequency of responses related to the question which asked, “How beneficial would you rate the overall importance of having a food protection manager for any applicant in the following positions?” For this question a total of 88% of respondents indicated a food protection certification was either absolutely important (68%) or very

important (20%) for the position of Chef/Head Cook. A total of 71% of respondents indicated a food protection manager was absolutely important (36%) or very important (35%) for the position of Cook. A total of 55% of respondent indicated a food protection manager was absolutely important (20%) or very important (35%) for the position of Food Preparation Worker. Again, results contrasted for the position(s) of Waiter/Waitress as a total of 54% of respondents indicated a food handler certificate was of little importance (23%) or not important at all (11%).

Table 13 shows the frequency of responses related to the question which asked, “For each of the following positions, please rate how likely or unlikely you/your organization would be to hire someone who has neither a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification. For this question a total of 71% of respondents indicated they were either unlikely (30%) or extremely unlikely (41%) to hire an employee into the Cook/Head Cook position who has neither a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification. A total of 41% of respondents indicated they were unlikely (29%) or extremely unlikely (15%) to hire an employee into a Cook position who has neither a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification. In contrast, a total of 50% of respondents indicated they would be extremely likely (20%) or likely (30%) to hire a food preparation worker without a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification. A total of 60% of respondents also indicated they would be extremely likely (42%) or likely (18%) to hire someone into a Waiter/Waitress position who had neither obtained a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification.

Table 13

*Likelihood of Hiring an Employee without Food Handler Certificate or Food Protection**Manager Certification*

	<i>Extremely Likely</i>	<i>Likely</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Unlikely</i>	<i>Extremely Unlikely</i>
	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N (%)</i>
Chef/Head Cook	8 (13%)	3 (5%)	7 (11%)	18 (30%)	25 (41%)
Cook	18 (12%)	12 (18%)	14 (21%)	19 (29%)	9 (15%)
Food Preparation Worker	13 (20%)	19 (30%)	20 (31%)	9 (14%)	3 (5%)
Waiter/Waitress	27 (42%)	12 (18%)	23 (35%)	1 (2%)	2 (3%)

Table 14 shows the frequency of responses related to two questions. The first question asked, “For each of the following positions, please rate how likely or unlikely you would be to hire someone who has obtained a food handler certificate.” For this question a total of 77% of respondents indicated they would be either extremely likely or likely to hire someone who has obtained a food handler certificate into the positions of Chef/Head Cook, Cook, and Food Preparation Worker. A total of 60% of respondents were also either extremely likely (42%) or likely (18%) to hire a Waiter/Waitress who has obtained a food handler certificate.

Table 14 also shows the frequency of responses related the question “For each of the following positions, please rate how likely or unlikely you would be to hire someone who has obtained a food protection manger certification.” For this question a total of 83% of respondents indicated they would either be extremely likely (57%) or likely (26%) to hire someone who has obtained a food protection manager certification into the position of Chef/Head Cook. A total of 81% of respondents indicated they would be either extremely likely (52%) or likely (29%) to hire someone who has obtained a food protection manager

certification into the position of Cook. Respondents also indicated a total of 82% would either be extremely likely (40%) or likely (42%) to hire someone who has obtained a food protection manager certification into the position of Food Preparation Worker. A total of 57% of respondents also indicated they would be either extremely likely (29%) or likely (28%) to hire a Waiter/Waitress who has obtained a food protection manager certification.

Table 14

Likelihood of Hiring an Employee with Food Handler Certificate or Food Protection Manager Certification

	<i>Extremely Likely</i>	<i>Likely</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Unlikely</i>	<i>Extremely Unlikely</i>
	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N (%)</i>
Food Handler Certificate					
Chef/Head Cook	28 (46%)	19 (31%)	4 (7%)	3 (5%)	7 (11%)
Cook	34 (52%)	16 (25%)	8 (12%)	3 (5%)	4 (6%)
Food Preparation Worker	29 (45%)	22 (34%)	12 (19%)	2 (3%)	0 (0%)
Waiter/Waitress	27 (42%)	12 (18%)	23 (35%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)
Food Protection Manager Certification					
Chef/Head Cook	35 (57%)	16 (26%)	3 (5%)	3 (5%)	4 (7%)
Cook	34 (52%)	19 (29%)	9 (14%)	1 (2%)	2 (3%)
Food Preparation Worker	26 (40%)	27 (42%)	11 (17%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)
Waiter/Waitress	19 (29%)	18 (28%)	26 (40%)	2 (3%)	0 (0%)

The next question asked of respondents was, “For each of the following, positions please rate how likely or unlikely you would be hire someone with a criminal background who has not

obtained a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification.” As reported in Table 15, responses to this question also contrasted by position. For the Chef/Head Cook position, a total of 57% of respondents indicated they would either be unlikely (26%) or extremely unlikely (31%) to hire someone with a criminal background who has not obtained a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification. For the Chef position, a total of 43% of respondents indicated they would be either unlikely (32%) or extremely unlikely (11%) to hire someone with a criminal background who has not obtained a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification. A total of 50% of respondents indicated they would either be extremely likely (20%) or likely (30%) to hire someone with a criminal background who has not obtained a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification into the position of Food Preparation Worker. A total of 60% of respondents reported they would also be either extremely likely (42%) or likely (18%) to hire someone with a criminal background who has not obtained a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification into the position(s) of Waiter/Waitress.

Table 15

Likelihood of Hiring Someone with a Criminal Background Who Has Not Obtained a Food Handler Certificate or Food Protection Manager Certification

	<i>Extremely Likely</i>	<i>Likely</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Unlikely</i>	<i>Extremely Unlikely</i>
	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N (%)</i>
Chef/Head Cook	4 (6%)	7 (11%)	11 (17%)	17 (26%)	20 (31%)
Cook	4 (6%)	16 (25%)	15 (23%)	21 (32%)	7 (11%)
Food Preparation Worker	13 (20%)	19 (30%)	20 (31%)	9 (14%)	3 (5%)
Waiter/Waitress	27 (42%)	12 (18%)	23 (35%)	1 (2%)	2 (3%)

Table 16 shows the frequency of responses related to two questions. The first question asked, “For each of the following positions, please rate how likely or unlikely you would be to hire someone with a criminal background who has obtained a food handler certificate. For this question a total of 54% of respondents indicated they would either be extremely likely (8%) or likely (46%) to hire someone with a criminal background who has obtained a food handler certificate into a Chef/Head position. A total of 65% of respondents indicated they would either be extremely likely or likely to hire someone with a criminal background who has obtained a food handler certificate into either a Cook or Food Preparation Worker position. In addition, a total of 47% of respondents indicated they would be either extremely likely (17%) or likely (32%) to hire someone with a criminal background who has obtained a food handler certificate into a Waiter/Waitress position.

Table 16 also shows the frequency of responses related the question “For each of the following positions, please rate how likely or unlikely you would be to hire someone with a

criminal background who has obtained a food protection manger certification.” For this question a total of 79% of respondents indicated they would either be extremely likely (15%) or likely (64%) to hire someone with a criminal background who has obtained a food protection manager certification into the position of Chef/Head Cook. A total of 78% of respondents indicated they would be either extremely likely (25%) or likely (53%) to hire someone with a criminal background who has obtained a food protection manager into the position of Cook. Respondents also indicated a total of 72% would either be extremely likely (21%) or likely (51%) to hire someone with a criminal background who has obtained a food protection manager into the position of Food Preparation Worker. A total of 49% of respondents also indicated they would also be either extremely likely (17%) or likely (32%) to hire a Waiter/Waitress who has a criminal background and has obtained a food protection manager certification.

Table 16

Likelihood of Hiring Someone with a Criminal Background Who Has Obtained a Food Handler Certificate or Food Protection Manager Certification

	<i>Extremely Likely</i>	<i>Likely</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Unlikely</i>	<i>Extremely Unlikely</i>
	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N (%)</i>	<i>N (%)</i>
Food Handler Certificate					
Chef/Head Cook	5 (8%)	27 (46%)	15 (25%)	8 (14%)	4 (7%)
Cook	12 (19%)	29 (46%)	17 (27%)	5 (8%)	0 (0%)
Food Preparation Worker	11 (17%)	30 (48%)	20 (32%)	2 (3%)	0 (0%)
Waiter/Waitress	9 (14%)	21 (33%)	27 (43%)	5 (8%)	1 (2%)
Food Protection Manager Certification					
Chef/Head Cook	9 (15%)	38 (64%)	8 (14%)	4 (7%)	0 (0%)
Cook	16 (25%)	33 (53%)	12 (19%)	2 (3%)	0 (0%)
Food Preparation Worker	13 (21%)	32 (51%)	16 (25%)	2 (3%)	0 (0%)
Waiter/Waitress	11 (17%)	20 (32%)	26 (41%)	5 (8%)	1 (2%)

To further determine if having a Food Handler Certificate or Food Protection Manager Certification impacted how likely respondents were to hire individuals with a criminal background, Likert mean responses were compared. As outlined in Table 17, having a Food Handler Certificate or Food Protection Manager Certification increased the likelihood an individual with a criminal background would be hired into all positions compared to those with a criminal background who did not. In addition, across all positions the likelihood an individual with a criminal background would be hired into all positions was higher for having a Food Protection Manager Certification compared to having a Food Handler Certificate.

For individuals with a criminal background the mean score increased from 2.63 ($SD = 1.61$) with no Food Handler Certificate or Food Protection Manager Certification to 3.64 ($SD = 1.29$) with a Food Handler Certificate to 4.11 ($SD = 0.96$) with a Food Protection Manager Certification for the chef/head cook position. For the position of cook, mean scores increased from 2.92 ($SD = 1.24$) with no Food Handler Certificate or Food Protection Manager Certification to 3.86 ($SD = 0.96$) with a Food Handler to 4.09 ($SD = 0.85$) with a Food Protection Manager Certification. For the position of food preparation worker, mean scores increased from 3.14 ($SD = 1.12$) with no Food Handler Certificate or Food Protection Manager Certification to 3.89 ($SD = 0.87$) with a Food Handler Certificate to 3.98 ($SD = 0.87$) with a Food Protection Manager Certification. For the position of waiter/waitress, mean scores increased from 3.26 ($SD = 1.08$) with no Food Handler Certificate or Food Protection Manager Certification to 3.62 ($SD = 1.02$) with a Food Handler Certificate to 3.67 ($SD = 1.04$) with a Food Protection Manager Certification.

Table 17

*Likelihood of Hiring Someone with a Criminal Background Who Has a Food Handler**Certificate or Food Protection Manager Certification*

	<i>Chef/Head Cook</i>	<i>Cook</i>	<i>Food Preparation Worker</i>	<i>Waiter/Waitress</i>
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>
Criminal Background with no Certificate or Certification	2.63 (1.61)	2.92 (1.24)	3.14 (1.12)	3.26 (1.08)
Criminal Background with Food Handler Certificate	3.64 (1.29)	3.86 (0.96)	3.89 (0.88)	3.62 (1.02)
Criminal Background with Food Protection Manager Certification	4.11 (0.96)	4.09 (0.85)	3.98 (0.87)	3.67 (1.04)

Question three: Is there a difference in the types of food service sector positions restaurant association members would hire individuals with a criminal background for?

To answer this research question, data from Research Question 2 was again utilized. These included responses to six previous survey questions including:

1. For each of the following positions, please rate how likely or unlikely you would be to hire someone who has neither obtained a food handler certificate nor food protection manager certification.
2. For each of the following positions, please rate how likely or unlikely you would be to hire someone who has obtained a food handler certificate.
3. For each of the following positions, please rate how likely or unlikely you would be to hire someone who has obtained a food protection manager certification.

4. For each of the following positions, please rate how likely or unlikely you would be to hire someone with a criminal background who has obtained a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification.
5. For each of the following positions, please rate how likely or unlikely you would be to hire someone with a criminal background who has obtained a food handler certificate.
6. For each of the following positions, please rate how likely or unlikely you would be to hire someone with a criminal background who has obtained a food protection manager certification.

To determine if there was a difference in the types of food service sector positions restaurant association members would hire individuals with a criminal background, Likert mean responses were compared. As outlined in Table 18, for both individuals with and without an identified criminal background and no Food Handler Certificate or Food Protection Manager Certification, the position of waiter/waitress was the most likely to be hired. For those with no identified criminal background, the mean score for the waiter/waitress position was 4.00 ($SD = 1.10$) compared to the mean scores of 3.58 ($SD = 1.21$) for the food preparation worker position, 3.30 ($SD = 1.37$) for the cook position, and 2.54 ($SD = 1.71$) for the chef/head cook position. For those with an identified criminal background, the mean score for the waiter/waitress position was 3.26 ($SD = 1.08$) compared to the means score of 3.14 ($SD = 1.12$) for the food preparation worker position, 2.92 ($SD = 1.37$) for the cook position and 2.63 ($SD = 1.61$) for the chef/head cook position.

For someone with a Food Handler Certificate, mean scores were high for the likelihood of hiring across all positions compared to someone without a Food Handler Certificate.

Respondents also indicated the position of food preparation worker as the most likely to be hired without and with having an identified criminal background. For those without an identified criminal background, the mean score for the food preparation worker position was 4.25 ($SD = 0.89$) compared to 4.06 ($SD = 4.06$) for the waiter/waitress position, 4.18 ($SD = 1.21$) for the cook position and 4.13 ($SD = 1.40$) for the chef/head cook position. For those with an identified criminal background, the mean score for the food preparation worker was 3.89 ($SD = 0.88$) compared to 3.62 ($SD = 1.02$) for the waiter/waitress position, 3.86 ($SD = 0.96$) for the cook position, and 3.64 ($SD = 1.29$) for the chef/head cook position.

For someone with a Food Protection Manager Certification, mean scores were higher for the likelihood of hiring across all positions compared to someone with and without a Food Handler Certificate. Respondents indicated the position of chef/head cook was the most likely to be hired without and with having an identified criminal background. For those without an identified criminal background, the mean score for the chef/head cook position was 4.39 ($SD = 1.23$) compared to 3.90 ($SD = 0.96$) for the waiter/waitress position, 4.25 ($SD = 0.82$) for the food preparation worker position and 4.31 ($SD = 1.00$) for the cook position. For those with an identified criminal background, the mean score for the chef/head cook position was 4.11 ($SD = 0.96$) compared to 3.67 ($SD = 1.04$) for the waiter/waitress position, 3.98 ($SD = 0.87$) for the food preparation worker position, and 4.09 ($SD = 0.85$) for the cook position.

Table 18

Likelihood of Hiring Someone with and without a Criminal Background Who Has Not and Who Has Obtained a Food Handler Certificate or Food Protection Manager Certification

	<i>Chef/Head Cook</i>	<i>Cook</i>	<i>Food Preparation Worker</i>	<i>Waiter/Waitress</i>
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>
No Food Handler Certificate or Food Protection Manager Certification (No Identified Criminal Background)	2.54 (1.71)	3.03 (1.37)	3.58 (1.21)	4.00 (1.10)
Criminal Background and No Food Handler Certificate or Food Protection Certification	2.63 (1.61)	2.92 (1.24)	3.14 (1.12)	3.26 (1.08)
Food Handler Certificate (No Identified Criminal Background)	4.13 (1.40)	4.18 (1.21)	4.25 (0.89)	4.06 (0.98)
Criminal Background and Food Handler Certificate	3.64 (1.29)	3.86 (0.96)	3.89 (0.88)	3.62 (1.02)
Food Protection Manager Certification (No Identified Criminal Background)	4.39 (1.23)	4.31 (1.00)	4.25 (0.82)	3.90 (0.96)
Criminal Background and Food Protection Manager Certification	4.11 (0.96)	4.09 (0.85)	3.98 (0.87)	3.67 (1.04)

Two additional questions were also asked of respondents. The first was, “Have you previously hired someone with a known criminal background into the following positions?” The follow-up question was, “If Yes, what considerations impacted your hiring decision? If

No, what type of correctional or restaurant association training or programming would potentially influence your future decisions? Why?” Table 19 shows the frequency of responses related the initial question with respondents indicating 37% had knowingly previously hired someone with a known criminal background into a Chef/Head Cook position, 77% of respondents had knowingly previously hired someone with a known criminal background into a Cook position, 73% of respondents had knowingly previously hired someone with a criminal background into a Food Preparation Worker Position, and 54% of respondents had knowingly previously hired someone with a criminal background into a position as a Waiter/Waitress.

Table 19

Have You Previously Hired Someone with a Known Criminal Background into the Following Positions?

	<i>Yes</i> <i>N (%)</i>	<i>No</i> <i>N (%)</i>	<i>Do not know</i> <i>N (%)</i>
Chef/Head Cook	22 (37 %)	26 (44%)	11 (19 %)
Cook	50 (77 %)	10 (15%)	5 (8%)
Food Preparation Worker	46 (73 %)	8 (13%)	9 (14%)
Waiter/Waitress	33 (54 %)	13 (21%)	15 (25 %)

A total of 68 individuals responded to the question, “Have you previously hired someone with a criminal background into the following positions?” Of those 68 respondents, only three respondents indicated they had knowingly not hired someone with a criminal background into any of the positions they had. In response to the follow-up question, “If No, what type of correctional or restaurant association training or programming would potentially influence your future decisions? Why?” only two responses were received with one respondent

stating, “Not a training issue, a liability issue. There would need to be a change in the labor laws to eliminate the severe punishments for hiring an ex-con who injures another on the job.”

Only three respondents indicated they had not knowingly hired someone with a criminal background into any position they had. In response to the follow-up question one respondent stated, “A criminal background can date way back in a person's life and not necessarily define them at the time of application. Therefore, I think it highly depends on the person, their resume, background, etc...If we know of a criminal background we would do our homework on the applicant before hiring, to ensure joining the team would be wise and not compromising the safety of our staff at all.” Another respondent stated, “Once you give the opportunity you will see and evaluate your candidate from a week period, then two-week period. It is more based on how they are developing their job or duties.” In addition, only three respondents indicated they had not previously hired someone with a criminal background into any position. No responses were received from these individuals in response to the follow-up question.

For the follow-up question, “If Yes, what considerations impacted your decision?” a total of 55 individual responses were received. Of these 55 responses, nine individuals provided no comment. Of the remaining 46 text responses, responses were initially separated into unique statement ideas (Appendix G). These unique statements were then sorted into common themes, developed into major concepts of themes, clustered by themes, and calculated into theme frequencies as detailed in Table 20.

As seen in Table 20, the most common concept impacting the hiring of an individual with a criminal background was their professional background. The most common themes for professional background included work experience and willingness and ability to work. Related

to the importance of work experience, one respondent stated, “Experience and restaurant knowledge are the most important aspects.”

A second concept identified impacting hiring decisions was criminal background. For the consideration of criminal background, the most common themes noted included offense history and honesty about past offenses. Related to these themes, there were several comments provided by respondents. Related to offense history comments included:

- “Some crimes we just can’t overlook.”
- “My major consideration would be severity or type of crime the person committed. I have hired numerous people over the years convicted of various crimes. I would be very reluctant to hire anyone convicted of sexual assault. Or, someone convicted of theft or embezzlement if they were to be in a position where they would be handling cash.”
- “It really depends on the crime, we have minors that work for us, their safety come first. If the crime is nonviolent and not theft related, (depending on the circumstances), there is a possibility we would hire them into an entry-level position and give the possibility of advancement with time and evaluation.”
- “It would depend on the type of crime. Drugs and child related crimes would be difficult to put in with my staff. Especially the underage employees.”
- “All considerations were made on the type of criminal activity.”
- “Types of crime behavior with protecting minors in mind.”
- “The importance to us would be what kind of criminal background. Sex offender...no chance in being hired. Got into a fight...there is a chance. Drugs?

Probably will hire. Theft? Less likely. It all depend on the crime, and then the person.”

- “The only thing in regards to criminal background that would impact the hiring decision is how violent was the offence and theft. We have hired several people over the years with criminal backgrounds.”

The third concept that was identified was personal characteristics. For this concept respondents indicated the individuals themselves, good attitudes, the ability to learn, and the fact they wanted to provide the individual a second chance as the most common considerations in providing an individual with a criminal background a job in the past.

Related to providing individuals a second chance, respondents stated:

- “I believe in second chances and believe in the power of forgiveness. If an employee shows positive and productive qualities I feel they will be hired regardless of their criminal background.”
- “We believe in giving individuals a chance and some of our best employees have criminal backgrounds.”

Table 20

Considerations that Impacted Hiring of Individuals with a Criminal Background

Frequency	Identified Theme	Cluster Concept
12	Work Experience	Professional Background
8	Willing/Able to Work	Professional Background
3	Skills	Professional Background
2	Recommendation	Professional Background
2	Schedule Flexibility	Professional Background
2	Position Fit	Professional Background
2	Organization Need	Professional Background
1	Interview	Professional Background
1	Reliability	Professional Background
1	Knowledge	Professional Background
1	Customer Service Skills	Professional Background
1	Certificate	Professional Background
18	Offense History	Criminal History
5	Honesty About Offense History	Criminal History
3	Recency of Offense	Criminal History
2	Sentence Length	Criminal History
1	Repetition of Crime(s)	Criminal History
7	Individual	Personal Characteristics
4	Good Attitude	Personal Characteristics
4	Ability to Learn	Personal Characteristics
4	Wanted to Provide a Second Chance	Personal Characteristics
3	Interpersonal Skills	Personal Characteristics
3	Personality	Personal Characteristics
3	Organization Fit	Personal Characteristics
1	Temperament	Personal Characteristics
1	Critical Thinking Ability	Personal Characteristics
1	Potential	Personal Characteristics
1	Willingness to Change	Personal Characteristics

Summary

This was a nonexperimental quantitative study that collected data using a researcher designed survey including closed and open-ended questions. The target population consisted of MRA and WRA members with a nonprobability self-selection sampling of MRA and WRA members utilized. The MRA and WRA email listservs were used to send out the survey (See Appendix D) to MRA and WRA members with the sample based on those who completed the survey. Closed-ended questions were assessed through descriptive statistics. Open-ended questions were assessed through the reading of text responses, separating responses into unique statements, sorting and identifying common themes, developing major concepts from themes, clustering of concepts by theme, and calculating theme frequencies.

The study's target population consisted of 377 MRA and 1421 WRA members. One hundred and six restaurant association members clicked the link within the emails with a sample of 69 restaurant association members completing the survey. Of the 69 respondents, a total of 68 identified their state association. Forty-two (62%) of the respondents reported being members of the WRA for a response rate of 3% while 26 (38%) of the respondents reported being members of the MRA for a response rate of 7%. Across both state associations, the total response rate for those who indicated a state association membership was 3%.

Most respondents were 41 years old or older, nearly all white, and 61% of respondents were male. In terms of experience, the majority of respondents were restaurant owners and most indicated they were directly responsible for hiring or provided final approval of hiring. In addition, respondents were also experienced with 71% indicating they have worked in the food service sector for 21 years or more. Most respondents represented a locally-owned, small

business with one or multiple sites with a majority having over 20 employees with the highest likely employment opening for the position of cook.

Based on the findings of the study, respondents would be comfortable with their staff working with an individual with a criminal background and believe their employees would be comfortable working with an individual with a criminal background as well. Related to the importance of a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification, responses varied across positions, with the chef/head cook position where it was identified as being the most important and the waiter/waitress position where it was identified as being the least important.

Regarding the type of training desired of individuals with criminal backgrounds, desired training varied across positions. For the positions of head cook/chef, cook, and waiter/waitress, the two top-ranked desired trainings were culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff in coordination with a college/university culinary arts program and a food protection manager or food protection manager certification received as part of a culinary training program provided by a prison/jail food service staff in coordination with a college/university culinary arts program. For the position of food preparation worker, the two top-ranked desired training were a food handler certificate followed by a food protection manager or food protection manager certification received as part of a culinary training program provided by a prison/jail food service staff in coordination with a college/university culinary arts program.

For those with a criminal background, the most additional desired certificates certifications or training was work experience. The second most desired training cited was customer service training followed by training in communication.

The overall importance of employees having a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification varied across position, with both being identified as the most important for the positions of chef/head cook and cook. The study also asked about the likelihood of hiring employees. The likelihood of hiring an employee with and without a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification varied across positions for those without an identified criminal background and those with a criminal background. Without a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification, the waiter/waitress and food preparation worker positions were the most likely to be hired for those with and without an identified criminal background. An applicant with a food handler certificate would most likely be hired into the roles of cook and food preparation worker for those with and without an identified criminal background. In addition, an applicant with a food protection manager certification would most likely be hired into the positions of chef/head cook or cook for those with and without an identified criminal background.

Most respondents had previously hired an individual with a criminal background into at least one type of position. For those who indicated they had, the most commonly noted reasons they had were due to previous work experience, the individual's criminal offense history, willingness and ability to do work, and honesty about criminal offense history. For those who had not previously hired individuals with criminal backgrounds, responses as to why indicated concerns with liability and labor law.

Chapter V: Summary, Conclusion and Recommendation

Chapter Five contains three sections. The first section provides a study summary. The second section presents the conclusions derived from the literature review and data collection and analysis, which answered the three research questions. The final section presents recommendations for future research.

Summary/Discussion

The United States has the highest incarceration rate of any nation in the world (DOJ, 2015). Upon release from incarceration, 67.8% of released prisoners were arrested for a new crime within three years and 76.6% were arrested within five years (Durose et al., 2014). The bolstering of efforts to deter and reduce recidivism is a goal of the criminal justice system and evidence-based strategies must be used (DOJ, 2015).

Quality academic and vocationally focused programs are a key service prisons can provide and a strategy to increase employment and reduce recidivism rates (Aos et al., 2006; Davis et al., 2013; Wilson et al., 2000). Correctional facilities are increasing utilization of food service certificate and certification programs as a form of vocational training to attempt to reduce recidivism (Guercio, 2014). However, this researcher found no literature assessing if food service certificates or certifications might increase the likelihood someone responsible for hiring employees might actually hire someone with a criminal background into any common food service sector positions. In light of this, as numerous correctional food service training programs offering certificates and certifications exist without evidence to support if certificates or certifications might actually increase employment of individuals with a criminal background in the food service sector, it needed to be determined if food service certificates and

certifications increased the likelihood of employment to provide an evidence-base for developing correctional food service training programs.

The primary purpose of this study was to identify if a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification would increase the likelihood of individuals with criminal backgrounds being hired into different types of jobs in the food service sector and provide an evidence-base for correctional food service programs to base their training programs on to help reduce recidivism rates. To guide the research, the study examined the following three research questions:

Question 1: What is the attitude of restaurant association members towards hiring individuals who have a criminal background to work in their food service operation?

Question 2: Does having a food protection manager certification, food handler certificate, or other professional training impact how likely restaurant association members are to hire individuals with criminal backgrounds?

Question 3: Is there a difference in the types of food service sector positions restaurant association members would hire individuals with a criminal background for?

To answer the research questions, a nonexperimental quantitative research design was utilized. Data was collected using a researcher designed survey including closed and open-ended questions titled *Midwestern Restaurant Association Member Attitudes about Hiring Individuals with a Criminal Background* (Appendix D). The target population consisted of Minnesota Restaurant Association (MRA) and Wisconsin Restaurant Association (WRA) members who hold positions as food service managers, restaurant owners, and restaurant franchisees/licensees within the state of Minnesota and Wisconsin. A nonprobability self-selection sampling of MRA and WRA members was utilized. The MRA and WRA email

listservs were used to send out the survey (See Appendix D) to MRA and WRA members with the sample based on those who completed the survey. Closed-ended questions were assessed through descriptive statistics. Open-ended questions were assessed through the reading of text responses, separating responses into unique statements, sorting and identifying common themes, developing major concepts from themes, clustering of concepts by theme, and calculating theme frequencies.

The study target population consisted of 377 MRA and 1421 WRA members. MRA and WRA members responded through the initial survey request email (See Appendix C) or follow-up survey request email (See Appendix E) sent to them by their respective association member listservs. One hundred and six restaurant association members clicked the link within the emails to review additional information about the research project. A sample of 69 restaurant association members completed the survey. Of the 69 respondents, a total of 68 identified their state association. Forty-two (62%) of the respondents reported being members of the WRA for a response rate of 3% while 26 (38%) of the respondents reported being members of the MRA for a response rate of 7%. Across both state associations, the total response rate for those who indicated a state association membership was 3%.

Most respondents were 41 years old or older, nearly all white, and 61% of respondents were male. In terms of experience, the majority of respondents were restaurant owners and most indicated they were directly responsible for hiring or provided final approval of hiring. In addition, 71% indicated they have worked in the food service sector for 21 years or more. Most respondents represented a locally-owned, small business with one or multiple sites. A majority had over 20 employees with the highest likely employment opening for the position of cook.

Respondents confirmed their comfort level and their believed staff's comfort level working with an individual with a criminal background. Seventy-one percent of respondents indicated they either somewhat agreed (43%) or strongly agreed (28%) they would be comfortable with their staff working with an individual with a criminal background. Seventy-one percent also indicated they either somewhat agreed (53%) or strongly agreed (18%) they believed employees in their organization would be comfortable working with an individual with a criminal background.

Respondents were also asked about the type of training they desired individuals with criminal backgrounds would have received for various positions. Desired types of training varied across positions. For the positions of head cook/chef, cook, and waiter/waitress, the two top-ranked desired trainings were culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff in coordination with a college/university culinary arts program and a food protection manager or food protection manager certification received as part of a culinary training program provided by a prison/jail food service staff in coordination with a college/university culinary arts program. For the position of food preparation worker, the two top-ranked desired training were a food handler certificate followed by a food protection manager or food protection manager certification received as part of a culinary training program provided by a prison/jail food service staff in coordination with a college/university culinary arts program.

Respondents identified and provided a rationale for additional desired certificates, certifications, or training for individuals with a criminal background. The most frequently cited additional desired training was work experience. The second most desired training cited was customer service training followed by training in communication.

The importance of having a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification was also assessed. The overall importance of employees having a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification varied across position, with both being identified as the most important for the positions of chef/head cook and cook as evidenced by approximately over 70% of respondents indicating they were either very important or absolutely important for both positions. The likelihood of hiring an employee with and without a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification varied across positions for those without an identified criminal background and those with a criminal background. Without a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification, the waiter/waitress and food preparation worker positions were the most likely to be hired for those with and without an identified criminal background. An applicant with a food handler certificate would most likely be hired into the roles of cook and food preparation worker for those with and without an identified criminal background. In addition, an applicant with a food protection manager certification would most likely be hired into the positions of chef/head cook or cook for those with and without an identified criminal background.

An applicant with a food handler certificate mean scores were highest for the likelihood of hiring into the roles of cook and food preparation worker for those with and without an identified criminal background. In addition, an applicant with a food protection manager certification would most likely be hired into the positions of chef/head cook or cook for those with and without an identified criminal background.

Most respondents (96%) had knowingly previously hired an individual with a criminal background into at least one type of position. For those who indicated they had, the most commonly noted reasons they had were due to previous work experience, the individual's

criminal offense history, willingness and ability to do work, and honestly about criminal offense history. For those who had not previously hired individuals with criminal backgrounds, responses as to why indicated concerns with liability and labor law.

Conclusion

Based on the survey responses of the population sample, conclusions were derived from each research question. These conclusions were then connected with previous research findings to determine if they supported current practices and research.

Question one. This question asked, “What is the attitude of restaurant association members towards hiring individuals who have a criminal background to work in their food service operation?” Respondents indicated they were both comfortable with their staff working with individuals with a criminal background as well as believed their staff would be comfortable working with an individual with a criminal background. These findings are in-line with what appears to be an attitude of support for hiring individuals with criminal backgrounds within the food service sector as noted by Visher et al. (2008), who indicated 12% of inmates gain employment in the food service sector after release. These findings are also in-line with findings of both the Arizona hospitality and tourism industry who revealed restaurants were most receptive to hiring inmates, especially kitchen staff (Collins, 2011), and Guercio (2014), who identified many restaurant organizations as “friendly” to individuals with criminal backgrounds.

The attitude toward desired types of training for individuals with criminal backgrounds varied across positions. For the positions of head cook/chef, cook, and waiter/waitress, the two top-ranked desired trainings were culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff in coordination with a college/university culinary arts program and a food protection manager or

food protection manager certification received as part of a culinary training program provided by a prison/jail food service staff in coordination with a college/university culinary arts program. For the position of food preparation worker, the two top-ranked desired trainings were a food handler certificate followed by a food protection manager or food protection manager certification received as part of a culinary training program provided by a prison/jail food service staff in coordination with a college/university culinary arts program.

These findings of higher ranked desired training for culinary training provided by a prison/jail food service in coordination with a college/university culinary arts program support the types of collaborative training Timpanogos Women's Correctional Facility had with Davis Applied Technology College in Utah as well as past programming at Northern Arizona University (Collins, 2011; Stephenson, 2014). However, for some positions, the findings of low ranking for desired training, such as just a food handler certificate, food protection manager certification, or culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff do not provide support for programs offered in the past such as Northeast Correctional Center, Trinity Service Group, or the Michigan, Virginia, or Wisconsin Department of Corrections (Camplin, 2017; Guercio, 2014; Matsumoto, 2000, Michigan Department of Corrections, 2017). In addition, these findings are consistent with the assumption of Signaling Theory that educational qualifications can be used to predict productivity and hiring decisions. These results are also in line with the assumption certain signals are more important with some types of jobs than others (Bushway & Apel, 2010; Page, 2010; Spence, 1973).

When given a question about aside from a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification, what additional certificates, certifications, or training would you desire of an individual with a criminal background, the most common types of training noted were

related to professional, interpersonal, or emotional development. The most desired training noted was work experience. Related to the importance of experience, respondent's comments included such statements as "experience is huge," "more experience is better," and "hands-on experience is very valuable in the restaurant industry." The identification of the importance of experience is in-line with that of the head/cook, cook, food preparation worker, and waiter/waitress positions as, for each of these positions, skills are learned through work experience (BLS, 2017a, Recruiter, 2017b). It is also in-line with the importance of experience correctional food service training can provided as highlighted by the Connecticut Department of Corrections and Aramark Correctional Services (Guercio, 2014; Werblow & Dischino, 2015).

Question two. Does having a food protection manager certification, food handler certificate, or other professional training impact how likely restaurant association members are to hire individuals with criminal backgrounds? The findings showed respondents indicated the importance of employees having a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification varied across position, with both being identified as the most important for the positions of chef/head cook and cook. These findings are consistent with the assumption of Signaling Theory that certain signals are more important with some types of jobs than others, such as the food protection manager certification being of more value for potentially increasing the likelihood of employment than the food handler certificate (Spence, 1973). These finding are also consistent with a food handler certificate knowledge being more for employee-level positions and the food protection manager certification being more for a person in charge (FDA, 2013; NRA, 2017c).

The study also asked about the likelihood of hiring employees with a criminal background. Mean Likert scores were compared, though not tested for significance. Without a

food handler certification or food protection manager certification, the waiter/waitress and food preparation worker positions were the most likely to be hired. With a food handler certification, the food preparation worker and cook position were the most likely positions individuals would be hired for. With a food protection manager certification, the cook and chef/head cook were the most likely to be hired. In addition, the likelihood of hiring someone with a criminal background increased across all positions with a food handler certification. There was an even greater likelihood of hiring someone with a criminal background across all positions with a food protection manager certification. These results support having a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification may impact how likely restaurant association members are to hire individuals with criminal backgrounds in all positions assessed and potentially even more so for specific positions. These finding also support the potential offering of food handler and food protection manager certifications as part of correctional education programming, such as those offered by the Virginia Department of Corrections, Trinity Services Group, or Aramark Correctional Services. In addition, these finding also support the idea that vocationally focused programs are a key service prisons can provide and a major component of the correctional system (Davis et al., 2013; Wilson, Gallagher, & MacKenzie, 2000).

These findings are also consistent with Signaling Theory, as job training and other programs resulting in certifications tailored specifically to the type of employment play an important role in communicating positive signals between applicants and employers and may provide a positive signal needed to increase employment potential. (Bushway & Ape, 2012; Dolaec, 2016; Fahey et al., 2006; Ramekers et al., 2012). Related to the potential signaling effect of certifications, it supports certifications serve to signal a level of competence the certification holder possesses, providing value to both the employer and applicant (Bartlett,

2012; Carter, 2005). It also supports findings that if a certification is not legally required for entry into a field, the certification improves the likelihood of employment as these forms of credentials are considered a signal for meeting certain levels of proficiency and widely accepted as a trend in education, and that certifications are a valuable investment if the applicant knows the employer will have information asymmetries in relation to their knowledge, skills and abilities and an asset to eliminate information gaps (Bartlett, 2012; Carter, 2005).

Question three. Is there a difference in the types of food service sector positions restaurant association members would hire individuals with a criminal background for? Results found that compared to someone without an identified criminal background, the highest mean scores for the types of positions individuals would be hired into without or with a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification were the same. Though there was not a difference in the type of positions members would hire individual with a criminal background, there was a decrease in the likelihood they would hire individuals with a criminal background across almost all positions both with and without a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification compared to someone without an identified criminal background. These findings are consistent with other finding that have shown the labor market in the United States can be difficult and an inequitable environment for individuals from a variety of demographics including those with criminal backgrounds (Bushway & Apel, 2012; Doleac, 2016; Fahey, Roberts, & Engel, 2006). These finding are also consistent with literature that suggests individuals with criminal backgrounds may differ from those who do not have criminal backgrounds with the same level of education due to a variety of negative signals that reduce an individual's perceived work readiness (Doleac, 2016). They are also consistent with Doleac

(2016) and Fahey et al. (2006) who have indicated the negative signal of a criminal background may motivate the use of a criminal background as a substitute for knowledge of work qualities.

Study findings also showed that most respondents had knowingly previously hired someone with a criminal background. To the question of what impacted your decision, the most common theme noted was related to professional background with the most frequently cited responses being experience and willingness to work. The identification of the importance of work experience to respondents is again in-line with that of the head/cook, cook, food preparation worker, and waiter/waitress positions as most individuals in these positions learn skills through work experience (BLS, 2017a, Recruiter, 2017b).

An additional concept affecting hiring decisions was the type of crime previously committed. Several responses indicated considerations to the type of crime in relation to potentially having to work with minors, safety, and management of money. These responses indicate respondents are potentially assessing individuals with criminal backgrounds in accordance to laws indicating employers must show exclusions are job-related and consistent with business necessity to avoid liability (EEOC, 2017b).

Recommendations

Vocationally focused programs are important within corrections in order to reduce recidivism rates. As correctional facilities utilize food service as a form of training, food service certificate and certification programs, as well as collaborations with non-correctional training programs, should be considered to attempt to reduce recidivism. In this section recommendation for correctional administrators, individuals with criminal backgrounds, and future research will be provided.

Recommendations for correctional administrators for development or expansion of food service training programs. It is recommended that correctional administrators consider doing the following:

1. Encourage inmate employment in food service operations as a way to gain and develop professional experience in the food service sector.
2. Continue to offer food handler certificates or food protection manager certifications as part of correctional food service training programs.
3. Coordinate correctional food service training programs with college/university culinary arts programs.
4. Encourage inmates who have received a food handler certificate to seek food preparation worker and cook positions and inmates who have received a food protection manager certification to seek cook and head cook/chef positions within the food service sector.

Recommendations for individuals with criminal backgrounds. It is recommended that individuals with criminal backgrounds consider doing the following:

1. If incarcerated, work within food service as a way to gain and develop professional experience in the food service sector.
2. If incarcerated and correctional food service training is offered, and includes the offering of a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification, participate in the training programming as a way to potentially increase the likelihood of employment in the food service sector upon release.
3. Pursue working in food service as a sector for employment upon release.

Recommendations for future research. In addition to recommendations for correctional administrators and individuals with criminal backgrounds, the following research is recommended:

1. Replicate this study using random sampling, by expanding the population and potential sample by surveying more state restaurant associations and by identifying specific criminal background type as an additional variable.
2. Build upon this study by performing a qualitative study researching the specific types of experience that would increase the likelihood of hiring an individual with a criminal background into specific positions.
3. Perform a qualitative study reviewing inmates' perceptions of working within correctional food service programs, correctional food service training programs, and working within the food service sector.
4. Perform a quantitative study following released inmates who have completed correctional food service training programs and have obtained food handler certificates or food protection manager certifications to see if they were more likely to gain employment in the food service sector than those who had not.

References

- American National Standards Institute. (2017a, October 11). *ANSI accreditation for food safety*. Retrieved from <https://www.ansi.org/accreditation/foodsafety/Default>
- American National Standards Institute. (2017b, October 11). *ANSI-CFP accreditation program (accredited)*. Retrieved from <https://www.ansi.org/accreditation/credentialing/personnel-certification/food-protection-manager/ALLdirectoryListing?menuID=8&prgID=8&statusID=4>
- American National Standards Institute. (2017c, October 11). *Certificate program accreditation overview*. Retrieved from <https://www.ansi.org/Accreditation/credentialing/certificate-issuers/Default>
- American National Standards Institute. (2017d, October 11). *Food handler training certificate program (accredited)*. Retrieved from <https://www.ansi.org/Accreditation/credentialing/certificate-issuers/AllDirectoryListing?prgID=237,238&statusID=4>
- Aos, S., Miller, M., & Drake, E. (2006). Evidence-based public policy options to reduce future prison construction, criminal justice costs, and criminal rates. *Washington State Institute for Public Policy*. Retrieved from <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/ReportFile/924>
- Aragon, S.T., Woo, H., & Marvel, M.R. (2005). The role of national industry-based skill standards in the development, implementation, and assessment of community college curriculum. *Journal of Career and Technical Education*, 21(2), 35-50.
- Bartlett, K.R. (2012). A theoretical review of the signaling role of certifications in career and technical education. *University of Minnesota*. Retrieved from http://www.nrccte.org/sites/default/files/uploads/barlett_acter_nexus_paper.pdf

- Black Box Intelligence. (2017, April 13). *Restaurant industry snapshot: March 2017*. Retrieved from <http://tdn2k.com/snapshot/2017-03/>
- Bloom, D. (2012). A signaling approach to criminal distance through transitional jobs programs. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 11(1), 93-99.
- Bonczar, T.P. (2003, August 17). Prevalence of imprisonment in the U.S. population, 1974-2001. *Bureau of Justice Statistics*. Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=836>
- Brame, R., Turner, M.G., Paternoster, R., & Bushway, S.D. (2012). Cumulative prevalence of arrests ages 8-23 in a national sample. *Pediatrics*, 129(1), 21-27.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2014, January). *Survey of state criminal information systems*, 2012. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/bjs/grants/244563.pdf>
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2016, December). *Prisoners in 2015*. Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/p15.pdf>
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2018, January 17). *Terms and definitions: State and federal prisoners and prison facilities*. Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=tdtp&tid=13>
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2017a, October 12). *Chefs and head cooks*. Retrieved from <https://www.bls.gov/ooh/food-preparation-and-serving/chefs-and-head-cooks.htm>
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2017b, October 12). *Cooks*. Retrieved from <https://www.bls.gov/ooh/food-preparation-and-serving/cooks.htm>
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2017c, October 12). *Food preparation workers*. Retrieved from <https://www.bls.gov/ooh/food-preparation-and-serving/food-preparation-workers.htm>

- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2017d, October 12). *Food service and drinking places: NAICS 722*. Retrieved from <https://www.bls.gov/iag/tgs/iag722.htm>
- Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2017e, October 12). *Waiters and waitresses*. Retrieved from <https://www.bls.gov/ooh/food-preparation-and-serving/waiters-and-waitresses.htm>
- Bushway, S.D., & Apel, R. (2012). A signaling perspective on employment-based reentry programming: Training completion as a desistance signal. *Criminology & Public Policy*, *11*(1), 21-50.
- Camplin, E. (2017). *Prison food in America*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group, Inc.
- Carter, C. (2005). The growth and supply and demand of occupational-based training and certifications in the United States, 1900-2003. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *16*(1), 33-53.
- Carrol, H. (2016, November 1). From prison cell to award-winning restaurant. *Delmarvanow*. Retrieved from <http://www.delmarvanow.com/story/entertainment/2016/11/01/prison-cell-award-winning-restaurant/93050532/>
- Case, P., & Fasenfest, D. (2004). Expectations for opportunities following prison education: A discussion on race and gender. *The Journal of Correctional Education*, *55*(1), 24-39.
- Collins, G. (2011). *A hospitality training model for prison inmates: Lessons learned from a pilot implementation*. Retrieved from <http://scholarworks.umass.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1582&context=refereed>
- Davis, L.M., Bozick, R., Steele, J.L., Saunders, J., & Miles, J N.V. (2013). Evaluating the effectiveness of correctional education. *Rand Corporation*. Retrieved from https://www.bja.gov/publications/rand_correctional-education-meta-analysis.pdf

- Davis, L.M., Steele, J.L., Bozick, R., Williams, M.V., Turner, S., Miles, J, N.V., ... Steinberg, P.S. (2014). How effective is correctional education, and where do we go from there? *Rand Corporation*. Retrieved from https://www.bja.gov/publications/rand_correctional-education-meta-analysis.pdf
- Decker, H.D., Spohn, C., Ortiz, N.R., & Hedberg, E. (2014, January). Criminal stigma, race, gender and employment: An expanded assessment of the consequences of imprisonment for employment. *National Institute of Justice*. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/244756.pdf>
- Department of Justice. (2000). *Crime and justice atlas 2000*. Retrieved from http://www.jrsa.org/projects/Crime_Atlas_2000.pdf
- Department of Justice. (2015). *Fiscal years 2014-2018: Strategic plan*. Retrieved from <https://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/jmd/legacy/2014/02/28/doj-fy-2014-2018-strategic-plan.pdf>
- Dick, A. J., Rich, W., & Waters, T. (2016). *Prison vocational education and policy in the United States: A critical perspective on evidence-based reform*. [E-reader version]. Retrieved from <http://link.springer.com.ezproxy.lib.uwstout.edu/book/10.1057/978-1-137-56469-6>
- Dictionary.com (2018, March 8). *Signal*. Retrieved form <http://www.dictionary.com/browse/signaling?s=t>
- Dillman, D. (2000). *Constructing the questionnaire. Mail and internet surveys*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Dillman, D.A., Smyth, J.D., & Christian, L.M. (2014). *Internet, phone, mail and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

- Doleac, J.L. (2016). Increasing employment for individuals with criminal records. *The Hamilton Project*. Retrieved from http://www.hamiltonproject.org/assets/files/increasing_employment_individuals_criminal_records.PDF
- Durose, M.R., Cooper, A.D., & Snyder, H.N. (2014). Recidivism of prisoners released in 30 states in 2005: Patterns from 2005 to 2010 – update. *Bureau of Justice Statistics*. Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=pbdetail&iid=4986>
- Fahey, J., Roberts, C., & Engel, L. (2006). Employment of ex-offenders: Employer perspectives. Final Report. *Crime and Justice Institute*. Retrieved from http://www.antonioacasella.eu/nume/Fahey_2006.pdf
- Fanning, E. (2005). Formatting a paper-based survey questionnaire: Best practices. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 10(2), 1-14. Retrieved from <http://pareonline.net/pdf/v10n12.pdf>
- Federal Register. (2016). *Annual determination of average cost of incarceration*. Retrieved from <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2016/07/19/2016-17040/annual-determination-of-average-cost-of-incarceration>
- Food and Drug Administration. (2013). *Food code*. Retrieved from <http://www.fda.gov/downloads/Food/GuidanceRegulation/RetailFoodProtection/FoodCode/UCM374510.pdf>
- Fowler, F.J. (1995). *Improving survey questions: Design and evaluation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Fowler, F.J. (2002). *Survey research methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Frazis, H. (2002). Capital, signaling, and the patterns of returns of higher education. *Oxford Economic Papers*, 54(2), 298-320.
- Freidman, M. (2015, November 17). Just facts: As many Americans have criminal records as college diplomas. *Brenner Center for Justice*. Retrieved from <https://www.brennancenter.org/blog/just-facts-many-americans-have-criminal-records-college-diplomas>
- Graham, R. (2015, March 8). How criminal records hold Americans back. *Boston Globe*. Retrieved from <https://www.bostonglobe.com/ideas/2015/03/08/how-criminal-records-hold-americans-back/bFnOmPhZKeimlafcPU5mmI/story.html>
- Guercio, G.F. (2014, May 1). Food service certification programs. *Corrections Forum*, 23, 44-47.
- Harlow, C.W. (2003). Education and correctional populations. *Bureau of Justice Statistics*. Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ecp.pdf>
- Harris, M.P., & Keller, K.S. (2005). Ex-offenders need not apply. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 21(1), 6-30.
- Heydon, G. (2012). Risk and rehabilitation in criminal records checking by employers: What employers are doing and why? *Employment Law Bulletin*, 18 (8), 129-135.
- Holzer, H.J., Raphael, S., & Stoll, M.A. (2006). Perceived criminality background checks, and the racial hiring practices of employers. *The Journal of Law*, 49(2), 451-480.
- Isaacson, M.S., & Green, S. (2015). Writing a survey: A basic review. *University of Wisconsin-Stout*. Retrieved from https://www.uwstout.edu/parq/intranet/upload/Survey_Basics.pdf

- Justice Center. (2015, July 7). *Three core elements of programs that reduce recidivism: Who, what, and how well*. Retrieved from <https://csgjusticecenter.org/jr/posts/three-core-elements-of-programs-that-reduce-recidivism-who-what-and-how-well/>
- Kjelland, J. (2008). Economic returns of higher education: Signaling v. human capital theory an analysis of competing theories. *The Park Place Economist*, 16(1), 70-77.
- Lawrence, S., Mears, D.P., Dubin, G., & Travis, J. (2002). The practice and promise of prison programming. *Urban Institute*. Retrieved from <http://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/60431/410493-The-Practice-and-Promise-of-Prison-Programming.PDF>
- Learn2Serve. (2017a, October 12). *Food handler training*. Retrieved from http://www.learn2serve.com/food-handler-training/?utm_source=msn&utm_medium=cpc&utm_term=food%20handler%20certification&utm_content=5929114021&utm_campaign=F&B%20-%20L2S%20-%20US%20-%20Food%20Handler&kclickid=_kenshoo_clickid_
- Learn2Serve. (2017b, October 12). *Food safety manager certification*. Retrieved from <http://www.learn2serve.com/food-safety-training/>
- Lipton, D., Martinson, R., & Wilks, J. (1975). *The effectiveness of correctional treatment: A survey of treatment evaluation studies*. New York: Praeger.
- Lockwood, S.K., Nally, J.M., Ho, J., & Knutson, K. (2015). Racial disparities and similarities in post-release recidivism and employment among ex-prisoners with a different level of education. *Journal of Prison Education and Reentry*, 2(1), 16-31. doi: 110.15845/jper.v2i1.703.

- Lund Research. (2017a, December 14). *Non-probability sampling*. Retrieved from <http://dissertation.laerd.com/non-probability-sampling.php#step3>
- Lund Research. (2017b, December 14). *Self-selection sampling*. Retrieved from <http://dissertation.laerd.com/self-selection-sampling.php>
- Martinez, M.S. (2011). *Employer perceptions about hiring released prisoners with a criminal history*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Capella University, Minneapolis, MN.
- Matsumoto, J. (2000). Serving time. *Restaurants & Institutions*, 110(3), 65-68.
- Mears, D.P., & Mestre, J. (2012). Prison reentry, employment, signaling, and the better identification of desisters. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 11(1), 5-15.
- Michigan Department of Corrections. (2017). *Vocational education program teaches marketable skills to prisoners*. Retrieved from <http://www.michigan.gov/corrections/0,1607,7-119--139913--,00.html>
- Mitchell, P.A. (2014, March 11). At eastern correctional facility in Napanoch, cooking program an effort to redirect inmates' lives. *The Daily Freeman*. Retrieved from <http://www.dailyfreeman.com/lifestyle/20140311/at-eastern-correctional-facility-in-napanoch-cooking-program-an-effort-to-redirect-inmates-lives-recipe>
- Monsen, E. R., & Van Horn, L. (2008). *Research: Successful approaches*. (3rd ed.). Chicago, IL: American Dietetics Association.
- National Institute of Justice. (2017, May 3). *Recidivism*. Retrieved from <https://www.nij.gov/topics/corrections/recidivism/Pages/welcome.aspx>
- National Institute of Justice. (2018, January 18). *Practice profile: Corrections-based vocational training programs*. Retrieved from <https://www.crimesolutions.gov/PracticeDetails.aspx?ID=24>

- National Reentry Resource Center. (2014, June). *Reducing recidivism*. Retrieved from https://csgjusticecenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/ReducingRecidivism_StatesDeliverResults.pdf
- National Research Council. (2014). *The growth of incarceration in the United States: Exploring causes and consequences*. Retrieved from http://johnjay.jjay.cuny.edu/nrc/NAS_report_on_incarceration.pdf
- National Restaurant Association. (2016, April 26). *Food safety manager program*. Retrieved from <https://www.servsafe.com/ss/regulatory/default.aspx?aliaspath=/Special-Pages/ssredirect>
- National Restaurant Association. (2017a, October 12). *Course details*. Retrieved from <https://www.servsafe.com/ServSafe-Food-Handler/Get-Certified>
- National Restaurant Association. (2017b). *2017 Restaurant industry pocket factbook*. Retrieved from http://www.restaurant.org/Downloads/PDFs/News-Research/Pocket_Factbook_FEB_2017-FINAL.pdf
- National Restaurant Association. (2017c, October 12). *Frequently asked questions*. Retrieved from <https://www.servsafe.com/ServSafe-Food-Handler/FAQs#!/>
- Page, M.E. (2010). Signaling in the labor market. *International Encyclopedia of Education, 3rd Edition*. (pp. 33-36). Elsevier Limited, Oxford.
- Pager, D. (2003). The mark of a criminal record. *American Journal of Sociology, 108*(5), 937-975.
- Patten, M.L. (2009). *Understanding research methods: An overview of the essentials*. Glendale, CA: Pyrczak Publishing.

- Piotrowski, C., & Lathrop, P.J. (2012). Prison-based educational programs: A content analysis of government documents. *Education, 132*(3), 683-688.
- Ramakers, A., van Wilsem, J., & Apel, R. (2012). The effect of labour market absence on finding employment: A comparison between ex-prisoners and unemployed future prisoners. *European Journal of Criminology, 9*(4), 442-462.
- Recipe for Change. (2017). *What we do*. Retrieved from <http://recipeforchangeproject.org/what-we-do>
- Recruiter. (2017a, November 24). *Food preparation workers*. Retrieved from <https://www.recruiter.com/salaries/food-preparation-workers-salary/>
- Recruiter. (2017b, November 24). *Salary for chefs and head cooks*. Retrieved from <https://www.recruiter.com/salaries/chefs-and-head-cooks-salary/>
- Recruiter. (2017c, November 24). *Salary for restaurant cooks*. Retrieved from <https://www.recruiter.com/salaries/cooks-restaurant-salary/>
- Recruiter. (2017d, November 24). *Waiters and waitresses*. Retrieved from <https://www.recruiter.com/salaries/waiters-and-waitresses-salary/>
- Reisinger, L.S. (2016). *A profile and perceived needs of Wisconsin correctional educators*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Wisconsin-Stout, Menomonie, WI.
- Rodriguez, M.N. (2011, March). 65 million “need not apply” the case for criminal reforming criminal background checks for employment. *The National Law Employment Law Project*. Retrieved from http://www.nelp.org/content/uploads/2015/03/65_Million_Need_Not_Apply.pdf

- Rolstad, S., Adler, J., & Ryden, A. (2011). Response burden and questionnaire length: Is shorter better? A review and meta-analysis. *International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research, 14*, 1101-1108.
- Society of Human Resource Management. (2012, January 22). *Background checking: Conducting criminal background checks* [PowerPoint slide]. Retrieved from https://www.slideshare.net/shrm/background-check-criminal?from=share_email
- Spence, M. (1973). Job market signaling. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 87*(3), 355-374.
- Stephenson, K. (2014, December 24). Job skills, confidence on the menu in Utah prison culinary program. *The Salt Lake Tribune*. Retrieved from <http://archive.sltrib.com/article.php?id=1923421&itype=CMSID>
- Travis, J., Western, B., & Redburn, S. (2014). The growth of incarceration in the United States: Exploring causes and consequences. *The National Academies Press*. Retrieved from http://johnjay.jjay.cuny.edu/nrc/NAS_report_on_incarceration.pdf
- U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2012, April 25). *EEOC enforcement guidance*. Retrieved from https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/guidance/upload/arrest_conviction.pdf
- U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2017a) *Pre-employment inquiries and arrest & conviction*. Retrieved from https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/practices/inquiries_arrest_conviction.cfm
- U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (2017b). *What you should know about the EEOC and arrest and conviction records*. Retrieved from https://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/newsroom/wysk/arrest_conviction_records.cfm

- USLegal.com. (2018, January 17). Criminal history background information check law and legal definition. Retrieved from <https://definitions.uslegal.com/c/criminal-history-background-information-check/>
- Visher, C., Debus, S., & Yahner, J. (2008). Employment after prison: A longitudinal study of releases in three states. *Urban Institute Justice Policy Center*. Retrieved from: <http://www.lemosandcrane.co.uk/bluesalmon/resources/Urban%20Institute%20Justice%20Policy%20Centre%20-%20Employment%20after%20prison.pdf#page=1&zoom=auto,-99,792>
- Walter, L. (2016, April 22). Prison culinary program to open in Haley's memory. *Bethany Beach News*. Retrieved from http://bethanybeachnews.com/content/prison-culinary-program-open-haley%E2%80%99s-memory_04_22_2016
- Werblow, J., & Dischino, M. (2015). *Program evaluation study of culinary arts programs in the Connecticut department of corrections*. The Institute for Municipal & Regional Policy. Retrieved from <http://resultsfirstct.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/Culinary-Arts-Report.pdf>
- Wiersma, W., & Jurs, S.G. (2009). *Research methods in education*. (9th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Wilson, D.B., Gallagher, C.A., & MacKenzie, D.L. (2000). A meta-analysis of corrections-based education, vocation, and work programs for adult offenders. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 37(4), 347-368.

Appendix A: Cognitive Interview Responses

Cognitive Interview #1

Comprehension

Are the questions understandable? - Yes

Are the answers understandable? - Yes

Are there any terms utilized you feel would be unknown to respondents? - No

Do respondents have the needed information to answer corresponding questions? - Yes

Recall

Do you feel respondents would have a hard time recalling needed information to answer questions? - No

Judgement

Do you feel question are biased or overly sensitive? - No

Do you feel the survey is overly difficult for respondents to complete? - No

Response

Do the answers provided describe what the respondents have to say? - Yes

Do you feel the answers provided are valid measures for the questions? - Yes

Do you believe the survey appears effective in terms of its stated aim? - Yes

Do you feel the appropriate period noted to complete the survey is appropriate? - Yes

Cognitive Interview #2

Comprehension

Are the questions understandable? - Yes, except with definition of food handler certificate and food protection manager certification. There could be confusion and definition might be needed.

Are the answers understandable? - Yes

Are there any terms utilized you feel would be unknown to respondents? – The difference between food handler certificate and food protection manager certification unknown.

Do respondents have the needed information to answer corresponding questions? - Yes

Recall

Do you feel respondents would have a hard time recalling needed information to answer questions? - No

Judgement

Do you feel question are biased or overly sensitive? - No

Do you feel the survey is overly difficult for respondents to complete? – The middle questions could be difficult to understand if not formatted correctly once in the survey.

Response

Do the answers provided describe what the respondents have to say? - Yes

Do you feel the answers provided are valid measures for the questions? - Yes

Do you believe the survey appears effective in terms of its stated aim? - Yes

Do you feel the appropriate period noted to complete the survey is appropriate? - Yes

General Comments

- Waiter/Waitress and Head Cook position titles are frequently not utilized within the restaurant industry.

Appendix B: Pilot Test Interviews

Interview #1

Did you have any issues with the survey's online format? – No

Are the survey instructions clear? – Not for the rank order questions.

Are the questions easy to understand? Yes

Did you know how to indicate responses? It took me a moment for the rank order questions.

Could you correctly use the commands? Yes

Did you know how to “change” your answers? I did not have to.

Do you have any suggestions regarding the addition or deletion of questions, clarification of instructions, or improvements in format? Rank order question could be improved.

Do you believe there were any inherent biases? No

How long do you believe it took you to complete the survey? No more than 10.

Interview #2

Did you have any issues with the survey's online format? - No

Are the survey instructions clear? - Yes

Are the questions easy to understand? - Yes

Did you know how to indicate responses? – Yes, except from rank order questions, however, I was able to figure out.

Could you correctly use the commands? – Yes

Did you know how to “change” your answers? - Yes

Do you have any suggestions regarding the addition or deletion of questions, clarification of instructions, or improvements in format? - No

Do you believe there were any inherent biases? - No

How long do you believe it took you to complete the survey? - 8-9 minutes

Appendix C: Initial Survey Request Email

Dear Restaurant Association Member,

My name is Mitchel Holliday, and I am currently a doctoral candidate at the University of Wisconsin-Stout pursuing an Ed.D. in Career and Technical Education. As part of my degree requirements, I am conducting research on the attitudes of restaurant association members towards hiring individuals who have a criminal background. The purpose of this survey is to identify if a food handler certificate (e.g. ServSafe Food Handler Certificate) or food protection manager certification (e.g. ServSafe Food Manager Certification) would increase the likelihood individuals with criminal backgrounds would be hired into the different type of jobs in the food service sector. This knowledge will potentially assist correctional administration in development or expansion of food service related training programs to better equip individuals with criminal backgrounds to productively serve in the high demand food service sector.

Below is a link to a survey that will be available through March 11th, 2018 and will provide additional information about this research project and survey.

Please click this link to begin the survey or copy and paste the URL into your internet browser:

https://uwstout.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_0BruQla3YfUFkuV

Your participation in this survey is greatly appreciated. Thank you in advance for your support.

Mitchel Holliday

University of Wisconsin-Stout

Email: hollidaym2003@my.uwstout.edu

Phone: 715-563-0650

Appendix D: Survey Instrument

Midwestern Restaurant Association Member Attitudes about Hiring Individuals with a Criminal Background

Q28 Thank you for your willingness to participate in this survey. As the purpose of this survey relates to the potential impact of a food handler certificate (e.g. ServSafe Food Handler Certificate) or food protection manager certification (e.g. ServSafe Food Manager Certification) on hiring practices, we wanted to ensure clear distinctions between both by defining these types of training before you begin the survey.

Food Handler Certificate: Verifies basic food safety knowledge for food handlers in employee-level positions. A food handler certificate provides knowledge on food safety, personal hygiene, cross-contamination, allergens, regulations and techniques to maintain a food-safe environment allowing for reduction in risk, improvement in safety and reduced costs

Food Protection Manager Certification: Is similar in content to a food handler certificate, however, provides more comprehensive education. Food service manager certification verifies a person in charge has sufficient food safety knowledge to protect the public from foodborne illness in-line with requirements of the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) Food Code. Thank you again for your time and willingness to participate in this survey. You many begin taking the survey at any time.

If you have any additional questions about survey risks or benefits, time commitment, confidentiality, right to withdraw, University of Wisconsin-Stout Institutional Review Board approval, or would like to contact the investigator additional information is below.

Consent to Participate in UW-Stout Approved Research The researcher conducting this study is Mitchel K. Holliday. You can ask questions of this researcher by contacting him via email at hollidaym2003@my.uwstout.edu or by phone at 715-563-0650.

Risks and Benefits There are no anticipated risks from taking this survey. All responses are anonymous, and all finding will be reported in aggregate. Findings will not be presented in a way that will allow for identification of respondents or respondent organizations.

Time Commitment The total time commitment for this survey is anticipated to take 10-15 minutes as all but two questions can be completed with the click of a mouse.

Confidentiality Responses to this survey are returned anonymously. No identifiers representing individual or organization names will be collected or included in any documents. Collected data will only be reported in aggregate. It is not believed you or your organization can be identified from any of the information being collected.

Right to Withdraw Your participation in this survey is completely voluntary and you can opt in by clicking the link above. You may choose not to participate without any adverse consequences to you or your organization. Should you choose to participate and later wish to withdraw from the survey after it is initiated, you may discontinue your participation at any time without incurring any adverse consequences.

IRB Approval This study has been reviewed and approved by The University of Wisconsin-Stout's Institutional Review Board (IRB). The IRB has determined that this study meets the ethical obligations required by federal law and University policies. If you have questions or concerns regarding this study, please contact the Investigator or Advisor. If you have any

questions, concerns, or reports regarding your rights as a research subject, please contact the IRB Administrator.

Investigator

Mitchel K. Holliday

hollidaym2003@my.uwstout.edu or 507-424-7469

Advisor

Dr. Debbie Stanislawski

stanislawskid@uwstout.edu or 715-232-3195

IRB Administrator

Elizabeth Buchanan

Office of Research and Sponsored Programs

152 Vocational Rehabilitation Bldg.

UW-Stout

Menomonie, WI 54751

715.232.2477

Buchanane@uwstout.edu

Page Break

Q1 What state restaurant association are you a member of?

- Wisconsin Restaurant Association (1)
 - Minnesota Restaurant Association (2)
-

Q2 Related to the hiring of Chef/Head Cook, Cook, Food Preparation Worker or Waiters/Waitress positions, how would you best describe your current responsibility level?

- Directly responsible for hiring or provide final approval of hiring (1)
 - Provide manager training on organizational hiring practices (2)
 - Have no responsibility related to hiring (3)
 - Other (4) _____
-

Q3 How would you best describe your current position within the restaurant industry?

- Restaurant Owner (1)
 - Restaurant Franchisee/Licensee (2)
 - Restaurant Manager (3)
 - Other (4) _____
-

Q4 What type of restaurant best represents your establishment(s)?

- Locally-owned, small business with only one site (1)
- Locally-owned business with multiple sites (2)
- Regional franchise/licensed (3)
- National franchise/licensed (4)
- Other (5) _____
-

Q5 In total, how many years have you worked in the food service sector in any position?

▼ 1 (1) ... 40+ (41)

Q6 In total, how many Chef/Head Cook, Cook, Food Preparation Worker, and Waiter/Waitress positions does your restaurant/do your restaurants have?

▼ 1 (1) ... 40+ (41)

Q7 What type of position would you most likely have an employment opening for at any given time?

- Chef/Head Cook (1)
- Cook (2)
- Food Preparation Worker (3)
- Waiter/Waitress (4)

Q8 Below are some examples of the types of training individuals with criminal backgrounds may have received. If an applicant had a criminal background and was applying for a Chef/Head Cook position (i.e. supervision and coordination of cooks, development of recipes and menu planning, monitoring of sanitation practices), please rank the following types of training you desire they would have received? (Please give numbers: 1 for your first choice, 2 for your second choice... and so on through 6)

- Food handler certificate (1)
 - Food protection manager certification (2)
 - Culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff (3)
 - Culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff in coordination with a college/university culinary arts program (4)
 - Food handler certificate or food protection manager certification received as part of a culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff (5)
 - Food handler certificate or food protection manager certification received as part of a culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff in coordination with a college/university culinary arts program (6)
-

Q9 Below are the same examples of the types of training individuals with criminal backgrounds may have received. If an applicant had a criminal background and was applying for a Cook position (i.e. prepares and cooks foods) please rank the following types of training you desire they would have received? (Please give numbers: 1 for your first choice, 2 for your second choice... and so on through 6)

- Food handler certificate (1)
 - Food protection manager certification (2)
 - Culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff (3)
 - Culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff in coordination with a college/university culinary arts program (4)
 - Food handler certificate or food protection manager certification received as part of a culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff (5)
 - Food handler certificate or food protection manager certification received as part of a culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff in coordination with a college/university culinary arts program (6)
-

Q10 Below are the same examples of the types of training individuals with criminal backgrounds may have received. If an applicant had a criminal background and was applying

for a Food Preparation Worker position, please rank the following types of training you desire they would have received? (Please give numbers: 1 for your first choice, 2 for your second choice... and so on through 6)

- _____ Food handler certificate (1)
 _____ Food protection manager certification (2)
 _____ Culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff (3)
 _____ Culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff in coordination with a college/university culinary arts program (4)
 _____ Food handler certificate or food protection manager certification received as part of a culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff (5)
 _____ Food handler certificate or food protection manager certification received as part of a culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff in coordination with a college/university culinary arts program (6)
-

Q11 Below are the same examples of the types of training individuals with criminal backgrounds may have received. If an applicant had a criminal background and was applying for a Waiter/Waitress position, please rank the following types of training you desire they would have received? (Please give numbers: 1 for your first choice, 2 for your second choice... and so on through 6)

- _____ Food handler certificate (1)
 _____ Food protection manager certification (2)
 _____ Culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff (3)
 _____ Culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff in coordination with a college/university culinary arts program (4)
 _____ Food handler certificate or food protection manager certification received as part of a culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff (5)
 _____ Food handler certificate or food protection manager certification received as part of a culinary training provided by prison/jail food service staff in coordination with a college/university culinary arts program (6)
-

Q12 How beneficial would you rate the overall importance of having a food handler certificate for any applicant in the following positions

	Not important at all (1)	Of little importance (2)	Of average importance (3)	Very important (4)	Absolutely important (5)
Chef/Head Cook (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cook (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Food Preparation Worker (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Waiter/Waitress (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q13 How beneficial would you rate the overall importance of having a food protection manager certification for any applicant in the following positions:

	Not important at all (1)	Of little importance (2)	Of average importance (3)	Very important (4)	Absolutely important (5)
Chef/Head Cook (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cook (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Food Preparation Worker (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Waiter/Waitress (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q15 For each of the following positions, please rate how likely or unlikely you would be to hire someone who has obtained a food handler certificate.

	Extremely unlikely (1)	Unlikely (2)	Neutral (3)	Likely (4)	Extremely likely (5)	Do not have this position (6)
Chef/Head Cook (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cook (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Food Preparation Worker (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Waiter/Waitress (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q16 For each of the following positions, please rate how likely or unlikely you would be to hire someone who has obtained a food protection manager certification.

	Extremely unlikely (1)	Unlikely (2)	Neutral (3)	Likely (4)	Extremely likely (5)	Do not have this position (6)
Chef/Head Cook (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cook (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Food Preparation Worker (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Waiter/Waitress (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q17 For each of the following positions, please rate how likely or unlikely you would be to hire someone **with** a criminal background who has not obtained a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification.

	Extremely unlikely (1)	Unlikely (2)	Neutral (3)	Likely (4)	Extremely likely (5)	Do not have this position (6)
Chef/Head Cook (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cook (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Food Preparation Worker (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Waiter/Waitress (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q18 For each of the following positions, please rate how likely or unlikely you would be to hire someone **with** a criminal background who has obtained a food handler certificate.

	Extremely unlikely (1)	Unlikely (2)	Neutral (3)	Likely (4)	Extremely likely (5)	Do not have this position (6)
Chef/Head Cook (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cook (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Food Preparation Worker (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Waiter/Waitress (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q19 For each of the following positions, please rate how likely or unlikely you would be to hire someone **with** a criminal background who has obtained a food protection manager certification.

	Extremely unlikely (1)	Unlikely (2)	Neutral (3)	Likely (4)	Extremely likely (5)	Do not have this position (6)
Chef/Head Cook (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cook (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Food Preparation Worker (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Waiter/Waitress (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q20 Aside from a food handler certificate or food protection manager certification, what additional certificates, certifications, or training would you desire an individual with a criminal background have? Why?

Q21 I would be comfortable with my staff working with an individual with a criminal background?

- Strongly agree (1)
 - Somewhat agree (2)
 - Neither agree nor disagree (3)
 - Somewhat disagree (4)
 - Strongly disagree (5)
-

Q22 I believe employees in my organization would be comfortable working with an individual with a criminal background?

- Strongly agree (1)
 - Somewhat agree (2)
 - Neither agree nor disagree (3)
 - Somewhat disagree (4)
 - Strongly disagree (5)
-

Q23 Have you previously hired someone with a known criminal background into the following positions?

	Yes (1)	No (2)	Do not know (3)	Do not have this position (4)
Chef/Head Cook (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cook (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Food Preparation Worker (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Waiter/Waitress (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q24 If Yes, what considerations impacted your hiring decision? If No, what type of correctional or restaurant association training or programming would potentially influence your future decisions? Why?

Q25 What is your gender?

- Male (1)
 - Female (2)
 - Nonbinary (3)
 - I prefer not to disclose (4)
-

Q26 What is your age?

▼ 18 (1) ... 100 (83)

Q27 What is your ethnicity?

- African American/Black (1)
- American Indian / Alaska Native (2)
- Asian (3)
- White (4)
- Hispanic (any race) (5)
- Native Hawaiian / or other Pacific Islander (6)
- Two or more races (7)
- Other (8)

Appendix E: Follow-Up Survey Request Email

Dear Restaurant Association Member,

One week ago, I asked you to participate in a survey regarding the attitudes of restaurant association members towards hiring individuals who have a criminal background. Thank you to those of you who have responded. If you have yet to respond, your valuable opinion and insight would be greatly appreciated to potentially assist correctional administration in development or expansion of food service related training programs to better equip individuals with criminal backgrounds to productively serve in the high demand food service sector.

Below is a link to a survey that will be available through March 11th, 2018, and will provide additional information about this research project and survey.

Please click this link to begin the survey or copy and paste the URL into your internet browser:

https://uwstout.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_0BruQla3YfUFkuV

Your participation in this survey is greatly appreciated. Thank you in advance for your support.

Mitchel Holliday

University of Wisconsin-Stout

Email: hollidaym2003@my.uwstout.edu

Phone: 715-563-0650

Appendix F: Desired Training Idea Response: Sample Breakdown

Text Response	Unique Statement(s)	Identification of Theme	Concept
<p>I would be more interested in the work ethic and willingness to have on the job experience more so than any certificate. That being said I believe by obtaining one or any of these certificates also exemplifies that the potential employee has taken measures to better themselves and their future employers for employment.</p>	<p>Interested in the work ethic</p> <p>On the job experience</p>	<p>Work Ethic</p> <p>Experience</p>	<p>Professional</p> <p>Professional</p>
<p>Some experience in the food service business is always welcome. Customer service in other areas is also a consideration--pending a reference check.</p>	<p>Experience in the food</p> <p>Customer service in other areas</p>	<p>Experience</p> <p>Customer Service</p>	<p>Professional</p> <p>Professional</p>
<p>Communication and social skills training-need to be able to work closely with others in a very confident and non-threatening atmosphere.</p>	<p>Communication and social skills training</p>	<p>Communication</p> <p>Social Skills</p>	<p>Interpersonal</p> <p>Interpersonal</p>

Appendix G: Considerations Impacting Hiring Decisions Response: Sample Breakdown

Text Response	Unique Statement(s)	Identification of Theme	Concept
Experience in the industry, type of crime committed by the individual, recency and repetition of the crime(s)	Experience in the industry	Work experience	Professional background
	Type of crime committed	Offense history	Criminal history
	Recency of crime	Recency of offense	Criminal history
	Repetition of crime(s)	Repetition of crime(s)	Criminal history
Personality, work ethic and honesty about their situations.	Personality	Personality	Personal characteristics
	Work ethic	Willing/ability to work	Professional Background
	Honesty about their situation	Honesty about offense history	Criminal Background
It would depend on the type of history. Drugs or child related criminals would be difficult to put in with my staff. Especially the underage employees	Type of crime committed	Offense history	Criminal background